

University of St Andrews



Full metadata for this thesis is available in
St Andrews Research Repository
at:

<http://research-repository.st-andrews.ac.uk/>

This thesis is protected by original copyright

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

by

F. A. Gosling.

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

1992



I should like to express my thanks to Mr Peter W. Coxon 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, 1967, No 1 (as amended), and is qualified to submit this thesis in application for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Signature of supervisor

(b) I was admitted as a research student under Ordinance 350 (general No. 12) on 1st October 1989 and as a candidate for the degree of Ph.D. under Resolution of the University Court, 1967, No. 1 (as amended) on 1st October 1989 .

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 Mr Peter W. Coxon.

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 establish that there is a definitive syntax of Hebrew poetry and that this syntax is best illustrated by the use of tense in poetry.

The two introductory chapters review critically the works of those scholars who have made a contribution to this area and to discuss the language of the book of Job.

The third chapter examines the use of the imperfect consecutive and notes that its use is to denote the concept of consequence as well as acting as an emphatic construction.

The fourth chapter considers the role of the imperfect conjunctive and notes that it is also used to express the concept of consequence as well as being a simple copulative. It is also used to indicate the dependant verb after the optative construction $\int\aleph' \text{ } \text{'}\aleph$.

In the fifth chapter the role of the simple imperfect is examined and is found to be the tense of discourse which expresses various kinds of religious language such as prayer and lament.

The role of the perfect consecutive/conjunctive is examined in the sixth chapter and it is also used to denote the concept of consequence

as well as being used in a copular sense. It is also used as an emphatic construction and in one instance only to indicate a change of subject.

The seventh chapter examines the role of the simple perfect. The chapter shows that it has a definitive stative usage as well as being used to denote distress in the songs of lamentations. It is also used as an alternate tense to the imperfect and expresses the concept of consequence.

The final chapter provides a summary and conclusion.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface

Abbreviations

Bibliography

Chapter One -----The Position of Syntax in the Discussion	p 1
Chapter Two -----The Language of the Book of Job	p 41
Chapter Three ---The Use of the Imperfect Consecutive	p 86
Chapter Four ----The Use of the Imperfect Conjunctive	p 174
Chapter Five ----The Use of the Imperfect	p 276
Chapter Six ----The Use of the Perfect Conjunctive	p 383
Chapter Seven ---The Use of the Perfect	p 437
Chapter Eight ---Conclusions	p 528

PREFACE

It has often been expressed that one of the most urgent needs in the field of Hebrew syntax is that of a syntax of Hebrew poetry; this work seeks to meet a small but vital part of that need.

At the beginning of chapter three the method which I have employed was noted, namely, that in the book of Job (Ch 3.1-20.29; 32.1-37.24; & 38.1-42.6) every verbal form to which the category of tense may be applied has been noted and numbered. In this connection it should be noted that for reasons of space this study has had to be restricted to the above named chapters and they have been chosen because it seemed appropriate to deal with the tenses as they occurred in the Job dialogue, the Elihu speeches and the Divine speeches. The numbering system thus used has aided easy identification when the varying forms were grouped together in categories of tense (imperfect consecutive etc.) which in themselves constitute the chapters of this study. In every chapter each form was examined by citing its respective context and showing how it fitted in to the genre of the speech. At this stage any textual emendations which were relevant to the work were noted and evaluated. It was from this basic exegetical work that the syntax of the various categories was evolved.

Every section is begun by a reference to the relevant number or numbers and this is followed 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. 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 syntactic point of view. In methodology, the work has taken its inspiration from the earlier study of Michel: Tempora und Satzstellung in den Psalmen Bonn 1961; but the approach and interpretation are my own. Each chapter has been given its own conclusion and for convenience these are also repeated and expanded in the final chapter which provides a summary and conclusion.

In the first chapter I intensely disagreed with Michel because of his reluctance to use cognate languages in the evaluation of tense in the book of Psalms. My original intention had been to use Ugaritic by way of comparison, but space has precluded this necessary evaluation which will have to await a later work. Nevertheless, reference has been made to Ugaritic and to a number of scholars who have worked in this area such as:

- T. L. Fenton: The Ugaritic Verbal System (unpublished Ph. D.) 1963
- D. I. Marcus: Aspects of the Ugaritic Verb in the Light of Comparative Semitic Grammar (unpublished Ph. D.) 1970.

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

- A. B. Davidson: Hebrew Syntax (3rd edition) 1901.
- S. R. Driver: Hebrew Tenses (3rd edition) 1892
- GKC: Hebrew Grammar (28th edition) 1910

as well as to the latest work in Hebrew Syntax:

- B. Waltke &
M. O'Connor: Hebrew Syntax (1st edition) 1990.

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 syntax of Hebrew poetry. 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. In addition to the above mentioned works, reference has also been made to the work of

the Dahoodian school in the person of:

A. C. M. Blommerde: Northwest Semitic Grammar and Job 1969.

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 the use of tense in Hebrew poetry and consequently only a few references are to be found to such articles in the body of the work.

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

BASOR	Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research
BA	Beiträge zur Assyriologie und semitischen Sprachwissenschaft
BDB	Brown-Driver-Briggs, A Hebrew and English Lexicon
BHK	Biblia Hebraica, 3rd edition
BHS	Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia
Bibl	Biblica
CBQ	Catholic Biblical Quarterly
ExpT	Expository Times
G	The Septuagint
GKC	Gesenius-Kautzsch-Cowley, Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar
HEB	Hebraica

HUCA	Hebrew Union College Annual
ICC	International Critical Commentary
JANES	Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society of Columbia University
JAOS	Journal of the American Oriental Society
JB	Jerusalem Bible
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature
JCS	Journal of Cuneiform Studies
JETS	Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society
JNES	Journal of Near Eastern Studies
JNSL	Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages
JPS	Jewish Publication Society Version
JQR	Jewish Quarterly Review
JRAS	Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society

JSL	Journal of Sacred literature
JSS	Journal of Semitic Studies
JTS	Journal of Theological 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
OL	Orientalistische Literaturzeitung
OR	Orientalia

PFWCJS	Proceedings of the Fifth World Congress of Jewish Studies
PICSS	Proceedings of the International Conference on Semitic Studies
RQum	Revue de Qumran
REB	Revised English Bible
RSV	Revised Standard Version
RV	Revised Version
SOTS	Society for Old Testament Study
Symm	Symmachus
Syr	Syriac Peshitta
Targ	Targum--various editions
TCOT	Tyndale Commentary of the Old Testament
Theod	Theodotion
UF	Ugarit Forschungen

VT	Vetus Testamentum
VTS	Supplements to Vetus Testamentum
Vulg	Vulgate
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
ZAW	Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
ZDMG	Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft
ZS	Zeitschrift für Semitistik und verwandte Gebiete

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aistleitner, J. Untersuchungen zur Grammatik des Ugaritischen
1954
- Alden. R.L. 'Chiastic Psalms: A study in the mechanics of
Semitic poetry in Psalms 1-50.'
1974 JETS vol 17/1
- Althann, R. Philological analysis of Jer 4-6 in the light
of Northwest Semitic
1983
- Andersen, F.I. The Hebrew Verbless clause in the Pentateuch
1970
- ibid Job TCOT 1976
- ibid The Sentence in Biblical Hebrew
1980
- Ballantyne, W.G. 'Suggestions toward a more exact nomenclature
and definition of the Hebrew Tenses'
1885 Heb vol 2 pp53-55.
- Barr, J. Comparative Philology and the Text of the Old
Testament.
1983
- Battle, J.H. Syntactic Structures in the Masoretic Hebrew
Text of the Psalms.
Unpublished Ph.D. Diss. University of Texas
1969.
- Bauer, H. 'Die Tempora im Semitischen'
1910 BA vol 8/1 pp1-53.
- Bauer, H. &
Leander, P. Grammatik des Biblisch Aramäischen
1927.
- ibid Historische Grammatik der Hebräischen Sprache
des Alten Testament. Vol 1.
1962
- Begrich, J. 'Der Satzstic im Funfer'
1933/34 ZS vol 9 pp169-209.

- Bennett, W. H. 'Notes on the use of the Hebrew Tenses'
1885/86 Heb vol 2 pp 193-208, vol 3 pp22-29, & vol 5 pp 202-204.
- Bergsträsser, G. Hebräische Grammatik
Vols 1 & 2. 1962
- ibid Introduction to the Semitic Languages
1983
- Berlin, A. 'Grammatical Aspects of Biblical Parallelism'
1979 HUCA L pp17-43
- Beyer, K. Althebräische Grammatik
1969.
- ibid 'Althebräische Syntax in Prosa un Posie'
1971 in Tradition und Glaube (K. G. Kuhn Festschrift) pp 76-96.
- ibid Die Aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer
1984.
- Blake, F. R. 'The Hebrew Waw Conversive'
1944 JBL vol 63 pp 271-295.
- ibid A Resurvey of the Hebrew Tenses
1951
- Blau, J. 'Studies in Hebrew Verb Formation'
1971 HUCA vol 42 pp 133-158.
- ibid Grammar of Biblical Hebrew
1976.
- ibid 'Hebrew and Northwest Semitic: Reflections on the classification of the Semitic Languages'.
1978 Hebrew Annual Review vol 2 pp 21-44.
- Blommerde, A. C. M. Northwest Semitic Grammar and Job
1969.
- Boadt, L. Ezekiel's oracles against Egypt
1980.
- Bobzin, H. Die Tempora im Hiobdialog
1974.
- Boling, R. G. Synonymous Parallelism in the Book of Psalms
Unpublished Ph.D. Diss Johns Hopkin's University 1959.

- Borger, R. Babylonian-Assyrische Lesestücke
Vols 1 & 2 1979.
- Bornemann, R. E. Verbal Parallelism in Ugaritic and Biblical Poetry
Unpublished Ph.D. Diss Dropsie University
1970.
- Brockelmann, C. Hebraische Syntax
1956.
- Brown, F., Driver, S. R., & Briggs, C. A. Hebrew & English Lexicon of the Old Testament
1951.
- Burney, C. F. Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Kings
1903.
- ibid 'A Fresh Examination of the Current Theory of the Hebrew Tenses'
1919 JTS vol 20 pp 200-214.
- Buttenweiser, M. 'The Importance of the Tenses for the Interpretation of the Psalms'
1925 HUCA Jubilee Volume pp 89-111.
- Calderone, P. J. 'HDL 2 in Poetic Texts'
1961 CBQ vol 23 pp 451-460.
- Cathcart, K. J. Nahum in the light of Northwest Semitic
1973.
- Ceresko, A. R. Job 29-31 in the light of Northwest Semitic
1980.
- Clines, D. J. A. Job 1-20 WBC Vol 17
1990.
- Cooper, A. M. Biblical Poetics
Unpublished Ph.D. Diss Yale University 1976.
- Craigie, P. C. Ugarit and the Old Testament
1983.
- Cross, F. M. & Freedman, D. N. Studies in Ancient Jahwistic Poetry
1975.
- Dahood, M. Proverbs and Northwest Semitic Philology
1963.
- ibid & Penar, T. 'Grammar of the Hebrew Psalter'
in--Psalms vol 3 Anchor Bible 1979.

- Dalman, G. Grammatik des Jüdisch-Palästinischen Aramäisch
1897.
- Davidson, A. B. Commentary on Job
Vol 1 1862.
- ibid Hebrew Syntax
third edition 1896.
- Delitzsch, F. Commentary on the Old Testament
Job 1866.
- Delitzsch, Fried. Das Buch Hiob 1902.
- Dhorme, E. Commentary on the book of Job.
English Translation 1967.
- Driver, G. R. Problems of the Hebrew Verbal System
1936.
- ibid 'Problems of Semitic Grammar'
1937 ZDMG vol 91 pp343-351.
- ibid 'Problems in the Hebrew text of Job'
1955 VTS 3 pp 72-93.
- ibid 'Some uses of QTL in the Semitic Languages'
1969--in--Proceedings of the International
Conference on Semitic Studies. pp 49-64.
- Driver, S. R. Hebrew Tenses
third edition 1892.
- ibid Introduction to the Literature of the Old
Testament
1913.
- ibid & ICC Job
Gray, G. B. 1921.
- Elliger, K. & Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia
Rudolph, W. 1984.
- Ewald, G. H. A. Ausführliches Lehrbuch der Hebräischen
Sprache des Alten testament
eighth edition 1870.
- ibid The Book of Job
1882.
- ibid Syntax of the Hebrew Language
1891.

- Fensham, F.C. 'The use of the Suffix Conjugation and the Prefix Conjugation in a Few Old Hebrew Poems' 1978 JNSL vol 6 pp 9-18.
- Fenton, T.L. Ugaritic Verbal System
Unpublished Ph.D. Diss University of Oxford
1963.
- ibid 'The Absence of the Verbal Formation YAQATTAL from Ugaritic and Northwest Semitic' 1970 JSS vol 15 pp 31-41.
- ibid 'The Hebrew Tenses in the Light of Ugaritic' 1973 PFWCJS vol 4 pp 31-39.
- Freedman, D.N. Pottery, Poetry and Prophecy
1980.
- Galbraith, J.A. Quantitative Analysis of the Parallelistic Structures in Hebrew Poetry
Unpublished Ph.D. Diss Boston University
1981
- Geller, S. Parallelism in Early Biblical Poetry
1979.
- Gesenius, W. Hebrew Grammar
second English edition revised by A. E. Cowley
1910.
- Gevirtz, S. Patterns in the Early Poetry of Israel.
1963.
- Goetze, A. 'The Tenses of Ugaritic'
1938 JAOS vol 58 pp 266-309.
- Gordis, R. The Book of God and Man
1965.
- ibid The Book of Job
1978.
- Gordon, C.H. Ugaritic Textbook
1965.
- Goshen-Gottstein, M.H. 'The System of Verbal Stems in the Classical Semitic Languages'
1969--in--Proceedings of the International Conference on Semitic Studies pp 70-91.
- Grabbe, L.L. Comparative Philology and the text of Job.
1977.

- Gray, G. B. The Forms of Hebrew Poetry
1915.
- Gross, W. Verbform + Funktion WAYYIQTOL für die Gegenwart
1976.
- 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
1968.
- Hammershaimb, E. Das Verbum im Dialekt von Ras Shamra
1941.
- ibid 'On the So-Called Infinitivus Absolutus in Hebrew'
1963--in--Hebrew and Semitic Studies
presented to G.R.Driver pp 85-94.
- Harris, Z. G. Grammar of the Phoenician Language
1936.
- Held, M. 'The YQTL-QTL (QTL-YQTL) Sequence of Identical Verbs in Biblical Hebrew and Ugaritic'
1962--in--Studies and Essays in honour of Abraham A. Neuman pp 281-290.
- ibid 'The Action-Result (factitive-passive) Sequence of Identical Verbs in Biblical Hebrew and Ugaritic'
1965 JBL vol 84 pp 272-282.
- Hetzron, R. 'The Evidence for Perfect YAQTUL and Jussive YAQTUL in Proto-Semitic'
1969 JSS vol 14 pp 1-21.
- Hillers, D. R. 'Observations On Syntax and Meter in Lamentations'
1974--in--A Light unto My Path (J. Myers Festschrift) pp 265-270.
- Hoftijzer, J. The Function and Use of the Imperfect Forms with Nun Paragogicum in Classical Hebrew
1985.
- Holladay, W. L. Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament
1971.
- Huesman, J. 'Finite uses of the Infinitive Absolute'
1956 Bibl vol 37 pp 271-295.

- ibid 'The Infinitive Absolute and the Waw + Perfect Problem'
1956 Bibl vol 37 pp 410-434.
- Hughes, J. A. Some Problems of the Hebrew Verbal System with particular reference to the use of the Tenses
Unpublished Ph.D. Diss University of Glasgow
1962.
- ibid 'Another Look at the Hebrew Tenses'
1970 JNES vol 29 pp 12-24.
- Irwin, W. H. Isaiah 28-33 Translation with Philological Notes
1977.
- ibid 'Syntax and Style in Isaiah 26'
1979 CBQ vol 41 pp 240-261.
- Johns, A. F. Short Grammar of Biblical Aramaic
1982.
- Johnson, Bo. Hebräisches Perfekt und Imperfekt mit Vorangehendem 1
1979.
- Jouon, P. Grammaire de L'Hebreu Biblique
1923.
- Krasovec, J. Antithetic Structure in Biblical Hebrew Poetry
1984.
- Kugel, J. L. The Idea of Biblical Poetry
1981.
- Kutscher, E. Y. History of the Hebrew Language
1982.
- Lambdin, T. O. Introduction to Biblical Hebrew
1971.
- Liddell, H. G. & Scott, R. Greek-English Lexicon
ninth edition 1982.
- Lisowsky, G. Konkordanz zum Hebräischen Alten Testament
1958.
- McDaniel, T. Deborah Never Sang
1983.

- McFall, L. Enigma of the Hebrew Verbal System
1982.
- Marcus, D. 'The Stative and the Waw Consecutive'
1969 JANE vol 2 pp 37-40.
- Marcus, I. D. Aspects of the Ugaritic Verb in the light of Semitic Grammar
Unpublished Ph.D. Diss Columbia University
1970.
- Mettinger, T. N. D. 'The Hebrew Verb System--A Survey of Recent Research'
1974 Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute vol 9 pp 64-84.
- Meyer, R. Hebraische Grammatik Vols 1-4
1959-1972.
- Michel, D. Tempora und Satzstellung in den Psalmen
1960.
- Moran, W. L. A Syntactical Study of the Dialect of Byblos as Reflected in the Amarna Tablets
Unpublished Ph.D. Diss Johns Hopkin's University
1950.
- Moscatti, S. Introduction to the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages
1980.
- Muller, A. Outlines of Hebrew Syntax
1888.
- Muraoka, T. Emphatic Words and Structures in Biblical Hebrew
1985.
- Niccacci, A. Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose
1990.
- Nöldeke, T. Compendious Syriac Grammar
second edition 1904.
- O'Connor, M. Hebrew Verse Structure
1980.
- Penar, T. Northwest Semitic Philology and the Hebrew Fragments of Ben Sira.
1975.

- Polzin, R. Typology of Biblical Hebrew Prose
1976.
- Pope, M. H. Job--Anchor Bible
1982.
- Proulx, D. Ugaritic Verse Structure and the Poetic
Syntax of Proverbs
Unpublished Ph.D. Diss Johns Hopkin's
University 1956.
- Ralphs, A. Septuaginta
Vols 1 & 2
1982.
- Robertson, D. A. Linguistic Evidence in Dating Early Hebrew
Poetry
1972.
- Robinson, T. H. Paradigms and Exercises in Syriac Grammar
Fourth Edition revised by L. H. Brockington
1981.
- Rosen, H. B. 'On the Use of the Tenses in the Aramaic of
Daniel'
1961 JSS vol 6 pp 183-203.
- ibid 'The Comparative Assignment of Certain Hebrew
Tense Forms'
1984--in--East & West: Selected Writings in
Linguistics 2 pp 229-251.
- Rosenthal, F. Grammar of Biblical Aramaic
1974.
- Rowley, H. H. The Book of Job.
1980.
- Rowton, M. B. 'The Use of the Permissive in Classic
Babylonian'
1962 JNES vol 21 pp 233-308.
- Rubenstein, A. 'A Finite Verb continued by an Infinitive
Absolute in Biblical Hebrew'
1952 VT vol 2 pp 362-367.
- ibid 'The Anomalous Perfect with the Waw
Conjunctive in Biblical Hebrew'
1963 Bibl vol 44 pp 62-69.
- Sappan, R. The Typical Features of the Syntax of
Biblical Poetry
1981.

- Sawyer, J. F. A. Modern Introduction to Biblical Hebrew
1976.
- Saydon, P. P. 'The Inceptive Imperfect in Hebrew and the
Verb לָחַל 'to begin''
1954 Bibl vol 35 pp 43-50.
- ibid 'The Use of the Tenses in Deutero-Isaiah'
1959 Bibl vol 40 pp 290-301.
- Schmidt, J. Studien zur Stilistik der Alttestamentlichen
Spruchliteratur.
1936.
- Segert, S. Basic Grammar of the Ugaritic Language
1984.
- ibid Grammar of Phoenician and Punic
1976.
- Sokoloff, M. The Targum to Job
1974.
- Stevenson, W. B. Grammar of Palestinian Jewish Aramaic
1924.
- Strahan, J. The Book of Job.
1913.
- Stuart, D. K. Studies in Early Hebrew Meter
1976.
- Thacker, G. W. Relationship of the Semitic and Egyptian
Verbal Systems
1954.
- Thomson, D. L. The Order of Adverbial Modifiers in Genesis &
Proverbs: A Study in the Syntax of Hebrew
Poetry
Unpublished Ph. D. Diss Johns Hopkin's
University 1973.
- Tsevat, M. Language of the Biblical Psalms
1954.
- Tur-Sinai, N. H. The Book of Job
1967.
- De Vries, S. J. 'The Syntax of the Tenses and Interpretation
in the Hodayot'
1964 RQUM vol 3 pp 375-414.

- Waltke/O' Connor Biblical Hebrew Syntax
1990.
- Watson, W. G. E. Classical Hebrew Poetry
1984.
- Weingreen, J. Hebrew Grammar
second edition 1978.
- Westermann, C. The Structure of the Book of Job
1981.
- Williams, R. J. Hebrew Syntax
second edition 1976.
- Wright, W. Lectures on the Comparative Grammar of the
Semitic Languages
1890.
- Yoder, P. B. Fixed Word Pairs and the Composition of
Hebrew
Poetry
Unpublished Ph.D. Diss University of
Pennsylvania 1970.
- Young, G. D. 'Origin of the Waw-Consecutive'
1953 JNES vol 12 pp 248-252.
- Zuber, B. Das Tempussystem des Biblischen Hebräisch
1985.

Chapter One

The Position of Syntax in the Discussion

In this work, it will be demonstrated that there is a definite syntax of poetry and that this unusual syntax may be seen in the use of tense in poetry. There are, of course, other ingredients to this syntax, such as the use of prepositions and particles etc., but this study will concern itself with the use of tense in poetry, since it is in the use of tense that the major deviation from prose may be clearly demonstrated. This introductory chapter will look at the place that syntax has already played in this discussion. The major writers on Hebrew syntax who have neglected this area will be noted as well as those who have entered into it. This exercise will be limited to those scholars who have said something about the use of tense in Hebrew poetry. This chapter, then, lays the foundation of all that is to follow on the use of tense as it may be seen in the book of Job.

That the poetic language of the Old Testament was different from that of the prose language was long ago recognised by Cowley in his revision of Gesenius where he stated:

' To the syntax belongs the far more sparing use of the article, of the relative pronoun, of the accusative particle ל ; the construct state even before prepositions; the shortened imperfect with the same meaning as the ordinary form; the wider governing power of prepositions; and in general a forcible brevity of expression.' (1).

The Scottish master of Old Testament studies in the nineteenth century, A.B. Davidson, also noted that certain points of syntax were still obscure:

'Several points in Syntax are still involved in some obscurity, such as the use of the imperfect, and its interchange with other tenses, especially in poetry; and the use of the jussive, particularly in later writings.' (2).

For the purposes of the present study, it is interesting to note that the ingredient of syntax which Davidson has defined as obscure, is the use of tense especially as it is used in poetry. Now these two perceptive scholars noted these points before the discovery of Ugaritic at Ras Shamra, yet what they say is typical of the study of the Hebrew language in their day. In their day the deviations of poetic Hebrew from that of the prose language of the Old Testament were generally regarded and described as poetic licence. Thus the poetic language of the Old Testament is described by these 19th., century scholars as being marked by the omission of the prose particles such as the definite article, the relative pronoun, and the sign of the definite object $\eta\chi$. Yet, in truth the syntax of Hebrew poetry is more than just a mere omission of these particles, it is a language with a syntax in its own right. In this context it is true to say that the discovery of Ugaritic has normalized those parts of Hebrew syntax which used to be thought of as poetic licence.

However, it is nevertheless true to note in passing how few studies there are of Hebrew poetic syntax and, until recently, of Hebrew syntax in general. Beyond the rather obvious observation that poetic passages present unusual patterns and considerable 'freedom', little is said precisely about the patterns which as a matter of fact

do exist, the relation and interaction between Hebrew syntax and poetic style, and little regard has been given to the sequence of adverbial modifiers in Hebrew poetry. ⁴⁴ Jouon points out the importance of separating prose from poetry in syntactic analysis, but cautions that his Grammaire is based mostly on Hebrew prose, especially in Syntax. (3).

The treatments of Cowley and Brockelmann are typical in this respect of many other grammars since Gesenius. Cowley gives 'the natural order of words' in the verbal sentence and observes frequent variation for emphasis on any member of the sentence. The fact that poetic style (chiasm alone is mentioned) occasions a departure from prose patterns is relegated to brief footnotes. (4). Examples used in the description of word order are taken indiscriminately from prose and poetry alike. A paragraph specifically on poetic style notes poetic language to be characterized, among other things, by peculiar 'syntactical constructions', but offers no elaboration. (5).

Brockelmann, in his Hebräische Syntax, omitted a comprehensive treatment of the syntax of Hebrew Poetry and apparently made no effort to distinguish prose from poetry in the selection of examples to illustrate the several patterns taken up in sections on 'Die Wortfolge im Verbalsatz' and 'Die Wortfolge im bekleiden Satz' (6).

Since this is the case with those who have offered classical treatments of Hebrew Syntax it is now necessary to say a word on those who have broken with the tradition and have written albeit briefly on

the syntax of Hebrew poetry. One of the first to contribute a work in this field was D. Michel with his Tempora und Satzstellung in den Psalmen. This work appeared in 1960 in German but was never apparently reviewed by any British or American scholars, the result of which is that it was virtually unknown until the appearance of a recent work entitled Biblical Hebrew Syntax by Waltke and O'Connor (1990) in which his work is discussed on pages 470ff. Michel has restricted himself to two features of poetic syntax namely, the use of tense in poetry and that of sentence structure. In the introduction, he defends his thesis of looking at the tenses of poetry. In doing so he notes that all former grammatical investigations have been limited to that of the prose texts. :

"So far as we can see all grammatical investigations have been restricted to prose. Admittedly that is not expressly stated in any grammar to our knowledge, but can be concluded from the quotations and above all the results." (7).

He sees this way as leading to difficulties:

" In the case of Hebrew, however, one should not fail to recognize that this way leads to difficulties. In addition to the fact that sentence structures which seem very important in prose texts have little significance in poetry, according to the generally held opinion, it has to be pointed out also that, frequently, to lift the meaning of a verbal form from a prose text into poetry simply cannot be done". (8)

To do this, Michel argues, only leads to confusion and results in the opinion that:

" the Hebrew tenses in poetry are extraordinarily ambiguous." (9).

Because Michel believes that this is not the case he has produced his thesis. Indeed, he now formulates his basic assumption on the use of the Perfect and Imperfect:

"In principle it is as well to accept that every verbal form must have had its own significance. A language does not develop different verbal forms unless it wishes to express different meanings. And if a Language develops only two verb forms it can be taken that these two must express fundamentally different, perhaps even opposite, things." (10).

He now calls attention to a salient point in all work on the syntax of prose Hebrew tenses and that is that the prose texts of the Old Testament almost throughout claim to report past events. This is of fundamental importance for the work in which we are now engaged, as he states:

" If a text only reports past events, it is easy to say which of the tenses (Perfect and Imperfect consecutive) mainly occurring in it express a past or completed action. Since the difficulties in the meaning of the verbal forms sketched above occur, above all, when the texts do not report a past event (compare for example the Prophetic Perfect and the Declared Perfect), the question arises whether these difficulties might not have their cause in the fact that the prose texts, due to their character (historical reports), could only be used under strict conditions in throwing into relief the meaning of the tenses." (11).

It is this observation which caused him to conduct a survey of how the tenses are used in the Psalms, since the actions reported by them lie in all three stages of time. Thus the aim in his thesis is now

expressed, and it is that:

" we must examine the Psalms as though the meaning of the verbal forms occurring in them were completely unknown." (12).

This an exercise that he is doing on the basis of the text alone without any preconceived opinions. However Michel notes that his work is not free from assumptions. To begin with it is built on the results of the Form-Critics such as Gunkel and his school.

His second assumption is that he will not use the findings of Comparative Philology on the meaning of the Semitic Verbal forms.

Having completed a review of what Michel is doing in his work it is now time to offer a few criticisms upon it. To begin with one must applaud what Michel has achieved. In his work he has collated all the forms of the tenses as they occur in the book of Psalms. His work is divided into 6 parts. These six parts are 1 the Imperfect Consecutive, 2 the Perfect, 3 the Meaning of the Tenses with regard to the subjects of action, 4 the Imperfect, 5 Syntax of Clauses, & 6 Appendix. What these sections reveal is the extensive nature of his work. While appreciating the ground breaking effort which Michel has achieved it, has, nevertheless certain weaknesses. One of these is one of his acceptable assumptions, namely his use of the Form Critical school. The problem here is that he analyses his data with form-critical rigour; things mean what they are supposed to mean according

to the Gattung in which they occur. This has led to a lack of penetration into the deeper functions of syntax in poetic structure. This approach of solving the apparent use of the tenses by appeal to the genre of the Psalm is also an approach favoured by Prof J. C. L. Gibson (of New College, Edinburgh).

A second criticism which may be offered is on his non-use of Comparative Philology. In his introduction he stated that he would not use any approach by Comparative Philology because of his professed agnosticism towards the theories of Bauer and that of Brockelmann. Whilst not in disagreement with his insistence on allowing the text to speak for itself, it does seem that a balanced use of Comparative Semitic Philology, especially a recourse to Ugaritic, would have enhanced this work.

As was stated earlier Michel's work is notable for its systematic collection of the varying verbal forms used in every possible context. Following each of these collections is a summary of the meaning of the use of the respective tenses in poetry.

It would seem appropriate to turn in the first instance to his first section entitled The Imperfect Consecutive. In this section he considers the imperfect consecutive under the following subdivisions: 1 imperfect consecutive after perfect, 2 imperfect consecutive after imperfect, 3 chains of the imperfect consecutive, and 4 imperfect consecutive after noun clause, participle and infinitive. At the

end of this section Michel has formulated his conclusion where he states:

"In the preceding paragraphs it has been shown that the so-styled imperfect consecutive indicates a consequence; without, indeed, any reference to a period of time. Certainly the majority of passages used so far are to be translated in this way, but there remains a sizeable group which cannot be categorized into any time period." (13).

In his second section he considers the Perfect in the following sections: 1 the perfect in the portrayal of distress in the lamentations and songs of thanksgivings, 2 the perfect in reporting deliverance, 3 the perfect in the portrayal of past actions, 4 the perfect in the expression of pluperfect actions, 5 the perfect in the portrayal of present actions, 6 the perfect in the expression of future actions, 7 the declared perfect and 8 explanation by means of the perfect. I now turn to his summary of the Perfect and to his provisional description of the Perfect at the conclusion of section 2, subsection 14. There he states:

" In rendering the actions depicted by the perfect into German (or English) , it is necessary to make use of the pluperfect, past, present, and future states of time. There is no indication in Hebrew that a specific period of time is being referred to. In translating, the time period simply has to be inferred from the sense. This state of affairs admits of only one conclusion : THE PERFECT DOES NOT SERVE TO EXPRESS A STATE OF TIME." (14).

This leads Michel to the conclusion that:

" the Perfect reports an action which is dependant on nothing else: one which has its own significance." (15).

According to Michel this can be proved as follows:

"This can be demonstrated in three ways:

- 1) When a perfect is isolated, or stands at the beginning of a sentence, it confirms a fact.
- 2) When a perfect joins with an imperfect or a participle in syndeton or asyndeton, it does not take this further, but sets a fact of explication beside it.
- 3) When several unlinked perfects are in juxtaposition, they do not show progress in the action but list facts of equal import.

The first thing to be said about the imperfect is that it does none of these things, and, therefore, reports an action which is standing in some relationship." (16).

He now turns to consider the significance of the conjugations in view of the acting subject. After an in-depth consideration of Psalm 1 he provisionally advances his thesis:

"The actions typically expressed by perfects indicate facts which are enacted by a person who, however, in theory can also cause them to happen. The actions can be called typical, inasmuch as the person who performs them manifests thereby that he belongs to a particular kind of person. Had he done differently, he would have proved himself to belong to a different category of human being. The actions are not reported therefore from the standpoint of being consequential to the particular state of being of the person, but rather from the standpoint that they should first reveal this state of being. In brief: Actions designated by the perfect are of a chance nature, with regard to the person engaging in them.

On the other hand, in v3, the kind of tree is established at the outset: it is about a tree planted by the streams of water. That this tree brings forth its fruit in its season, that its leaves do not wither, are not things that it can do or cause to be done; rather are they the consequences which the nature of the tree entails.

In brief: As concerns the subject of the action, actions designated by the imperfect are material in character." (17).

Michel seeks to corroborate this provisional definition by a comprehensive study of the Psalter. Having arrived at this provisional definition on the use of the tenses in Poetry, he now turns his attention to that of the Imperfect in isolation.

His fourth section is entitled The Imperfect and is divided as follows: 1 the imperfect in the designation of a dependant action, 2 the negative consequence, 3 the so called poetic aorist, 4 the corresponding concurrence, 5 the modal use of the imperfect, 6 the imperfect in the statement of repeated actions, 7 the imperfect in the expression of desires, and 8 the imperfect after conjunctions.

He now formulates his summary as follows:

"Like the perfect, the imperfect also is not restricted in its use to any specific period of time. We therefore conclude the imperfect does not serve to express a state of time. Positively, the following can be stated: the imperfect reports an action which is dependent and which is not by itself significant and this can shown in the following manner:

- 1) The imperfect reports an occurring action as a consequence or as an aim.
- 2) If the action occurring should be particularly closely connected as the consequence of what has preceded it, the so-called consecutive form is used. The simple imperfect can, however, also be used.
- 3) Two imperfects standing one after the other at the beginning of the sentence as a rule expresses a corresponding occurrence.
- 4) If an action occurs as a consequence of the nature of the person engaging in it, or if the facts of the situation, the imperfect then

indicates a modal action, which is best expressed in English by one of the auxiliaries "can, will, let, may, must".

5) The substantial use of the imperfect is really only a special case of the modal use.

6) The imperfect serves to express recurring actions. this is comprehensible because, with a recurring action, it is not one actuality but an ever-new occurrence that is being reported.

7) The imperfect serves to express desire(jussive, cohortative, prohibitive). This is consistent with the other use; for an action which is commanded or forbidden is not by itself significant, but has the meaning through its association with the person giving the order." (18).

There is no doubt that we all stand in debt to Michel and his extensive work. He has laid a sound foundation for any one to build upon who desires to formulate a syntax of poetic Hebrew. Michel has clearly shown that the use of waw consecutive with the imperfect signifies consequence or dependence and this may be considered to be one of the genuine contributions of his work. When, however, the use of the other tenses is examined, his work is marked with flaws.

While in agreement with him that in poetic syntax the Perfect does not express a state of time, his findings in connection with the use of the Perfect in poetry are somewhat lacking. In trying to define the Perfect in the sense of independent action he has altogether missed the point of the special poetic nuances and uses of the tenses in poetry because his understanding of tense has been dominated by his philosophical presuppositions. Moreover he has failed to utilize the resources of Comparative Semitic Philology and in particular to consider the way the tenses are used in Ugaritic. Had such a route

been followed, it would have led to the discovery of the perfect's unique usage in Hebrew poetry. The same criticism may be levelled against his definition of the use of the imperfect, as that previously made against his definition of the perfect, namely that it conceals the way the Imperfect is used in poetry and it obscures the special nuance of poetic usage of the Imperfect. This is because of his philosophical presuppositions as noted above. Such poetic nuances can only be discovered by an examination of the way that the imperfect operates in the speeches of Job and his friends.

It also can be said the greatest strength of his work is at the same time its greatest weakness. Here reference is made to his extensive classification system of the tenses. For this classification system has meant that the qtl/yqtl use of tenses has not been considered by him. This has also meant that some of the forms have been dealt with outside of their own context. It can also be shown that his philosophical definition of the use of the tenses is faulty. This fact has been noted by Waltke/O'Connor as follows:

"His work contains flaws in its account of the prefix forms. It is not true that the conjugations present a philosophical contrast between situations that are accidental and factual and those that are substantial and less factual. Many actions represented by the wayyqtl construction signify self important, independent acts (cf the creation narrative, Gen 1.3ff.). Although the prefix conjugation sometimes represents "substantial" acts, acts which of necessity proceed from the subject, it does not always do so." (19).

A final criticism that may be made on his work is that it makes no

attempt to date the Psalms in any way whatsoever and so to consider the history of the language. While the dating of the Psalms is in itself a controversial topic, there are number of Psalms which most scholars would agree are archaic. Among these are Psalms 18 and 68 which show some points of contact with the archaic poetry of the Pentateuch such as Genesis 49 and Exodus 15. It would then have been better if Michel had treated these Psalms differently and tried to plot a historical development in the tenses used in the archaic poetry from those used in some of the later Psalms.

While offering these criticisms it has to be stressed that Michel has truly produced a remarkable and original study which has not received the attention it deserves and remains the only textbook available today on the subject.

Michel's work has however, largely gone unnoticed in this country but it is of course well known in his native land of Germany. A study which has taken notice of his work is that of Verbform + Funktion. Wayyiqtol Für Die Gegenwart (1976) by W. Gross, whose subtitle is Ein Beitrag zur Syntax Poetischer Althebräischer Schriften. In his work he offers the following criticism of Michel's work:

" How can this wrong be remedied? (the wrong of not understanding the use of the tenses in poetry) Certainly not by analysing the relevant, highly complicated texts as a whole, and trying thereby to solve all the problems at the same time. That this is not possible is shown by Michel's investigation, in which he sought to elucidate, at a stroke, the syntax of all 150 Psalms --- deliberately disregarding in the process results obtained from prose --- and, due

to the superabundant material, was consequently not able to offer even the one essential premise for such an attempt at interpretation: namely, a complete inventory of the distinct units of expression used, and their formal opposites." (20).

In Ch 1 of his work Gross subjects Michel's work to severe and penetrating criticism, but since it is not the object of this study to discuss the interaction between various scholars and their respective works, that discussion will be passed over for the moment. When Gross' work first appeared it was reviewed by J. A. Emerton in the S. O. T. S Booklist who wrote:

" This work discusses whether the waw consecutive with the imperfect can be used of the present. It makes use of the distinction between the uses of the verb in individual and general senses. After an introduction and summary of previous work on the subject, there is an examination of the various uses of the waw consecutive with the imperfect that have been understood by many to refer to the present. It is argued that this form of the verb is normally used of individual actions in the past, and can be used in a perfective sense. It can be used of the present in a general sense only in certain circumstances, and not in an individual sense except with certain types of verb (e. g. verbs denoting mental or emotional states). This is not an easy book to read, but it is a substantial contribution to the study of the Hebrew verbal system." (21).

With Emerton's review in mind Gross' work will now be critically examined. Gross makes the point that his present work has grown from a former study of the so-called Apocalypse of Isaiah, Isaiah 24-27. In his view, this text is well placed regarding the verb functions vis-a vis the greatest of the problems. In chapter 24 especially, x-qatal, wayyiqtol, w=qatal-x, qatal-x, x-yiqtol, seem to be used for the same functions. In so doing Gross notes that the current state of research has failed to provide an adequate explanation for

this seeming contradictory usage of tense, especially in Hebrew Poetry.

This he does by a quote from Bergsträsser:

"In poetry, above all the later poetry, a further extension of the ways of using the present and future connotations of the perfect led to a complete intermingling of the distinctions in meaning of the tenses, and to a promiscuous use, without any rules, of all the indicators of tense (including the perfect consecutive, the imperfect consecutive and also the noun clause) in the present and future senses ----- for this reason it is often difficult to establish which time state is really meant." (22).

Gross is not impressed by that particular explanation and applies to it the following comment:

"a syntactically bankrupt explanation"!

He further notes that this has led to characteristic reactions among the commentators and names Duhm and Rudolph among those who have failed to do justice to the syntax of tenses as used in poetry; as a result their translations have led to the original meaning being obscured. By so doing Gross rejects the commonly held opinion that in poetry, especially late poetry, all the verb forms can be used to express the present. Building on his examination of the 'promiscuous use' of the tenses in poetry whose meaning is obscure, he tries to find a form whose meaning is unambiguous. He does so in the following words:

" Thus a form must be sought as a first step, which is unambiguous (at least in Masoretic), which does not, as far as possible, fulfil different functions in different positions in the sentence, and which

is, as far as possible, conclusively established in its function. There is a well known verb-form in prose which satisfies these conditions: wayyiqtol. Wayyiqtol is morphologically unequivocal: wa + short form of conjugational prefix. It must be placed first in the clause. It indicates almost exclusively particular circumstances in the past, especially when used as a narrative form, and, almost without exception, progress." (23).

In syntax too, Gross notes that its position is unequivocal. It is for these reasons that Gross has chosen wayyiqtol as a subject clearly capable of delineation. He has also taken as a basis for the investigation those clauses in which wayyiqtol is intended to establish circumstances in the present, contrary to prose, according to the evidence of relevant Hebrew grammars from Bottcher to Bergsträsser. In doing so he notes that the the examples which the aforesaid Hebrew grammarians use derive almost exclusively from poetic texts.

This then is the ground of his investigation. An outline of what he intends to do in his work is provided by Gross towards the end of his introduction. This is now quoted in full:

"First of all, wayyiqtol is examined after the interrogative noun clause with mah/mi. With the help of the concordance all the examples of the opposition-forms can quickly be found. This section will prove above all the necessity of taking serious cognizance of the multiplicity of turns of phrase in Hebrew and of the distinctions between them in syntax as well. In the next part, wayyiqtol after a participle, the problems especially are clearly revealed, since the participle hardly has the capacity to contribute supporting facts for a definition of the following wayyiqtol. The chapter on wayyiqtol after a conjugational suffix states the results already achieved and underpins first and foremost the use of wayyiqtol in perfective circumstances and in lessons learned from experience. The chapter following, wayyiqtol after a conjugational prefix, contains the cases which are the most problematical, on account of the ambiguity of conjugational prefixes, and the least certain, because only

distinguished by Masoretic pointing. Here it can merely be shown that, in most of the examples, a use does not contradict the theories already elaborated. The next chapter deals with the remaining passages, and the last summarizes the findings." (24).

Without discussing the details of these investigations at this stage it is best to pass straight on to Gross' findings, in chapter 8 of his work. There he states that:

"In examining the almost exclusively poetical examples with wayyiqtol for the present supposed or actual, particular or general---, the hypothesis that wayyiqtol (like the suffix conjugation, and in contrast with the prefix conjugation long form) denotes the perfective aspect has proved adequate as an explanation. The results are very simple: wayyiqtol is to be classed with the suffix-conjugation, and not with the long form prefix-conjugation. This is probably valid not only for wayyiqtol, but also other short-form prefix-conjugations in a declarative function." (25).

So Gross argues that wayyiqtol (like qatal) denotes the perfected completed aspect of an action, in direct contrast with the lengthened form of yiqtol. Wayyiqtol, then, would not be a true past tense but would express more the aspect (completed) of an action without having a tense of its own. This conclusion leaves a lot to be desired as does some of his methodology and general approach, and it is the subject of his methodology which will now be considered.

It seems to me that there are, two inherent weaknesses in his general approach that deserve comment.

The first is that his examples have been drawn from a wide spread of Hebrew literature without any attempt to date them with any precision.

This is in fact the same criticism that was levelled at Michel's work and it is true here also that Gross has not attempted to deal in any way with the history of the Hebrew language. Since the discovery of Ugaritic it is true to say that the dating of poetry is now easier on morphological and syntactic grounds. Thus a distinct difference can now be stated with some confidence on the question of dating the poems of the Pentateuch as over against some of the clearly later poetry of the Psalms.

It seems appropriate now to pass from the question of dating to that of prose versus poetic syntax. Here Gross has used his knowledge of prose syntax to determine the meaning of poetic syntax. In criticizing Michel on this subject he states:

"It is therefore to be recommended that one should approach poetic texts with a knowledge of syntax gleaned from prose; without, of course, applying it unchecked to the poetic texts." (26).

Yet this procedure is marked with danger as it is not necessarily the case that the rules of prose syntax also apply to that of poetry. It is rather the case that tenses are used in poetry with special nuances. This can be illustrated by the current study of Ugaritic.

In his recent Ugaritic grammar Stanislav Segert defines the difference between the use of tense in prose and poetry as follows:

"The two sets of verbal forms, the perfect, marked by affirmatives, and the imperfect, marked by prefixes and affirmatives, have

different functions, aspectual in poetry and temporal in prose. Ugaritic poetry was fixed in writing in the fourteenth century B.C., but preserves traditions going back several centuries. In poetry the function of the perfect and imperfect can be characterized by the notion of aspect. Aspect is by definition subjective, i.e., it expresses the subjective attitude of the speaker to an action or state. The constative aspect is noted by the perfect. The speaker is concentrating on noticing an action, without respect to its circumstances; usually actions which are independent of other actions or circumstances are expressed by the perfect. The cursive aspect is expressed by the imperfect. The speaker follows the action in its course, taking its circumstances into consideration. Actions dependent on other actions and those conditioned by circumstances may be indicated by the imperfect. Most of the Ugaritic non-literary prose texts were written in the last stage of the City's existence, around 1200BC. In these texts the perfect and imperfect have temporal character. The tenses expressed by the perfect and imperfect indicate the relation of the action or state to the basic level of time, the present. The perfect of active verbs expresses actions which happened and were accomplished in the past or which were done in the past with consequences lasting into the present. The imperfect as a tense expresses the non-past, i.e., the present and the future. Actions or states expressed by the imperfect are considered unaccomplished or not yet accomplished." (27).

Now what this extended citation from Segert serves to demonstrate is that there is a difference in usage of tense between prose and poetry in Ugaritic. Since Hebrew is also a North West Semitic language could it not be the case that such a difference exists in it? The answer to this question can only be achieved by a mathematical examination of the poetic texts which this study seeks to do. It is one of the strengths of Michel's work reviewed earlier that it seeks to do justice to the particular usages of tense in poetry without recourse to the usages of prose. However when Gross seeks to equate wayyiqtol with the suffix conjugation it would appear that he has failed to detect the distinctively poetic nuances of this construction. The reason for this is not hard to find, it is because his understanding of wayyiqtol in poetry is dominated by an

understanding of how it operates in prose. His conclusion has led to the confession that even he has had some difficulty in analysing certain texts such as Ps 29 and Job. (28). Thus, his confession in itself betrays the fact that his understanding of how wayyiqtol operates in poetry is somewhat lacking. Yet one of the sure results that has followed the discovery of Ugaritic is that the form wayyiqtol in Hebrew is a true preterite and is used in an narrational sense just as it is in Ugaritic poetry. This form is distinct from the long form of the prefix conjugation and from the suffix conjugation. He is, however correct in this that it has a reference to past events and its use is clearly seen in this way in Ugaritic poetry. What Gross has sought to do here is to solve the problem of the verbal forms used in poetry by appealing to the aspect of an action but this approach does not really further the solution.

In concluding this review of Gross's work one has to concede that he has come to it with considerable ability and acumen but one wonders if he has achieved anything as far as the syntax of Hebrew poetry is concerned since his understanding of how wayyiqtol is used in poetry is marred by his attempt to give to it an identical meaning to that which it has in prose.

He would have made a genuine contribution to the syntax of Hebrew poetry had he noted the way that wayyiqtol is used in poetic texts to denote consequence, result or emphasis.

A third work which may be said to have drawn its inspiration from Michel is Die Tempora im Hiobdialog (1976) by H. Bobzin. In the introduction Bobzin acknowledges his own debt to Michel:

"My work is obligated to his only insofar as I took the inspiration to investigate a poetic text from it. On the other hand I pursue a completely different path in methodology, both in the construction of the work and in the treatment of the text to be analysed" (29).

Here Bobzin also makes the point that although he is indebted to Michel for inspiration he pursues a completely different path in terms of his methodology and approach. What is Bobzin's methodology?

Elsewhere in this chapter it has been noted that in general terms there are two approaches to the question of the use of tense in poetry. The first is to consider what the background of the Hebrew verbal system is, and the second is to consider what the actual use of tense is in poetry. If Michel may have said to have followed the second approach, then clearly Bobzin has followed the first.

Bobzin defends his position thus:

"If we return to the starting point (cf § 1,2), it now becomes clear why, under certain conditions, the attempt to describe the use of the Hebrew tense forms, without also taking into account at the same time their origin, would have to fail." (30).

In these words he recommends the study of the Hebrew tenses from a diachronic point of view, but he also makes the point that a

synchronic study is desirable so that the latter may be said to aid the explanation of the former. (31).

In §2 of his introduction Bobzin noted the various approaches that scholars have made towards their understanding of the "consecutive tenses." He noted the contributions made by G. R. Driver, S. R. Driver, H. Ewald, Gesenius-Kautzsch, D. Michel, & Siedl. After this section he considers various deliberations on the history of the origins of the Hebrew tense system headed by Hans Bauer. Bauer's solution is based upon the Accadian verbal system which he held to be Proto-Semitic. Bobzin accepts this proposition and equates Accadian with "Old Semitic." (32). Bobzin then comes to the conclusion that pre-classical Hebrew possessed the following tenses: qatala: verb of condition=stative, yaqtul(u) & yaqattal: verb of action=punctual and durative. (33). He considers these tenses also to have been operative in Proto-Semitic. He notes that the Accadian iprus (preterite) can be compared with the imperfect consecutive not only morphologically but also functionally (jussive and narrative function). (34). He then notes that the case with the simple imperfect yiqtol is somewhat different since yiqtol in many points corresponds to the Accadian present iparras. (35). Because iparras does not cover all the functions of yiqtol and because its presence is hotly debated in Ugaritic and Canaanite he further notes that such functions are covered in Ugaritic and in Arabic by yaqtulu and

considers that further study of this form will shed much light on the Hebrew tense system. (36). This led him to the conclusion that the incontestable existence of yaqtulu in Ugaritic now suggests that yaqtulu should be included in Hebrew alongside yaqtul and yaqattal. He further notes that prior to the emergence of classical Hebrew as we know it yaqattal became obsolete and yaqtulu took its place and furthermore with the decline of the final vowel in Hebrew yaqtul became yiqtol and yaqtulu also became yiqtol thus making both of these forms morphologically indistinguishable. (37). Since he has reached a satisfactory explanation for the various forms, he is now in a position to turn his attention to the question of function. To aid description he has adopted the terminology used by Rössler, who following the Babylonian grammarians, has called the two tenses Hamet and Mare. (38). The benefit of this classification is that it distinguishes between the shorter form of the prefix conjugation iprus (Hamet) and the longer form iparras (Mare). The benefit of this classification system is also to be seen in the distinction it makes not only between the tenses in morphological terms but also on the basis of word order. For these two tenses --Hamet and Mare--in each case possess two morphological possibilities of realization (prefix and suffix conjugation), which depend respectively on whether the verbal form concerned is used at the beginning of the clause or not. (38). The functions of Hamet and Mare are defined by Bobzin in terms very similar to that which Michel has used in his study. Thus the function of Hamet is said to be: unique, not repeated, non-essential, not certain, accidental, individual & simplex; while

the function of Mare is said to be: not unique, repeated, essential, certain, substantial, general & complex. (39).

A few comments may be made on what Bobzin has attempted to do in this reconstruction of the Hebrew tense system and in particular in the way that such tenses are used in Job 3.1-42.6. As has been noted above it is clear that in his historical reconstruction of the Hebrew verbal system Bobzin regards Accadian as virtually tantamount to Proto-Semitic. While such may be the case, it is far from certain since the type of imperfect based upon Accadian iparras is known only in Ethiopic and the Tell Amarna glosses among the Semitic languages, although it is also known in the Hamitic languages. (40). It should be further noted that the existence of yaqattal in ancient Hebrew as proposed by Bobzin (who follows Rössler) must be regarded as questionable. The problem of the existence of yaqattal in Hebrew has already been examined by D. Marcus in Aspects of the Ugaritic Verb in the light of Comparative Semitic Grammar (1970). Here he provided very convincing evidence why such a tense should not be postulated to have existed in Hebrew and he also notes that it does not exist in the Mari, Amarna (contra Moscati), or Phoenician material. (41). It has been noted above that Bobzin has used the classification system of Hamet and Mare to differentiate between the categories of morphology and word order in the actual use of the tenses in Job. Yet further on in his work he notes that the criterion of morphology is severely restricted: the

difference between long form and short form have merely the value of indices for distinguishing between Hamet and Mare: that is to say, word order in the clause and the clause's syntactic function are first and foremost the deciding factors in determining the tense. (42). This can be illustrated by his treatment of the morphologically unambiguous short form 'ה', which is not placed first in 3.4, and there he observes: it seems to be Mare according to the position in the clause, even though, according to the form (short imperfect) it indeed looks like a Hamet. (43). It can also be stressed that the criterion of position is also weakened in its significance. If the verb form is wrongly positioned, according to the rules of order and stated function, Bobzin finds various ways out of this difficulty:

(a) He ignores the problem: In Job 13.20 a particle and a numeral functioning as the object precede the prohibitive (vetitive), although according to p31 No 145, the prohibitive (vetitive) must be placed first.

(b) If a suffix conjugation is placed first, which should by reason of its function be in second place, then it is moved back into the second place by adding something on to a preceding word. See his treatment of Job 7.9 when he adds the comparative particle 'ך.

(c) If Bobzin finds a short-form prefix-conjugation in the second position when it should be in the first, he maintains that this preceding part of the clause is outside the true clause which only begins with 'ה': see his treatment of 3.4 & 7. It seems that all these explanations are without any basis, since, in Job 3.4 & 7, the subject stands each time directly before its agreeing verbal predicate and is not thereafter taken up by

a pronoun; and also since there is no ׀ in front of the verb marking the new insertion.

The chief difficulty with his work is that he has come to the text with prejudiced proposals for a solution and he has placed his own assumptions beyond further discussion in that he has not taken the text seriously enough in its existent form. Moreover he has also noted in connection with the functions of Hamet and Mare that the description of the functions are only to be taken with a grain of salt since he has only used them by his own confession when such descriptions fitted his own understanding of the sense that the tense was attempting to convey. (44). This approach has resulted in obscure analysis of the verb forms as well as their intended functions. It can also be said that because of the aforementioned methodology his assertions are not satisfactorily backed up.

A work which has emanated from the Israeli scholar, R. Sappan, The Typical Features of the Syntax of Biblical Poetry in its Classical Period (Hebrew 1981), deserves comment. The title raises false expectations as Sappan is not writing about syntax but poetic structure. This becomes clear as the work is examined in detail. The introductory subsection 5 is entitled: "Impact of parallelism upon sentence structure". An examination of this subsection will show that what Sappan is talking about is how Parallelism makes an impact upon sentence structure. This he does by defining 5 types of correspondence which parallelism imposes upon

poetic structure. No reference is made in this study as to how prepositions, particles, tenses, or any other regular feature of syntax are used in poetry. It is devoted merely to the subject of poetic structure, and deals with how sentences are structured in Hebrew poetry. It seems to me that nothing worthwhile comes from this study.

A work solely devoted to the grammar and syntax of Hebrew poetry written by a member of the Dahood school will now be reviewed; it appears as an appendix to volume 3 in Dahood's commentary on the Psalms. This grammar has a very helpful chapter entitled "Syntax and Poetic Devices." In it the subject of tense is treated, although not in detail. The compiler has limited himself to those aspects of tense which on the basis of Ugaritic are fairly well accepted i. e., the pattern qtl-yqtl, and yqtl-qtl.

Detailed examination of this work reveals a major flaw - one that is common to the Dahoodian school as a whole: the devaluation of the Masoretic tradition. In his commentary on the Psalms Dahood does not feel himself bound by the Masoretic pointing the result of which is that he deviates from it whenever he pleases. Thus even when wayyiqtol makes good sense he often changes it into weyiqtol for no apparent reason. He also classifies as a "Precative Perfect" a qatal which is parallel to wayyiqtol which for the sake of coherence has to be also changed into a jussive weyiqtol so that he can establish a Precative Perfect in Biblical Hebrew, a fairly dubious proposition

in itself. All this gives to this syntax of Hebrew poetry a strongly hypothetical character which makes its findings dubious. What must clearly be said here is that the methodology of the Dahood school is just not scholarship.

Here the strength of Michel's work comes into its own for he at least was prepared to allow the text to speak for itself. Any successful syntax must be based on the text as we find it and not as our particular theory demands that we find it! Such questionable methodology will be encountered again in connection with the book of Job.

We now turn to a work called The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose. This has been written by an Italian scholar called Alviero Niccacci. Although the title would seem to indicate that this book is solely concerned with prose, his final chapter is entitled "Comments of the use of Tense in Poetry". Niccacci commences his work on the use of tense in poetry by noting that different rules apply to the use of tense in poetry than those used in prose.

"It is at least likely that for the use of the verb forms Poetry had its own rules which were not the same as for prose. This is why I consider it necessary to discuss the topic in a completely separate way." (45).

In his preliminary remarks Niccacci notes that the study of poetry has

to be based on the MT, the traditional consonantal text vocalised and interpreted by the Masoretes several centuries later. This approach is a healthy correction of Dahood's impulses. He also notes that the custom of pruning conjunctions and other particles, which are practised by Cross, Freedman and their school, to be speculative and is in the very least a seemingly doubtful practice. When he comes to consider the actual use of tense in poetry he notes:

"Although it is possible to obtain a reasonably consistent account of how verb forms are used in Prose, for Poetry the problem is much more complicated and debated." (46).

He then makes two actual observations on the use of particular tenses in Poetry. The first is based on the poetry of Ugarit, which clearly shows that YIQTOL can be used as a form for past narrative; the same form is also used for the present and the future: in other words, it is universal as regards tense.

He notes that this phenomenon also occurs in the archaic poetry of the Pentateuch and in certain Psalms. This definition is very similar to that of F.R. Blake who has defined the imperfect as used in the archaic poetry of the Pentateuch as having an omnitemporal sense. (47). His second observation is on the use of YIQTOL and QATAL for the same tense in parallel lines. This is also defined by the Dahood school in their Grammar of Hebrew Poetry referred to above. This is a feature which was previously considered suspect by scholars; but the poetry of Ugarit has shown that it is perfectly legitimate. He notes

that Cassuto has drawn attention to several examples of the pairing of the verb forms YIQTOL/QATAL or QATAL/YIQTOL from the same verbal roots. In addition, Gevirtz has shown that this characteristic alternation of YIQTOL/QATAL also occurs in the Amarna letters.

It is also to be noted that the alternation YIQTOL/QATAL or QATAL/YIQTOL is of course also attested between verbs of different roots. In this small contribution to the syntax of tense in poetry Niccacci has drawn attention to some salient points. What he has said by way of methodology is supremely important. He has however limited himself to the more or less well established facts of how tenses are used in poetry. It is certain that had he applied the methods he has applied to prose he would have produced a worthy syntax of Hebrew poetry. However he has published an important contribution to the syntax of Hebrew Poetry.

We now turn to what is perhaps the most useful of all the works produced so far on the subject of poetic syntax. Reference is now made to an article produced in 1978 by the South African scholar F.C. Fensham entitled The Use of the Suffix Conjugation and the Prefix Conjugation in a Few Old Hebrew Poems. In that work Fensham first of all seeks to appeal to the function of the Hebrew verb and in so doing he reviews the research of the past century. By so doing he looks at the work of the following scholars Rundgren, Kustar, Michel, Sperber, Meyer, Rainey, Moran, and Lambdin. Having completed this review he states his conclusion:

"These different views show that no clear consensus of opinion exists at the moment on the function of the verb in Biblical Hebrew. While keeping the different approaches to the problem in mind, we want to investigate the function of suffix and prefix conjugations in a few old Psalms." (48).

It seems to us that Fensham is correct in his analysis of this type of approach. When we investigate the the syntax of tense as it is used in poetry there are two approaches to the question; (a) The background to the Hebrew verbal system and (b) the actual use of the tense in poetry which can only be arrived at by a systematic analysis of the texts concerned. The former approach has resulted in no consensus as Fensham has noted, due to the fact that we lack the necessary evidence that we need to make a scientific conclusion, so that the scholars who have worked in this area have proceeded to argue their respective case in a highly speculative fashion. A far better approach is the latter one which seeks to plot the actual use of tense in a mathematical style and by so doing establishes what is the syntax of tense as it is used in the respective text in question. This is the approach that Fensham uses in his article and it is also the approach which will be used in this study.

In his article Fensham proceeds to examine the tenses that are used in Psalms 29, 82 and 93. Beginning with Psalm 29 Fensham analyses the actual tenses which are used in that Psalm:

"In Ps 29, according to the Massoretic punctuation the suffix conjugation occurs twice, the prefix conjugation four times and the so-called waw consecutive four times." (49).

He proceeds to examine the use of the waw consecutive first. In that Psalm there are four examples of the waw consecutive:

וְיִשְׁבֵּר, וְיִקְדָּם, וְיִחַשֵּׁף, וְיִשָּׁן

The interpretation of the waw consecutive in poetry is quite important and it raises a number of associated questions. These points are noted by Fensham who stated:

"We want to begin with the waw consecutive forms which are the most complicated. One may ask the question whether these forms already existed when this old Psalm was composed. Are they later forms introduced with the re-editing or are they erroneously punctuated by the Massoretes? It is quite possible that all the waw consecutive prefix conjugations in this Psalm must be regarded as pure prefix conjugations, because at such an early stage the waw consecutive was not as yet developed (cf Ugaritic).

Or, according to W.Gross, they may be equivalent to the perfect describing a present state resulting from a past action." (50).

Having noted the varying possibilities, Fensham now goes on to formulate his conclusion regarding the interpretation of the use of the waw consecutive in Psalm 29:

"If we take the relationship of the verb forms into consideration, however, it is clear that in Ps 29.5 w.c. prefix conjugation is used after a participle. In this case the breaking of the cedars in the second colon cannot to my mind signify a present state resulting from a past action, but refers to a habitual or customary action." (51).

He now turns his attention to the use of the pure prefix conjugations which are used in this Psalm.

"In the case of the pure prefix conjugations like יָחִיל (v 8), יָחֹלֵל (v 9), יָחַן and יָבִיחַ (v 11) Yahweh is the subject and may in all cases refer to a habitual action." (52).

He then goes on to deal with the suffix conjugation:

"The suffix conjugation occurs in v 3, viz. הָרָעִים . Why is it used here? D. Michel translates it by a praesens in what he has called "Fremberichte". This word is usually regarded as a praesens by commentators, e. g. by H-J. Kraus, H. Herkenne and A. Weiser. It is clear that הָרָעִים cannot be taken as punctual in this case. In accordance with the above mentioned observation of Lambdin we want to regard it as habitual action. God has thundered and is still thundering and will thunder in the future." (53).

He now goes on to consider the only other use of the suffix conjugation, namely in v 10:

"In v 10 we have the suffix conjugation יָשָׁב and in the next line the w. c. prefix conjugation יָשָׁב with יָשָׁב. If we take יָשָׁב as an ordinary prefix conjugation, we have the extraordinary position in which in the first colon the sitting of Yahweh on the flood is expressed by a suffix conjugation and in the second colon where he sits as king for ever in the prefix conjugation. What is the difference? Moshe Held has tried to explain this alternation of qtl/yqtl or yqtl/qtl of identical verbs as a typical pattern in Hebrew and Ugaritic poetry." (54).

Having discussed all the tense forms that are used in Psalm 29 he now proceeds to formulate his conclusion regarding their use:

"It should make much more sense to take the prefix and suffix conjugations as well as the participles as describing habitual activities. From the view of the speaker it describes the activity of the Lord in a thunder storm and the effects which this has on nature. Yahweh came in a thunder storm is coming and will come in

future in a thunder storm. Yahweh sat as King over the flood, still sits and will be sitting in the future." (55).

Having fully analysed the way in which Fensham deals with the use of tense in this Psalm it is now necessary to react to his particular contribution. Fensham has correctly noted that the varying tenses used i.e., perfect, imperfect and participle are all to be translated by a kind of continuous present denoting habitual activity. To translate according to the strict dictates of tense i.e., time would make total nonsense of the Psalm and its meaning. This means that the varying forms are used interchangeably with no difference in meaning. Yet one has to ask the question, if such is the case are the varying forms used without any significance at all? If we were to answer this question negatively then there is no syntax of poetry as far as the use of tense is concerned. Since that thesis is not accepted, as a consequence there must be some hidden design in the way that the varying tenses are used. Fensham comes close to this when he says:

"The role of Yahweh in the eyes of the speaker, as is the case with Baal in Ugaritic poetry, gives a special nuance to the use of verbs in their grammatical function. The views of T.O.Lambdin in connection with the usage of the suffix and prefix conjugations seems to be exactly appropriate to certain examples discussed above. The time aspect cannot fully be left out, but there is much more to the Hebrew verb than tense, e.g., habitually, the way in which an action is performed, by whom it is performed, the relation of the verbal forms to each other. The function of the verb can only be understood in the context, e.g., Yahweh sits, it is something totally different from when a mortal king sits." (56).

Now what Fensham says in the above quote is the vital clue in

formulating a syntax of the verb in Hebrew poetry and one which this researcher will seek to put to good use in this study.

In deciding such a question the criteria which are to be used include the impact of parallelism upon tense, the place in the poem where the action is performed, the way in which the action is performed, the person performing the action, and the relation of the verbal forms to each other. Thus, Fensham has rendered sterling service to the cause of establishing a poetic syntax by his analysis of Psalms 29, 82 & 93 and by his concluding remarks in his article. While he has supplied all the necessary clues to a correct understanding of the use of tense in poetry, he has not worked them through sufficiently in his treatment of the above Psalms. Another caveat which may be made is that it is not really possible to formulate a poetic syntax by treating such short Psalms as those he has chosen. What is required is to choose a longer poetic work so that the way which the tenses work in poetry may be clearly seen. Nevertheless what he has said is of supreme importance for the subject of this work.

There has been a twofold aim in reviewing the contributions made by these scholars: first to show that this study is conversant with the literature that has been produced on this subject. This chapter has however been limited to the main published works and has not sought to review a number of other articles which have also been produced on this topic. The second aim has been to evaluate their respective strengths and weaknesses and to show the position of this study in

regard to points of disagreement. There has not been any intention to merely set up these scholars and their respective works with a view to demolishing them. Rather the object has been to evaluate their contribution in the light of our own particular research.

NOTES

- (1) Gesenius Hebrew Grammar revised by A. E. Cowley 1910. p15.
- (2) A. B. Davidson -- Hebrew Syntax 3rd edition 1901. pvi.
- (3) Jouon -- Grammaire de L'Hebreu biblique 1947. p6.
- (4) Gesenius Hebrew Grammar revised by A. E. Cowley 1910. p456, notes 1 and 2. See also p454 for similar statements.
- (5) Gesenius --ibid -- p13.
- (6) Brockelmann -- Hebraische Syntax 1956 pp49, 118-121, 137.
- (7) Michel -- Tempora und Satzstellung in den Psalmen 1961. p11.
- (8) Michel -- ibid -- p11.
- (9) Michel -- ibid -- p12.
- (10) Michel -- ibid -- p12.
- (11) Michel -- ibid -- p12.
- (12) Michel -- ibid -- p13.
- (13) Michel -- ibid -- p41.
- (14) Michel -- ibid -- p98.
- (15) Michel -- ibid -- p99.
- (16) Michel -- ibid -- p99.
- (17) Michel -- ibid -- p110.
- (18) Michel -- ibid -- p176.
- (19) Waltke/O'Connor Biblical Hebrew Syntax 1990 p473.
- (20) Gross -- Verbform + Funktion. Wayyiqtol Für Die Gegenwart 1976. p5.
- (21) S. O. T. S. Booklist 1978. p138.
- (22) Gross -- ibid -- p3.

- (23) Gross -- *ibid* -- p6.
- (24) Gross -- *ibid* -- p13.
- (25) Gross -- *ibid* -- p163.
- (26) Gross -- *ibid* -- p7.
- (27) Segert -- A Basic Grammar of the Ugaritic Language. 1984.
p88.
- (28) Gross -- *ibid* -- pp93-99 & 165
- (29) Bobzin -- Die Tempora in Hiobdialog 1976 p1
- (30) Bobzin -- *ibid* p12
- (31) Bobzin -- *ibid* p12, 13.
- (32) Bobzin -- *ibid* p22
- (33) Bobzin -- *ibid* p18
- (34) Bobzin -- *ibid* p18
- (35) Bobzin -- *ibid* p18
- (36) Bobzin -- *ibid* p22
- (37) Bobzin -- *ibid* p24
- (38) Bobzin -- *ibid* p31
- (39) Bobzin -- *ibid* p42
- (40) Moscati -- The Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages
1964 p132f
- (41) Marcus -- Aspects of the Ugaritic Verb in the light of
Comparative Semitic Grammar 1970 p104
- (42) Bobzin -- *ibid* p60
- (43) Bobzin -- *ibid* p75
- (44) Bobzin -- *ibid* p33
- (45) Niccacci -- The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose.
1990. p194.
- (46) Niccacci -- *ibid.* p194.

- (47) Niccacci -- ibid. p194.
- (48) Fensham --'The use of the Suffix Conjugation and the Prefix
Conjugation in a few old Hebrew poems'. 1978
p14.
- (49) Fensham -- ibid. p14
- (50) Fensham -- ibid. p14
- (51) Fensham -- ibid. p14
- (52) Fensham -- ibid. p15
- (53) Fensham -- ibid. p15
- (54) Fensham -- ibid. p15
- (55) Fensham -- ibid. p16
- (56) Fensham -- ibid. p18

Chapter Two

The Language of the book of Job

This chapter is devoted to the subject of the language of the book of Job, since any work which purports to deal with the syntax of the book of Job must make some sort of conclusion with regard to the type of language that is being used.

Yet it has been long recognised that the language of the book of Job is to say the least eccentric. This fact was noted by Driver in his introduction:

"The language of Job points likewise to a relatively late date. The syntax is extremely idiomatic; but the vocabulary contains a very noticeable mixture of Aramaic words, and (in a minor degree) of words explicable only from the Arabic. This is an indication of a date more or less contemporary with 2 Isaiah; though it appears that the author came more definitely within the range of Aramaizing influences than the author of Isaiah 40-66, and perhaps had his home in proximity to Aramaic and Arabic speaking peoples." (1)

When we examine Driver's quotation we can discern that the linguistic peculiarities to which he is drawing our attention can be examined under two categories. These categories are (1) Vocabulary and (2) Syntax. It is only as we examine this evidence with which the book of Job presents us that we are able to come to some sort of conclusion about the language of the book of Job. Thus what is proposed in this chapter is a meticulous examination of the vocabulary and syntax of the language of the book of Job so that some sort of conclusion can be reached regarding what kind of language it is. The vocabulary of the book of Job will be considered first of all.

(1) The Vocabulary of the Book of Job.

What kind of vocabulary does the book of Job contain?

This question has been answered by Gordis who notes that Job has more words of unique occurrence and a richer vocabulary than any other biblical book. This may be seen in the way that the author uses four nouns for "lion", six terms for "trap", and four synonyms for "darkness". His extensive vocabulary is drawn from the names of the constellations, of metals, of many precious stones; in addition to which he is familiar with the detailed anatomy of great beasts, the technical language of the law courts, and the occupations of mining and hunting. (2).

The first characteristic that Gordis has called attention to is that of the occurrence of Hapax Legomena and it is to this feature of the language of the book of Job that attention will first be drawn. A list of the words which are only found in Job has been drawn up by Friedrich Delitzsch:

"§1) As with every book of the Old Testament the book of Job has a number of roots which are only verifiable within itself. And of the number of these roots (just as the word forms listed in §2) none is insignificant, thus it is the case that with a poetical book such as the one under discussion, this is to be expected from the outset.

Of these roots which appear exclusively in the book of Job some are verbs, the rest nouns.

(a) Verbs

לֶחֶם Hi 25, 5

חַיִּי Pi 33, 20

גרר Hithpa. 2, 8

דוץ 41, 14

הדר 40, 12

הוא 37, 6

הנר 19, 3

חרף impf יחרף 27, 6

טמה Ni 18, 3

לקש Pi 24, 6

מרא Hi 39, 18

נקט 10, 1

נתע Ni 4, 10

סלד Pi 6, 10

עבד 36, 11

ערק 30, 3. 17

פרשו 26, 9

קמט 16, 8 Pu 22, 16

רוב 33, 19

רטב 24, 8

רנה 39, 23

(b) Nouns

אבה 9, 26

אמש 30, 3

בר 39, 4

גביש 28, 18

גלד 16, 15

חלמות 6, 6

יקוט 8, 14

ויר 19, 17

זחל 32, 6

זעך Ni 17, 1

זרב Pu 6, 17

זחפץ impf יחפץ 40, 17

טוש 9, 26

נתר 36, 2

מיש 23, 12

נהק impf ינהק 6, 5. 30, 7

נחס 30, 13

נסנן impf ינסנן 15, 3. 22, 2a. 34, 9. 35, 3

סלה Pu 28, 16. 19

עלל Po 16, 15

פדע impf יפדע 33, 24

קדר 6, 16

רנע 7, 6

רום 15, 12

רטפש (?) 33, 25

רפף Po 26, 11

אגלי-טל 38, 28

בהיר 37, 21

גבינה 10, 10

גוש 7, 5

חין 41, 4

חק 33, 9

יתור 39, 8

נידוד 41, 11	נדוי 6, 7
ניד 21, 20	נידוד 15, 24
נלח 5, 26. 30, 2	נמרירי יום 4, 5
מטיל 40, 18	נבנייים 38, 16
נהרה 3, 4	נסד 13, 27. 33, 11
סדרים 10, 22	עסין 21, 24
עסיות 41, 10	עש 38, 32 עש 9, 9
ערוד 39, 5	ערץ 30, 6
עש 4, 19. 27, 18	פחד Du 40. 17
מפלש 37, 16	פש 35, 15
צאלים 40, 21f	צמים 18, 9
מצנים (?) 5, 5	קנצי 18, 2
רוב 21, 33. 38, 38	רעמה 39, 19
שיא 20, 6	שנני 38, 36
שביב 18, 5	שחח בניי 28, 8. 41, 26
שריה 41, 18	שהלה 4, 18
חר 31, 35	חוחח 41, 21
חפת 17, 6	

\$2) Another line of roots is certainly not preserved alone and uniquely in the book of Job, but only there are we offered these same roots a) as verbs (next to other nominal constructions), or b) in verbal roots which are no longer elsewhere authenticated by the verb in question, or lastly c) in nominal constructions which are absent in the rest of the Old Testament books

(a)

אבר (H1) 39, 26	וקק 28, 1. 36, 27
חלם 39, 4	חתף impf יחתף 9, 12
טרח (H1) 37, 11	נבר (H1) 35, 16. 36, 31
נכא (N1) 30, 7	סוך 29, 4

עקב (Pi) 37, 4

צהר (Hi) 24, 11

(b)

אחז Pi 26, 9

ג'ח Qal 38, 8

געש Pu 34, 20

דנא Hithpa. 5, 4. 34, 25

הלל Qal 29, 3

הרה Pu 3, 3

חבר Hi 16, 4

חצץ Pu 21, 21

ידע Pi 38, 12

לבב Ni 11, 12

לכר Hithpa. 38, 30. 41, 9

מלא Hithpa. 16, 10

מרצ Hi 16, 3

נחל Ho 7, 3

נסה Ni 4, 2

סבך Pu 8, 17

עדה Qal 28, 8

ענה Hi 20, 3

עתר Hithpa. 15, 28

פצפץ 16, 12

צמת Ni 6, 17. 23, 17

קטף Ni 8, 12

קפץ Ni 24, 24

ראה Pu 33, 21

פלץ (Hithpa.) 9, 6

ירפד impf 41, 22 (Pi 17, 13)

החגלגל 30, 14

גמא Pi 39, 24

דבק Pu 38, 38. 41, 9

דעך Ni 6, 17

הפך Ho 30, 15

חבא Pu 24, 4

חמם Pi 39, 14. Hithpa. 31, 20

חחם Pi 24, 16

חזב Hi 24, 25

לון HI 24, 7

מנך Ho 24, 24

מלט Hithpa. 19, 20. 41, 11

נדר Hi 18, 18

ננר Pi 34, 19

נפח Pu 20, 26

סבח Pu 30, 7

עלס Qal 20, 18; Ni 39, 13

עקש Hi 9, 20

פגש Pi 5, 14

פרפר 16, 12

צעד Hi 18, 14

קפא Hi 10, 10

קרץ Pu 33, 6

רקע Hi 37, 18

רוח Pu 30, 27. Hi 41, 23

שום Hi 4, 20

שרג Pu 40, 17

שקה Pu 21, 24

(c)

אני 34, 36

אנף 33, 7

אמץ 17, 9

ארב 38, 40. 37, 8

בטחות 12, 6

הלך 29, 6

התלים 17, 2

זכונות 28, 17

חברה 34, 7

חילה 6, 10

חתלה 38, 9

טחות 38, 36

דע 32, 6. 10. 17. 36, 3

כסלה 4, 6

מלכדח 18, 10

מזיח 12, 21

ממרורים 9, 18

משל 41, 25

נוה 8, 6

נחש 6, 12

נטיפים 36, 27

נכר 31, 3

שורף Pol 10, 11

שער P1 27, 21

שלם Ho 5, 23

אחזה 13, 17

אל 24, 25

מאמצים 36, 19

באשה 31, 39

דאבה 41, 14

המרת P1. 17, 2

מורשים 17, 11

חבר 40, 30

חדודים 41, 22

מחנק 7, 15

חתת 6, 21

יגע 20, 18

יצורים 17, 7

מלוח 30, 4

ממד 38, 5

מורה 16, 13

משכות 38, 31

נדודים 7, 4

נהר 39, 20,

נחת 36, 16

ניד 16, 5

נצר 36, 14

נפש 11, 20	ספיהה 14, 19
עננה 3, 5	עשתות 12, 5
מפנע 7, 20	מפלאות 37, 16
פרחה 30, 12	צלצל דגים 40, 31
ראי 37, 18	רחב 38, 18. 36, 16
רקבון 41, 19	שהד 16, 19
שעפים 4, 13. 20, 2	שפק 36, 18
משטר 38, 33	שמץ 4, 12. 26, 14
שרירים 40, 16	

\$3) A number of verbs and nouns are finitely encountered in the book of Job in nuances of meaning hitherto still unauthenticated. Here at least the following may be emphasized.

(a) Verbs

נזר 22, 28	הפך Hithpa. 38, 14
חבל Pu 17, 1	חבש Pi 28, 11
חטא Hithpa. 41, 17	חפר 39, 21
נרה על 6, 27. 40, 30	לפת Ni 6, 18
מאס 42, 6	מדד Pi 7, 4
מהר Ni 5, 13	מחק 24, 20. Hi 20, 12
נכר Pi 21, 29	ספק impf יספוק 34, 37
עשק impf יעשק 40, 23	פלח Pi 39, 3
פרד Hithpa. 4, 11	צמח Ni 23, 17
קדר 6, 16	קרב Pi 31, 37
שאר Ni (Part) 21, 34	שבר חק 38, 10
שוב Hi 20, 2	חקע Ni 17, 3
חקר 14, 20. 15, 24	

(b) Nouns

אפיק 12, 21	בדים 17, 16
בהמות 40, 15	גיל 3, 22
חמוד 20, 20	חקר 11, 7. 38, 16
חרף 27, 4	יארים 28, 10
חנונה 23, 3	משן 28, 18
מפלי בשר 41, 15	עם 12, 2
מקום 16, 18. 28, 1. 12. 20. 23	רטן 41, 5
מרקחה 41, 23	שורים 41, 17
חשובה 21, 34" (3)	

In the above quotation, Delitzsch has considered the phenomenon of Hapax Legomena in the book of Job in three particular ways; he has first of all called attention to those roots which only occur in the book of Job either as verbs or as nouns. He then has noted those roots which the book of Job has shared with other Old Testament books but whose usage in the book of Job is unique. This unique usage of these roots expresses themselves either as verbs (next to other nominal constructions) or as verbal roots whose only occurrence as verbs is to be found in the book of Job or in nominal constructions which are absent in the other Old Testament books.

Yet it has to be noted that this list which Delitzsch has produced has by no means met with universal agreement. Dhorme produced his own list and omitted words which he classified as due to distortion. (4).

Now what Dhorme is saying here is that his list has been compiled from those portions of the Massoretic text which have been judged by him as being free from corruption. In this work I am not arguing for the acceptability of one list against the other or for the value of the Masoretic text or otherwise but am merely acknowledging the existence of such scholarly debate about these questions.

Having said that it seems that one can accept Delitzsch' list as a basis for defining the Hapax Legomena of the book of Job. However when we turn our attention to the said Hapax Legomena what basis can we use to explain these roots whose occurrence is unique or whose use is unique?

The procedure which Gordis adopts to elucidate the rich vocabulary of Job, is to invoke cognate roots in the other Semitic languages such as Akkadian, Ethiopic, and Ugaritic, but most especially to Arabic, Aramaic, and post biblical Hebrew. Such a procedure is based upon the assumption that Hebrew and its sister languages are all descended from a proto-semitic tongue. Its value is to explain the relatively limited vocabulary of the Hebrew Bible by the occurrence of the same root in another Semitic language where it occurs more frequently and its meaning is more certain. (5)

Thus the procedure which we have to adopt in our attempt to explain these roots is one of comparative semitic philology.

Dhorme also uses the same procedure when he explains the following terms by reference to Hebraic or Semitic common roots: חלה (4:18), סלד (6:10), חחת (6:21), נדדים (7:4), גיש or גוש (7:5), מחנק (7:15), מפגע (7:20), מסת (9:23), רקבון (13:28;41:19), ניד (16:5), שיא (17:2), תפת (common noun 17:6), מלכדת (18:10), צהר (15:31;20:6), צהר (24:11), בלימה (26:7), הליך (29:6), שחר (30:30), ירוק (31:40), חחלה (38:9), אגל (38:28), משכות (38:31), נחיר (39:8), רנונים (39:9), רעמה (39:19), נחר (39:20), and נחיר (41:12), אבר (39:26), חברים (40:30), חרוך (41:22). (6)

Yet he also has to extend such an application to other Semitic languages such as Assyrian, Arabic, and Aramaic which possess the equivalents of גלד (16:15) and of מח (21:24). He uses Assyrian and Arabic to explain אבה (9:26), שנות (40:31), and the verb זקק of 28:1;36:27. Aramaic and Arabic are also used by him to recognise the verbs גרד (2:8), נהק (6:5;30:7), רפף (26:11), the nouns נבונה (10:10), זנבנית (28:17), עטישה (41:10). Assyrian is further used to analyse the terms מזיח (12:21), נביש (28:18), משיר (38:33), בול (40:20), מוחח (41:21). He also uses Aramaic to explain a number of words: נחע (4:10), טוש (9:26), אחוה (13:17), סד (13:27;33:11), רום (15:12), חב (31:33), ערוך (39:5), שריר (40:16), דוץ (41:14). The Arabic language is further used to supply the key to the understanding of terms peculiar to Job: נידור (15:24), הנר (19:3), בצר (22:24,25), נידוד (40:12), מטיל (40:18), צאליים (40:21), צלצל (40:31), נידוד (41:11), מטע (41:18), שריה (41:18). The terms שנוי and טחות are explained by him as being perhaps of Egyptian origin. (7).

Thus we can see how extensive this application is of explaining these obscure words by appealing to cognate Semitic languages. Of particular importance in this discussion is the Aramaic influence which may be detected in the vocabulary and syntax of this book. Dhorme has observed that the study of the vocabulary reveals the fact that sometimes an Aramaic word has been chosen to supply, in the parallelism, the equivalent of the Hebrew word. To the Hebrew עֵד 'witness' corresponds the Aramaic עֵד (16:19); to the Hebrew פָּרָא 'onager' the Aramaic עֵרָא (39:5); to the Hebrew עֵצ 'bone' the Aramaic עֵצ (40:18). The poet's technique is to find in Aramaic a synonym for the Hebrew word which he has used. Dhorme has noted that when the poet does so Aramaic always comes second. (8).

Here Dhorme has called our attention to what we might call poetic structure. He has called our attention to a style which the poet has used in the construction of his parallelism. His style is to vary a Hebrew word with an Aramaic word. However Aramaic is not only found in use in the technique of Parallelism, but also in his choice of vocabulary that he uses.

Dhorme has further detected that another significant procedure of the author is to use Aramaic rather than the current Hebrew word, either to vary the style or because Aramaic has become so deeply rooted in his mother-tongue. Thus 'to come' is in Hebrew אָבָן but אָבָן in Aramaic. He has found that in the book of Job אָבָן sometimes takes the place of אָבָן, for example in order to avoid the repetition of the

word בּוֹא in 3:25, or for the sake of rhythm in 16:22 (cf 37:22, Elihu). The Aramaic מְלַל replaces the Hebrew דָּבַר 'to say' in 8:2 (cf 33:3, Elihu). Its derivative מְלֵה 'word' is quite characteristic of the book of Job, in which it appears 34 times; but its plural sometimes assumes the Hebraic form מְלִים (10 times), sometimes the Aramaic form מְלִין (13 times). The poet's style is to be observed again in the substitution of מְלִין (Aramaic) for לַעֲנָה famine in 5:22; 30:3; of מְלֵה (Aramaic) for הִגִּיד 'to explain' in 15:17 (cf 32:6, 10, 17; 36:2, Elihu); of מְלִין (Aramaic) for סְלֵעִים 'rocks' (30:6). (9).

Thus, Dhorme has made clear how deeply the influence of Aramaic is to be felt within the book of Job as far as its vocabulary is concerned. However it has to be noted that the 'Elihu' discourses (Ch's 32-37) contain a higher degree of Aramaisms than the rest of the book. Driver and Gray also note that in common with the whole of the book of Job, the Elihu speeches contain a number of Aramaisms but that it is in these speeches that the Aramaic element is somewhat prominent. Thus common to the whole book אָלַף (Piel to teach, 15.5, 33.33, 35.11: Qal to learn), חָרַה 15.17, מָלַל 8.2, מָלַה 4.2, שָׁנָה, שָׁנָא 8.7.

Peculiar to Job 3.1-31.40 & 38.1-42.6 are אַחֲרָה 13.17, הֵן, if, חָדָה 3.6, טָוֵשׁ 9.26, טָפַל 13.4, יָקָר, glorious 31.26, נָף 30.6, נָפַן 5.22, לָהֵן, therefore 30.24, מָנַךְ 24.24, נָחַח, to descend 21.13 (17.16), עָרַד 39.5, עָתַק 21.7, עֲשָׂחוֹת 12.5, קָבַל 2.10, קָרַב, war 38.23, שָׁהַד 16.19, שָׁרִירִים 40.16, חָקַף 14.20.

Peculiar to the Elihu speeches are בחר 34.4, חף 33.9, נחר 36.2, מענד 34.25, עקב (= ענב) 37.4, רצע (= רצץ) 34.24, שויא 36.26, שרה 37.3.

Other words which should also probably be considered Aramaisms are אנף 33.7, קטל 13.15, 24.14, and שלהבת 15.30. רקב in 13.28, if it meant wine skin, would also be an Aramaism, but מאט 7.5, cited by Kautzsch in his doubtful examples, may be disregarded. (10).

Dhorme has also noted the Aramaic character of the Elihu speeches for instead of the verb רצץ 'to break' (20:19), Elihu does not hesitate to use the Aramaic רצע (34:24), just as he uses the Aramaic מענד 'deed' (34:25) as synonym for the Hebrew מעשה. Aramaic is to be found in one whole hemistich of Elihu (36:2a). Another distinctive mark of the style of Elihu is a fondness for the verb פעל instead of עשה. He has also observed that Elihu uses the Aramaic בחר (36:21) instead of the Hebrew בחרן; שויא (36:26, 37:23) meaning 'great'; למנביר (36:31) instead of לרב 'in abundance'; perhaps עלעולה 'tempest' (36:33) rather than טערה; הוא in the sense of 'fall' (37:6); מפלאות instead of נפלאות 'wonders' (37:16); בהיר (37:21). (11).

From what these scholars have said we can see how extensive is the penetration of Aramaic into the language of the book of Job and to the Elihu speeches in particular. The general character of the language of the book of Job is noted by Driver and Gray when they argue for the probable age of the book. The starting point for this investigation

is the language of the book of Job itself. In dating the book they note that certain linguistic features would point even to a period earlier rather than later than the 5th cent. BC : thus ׳ננא is relatively more frequent in Job than in Isa 40-55 (Job ---excluding Elihu --- ׳ננא 12, ׳נא 20; Isa 40-55, ׳ננא 18, ׳נא 54). Many other features point away from the latest periods --eg the use of the waw conversive (cf Eccl), the avoidance of װ (cf eg Eccl.). On the other hand, there are distinct signs of lateness. Even apart from the Elihu speeches, the Aramaisms --- decidedly more conspicuous than in Isa 40-55 --- are very noticeable; and so also is the use of ׀ as the nota acc.: see 5.2, 8.8, 9.11, 12.23, 14.21, 19.28, 21.22, 23.8, and perhaps 34.3 (Elihu). The rarer forms of particles and pronominal suffixes, which form a striking feature of the language of Job, might be largely explained as the idiosyncrasy of a writer of any period, but as a whole point rather to a relatively late period. The vocabulary contains very much that is peculiar to the book, including a number of words explicable only from the Arabic, and sometimes termed Arabisms. (12).

Here Driver and Gray have been using the linguistic evidence to arrive at a probable date of composition, yet what they say is very useful to us in giving to us a summary of the language of the book. It will be remembered in an earlier quotation that Driver had defined two areas for consideration as far as the language of the book is concerned. These were that of morphology and syntax. We have now completed looking at the first of his linguistic categories, namely

that of morphology. We now turn to consider his second linguistic category, namely that of syntax.

2 The Syntax of the Book of Job.

When we turn to consider the syntax of the book of Job we find that rather fewer scholars have written on this subject than have those who wrote on the vocabulary or morphology of the book. The need for such an approach was voiced by Andersen when he wrote the preface to the reissue of Dhorme's great commentary. In that preface he has noted that much work remains to be done in the area of syntax. The reason for this is that it is an almost universal approach among Old Testament scholars to learn their Hebrew from texts in standard literary prose. This in turn has led to an almost wholesale neglect of the syntax of Hebrew poetry as has been commented on in Ch1. Here Andersen argues for a recognition of the differences between poetry and prose so that a definitive poetic syntax should be established. (13).

That there is such a thing as the syntax of prose and a quite different syntax of poetry is the basic understanding upon which this study is being written. It is because of this basic misunderstanding of not differentiating prose from poetry that so little has been written on the needy subject of poetic syntax. Yet we must progress from the expression of the need of a poetic syntax to (actually) doing a poetic syntax.

Among the few commentators who have dared to enter the field of poetic syntax is Tur-Sinai. Writing on the subject of the syntax of Job he states:

"The Book of Job holds a special position also as regards syntax and style. The definite article --- apart from its use with participles, instead of the relative pronoun, as *המרוצו, המצתיק* --- occurs only in isolated cases, in accordance with the usage of biblical poetry generally; in fact, in the few instances in which it does occur it may be a later addition, due to the influence of ordinary prose. However, the lack of the definite article was apt to lead to misunderstandings. Thus *עם* (12.2) is the people, the whole people, *מחים* (11.3) means all men, *חיה* (37.8) is the beast, the cherub of Ezekiel's vision, etc., while there is nothing to indicate the determination required by the sense. The governing term of the construct is sometimes separated --- as a quasi absolute --- from the dependant term: *ארכה מארץ מדה* (11.9); *נביר מאביר ימים* (15.10); and *ונחול ימים ארבה* (29.18), which means *ימים ארבה*, like *ומטה ועמי הוא בידם* (Isa 10.5) for *ומטה הוא בידם ועמי* where *בידם* signifies for them.

Changes in word order are quite frequent in the book. Instead of *כי אמנע מחפץ דלים* we find *כי אמנע דלים מחפץ* (31.16), *הסיתך מפי צר* (36.16), etc. With similar inexactness of word order we have *תחת כל השמים* (25.24, 41.3) for "all that is under the sky"; *כי על נן סרו* (36.27), and similarly *על נן* (18.5, 19.8; etc.) are transposed for *על אשר סרו*.

Another deviation from the normal word-order is the very frequent placing of the object before the subject, which too sometimes prevents the understanding of the sentence. For since the definite article is infrequent in the poem, the accusative particle *אח*, which ordinarily goes with a determinate noun only, is likewise rare. Cp. sentences such as *ואחריו כל אדם ימשון* (14.19); *ואחריו כל אדם* (21.33), in which only the context reveals that *אננים* and *כל אדם* are the object. A similar difficulty is presented eg. by the sentence *נמו נגיד אקרננו* (31.37) where *נגיד נמו* relates to the object and not to the subject of the verb: "I approached him as though he were a prince". On the other hand, in 16.14, *פרץ על פני פרץ* (יפרצני) should not be understood as the object of the verb *יפרסני*, but we should rather assume two sentences: "He breaketh to me, breaketh a breach upon me". Likewise interesting and important are other noun usages, such as the use of *אל*, *אלוה* as though they were proper nouns, which do not take a pronominal suffix.

1) As for verb usage, we should note the causative sense of the participle *מוערי* (רנל) (12.5), in parallelism with *אל מריוני* (12.6), denoting God's emissaries who startle and frighten men out of

their safe dwellings. Verbs like יִגְבִּיהֶן עוֹף (5.7) or (יִרְדֵּן אֶל פִּיהֶן) יִגִּיחַ (40.23) are likewise transitive or causative: the Reshef-birds make the new born child fly high up into the air with them, the river will make food come into Leviathan's mouth.

The predicative participle is always accompanied by a pronominal copula: הוּא מְנַלֵּה (9.22), הוּא מִתְחַוֵּלֵל (15.2), נוֹדֵד הוּא (15.23), הוּא חוֹקֵר (28.3). Alone, without a pronoun, the participle is either an attribute or a circumstantial complement. This latter use, which in other books occurs mainly with verbs of motion, is greatly extended in the poem of Job, as וְאֲנִי יֹדְעָתִי וְאֵלֵי חַי "Yet I, I want to know my redeemer while (I am) alive" (19.25), מְשִׁיב יוֹעַ "he labours whilst restoring" (20.18), וְרֹעֵבִים נוֹשְׂאוּ עִמָּר "and whilst hungry they carry the sheaf" (24.10); this is the key to the understanding of these sentences.

Even more misleading is the use of tenses. The extent to which the "future" is used with the meaning of the past is greater than in any other book. It is difficult to recognise, eg, that the sentence וְנִי לִפְנֵי לַחֲמִי אֲנַחֲתִי חֲבוּא (3.24), contrary to the commentaries, and in accordance with the sequel, means: "for my sighing came even before my misfortune," for the thing which I always greatly feared is come upon me, etc." (14).

Now the items of unusual syntax to which Tur-Sinai is calling attention are as follows:

- (1) The Use of the Definite Article.
- (2) The Broken Construct Chain.
- (3) Unusual Word Order.
- (4) The Use of the Participle.
- (5) The Use of Tense.

All of these may be said to be the elements of the syntax of Hebrew poetry, some of them however, were noted a long time ago by Gesenius in his grammar:

"To the syntax belongs the far more sparing use of the article, of the relative pronoun, of the accusative particle ׀; the construct state even before prepositions; the shortened imperfect with the same meaning as the ordinary form; the wider governing power of prepositions; and in general a forcible brevity of expression." (15).

Yet it would be true to say that a complete syntax of Hebrew poetry would comprise more ingredients than either Tur-Sinai or Gesenius propose. It seems to me that a complete syntax of Hebrew poetry would be made up of the following elements:

- (1) The Use of the Definite Article.
- (2) The Use of the Conjunction as Relative Pronoun.
- (3) The Broken Construct Chain.
- (4) The Omission of the Prose Particles
- (5) The Use of Prepositions especially those that are only used in poetry.
- (6) The Use of Particles especially those that are only used in poetry.

- (7) The Use of Tense especially that of the waw-consecutive.
- (8) The Use of Elision with regard to Prepositions, Particles and Verbs.
- (9) The Construction of clauses within poetry.
- (10) The Impact of Parallelism on Syntax.
- (11) The Impact of Metre on Syntax.

A number of these ingredients have been commented on by Andersen in his introduction to Dhorme's commentary. In that introduction he comments on the following points of syntax:

- (1) The Absence of the Prose particles.
- (2) The Double Duty Nature of Prepositions and the like.
- (3) The Use of Tense.

It seems that what he says there is of great value to anyone who is engaged in the work of looking at the syntax of poetry and so it seems appropriate to quote what he says on the above three points.

1 The Absence of the Prose Particles

"It has long been known that archaic Hebrew poetry uses certain 'particles' sparingly, notably the article ה, the relative pronoun וְ, and nota accusativo, ׀. What has not been appreciated is the fact that this feature prevails in all lyric poetry (cult and wisdom) right down until the sixth century. There is a striking change during (perhaps not until after) the exile. Deutero-Isaiah still follows this tradition; but Psalm 137 shows the new trend.

Psalms, Job, Proverbs, Lamentations, and some portions of prophecy line up against the rest of the Hebrew Bible in having low frequencies for these 'prose particles'. In normal prose the count can be over 30% of words. It is usually 15% or over. In most poetry it is less than 5% of all tokens. In Job there are thirty nine chapters containing poetic speeches. In thirty seven of these fewer than 1.25% of vocabulary tokens are 'prose particles'. Twenty nine chapters have lower than 1%. These particles, ubiquitous in standard Hebrew prose, are hardly used at all in this poetry. The two exceptions are chapter 28 (2.59%) and chapter 3 (5.05%). By contrast, these particles contribute 9.16% to the narrative portions of Job.

The significance of these statistical facts has yet to be appreciated. It is no longer possible to assume that Hebrew poets used the language of prose, but simply left out these three words, 'stripped bare of the definite article or the relative pronoun.' (Gordis p. 32). We must ask more carefully if they avoided constructions in which these particles would have to be used. If so, by what alternative devices did they show that a noun was definite, that a clause was relative, that something was an object?" (16).

Here Andersen is calling attention to the well documented fact that prose particles are rare in poetry. He renders sterling service to the cause of establishing a syntax of Hebrew poetry when he goes on to ask ' what alternative devices did they use ' to replace the work of these prose particles. Thus syntactically, he is on firm ground in his remarks here. The question of double duty prepositions and the like will now be dealt with.

2 The Double Duty Nature of Prepositions and the like.

"In most cases the legacy of Lowth is still with us. In his classic analysis he viewed each line (=hemistich or colon) of poetry as a sentence. A bicolon consists of two sentences which say the same thing twice. It was assumed that each statement was grammatically complete. Often, of course, the second hemistich was seen to be incomplete. 'Incomplete synonymous parallelism' is one of the well known categories. It was usually considered enough to say 'ellipsis'; something in the first hemistich was 'understood' in the second. In recent years there has been more awareness that an item in one hemistich may operate simultaneously in two hemistichs--i. e., a 'double duty' item. There is reluctance, however, to recognize such a function as retroactive (something in the second colon has to be understood in the first: which is thus left in suspense until the second colon completes it). Even so, such explanations have been invoked ad hoc, as a last resort, to solve an otherwise insoluble problem. In the eyes of many scholars, such results seem to be contrived and unconvincing. This is partly because they are still felt to be grammatically abnormal. A systematic treatment is urgently needed." (17).

This principle, which Andersen has correctly announced, is now further applied by him as follows:

"The most spectacular trick played by Hebrew poets is to make grammatical constructions operate over quite a distance in the text. Double-duty items are only one aspect of this. They might sometimes receive their second application, not in a contiguous line, but in one at considerable remove. Some scholars, perceiving such long range connections, have 'solved' the problem by shunting the related lines together. This is usually a mistake; it loses more than it gains.

For example, Dhorme correctly saw the affinity between Job 3.11 and 3.16, recognizing that the one לָמָּה , 'why?' governs all four lines. But he needlessly moved v 16 next to v 11 (cf NEB). Gordis (p36) rightly recognized the chiasmic structure of vv 11-16, and left them as is; but he did not follow through by making v 16 a double question. The insight of Dhorme (but not his error) and the insight of Gordis (but not his error) must now be combined to gain a full solution." (18)

Here Andersen has correctly observed the double duty nature of prepositions and particles and has noted how such constructions may

operate over a considerable distance. This is not the syntax of prose, but it may be correctly said to be the syntax of Hebrew poetry into which poetic structure plays its own part. The subject of tense, which of course is of particular interest to this study, will now be considered.

3 The Use of Tense

"More serious is Gordis' argument that the ך in ךׁׁׁׁ (3.11) and ׁׁׁׁׁ (3.13) is 'a weakened pronunciation of the Waw-consecutive' (pp 36,37). Dhorme is on firmer ground---'these two verbs are again real aorists'

It is remarkable that the 'imperfect' as such is never used in narrative portions of the book; it reaches over 13% of tokens in Zophar's speeches. In contrast its sequential use is prominent in narrative (13.44%), as one would expect, but very sparse in the speeches. The sequential 'perfect' is hardly used anywhere, and even the use of 'perfect' for past tense is rare----rarest in Joban narrative! The 'imperfect' (preterite in many instances) is over 10% of tokens in most speeches, the perfect (mainly stative) is under 5% in most speeches.

Dhorme's instinct concerning the verbal tense was sound. It is another case where forcing poetry into the grammar of prose (as Gordis does with the verbs in 3.11-13) is unfortunate and unnecessary. Until our bearings on such problems are more secure, it will always be wise to go back and see what Dhorme said." (19).

Now in making these remarks Andersen has of course been commending Dhorme to us as a commentator who anticipated such developments. Yet having said that, it seems to me that what he has said is sufficient to show where such studies in syntax should be leading. One of the main points of Andersen's comments is that poetry has a syntax all of its own. This is none the less true of the use of tense in poetry as

this study will seek to show. In future chapters the tenses will be plotted in a mathematical style and at that stage Dhorme's comments on tense usage will be examined.

Another work which purports to deal with the syntax of the Book of Job is that of Northwest Semitic Grammar and Job by Anton C.M. Blommerde.

In this work he deals with syntax under the following headings: CH 5 Verbs, CH 6 Prepositions, and CH 7 Adverbs and particles.

Blommerde argues that the discovery and study of the Ugaritic texts and progress in Northwest Semitic philology have given a new impulse to Hebrew philology : Both lexicography and grammar have profited by this renewed interest, and new insights into the thematic and stylistic resemblances between Ugaritic, Phoenician, and Hebrew literature have been gained. In his study he is chiefly concerned with some grammatical peculiarities which either have been discovered for the first time in Ugaritic or Phoenician and afterwards also in Hebrew, or which were already known from Hebrew, but have received renewed attention under the impulse of Northwest Semitic studies; thus He tries to shed new light on a series of passages from Job by applying these grammatical principles. (20).

While the title of this work at the outset raises one's hopes, when the work is subjected to critical examination the result is that our hopes are somewhat dashed; this is because the work has two inherent defects. The first of them is the wholesale devaluation of the Masoretic tradition, not only by Blommerde, but by the whole of the

Dahoodian school. The second is that our author superimposes on the Hebrew text the grammatical categories he has already found in Ugaritic and when the Hebrew text will not support these said categories he simply emends the text to fit his theory. It seems to me that this is just not scholarship, since any scholarship which has as its foundation stone textual emendation must be subject to suspicion.

It is proposed to illustrate the above stated points by an examination of some examples drawn from his work. First of all it seems best to consider his Ch 5, entitled Verbs. In this section at subdivision 5 he defends the existence in Hebrew of the Precative Perfect by noting that it exists in Ugaritic, Phoenician, and Hebrew (as well as in Arabic); and that an example from Job is to be found in Job 17.5. (21).

When we turn to Job 17.5 we find that the Hebrew text reads:

לחלק יגיד רעים ועיני בניו תכלנה

this 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 point at issue in this difficult verse is the interpretation of:

קָלַל.

This is analysed by Blommerde as an emphatic lamed with precative perfect. To get such an interpretation Blommerde has to emend the text by using a different vowelism thus:

קָלַל.

This procedure is adopted by him because he wants to establish that a precative perfect exists in Hebrew. The existence of the precative perfect in Hebrew was long ago suggested by Ewald in the sixth edition of his grammar on the basis of Arabic:

"Hence the infusion of this colouring into the discourse produces the appropriate form of expression in Arabic for a pious (religious) desire; and the perfect with such a position and meaning is most fitly termed the precative. That the perfect could be so used in Hebrew also, is safely inferred from the occurrence of particular expressions which otherwise remain unintelligible; as, אָנְכֵם perish the wicked! Ps 10.16, 57.7; the counsel of the wicked אָנְכֵם be far from me! Job 21.16, 22.18; אָנְכֵם thou (O God) hast redeemed me! (OR redeemest me!) Ps 31.6, 116.16; Lam 1.21, 3.57-61; Isa 26.15. In Arabic, the perfect, in such a case, must likewise stand at the beginning with emphasis; and in the usage actually followed by the language, it has gradually become restricted to certain expressions. In Hebrew, as is shown by the instances quoted above, somewhat greater freedom still remains here; but, besides the above few examples, all of which, moreover, belong to the language of poetry, it can scarcely be said that there are many others in the Old Testament." (22)

It should however, be noted, that Ewald in his commentary on the book of Job did not find that the word קָלַל was to be interpreted as a

precativ perfect since his comments are based on the text as we have it and not as scholars would want to find it. S.R.Driver also asked the question is there a precativ perfect in Hebrew? After considering the views which Ewald had propounded he concluded that it would be safer to reject it altogether since the evidence for it is so precarious. (23).

As far as the existence of the precativ perfect in Hebrew is concerned, it seems to me that the conclusion of S.R.Driver is a sound one which has stood the test of time. But even if we should admit that קלל is capable of being understood as a precativ perfect, there is also the question of which root it is to be derived from. In his work, Blommerde, derives קלל from קלל^3 which means to destroy and of which there is only one example to be found in the Old Testament at Lam 4.16. In his commentary, Clines has noted that this latter derivation is cognate with Ugaritic hlq , but the attestation of this root in Hebrew is uncertain. (24). Now what this in depth examination of Blommerde's technique shows, is that it operates upon questionable methodology. For on two different counts it is subject to question. These are (a) the existence in Hebrew of a precativ perfect which is a somewhat doubtful proposition and (b) the attestation in Hebrew of the root קלל^3 "to destroy" a proposition also of uncertain value. In reality what Blommerde is doing here is imposing on Hebrew the meaning of קלל^3 derived from Ugaritic and also imposing a grammatical category which at the very least is open to question. In this action he is simply following Dahood. It seems

that לַחֲלֹל is best understood in line with the majority of commentators as preposition plus noun.

His chapter 7 entitled Adverbs and Prepositions now merits consideration. In his section 5 of that chapter he deals with what he calls The Emphatic Lamed.

He thus argues that proclitic ל may function as emphatic particle, both with nouns and with verbs. Examples from Job are to be found in: Job 5.2; 5.7; 13.12; 17.5; 18.15; 21.22; 32.14; cf also 12.23. (25). It seems appropriate to look at the first of his examples, namely that of Job 5.2. In that verse the Hebrew text reads as follows:

כִּי לְאוֹיִל יָהָרַג כַּעַשׂ וּפְתוּחַ אִמְיִד קָנָאָה

which is translated by the RSV thus:

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

Surprisingly the Hebrew text as is is accepted by Blommerde without any further need to emendation or to a different vowelning. So that Blommerde translates as follows:

"Indeed, it is really a fool whom anger kills, a stupid man, whom jealousy makes die;" (26).

Here the words or rather particle and preposition in question are the initial לַ 'ַ' which Blommerde understands as emphatic particles and are used to bring out a strong emphasis which the the Vulgate renders as: " vere stultum interficit iracundia ", or as Gordis translates: " anger surely kills the fool ". He also notes the possible objection that לַ is used with לָלַן without emphatic character in 2 Sam 3.30; but notwithstanding he still considers that in Job 5.2 emphatic לַ makes a particularly good sense. (27). One may agree with Blommerde when he makes the assertion that 'ַ' is an emphatic particle and is used as such in poetry. The case for understanding 'ַ' as an emphatic particle is moreover defended by Gordis. (28).

But one must disagree with Blommerde when he tries to assert that לַ is used as an emphatic preposition here. Dhorme is surely on better ground when he argues that the preposition לַ before the direct complement is an Aramaism (cf v. 7). In support of his argument Dhorme notes the use of the verb לָלַן with לַ before the object in 2 Sam 3.30. (29). This is surely the best way of understanding the Hebrew text here, a similar usage in the Hebrew Bible confirms the Aramaic usage of לָלַן with לַ being understood as the marker of the definite object as is regular in Aramaic. Here is another instance of Blommerde trying to find the syntax of Ugarit in Hebrew where in this case the Hebrew text is best understood in a more natural way. When however, we come to tense usage Blommerde has no comments to make whatsoever and so he has missed making a contribution to the syntax of Hebrew poetry.

Enough has now been said to show that not only does the book of Job have a language all of its own, it also has a syntax all of its own. It now seems best to move on from this consideration of the elements of the language and syntax of the book to an evaluation of how best we are to understand that language. Now it seems that there are four main theories as to what kind of Hebrew the book of Job is or that there are four kinds of explanations as to how the Hebrew of this book may be understood. These are as follows:

- 1 The Dialectical Argument
- 2 The Literary Argument
- 3 The Translation Argument
- 4 The Composite Language Argument

We shall consider each of these arguments in turn as follows:

1 The Dialectical Argument

This argument is stated succinctly by Andersen in his commentary on the Book of Job

"The first question to be decided is whether the language of this book is a real sample of some variety of Hebrew or not. If it is Hebrew, it varies considerably from the standard of the language which dominates most of the Old Testament. The prestige of David's court

established the dialect of Jerusalem under the united monarchy as a norm which controlled Israelite literature until the time of the exile. Quite apart from the high incidence of unusual words (the book has about one hundred words not found anywhere else), Job deviates from the vocabulary of standard Hebrew in the area of ordinary words, and also in grammar, particularly morphology. To pinpoint the language of Job as a sample of a distinct dialect of Hebrew has a bearing on the date and location of the book, but until more specimens are found, we cannot say when or where such a dialect might have been in use." (30).

Andersen is correct when he gives the conclusion to this argument which as he says is circumvented because of lack of evidence. That there were such things as dialects in Biblical Hebrew is clear from sparse examples in the Hebrew Bible. Here I am thinking of the first book of Kings where some examples of a supposed northern dialect may be traced.

C.F. Burney has noted the following peculiarities of diction which may belong to the dialect of North Palestine. The use of the 2nd Fem. sing. suffix נִי ; the use of the 2nd Fem. sing. Pers. Pron. אֵלַי ; The use of the Fem. Demonstrative Pron. זֹאת Cf. Aram זֵאת ; the use of the Infinitive Construct of a ה' verb with suffixes; the use of the Relative Pron. אֲשֶׁר , In Phoenician rel. is אֲשֶׁר with prosthetic א ; the preservation of ה of art. after prepositions; the use of the construct with suffixed pronoun which anticipates the object; The indefinite use of אֲנִי ; and to these may be added a few roots which betray the influence of Aram.: קָפַץ ; מַדִּינָה ; חֲרִיִּם ; הַשְׁלָה . There is also a fair number of $\alpha\pi\alpha\xi\lambda\epsilon\gamma\gamma.$, some of which take the place of ordinary words and thus may be dialectical; e.g. סָבַח gird, (for חָגַר , אָזַר), מַאֲכָל food, (for אָכַל , אֲכַלָה , אֲכַלְתֶּם). (31)

While this may be seem to be an impressive array of evidence to substantiate a northern dialect for Biblical Hebrew it is still too fragmentary to build a case. It seems best to adhere to the much saner verdict of Waltke and O' Connor who consider that most of Biblical Hebrew is, in fact, in the dialect of Jerusalem, and that little material remains to fill in the dialect geography of the surrounding areas. (32).

It now seems appropriate to consider the literary and the composite language arguments which have been combined together because much of this evidence has already been considered in the first half of this chapter. The position of these arguments is now stated succinctly.

2 The Literary Argument

The gist of this particular argument is that what we are dealing with in the book of Job is not a real language but a mere literary language which has been specially devised for the purpose of the didactic tale. In this case the book of Job is given a late date which means that its author/authors have tried to write a poem in the style of classical Hebrew poetry in a similar way to the sectarians at Qumran who tried to write in classical Hebrew poetry but who also it may be said were not successful in their attempt.

In this case the archaisms which are to be found in this book are not genuine but merely copied from existing Hebrew literature. Thus the

antique flavour of this book is one that has been cultivated deliberately. In the favour of this argument is the fact that such archaisms are not regularly effected throughout the book although the same impression would be given if an old text were only partly modernized in transmission.

Against this particular argument is the fact that this theory has as its foundation stone the ability to date the language in question, a somewhat doubtful procedure on which to build a thesis. It also means that we cannot take the book of Job or its syntax seriously since it is a mere literary form for the transmission of the poem. At best what we could do is to compose a syntax of a literary language which was late in its derivation and whose forms might throw some light on the uses of ancient Hebrew poetry. For these reasons I lay this argument to one side and proceed to consider the composite language argument.

4 The Composite Language Argument

This argument is again briefly stated by Andersen:

"Many of the linguistic features in which the language of Job differs from standard Hebrew are found in one or other of the related Semitic languages. A simple example is found in the use of the suffix]' for masculine plural nouns. This is found in Arabic and Aramaic, whereas Canaanite, represented by Ugaritic or Phoenician, uses □'. Both endings are found in Job. While □' is standard in Hebrew,]' is occasionally found in the Old Testament, apart from occurrences in Job. This variant cannot be attributed solely to late Aramaic influence, for it is found also in some ancient poems. And its use in the Mesha inscription (Moabite) suggests that it was a dialectical

variant within the South Canaanite languages spoken by the Israelite tribes and other closely related peoples.

So while such an alternate ending could have survived as a legitimate dialectical variant within Hebrew many scholars consider it, and other similar features, to be the result of contamination of Hebrew by another language." (33)

The thing that one has to admit about this particular theory is that it gives credence to the background of the book of Job which is reported to be the land of Uz. Whether the land of Uz is located in the north or in the south, Job's homeland is somewhere to the east of Israel proper. Such a location would mean that he would be open to diverse linguistic influence. Israelites living in northern Transjordan would be more influenced by Aramaic than those living west of the river, while those living to the south, on the other hand, would be in contact with peoples speaking languages akin to Arabic.

Further, if it can be argued that Proto-Semitic was some kind of Arabic/Aramaic mix then it can also be argued that the language of the book of Job reflects this mix in its vocabulary and syntax. Yet this very statement reflects the weakness of this particular argument, that much of it is based on speculation and not on hard concrete fact. We lack the kind of evidence we need to compose the real picture of how Hebrew was influenced by its neighbouring languages. The likelihood is that such linguistic influence and borrowing was far more complicated than we envisage. Thus while this view is attractive, it is one which must await the arrival of more evidence. The final view will now be considered.

3 The Translation Argument

The final argument which will be considered is in reality an extension of the argument which has just been considered, namely the explanation of the language of the book of Job by considering the influence of the other Semitic languages on Hebrew. It is because of the fact that this argument has proceeded on the basis of speculation and so cannot be proved one way or another that some scholars have turned to theories which explain the language of the book of Job as an imperfect translation from another language.

This particular argument has manifested itself in two forms: (a) Arabic and (b) Aramaic. Arabic will be considered first of all. The idea that Job was written first in Arabic has been expressed in modern times by A. Guillaume in his 'Studies in the book of Job'. In his introduction Guillaume states his thesis:

" The fundamental reason for this lack of success lies in the centuries long failure to perceive that the book was written by a poet whose language was impregnated through and through with Arabic. Consequently commentators did not see that the book must have been written in Arabia; and furthermore that the very first chapter told them exactly when and almost exactly where it was written, or rather the time and place where Job lived, for the book could not have been written until Job had been restored to health and wealth after his sickness and poverty." (34).

From his opening statement it is clear that Guillaume is trying to take the introductory chapter of this book seriously and so he is positing a 6th century B. C. background to the personality of Job and

definite geographical location to Job in a community which he asserts existed in the Hijaz at that time. As we study his work, we find to our surprise that his argument is not based on the supposed 'Arabisms' in the book although that obviously has a part to play, but we find that his argument is based on the historical reconstruction of this community which he asserts existed in the Hijaz. This it may be said is the foundation stone upon which his theory is built. Now what is the evidence for the existence of this community which gave birth to the book of Job?

For Guillaume the starting point for his thesis is the discovery of the inscriptions of Nabonidus:

"Here it must be added that were it not for the discovery of the inscriptions of Nabonidus which gives an account of his conquest and occupation of the principal oases of the Hijaz in the sixth century BC., though it would have been possible to make out a strong case for an Arabian origin of the book of Job philologically, without this historical evidence it would have been, and would have remained, little more than a theory. But with this and other archaeological discoveries before us it is possible to assert as a fact of history that this wonderful book was written in the Hijaz in the latter part of the sixth century BC." (35).

Now what Guillaume is asserting about this historical background to the book of Job is this, that it shows that there was a Hebrew settlement in Arabia. This took place by the ten years sojourn of Nabonidus to Tema in around the year 550 BC. So he states:

"In 1956 Professor D. S. Rice discovered in Harran inscriptions of Nabonidus in which he described his ten years sojourn in Arabia round about the year 550 BC. He took the road to Tema, Dedan, Fadak,

Khaybar, Yadi and Yathrib (ie Medina), making Tema his temporary capital. In all these places he established garrisons composed of Babylonians and levies from the west. These oases lie within a few days camel journey of Medina. It is a most significant fact that at the time of Muhammad large Jewish settlements were established in four of the five places named above,---" (36)

Having asserted that such communities existed Guillaume now goes on to state the activity of such communities:

"Medina was the centre of Jewish Arabian fusion. In later days Jews vied with Arabs in writing verse. Arab proselytes were numerous and educated Jews were masters of both languages. For these reasons Job may be regarded not as an Edomite, but as an Hebrew settled in what is now known as the Hijaz, and his acquaintance with the Old Testament writings which from time to time emerges is what one would naturally expect. If we add to these considerations the use of the peculiarity in Hijaz Arabic, the cumulative evidence for a sixth century date and a Hebrew-Arabian author is impressive." (37).

It is only now that Guillaume goes on to deal with the actual language of the book of Job and to show how the actual obscurities of the text may be understood on the basis of Arabic.

"Inasmuch as the text of Job has been subject to 'emendation', ie., deliberate falsification of the evidence, to an appalling degree, and inasmuch as the integrity of the book has been called in question I determined to read it as though it were an Arabic work with the hope of throwing light on passages which have never been satisfactorily explained; deciding whether the language of Elihu and the poem on Wisdom differ philologically from the rest of the book; and whether any part of it is strongly marked by Aramaisms. To save space Arabic parallels cannot be given, but it may be said that Aramaisms in Job are very rare indeed, and that the Elihu and Wisdom chapters contain words and forms familiar in Arabic but unknown in Biblical Hebrew." (38).

Having now stated the salient points of Guillaume's case we will now

proceed to examine this theory of the language of the book of Job. However, when we come to examine this theory we find that its foundation stone is at once to say the least defective. It has been already noted above that the major building block in this theory is the historical reconstruction of the community in the Hijaz in the sixth century BC. Yet it is this very reconstruction which is to say the least doubtful. Andersen argues in his commentary that as with the Edomite theory, we know nothing of a community which developed literature in the Hijaz in the sixth century BC. (39).

It would seem that what Guillaume has done is to take a historical situation which definitely existed in the seventh century AD., and projected it backwards presumably to locate the book of Job within the period of the earliest literary Arabic. By so doing he can maximise on the Arabisms which are to be found within the book of Job. Yet his procedure is to say the least highly speculative. For it is one thing to examine the vocabulary of the book of Job and to find there words which are only explicable on the basis of Arabic as Dhorme for example has done. It is quite another to build from that a supposed historical background as Guillaume has done to make his examination of the book of Job intelligible and so to prove the existence of an Arabic original. The late setting of the book of Job as Guillaume has proposed does not seem to do justice to the archaisms which abound within its language.

Therefore while we may readily applaud his attempt to give to the book

of Job a definite historical background which in turn would give credence to the Arabisms which abound within it; his theory must be set aside because of the highly speculative way that it is built. It must also be said that Guillaume has not paid sufficient heed to the other commentators such as Dhorme when he makes his conclusion that Aramaisms are very rare in the book of Job. Because of this and the other factors mentioned above his approach of an Arabic original to the book of Job must be set aside.

The question of an Aramaic original to the book of Job which has been argued by Tur-Sinai in his commentary will now be considered. After a very useful review of the language of the book of Job, Tur-Sinai states:

"The whole of the above picture of the language and style of the book of Job, with all their peculiarities and the difficulties they create for the understanding of the text, is modified and corrected by the realization that the poem in its extant form is mainly a translation from an Aramaic original. The Hebrew text is intelligible only in the light of this fact, with all its implications." (40).

The encouraging thing about this view is that it has, at least initially, as its starting point the language of the book of Job as we find it in the Hebrew Bible. So far all is well. Yet when we examine this work in detail it becomes clear that it also proceeds on the basis of speculation.

"The indications of the Aramaic original of the book are very numerous. In a number of cases the translator erred, and the

meaning can only be established by reconstructing the Aramaic text." (41).

Now what does he mean by the the reconstruction of the original Aramaic text? In some cases the proposed reconstruction involves little more than using the same consonants as are found in the Hebrew Bible but finding an Aramaic word instead of a Hebrew one. It is best to show how he does this by citing an example. In Ch 3.24, e.g., the Hebrew text reads:

נִי לִפְנֵי לַחְמִי אֲנוּחָתִי הַבֶּלֶת

and is translated by the RSV as:

"For my sighing comes as my bread,"

On this verse Tur-Sinai comments:

"Therefore the sigh, as a sign of this disquiet, actually proceeded something else, which is denoted by the word traditionally read 'לחמי' 'my bread'. But it is clear from the context that the word intended must mean something like 'my trouble, misfortune', the same subject which Job frequently calls 'לַחְמִי', the terror, trouble. Now such an idea of something frightening and menacing is expressed in Syriac by 'luhma', from 'lhm' 'threaten', 'lehim', threatening. This word, in the defective spelling of the Biblical period written 'לחמל', exactly like the word for bread, occurs also in the Syriac translation of the Bible. But what is more, the word 'לחמל' in the sense of 'terror, menace' occurs in another passage of Job (15.23) by the side of 'לחמל', terror, and in this case it was recognised by the Syrian, who translated it correctly by the cognate 'luhma'. 'לחמל' is in both passages an Aramaic word, meaning 'threat, terror, menace', and so are many other words within the book." (42).

It seems to me that this procedure is justifiable since it is based on the text as we now have it and not on a hypothetical reconstruction and it is by such procedure that Tur-Sinai has found the solution to many difficult passages within the book of Job and has made a definite contribution to the lexicography of the book of Job. However when we turn to his comment on Ch 6.4 we see a different procedure at work which is more questionable.

In Ch 6.4 the Hebrew text reads:

כִּי חֲצֵי שָׁדַי עִמָּדִי

which the RSV translates as:

"For the arrows of the Almighty are within me"

and upon which Tur-Sinai offers the following comment:

"First of all, we must determine more exactly who or what are the arrows of Shaddai and terrors of God mentioned in v 4. These terrors, **בַּעֲוֹתַי**, are according to Job's complaint in 7.14, frightening apparitions, demons and angels, who terrify him in dreams. Here, too, dreams are expressly referred to by the expression **חֲלֻמֹתַי**; for this, **חֲלֻמֹתַי**, dreams, is the only natural interpretation of these letters, as was recognised by the medieval commentators quoted by Rashi, and the rendering of G, **εν ρημασι κενοις**, 'in empty words', is apparently based on the same interpretation. In parallelism to 'the terrors of God', **חֲצֵי** too, must mean the terrifying apparitions sent by God that frighten Job in dreams---and not arrows, of which it can hardly be said that they are 'with me'. Nevertheless the reading **חֲצֵי** of the extant Hebrew text is not to be doubted; but the Hebrew word represents a translation from an ancient Aramaic original which, here as in many other passages of the book, the Hebrew translator did not render correctly. For

according to the context, the parallel term to the terrors of God should have been apparitions, Aramaic 'לן, 'of Shaddai'. However in early Aramaic, where y corresponding to Arabic z had not yet changed to b, the letters 'לן could be interpreted both as Arrows and apparitions." (43).

Here Tur-Sinai is on less firm ground since the case for reading 'לן as לן is built on the supposed Aramaic original and not on the extant Hebrew text as we now have it. It seems to me that here Tur-Sinai has overstated his case as the argument for an Aramaic original is not proved by appealing to the obscurities which are to be found in the text and explaining these by postulating a supposed Aramaic original. The reconstruction of the original Aramaic text has been arrived at by the assertion that the translator had often erred and so the text can only be re-established by scholarly conjecture which is of necessity subjective. Thus the building block for this particular hypothesis is the errors of the half-witted translator as without the supposition of his errors the original Aramaic text cannot be re-established. Tur-Sinai has developed his theory with vast learning and great ingenuity, and his numerous observations on the text as we now have it bring much light from the Aramaic quarter. But the case for an Aramaic original from which the book of Job has been translated has not been established on a sure foundation.

What conclusions can be arrived at as to the language of the book of Job? It seems that at the conclusion to this chapter which has concerned itself with an in depth investigation into the language of the book of Job that almost no conclusions can be reached at all.

We have seen above that the case for either an Aramaic or an Arabic original to the book of Job has not been proved since the case for it is built upon somewhat speculative lines. That comment could also be applied to the other arguments which have sought to explain the language of the book of Job as either a dialect, or a literary medium or that of a composite language. It is perhaps best to leave the question open and to conclude this chapter in the way in which we began by referring to the words of S. R. Driver who stated on the language of the book of Job:

"It appears that the author came more definitely within the range of Aramaizing influences than the author of Isa 40-66, and perhaps had his home in proximity to Aramaic and Arabic speaking peoples." (44).

NOTES

- | | | | | |
|------|-----------------|--|------------|-------|
| (1) | Driver | <u>Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament</u> | p434. | 1913. |
| (2) | Gordis | <u>The Book of God and Man</u> | p160. | 1965. |
| (3) | Delitzsch | <u>Das Buch Hiob.</u> | p125-30 | 1904. |
| (4) | Dhorme | <u>A commentary on the Book of Job</u> | pclxxv | 1967. |
| (5) | Gordis | <u>The Book of God and Man</u> | p161 | 1965. |
| (6) | Dhorme | <u>A Commentary on the Book of Job</u> | pclxxv | 1967. |
| (7) | Dhorme | ibid | pclxxvi | 1967. |
| (8) | Dhorme | ibid | pclxxvii | 1967. |
| (9) | Dhorme | ibid | pclxxviii | 1967. |
| (10) | Driver and Gray | ICC- <u>Job</u> | p1vi-vii | 1921. |
| (11) | Dhorme | ibid | pcv | 1967. |
| (12) | Driver and Gray | ibid | plxx | 1950 |
| (13) | Andersen | Preface to Dhorme | piv-v | 1984 |
| (14) | Tur-Sinai | <u>The Book of Job</u> | pxxii-xxiv | 1957 |
| (15) | Gesenius-- | <u>Hebrew Grammar</u> | §2r p15. | 1910. |
| (16) | Andersen | ibid | pv-vi | 1984. |
| (17) | Andersen | ibid | pvi-vii | 1984 |
| (18) | Andersen | ibid | pvi11 | 1984 |
| (19) | Andersen | ibid | pvi11-ix | 1984. |
| (20) | Blommerde | <u>North West Sem & Job</u> | p1 | 1969 |
| (21) | Blommerde | ibid | p21 | 1969 |
| (22) | Ewald- | <u>Hebrew Syntax</u> | p15 | 1879. |
| (23) | Driver- | <u>Hebrew Tenses</u> | p25-6 | 1892 |

(24)	Clines-W. B. C. - <u>Job</u>	p373	1989
(25)	Blommerde ibid	p31	1969
(26)	Blommerde ibid	p43	1969.
(27)	Blommerde ibid	p43	1969
(28)	Gordis ibid	p52	1965
(29)	Dhorme ibid	p57	1967
(30)	Andersen-T. C. O. T. - <u>Job</u>	p56	1976
(31)	Burney- <u>Text of the Books of Kings</u>	p208-9	1903
(32)	Waltke & O'Connor- <u>Hebrew Syntax</u>	p59	1990
(33)	Andersen-T. C. O. T. - <u>Job</u>	p57f	1976
(34)	Guillaume- <u>Studies in the Book of Job</u>	p1	1968
(35)	Guillaume-ibid	p3	1968
(36)	Guillaume-'Arabic background'	p106	1963
(37)	Guillaume-'Arabic background'	p108	1963
(38)	Guillaume-'Arabic background'	p108f	1963
(39)	Andersen-T. C. O. T. - <u>Job</u>	p60	1976
(40)	Tur-Sinai- <u>The Book of Job</u>	pxxx	1957
(41)	Tur-Sinai-ibid	pxxx1	1957
(42)	Tur-Sinai-ibid	p67	1957
(43)	Tur-Sinai-ibid	p115, 6.	1957
(44)	Driver- <u>ILOT</u>	p434	1961.

Chapter Three

The use of the Imperfect Consecutive.

At the beginning of this chapter, it is necessary to say something about the methodology that will be used in the remainder of this thesis. The poetic portions of the book of Job (Ch 3.1-20.29 & 32.1-42.6) have been systematically worked through and every verbal form has been noted and numbered to aid easy identification when these forms are grouped together in the categories of tense (Imperfect Consecutive etc.). What this means in practical terms, is that, some 2347 verbal forms will be examined in detail. From this mathematical way of looking at the tenses as they occur in the book of Job a syntax of the use of tense in Hebrew Poetry will emerge. The groups that will be examined are as follows:

- (a) The Imperfect Consecutive.
- (b) The Imperfect Consecutive.
- (c) The Imperfect.
- (d) The Perfect Consecutive.
- (e) The Perfect Consecutive.
- (f) The Perfect.

In the first instance, the use of the Imperfect Consecutive will be examined. In doing so, however, a number of questions must be answered with regard to how to interpret the Imperfect Consecutive in poetry. These points have already been noted by Fensham in his study:

"We want to begin with the waw consecutive forms which are the most complicated. One may ask the question whether these forms already existed when this old Psalm was composed. Are they later forms introduced with the re-editing or are they erroneously punctuated by the Massoretes. It is quite possible that all the waw consecutive prefix conjugations in this Psalm must be regarded as pure prefix conjugations, because at such an early stage the waw consecutive was not as yet developed (cf Ugaritic). Or, according to W. Gross, they may be equivalent to the perfect describing a present state resulting from a past action." (1).

Thus, according to Fensham, there are a number of possibilities:

- (a) They are later forms introduced with the re-editing of the texts.
- (b) They are in reality pure prefix forms which have been erroneously punctuated by the Massoretes.
- (c) They have been correctly punctuated by the Massoretes and should be interpreted as being equivalent to the perfect describing a present state resulting from a past action. This is the position of W. Gross.

In his study, Fensham opts for the second alternative; but is he correct in so doing?

In order to answer the question we require to consider all the alternatives and make an appropriate response to them. The first of his possibilities will now be considered. This is that the Imperfect Consecutives are in reality later forms introduced with the re-editing of the texts. If they are later forms, then one would have to pick and choose between what scholars have agreed is later and what appears to be earlier. This in reality would mean postulating two kinds of syntax, an earlier syntax and a later one. To do so, it seems to me, would destroy the very syntax one is attempting to examine, since then one would have to argue that the editor in his revision of the book was also attempting to improve its syntax or to bring it into line with what he knew of prose texts. One would also have to argue that the editor had not carried out his work efficiently since there are places where an Imperfect Consecutive might be expected but where it does not appear. This view is therefore laid to one side.

His next possibility is that these forms have been erroneously punctuated by the Massoretes. This is the view which Fensham has decided to accept. While this may be a real possibility it is preferable to believe that the Massoretes were preserving a tradition and that tradition is to be seen in the way that they punctuated the

Hebrew Bible. On the whole the Hebrews were rather good at preserving their traditions and it would be consistent with their character as 'guardians of the faith' if we could see in the Massoretic punctuation a tradition which had been handed down in the familiar Jewish way. Although this view is in itself not without difficulties, it seems to me to be more acceptable than the other two alternatives. This means that the Imperfect Consecutives which the Hebrew Bible has preserved are to be accepted.

The vexed question of the interpretation of the Imperfect Consecutive in poetry will now be considered. As far as prose is concerned its use is well defined in Gesenius' grammar:

"The imperfect with waw consecutive serves to express actions, events or states, which are to be regarded as the temporal or logical sequel of actions, events, or states mentioned immediately before. The imperfect consecutive is used in this way most frequently as the narrative tense, corresponding to the Greek aorist or the Latin historic perfect. As a rule the narrative is introduced by a perfect, and then continued by means of imperfections with waw consecutive." (2).

But what is the use of such a form where it exists in poetry?

This question will be answered by a detailed examination of the Imperfect Consecutives which are used in the book of Job. Now in the chapters which are under consideration this form is used some 135 times. Of these, 47 can be discounted since they are represented by the introductory formula וַיְהִי--כִּי and a prose introduction to

chapter 32 which occupies the first 6 verses. It is therefore the remaining 88 examples that will be considered in this chapter and these are listed in accordance with the numeration described above.

No 25:

כִּי לֹא סָגַר דְּלֹחַי בְּסִנִּי וַיִּסְתֵּר עֵמֶל מֵעֵינַי

"because it did not shut the doors of my mother's womb,
nor hide trouble from my eyes". (3.10 RSV).

This first occurrence of the imperfect consecutive is to be found in Job's introductory poem which may be classed as a complaint. In form this may be further subdivided thus : vv3-10 the curse and vv11-26 the lament. The imperfect consecutive וַיִּסְתֵּר occurs right at the end of the curse section. Now all the verbs in the curse are expressed by the jussive as one might expect, the exceptions being אָמַר and עָרַר. They are not part of the main expression of the curse and can be commented on later. In v 10 we have a motive clause giving the reason for the curse. The motive is that Job was not allowed to die at birth and it is expressed by the two verbs סָגַר and וַיִּסְתֵּר whose subject is still 'that Night'. The significance of וַיִּסְתֵּר as it is used in this verse is that it denotes the result or consequence of לֹא סָגַר. That is because the doors of his mother's womb were not shut, the result was that trouble was not hid from him.

Now this unique usage of the waw consecutive in poetry was noted a long time ago by Davidson who stated in his unfinished commentary on that book:

"--- so hid, the result, or what would have been the result of shutting". (3).

It should be noted that none of the modern commentators makes any comment on the use of ׀׀׀׀. It has already been noted in the introductory chapter that Michel came to a similar conclusion with regard to the use of the imperfect consecutive in poetry:

"In the preceding paragraphs it has been shown that the so styled imperfect consecutive indicates a consequence; without, indeed, any reference to a period of time." (4).

This conclusion has been noted by Waltke and O'connor who state:

"He has demonstrated beyond reasonable doubt that the waw-relative construction (׀׀׀׀) can signify consequence or dependence." (5).

Now while Michel on the basis of his findings concludes that the imperfect consecutive denotes consequence; the evidence from the book of Job at least shows that consequence can also be denoted by ordinary waw + imperfect, or by ordinary waw + perfect, and this will be noted when other tense usage is considered.

No 45

המחכים למות ואיננו יִחַפְּרוּ מִמָּטְמוֹנִים

"Who long for death, but it comes not,
and dig for it more than for hid treasures;" (3.21 RSV).

Job's complaint yields yet another example of the imperfect consecutive. This time it is to be found however, not in the first part of his complaint which concerns the curse, but in the second part which is his lament. The lament itself can be further broken down into two parts : vv 11-19 & vv 24-26 the self-lament, and vv 20-23 which may be called the God lament. Characteristic of the lament are the 'why' questions in vv 11, 12, 16, 20 and v 23 where it is implied. The questions expressed in vv 11 and 20 are introduced by לָמָּה while that in v12 is introduced by מָדוּעַ. V 16, however, is introduced by אֲיֵךְ which has made many commentators think that the verse has been misplaced and really needs to follow v 12. What has to be remembered is that vv 13 - 15 are an expression of a hypothetical situation which Job wishes had come about so that the אֲיֵךְ of v 16 is in reality picking up the מָדוּעַ of v 12. In v 20 the questioning is resumed by לָמָּה. This is followed by vv 21 & 22 which are an extended relative clause and once again the imperfect consecutive denotes the consequence of an action indicated by הַמְחַכִּים. In other words, those who are in bitterness of soul are also the ones who are looking for death.

Yet because they do not find it the consequence is that they are actively pursuing it. This is denoted by the imperfect consecutive וַיִּחְפְּרוּ. Davidson comments on the use of the waw consecutive used here:

"The construction with waw consecutive implies that dig is the thought consecution of the waiting; both are present; but the already finished may be considered as extending into the present". (6).

Dhorme notes only that:

"The participial clause of the 1st hemistich is continued by the consecutive imperfect (Gesenius-Kautzsch § 116x)". (7).

The construction to which he refers is in fact regularly to be found in the book of Job. But beyond that he makes no reference to the actual use of the imperfect consecutive. But enough has already been said to indicate its use in Hebrew poetry.

No 50

לִגְבוֹר אֵשֶׁר דָּרְנוּ נִסְתָּרָה וַיִּסַּךְ אֱלֹהִים בְּעוֹר

"Why is light given to a man whose way is hid,
whom God has hedged in"? (3.23 RSV).

With this verse the questioning is resumed which was separated from v 20 by the extended relative clause of vv 21 & 22 which lamented the

lot of suffering mankind in general. In this verse he turns to his own particular lot and uses the third person as a bridge between v 22 & v 23. It is necessary to consider the למה יתן אור of v 20 to be understood in this verse. However, when the waw consecutive וַיִּסַּךְ is considered it is difficult to see how it denotes the consequence of anything. Rather than denoting the consequence of any action it seems rather to denote an emphatic action that it is God himself who has brought this condition about on the life of Job. In the two previous examples it has been shown that the imperfect consecutive used in these verses clearly denotes the concept of consequence. That, however cannot be said here. What may be clearly said here is that the imperfect consecutive וַיִּסַּךְ is used to denote emphasis and it continues the force of the perfect נִסְחָרָה 'hid' of the 1st hemistich. This was also noted by Davidson:

"Set a hedge וַיִּסַּךְ hiphil of סָכַךְ Job 38.8, allied to סָכַךְ Hosea 2.8; Job 10.11; conf. Job 19.8; 1.10; waw consecutive expresses the consecution, but not infrequently leaves the cause or preceding circumstances unexpressed, so that it does not rigidly express a logical consequence, whether of thought or action, but is used to designate any new occurrence, being more emphatic than a mere perfect." (8).

Thus, the use of the imperfect consecutive is an emphatic one. The same may also be said of Nos. 54 & 60 which are dealt with below.

No 52

כִּי לִפְנֵי לַחֲמִי אֲנֹחֲתִי חִבָּא וַיִּתְּנֵנִי נַמִּים שְׂאוֹתִי

"For my sighing comes before my bread,
and my groanings are poured out like water". (3.24 RSV).

The opening ׀ of 3.24 links it to v23 and thence to v 20 and thereby gives a reason as to why Job should be dead: his diet is insubstantial and so life is no longer worth living. In the first hemistich this is expressed by means of the depiction of Job's tears as his food which in itself is familiar Psalmic language. It should be noted that the preposition ׀ which usually means 'before' here has the rarer meaning of 'as, like' as the parallelism indicates. The consequence of this state of affairs is denoted in the second hemistich by means of the imperfect consecutive ׀ 'pour out'. The author wants us to note what the consequence of Job's sighing is and so he has used the imperfect consecutive to express it in metaphorical terms: his groanings are poured out like water.

No 54

כי פחד פחדתי ויאתיני ואשר יגותי יבא לי

"For the thing that I fear comes upon me,
and what I dread befalls me." (3.25 RSV).

No 60

לא שלותי ולא שקסתי ולא נחתי ויבא רגז

"I am not at ease, nor am I quiet,
I have no rest, but trouble comes". (3.26 RSV).

Both of these examples are taken from the concluding self-lament as noted above. The opening כִּי of v 25 may be regarded as giving the reason for the sighing of v 24 and of showing Job's state of mind. The reason that sighing is his staple food is that the very thing he feared has taken place and the arrival of disaster is denoted by the use of the imperfect consecutives. It would be very difficult to argue that the imperfect consecutive וַיִּאֲחַז יָנִי is in any way the consequence of פָּחַדְתִּי since the coming of disaster cannot really be the consequence of fearing. The same may be said with regard to the imperfect consecutive וַיִּבֹא. It cannot really be conceived as the consequence to any of the three perfects נָחַת שָׁקַט וְשָׁלַח which actually describe the state of not being at peace. Therefore what is being argued here is that the imperfect consecutive is used emphatically.

No 73

כִּי עָתָה חָבוּא אֵלַיךְ וְחָלָא חֹנַע עֲדֶיךָ וְחַבְהָל

"But now it has come to you, and you are impatient,
it touches you, and you are dismayed". (4.5 RSV).

Chapter 4 constitutes the first reply to Job by Eliphaz the Temanite. His reply, like those in the dialogue, does not follow any fixed form, but contains a great variety of form critical elements. In

the portion in which the imperfect consecutive occurs we have a first conventional speech preface. He refers to Job's position as a teacher and shepherd of Israel and notes that trouble has now come to him. The result of this coming of disaster is that Job is now impatient and this is denoted by $\alpha\lambda\lambda$. Thus this particular occurrence of the imperfect consecutive denotes the concept of consequence. This interpretation of this verb is confirmed by Davidson who argues that:

" $\alpha\lambda\lambda$ regular waw consecutive introducing the result or issue of $\alpha\lambda\lambda$, and in a like way, $\alpha\lambda\lambda$ expresses the issue of $\alpha\lambda\lambda$. " (9).

And Dhorme, who writes that:

"The waw consecutive in $\alpha\lambda\lambda$ and $\alpha\lambda\lambda$ implies that Job's state of mind is a consequence of the events summed up by $\alpha\lambda\lambda$ and $\alpha\lambda\lambda$." (10).

Both of these scholars have also made clear that this interpretation also applies to No 75 which is to be found in the same verse in the construction $\alpha\lambda\lambda$. A further note must be added with regard to its interpretation. Not only do both of these waw consecutives denote the concept of consequence but also they denote a state. For the state of Job is that he was both impatient and dismayed because disaster had come to him. The denoting of states is usually marked in Hebrew poetry by the perfect, but this is not always the case; elsewhere the state may also be denoted by the waw consecutive as well.

No 89

וְאֵלַי דָּבַר יְגִנֵּב וְחִקָּה אֶזְנִי שְׁמַע מְנִהוּ

"Now a word was brought to me stealthily,
my ear received the whisper of it". (4.12 RSV).

Vv 12-21 may be described as the second major part of Eliphaz' reply because in it he wants to draw attention to the fact that he too has received a vision. This whole verse is an emphatic construction. For the verse begins with 'וְאֵלַי' 'even to me' and the poet wants to emphasize that Eliphaz too has a knowledge of the Deity. The imperfect consecutive וְחִקָּה clearly denotes the consequence of יְגִנֵּב. Davidson recognized this when he noted:

" וְחִקָּה proper waw consecutive imperfect, the result of steals, and of course of the same time." (11).

Yet it seems to me that this occurrence of the imperfect consecutive not only denotes consequence but also the concept of emphasis. For the writer is surely drawing attention to the fact that Eliphaz too has a knowledge of God equal to that of Job and wishes to draw attention to this fact by using the imperfect consecutive in an emphatic way. Thus it would appear that the best way to understand this imperfect consecutive is by that of an emphatic construction.

No 116

אני ראיתי אויל משריש ואקרב נוהו פתאם

"I have seen the fool taking root,
but suddenly I cursed his dwelling." (5.3 RSV).

In the third main section of Eliphaz's first speech Eliphaz discourses with Job on the fate of the fool. The theology of the fate determining deed and the proverb like conclusion to these verses (1-7), confirm its wisdom derivation. But what of the use of the imperfect consecutive?

All the commentators note the difficulty presented by וַאֲקָרַב of the M.T. The difficulty is based on the supposition that the second hemistich must picture the catastrophe itself. Because of this supposition וַאֲקָרַב has been changed to וַיִּקְרַב or to וַיִּרְקַב following G's εἰβρωθη. It should be noted, however, that βιβρωστω is never used to render וַיִּקְרַב 'to rot'. The use of the root וַיִּקְרַב 'to rot' as proposed by scholars would produce a translation which read 'His dwelling suddenly rotted' and one wonders what that could mean since the rotting of one's house is not a catastrophe of any kind. It is perhaps better to take the text as it stands and to try and make something of the syntax of the imperfect consecutive. If it can be accepted that Eliphaz had noted the prosperity of the fool then it must also be accepted that his action in solemnly cursing such prosperity is

denoted by an emphatic construction, namely the imperfect consecutive. Thus what is being argued for here in Job 5.3 is an understanding of the imperfect consecutive as a construction which denotes emphasis. Job 5.3 is yet another example of the imperfect consecutive used emphatically.

No 142

וְיִשָּׁע מִחַרְבַּ מַּפְיָהֶם וּמִיַּד חֹזֵק אֲבִיּוֹן

" But he saves the fatherless from their mouth,
the needy from the hand of the mighty." (5.15 RSV).

This example is of particular interest since it happens to be the clearest among those studied thus far of the imperfect consecutive being used to denote emphasis. First it is necessary to describe its setting and background.

This example is once again located in the speech of Eliphaz who is making his reply to the lament of Job as to why he was born. In 5.8-16 he presents a further discourse on God's contrasting dealings with righteous and wicked. This hymn, which principally describes the acts of God, may have had its origin in cultic usage. In it the acts of God are almost exclusively denoted by the use of the participle and further mention will be made of the divine use of the participle in a subsequent chapter. In the latter part of v 13,

Eliphaz notes how God brings the schemes of the wily to a sharp end and that end is to be found in utter darkness. The action of the wicked in this darkness is denoted by two imperfects לִשְׁחַח' --- לִשְׁכַּח' . The next verse, which describes the action of God in saving the fatherless uses the imperfect consecutive to denote such action. The action of God in salvation cannot be conceived in any sense as a consequence of the action of the wicked who are groping in the darkness; rather it seems better to describe the use of the imperfect consecutive here as an emphatic one. When however, No 143 is examined, it will be seen that the use of the imperfect consecutive there reverts to its normal use in poetry, namely that of describing a consequence of actions.

No 143

$\text{וְתִהְיֶה לְדָל תִּקְוָה וְעַלְתָּה קִפְצָה פִּיָּה$

"So the poor have hope,
and injustice shuts its mouth." (5.16 RSV).

This example represents the conclusion to the hymn of praise and denotes the consequence of God's saving action described by the emphatic construction וְיִשְׁׁוּׁ which has been referred to above (No 142). The consequence of God's saving action is that the poor have hope and this is denoted by the imperfect consecutive וְתִהְיֶה .

No 213

בָּשׂוּ כִּי בָטְחוּ בְּאֵלֵי ה' וְהִתְפַּחְּסוּ

"They are disappointed because they were confident;
they come thither and are confounded" (6.20 RSV).

This example is set in Job's reply to Eliphaz. The structure of the speech may be divided into three parts, (1) vv2-13: Job is evidently uttering a monologue, speaking neither to the friends nor to God who is spoken of in the third person. (2) vv14-20: Job is clearly addressing himself to the friends although they are referred to in the third person as though they were not there; but there can be no doubt that these lines can be addressed to them. (3) vv21-30: Job addresses his friends directly in every verse except the last. Thus Job has begun to address his friends as being as treacherous as a torrent bed.

In vv 18-20 the image of the Wadi is employed. These verses describe thirsty caravaneers who are tempted by their knowledge of a nearby wadi and leave the regular track in search of water. They go off into the unmarked desert and find only dried up streams, and perish before they can reach the next watering place. Their action in so doing is denoted by three perfects וָאֵלֶּם --וָאֵלֶּם --וָאֵלֶּם which in reality denote states although they may be translated by the present tense. The consequence of their fruitless search is that they are confounded because of the waterless streams and this is denoted by the

imperfect consecutive וַיִּחַפְּרוּ.

No 216

כִּי עַתָּה הִיָּיתָם לִי תִרְאוּ חַתָּת וַתִּירְאוּ

"Such you have now become to me;

you see my calamity, and are afraid" (6.21 RSV).

The context to the example in 6.21 is as noted above for No 213. The commentators make much of the difficulty of the first hemistich and here it seems best to follow Dhorme who states:

"There then remains the difficulty of כִּי עַתָּה 'now that' or 'because now', which is with difficulty joined to the context. Houbigant very justly remarked that G and Syr. read לִי. He then proposed the slight correction of כִּי to כִּן. Thus we obtain for the first hemistich 'Thus have you been for me on this occasion'." (12).

This reading of the text is clearly followed by the RSV. There follows a statement that Job's friends have seen his calamity and the consequence is that they are afraid. This consequence is denoted by the imperfect consecutive וַתִּירְאוּ. In making this observation it is necessary to note the paronomasia that exists between the two verbs וַתִּירְאוּ -- וַתִּרְאוּ. Thus this occurrence of the imperfect consecutive also denotes the concept of consequence.

No 251

לְבַשׁ בְּשָׂרִי רִמָּה וְגִיֹשׁ עֲפָר עוֹרִי וְגַזְזֵנוֹ

"My flesh is clothed with worms and dirt;
my skin hardens, then breaks out afresh." (7.5 RSV).

Here Job is talking about his sickness in the appeal that he is making to God. God, although not mentioned by name in 7.1-6 is clearly the addressee, a fact that is made clear by the imperative 'remember' of v 7. Here Job describes his sickness to God. He does so by using two perfects with one imperfect consecutive. As with No. 213 the perfects are used to describe a state, and in this case the state is Job's failing health. The perfects referred to are לְבַשׁ --- וְגַזְזֵנוֹ. He then uses the imperfect consecutive וְגִיֹשׁ which most scholars take to be a by-form or metaplastic form of גִּזְזָה niph. 'flow, drip' : thus e.g. NEB marg 'discharging', NIV 'festering', JB 'oozes pus'. It should be noted however, that both BDB and Holladay posit the possibility of a homonym גִּזְזָה 2 'flow, run' but this is both rare and dubious. How is the use of the imperfect consecutive to be taken here?

The clue is to be found with the previous perfect וְגַזְזֵנוֹ. It seems best to take וְגַזְזֵנוֹ as having the meaning 'break, shatter' since in 26.12 it is parallel to חָנַח which bears that meaning. It should be noted that the verb וְגַזְזֵנוֹ expresses the divine action on the sea when it is necessary to cut a way through it. Here the verb is used intransitively, 'my skin splits' with a similar meaning.

The imperfect consecutive וַיִּמָּאֵס therefore denotes the consequence of that action so that it may be said to 'flow with pus'. Thus once again the imperfect consecutive denotes the consequence of the action denoted by the previous perfect. This conclusion as to the use of the imperfect consecutive here is also observed by Dhorme. (13).

No 253

יָמֵי קָלוּ מִנִּי אֲרוֹן וַיִּנְלוּ בְּאִפְסֵי חֲקוּוֹה

"My days are swifter than a weaver's shuttle,
and come to their end without hope." (7.6 RSV).

The context to the example in 7.6 has been noted above (No 251). In this example Job continues his address to God by describing his state: his days are swifter than a weaver's shuttle. By the use of this metaphor the poet demonstrates that life is compared to a tissue which man himself weaves. The shortness of his days is denoted by the perfect קָלוּ which is used with a stative nuance. The consequence of is that they are coming to an end all too soon and this is denoted by the imperfect consecutive וַיִּנְלוּ which also carries on the description of his state. Thus the imperfect consecutive is used here with the concept of denoting consequence.

No 260

כִּלְהָ עֲנֹן וַיִּלֶּךְ כֵּן יוֹרֵד שְׂאוֹל לֹא יַעֲלֶה

"As the cloud fades and vanishes,
so he who goes down to Sheol does not come up." (7.9 RSV).

In this verse Job expands on the theme of the shortness of his days and makes a comparison to the cloud which fades and then vanishes. This image is also to be found in 30.15; Isa 44.22. The implication is that as the appearance of the cloud is short lived so are his days. The initial action of the cloud fading is denoted by the perfect כלה and the consequence of its disappearance is then denoted by the imperfect consecutive וילך. The verb הלך is used in Hosea 13.3 of the transience of the morning dew. Thus we have another example of the imperfect consecutive denoting consequence.

No 274

וּבַחַר מְחַנֵּק נַפְשִׁי מוֹת מַעֲצָמוֹתִי

"So that I would choose strangling
and death rather than my bones." (7.15 RSV).

In vv 11-21 of Job's appeal he is in reality making a complaint to God. He complains that if he says 'my bed will comfort me' then the result is that God terrifies him with dreams and visions. Job then states his reaction to this by reiterating the death wish of Ch 3:

"So that I would choose strangling".

This action of Job is denoted here by the imperfect consecutive וַחַנְּחֵן.
It is possible to understand the imperfect consecutive as denoting
this action as the consequence to God's action. Davidson takes it in
this way:

"So that my soul chooses strangling וַחַנְּחֵן waw consecutive, the result
of the severe dealing, v 14, was this choice, v 15." (14).

Bearing this in mind it still seems better to understand this
occurrence of the imperfect consecutive to denote emphasis. Rather
it describes what Job's reaction is to God's severe dealing with him.
Thus this particular example is to be understood from the concept of
an emphatic construction.

No 280

וַחֲפֹקֶנּוּ לְבָקְרִים לְרוּעִים חֲבַחֲנֵנוּ

"and that thou dost visit him every morning,
and test him every moment"? (7.18 RSV).

In vv. 11-21 of this chapter Job pours out his soul in a complaint
against God. He complains that God is harassing him and he also
makes an appeal for God to desist. Yet in vv 17&18 he notes that the
treatment which he has received from the hand of God is the way that
God handles all mankind.

The language that he uses here may be based on Psalm 8 and be seen as a bitter parody upon it. God's action as it concerns all mankind is denoted by three imperfects and one imperfect consecutive. V 17 asks the question "What is man that you make so much of him, and that you do set your mind upon him"? These two actions are denoted by the imperfects תַּשִּׁיחַ --תִּגְדַּלְנֶנּוּ. Then in v 18 the next action is denoted by the imperfect consecutive וְתִפְקַדְנֵנוּ. This action consists in God visiting mankind with a view to inspecting him, which is the basic meaning of the verb פִּקַּד. When the Hebrew text of Psalm 8.5 is examined it should be noted that the form תִּפְקַדְנֵנוּ is that of the ordinary imperfect and not the imperfect consecutive as here. This observation in itself gives a clue as to its use here in Job 7.18. For while וְתִפְקַדְנֵנוּ could be understood as denoting consequence (and this is how Davidson understands it (15).), it seems better to take it as denoting emphasis, the emphasis being that God is continually harassing mankind and Job in particular. Thus the imperfect consecutive may be seen as connoting emphasis.

No 289

חַטָּאתִי מֵה אֲפַעַל לְךָ נֹצֵר הָאָדָם לְמָה שִׂמַּחְנִי לְמַפְגֵּעַ לְךָ
וְאֵהִי עָלַי לְמַשָּׂא

"If I sin, what do I do to thee, thou watcher of men?
Why hast thou made me thy mark?
So that I have become a burden to thee." (7.20 RSV).

Here Job appeals to God to leave him alone and then gives the rationale for God to do so. The action of Job in sinning is denoted here by the perfect 'קאטן as is the action of God in making Job his mark ('קתן). The divine action of God as a watcher of men is denoted, as in other poetic parts of the Hebrew Bible, by the participle, a use which has already been alluded to. The imperfect consecutive קאנ denotes the consequence of God making Job his mark, the result being that Job has become a burden to God. It is of course necessary to emend עלי to עליו as with the text of G and Tischendorf.

No 300

אם בניך חטאו לו וישלחם ביד פושעם

"If your children have sinned against him,
he has delivered them into the power of their transgression" (8.4 RSV).

This example belongs to the second speech, that of Bildad the Shuhite. In this speech Bildad is arguing that the suffering which Job is enduring is punishment. The whole basis to what Bildad is saying is the doctrine of retribution and this doctrine he applies to Job and his children in the first seven verses. In v 4 the first of two hypotheses is to be detected and it is applied to Job's sons. The reason for their loss is that they have sinned against God; because of this they have been delivered into the

fruits of their transgression. In this hypothetical sentence the condition is expressed by ׀א with the perfect. Davidson notes that this may be translated either as a concessive sentence 'though your children have sinned' or as a conditional sentence 'If your children have sinned'. (16). It should be noted that Gordis wants to take ׀א as an emphatic particle and Clines wants to take it as denoting a result 'since'. (17). The apodosis is then denoted by the imperfect consecutive ׀ללשׁוׁי. The use of the imperfect consecutive here is clearly to denote consequence. Your children have sinned against God and so the consequence of this is that He has delivered them into the power of their transgression. Having defined what is the use of the imperfect consecutive here, it should further be noted that the introduction of an apodosis by the imperfect consecutive is a rare construction a fact that is noted by Dhorme. (18).

No 343

חכם ללב ואמץ כח מי הקשה אליו וישלם

"He is wise in heart, and mighty in strength

---who has hardened himself against him, and succeeded?--" (9.4 RSV).

The speech itself, which consists of Job's reply to Bildad and extends over two chapters, can be broken into two parts: (a) 9.2-24 it is not clear whether this is a monologue or an address to the

friends, but God is spoken of in the third person. (b) 9.25-10.22 God is now addressed in the second person. The theme developed here is that of Job's powerlessness before God and the fact that he is trapped in his own private hell. In developing this theme of powerlessness before God, Job also expresses the need for vindication a need he sees as being fairly hopeless. This is expressed in v 4 by affirming that no-one has ever successfully brought God to Law and succeeded. The verse begins by affirming the attributes of God by two nominal expressions. He then uses the hiphil perfect of the verb הָרַךְ which is usually translated 'hardened' although Gordis suggests that the hiphil means 'argue, dispute, raise a question' as in Mishnaic Hebrew, and this is adopted by Clines in his commentary. (19). The imperfect consecutive לֹא יִשְׁלַח is used to indicate success in law against God. The imperfect consecutive here denotes the consequence of a successful disputation against God. Thus the construction לֹא יִשְׁלַח denotes consequence here as elsewhere in poetry.

No 374

אם קראתי ויענני לא אאמין כי יאזין קולי

"If I summoned him and he answered me,

I would not believe that he was listening to my voice." (9.16 RSV).

This example is taken from part of Job's reply to Bildad and is similar to that of No 300 in the sense that it may be treated as a

conditional sentence; if such is the case then the comment made above also applies here, namely that the introduction of the apodosis by the imperfect consecutive is a rare construction. G (b) here has a negative: $\kappa\alpha\iota \mu\eta \acute{\epsilon}\tau\alpha\chi\omicron\upsilon\sigma\eta$ and this has been followed by Duhm who takes the Hebrew text to read 'עַנְנִי אֲלֵי 'then he would not answer me'. This versional evidence has been examined by Dhorme who rejects the emendation of the text since it is not supported by Targ., Syr., and Vulg. (20). Blommerde who follows Dahood here, wants to emend the Hebrew text following Duhm, but to take the proposed אֵל as a noun meaning 'nothing' which is then the object of the verb 'עַנְנִי' and give the translation "If I call he answers me nothing". The problem with this suggestion is that it is built upon the shaky ground of textual emendation and as such can be rejected as unsound.

Dhorme is surely right when he suggests that the connection between the two verbs קרא and ענה is to be noted. (21). This combination often appears in Hebrew poetry as the following examples indicate:

אֵל יְהוָה בְּצָרָתִי לִי קָרָאתִי וַיַּעֲנֵנִי

"In my distress I called to the Lord and he answered me".

Ps 120. 1.

קָרָאתִי מִצָּרָה לִי אֵל יְהוָה וַיַּעֲנֵנִי

"In my distress I called to the Lord and he answered me".

Jonah 2.3.

In the example we are discussing in the book of Job, as well as the two other examples from Hebrew poetry, the imperfect consecutive surely denotes the consequence of calling upon the Lord, It is that those who called received an answer. Thus Job 9.16 denotes consequence.

No 385

אם אצדק פי ירשיעני חם אני ויעקשני

"Though I am innocent, my own mouth would condemn me;

though I am blameless, he would prove me perverse" (9.20 RSV).

Here Job is still expressing the thought of his powerlessness before God. In this concessive sentence, the concession is first of all expressed by the imperfect אצדק 'Though I am innocent', which is followed by the declarative hiphil ירשיעני 'my own mouth condemns me'. In the second hemistich the concession is again repeated by means of the nominal construction חם אני 'though I am blameless' which in turn and in parallelism to ירשיעני is followed by a second declarative hiphil ויעקשני but this time in the form of the imperfect consecutive. It seems that this is best taken as an emphatic construction in parallelism to ירשיעני which denotes that which his

mouth is doing by contradicting his own state of innocence. Thus the imperfect consecutive here denotes emphasis as elsewhere in the book of Job.

No 439

יְדִיךָ עֲצַוְנוֹנִי וַיַּעֲשֶׂנוּנִי יְחַד סוֹבִיב וְחַבְלָעֲנִי

"Thy hands fashioned and made me,
and now thou dost turn about and destroy me". (10.8 RSV).

In this verse there are two examples of the imperfect consecutive which must be considered in turn. In the first hemistich Job is making an affirmation about God's creative work:

יְדִיךָ עֲצַוְנוֹנִי וַיַּעֲשֶׂנוּנִי

'Your hands fashioned and made me"

The imperfect consecutive here וַיַּעֲשֶׂנוּנִי is surely best understood as denoting the concept of consequence since fashioning can be equated with the beginning of God's creative work while making can be equated with the conclusion of it. Thus the imperfect consecutive denotes consequence. The second hemistich which contains No 441 is somewhat less straightforward due to textual difficulties.

The textual difficulties which are referred to revolve round the two words $\text{וְחָרַבְתָּ} \text{וְאָחַר}$. How is one to understand them?

G here reads $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha \tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha \mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\beta\alpha\lambda\omega\nu$ which presupposes a Hebrew text which read $\text{וְאָחַר} \text{וְחָרַבְתָּ}$. This reading is accepted by the RSV which translates 'and now thou dost turn around'. Dhorme here would accept the change from וְחָרַבְתָּ to וְאָחַר but instead of trying to find a verbal form for the MT's וְחָרַבְתָּ would retain the MT and translate it as an adverb qualifying וְחָרַבְתָּ . This then produces the translation 'and afterwards thou wilt destroy me utterly'. (22). Against this solution it ought to be mentioned that the existence of postpositive waw is dubious.

Since Dhorme retains as much as possible of the MT, it is best to accept his reading. It remains to note the imperfect consecutive וְחָרַבְתָּ , which is best taken as denoting emphasis and this is how Davidson understands it. (23). The Hebrew text emphasizes that despite the fact that God created Job he is now destroying him.

No 476

$\text{אֶרֶץ עֲפָתָה כִּמּוֹ אֶפֶל צְלִמּוֹת וְלֹא סֹדְרִים}$
 $\text{וְחִפְעַע כִּמּוֹ אֶפֶל}$

"the land of gloom and chaos,
where light is as darkness". (10.22 RSV).

Chapter 10 ends like the previous speeches in a description of the land of Sheol. The nominal constructions in the first stich are arranged in such a way as to emphasize that Sheol is a place of deep darkness with no order to it. This is emphasized by the use of the three synonyms צלמות --אפל-- עפחה so arranged that they qualify the nature of Sheol by the over translation 'A land of gloom and darkness, deep darkness'. The words לא סדרים convey the idea of disorder and confusion. This is further emphasized by the use of the imperfect consecutive ותפע which presupposes some such term as נהרה 'light'. Thus the use of the imperfect consecutive here does not denote consequence but emphasis.

No 482

בדיך מתים יחרישו ותלעג ואין מנלם

"Should your babble silence men,

and when you mock, shall no-one shame you"? (11.3 RSV).

Zophar's speech may be evenly divided into three parts which are appropriately marked in the RSV's typography: vv 2-6, vv 7-12, & vv 13-20. Each of these divisions contains a different subject matter and this may be noted as follows: in vv 2-6 Zophar reproaches Job for his claim to innocence; in vv 7-12 he affirms the inscrutability of God; in vv 13-20 he counsels Job on the right way to behave and offers him hope if he will take Zophar's

advice. The example here comes from the first of these divisions and is found in 11.3. In the opening verses Zophar reproaches Job for his words and does so in the language of conventional disputation. The interrogative particle is missing from this line and may be carried forward from v 2. The question is then expressed by the imperfect וְהָיָה and the consequence to that question is expressed by the imperfect consecutive וַיִּלְעַן . The RSV has translated the imperfect consecutive by a temporal clause but it is better to take it as Clines does and translate as a resultant clause: 'so that you may mock on without anyone to shame you'. BHS here wants to remove the waw consecutive and reposit as an ordinary conjunction. Here Clines comments on his translation:

"Representing the waw consecutive of the MT, against proposed revocalization to וַיִּלְעַן ; consequent action is resulting action: if others are silenced, Job can continue speaking his blasphemies." (24).

Thus the imperfect consecutive here is best understood as denoting consequence.

No 484

וְתִאֲמַר זָךְ לִקְדָּשִׁי וְנָרְ הִיִּיתִי בְעֵינֶיךָ

"For you say, 'My doctrine is pure,
and I am clean in God's eyes'". (11.4 RSV).

The form וַחֲמַר is exceedingly common in prose and is the usual construction for introducing speech, direct speech being introduced by the pausal form of that verb. Its position here at the beginning of the verse is rare in poetry and Zophar is referring to what Job has said. This occurrence of the imperfect consecutive is commented on by Gordis:

"וַחֲמַר The waw consecutive suggests that this verse is linked to the preceding, 'as you say, my teaching is pure.'" (25).

This however, gives to the imperfect consecutive the concept of consequence and it seems that, this is not the sense required here. Dhorme is surely on firmer ground when he translates 'Now you say', (26) for he sees in this occurrence of the imperfect consecutive the element of emphasis and it would appear that his interpretation is sounder than that of Gordis.

No 500

כִּי הוּא יָדַע מַחֵי שׂוֹא וְיֵרָא אֹן וְלֹא יַחְבֹּנֵן

"For he knows worthless men,
when he sees iniquity, will he not consider it"? (11.11 RSV).

As stated above, in vv 7-12 of this chapter Zophar comments on the inscrutability of God and in so doing he comments on the

omniscience of God. The absolute omniscience of God is here denoted by the perfect וַיֵּדַע and the consequence of that knowledge is denoted by the imperfect consecutive וַיִּרְאֶה . The consequence is that because God knows worthless men he also knows what their sin is and so considers it. It seems best to take this occurrence of the imperfect consecutive as denoting consequence.

No 531

שִׁחֵק לְרֵעֵהוּ אֵהִיָּה קָרָא לְאֵלֹהִים וַיַּעֲנֵהוּ שְׁחוֹק צַדִּיק תַּמִּים

"I am a laughingstock to my friends;
I, who called upon God and he answered me,
a just and blameless man, am a laughingstock." (12.4 RSV).

This is part of Job's reply to Zophar, a speech which will be spread over three chapters (ch's 12-14), only to be exceeded by the closing speech of Job himself which consists of four chapters. It marks the end of the first cycle and leads on to the second. In this position, it serves both as a first reply to the friends collectively and as the precipitating cause of the ensuing cycle of speeches.

Questions of content are influenced to some extent by decisions about the integrity of the text. Only some of the numerous excisions that have been proposed for this speech are noted here and these are usually made on the grounds of irrelevance or contradiction.

Fohrer and Hesse omit 12.7-11 and 12.12-25 as later expansions, and Gray 12.4-12. Duhm regarded 12.4-6 and 12.7-10 as extraneous, while Siegfried omitted 12.4-13.1, and Volz transferred 12.4-10, 13-25 and 13.1 to Zophar's speech of chapter 11. More recent commentators like Rowley, Pope, Andersen and Horst tend to be sceptical of such drastic excisions, and Gordis in particular argues vigorously in favour of the Masoretic text. As has been indicated elsewhere in this work, it seems best to argue for the retention of the MT as the excision proposals tend to be somewhat subjective in their formulation and no agreement exists between scholars who have adopted this position.

The content of the speech has seemed plain to most scholars, who have divided it into three sections, usually corresponding to the chapter divisions. Clines here, however, sees only two main sections, making the transition from Job's address to his friends to his address to God the major dividing line in the speech and so analysis is as follows: 12.2-13.19 A wisdom disputation speech addressed to the friends, and 13.20-14.22 A legal disputation speech addressed to God. (27). It is in this speech that Job for the first time invites God to enter the disputation with him.

The speech proper begins with Job commenting on their collective wisdom. He then defends his own position and understanding as a man of wisdom. It is then that No 531 occurs. In content it is similar to No 374 which also uses the two verbs אָרַךְ and עָנָה.

For the sake of brevity it is not necessary to say more than that the use of the imperfect consecutive וַיַּעֲנֶה denotes, as in the previous example, the concept of consequence.

No 560

מוֹסֵר מַלְכִּים פָּתַח וַיֹּאסֵר אֶזְרוֹר בְּמַחְנֵיהֶם

"He looses the bonds of kings,
and binds a waistcloth on their loins." (12.18 RSV).

In this part of Job's reply to his friends he addresses them in the form of a wisdom disputation speech. He gives his own interpretation of the activities of God in 12.13-24. The main activities of God are defined in vv 18-24 and it is in these verses that we see the writer making use of what has been called earlier in the chapter, a Divine use of the participle. These participles are either followed by the simple imperfect, imperfect consecutive and in one case the simple perfect. Attention has already been drawn to the prevalence of the construction earlier in this chapter. (28).

Having noted all this, this verse here proves to be the exception to the rule since it begins with the perfect. The perfect פָּתַח here denotes what in all the other verses is characterized by the participle and one can only suggest that the writer has varied his use of the tenses here either for the sake of variety or for emphasis.

It should be noted however, that G has καθιζανων βασιλευς επι θρονους which presupposes a Hebrew text which read כִּי־שָׁמַר while פָּתַח is not translated at all. Although such an emended Hebrew text would be attractive and would produce a uniform syntax the MT is to be preferred since what we are concerned to produce is a syntax based on the text itself and not what we think the text should have read.

The consequence to that action is then denoted by the imperfect consecutive וַיִּגְדֹּל. The consequence in this instance is that the kings thus derobed of their regal garments are now led away captive. The same kind of interpretation of the imperfect consecutive described above can also be applied to numbers 570, 574, 576 and 578. They all follow participles and thus denote the consequences of actions begun by the participles.

No 570

מגלה עמקות מני חשך ויצא לאור ולמות

"He uncovers the deeps out of darkness,
and brings deep darkness to light." (12.22 RSV).

No 574

משגיא לגוים ויאבדם שטח לגוים וינהם

"He makes nations great, and destroys them,
He enlarges nations, and leads them away". (12.23 RSV).

No 576

מסיר לב ראשי עם הארץ ויתעם בטהו לא דרך

"He takes away understanding from the chiefs of the people of the
earth,
and makes them wander in a pathless waste." (12.24 RSV).

No 578

ימששו חשך ולא אור ויתעם נשכור

"They grope in the dark without light;
and he makes them stagger like a drunken man". (12.25 RSV).

No 572 is an exception to this sequence since the imperfect consecutive denotes emphasis and not consequence:

No 572

משגי'א לגוים ויאבדם שטח לגוים וינחם

"He makes nations great and destroys them,
he enlarges nations and leads them away." (12.23 RSV).

Here the imperfect consecutive ויאבדם is best understood as denoting emphasis.

No 581

הן כל ראתה עיני שמעה אזני וחבן לה

"Lo, my eye has seen all this,
my ear has heard and understood it." (13.1 RSV).

Here Job refers back to Ch 12.2-3, and introduces a new direction for the speech to develop. He begins by calling attention to the fact that he has personally experienced the acts of God which he has catalogued in Ch 12.14-25. He does so by using the two perfects ראתה--שמעה which denote the act of Job seeing and hearing and may be regarded as statives. These two perfects are then followed by the imperfect consecutive וחבן which denotes the consequence of seeing and hearing, namely that Job has understood all this.

This occurrence of the imperfect consecutive may be interpreted as denoting consequence.

No 646

נצ'ץ ו'צא ו'ימל ו'ינרח נצל ולא 'צמור

"He comes forth like a flower, and withers;
he flees like a shadow, and continues not." (14.2 RSV).

In his legal disputation addressed to God himself, Job considers mankind in general, although he is also thinking of his own experience, and the point that he is making to God is that mankind in its insignificance does not merit the kind of divine surveillance that he himself is being subjected to. He now proceeds to show how insignificant man is by giving some thoughts on the brevity of life. This he does by applying two images of the brevity of this life. The perfect ו'צא is used to denote the growth of a flower. It is used elsewhere of plants in the Hebrew Bible at 1st Kings 5.13; Isa 11.1. Its use here may be regarded as a stative. The perfect is then followed by the imperfect consecutive ו'ינרח which denotes the consequence of this growth: it in the end it withers away. It is also interpreted in this way by Davidson. (29).

The next occurrence of the imperfect consecutive may for the sake of convenience be treated here also since it comes from the same verse.

Reference is of course made to No 647 which represents the imperfect consecutive וַיִּבְרַח . This also may be interpreted as denoting consequence and in being in parallelism to וַיִּהְיֶה . The consequence of the growth is that in the end it will wither away and disappear like a shadow.

No 666

וַיָּבֹרֵךְ יְמֹתָיו וַיִּחַלֵּשׁ וַיָּגֹעַ אָדָם וַאֲרִי

"But man dies, and is laid low;

man breathes his last, and where is he"? (14.10 RSV).

In vv 7-12 Job compares the hope of a tree which although it be cut down may yet again spring to life with the hope of man who if he dies has no hope of returning to live again. The fact of man's death is denoted in this verse by the imperfect וַיָּחַלֵּשׁ which acts here as a kind of stative. The consequence of his death is then shown by the imperfect consecutive וַיָּגֹעַ . At first sight this seems odd since it is expressed by the verb וַיָּחַלֵּשׁ which means to be prostrate, be weak. Clines however, has shown that וַיָּחַלֵּשׁ refers to human loss of power after death as contrasted with the tree's continuing vitality after it is cut down, and that the stress is on this verb, not upon 'dies'. (30). Consequently וַיָּחַלֵּשׁ does indeed express the result of וַיָּמָת , it is that after death man is bereft of every power.

It may be convenient to deal with No 667 here also since it is the next verbal form to occur. How then is the imperfect consecutive וַיִּנְוַע to be understood? At first sight it repeats the thought of מָוַת and may be considered as being parallel to it. But rather than being an exact parallel to מָוַת it in fact advances the thought since breathing one's last may be considered to be the final act in death. In this sense it may be considered to denote the consequence of מָוַת and this is how Davidson understood it. (31).

No 691

חַתֵּם בַּצְרוּר פִּשְׁעֵי וְחַטָּאֵל עַל עוֹנֵי

"My transgression would be sealed up in a bag,
and thou wouldest cover over my iniquity". (14.17 RSV).

Job in the former section which we considered treated the theme of the brevity of human life and the hopelessness of mankind in general. In this section which runs from vv 13-17, he considers and wishes that God would make Sheol not a land of no remembrance to which in his anger he sends men for ever, but an asylum while his wrath is abroad. For if such were true then he would have the privilege of fellowship with God renewed. This is the sentiment that is being expressed in the text here. The passive participle חַתֵּם denotes the act of the sealing of his transgressions while the imperfect consecutive וַיִּנְוַע denotes the consequence of this sealing: namely that his iniquity has

been covered over. It should be noted that the verb **כָּסַף** is used with the nuance of covering sin only here in the Hebrew Bible.

No 699

תַּחֲקֵפֶהוּ לְנֹצַח וַיִּהְיֶה כִּי מִשְׁנָה פָּנָיו וַתִּשְׁלַחֲהוּ

"Thou prevailest for ever against him, and he passes;
thou changest his countenance, and sendest him away". (14.20 RSV).

In this discourse Job has been expounding on the theme of the insignificance of man and here in these verses returns to what he had stated earlier in the chapter, namely the world of reality in which there is no hope for man. Indeed, the previous verse states "So thou destroyest the hope of man". This is expressed by the perfect **הִאַבְדָהּ** which acts as kind of stative. The state of hopelessness is continued in the present verse where death is now depicted as God's victory over human hope for life. The dealing of death is no more than the last item in the history of God's hostile dealings with a human being from conception; in the end God inevitably prevails. This is denoted by the imperfect **תַּחֲקֵפֶהוּ**. The consequence to this overpowerment of man by God is then expressed by the imperfect consecutive **וַיִּהְיֶה**. Dhorme here notes that the form **וַיִּהְיֶה** is poetic, but says nothing about the use of the imperfect consecutive in this context. (32). Blommerde notes that the waw of the imperfect consecutive is emphatic and not consecutive. (33).

It seems however, that the best way of understanding וַיִּהְיֶה is to see it as denoting the consequence of the action already denoted by the imperfect תִּתְקַפֵּהוּ. Here the verb יָהָה is best understood as a euphemism for death i. e. pass away. For the sake of convenience it seems best also to deal with No 701 here since it belongs to the same verse.

In the second part of v 20 Job talks of God prevailing over man. This action is denoted by the participle תִּשְׁנֶה 'thou changest his face' which Gordis has understood as denoting rigor mortis. (34). It is clearly God who disfigures human beauty with the ravages of old age and death itself. The consequence to this is then denoted by the imperfect consecutive וַיִּשְׁלַחֵהוּ. The consequence being that God by bringing on death so banishes his creature from the land of the living. The imperfect piel of שָׁלַח denotes that man has been expelled to Sheol, that shadowy existence where there is no hope or fellowship with God.

No 762

כִּי כִסָּה פָּנָיו בַּחֲלָבוֹ וַיַּעַשׂ פִּימָה עָלָיו כִּסָּל

"Because he has covered his face with his fat,
and gathered fat upon his loins," (15.27 RSV).

With this example we now come to the beginning of the second cycle of speeches (ch's 15-21), which is introduced by the discourse of Eliphaz the Temanite. It is also worth noting in passing that Davidson's commentary on the Hebrew text of the book of Job concludes with chapter 14 and it is to be regretted that he did not see fit to finish such a penetrating study.

Eliphaz's speech may conveniently be divided into two parts: (a) vv1-16 contain the address to Job in which he states that Job has spoken unwisely, self importantly, and aggressively, and in so doing has adopted a stance that ill becomes his piety. Because of this he is in need of correction. (b). vv17-35 Describe the wicked man and his fate, which indeed is for Job's instruction-the point being that Job is not such a man and therefore has good reason for confidence. The example that is now being considered comes clearly from the second division where a description of the wicked man is being given. A picture of the wicked man's prosperity is given under the figure of fatness. The action of the ungodly man is first of all denoted by the perfect הָסָת which means literally 'hidden' but is probably used with the meaning of 'covered' which is how the RSV has understood it. It seems to me that the imperfect consecutive וְעָלַם is not to be understood as denoting consequence but rather emphasis, because the writer is underlining here how arrogant the ungodly man is under the figure of fatness, i. e., he is totally fat or totally arrogant. It seems best to understand the imperfect consecutive as expressing emphasis. The same interpretation may also be applied to No 763.

This example is to be found in the very next verse where the description of the prosperity of the arrogant man is continued. The verse opens with the imperfect consecutive וְיִשְׁנַן which may be interpreted as depicting the future of the wicked man. Thus understood, the imperfect consecutive does not denote the consequence of his prosperity since it speaks of such a man dwelling in desolate cities, but the emphasis is being laid on the bleakness of his future which is the lot of the wicked man.

No 798

וּתְקַמְסֵנִי לְעַד הִיא וְיִקַּם בִּי כַחַשׁ בְּפָנַי יְעִנֵה

"And he has shrivelled me up, which is a witness against me; and my leanness has risen up against me, it testifies to my face". (16.8 RSV).

The commentators all note how disjointed Job's reply to Eliphaz is. It seems best to follow Clines who sees three major divisions in this speech: (a) vv2-6 Job addresses the friends with criticisms of their words. (b) vv7-17 he begins to soliloquize, first lamenting the attacks of God. (c) vv18-22 he envisages the possibilities for vindication. (35). Following on from this analysis of the content of chapter 16 it can be seen that 16.8 is part of the second division where he laments the attacks of God. There he states that God has worn him out and has made desolate all his company.

What he is saying is that the attacks of God upon him are such that the whole company of his household are appalled at his condition. In v 8 he carries on with the description of his condition by the imperfect consecutive 'וַיִּקְרַח'. The root קרַח is used only here and at chapter 22.16 and properly has the meaning of 'seize or grasp' but may here mean 'wrinkle'. It is necessary to read 'וַיִּקְרַח' as 'וַיִּקְרַח' in order to preserve the sense which has been begun with 'וַיִּלְאֵן' of v 7. It seems best to take the imperfect consecutive 'וַיִּקְרַח' as emphatically denoting that which God has done to him. The same interpretation can also be applied to No 800. This example is also to be found in this verse and the imperfect consecutive 'וַיִּקְרַח' denotes emphatically that his slanderer has risen up against him. This latter suggestion involves the repointing of 'וַיִּלְאֵן' as 'my liar'. These two constructions are to be seen as emphatic constructions emphasizing what Job's conditions are.

No 803

אָפַר טָרַף וַיִּשְׁטַמְנֵי חֶרֶק עָלַי בְּשֹׁנֵי זָרִי יִלְטֹשׁ עֵינָי לִי

"He has torn me in his wrath, and hated me;
 he has gnashed his teeth at me;
 my adversary sharpens his eyes against me". (16.9 RSV).

This example also occurs in Job's reply to Eliphaz which in fact stretches over two chapters, namely Ch's 16-17.

It will be remembered that in vv 7-17 Job is lamenting on the attacks of God on himself. The verse under consideration utters such a lament. The action of God on venting his wrath on Job is here expressed by the perfect $\eta\tau\theta$ which is a verb that denotes the action of the wild beast which finds a prey and treats it as such, i. e., tears and devours it. The emphatic nature of that which God has done is now expressed by the imperfect consecutive וַיִּשְׂטֹטֵן 'and he hated me'. That this occurrence of the imperfect consecutive does not express a consequence is clearly seen in the fact that for a consequence to be expressed the order of the verbs would have to be reversed, i. e., 'he hated me and has torn men in his wrath'. This very fact causes Gordis to comment that the order of the verbs is a case of hysteron proteron. (36). It seems best therefore, under these circumstances to understand this imperfect consecutive as denoting emphasis.

No 812

שְׁלוֹ הַיְיָחִי וַיִּפְרֹצֵנִי וְאָחַז בְּעַרְפִּי וַיִּפּוֹצֵנִי וַיִּקְיַמֵּנִי לִרְמָה

"I was at ease, and he broke me asunder;
 he seized me by the neck and dashed me to pieces;
 he set me up as his target," (16.12 RSV).

Here the writer refers to the pre-hostile state of Job by means of the perfect $\text{וַיִּשְׁלַח ה' יָדָיו$ and Dhorme has noted the similarity to the Aramaic phrase in Daniel 4.4: $\text{וַיִּשְׁלַח ה' יָדָיו$. The emphatic nature of what God has done to Job is still indicated by means of the imperfect consecutive $\text{וַיִּפְרֹץ$. The root of this verb is פָּרַץ and it means 'break, dash to pieces'. Thus the writer by means of the imperfect consecutive is emphasizing what God has done to Job by destroying his peace and breaking him asunder. For the sake of convenience it seems appropriate to deal with numbers 814 & 815 here also. The next action of God is again indicated by the perfect $\text{וַיִּקַּח$ 'seize' and this is followed by the imperfect consecutive $\text{וַיִּפְרֹץ$. The occurrence of the imperfect consecutive is best understood as denoting the consequence of the action of God already expressed by the perfect וַיִּקַּח 'seize', the consequence being that Job is dashed to pieces. The next verbal form to occur in this verse is the imperfect consecutive $\text{וַיִּקְּם$ 'he set me up'. It seems that this is once again best taken as denoting emphasis since there is no action of God denoted prior to it that it could be seen as denoting the consequence to. In this verse which contains three occurrences of the imperfect consecutive, it seems odd that two of them can be understood as denoting emphasis and one as denoting consequence, but this seems the best way of understanding the evidence provided by the MT.

No 844

וַחֲנָה מִנְעֹשׁ עֵינַי וַיִּצְרֵי כֶּצֶל כָּלִם

"My eye has grown dim from grief,
and all my members are like a shadow". (17.7 RSV).

In chapter 16 and in particular from vv 7-17 Job expressed a lament about God's attacks on him. In this chapter Job continues to lament but this time in words to his friends although God is addressed in vv 3-4. The friends are thus addressed in vv 1-10 and in vv 11-16 he utters a lament about his death without vindication. 17.7, therefore comes from the first section which is addressed to the friends. The language that is used here is still the language of emphasis denoting Job's state as a result of his sufferings. Emphasis is conveyed at the beginning of the verse by the use of the imperfect consecutive וַחֲנָה. The construction indicates that his eyes have grown dim, not as usual because of advancing years (Gen 27.1; Deut 34.7), but because of his grief. The verb in question וַחֲנָה denotes not only that his eyes have been dimmed because of old age but that they have also been violently blinded. Thus the imperfect consecutive imparts emphasis.

No 920

כְּבוֹדִי מִעַלִּי הַפְּשִׁיט וַיִּסַּר עֲטָרַת רִאשִׁי

"He has stripped me from my glory,
and taken the crown from my head". (19.9 RSV).

The content of Job's reply to Bildad (which incidentally contains no examples of the imperfect consecutive) may be analysed as follows: vv2-6 address to the friends in which Job protests against their persecution of him, vv7-12 and vv13-20 the reason of Job's downfall is developed as being brought about by God's direct hand, vv21-22 second address to the friends calling on them to stop persecuting him, vv23-27 the reason that they should do so is that Job is innocent and one day will be declared so, vv28-29 third address to the friends giving a note of confidence as well as a final warning of the judgement to come that will give them what they deserve.

From this analysis it will be noted that 19.9 occurs in the section where Job is showing that his downfall has been brought about by God's hand. In vv 7-12 this is developed by a series of assault images; the hapless citizen set upon by thugs (v7), the traveller who finds his pathway blocked (v8), the prince who is humiliated by an alien lord (v9), the plant that is pulled out of the ground (v10), the warrior compelled into single-handed combat (v11), and the king or city surrounded by hosts of besieging enemies. All these images are in fact an expansion of what Job says in v 6 of our chapter.

"Know then that God has put me in the wrong,
and closed his net about me".

The image which v 9 yields is that of the the prince who is humiliated by an alien lord. The initial action of humiliation is denoted by the perfect סָרַף which means to 'strip, take off clothing'. Thus Job is saying that God has stripped him of his glory. This statement is then emphasized by the use of the imperfect consecutive וְסָרַף which denotes that his crown has been removed. Job has been reduced to a state of extreme humiliation. It would be hard to argue that וְסָרַף denotes a consequence here since the removal of the crown can hardly be regarded as a consequence to the removal of his clothing. It seems better to me to understand וְסָרַף as expressing an emphatic action, i. e., the state to which Job has been reduced.

No 922

יְחַצְוֵי סוּבִיב וְאֵלֶיךָ וְיִסַּע כַּעַץ חֲקוּמֵי

"He breaks me down on every side, and I am gone,
and my hope he has pulled up like a tree". (19.10 RSV).

As stated above, in vv 7-20 of this chapter Job develops the theme begun in v 6, namely that his downfall has been brought about by God's direct hand. In these verse this is accomplished by a series of images one of which has already been considered (v.9) and dealt with the prince humiliated by an alien lord. The downfall is illustrated again in v 10 by the image of a plant pulled out of the ground. The imperfect יְחַצְוֵי 'demolish' from the root חָצַן is

employed at this point. Clines noted that this root is used of destroying a house (Isa 22.10), a city wall (Jer 39.8), and an altar (Judg 2.2). (37). Thus Job is being reduced to rubble so that his hope is gone in the same way that one reduces a building to rubble. The consequence to this action portrayed by 'יָנַח' is denoted by the use of the imperfect consecutive גָּלַגַּל, a fact noted by Dhorme. (38). The RSV translates גָּלַגַּל as 'and I am gone' which is literally correct. But by comparing this use with that of Ch 14.20 we may recognize in גָּלַגַּל a euphemism for death and so may translate 'and I pass away'.

For the sake of convenience No 923 is dealt with here. The imperfect consecutive יָנַח introduces a second image, namely that of a tree being uprooted. The verb יָנַח in the hiphil conjugation means 'uproot, replant' and the imperfect consecutive denotes the fact that Job's hope has been destroyed as in Ch 14.20. It seems that it is best to take יָנַח as denoting emphasis here and not consequence since the verb actually begins the thought of the second hemistich and instead of denoting a consequence it in fact states what is the inevitable conclusion to the fact of death, i.e., that his hope has gone.

No 924

וְיָנַח עָלַי אֲפֹרֶת וְיִחַשְׁבֵּנִי לִבְצָרִים

"He has kindled his wrath against me,
and counts me as his adversary". (19.11 RSV).

In vv 7-20 of this chapter Job expounds on the theme that God has brought about his downfall by direct intervention and he illustrates the process in a series of images. The image which he uses in 19.11 is that of the warrior who is drawn into single armed combat. The first hemistich begins with the imperfect consecutive $\eta\eta' \eta$ which Driver-Gray, Duhm and Beer want to reposit as a Qal 'His wrath is kindled'. The suggested emendation would have in its favour that the imperfect consecutive conforms to ordinary idiom. G, however, reads $\overset{\eta}{\omicron}\overset{\eta}{\rho}\overset{\eta}{\gamma}\overset{\eta}{\eta} \overset{\eta}{\epsilon}\overset{\eta}{\chi}\overset{\eta}{\rho}\overset{\eta}{\eta}\overset{\eta}{\sigma}\overset{\eta}{\alpha}\overset{\eta}{\nu}\overset{\eta}{\omicron}$ here and confirms the vocalisation of the MT. Thus read, the imperfect consecutive is best understood as denoting emphasis. $\eta\eta' \eta$ does not note the consequence of any previous action since it begins the action of the first hemistich in question and there is certainly no reference to any action of a previous stich. 19.11 uses the language of emphasis and intensification, a fact which has been noted by Delitzsch in his commentary. (39).

In No 925 the imperfect consecutive $\eta\eta' \eta\eta' \eta$ is best understood as denoting emphasis in line with the previous example. The main point being emphasized is that God now considers Job to be his enemy. The second hemistich is in line with the thought expressed in Ch 13.24 'Why dost Thou veil Thy face and consider me Thy enemy'?

No 927

יָחַד יְבֹאוּ גִדּוּדֵיהֶם וַיִּסְלְּוּ עָלַי דְּרָגָם וַיַּחֲנוּ סָבִיב לְאַהֲלֵי

"His troops come on together;
they have cast up siegeworks against me,
and encamp round about my tent'. (19.12 RSV).

In these verses Job has accrued images in which he seeks to illustrate how God has brought about his downfall. The image he uses here is that of the king or city surrounded by hosts of besieging enemies. First he uses the imperfect יָבֹאוּ to portray their onward advance. The consequence to this action is then expressed by the imperfect consecutive וַיִּסְלְּוּ 'to cast up, to embank' from the root סָלַל . The consequence being that the troops have marched onward, and as part of their attack have raised paths against him. There is no need to emend the text as the RSV seeks to do and read וַיִּסְלְּוּ here, for as Gordis has noted the paving of roads is necessary for the movement of chariots and horses. (40). The final hemistich of No 928 is as has previously been the case couched in emphatic language and so we should see in the imperfect consecutive וַיַּחֲנוּ the expression of an emphasis that this is what has been done to Job. God has encamped against him like a besieging army. There is no idea here of וַיַּחֲנוּ portraying the consequence of וַיִּסְלְּוּ , since if consequence is to be denoted it demands the reversal of the verbal sequence, and so the erection of roads for war would truly be the consequence of encamping against the

enemy. But as we are dealing with the text as it stands and not as we would like it to be, we must conclude that the proper understanding of וַיִּנָּח includes the idea of emphasis. Clines here, offers the following explanation of the tenses as used in vv 7-12:

"It is hard to say whether the present or the past tense should be used in translating the variegated imagery of vv7-12. The English versions veer between past and present, typically producing past tense verbs in vv8-9, present in v10, past in v11a, present in vv11b-12. The Hebrew perfect and imperfect "tenses" do not of themselves indicate time, though the waw consecutive forms in vv10, 11, 12 do suggest that we have the form of a narrative before us." (41).

The difficulty with this particular interpretation is that it superimposes on poetry the way that the tenses work in prose and it is far from certain that such should be the case here. It is better to try and discover in the use of the tenses of these particular verses potential distinctive poetic nuances which the Hebrew poet is trying to convey. Nevertheless one must applaud Clines for giving an interpretation of the tenses; too many of the commentators conveniently ignore the problem.

No 942

וְגַם עוֹלָאִים מֵאִסּוּר בִּי אֶקְוִמָה וַיִּדְבְּרוּ בִּי

"Even young children despise me;
when I rise they talk against me". (19.18 RSV).

In vv 7-20 of this chapter Job elaborated on the theme of his downfall which had been brought about by God's direct intervention. Vv 7-12 carry the theme through by giving a series of images all of which illustrate his downfall. Now in vv 13-20 all of that is gone and he begins to speak clearly about the nature of his downfall. He does so by showing that he has been isolated from his kinsfolk (vv13-14), from his domestic servants (vv15-16), from his wife and brothers (v17), from the children of the neighbourhood (v18), and from the whole company of his intimates (v19). **וְיָדָנְוּ** here is taken from v 18 where Job states that he has been isolated from the children of the neighbourhood. This is first of all expressed by the perfect **וַיִּסְמָוּ** 'despise, scorn' which is used with **וְ** before the person towards whom scorn is shown. The consequence to the children's action is denoted further by the imperfect consecutive **וְיָדָנְוּ** which itself follows the cohortative **וַיִּקְוּמוּ**. If Clines and Blommerde are followed here the consequence becomes all the more clear since they take **וְיָדָנְוּ** as being derived from a **וְיָדָנְוּ** (1 in KB3) 'turn aside from, turn one's back on', cognate with Arabic *dabara* 'be behind'. (42). The consequence is that when Job stands up to address them then the children turn their backs on him. Such an understanding of **וְיָדָנְוּ** accentuates the isolation of Job although it does involve taking the **וְ** as 'from' and this in itself makes the case philologically weak.

No 947

בְּעוֹרֵי וּבְבִשְׂרֵי דְבָקָה עֲצָמֵי וְאֶתְמַלְטָה בְּעוֹר שׁוֹנֵי

"My bones cleave to my skin and my flesh,
and I have escaped by the skin of my teeth". (19.20 RSV).

The difficulties of this verse, one of the most problematical in the book, are too many to cover within the compass of this work and so it seems best to follow Clines here in his interpretation of the MT. He summarizes the problems as follows: (1) after speaking for seven verses about his isolation from his fellow humans it is strange that Job should suddenly be concerned about his physical distress. (2) it is curious that he should complain that his bones are 'cleaving to his flesh', since that seems to be a very satisfactory situation anatomically. (3) the first half of the line seems overlong (four stressed words instead of the usual three). (4) it is strange that Job should say that he has 'escaped' (חָלַץ hithpael), since that seems to be the last thing he would claim is his experience. (43).

The solution which Clines proposes is one which has much to commend it since it is based on an understanding of the MT as we have it while the solutions proposed by other scholars are all based on the emendation of the text so that Dhorme, e.g., wants to adopt the reading found in G. Clines notes that the crucial word in the first hemistich is חָלַץ 'cleave'. Observing that the usual meaning is that of one thing clinging or sticking to another, he adopts the meaning 'hang' following E. W. Hengstenberg in the book of Psalms (vol3 p216). Thus what he is proposing is a picture of the weak man whose bones appear to hang from his skin and his flesh.

This involves taking the preposition ׀ as 'from', but he has already suggested such a translation for No 942. He then notes that this is not literal but metaphorical language which gives the picture of Job's overpowering sense of weakness. Thus understood the verse gains a coherence and follows on naturally from the previous statements. His final suggestion is to take the imperfect consecutive ׀אחלל in the sense of 'left' indicating that Job has been delivered but has been left in such a state that he might as well be dead since he is left only with the skin of his teeth which in reality does not exist. He is therefore left with nothing. (44).

The above explanation thus suggests the translation:

"My bones hang from my skin and my flesh,
and I am left with the skin of my teeth".

Having thus sketched a possible solution to the difficulties of the interpretation of this verse it is now necessary to say a word on how we should interpret the tenses as used in this verse. The fact of Job's condition whether we accept that it is psychic or literal is denoted by the perfect ׀אחלל. The result of this action is then denoted by the imperfect consecutive. Hence the final occurrence of the imperfect consecutive in this verse denotes the concept of consequence.

No 999

חיל בלע ויקצנו מבטנו יורשנו אל

"He swallows down riches and vomits them up again;
God casts them out of his belly" (20.15 RSV).

Zophar's second speech divides conveniently into sections: After the conventional introduction (vv2-3), his speech on the fate of the wicked can be divided into three sections: (a) The utter annihilation of the wicked (vv4-11), (b) The futility of wrongdoing (vv12-23), and (c) The inescapable end of the wicked (vv24-29). From this analysis it can be seen that the example which is being treated here comes from the second section of his speech, namely the futility of wrongdoing. He shows this truth by using the sustained metaphor of eating. The primary theme appears to be that the sinner gains no lasting profit from his wrongdoing. The food he eats leads to his death, not his life. In the first place, the image is of food that is pleasant to the taste but sours the stomach and is vomited up (vv12-15), so that it does not function as life giving food. Zophar is applying this idea contained in the metaphor to the wicked man who gains no lasting profit from his wickedness just as the man gains no lasting enjoyment from sweet tasting food but which sours the stomach and so is vomited up.

The initial action of swallowing is denoted first of all by the perfect לָלַךְ which acts as a kind of stative to that which he has done. The consequence to this action of swallowing is then denoted by the

imperfect consecutive וַיִּקְאֵן 'vomit': his food soured his stomach and is vomited up.

No 1024

שֶׁלֶף וַיֵּצֵא מִגּוּהוֹ וּבִרְקָה מִמְרוֹתָיו יִהְלֵךְ עָלָיו אֲמִים

"It is drawn forth and comes out of his body,
the glittering point comes out of his gall;
terrors come upon him". (20.25 RSV).

The third division of Zophar's speech (vv24-29), which concludes the section ch 3-20 of the book, has as its principal theme the inescapable end of the wicked. This is illustrated by the use of a military metaphor (vv24-25b): even if he escapes one weapon, he will fall to another that will prove fatal. Two weapons are thus defined in v 24, namely a weapon of iron and a bronze arrow. The success of this latter weapon is then further defined in v 25 for the arrow then strikes him in the back. The wicked man thus wounded tries to withdraw the arrow from his back an action which is denoted by the perfect הִלָּךְ which is the precise term for drawing a weapon from a wound. The consequence to this removal of the arrow from the body is then denoted by the imperfect consecutive יֵצֵא 'comes forth'. The imperfect consecutive then defines what has already been implied by הִלָּךְ, namely that the arrow is removed completely from the body of the wicked man with disastrous results. The imperfect consecutive is

then best understood as denoting the consequence of $\eta\lambda\psi$.

The following examples are taken from the next section of Job, the Elihu speeches:

No 1801

ותקרב לשחת נפשו וחי'תו לממתי'ם

"His soul draws near the pit,
and his life to those who bring death". (33.22 RSV).

The position of Dhorme who regards these speeches to be of a secondary character is accepted in what follows. Dhorme argued that:

"The way in which Elihu is introduced, his total disappearance without trace, the secondary character of his invention, the aim and method of his arguments, the highly personal colour and Aramaic tendency of his language---all these are indications of an author working on an already completed book and bringing in a new character whose mission is to confute some exaggerations in the language of the chief speaker." (45).

In these speeches, which may for the sake of convenience be divided into three parts, Elihu first of all explains to the three friends and to Job and to himself why or how he is going to intervene 32.6-33.7; he secondly cites or summarizes the words of Job three times, having done so he refutes the claim made by Job that he is righteous and does not deserve the sufferings inflicted on him by God 33.8-

35. 16; and thirdly he presents independently his own view of the greatness of God, of his creative activity, and of his government of men 36. 1-37. 24.

From this analysis it will be seen that the first example comes from the section where Elihu cites the words of Job and refutes the claims made in them. In chapter 33 the two complaints of Job are noted, (a) that he is innocent and yet God persecutes him 33. 8-11; (b) that God does not answer him 33. 12, 13. It is this latter complaint that Elihu deals with first. In vv 14-30 Elihu asserts that God does speak sometimes in dreams and apparitions vv15-16; sometimes by pain and illness which are the gates of death vv19-22.

The description of the illness in which God speaks is then defined by Elihu in v 21. It is the consequence of this illness that is stated in v 22. The clue is thus presented as to how the opening imperfect consecutive is to be interpreted. וַחֲקַרְבַּנּוֹ is to be understood as denoting the consequence of v 21. Because he is so ill his soul is drawing near to the gates of death.

No 1804

וַיִּחַנְנוּ וַיֹּאמֶר פִּדְעֵהוּ מִרֶדֶת שְׁחַת מִצְאָתִי כִפֹּר

"And he is gracious to him, and says,
'Deliver him from going down to the pit,
I have found a ransom'"; (33.24 RSV).

As indicated above in this section of the speech Elihu responds to Job's complaint that God does not answer him. In the verse considered above we saw that Elihu posited the truth that God sometimes speaks in illness and pain. When man is at the point of death it is then that divine intervention takes place perhaps by an angel or other mediator. The function of the mediator is to protect man and shield him from divine anger. The action of the mediator in salvation is then defined by the imperfect consecutive וַיִּנְחַם . Yet how does one interpret this example of the imperfect consecutive? The clue to the interpretation is to define who the subject of the action is. Here the commentators are divided. Most of them take the subject of this action to be that of the interpreting angel as is indicated above. But Gordis following Budde makes the subject of the action God himself since it is only God who can be gracious and dispense true mercy. (46).

It would appear that the latter suggestion is the correct one and so we have to interpret the imperfect consecutive וַיִּנְחַם as emphatic, the emphasis being that in the circumstance of repentance which is implied by v 24 it is God alone who can be gracious and merciful. For the sake of convenience No 1805 is treated here also since it belongs to the same verse. Since the subject of וַיִּנְחַם is God himself, it

follows that the subject of וַיֹּאמֶר is also God. Consequently וַיֹּאמֶר indicates the consequence of God's graciousness, namely that being in a state of grace means that God can speak to the man in question.

No 1812

יַעֲתֵר אֶל אֱלֹהִים וַיִּרְצֶהוּ וַיֵּרָא פָנָיו בְּתִרְוָעָה וַיָּשׁוּב לֵאמֹר צְדִיקָתָהּ

"Then man prays to God, and he accepts him,
he comes into his presence with joy.

He recounts to men his salvation", (33.26 RSV).

Here Elihu refutes the error that God does not answer Job in the midst of his sufferings. The writer now defines what is the response of the sick man who has been healed of his malady. Such a man offers his prayer to God in thankfulness for his salvation. He can do this because God does indeed speak to men, his angel intervenes on man's behalf and the result of this action is that God is now merciful to the sinner. The verse then defines the result of such a prayer of contrition. The action of prayer is first of all expressed by the imperfect יַעֲתֵר which is not only the tense of discourse but is also the tense of prayer; the chapter on the imperfect will deal with this aspect in greater detail. The consequence of the prayer is then denoted by the imperfect consecutive וַיִּרְצֶהוּ: the man who prays thus is accepted by God. The action of acceptance by God is denoted by the verb וַיֵּרָא 'to delight in'. There are two further consequences to this

prayer which are denoted by my Nos. 1813 & 1814. The next imperfect consecutive ג'ו denotes the fact that because of such a prayer the man sees directly into the presence of God. The RSV here translates 'he comes into his presence with joy' which involves making the emendation ג'ו , but this is not necessary since it has no versional support. The next consequence is expressed by the final imperfect consecutive of this verse, ו'ו which indicates literally that as a result of the prayer God "restores" to him his salvation. The result may be seen to be parallel with that already denoted by ו'ו . Because of the latter factor there is no need to adopt the proposed emendation ו'ו 'and he relates, tells'. Thus the three occurrences of the imperfect consecutive in this verse do not relate a narrative but the three consequences of the prayer of contrition to God. The consequences are such that a man is accepted by God, he sees directly into the divine presence and his salvation is restored to him.

No 1816

ו'ו על אנשים ויאמר וחטאתי וישר העויתי ולא שרה לי

"And he sings before men, and says:

'I sinned, and perverted what was right,
and it was not requited to me.'" (33.27 RSV).

Here Elihu attempts to refute Job's idea that God did not answer him

at all. In 33.26 the results of the sick man praying the prayer of contrition are defined. The definition is now expanded by noting the song that the forgiven man now sings. This is first of all expressed in this verse by the imperfect שָׁר which most commentators derive from שָׁר 'sing'. Here the occurrence of the imperfect consecutive וַיִּשְׁמַח denotes little more than inverted commas and so introduces the words that are to be sung.

No 1883

יָרַע כְּבִירִים לֹא חָקַר וַיַּעֲמֵד אֲחֵרִים תַּחְתָּם

"He shatters the mighty without investigation,
and sets others in their place". (34.24 RSV).

Chapters 33 & 34 of this speech are concerned with refuting the errors of Job. In chapter 33 Elihu has been concerned in meeting the claim of Job that God does not speak to him or answer him. Here in chapter 34 he turns to Job's first complaint, namely that Job is innocent and that God is unjust in his dealings with him. Thus chapter 34 really asserts that God is just in his dealings with men and Job in particular. In vv 21-25 of this chapter Elihu is asserting that because God knows all things He is able to chastise those who have become estranged from him without any investigation. This is the sentiment of 34.24. The initial action is denoted by the imperfect יָרַע 'shatter' which is based on the Aramaic root רָעַע. Dhorme notes

that the Aramaic verb קעע 'shatter' has been used instead of the Hebrew קצר, but this is what we might expect in this part of the book of Job which is characterized by more Aramaisms than the rest of the book, a fact which has been dealt with in ch 2. (47). The consequence of this act of removal is then expressed by the imperfect consecutive ויעמד 'set' which is that having removed the proud and arrogant he places others in their place. This is a sentiment with which the writer of the book of Daniel would find empathy.

No 1963

לא יורע מצדיק עיניו ואת מלכים לנשא וישיבם לנצח ויגבורו

"He does not withdraw his eyes from the righteous,
but with kings upon the throne
he sets them for ever, and they are exalted". (36.7 RSV).

As stated above Elihu was concerned with correcting two of Job's fundamental errors which were that God was unjust in his dealings with Job and that God did not answer him when he spoke to him. He dealt with these two errors in chapters 33, 34 & 35. He now goes on in the two remaining chapters of his speech to present his own view of the greatness of God and of his creative activity. In ch 36 then he propounds his own view of the greatness of God and of his attributes. In v. 7 he observes that God never withdraws his eyes from the righteous, this is denoted by the imperfect וירע which as Dhorme has

noted is an unusual verb to choose. The root עָנַן means to 'suppress, pull down', and to 'take for one's self' and it is only by approximation that one can arrive at the translation which the RSV has adopted: "He does not withdraw his eyes from the righteous". (48).

The consequence to this action is then denoted by the imperfect consecutive וַיִּשָׂא 'he sets them up'. Blommerde here has noted that this is an emphatic construction and it seems to me that his interpretation of the imperfect consecutive is correct. (49). For the sake of convenience No 1964 can be treated here since it occurs in the same verse. $\text{וַיִּגְדַּלְוּ$ denotes the consequence to the kings being set up, they are exalted. It seems appropriate to interpret this occurrence of the imperfect consecutive to indicate consequence while taking the former one as denoting emphasis.

No 1967

$\text{וַיְגַדֵּל לָהֶם פְּעָלָם וּפְשָׁעֵיהֶם כִּי יִתְגַּבְּרוּ$

"then he declares to them their work and their transgressions, that they are behaving arrogantly" (36.9 RSV).

In this chapter and in the following one, Elihu speaks about the greatness of God and of his creative ability. He stresses the greatness of God here and in the previous verse and notes that God always has his eyes upon the righteous. That verse ended with the

not consequence. The same cannot be said for the next occurrence of the imperfect consecutive No 1970. This is the form וַיִּאָמֶר which is the commonest form of the imperfect consecutive in the Hebrew Bible. This form undoubtedly denotes the consequence of God opening their ears to receive instruction for they now can understand what he is saying to them. It is appropriate to take the second occurrence of the imperfect consecutive in this verse to denote the concept of consequence.

No 2015

עַל נַפְיִים נִסָּה אֹרֶךְ וַיִּצַּו עָלֶיהָ בַּמִּפְּלִיעַ

"He covers his hands with the lightning,
and commands it to strike the mark". (36.32 RSV).

In this chapter, as noted above, Elihu continues to extol the greatness of God and his creative activity. This theme is very much to the front of his mind as he describes the might of God's power as it is revealed in a thunderstorm. It is this aspect of God's power that is denoted in the verse which is now under consideration.

By common consent of the commentators this is a difficult verse. The difficulties commence with the use of the verb נִסָּה . Dhorme here has noted that the difficulty lies in the use of the verb נִסָּה with עַל נַפְיִים 'on two palms'. (52). Because of this apparent difficulty he

wants to emend the text to read אָוַן instead of אָוַן. This would produce the translation "with both hands he has lifted up the lightning". Yet this suggestion in itself is not free from difficulties, since it commands no versional support and is based purely on conjecture. In these circumstances it seems better to retain a difficult Hebrew text than to seek to evade the difficulty by resorting to conjectural emendation. This means that the translation of the RSV stands and finds support in such scholars as Gordis, Driver-Gray, and Delitzsch. The perfect אָוַן 'cover', then, denotes God's action in covering his hands with lightning which undoubtedly means that it is in his control. This is made clear by the occurrence of the imperfect consecutive אָוַן 'command'. For this occurrence of the imperfect consecutive certainly denotes the consequence of the lightning being in the hands of God, for it is God who commands it to strike the mark.

No 2037

וְחָבֵא חַיָּה בְּמִוְצְיֹתָיָהּ חֲשֹׁנָן

"Then the beasts go into their lairs,
and remain in their dens". (37.8 RSV).

In this chapter, as previously, Elihu talks about the greatness of God and his creative activity. Here in chapter 37 he notes that God is the author of all meteoric activity: rain, storm, snow,

showers, cold, ice, lightning and thunderbolts. The effect of all this on the creative order is then noted in vv 7 & 8. V 7 notes that 'he puts a seal on the hand of every man' which at first sight seems to be somewhat obscure. What the author intends to convey is the thought that man cannot leave his home when the weather is bad. The consequence to this bad weather on the animal kingdom is further defined in v 8 when the author states: "and the beasts return to their dens". Thus the imperfect consecutive וַתָּשָׁב with which the verse is begun denotes the consequence of the bad weather on the beasts of the field; it is that they return to their lairs.

No 2065

וַעֲתָה לֹא יִרְאוּ אֹרֶךְ בְּהַיִּר הוּא בְּשַׁחֲקִים וּרוּחַ עֲבָרָה וַתִּטְהַרֵם

"And now men cannot look on the light
when it is bright in the skies,
when the wind has passed and cleared them". (37.21 RSV).

As is noted above the theme of chapters 36-37 of Elihu's speech is the greatness of God and of his creative activity. Vv 21-24 however, may be regarded as the summing up of all that Elihu has been saying, for in these verses he gives a final acknowledgement of God's terrible majesty and his greatness. Yet here in this verse he returns to describe natural phenomena. He now describes the after

affects of the storm: it has abated and sunlight breaks through the remaining clouds. It is difficult to establish what is the connection with what has been described previously, but it appears that the author intends to convey the thought that as the sun is hidden by the storm but afterwards can be seen, so God, who through Job's sufferings was hidden, can suddenly reveal himself in all his glory. Thus understood the verse denotes the clearing of a stormy sky which is full of clouds by the wind. The action of the wind in clearing the skies is first of all denoted by the perfect עָנָה 'pass' and the consequence to that action is then further denoted by the imperfect consecutive וַתִּסָּרַח 'swept away'.

No 2088

בָּרַן יַחַד כְּוֹכְבֵי בֶקֶר וַיִּרְיְצוּ כָל בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים

"when the morning stars sang together,
and all the sons of God shouted for joy"? (38.7 RSV).

As far as the imperfect consecutive is concerned there are only five occurrences attested within these chapters which constitute the divine speeches and the first of these will now be considered. The main point of the speech is that Job in his ignorance had misrepresented God and this is put briefly in the challenging questions with which the speech opens (Ch 38.2) and closes (Ch 40.2). The main body of the speech (Ch38.4-39.30), also consists for the most part of

questions, is designed to bring out the immensity of Job's ignorance and the greatness of God's knowledge and his beneficent use of it. These questions fall into two main groups, referring (1) to the inanimate world, its creation and maintenance, 38.4-38; and (2) to animals, and in particular wild animals, their maintenance and habits, 38.39-39.30. Thus from this particular analysis Job is now asked about his attendance at creation. The verse under immediate consideration describes the joy of the stars at the moment of creation.

This joy which was expressed at creation is first of all denoted by the use of the infinitive construct ׀׀ which is here used with the preposition ׀. V 7 is thus a temporal clause which as is usual in Biblical Hebrew is constructed by means of the preposition ׀ or ׀ and the infinitive construct of the verb in question. Here the root is ׀׀׀ which means 'extol' or 'sing'. The consequence to the singing of the stars is that the heavenly beings also joined in with a united chorus and this consequence is then denoted by the imperfect consecutive ׀׀׀׀׀ 'shout in acclamation'. Accordingly, this occurrence of the imperfect consecutive is best understood as denoting consequence.

No 2089

וְיִסַּךְ בְּדִלְחִים יָם בְּנִיחֹן מְרַחֵם יָצַח

"Or who shut in the sea with doors,
when it burst forth from the womb"; (38.8 RSV).

As was noted above this divine speech begins with a series of questions which are designed to bring out the immensity of Job's ignorance. In 38.7 Job was questioned as to his presence and activity in creation. This is now continued in this present verse which begins with the imperfect consecutive $\eta\theta' \eta$. The form is problematical since its position at the opening of this sentence seems to make the sentence a sequel to v 7b: "and he has shut in". But the difficulty with that is that the subject is not made explicit. The text really requires $\eta\theta\alpha \eta$ and that is how G has understood it, producing the rendering $\epsilon\phi\phi\alpha\epsilon\alpha$. Most commentators have followed the Vulgate quis conclusit ?, and have emended the text to read $\eta\theta' \eta$ 'who has shut in' which would appear to be what the RSV has done. There are however, a few who would retain the MT and among these are Gordis, Blommerde and Tur-Sinai. Blommerde here, wants to retain the MT but derives $\eta\theta' \eta$ from $\eta\theta \eta$ not from $\eta\theta \eta$. This would produce the translation: "when the sea poured out of the two doors". (53). The difficulty with this proposal is that it produces an unnatural connection between vv 7 & 8 and that if adopted v 8 then becomes another temporal clause which is an unsatisfactory interpretation.

Tur-Sinai also wants to retain the consonantal text here and point $\eta\theta' \eta$ as a qal passive which produces the translation: "when the sea

was shut up". (54). This has the advantage of both retaining the consonantal text as well as deriving the verbal form from the root סַנַן . It does however have the disadvantage of making the subject 'the sea' which seems to break the flow of thought between vv 7 & 8 as well as making it into an extended relative clause as I noted under my review of Blommerde's proposal. All in all then, it seems best to retain the MT with all the inherent difficulties that might have. How then do we interpret the imperfect consecutive וַיִּסַּךְ ?

Is it not best to regard וַיִּסַּךְ as an emphatic construction which immediately turns our attention back to v 6 and to the subject implied in the construction $\text{וַיִּסַּךְ אֱלֹהִים אֶת הַיָּם בְּדַלְתָּיִם$? This means that it is proposed to take God as the subject in v 6, that v 7 is regarded as parenthetical and that the translation is as follows: "who shut in the sea with doors". For the above reasons then, it seems best to take וַיִּסַּךְ as an emphatic construction.

No's 2093 & 2094

$\text{וַיִּסַּךְ אֱלֹהִים אֶת הַיָּם בְּדַלְתָּיִם וַיִּלְחֶם$

"and prescribed bounds for it,
and set bars and doors". (38.10 RSV).

In this speech, as noted above the intent is to show the immensity of the ignorance of Job as well as to mark the exceeding greatness of

God's power. This object is achieved by means of the the questions that are being put to Job. The subject matter of the questions treated thus far was the attendance of Job at the divine act of creation. The verse now under consideration continues in fact the question of v 8: "who shut in the sea with doors"? as well as further defining the limits of the sea. This verse as already indicated contains two examples of the imperfect consecutive, namely $\text{וַיִּשְׁבַּח} \text{ --- } \text{וַיִּשְׁבַּח}$. Their interpretation is however, somewhat problematical. The difficulty is to be seen in the first verb which has as its object the noun קָו . The proper meaning of שָׁבַח is 'broke' which properly translated would produce the rendering 'and I broke on it my boundary'. Because of this difficulty Dhorme here, proposes to transpose the two verbs which then gives the translation: "When I imposed on it my bounds, I shattered bolt and doors". (55). This solution, attractive as it is, is to be rejected since it has no versional support, in particular in the second hemi-stich.

The attempt by other scholars to emend the text to וַיִּשְׁבַּח based on the reading of G: $\epsilon\theta\epsilon\mu\eta\nu \delta\epsilon \acute{\alpha}\upsilon\tau\eta \acute{\omicron}\rho\iota\alpha$ is likewise to be rejected since G itself may only be a paraphrase. Driver-Gray note that this construction $\text{וַיִּשְׁבַּח} \text{ --- } \text{וַיִּשְׁבַּח}$ may be an allusion to to the rocks and cliffs in which the mainland often abruptly ends. (56). Of these proposals none seems satisfactory and perhaps it is worth mentioning that Andersen here notes that no solution to this problem is yet in sight. (57).

For these reasons the problematical translation of the RSV for שָׁנָה
 'prescribed' is retained and it seems appropriate to move on from the
 problem of its translation to that of its syntactical use. It
 appears that both occurrences of the imperfect consecutive can be
 interpreted as denoting the consequence of the infinitive construct
 'וַיִּשְׁמַח' of v 9. The force of the infinitive construct is carried on by
 'וַיִּשְׁמַח' ---- 'וַיִּשְׁמַח' which denote the consequence of God providing for the
 sea a garment, it is that he has also set its boundaries which are
 also determined by its bolt and doors. The further consequence to
 this action is then denoted by my next example which is No 2095.
 Located in the very next verse No 2095 informs us of the decree of God
 relative to the sea. The consequence to this creative work of God is
 that he by his eternal word determines the limits of the sea.

No 2190

וַחֲשַׁנְחָה כִּי רַגְלֵי תַזְרוּרָה וַחֲמִית הַשָּׂדֶה תַדְלוֹשָׁהּ

"forgetting that a foot may crush them,
 and that the wild beast may trample them". (39.15 RSV).

It has been noted above that these chapters which contain the divine
 speeches include a number of questions which are designed to show the
 gross ignorance of Job and the greatness of God by comparison. In
 the previous examples studied in chapter 38 the questioning there was
 on the theme of whether Job was present at and had taken part in

the act of creation. From Ch38.39-39.30 the questions now refer to animals, and in particular wild animals, and to their maintenance and habits. In vv 13-18 of this chapter the questions are related to the habits of the ostrich and in particular the way that she cares for her young. It should be noted in passing vv 13-18, are in fact a crux interpretum and are wholly lacking in G which possibly faltered because of the difficulties of the text and as a result omitted them. They are obscure with the result that the exact point and reference of the description are uncertain. V 15, lies in the middle of the description relative to the ostrich's care of her young. The cruelty of the bird thus described in these verses is proverbial (cf Lam 4.3.), for having laid its eggs and having placed them in holes in the sand it then leaves them to go in search for food. This is denoted in v 14. V 15 further defines her cruel act by noting emphatically that she has no thought of them.

This is denoted by the occurrence of the imperfect consecutive וַתִּשְׁכַּח. These verses mark emphatically the behaviour of the ostrich and this is further stressed by the imperfect consecutive which indicates that having laid her eggs she no longer has any thought of them.

This chapter has examined some 88 examples of the imperfect consecutive as used in the book of Job which have been spread through Ch's 3.1-20.29; 32.1-37.24; and 38.1-42.6. This means that we have seen how it works in different types of literature contained within

the book of Job. It is now necessary to come to some sort of conclusion as to its use.

At the beginning of this chapter attention was drawn to Michel's interpretation of the use of the imperfect consecutive in poetry by which the factor of consequence was expressed and without any reference to a time period. (58). In examining the imperfect consecutives which occur in Job 3.1-20.29; 32.1-37.24 and 38.1-42.6, Michel's definition has been applied in each particular case, and has in fact confirmed the veracity of his theory in respect to the imperfect consecutive in poetry. He is correct, that is to say, as far as he goes in his examination of the imperfect consecutive as it is used in the book of Psalms.

What is being said here is that Michel has presented his evidence from the book of Psalms in such a way to give the impression that the concept of consequence can only be expressed by the imperfect consecutive. While this study is not concerned with the book of Psalms, an examination of the text of the book of Job would suggest to me that this is far from the case. Ch. 8.6 serves as an illustration where the concept of consequence is denoted by the ordinary conjunction/waw consecutive which is used with the perfect:

אם זך וישר אתה כי עתה יעיר עליך ושלם נות צדקך

"if you are pure and upright,
surely then he will rouse himself for you
and reward you with a rightful habitation". (8.6 RSV).

This example shows how the formulation of rules in Hebrew syntax can be broken when one attempts to apply them to poetic usage. Nor is this the only other construction which can be said to denote the concept of consequence. There are a number of examples which show that it can be expressed also by the use of ordinary conjunction used with the imperfect. An example of this is to be found in chapter 14 verse 13:

מִי יִתֵּן בְּשֵׁאוֹל תִּצְפּוֹנִי חֲסִי'רֹנִי עַד שׁוֹב אֶפֶךָ חֲשִׁית לִי חֶק וְחֹזְנֹרִנִי

"On that thou wouldst hide me in sheol,
that thou wouldst conceal me until thy wrath be past,
that thou wouldst appoint me a set time,
and remember me."

It would of course be possible to repoint the text into the form of an imperfect consecutive. But since it has been argued that the MT and its pointing as it stands should be accepted so that the occurrences of the imperfect consecutives could be retained and recognized as such, the reverse argument applied to

those occurrences of the imperfect conjunctive which denote consequence can hardly now be accepted for the sake of a scholarly theory.

Most of the examples cited show that the concept of consequence is not only denoted by the use of the imperfect consecutive as Michel would have us believe, but can also be expressed by either the ordinary conjunction used with the perfect or imperfect. Nor is this all that one can say with regard to the use of the imperfect consecutive in poetry as stated by Michel; for a use of the imperfect consecutive which he has missed altogether is the emphatic use of the construction. While it is true that a good number of the examples reviewed thus far in this chapter can be interpreted as denoting the concept of consequence there are equally many examples which cannot since they do not denote consequence but emphasis. An example which brings this into the light is No. 142:

וַיִּשַׁע מִחֶרֶב מִפִּיהֶם וּמִיַּד חֹזֵק אֲבִיוֹן.

This particular example of the imperfect consecutive cannot be interpreted as denoting consequence since the previous verse describes the activities and behaviour of crafty men. Thus וַיִּשַׁע is used in an emphatic sense to denote what God does for the fatherless in spite of the schemes of crafty men. It should be noted that this example is not unique but is quite widespread in the book of Job. In these examples the imperfect consecutive is used as an emphatic construction

sometimes stressing the force of divine action as in the example above, sometimes the actions of men.

Thus we may agree with Michel that the use of the imperfect consecutive in poetry can denote consequence as long as we do not apply the concept too rigidly and exclusively, and as long as we admit on the basis of textual evidence that this is not its only use; for as we have seen it can also be used emphatically. Under these circumstances it becomes somewhat difficult to formulate any rules as to its exact usage from a syntactic point of view but we must simply note what seems to be its main usage in Hebrew poetry and in the book of Job in particular. Thus one can say that the use of the imperfect consecutive in poetry is to denote the concept of consequence as well as that of any emphatic action to which the Hebrew poet wished to draw attention.

NOTES

- (1) Fensham. 'The use of the suffix conjugation and the prefix conjugation in a few old Hebrew poems'. 1978 p 14.
- (2) Gesenius Hebrew Grammar. 1910. §111a p326.
- (3) Davidson Commentary on the book of Job. 1862. p 46.
- (4) Michel Tempora und Satzstellung in den Psalmen. 1961. p 41.
- (5) Waltke/O' Connor Biblical Hebrew Syntax 1990 p473.
- (6) Davidson ibid p 51.
- (7) Dhorme Commentary on the book of Job. 1984 p 38.
- (8) Davidson ibid p 51.
- (9) Davidson ibid p 65.
- (10) Dhorme ibid p 44.
- (11) Davidson ibid p 71.
- (12) Dhorme ibid p 90.
- (13) Dhorme ibid p100.
- (14) Davidson ibid p120.
- (15) Davidson ibid p121.
- (16) Davidson ibid p127.
- (17) Clines WBC Job 1990 p198.
- (18). Dhorme ibid p113.
- (19) Clines ibid p216.
- (20) Dhorme ibid p136.
- (21) Dhorme ibid p136.
- (22) Dhorme ibid p148.
- (23) Davidson ibid p159.

Chapter Four.

The use of the Imperfect Coniunctive.

In this chapter we turn from a consideration of the use of the imperfect consecutive to that of the imperfect conjunctive. It is necessary first to note that the use of the imperfect conjunctive is a rarer use than that of the imperfect consecutive, there being only 89 occurrences in ch's 3.1-20.29; 32.1-37.24; 38.1-42.6, compared to 135 occurrences of the imperfect consecutive. It is however, not the rarest tense in the book of Job, for that honour is reserved for the Perfect conjunctive/consecutive which has only 38 occurrences.

It is also worth noting that this particular tense is hardly mentioned in the Grammars. Gesenius-Kautzsch makes no mention of it, but it is discussed in Davidson (§ 59), Driver (§ 134), and in Waltke/O'Connor (§ 33.4). Michel does not mention it and likewise omits any reference to the perfect conjunctive.

The use of the imperfect conjunctive is thus defined by Waltke/O'Connor:

"The conjunction does not mark לִּבְּרַךְ as successive or subordinate; it is rather an unmarked connector, though it may introduce (for lexical rather than grammatical reasons) a clause that is logically or temporally subordinate to its predecessor. In post exilic Hebrew לִּבְּרַךְ tends to replace sequential לִּבְּרַךְ . After a volitional (cohortative, imperative, jussive) form לִּבְּרַךְ has a consequential force. The prefix conjugation in this combination is usually imperfective, for example, in a habitual usage." (1).

Bearing this in mind it might also be noted that unlike the imperfect consecutive there are no uses where this construction merely introduces narrative and so we set out in this chapter to examine some

89 examples.

No 28

למה לא מרחם אמות מבטן 'צאתי' וגוונ

"Why did I not die at birth,
come forth from the womb and expire"? (3.11 RSV).

The literary genre of Job's first speech is that of the "complaint" (klage). It may further be divided into two parts: vv3-10 the curse and vv 11-26 the lament. The occurrence of וגוונ is right at the beginning of the lament which may further be divided into two parts: vv 11-19 & 24-26 the self lament and vv 20-23 the God lament.

3.11 may be considered to be the beginning of the self lament. But what exactly is the use of וגוונ here?

Even a cursory reading of the Hebrew text shows that וגוונ denotes the consequence or the result of coming forth from the womb; it is that man breathes his last. While death is not normally the consequence of being born, it is in the wish that Job gives expression to. Because of this apparent deduction, Gordis takes the imperfect conjunctive here as a weakened form of the imperfect consecutive. (2). Because of its use here, Driver/Gray expect to see the imperfect consecutive וגוונ, and (appear to) reprint the text accordingly. (3).

Davidson, in his Hebrew Syntax notes that there are some cases where the imperfect consecutive is pointed as an imperfect conjunctive and cites some examples from Isaiah, Zechariah and Psalms. He then notes that in most of these cases the peculiarity belongs to the first person. He then argues that they are to be understood as imperfect consecutives although they are imperfect conjunctives in form. (4).

Thus the balance of scholarship takes these occurrences as being equivalent to that of the imperfect consecutive and certainly the imperfect conjunctive in 3.11 may be understood in this way because it denotes the concept of consequence or result. The Hebrew text of this verse commences the lament proper which is in the form of a question begun by $\eta\eta\lambda$. The content of this lament is similar to that of Jeremiah 20.18 although the latter does not use the verb of the imperfect conjunctive $\nu\alpha\lambda\eta$. The first part of the lament is expressed by means of the simple imperfect $\eta\eta\lambda$ 'die' which Dhorme has noted to be a true Aorist. (5).

The question is then continued by the perfect ' $\eta\lambda\chi$ ' 'come forth' and the consequence or result of this action is then indicated by the imperfect conjunctive $\nu\alpha\lambda\eta$ 'expire'. From this examination of the text it can be seen that the imperfect conjunctive is performing exactly the same task syntactically as would have been performed by the imperfect consecutive, which denotes the concept of consequence. This is made clearer in connection with No 667 examined in the previous chapter. In that text the form $\nu\lambda\eta$, pointed in the Hebrew

Bible as an imperfect consecutive, denotes the concept of consequence, namely, that as a result of death man has breathed his last. No 667 uses the same verb as in 3.11, only the former is imperfect consecutive in form while the latter is imperfect conjunctive but the use of both verbs is identical from a syntactical point of view.

How is the grammarian to understand this puzzle?

F.R.Blake in his A Resurvey of Hebrew Tenses (1951) notes the following:

"Imperfect with ׀ (b) with supposed past meaning; here unless we make the assumption that in the syntax represented by these passages ׀ and ׀ were interchangeable, and that the imperfect has here the past meaning which is preserved with certain adverbs and conjunctions," (6).

Thus, according to Blake the answer to this apparent conundrum is that we are dealing with alternative forms which are used in the interests of variety at the discretion of the Hebrew poet. Perhaps part of the answer to the problem is to be discovered under the concept of emphasis. Throughout the previous chapter attention was drawn to a number of examples of the imperfect consecutive which were used, not to denote consequence but emphasis. Of these, perhaps the clearest is No 142 where the imperfect consecutive ׃׃׀ indicates not consequence but emphasis. In that text (5.15) the poet emphasizes, the saving action of God and has used the imperfect consecutive for emphasis. In simple terms what is being argued for

is a discrimination in the usage of imperfect consecutive/conjunctive from the point of view of emphasis or otherwise. Could it not be that the poet would normally use the imperfect conjunctive to denote consequence while at other times he may have used the imperfect consecutive to denote emphasis? As with other uses of the tenses in poetry one has to allow for a certain amount of latitude in the implementation of these rules due to the nature of the poet's task which meant that he would have to vary the constructions that he used.

No 32

כִּי צַחָה שָׁכַבְתִּי וְאִשְׁקוּטָה אֲנִי וְנֹחַ לִי

"For then I should have lain down and been quiet; I should have slept, then I should have been at rest," (3.13 RSV)

The self lament proper began at v 11 with two questions introduced by the particles לָמָּה and מָדוּעַ. In v 13 the lament is continued by the description of the state of death which Job would have enjoyed had he indeed died at birth. Here this state is described by the two perfects שָׁכַבְתִּי and אִשְׁקוּטָה. The states thus described are of lying down and of enjoying the sleep of death. The consequence to this state of lying down is then expressed by the imperfect conjunctive אִשְׁקוּטָה 'been quiet'. This occurrence of the imperfect conjunctive is understood by Gordis as a weakened form of the imperfect consecutive (7), while Driver/Gray want to repoint it as an imperfect consecutive. (8).

Davidson however, notes that the imperfect conjunctive טקוּשׁוּ expresses the result or consequence of the action begun by the perfect נָשׂוּ and it seems correct to interpret it in this way. (9). The second consequence is denoted by the simple imperfect נָשׂוּ אִם 'been at rest' which is of course parallel to טקוּשׁוּ and conveys the same nuance as the imperfect consecutive. Dhorme noted that the particle אִם is virtually equivalent to the conjunction ו and so the whole construction נָשׂוּ אִם may be understood as having the force of an imperfect conjunctive. (10). This example is a good illustration of the nature of the poet's work which has been noted above in that he uses a number of constructions to express the same concept.

No 118

$\text{יְרַחֵקוּ בְנֵי מִישַׁע וַיִּדְנְאוּ בַשַּׁעַר וְאִין מְצִיל}$

"His sons are far away from safety,
they are crushed in the gate,
and there is no-one to deliver them." (5.4 RSV).

This example is to be found in the third main section of Eliphaz's first speech in which he discourses with Job on the fate of the fool. The theology of the fate determining deed and the proverb-like conclusion to these verses (1-7), confirm its wisdom derivation. In v 4 Eliphaz defines not only the fate of the fool but also that of his sons. The focus of attention has shifted in this and the next

verse to the sons of the fool, since he is apparently dead and as a result he has left his sons in a miserable condition. That condition is indicated by the use of the imperfect יִחַקֵּן which denotes a state, the state of being far away from any sort of protection. The result of this state of orphanage is then expressed by the imperfect conjunctive וַיִּדְנֵאֵן which surely denotes the consequence of being without a deliverer, it is that his sons are crushed in the gate. Thus the use of the imperfect conjunctive in this verse is that of expressing the consequence of the act first indicated by the previous imperfect although Davidson regards it as being merely copulative.

(11). Dhorme here, alone among the commentators, following G wants to translate the verbs as jussives and to see in v 4 the content of the curse referred to in v 3. (12).

While this suggestion is certainly attractive it does alter the use of the imperfect conjunctive since the ו then merely becomes a coordinating particle which would denote simply the effect of the first imperfect. Since Dhorme is alone in this suggestion it makes better sense to interpret the imperfect conjunctive as has been outlined above.

No 148

כִּי הוּא יִנְאִיב וַיִּחַבֵּשׁ יִמְחַץ וַיִּדוּ תִרְפִּינָה

"For he wounds, but he binds up;
he smites, but his hands heal." (5.18 RSV)

With this example in Eliphaz's first speech he replies to the lament of Job that his birth was untimely. In 5.17-27 Eliphaz introduces the fifth major element in his discourse, namely, that suffering is educational in nature and must be considered as a positive act of God for the sufferer. V 18 defines the two-sided character of God which had already been defined in his relationships with the lowly and the crafty (vv11-12), only in this verse it is the same person who experiences this two fold character of God's dealings with his subjects for he is the one who both wounds and heals.

How are the tenses used in this verse to be understood?

It is first of all necessary to understand that Eliphaz in 5.17-26 is speaking of the happiness of the man who takes the troubles of life in the right spirit. The key to this idea is to be found in the fact that when disaster hits the godly man, he recognizes this as part of God's training, and so can rejoice in adversity. The salient feature is that the godly man will receive the correction intended by the varying trials of life. Seen in this light the initial action of God in wounding is first of all indicated by the imperfect וַיִּצַח 'wounds'. The consequence of this action is then denoted by the imperfect conjunctive וַיִּבְדֹּל 'binds up'. To interpret the imperfect conjunctive here properly it is necessary to see that Eliphaz is

concerned with the godly man who has already received the wounds which God has sent him in the recourse of his life. Thus the imperfect conjunctive denotes the consequence that God also pours out his healing balm on all who accept his correction and instruction (מְוֹסֵר).

No 185

וַיֹּאֲלֵ אֱלֹהִים וַיִּדְנֶנֶנִי יְהוָה וַיִּבְצַעֲנִי

"That it would please God to crush me,
that he would loose his hand and cut me off!" (6.9 RSV).

This example is set in Job's reply to Eliphaz. The structure of the speech may be divided into three parts: (1) vv2-13: Job is evidently uttering a monologue, speaking neither to the friends nor to God who is spoken of in the third person. (2) vv14-20: Job is clearly addressing himself to the friends although they are referred to in the third person as though they were not there; but there can be no doubt that these lines can be addressed to them. (3) vv21-30: Job addresses his friends directly in every verse except the last.

From this analysis it can be seen that the example with which we are concerned occurs in the first division of the speech: namely in the monologue which Job utters. In this monologue Job insists that his words are fully justified (vv2-7), and expresses the wish that he would die (vv8-10). The expression of his wish is begun in v 8

with the optative ׀ת׳ ״ן 'who will grant' the force of which is continued with the imperfect ׀ת׳ 'grant'. V 9 is then begun with No 185 לא׳י 'please' where the ׀ before the imperfect of הוּאֵל is simply co-ordinate to the optative formula of v 8. Such a use of the ׀ is defined by Gesenius in his grammar:

"Instead of subordination, the co-ordination of the complementary verbal idea in the finite verb frequently occurs,---
(a) With the second verb co-ordinated in a form exactly corresponding to the first by means of ׀. As a rule, here also the principal idea is introduced only by the second verb, while the first contains the definition of the manner of the action, e. g., with הוּאֵל in the jussive, Jb 6.9" (13).

Since No's 186 & 188 occur in this verse they will be dealt with here also. In 6.9 ׀ת׳נא׳נא׳י 'crush me' the ׀ indicates that it is dependant on לא׳י since both verbs are in the same mood as Dhorme has noted.
(14). This produces the unified translation: 'That it would please God to crush me'. The force of this optative mood is then continued by the simple imperfect ׀ת׳ and the consequence to this action is then denoted by the imperfect conjunctive ׀ת׳נא׳נא׳י 'cut me off'. Thus of the imperfect conjunctives which occur in this verse two may be understood as simply being co-ordinate, while the last is better understood as indicating consequence, the consequence being that if God's hand is loosed then his request will be granted and he will die.

וְתִהְיֶה עֲרֹךְ נַחֲמֵי וְאַסְלֵדָה בְּחִילָהּ לֹא יִחַמּוּד כִּי לֹא נִחְדַּתִּי אִמְרֵי
קָדוֹשׁ

"This would be my consolation;

I would even exult in pain unsparing;

for I have not denied the words of the Holy One". (6.10 RSV).

With this particular example we are still in the monologue which Job utters and in which he gives vent to his feelings about his own personal demise. In v 9 he particularises his thoughts about death and wishes that God would crush him or cut him off. In 6.10 the result of this wish being granted is then considered. This would be his consolation. The result thus tabulated is expressed by the imperfect conjunctive וְתִהְיֶה 'would be'. Davidson has noted that this particular occurrence of the imperfect conjunctive is of uncertain interpretation. (15). He notes three possible shades of meaning:

- (1) optative: "Oh! that I might still have consolation".
- (2) design: "in order that I might yet have consolation".
- (3) result: "so should I yet have consolation, and it should be yet a consolation etc".

He then compares parallel passages such as Job 13.5, 21.2 and concludes on the basis of the evidence that (3) is the correct one. In this case וְתִהְיֶה refers to that which precedes and surely denotes the consequence of the preceding wish stated in v 9. Since No 190 occurs in this verse it can be discussed here also.

וְאִסְלַדָּה has posed a great problem to commentators since it is a hapax legomenon. Dhorme is surely to be followed here when he retains וְלֵד because of the meaning attributed to it by G and Targum 'leap for joy'. (16). Since its meaning has been established by Dhorme, what can be said of the use of the imperfect conjunctive וְאִסְלַדָּה? Davidson notes that the וְ is simply copulative being parallel to וְחָהִי. (17). It seems better to take וְאִסְלַדָּה as expressing the consequence to Job still having a consolation, meaning that he would leap for joy. It seems appropriate therefore, to take this occurrence of the imperfect conjunctive as denoting consequence.

No 207

לִפְתוֹ אֲרוּחוֹת דְרָגָם יַעֲלוּ בַחֲהוֹ וַיֵּאבְדוּ

"the caravans turn aside from their course;
they go up into the waste and perish" (6.18 RSV).

This example occurs in the third section of Job's reply to Eliphaz where he clearly addresses himself to the friends. In vv 18-20 the image of the wadi is employed. These verses describe thirsty caravaneers who are tempted by their knowledge of a nearby wadi and leave the regular track in search of water. They go off into the unmarked desert and find only dried up streams, and perish before they can reach the next watering place. They are the victims of a mirage and the torrent in which they had counted turned out to be dry.

Their action in turning aside from their course is first of all expressed by the imperfects י'עלו ----לפתון. The consequence of this foolish action is then denoted by the imperfect conjunctive וי'אבדו, the consequence being that they perish.

No 233

אף על יתום תפילו ותכרו על ריעכם

"You would even cast lots over the fatherless,
and bargain over your friend," (6.27 RSV).

This example is to be found in the third section of Job's reply to Eliphaz in which Job addresses his friends directly in every verse except the last. In these verses he describes his friends as being as treacherous as a torrent bed. In 6.27 he describes their character as being such that they are men who have gambled for orphans. We may consider such language to be proverbial since there is no evidence that Job's friends actually did so. Their action in so doing is introduced by the imperfect תפילו. Because this verb has no complement, the first hemistich has been the subject of many differing interpretations. It seems best to follow most commentators who assume that the idiom תפילו 'cast lots' is employed since the complement is likewise omitted in 1 Sam 14.42. Their character is such that they have marked him out by the drawing of lots. Yet this is not all for they are ready to deliver him up to the highest

bidder. This is indicated by the imperfect conjunctive וַתִּנְרָן 'bargain'. The ו before the imperfect תִּנְרָה is once again denoting a consequence. The consequence which is being expressed is that Job's friends are so hard hearted that they are not only prepared to draw lots for an orphan, but even worse than that, they are prepared to speculate over their friend. The imperfect conjunctive gives expression to the consequence of their attitude but not of their actions.

No 291

וַמָּה לֹא חָשָׂא פִשְׁעִי וַתַּעֲבִיר אַח עוֹנִי כִּי עָתָה לְעַפְרָא אֲשַׁנֵּב וְשַׁחַרְתִּנִּי
וְאִיִּנִי

"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." (7.21 RSV).

This example is to be found in the very last verse of Job's reply to Eliphaz. In vv. 11-21 of this chapter Job pours out his soul in a complaint against God. This final part of his speech contains two strophes. The first (vv. 11-16), complains of God's harassment of him, especially by nightmares (v. 14). The second (vv. 17-21), pleads for God to desist from his harassment (v19), and then takes a bold step in challenging the rationale for God's behaviour towards

him. 7.21 is therefore taken from the part of the speech where Job challenges God for actions towards him. This challenge is begun by the use of the neuter interrogative pronoun **מַה** which here has the meaning of 'why' rather like the Greek **τι**. This is followed by the imperfect **אָפַח** 'forgive' which may have the meaning simply of 'tolerate' as Clines has observed. (18). The consequence to this act of forgiveness is then denoted by the imperfect conjunctive **וַחֲצִי־יָרֵם** 'remove'. The imperfect conjunctive here indicates the consequence to the divine act of forgiveness, since if Job's sins are forgiven they are by definition also removed.

No 358

הֵן יַעֲבֹר עָלַי וְלֹא אֶרְאֶה וַיַּחֲלֶף וְלֹא אֶבִּין לוֹ

"Lo, he passes me by, and I see him not;
he moves on, but I do not perceive him." (9.11 RSV).

This example is to be found in Job's reply to Bildad which extends over two chapters and can be broken into two parts: (a) 9.2-24: it is not clear whether this is a monologue or an address to the friends, but God is spoken of in the third person. (b) 9.25-10.22: God is now addressed in the second person. The theme developed here is that of Job's powerlessness before God and the fact that he is trapped in his own private hell. In developing this theme of powerlessness before God, Job also expresses the need for vindication, a need he

sees as being fairly hopeless. This is expressed in v 11 by affirming that any attempt to gain vindication from God is doomed to founder on the impossibility of establishing contact with him. All Job can hope for is the hurried passing by of a figure he cannot see or recognize. The action of God passing by in a hurried form is first of all expressed by the imperfect יַעֲבֹר 'pass by', the consequence being expressed by וְלֹא אֶרְאֶה 'I do not see him'. This latter construction may be considered to be identical to the imperfect conjunctive, but with the addition of the negative לֹא. This construction here certainly expresses the consequence of the action indicated by יַעֲבֹר. The actual imperfect conjunctive which occurs in this verse וַיִּחַלֵּף may be interpreted as being parallel to יַעֲבֹר of the first stich, and the ו before its imperfect as being purely copulative.

No 403

אִם אֶמְרֵי אֲשַׁנְּחָה שִׁיחִי אֶעֱזֹבָה פְּנֵי וְאֶבְלִיָּוָה

"If I say, I will forget my complaint,
I will put off my sad countenance,
and be of good cheer," (9.27 RSV).

Here in 9.27 Job is still expressing the thought of his powerlessness before God. In this verse, Job contemplates a means of relief, only to realize immediately its futility. If he resolves to have done

with his moaning to the point where he has forgotten it entirely, and to put a brave face on things his resolve is undermined by the fear of what new sufferings may lie in store for him. This is first of all indicated by a hypothetical clause begun by אַם with the infinitive construct אָמַר 'say'. The hypothesis is then defined by the cohortative אֲשַׁכַּח 'forget' which in turn is followed by the second cohortative אֶצְוֶנָה 'put off'. The consequence to this hypothesis is then denoted by the cohortative conjunctive וְאֶבְלִיגָה 'be cheerful', since if one puts off his sad countenance the result is that one has a cheerful disposition.

No 459

וַיִּגָּאֵה כִּשְׁחַל חֲצוּדָיו וַתִּשָּׁב חַתְּפֵלֶא בִי

"And if I lift myself up, thou dost hunt me like a lion,
and again work wonders against me"; (10. 16 RSV)

This example is again located in Job's reply to Bildad where he expresses his feeling of powerlessness before God. Continuing the second major section of the speech, Job returns to the second person form of address, and throughout persistently addresses God. There is no doubt that parts of this speech could be classed in form-critical terms as an accusation. This second part of the speech may be divided into four parts: (a) programme for the speech (vv. 1-2); (b) possible motivations for God's treatment of Job (vv. 3-7); (c)

the contradiction between the apparent and the hidden purpose of God in creating and sustaining Job (vv. 8-17); (d) appeal for release from God's oppressive presence (vv. 18-22). From this analysis it will be easily seen that 10.16 comes from the section where Job is examining an apparent contradiction, namely, God's creation of him and God's treatment of him.

From the point of view of textual analysis it is necessary to note that vv. 14-15 begin with the particle ׀א. According to the RSV this particle has been elided from the beginning of v 16 and is simply commenced with ׀. This interpretation has been followed by Driver-Gray and Clines. (19). All the commentators have found difficulty with ׀א׀׀. Clines reads ׀א׀א׀ 'and if I lift myself up' following the Syriac which is the way that the RSV has taken it. (20). Driver-Gray and Davidson both want to understand the subject of ׀א׀׀ as the ׀א׀ of v. 15c. (21). Dhorme on the other hand, reads ׀א׀׀ as ׀א׀ since he thinks that it makes better sense and suits the context of v 15c better. If ׀א׀ is to be read then this due to an error in audience. (22). Finally Gordis wants to take ׀א׀׀ as an adverb and read ׀א׀ 'proudly'. (23). From this review it can be seen that there is no unanimity among the commentators and it seems best to adhere to the RSV here. Taking ׀א׀׀ as ׀א׀א׀ it is necessary to understand the ׀ as being merely copulative to vv. 14-15. Since No 461 occurs in this verse it seems best to deal with it here also.

The verb ׀א׀ is here used in the sense of an auxiliary verb giving

the meaning of 'do again, repeat' and is simply juxtaposed to the verb it governs to convey that an action is constantly renewed or repeated. (24). It does seem however, that the ך immediately prior to it must be understood as denoting consequence since God is constantly working wonders against Job because he is hunting him down like a lion. The imperfect conjunctive here as elsewhere in the book of Job denotes consequence.

No 464

תחדש עד־ך נגד־י ותרב כעשך עמדי חליפות וצבא עמי

"thou dost renew thy witnesses against me,
and increase thy vexation toward me;
thou dost bring fresh hosts against me". (10.17 RSV).

As in No 461 10.17 is taken from the section where Job examines an apparent contradiction i. e., God's creation of him over against God's treatment of him. Thus the strophe concludes on a note of heightened intensity. If Job dares to assert himself (v16a), God renews the vigour of his hostility against him. Interpreted thus v 17 may be seen in itself as denoting the consequences indicated by v 16b, namely, the result of God hunting him down like a lion and working wonders against him. The first of these results is expressed by the imperfect ׀חדש 'renew', although the interpretation of the word עד־ך is a matter of conjecture. What exactly is it that is being

witnessed against Job? One could argue that the witnesses indicated here are Job's sufferings which are regarded as so many proofs of his guilt. But despite the presence of legal terminology, this rendering does not fit the context; nor is the personification of his sufferings seen elsewhere in the chapter. It is better then, with Clines, to take עֲדֵיךָ as 'your hostility' which would then be cognate with the Arabic *adiya* 'was hostile'. This suggestion, if accepted, then produces synonymous parallelism with the second line for God's anger, a leitmotif throughout the speech, appears again in the words עֲדֵיךָ 'hostility' and אַפְּךָ 'anger', only in intensified form: Job's protestations of innocence serve only to multiply God's outbursts against him. (25).

With the next hemistich we come to the occurrence of the imperfect conjunctive in question. In order to consider fully this example it is necessary to realise that vv16-17 are a conditional sentence, v16a being the protasis and vv16b-17 the apodosis. Clines has noted that the form וְהָיָה is the jussive which indicates that the apodosis after the hypothesis of v16a continues. (26). Since it has been argued above that the word עֲדֵיךָ means 'hostility' and not 'witnesses' it is also necessary to take the וְ prior to וְהָיָה as being purely copulative since it preserves the parallelism between the first and second lines. Thus this particular example of the imperfect conjunctive may be taken as a simple conjunction continuing the thought without expressing the idea of consequence.

No 473

הלך מעט ימי יחולל ישית ממני ואנלינה מעט

"Are not the days of my life few?

Let me alone, that I may find a little comfort" (10.20 RSV).

In the above example Job examines the conundrum which has perplexed his soul, namely, that God is good in his creative work, but at every turn he is faced with God being in contention with him. In vv18-22 of this present chapter, the baffled Job returns to his first position, the lament of chapter 3, which is resumed in the closing lines of this speech. In v 19 he returns to the theme of wishing he had not been born. Then he considers that he has been born and so wishes that he had died immediately or that his life had been short. He then expresses his desire for a little comfort in this life before he enters the land of complete darkness, the land of Sheol.

V20, however, is full of textual problems. Consequently, it seems best to follow Dhorme in his interpretation. He reads ימי יחולל 'days of my life' for ימי יחולל because this reading makes better sense and has the support of G and Syr. He then reads ישית ממני 'withdraw from me' for ישית ממני since this reading corresponds to the יחולל of 7.16. Dhorme considers that the parallel text of 7.16 where the verb יחולל occurs has brought confusion into the MT. He then translates:

"Are not the days of my life but a trifle?

Withdraw from me that I might be a little cheerful," (27).

With the above reconstruction of the text an interpretation of the imperfect conjunctive of this verse may be essayed. Job gives vent to his feelings about the shortness of his life as he sees it. He wants to experience a little comfort before he goes to the land of Sheol and this will only be accomplished if God will leave him alone. The cry that God should do this is expressed by the imperative שׁוּב 'withdraw'. The consequence to this action is then indicated by the imperfect conjunctive וְאָנֹכִי . The latter construction expresses the comfort which Job will experience when God listens to his cry and withdraws from him. This example of the imperfect conjunctive then denotes consequence.

No 488

וְאִלֵּים מִי יִתֵּן אֱלֹהֵי דָבָר וְיִפְתַּח שִׁפְתָיו עִמָּךְ

"But oh, that God would speak,
and open his lips to you" (11.5 RSV).

Zophar's speech may be evenly divided into three parts which are appropriately marked in the RSV: vv 2-6, vv 7-12, & vv 13-20. Each of the divisions contains a different subject matter: in vvs 2-6 Zophar reproaches Job for his claim to innocence; in

vv 7-12 he affirms the inscrutability of God; in vv 13-20 he counsels Job on the right way to behave and offers him hope if he will take Zophar's advice. The example here comes from the first of these divisions and is found in 11.5. In the opening verses Zophar reproaches Job for his words and does so in the language of conventional disputation. Zophar sees the antidote to Job's situation as being that God himself should speak to Job and confirm what he has said to Job. Gordis along with most of the other commentators has noted that the word order is eccentric since the usual order would have been:

מִי יִתֵּן דְבַר אֱלֹהִים

or:

מִי יִתֵּן יְדַבֵּר אֱלֹהִים.

In 11.5 the order has been reversed so as to put אֱלֹהִים in the emphatic position. (28). Zophar's wish that God should speak to Job is expressed in the first hemistich by the optative formula + infinitive דְבַר יִתֵּן מִי 'Oh that he would speak'. This action of God speaking is then expressed in the second hemistich by the imperfect conjunctive וַיִּפְתַּח which it is best to understand in a copulative sense since the speaking of God must necessarily be equal to the opening of his lips against Job. Thus the imperfect conjunctive may be taken in a copulative sense. Since No 489 occurs in the same context as 11.5 and in the very next verse it seems best to deal with it here also.

Although it has been argued above that וְיַגִּיד should be understood in a copulative sense it seems best not to apply that understanding to וְיַגִּיד . For the imperfect conjunctive וְיַגִּיד actually denotes the consequences of the divine communication: 'That he would tell you the secrets of wisdom'. Seen in this way the use of the imperfect conjunctive to indicate consequence seems perfectly correct and gives a design to the way that the poet has used the tenses of the Hebrew language.

No 497

אם יחלף ויטגיר ויקהיל ומי שיבנו

"If he passes through, and imprisons,
and calls to judgement, who can hinder him"? (11.10 RSV).

Since this example also occurs in chapter 11 it seems best to take what was said above with regard to introductory matters as understood. The example here in 11.10 occurs in the second part of Zophar's speech which as has been noted above contains Zophar's affirmations on the inscrutability of God. In vv 7-9 of this second section of his speech he affirms that God possesses a secret wisdom, the implications of which are stated in v. 10. These are that he knows the truth about secret sinners such as Job and that if he is punishing him then Job must have done something to deserve it, even though the rest of mankind may not know of it.

This is a difficult verse to interpret and this has led Gordis to deviate from the MT and read $\eta\theta\eta'$ or $\eta\theta\eta'$ in line with G which reads $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\sigma\tau\epsilon\phi\eta$. (29). It should be noted however, that Clines argues that G's $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\sigma\tau\epsilon\phi\eta$ could well represent the $\eta\lambda\eta'$ of the MT. (30). Thus the opening thought of the first hemistich is conveyed by the imperfect $\eta\lambda\eta'$ 'pass by' a word which has already occurred in 9.11 where Job used it to denote that the God he wants to enter into a dialogue with will never stop to listen or to reply. Here the verb $\eta\lambda\eta$ indicates God's routine government of the world which reveals itself in the judgement of all human beings whose sins God's eyes are ever open to. The result of God's government of the world is then denoted by the imperfect conjunctive $\gamma'1\theta'1$ 'shuts up' a word which suggests that the guilty man should be held in custody until it is plain what is to be done with him. Gordis has noted that the verb $\gamma\lambda\theta$ is used in this sense in Lev. 13 & 14. (31). Thus the imperfect conjunctive as used here indicates the inevitable legal processes which occur as a result of God's governance of the world. The use of $\gamma'1\theta'1$ may be considered to be consequential following on from the hypothesis expressed by $\eta\lambda\eta'$ $\alpha\chi$. The same may be also said of No 498. The imperfect conjunctive $\lambda\eta\eta\eta'1$ 'call to judgement' denotes the ongoing consequence of such a man being held in custody, it is that he summons a legal assembly to inquire into the facts so as to arrive at a legal judgement. Thus the imperfect conjunctive indicates the consequence of God governing his world.

No 538

ואולם שאל נא בהמות וחורך ועוף השמים ויגד לך

"But ask the beasts, and they shall teach you;
the birds of the air, and they will tell you"; (12.7 RSV).

This is part of Job's reply to Zophar, a speech which will extend over three chapters (ch's 12-14), only to be exceeded by the closing speech of Job himself which consists of four chapters. It marks the end of the first cycle and leads on to the second. In this position, it serves both as a first reply to the friends collectively and as a precipitating cause of the ensuing cycle of speeches.

The content of the speech has not troubled scholars, who have divided it into three sections, usually corresponding to the chapter divisions. In the previous chapter it was noted that Clines sees only two main sections: 12.2-13.19, a wisdom disputation speech addressed to the friends, and 13.20-14.22, a legal disputation speech addressed to God. It is in this speech that Job for the first time invites God to enter the disputation with him.

The speech proper begins with Job commenting on their collective wisdom. He then defends his own position and understanding as a man of wisdom. When we come to v 7 however, a change of mood is to be observed. Because of this change of mood many readers have decided that these verses (vv. 7-12) are out of place and omit them as being a later addition. Clines has noted 5 difficulties with these

verses: (a) The questions of vv7-8 are addressed to an individual, not to the friends collectively, as is Job's normal practice. (b) The idea that wisdom is the prerogative of the aged (v12) sounds more at home in the mouth of the friends than of Job. (c) The use of the name of Yahweh in v9 is unparalleled in the whole of the dialogues. (d) The reference of 'this' at the end of v 9 is unclear. (e) The whole passage begins (v7) with the strongly adversative conjunction ׀לןל, 'but assuredly', which suits the sense very poorly, since Job has just now been speaking of his own superior insight and depth of experience (vv4-6), not of commonplace knowledge. (32). Since this work is not concerned fundamentally with such textual work it seems best to follow Clines here who has adopted the solution to these problems proposed by Gordis. Gordis solution is that these verses are in fact a quotation. Clines further suggests that these verses are not Job's address to the friends but an ironic statement by him of what he imagines they have been saying to him, or might well say to him. (33). Thus understood we can now proceed to examine the use of tense in v 7. The verse begins with the adversative conjunction ׀לןל 'but assuredly' which is then followed by the imperative ללל 'ask'. The consequence to this command is then denoted by the imperfect conjunctive ׀ללל 'teach you'. The imperfect conjunctive then expresses what is the result of asking the beasts, it is that they will teach you. It should be noted that this is a singular verb which has a plural collective subject cf GKC § 145k. Since No 539 also occurs in this verse it seems best to deal with it here also. The force of the

imperative אָל 'ask' also extends to the second hemistich and as a result the imperfect conjunctive וַיֹּדֵעַ 'tell' may also be interpreted as denoting the consequence of asking as with No 538. From this syntactic analysis of the Hebrew text it can be clearly shown that the two imperfect conjunctives which occur in this text both indicate consequence.

No 540

$\text{אוֹ שִׁיחַ לְאָרֶץ וְחֶרֶף וַיְסַפְּרוּ לְךָ דְגַי הַיָּם}$

"or the plants of the earth, and they will teach you;
and the fish of the sea will declare to you". (12.8 RSV).

Since the example which it is proposed to deal with here is to be found in the very next verse (12.8), it seems best not to repeat the introductory matters concerning vv7-12 which have been noted above but to take them as understood. This then means that 12.8 continues the ironical quotation which Job makes of his friend's sentiments. The verse is prefaced by the conjunction אָן which immediately connects it to v7. The next word שִׁיחַ 'plant' is however textually doubtful. Clines has noted that many scholars have emended the text in order to find an animate object to parallel cattle, birds, and fish. (34). Among the emendations that have been proposed are: הַאֲרָץ 'the animals of the earth'; שָׂרָץ הַאֲרָץ 'reptiles of the earth'; or דְּוָלִי הַאֲרָץ 'creeping things of the earth'. Davidson, however, has noted

that the Hebrew text is capable of being understood in two ways without resorting to textual emendation. (35). The word דַבֵּר may either be understood as the imperative of the verb 'speak, complain' or as the noun 'shrub'. The former understanding is followed by Clines, Davidson, Tur-Sinai and Gordis. Dhorme emends the text to זִרְחֵלֵי הָאָרֶץ 'creeping things of the earth', while Driver/Gray seem diffident about either proposal. It seems best to follow the majority of scholars here and take דַבֵּר as the imperative of the verb 'speak' since then at least it can be seen to be parallel to the verb לִמַּד of v7. It also seems best to take the imperfect conjunctive וְיָרַח 'teach' as denoting the consequence of speaking to the earth, since if one does this the earth shall also teach you wisdom. No 541 may also be noted at this point: as with v7 the force of the imperative דַבֵּר 'speak' extends to the second hemistich and the consequence of that action to the fish of the sea is indicated by the imperfect conjunctive וְיִסְפְּרֶנּוּ 'relate'. It is then best to understand both these examples of the imperfect conjunctive as expressing the nuance of consequence.

No 551

הֵן יַעֲצֵר בַּמַּיִם וַיִּבְשּׁוּ וַיִּשְׁלַחֵם וַיַּהֲפֹכּוּ אֶרֶץ

"If he withholds the waters, they dry up;
if he sends them out, they overwhelm the land". (12.15 RSV).

It was noted above that many scholars take vv7-12 as an ironic quotation made by Job of his friend's views. It ends at v12 and v13f thus leads a new section in this chapter. Clines noted that these verses constitute a hymn to the power of God in the human world. (36). As such it may be compared with what he has called a 'hymn to the power of God in nature' in the previous speech of Job (9.5-10). In Ch 9 the acts of God are denoted by the article plus participle, a use that has been referred to as the divine use of the participle. Here again in this present hymn the acts of God are again denoted by the participle but without the adjoining article. The purpose of the hymn is to convey Job's wisdom, i. e., his understanding of the true nature of God's activity.

The hymn proper starts by an affirmation of God's wisdom by Job:

עִמּוֹ חֵכְמָה וְגִבּוֹרָה לּוֹ עֲצָה וְתוּבוֹנָה

"With him are wisdom and might;

he has counsel and understanding". (12.13 RSV).

This is followed by two sets of antithetical clauses, both of which are introduced by the Aramaic particle הן 'if'. In 12.15 the force of the first antithesis is expressed by the simple imperfect וְעָצָר 'withhold', and the consequence to this action is denoted by the imperfect conjunctive וְיָבֵשׁוּ 'dry up'. It should however be noted that the ו of this imperfect conjunctive also marks the apodosis of

the conditional sentence which by its very nature also denotes the consequence of the condition expressed by 'הן 'עצר' 'if he withholds'. Since No's 552 & 553 also occur in this verse they can be dealt with here. The second hemistich begins with the imperfect conjunctive 'שילחם' 'sends them out', but the ו here is simply copulative to the verb 'עצר' 'withhold' and denotes the continuance of the condition. The consequence to this condition is then indicated by the imperfect conjunctive 'יהפננו' 'overwhelm'. This particular verse is of great interest since the examples reveal the imperfect conjunctive used in a copulative way as well as denoting the consequence of an action.

No 592

מי יחן החרש חחר'שון וחה' לכם לחנמה

"Oh that you would keep silent,
and it would be your wisdom"! (13.5 RSV).

The example in 13.5 occurs towards the end of the first division of this speech which is a wisdom disputation speech addressed to the friends. Towards the end of this speech Job gives an evaluation of what he considers his friends to be. They consider themselves to be God's spokesmen to Job. He however, considers that they have falsely accused him of wrongdoing. Job, for all his doubts about the divine generosity, believes that God must disapprove of such behaviour and will surely punish them for their partiality towards

himself and their lack of objectivity. Job criticizes his friends because they have failed to help him. This concept is expressed in 13.5 where he states that none of their words should have been spoken. This is indicated in the first hemistich by the optative formula תן מ' 'oh that' which then infuses the imperfect $\text{תחרישון 'keep silent'}$ with the strength of a wish: 'oh that you would keep silent'. The imperfect itself is further strengthened by the addition of the infinitive תחריש before it which then produces the translation: 'oh that you would keep utterly silent'. This is what Job wants his friends to do, for if they would only comply, then their actions would be wisdom and understanding to them. This consequence is denoted by the imperfect conjunctive ותהי 'it will be' which is here used impersonally.

No 608

$\text{תחרישון ממני ואדברה אני ויעבר עלי מה}$

"Let me have silence, and I will speak,
and let come on me what may". (13.13 RSV).

The example in 13.13 occurs towards the end of the first part of the speech where Job is preparing to address God. The subject matter is no longer the friends as it was in vv4-12; it is now the significance of the new address to God upon which he is about to launch himself (13.20-14-22). After the digression that warned the

friends of becoming false witnesses (vv4-12), Job now returns to where he was in v 3: "But I would speak to the Almighty". His request now is that the friends should be silent not as in vv4-12 that they might receive wisdom but that he should now be allowed to address God in the terms of a legal controversy. This is first of all expressed by the imperative **שׁוּב־וְהִחַרְטֵנּוּ** 'be silent' which is here used with **וְהִחַרְטֵנּוּ**; in itself this is a pregnant construction implying 'stand away from me in silence' (cf GKC §119ff). The consequence of this command is indicated by the imperfect conjunctive which here is the form of a cohortative **וְאֶנְשֵׁי יָדַעְתִּי** 'and I will speak' which is a favourite form with Job (7. 11; 9. 35; 10. 1; 16, 4, 6.). If they will only be silent he will now get on with the delicate task of addressing God. Since No 609 also occurs in this verse it seems appropriate to deal with it here also. The second hemistich opens with the imperfect conjunctive **וְיָבִיחַ** 'let it come' which here is a jussive and simply denotes the continuance of the force of the opening imperative and is simply copulative in nature. Dhorme has noted that the verb **יָבִיחַ** is used with **וְ** before the complement of the person to express the advent of misfortune (cf Nah 3. 19). (37).

No 623

מִי הוּא יִרְיֵב עִמָּדִי כִּי עֲתָה אֲחִירֵשׁ וְאָגוּץ

"Who is there that will contend with me?

For then I would be silent and die". (13. 19 RSV).

In vv13-19 of the present chapter Job is preparing to address God in a formal legal disputation speech. As he prepares for this sensitive task he again affirms his confidence in the rightness of his cause. The difficulties of the verse disappear if it is recognised that it has the form of a conditional sentence, the apodosis being introduced by $\text{אם} \text{נִּי}$ 'for then'. Clines and Gordis both want to take the first stich as being a quotation which may have introduced a legal process cf Isa 50.8. (38). The verse can then be rendered: "But if God says, 'Who is this who dares to contend with me?' then I can only die in silence." The legal process as such is then introduced by the imperfect יִגִּד 'contend' which must have the meaning of 'argue successfully' or 'make a case against'. Clines has noted however, that such a meaning would be fairly unique for יִגִּד , since elsewhere it refers to the lawsuit in general, or to certain elements of it, but never to elements having to do with its conclusion. (39). The apodosis is then expressed by the simple imperfect אֶתְחַלֵּט 'be silent' and the consequence to this state of silence is then denoted by the imperfect conjunctive וַיִּפְּטֵר 'expire' which Tur-Sinai considers to be a weakened form of the imperfect consecutive. (40). Reference has already been made in this chapter to this particular verb in No 28 where it was noted that it indicated the concept of consequence either as an imperfect consecutive or as an imperfect conjunctive. This suggests that for the sake of variety the poet was free to draw on a number of constructions which are morphologically different but syntactically identical. The meaning of the verse is that if God refuses to listen to his case then he can only die in silence. The

consequence to God's refusal is denoted here by means of the imperfect conjunctive.

No 634

למה פניך מסתיר ותחשבני לאויב לך

"Why dost thou hide thy face,
and count me as thy enemy"? (13.24 RSV).

The example in 13.24 is found in the second half of the speech in which Job addresses God in a legal disputation speech. However it comes something of a surprise to find that after the great build-up of 13.3, 13-19 there is nothing systematic about this part of the speech. Clines however, has noted that the speech has a twofold thrust. Its first concern is to require God to give an account of the supposed sins for which he is being punished. The second is a paradoxical plea for God to ignore him, a plea which contains an undisguised expression of longing for renewed intimacy with God. (41).

The question here is introduced by למה which serves both stichs, as is often the case with parallelism. The object of the question is not to elicit a reason but to reproach the one addressed in the hope of changing the situation. The veiling of God's face, a sure sign of his displeasure with Job, is indicated by the imperfect מסתיר

'hide'. Blommerde regards the imperfect as an infixed ן form from ךוּ, but from the viewpoint of Hebrew grammar his proposal seems to be more of an attempt to recognise a verbal theme from Ugaritic in the Hebrew text and as such must be rejected as being unsound. (42).

The consequence of God hiding his face is then denoted by the imperfect conjunctive וַתִּשְׁכַּח 'consider'. The verb וַתִּשְׁכַּח stands with ך before the object to which the complement is assimilated. In his treatment of Job, God has considered Job to be his enemy and this in itself is the consequence of the withdrawal of his face from Job. Thus the imperfect conjunctive as used here expresses the consequence of God's anger.

No 638

כִּי תִכְתֹּב עָלַי מְרִירוֹת וְחִוּרֵי־שָׁנַי עֲוֹנוֹת נַעֲוִרַי

"For thou writest bitter things against me,
and makest me inherit the iniquities of my youth". (13.26 RSV).

The example in 13.26 is also in the part of the speech in which Job requires God to give an account of the sins for which he is supposedly being punished. The presence of כִּי at the beginning of the verse immediately suggests that this is a causal clause in which Job gives the reasons for his questioning of God. Here כִּי is used after the interrogative of v.25 as in 7.12. God's harassment of him consists in his writing 'bitter things' against him. Clines has noted that

the image here is of a judge prescribing a sentence and this maintains the legal depiction. (43). The verb נָחַן can mean 'prescribe' and is found in parallelism to דָּקַדַּק 'decree' in Isa 10.1 where it has the same meaning. But the meaning of the first hemistich is uncertain as can be seen in the varied explanations of the commentators. While the example with which we are concerned is in the second hemistich it is necessary to elucidate the meaning of the first, since that has a bearing on the understanding of the imperfect conjunctive. In pursuit of his task of finding an Aramaic original behind the text of Job, Tur-Sinai makes an interesting proposal at this point. He follows the Talmud which uses the formula לְנַחֵן in the written assignment of property. He understands the word מְרַחֵן to be an incorrect translation for the Aramaic מְרַחֵן 'inheritance'. He then translates: "For thou assignest to me an inheritance". (44). His suggestion is certainly attractive for it has the benefit of creating a good parallelism in this verse as well as making good sense. His suggestion is rejected by Gordis who prefers to derive מְרַחֵן from the Arabic 'mrr' 'pass by' and he translates "past actions". (45). These proposals are however speculative in character and are to be rejected since there is no lexicographical evidence for מְרַחֵן to be translated either as 'inheritance' or as 'past actions'. It is surely better to understand the first hemistich with Andersen who suggests that it records the decree allocating bitter things to Job. (46). Having arrived at an understanding of the first hemistich we are in a better position to interpret the meaning of the

imperfect conjunctive used in the second hemistich. In 13.26 וַתִּשְׁפֹּן is used to denote the consequences of the bitter things which God has planned for him. It is that he is caused to inherit the sins of his youth. Clines takes the view that Job inherits the consequences of the sins of his youth. (47). The consequence of those sins, if such existed, is the wrath of God, an inheritance which produces no blessing. Thus the imperfect conjunctive here expresses the consequence of God planning bitter things for Job.

No 639

וַתִּשְׁפֹּן בְּסֹד רַגְלֵי וַתִּשְׁמֹר כָּל אֲדָמוֹתַי עַל שְׂרָשֵׁי רַגְלֵי תַחֲחֻקָה

"Thou puttest my feet in the stocks,
and watchest all of my paths;
thou settest a bound to the soles of my feet". (13.27 RSV)

This example in 13.27 is to be found in the exact same location as that described for the above example. In this part of the speech he requires that God should supply an account of his sins for which he is being punished. Clines notes that what is described here is not a legally determined punishment, but the kind of aggressive behaviour engaged in by a powerful person against his adversary at law. Such a person could arrest or imprison his opponent, without trial, but in the expectation of a formal trial to resolve the matter at issue. (48). These acts of close arrest carry legal implications: God

should follow up his arrest with the formulation of the charges, but if that does not happen he is behaving like a gangster (צָרַע). The verse opens with the use of the jussive with the conjunction וְהָיָה, a fact noted by Dhorme. (49). Now the use that Dhorme draws attention to is a distinctively poetic usage of the jussive. The jussive is normally used to express a more or less definite desire that something should or should not happen. (50). Yet the jussive as used in 13.27 does not denote the expression of a desire but a fact. Gesenius had already drawn attention to this anomaly in his grammar:

"Moreover, in not a few cases, the jussive is used, without any collateral sense, for the ordinary imperfect form, and this occurs not only in forms, which may arise from a misunderstanding of the defective writing, as Dt 28.31,36; 32.8; 1 Kg 8.1; Isa 12.1; Mi 3.4, 5.8; Ps 11.6, 18.12, 21.2, 25.9, 47.4, 90.3, 91.4, 107.29; Pr 15.25; Jb 13.27, 15.33, 18.9, 20.23, 37.22, 33.11, 36.14, 38.24; Ec 12.6; Dn 8.12;---but also in shortened forms, such as יִהְיֶה Gn 49.17; Dt 28.8; 1 Sm 10.5; 2 Sm 5.24; Ho 6.1, 11.4; Am 5.14; Mi 1.2; Zp 2.13; Zc 9.5; Ps 72.16f, 104.31; Jb 18.12, 20.23,26,28, 27.8, 33.21, 34.37; Ru 3.4. This use of the jussive can hardly be due merely to poetic licence, but is rather to be explained on rhythmical grounds". (51).

Thus according to Gesenius the explanation of this poetic use is to be found in rhythm. S. R. Driver also makes the following observations:

"The passages here collected are in many ways dissimilar; and the reader should examine each separately by itself. In some, for instance, there is no reason why the verbs should not be understood strictly as jussives: ----- The difficulty lies rather with those which, as it seems, involve merely the statement of a fact, and in which, therefore, the verb is jussive in form only, and not in meaning". (52).

S. R. Driver has two solutions to explain this difficulty, the first is

that when the shorter form of the imperfect occurs at the beginning of a clause it then occupies the position which would normally be pointed as a waw consecutive and so the shorter form was retained as a reminiscence of the normal waw consecutive. His second explanation is to suggest that when the shorter form occurs preceded by the ordinary conjunction ׀, the punctuation is in all probability wrong and it should be repointed as a waw consecutive. (53). It seems to me that neither of these explanations satisfactorily solves this problem. The difficulty with the first solution is that it seeks to solve the problem in poetic syntax by resorting to an explanation from prose syntax. For the problem of the Massoretic pointing see remarks at the beginning of chapter three.

Enough has now been said to show the complexity of this problem which belongs rather to the realm of the evolution of the Hebrew verbal system and thus falls outside the scope of the present work. It now seems appropriate to return to its use in the passage under discussion. It seems that the best solution to the above stated problem is to understand that the jussive conjunctive here reports what is the consequence of God determining bitter things for Job (v.26); because God has planned bitter things for Job the consequence is that he puts his feet in the stocks. Its use here may be likened to the preterite which occurs in Hebrew poetry with certain particles such as ׀ל 'then'. According to R.J. Williams the jussive is identical in form to the preterite so that it may be that what we are dealing with in such examples is a preterite which has been wrongly

pointed as a jussive. (54). Before leaving the example of the jussive in 13.27, it is to be noted that when these words of Job are quoted by Elihu in 33.11 both verbs are rendered as simple imperfects and that this may be due to Aramaic influence. Since No 640 also occurs in this verse it seems convenient to deal with it here also. Even from a casual reading of the text it is clear that וַחֲשׂוֹר 'watches' reports the further consequence of God putting Job's feet in the stocks he also watches over all his paths. Such language is of course metaphorical but it intensifies the way that God is harassing him.

No 656

שְׁעָה מִצִּלּוֹ וַיִּחְדַּל עַד יִרְצֶה נִשְׁכַּיִר יוֹמֹ

"Look away from him, and desist,
that he may enjoy, like a hireling, his day". (14.6 RSV).

In his legal disputation addressed to God himself, Job considers mankind in general, although he is also thinking of his own experience, and the point that he is making to God is that mankind in its insignificance does not merit the kind of divine surveillance that he himself is being subjected to. In the present verse Job makes his appeal to God based upon what he has previously said about the brevity of human existence. Because life is so short God is to look away from Job and allow him to enjoy such parts of his life as are left to

him. His appeal is first of all expressed by the imperative שעה 'look away' which is then followed by the imperfect conjunctive ויחל 'desist'. The difficulty is that the text as read does not make good sense. This has led many modern scholars to follow one Hebrew manuscript which reads ויחל and is of course the imperative of the verb. Such a proposal has as its authority the text of 7.16b and Jer 40.4. Some want to retain the MT and translate: "that he may be at ease" but such a meaning cannot be paralleled. The legitimate rendering of the MT would be: "that he may cease", but this does not suit the context. An interpretation which does retain the MT has been proposed by P.J. Calderone. He posits a homonym ויחל 2 'be fat prosperous'. This however, would require the postulation of a word ויחל 'food' which is hardly credible in the context. (55). Blommerde takes up this proposal but then takes ויחל to mean 'lifetime', a somewhat speculative suggestion. (56). Because of these inherent difficulties it seems better to follow the majority of scholars who emend the text here and read ויחל 'desist'. Since such is the case there is quite clearly no imperfect conjunctive to treat.

No 680

מִי יִחַן בְּשֵׂאוֹל תַּצְפִּנֵנִי תַסְתִּירֵנִי עַד שׁוֹב אֶפְרַיִם חֲשִׁית לִי חֶק וְתִזְכְּרֵנִי

"Oh that thou wouldest hide me in Sheol,
 that thou wouldest conceal me until thy wrath be past,
 that thou wouldest appoint me a set time, and remember me".
 (14.13 RSV).

In 14.1-6 Job treated the theme of the brevity of human life and the hopelessness of mankind in general. In this section, which consists of vv13-17, he wishes that God would make Sheol, not a land of no remembrance to which in his anger he sends men for ever, but an asylum while his wrath is abroad. For if such were true then he would have the privilege of fellowship with God renewed. In 14.13 Job gives vent to such feelings of hopelessness. He begins to express his feelings by הן 'oh that you would' which Dhorme has called the interrogative of desire. (57). This is then followed in turn by a chain of three imperfects: חצפנני--חסס'רני--תשיח. The consequence to this wish being granted is then denoted by the imperfect conjunctive וזכרני 'remember me'. The imperfect conjunctive as used in 14.13 indicates the nuance of consequence.

No 704

יָנֻדוּ בָנָיו וְלֹא יָדַע וַיִּצְעֲרוּ וְלֹא יָבִין לָמוֹ

"His sons come to honour, and he does not know it;
they are brought low, and he perceives it not". (14.21 RSV).

In this discourse Job has been expounding on the theme of the insignificance of man and in these verses returns to what he had said earlier in the chapter, namely the world of reality in which there is no hope for man. In this verse Job states what is the psychological consequence of being dismissed from this world to Sheol. Here Job

feels for all of mankind not merely for himself. The inevitable consequence is that for humans in general death means a withholding of knowledge of how it befalls those who were near and dear to them. The consequence is being spelled out in this verse. Initially this is expressed by use of the imperfect **וְנִבְרַח** 'honour' with the particle **אִם** 'if' being understood. The consequence to the action is then indicated by the construction **וְלֹא יָדַע** 'he does not know it'. The antithesis is then indicated by the imperfect conjunctive **וַיִּצְעַר** 'brought low'. The verb **נִבְרַח** is in fact parallel to the verb **צָעַר** so that the conjunction here is merely copulative and does not denote any nuance of consequence as in the other examples. Dhorme has rightly noted the antithesis between these two verbs which is clearly seen in the MT of Jer 30, 19b:

וְהִנְבְּרַחְתֶּם וְלֹא יִצְעַרוּ

"I will bring them honour and they shall not be brought low". (58).

No 711

הֲחָכִים יִצְעָרוּ דַעַת רִוּחַ וַיִּמְלֵא קִדְיָם בַּטּוֹר

"Should a wise man answer with windy knowledge,
and fill himself with the east wind"? (15.2 RSV).

Eliphaz's speech may conveniently be divided into two parts: (a)

vv1-16 contain the address to Job in which he states that Job has spoken unwisely, self importantly, and aggressively, and in so doing has adopted a stance that ill becomes his piety. Because of this he is in need of correction. (b) vv17-35 describe the wicked man and his fate, which is for Job's instruction--the point being that Job is not such a man and therefore has good reason for confidence. The example in 15.2 comes clearly from the first division of the speech where Eliphaz asserts that Job has spoken unwisely. Eliphaz begins his assertion by the interrogative particle הַ which, as Clines has noted, is his usual practice. The question that he begins with is usually, as here, the introduction to a disputation speech. (59). The action of the wise man in speech is denoted first of all by the imperfect הַעֲנֵה 'answer'. Job is said to answer with windy knowledge which here symbolizes that which is violent. Job is then said to have filled himself with the east wind. This action is indicated by the imperfect conjunctive אֶמְלֵא 'fill'. Rather than denote the consequence of הַעֲנֵה, it seems better to take אֶמְלֵא as being parallel to the former verb and thus the וְ is copulative. Supportive of this interpretation are the nominal elements which are also parallel. Job is said in the first hemistich to have spoken with 'windy knowledge' which is considered by the commentators to indicate that he has spoken under the dictates of violent passion. This is paralleled in the second hemistich by the concept of the east wind which is also considered to be hot and violent. Thus this verse asserts that Job has spoken from his feelings.

No 716

אָף אַתָּה תִּפְרַר יִרְאַה וְחִגְרַע שִׁיחָה לִפְנֵי אֱל

"But you are doing away with the fear of God,
and hindering meditation before God". (15.4 RSV).

This example is also to be found in the first section of Eliphaz's speech where Job is accused of arguing aggressively. It seems to me that here he states the consequences of Job speaking in such a way: by so doing he has destroyed the fear of God. This is indicated in the first hemistich in an emphatic way, by the use of אָף with the personal pronoun אַתָּה with the imperfect תִּפְרַר. Thus the whole of this first hemistich is an emphatic construction which underlines what Job has done by his speech. Most commentators take יִרְאַה as an abbreviation for the fear of God (see RSV). The consequence of this action is then denoted by the imperfect conjunctive וְחִגְרַע 'diminish' which expresses the concept that the force of his speech has hindered the pious from their meditation before God. The imperfect conjunctive here denotes the dreadful consequence of what Job has done: he has hindered meditation before God.

No 718

כִּי יֵאלֶף עֹנֵךְ פִּיךָ וְחִבַּחַר לְשׁוֹן עֲרוֹמִים

"For your iniquity teaches your mouth,
and you choose the tongue of the crafty". (15.5 RSV).

The example here is also taken from the first section of Eliphaz's speech and provides a more profound cause of Job speaking in the way he has. Gordis takes the opening 'נ as asseverative 'indeed' and this seems to be better than the RSV's translation 'for'. (60). The source of Job's speech is indicated by the noun עוֹנֶיךָ 'your iniquity' which is best taken as the subject of the verb יִלְמַד 'teach'. The verb יִלְמַד here has the meaning of 'teach, instruct' and not of 'reveal' which it has elsewhere. Thus the first hemistich indicates that the inspiration of his speech is his very own sins. The result of this is that he adopts a manner of speech that does not come naturally to him and this is denoted by the imperfect conjunctive. So Clines understands the use of the imperfect conjunctive here. (61).

No 724

הַבִּטוּר אֵלֶיךָ חֲכָמָה וְחִגְרוּעַ אֵלֶיךָ חֲכָמָה

"Have you listened in the council of God?
and do you limit wisdom to yourself"? (15.8 RSV).

Here Eliphaz refers to the assault by Job on the friend's wisdom. Job has claimed superior wisdom, but Eliphaz rejects any implication

that Job alone is wise. He does so by the question in the first hemistich. The force of the interrogative particle ה extends to the second hemistich following the practice in Hebrew poetry. The force of the question is expressed by the verb חשמע 'listen' which as Dhorme has noted assumes the meaning of 'listen' when it is used with ך before the complement. (62). The word טוד properly means 'confidence' which when used with יהוה or אלוה has the derived meaning of 'secret counsel of Yahweh'. The point of the question is to question Job's possession of superior wisdom. This is reinforced by the imperfect conjunctive ותורע 'limit' of the second hemistich which also means to 'claim for oneself', or in other words, to 'have the monopoly of'. Driver/Gray note that the imperfections ותורע---חשמע allude either to (1) the particular divine council in which the plan of creation was revealed or to (2) a recurrent present usage. In either case they note that the imperfect conjunctive has a consecutive meaning because it is not merely co-ordinate but denotes a consequence. (63). The consequence being that because Job has listened to the secret counsel of God then he has a monopoly on wisdom which others do not have.

No 742

אחור שמע לי וזה חזיתי ואספרה

"I will show you, hear me;

and what I have seen I will declare" (15.17 RSV).

The example here is located in the second part of Eliphaz's speech in which he proffers a description of the wicked man and his fate. 15.17 may be considered to be the introductory statement to that part of his speech. The introduction as such may be considered to be similar to the introduction (8.8-10) to Bildad's topos on the same theme (8.11-22). Once again Eliphaz appeals to his own experience, that which he has seen and learned. The introduction proper is begun by the Aramaic verb חוה 'show' which as Dhorme has noted is characteristic of the book of Job (32.6, 10, 17; 36.2.) and only occurs outside of this book in Daniel and in Ps 19.3. (64). The verb שמע is used here with ל and so produces the meaning of 'listen'. The demonstrative הוה is used with the meaning of the relative 'what' and this in itself may be an Aramaism as Gordis has noted. (65). Although there is clearly no prophetic vision in mind he uses the verb חוית 'seen' which is often used of prophetic visions. The imperfect conjunctive ואספרה 'declare' which is cohortative in form is used in the sense of denoting the consequence of his spiritual insight. What he has seen will result in him declaring the truth of his vision. The ך of this construction is regarded as pleonastic by Dhorme (66), but is better regarded as the *waw-apodoseos* after a relative clause as noted by Gesenius. (67).

No 771

לא יסור מני חשך ינקחו תיבש שלהבת ויסור ברוח פיו

"He will not escape from darkness;
the flame will dry up his shoots,
and his blossom will be swept away by the wind". (15.30 RSV).

The occurrence of the imperfect conjunctive גָּזַל 'depart' in 15.30 has been the subject of much scholarly ink because the verse is difficult. Since this work is not primarily concerned with textual matters but with syntactical questions, it seems best to follow Clines in his interpretation of the MT. Most of the verse seeks to introduce the image of a short-lived plant which illustrates the brevity of the wrongdoer's life. This represents a slight change in the theme since what Eliphaz has been asserting up to now has been the misery of the wrongdoer's life. It is necessary to note however, that the image proper does not begin until the second colon. This is because the first colon $\text{לֹא יִסָּוֶה וְיָחַד$ simply repeats words from v 22a and as such has nothing to do with the image of the plant. This very fact has resulted in some scholars deleting this colon altogether, a not improbable conclusion to draw, though it could be argued that the phrase is simply a repetition of the darkness theme. With the second colon the image proper begins. The plant is represented by the word יָחַד 'his shoots' which is said to be scorched or dried up by the the hot wind or flame. The action of the flame is indicated by the imperfect $\text{יָבֵשׁ$ 'dried up'. The third colon in itself represents something of a difficulty since it is textually doubtful. The MT as it stands produces the rendering "and he shall turn away by the breath of his mouth". By the pronoun 'his' there is

presumably a reference to God although he has not been referred to since v26. Since וְיִסּוּר is somewhat weak it is usual to emend the text to read some form of the verb וְעָנָה 'drive away', and it is this verb that is represented by most of the modern translations. In common with most modern scholars וְיִנְחַן is best emended to וְיִנְחַן 'his blossom'. The reconstructed text thus reads: "and his blossom will be swept away by the wind". (68).

Having paid due attention to textual matters, it is now time to evaluate the imperfect conjunctive וְיִסּוּר. Accordingly, it seems best to take the imperfect conjunctive as simply being parallel to וְיִנְחַן and so the וְ is simply copulative.

No 777

יְחַמֵּס כְּגִפְנֵי בִטְרוֹ וְיִשְׁלַךְ כְּזֵיתִים נֶצְחָרִים

"He will shake off his unripe grape,
like the vine,
and cast off his blossoms, like the olive tree". (15.33 RSV).

With this example the image of the plant is developed differently: the wicked man is like a plant that behaves unnaturally in not bringing its fruit to complete ripening. It would only be a diseased or unnatural vine that dropped its grapes while they were unripe (וְיִסּוּר sour grapes as in Jer 31.29; Ezk 18.2.). The action of the vine in

casting off its unripe grapes is indicated by the imperfect חָחַטְּ
 'shake off' which is normally used for violent activity but with
 regard to plant life means to 'cast off' its fruits. A parallel
 image is introduced in the second colon and its action is expressed by
 the imperfect conjunctive וַיִּשְׁלַךְ which is jussive in form and is best
 taken as being copulative to חָחַטְּ of the first colon. Dhorme has
 again noted the poetic use of the jussive here as previously. (69).
 In No 639 detailed comment was made on the problem of the jussive as
 used in poetry. While it is still an open question it may have been
 used here as an alternative form to the imperfect for the sake of
 variety since it clearly has no different syntactic value to that of
 an ordinary imperfect conjunctive.

No 789

גַּם אֲנִי כַכֶּם אֲדַבֵּר לֹא יִשְׁפֹּט נַפְשֵׁיכֶם חַחַח נַפְשִׁי
 אַחֲבִירָה עֲלֵיכֶם בְּמַלְיָם וְאֲנִיעָה עֲלֵיכֶם בְּמִוֹרָאִשִׁי

"I also could speak as you do,
 if you were in my place;
 I could join words together against you,
 And shake my head at you". (16.4 RSV).

The commentators all note how disjointed Job's reply to Eliphaz is.
 It seems best to follow Clines who sees three major divisions in this

speech : (a) vv2-6 Job addresses the friends with criticisms of their words. (b) vv7-17 he begins to silloquize, first lamenting the attacks of God. (c) vv18-22 he envisages the possibilities for vindication. (70). Following on from this analysis of the content of chapter 16 it can be seen that 16.4 is part of the first division where he addresses the friends and criticizes their words. The verse thus begins with an emphatic construction גַּם אֲנִי 'I also, even I' as other speeches of Job do i. e, 7.11; 13.2. This emphatic construction is then reinforced by the use of the cohortative אֲדַבֵּר 'I could speak' . Job then underlines the possibility that he could also use such speech as theirs. Dhorme has noted that the conjunctive וְ 'if' which is used to indicate the optative, introduces a condition that is incapable of fulfilment. (71). It should also be noted that the presence of וְ before the subordinate clause allows us to give to the cohortatives $\text{אֲדַבֵּר אֲחַבְרֵה אֲנִיעֶה}$ a conditional sense. The condition is thus expressed by the particle וְ as in Num 22.29. The next cohortative אֲחַבְרֵה has attracted attention from etymological grounds. Again the best course is to follow Clines and derive the form from חָבַר 2 'make a sound' cognate with Ugaritic *hbr*. The traditional rendering is given in the RSV "I could join words" which is derived from the normal meaning of 'bind'. This condition is then paralleled by the use of the imperfect conjunctive וְאֲנִיעֶה 'shake' which must surely be regarded as being simply copulative to אֲחַבְרֵה . Thus the imperfect conjunctive as used here is best explained by its parallelism.

No 794

אם אדברה לא יחשך נאבי ואחדלה מה מני יהלך

"If I speak, my pain is not assuaged,
And if I forbear, how much of it leaves me"? (16.6 RSV).

The example here is also taken from the first part of Job's reply where he addresses the friends and criticizes them for their words. Job now turns from imagining a reversal of roles with his friends, that he has been contemplating, to the tragic realities of his present position, and finds that neither speech nor silence brings him any relief. This situation is expressed in the first instance by the conditional clause אם אדברה 'if I speak'. The protasis then follows and is indicated by the verb יחשך 'restrain' and denotes the sad fact that if Job speaks himself he still finds no comfort. The force of the initial אם 'if' is carried over into the second hemistich and so the imperfect conjunctive ואחדלה 'cease' must simply be regarded as being copulative to אדברה.

No 828

ויזנח לגבר עם אלוה ובן אדם לרעהו

"that he would maintain the right of a man with God,
like that of a man with his neighbour". (16.21 RSV).

The example in 16.21 is to be found in the third part of Job's speech where he envisages the possibilities of vindication. In considering such possibilities Job appeals for blood vengeance to be wreaked upon God by a heavenly vindicator. He expresses his faith in the heavenly vindicator in v19, but v20 seems to turn from that thought comforting as it must have been to the present reality that his friends mock him and this in turn causes him to pour out his tears before God. Now all of this has a purpose and this is denoted by the imperfect conjunctive וַיִּנַּח 'maintain the right'. Clines has correctly noted that the ו here is final and introduces a purpose clause as is often the case in Hebrew prose. (72). The 'he' which the RSV gives in translation must then refer not to God of v20, but to the heavenly vindicator of v19. Clines however, by a different interpretation of the MT makes the heavenly vindicator the theme of v20 as well and so translates: "It is my cry that is my spokesman; sleeplessly I wait for God's reply". (73). This makes better sense and makes the translation flow towards the purpose clause of v21 which is expressed by the use of the imperfect conjunctive.

No 847

וַיִּאָחַז צַדִּיק דְּרָגוֹ וְטָהַר יָדָיו יֵסֵף אִמָּץ

"Yet the righteous holds to his way,
and he that has clean hands grows stronger and stronger".
(17.9 RSV).

In chapter 16, in particular from vv7-17 Job expressed a lament about God's attacks on him. In this chapter Job continues to lament but this time in words addressed to his friends although God is addressed in vv3-4. The friends are thus addressed in vv1-10 and in vv11-16 he utters a lament about his death without vindication. 17.9 therefore comes from the first section which is addressed to the friends. In vv8-9 he offers a statement about the effect that his downfall has had upon righteous men. In v8 the upright are said to be וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ 'appalled' at this so much so that the innocent are further said to be וַיִּתְעַרְבוּ 'vexed' with the godless. Yet despite the prosperity of the wicked in this world the righteous hold true to the faith. This is denoted by the imperfect conjunctive וַיִּחַזְקוּ 'hold'. Here the imperfect conjunctive is surely used to indicate that there is a connection between vv8 & 9 and so must be considered to be merely copulative. Some scholars have considered that there is a comparison intended between the godless of v8 and the righteous of v9 and such a comparison is indicated in the translation of the RSV. This is, however, an unlikely interpretation because Job is unlikely to speak of himself as 'gaining strength' in a speech in which he bewails the loss of his vitality and strength. (74). The ו is best taken as has already been indicated to be copulative and in itself this produces true harmony between the verses in question.

No 870

סוף נפשו באפו הלמענך תעזב ארץ ויעתק צור ממקמו

"You who tear yourself in your anger,
shall the earth be forsaken for you,
or the rock be removed out of its place". (18.4 RSV).

The example here is to be found in the second speech of Bildad the Shuhite which may be analysed as follows: (a) vv2-4 an exordium addressed directly to Job. (b) vv5-21 a wisdom type instruction on the fate of the wicked. In this speech Bildad undoubtedly casts Job as one of the wicked who will inevitably suffer the fate here portrayed. Clines has noted however, that textual and linguistic problems in vv2-4 present a formidable obstacle to a satisfactory interpretation. The problems he refers to are the use of the plural 'you' form in vv2-3 and addressing Job in the singular only in v3. As is the custom in all the speeches we should have expected Job to be addressed in the singular but instead the plural is used. (75). Gordis however, would suggest that there is some evidence both in Hebrew (Cant 5.10) and in Arabic that the plural was used at times in direct address even to one person. (76). In this verse Bildad quotes Job's own words (16.9), and applies them to him. He affirms that Job by attacking the moral order is demanding the overthrow of the natural order. It is not God's anger but Job's own which is destroying him. The verse begins with the vocative וְאַתָּה בְּאַפְּךָ תִּשָּׂא 'you who tear yourself in your anger' which Driver/Gray has noted to be similar to the phrase וְהַטְּלֵם זִמְרִי הֲלוֹא אֲדָרְגִי 'is it peace, thou Zimri, thy master's murderer'? (77). The second hemistich contains the first of two proverbial questions the action of which is indicated

by the niphal חָעַז 'deserted'. The second proverbial question is located in the third hemistich and is begun by the imperfect conjunctive וְנִסְרַח 'removed'. This proverbial question is also taken from Job's very own words (14.18). The use of the ו prior to the verb is best taken as being simply copulative and has been used in this way to tie together the two proverbial questions. The point of these questions is to suggest that if the retributive order of the moral universe is abandoned, as Job demands it should be for his sake, the cosmic order of stability goes with it.

No 875

וְצַרְוֹ צַעֲדָיו אֶרְוֹ וְחִשְׁלֵי כִנְהוֹ עֲצָמוֹ

"His strong steps are shortened,
and his own schemes throw him down". (18.7 RSV).

This example is again to be found in the second part of the speech of Bildad where he gives a wisdom type instruction on the fate of the wicked. In this verse he uses the metaphor of the shortening of the step. This is described by the intransitive form of the root צַרַח which indicates that his vigorous steps have become cramped. Andersen has suggested that the background to this image may well be the failing powers of old age so that his once athletic pace has become a shuffle. (78). The image thus presented is one of decay and of laying low. The second hemistich is begun by the imperfect

conjunctive וְחָשַׁל יְהוָה 'throw him down' which if the reading of the MT is retained can only be regarded as copulative, simply preserving the parallelism between the stichs. Dhorme here notes that G, which has σφαλαι δε represents the reading וְחָשַׁל יְהוָה 'cast him down'. (79).

If such a reading were to be accepted it means that the image of the first hemistich is most certainly present in the second and if such is the case then the imperfect conjunctive may denote the consequence of having shortened steps.

No 888

יָנַק מֵאֵהָלוֹ מִבֵּטְחוֹ וְחִצְצֵדָהּוּ לְמֶלֶךְ בְּלֵהוֹת

"He is torn from the tent in which he trusted,
and is brought to the king of terrors". (18.14 RSV).

The location of the example in 18.14 is identical to that of the previous example considered above. The image of death and decay present in the previous verse is now brought to a climax with the picture of the man being prised from his home and frogmarched before the underworld king. This is indicated in the first hemistich by use of the imperfect יָנַק 'torn'. The image thus presented is quite a vivid one, for the picture is that of the wicked man who enjoyed the security of his home which is represented by the phrase מֵאֵהָלוֹ מִבֵּטְחוֹ 'tent of his security' and then is wrenched from it by the emissaries

of death. The result of this action is then denoted by the imperfect conjunctive **וַיִּצְעֲדוּ** 'lead him away'. The emissaries having wrenched the man from his home now bring him to the king of terrors who may be regarded as the master of the underworld. The imperfect conjunctive **וַיִּצְעֲדוּ** however, does present a difficulty as it has no visible subject. Gordis notes that the impersonal may be expressed in Biblical Hebrew, not only by the masc. sing. and by the masc. plural, but also by the fem. sing. (80). It seems best to accept this explanation for the present.

No 902

עַד אַנְה תִּוְגִ'וֹן נִפְשִׁי וְתִדְנָאוּנִי בְמַלִּים

"How long will you torment me,
and break me in pieces with words"? (19.2 RSV).

The content of Job's reply to Bildad in ch19 may be analysed as follows: vv2-6 address to the friends in which Job protests against their persecution of him, vv7-12 and vv13-20 the reason of Job's downfall is developed as being brought about by God's direct hand, vv21-22 second address to the friends calling on them to stop persecuting him, vv23-27 the reason that they should do so is that Job is innocent and one day will be declared so, vv28-29 third address to the friends giving a note of confidence as well as a final warning of judgement to come that will give them what they deserve.

The protestation against their persecution of him is therefore begun with the initial אנה עך 'how long' which is the way that Bildad began his two speeches (8.2; 18.2). It may be that the poet wants us to recognise how tempers have become frayed on both sides and how patience is in short supply. (81). The action of the first hemistich is indicated by the imperfect תוּגִי'ן 'torment' which is derived from תָּגַ' 'afflict' and outside the book of Job is found mainly in the book of Lamentations (where it is a favourite term). Dhorme noted that we have in this verb the only case in which in the hiphil אִתְּ' preserves the final ' of the original form. (GKC §75gg). (82). Clines has noted that the imperfects of this verse may be taken in a modal way which results in interpreting the verbs not as Job's actual experience but what he perceives that the friends are trying to do to him. (83). The action of the second hemistich is then denoted by the imperfect conjunctive וְתִגְדָּעוּנִי 'crush' which is best taken as being copulative to תוּגִי'ן.

No 909

אם אמנם עלי תגדילו ותוכיחו עלי חרפתי

"If indeed you magnify yourselves against me,
and make my humiliation an argument against me" (19.5 RSV).

The example here in 19.5 is taken from the first section of Job's

reply to Bildad where he addresses the friends and protests against their persecution of him. In this verse he protests against their treatment of him in that they have set themselves up as his moral and spiritual superiors. The first hemistich is begun by the word אָמֵן 'indeed' which had already occurred at the beginning of v 4. This is the emphatic language that is being used here as if Job were underlining their arrogant attitude. The attitude in itself is indicated by the imperfect תִּגְדִּילוּ 'magnify' which is used with עַל before the complement of the person. The meaning of גָּדַל is that of assuming a lofty attitude. The consequence of the friends having such an attitude is then denoted by the imperfect conjunctive וַחֲוִינִיחֻן 'reproach'. The consequence is that because the friends are so arrogant they use Job's suffering as prima facie case against him to prove that he has sinned.

No 954

מִי יִחַן אֶפֶן וַיִּכְתְּבוּן מִלִּי מִי יִחַן בְּסֵפֶר וַיִּחְקֹר

"Oh that my words were written!

Oh that they were inscribed in a book"! (19.23 RSV).

The example in 19.23 is part of the second address by Job to the friends in which he appeals to them to stop persecuting him and gives as the reason that he is innocent and will one day be declared so. In this verse he gives vent to the wish that his assertion of

innocence could be inscribed in some permanent medium that will last beyond his death; for he has given up hope of vindication before his death and asks that his case be given a permanent record. Nobody listens to his word to-day but if they are given a permanent form then future generations will listen to them and Job will be declared guiltless. His wish is first of all expressed by the optative formula ׁןׁ ׁן lit. 'who will grant that--'. Clines has noted that this formula introduces all the wishes which have a forlorn hope of being fulfilled. (84). The phrase is used by Job in the following passages: 6.8-9; 13.5; 14.13; 23.3; 29.2; and 31.35. The phrase ׁןׁ ׁן is then followed by the particle $\text{ׁןׁ$ 'then' which in turn is followed by the imperfect conjunctive ׁןׁןׁןׁןׁ 'write'. Dhorme has noted that the ׁןׁ merely denotes that the following imperfect is dependant on the optative formula. (85). Job does not mean that his words should be written in a scroll as may be suggested by the word ׁןׁןׁ 'book', but that they should be given a permanent form by being inscribed on a stela. Thus the general meaning of the word ׁןׁןׁ 'write' is specified by the second imperfect conjunctive ׁןׁןׁןׁןׁ 'engrave'. Since No 956 also occurs in this verse it is convenient to deal with it here. The second hemistich is also begun by the optative formula ׁןׁ ׁן 'who will grant' which further means that the following imperfect conjunctive has the same nuance as the preceding one, i. e., the ׁןׁ merely denotes that the following imperfect is dependant on the optative formula.

No 984

נחלום י' עוף ולא ימצאוהו וידד כחזיון לילה

"He will fly away like a dream, and not be found;
he will be chased away like a vision of the night". (20.8 RSV).

Zophar's second speech divides conveniently into sections: after the conventional introduction (vv2-3), his speech on the fate of the wicked can be divided into three sections: (a) The utter annihilation of the wicked (vv4-11), (b) the futility of wrongdoing (vv12-23), and (c) the inescapable end of the wicked (vv24-29). From this analysis it can be seen that the example which is being treated comes from the first section of the speech, namely the utter annihilation of the wicked. In vv7-9 the dominant theme is that of the absence or disappearance of the wicked. This theme is expressed in the first hemistich by the imperfect $\eta\epsilon\omega'$ 'fly away' which here conveys the thought of death as it does in Ps 90.10. (86). As the dream is transitory so is the fate of the wicked man, it will soon be accomplished. The parallelism of this thought is introduced in the second hemistich by the imperfect conjunctive $\eta\epsilon\omega' \gamma$ 'chase away' which is derived from $\eta\epsilon\omega'$. Even a cursory reading of the text shows that the γ is merely copulative and continues the verbal parallelism of $\eta\epsilon\omega'$.

No 996

יחמל עליה ולא יעזבנה וימנענה בחורך חכו

"though he is loath to let it go,
and he holds it in his mouth", (20.13 RSV).

The example in 20.13 is located in the second section of Zophar's speech in which he discourses on the theme of the futility of wrongdoing. This second strophe (vv12-23) defines itself by the sustained metaphor of eating: we have the mouth (v12), the tongue (v12), the palate (v13), the stomach (v14), the innards (v14), the belly (vv15,20,23); there is savouring (v12), swallowing (v15), vomiting and disgorging (v15), sucking (v16), disgorging (v18), not swallowing (v18), eating (v21); there is sweetness (v12), oil, honey and cream (v17), food (v23); above all, there is fullness of abundance (v22) and filling to the full (v23). As might be expected the metaphor is employed in a variety of ways. In this strophe the primary theme is that the sinner gains no lasting profit from his wrongdoing. (87). In vv12-14 the wrongdoer's wickedness is depicted as sweet food that becomes bitter in the stomach. The tasty morsel is sweet to the mouth, the tongue, and the palate and so presents the picture of sin as enticing. In this long sentence vv12-13 are two conditional clauses while v14 is the principal clause.

The enticing nature of sin is expressed in the first hemistich by the phrase **על'ה יחמל** 'he spares it' which means that he keeps it and this in turn is reinforced by the second phrase of this hemistich **עזבנה ולא** 'and will not abandon it'. The whole phrase must be interpreted bearing in mind the metaphor of sin as the tasty morsel, and thus shows the action of the wicked man who retains evil in his mouth and refuses to swallow it so as to savour the pleasure of it as long as possible. The imperfect conjunctive **ויחנענה** 'holds it' then denotes the consequence of evil being kept in his mouth, it is that it is retained in the midst of his palate. **חך** is mentioned in 6.30 with the tongue as an organ of taste. As the man who retains the tasty morsel in his mouth also brings it to the palate that he might taste of its delicacies; so is the man who in a like manner eschews evil, his sin is retained by him because he is enticed by its taste.

No 1020

יהי למלא בטנו ישלח בו חרון אפר וימטר עלימו בלחומר

"to fill his belly to the full

God will send his fierce anger into him,

and rain it upon him as his food". (20.23 RSV).

The example here in 20.23 is also to be found in the second address of Zophar's speech which has as its theme the futility of wrongdoing. The theme is expressed by use of the sustained metaphor of eating

which is used to show that there is no lasting satisfaction in wrongdoing. The thought being expressed here is that the wicked person thinks that he has been satisfying his greed; but he will not know what satisfaction really is until he is filled by the wrath of God. Thus the metaphor of eating is expressed in the first hemistich by the difficult phrase: $\text{יְהִי לִמְלֵא בִטְנוֹן}$ 'to fill his belly to the full'. The opening verb יְהִי is of course jussive and Driver/Gray have sought to preserve this with the translation: "his belly must be filled". (88). The real meaning of יְהִי is 'may it be' and if so expressed means that the poet wishes that God will so judge the ungodly. Gordis has taken יְהִי to be equivalent to יְהִי־יֵהְיֶה and so has given the translation: 'it will happen'. (89). This has the added benefit of being used in a similar way to the jussives so far examined in this work. It has been noted above that the jussive is used in poetry with the same meaning as the ordinary imperfect and may simply be used as an alternative form for the sake of poetic variety. The important question in the interpretation of this difficult phrase is the identification of the subject. The Hebrew can either be taken to mean that God filled his belly--so Clines (90), or that the wicked man filled his own belly as with Dhorme (91). Perhaps it is best to translate with the RSV "to fill his belly to the full" which leaves the question open to the interpreter.

The thought of the second hemistich is then expressed by the imperfect יִשְׁלַח 'send' whose subject must be understood as God since אֵשׁ אַרְצוֹ 'the fire of his anger' always alludes to the divine anger. Thus in

the same way that the wicked man fills his belly with food, so for his sins God will fill him with his own wrath. The third hemistich is begun by the imperfect conjunctive וַיִּמְטֵר 'rain down' and it should be noted that this verb is also jussive in form but see the remarks above for the use of the jussive in poetry. The use of the ו here must surely be regarded as copulative as it simply preserves the parallelism between וַיִּשְׁלַח and וַיִּמְטֵר.

With the treatment of No 1020 the consideration of the examples in the first section of the book of Job (3.1-20.29) is completed, and we now proceed to the Elihu speeches from which the following examples are drawn.

No 1750

אֲדַבֵּר וְיִרְוַח לִי אֶפְתַּח שִׁפְתֹתַי וְאֶעֱנֶה

"I must speak, that I may find relief;

I must open my lips and answer". (32.20 RSV).

In these speeches, which may for the sake of convenience be divided into three parts, Elihu first of all explains to the three friends and to Job and to himself why or how he is going to intervene (32.6-33.7); secondly, he cites or summarizes the words of Job three times and having done so refutes the claim made by Job that he is righteous and does not deserve the sufferings inflicted on him by God (33.8-

35.16); and thirdly he presents independently his own view of the greatness of God, his creative activity, and his government of men (36.1-37.24).

From this analysis it will be seen that the first example comes from the section where Elihu explains how or why he is going to intervene. In this text Elihu announces that he feels constrained to speak to Job by a sort of prophetic compulsion. This is indicated in the first hemistich by the use of the cohortative אָנֹרָה 'speak' which surely reveals the will of the speaker. The imperfect conjunctive וַיִּרְוֶה 'refresh' follows and, as Dhorme has noted, is prefaced by a copulative ׀ which has the nuance of introducing a subordinate clause. (92). The use of the imperfect conjunctive is merely a copulative one. Since No 1752 also occurs in this verse it seems best to deal with it here also. The action in the second hemistich is indicated by the imperfect אֶפְתָּח 'open' which must be taken as being parallel to אָנֹרָה of the first hemistich. The following imperfect conjunctive וַאֲעֹנֶה 'answer' then denotes the consequence of Elihu opening his lips, namely he will answer Job.

No 1835

אִם אֵין אַתָּה שֹׁמֵעַ לִי הֲחָרֵשׁ וְאֶאֱלָפֶךָ חֲכָמָה

"If not, listen to me;

be silent, and I will teach you wisdom". (33.33 RSV).

Here Elihu attempts to refute Job's idea that God did not answer him at all. He quotes Job's words that he has complained that God does not answer him in any way whatsoever. Elihu now sets out to correct this by showing that God does sometimes speak in dreams and apparitions (vv15-16), and sometimes by pain and illness (vv19-22). He then recounts that the action of the man to whom God has spoken is one of repentance (vv26-28). Finally in vv29-33 Elihu gives to Job some words of practical application. The application presumes that Job has not acted in the manner of a man to whom God has spoken. He invites Job to be silent and listen to him or if he prefers he may say what he wishes to Elihu. The final verse of this chapter which contains the example under consideration is another alternative which Elihu has put to Job. The verse is begun by the phrase אִם אֵין 'if not' which is in opposition to אִם י' of v32. The injunctions of v31 are then repeated by the use of the two imperatives שִׁמְעוּ--הִחַרְשׁוּ 'listen---be silent'. The consequence to these commands is then denoted by the imperfect conjunctive וְאֶלְפֶיךָ 'teach you'. The imperfect conjunctive surely expresses what the consequence will be if Job will only be silent, it is that Elihu will teach him wisdom.

No 1876

יָגַע יָמָתוֹ וַחֲצוֹת לַיְלָה יִגְעָשׁוּ עִם וַיִּעֲבֹרוּ וַיִּסְיָרוּ אַבִּיר לֹא בַיּוֹם

"In a moment they die;

at midnight the people are shaken and pass away,

and the mighty are taken away by no human hand". (34.20 RSV).

Chapters 33 & 34 of this speech are concerned with refuting the errors of Job. In chapter 33 Elihu was concerned in meeting Job's claim that God does not answer him. Here in chapter 34 he turns to Job's first complaint, namely that Job is innocent and that God is unjust in his dealings with him. Thus chapter 34 really asserts that God is just in his dealings with men, and with Job in particular. In vv 14-28 Elihu asserts that God cannot be questioned and is supreme, and because he is so he does not fail to punish the wicked. This is the sentiment of 34.20 which contains a description of the instantaneous destruction of the wicked. The varied emendations which have been proposed for this verse may be found in the philological notes of Driver/Gray (93), the difficulties being summarized as follows: (a) What is the meaning of $\square\gamma$ here? (b) What is the congruence of the plural verbs $\square\gamma\text{---}\square\gamma$? Since this work is primarily concerned with matters textual it is proposed to follow Gordis in his elucidation of the MT. (94). The difficulties actually disappear once it is recognised that $\square\gamma$ refers to the upper classes of society in the same way that English uses the word 'society' to refer to the aristocracy. The congruence of the plural verbs is found in the fact that $\square\gamma$ is obviously used collectively. Having arrived at a comprehensible meaning of the text it is now time to evaluate the imperfect conjunctives which are used in it.

The initial action of the death of the wicked is expressed by the imperfect יָמָו 'die'. This is continued by the next imperfect וְנִשָּׁן 'be shaken' which is pual in form and has the meaning of 'be agitated' and is similar to the hithpoel of Jer 46.8. Thus the upper classes of the nation are said to be shaken, the consequence of which is then conveyed by the imperfect conjunctive וַיָּעָוּ 'pass away'. Since No 1877 also occurs in this verse it is best to deal with it here. The third hemistich of the verse is introduced by the imperfect conjunctive וַיִּסְרֹן 'remove' which is best understood as a parallel to the initial יָמָו. Thus this verse describes the destruction of three groups of people, the ordinary people, the aristocracy and the mighty.

No 1886

לִכְן יִכִּיר מַעֲבָדֵיהֶם וְהִפֵּךְ לַיְלָה וַיִּדְנָגוּ

"Thus, knowing their works,
 he overturns them in the night,
 and they are crushed". (34.25 RSV).

In chapter 34 Elihu has been refuting Job's first complaint, namely that God is unjust in his dealings with him. In vv 21-25 of this chapter Elihu asserts that because God knows all things he is able to chastise those who have become estranged from him without any investigation. This is the thought that is expressed in 34.25.

The source of God's judgement is expressed by the imperfect יִנִּיחַ 'recognise' which asserts that God knows all their deeds which in itself is indicated by the Aramaic term מַעֲבֹד instead of the usual Hebrew מַעֲשֵׂה. The result of this knowledge of God is first of all indicated by the perfect conjunctive וַהֲפִיךָ 'overturn' (for further details on this use see ch.6) and the result of God's overturning the wicked is then denoted by the imperfect conjunctive וַיִּדְכֹּאן 'crush'. This verse is a very interesting example of how the two different forms וַיִּדְכֹּאן---וַהֲפִיךָ are used in an identical way from the syntactical point of view.

No 1894

וְהוּא יִשְׁקֵט וּמִי יִרְשָׁע וַיִּסְתֵּר פָּנָיו וּמִי יִשׁוּרְרוּ
וְעַל גּוֹי וְעַל אָדָם יַחַד

"When he is quiet, who can condemn?

When he hides his face, who can behold him,

whether it be a nation or a man"?

(34.29 RSV).

In this somewhat obscure verse Elihu returns to his thought of God's absolute independence which he had expressed earlier in the chapter in vv13f. Driver/Gray regard this verse as wholly unintelligible, and any sense can only be gained by the application of textual emendation. (95). Dhorme however, regards the first two hemistichs as offering no difficulty.. (96).

The thought of the first hemistich is expressed by a series of imperfects which are used to indicate a hypothesis and its realisation. This in itself is a fairly common use of GKC §159c. The thought is then expressed by the imperfect בָּקָשׁ 'be still' of the stillness of God, this verb has already been used in 3.26 to describe the state of Job. The realisation of the hypothesis of the stillness of God is then indicated by the imperfect צָרַע 'condemn'. Both Dhorme and Gordis want to read this verb as רָעַע 'stir up' which is of course from the root רָעַע . This emendation has the effect of making better sense and consequently there is no difficulty in adopting it since the same consonants are used. The thought of the second hemistich is then indicated by the imperfect conjunctive וַיִּסְתֵּר 'hide' which is surely best taken as being in parallelism to בָּקָשׁ and thus the ו is merely copulative.

No 1916

נִי יִסִּיף עַל חַטָּאתוֹ פֶּשַׁע בִּינִינֹו יִסְפֹּק וַיִּב אַמְרָיו לְאַל

"For he adds rebellion to his sin;
 he claps his hands among us,
 and multiplies his words against God". (34.37 RSV).

The context of the example in 34.37 is exactly the same as in the previous examples. This verse concludes this chapter in which Elihu has been refuting the errors of Job. The conclusion (vv34-37)

preserves the opinion of the wise on the words and deeds of Job. Now the wise are of the opinion that Job adds rebellion to his sin, this is expressed by the imperfect יָסִיף 'add'. The second hemistich expresses the thought that "he claps his hands among us" which is indicated by the imperfect יִסְפֹּק 'clap' with כַּפַּיִם understood. Gordis wants to understand the verb as a metaplastic form of שָׂפַק 'suffice, abound', its common meaning in Aramaic, Rabbinical Hebrew and Syriac. If understood in this way it has the added attraction that the verse would then have three verbs יָסִיף--יִסְפֹּק--יָרֵב which all have the meaning of multiply. (97). The third hemistich is then begun by the imperfect conjunctive וַיִּרֶב, an apocopated form of the imperfect and must surely be regarded as being parallel to יָסִיף. This in turn means that the ׀ of this construction is merely copulative.

No 1948

אִךְ כִּי תֹאמַר לֹא חִשְׁבִּנּוּ דַיִן לִפְנֵי וְתַחֲלוּל לֹ

"How much less when you say that you do not see him,
that the case is before him,
and you are waiting for him". (35.14 RSV).

In this chapter Elihu is dealing with the assertion which Job had earlier made (24.12), namely that God does not listen to the cries of the oppressed. Elihu then suggests that if God fails to intervene, it is because the unfortunate utter vain cries without turning

directly to God, the Creator and Governor of all things. Still more justifiably will God refrain from replying if man refers to him by the kind of remarks as Job has uttered and which have been heard by all. Elihu then in this verse gives the reason for unanswered prayer. He does so by quoting the words of Job as a valid reason as to why God has not listened to him. This is introduced by the opening **כִּי אַךְ** 'how much less' as in 9.14; 25.6. The words of Job are introduced by the pausal form of **אָמַר** as we might expect which is then followed by the imperfect **תִּשְׁרַן** 'behold him' as in 34.29. With the use of **וַיִּן** there is an unmistakable allusion to those passages in which Job declares that he has drawn up the details of the case and is awaiting the judge (13.18ff; 31.35ff). The consequence of the case coming before the judge is now indicated by the imperfect conjunctive **וַתַּחַלְל** 'wait' which is derived from the root **חָלַל** and is the equivalent to **יָחַל**. The use then of the imperfect conjunctive in the second hemistich of this verse is that it denotes the nuance of consequence.

No 1956

נָחַר לִי זַעִיר וְאַחֲרָיִךְ כִּי עוֹד לְאַלְוָה מִלִּי

"Bear with me a little, and I will show you,

for I have yet something to say on God's behalf". (36.2 RSV).

As stated above Elihu was concerned with correcting two of Job's fundamental errors which were that God was unjust in his dealings with Job and that God did not answer him when he spoke to him. He dealt with these two errors in chapters 33, 34 & 35. He now goes on in the remaining chapters of his speech to present his own view of the greatness of God and of his creative activity. In chapter 36 then he propounds his own view of the greatness of God and of his attributes. However, in the verse immediately under discussion he again appeals for patience while he sets forth his remaining defence. This appeal is begun with the piel imperative נַחַךְ 'wait' which in itself is an Aramaism. The consequence to the friends and Job of responding to his appeal is then denoted by the imperfect conjunctive וַאֲחֹרַךְ 'show'. This in itself is also an Aramaism from the root חוּךְ and as Dhorme has noted is a favourite word of Elihu. (98).

No 1973

אם ישמעו ויעבדו יכלו ימיהם בטוב ושניהם בנעימים

"If they hearken and serve him,
they complete their days in prosperity,
and their years in pleasantness". (36. 11 RSV).

In this chapter, as noted above, Elihu presents his own view of the greatness of God and of his creative activity. Here Elihu maintains

that God treats men severely or with favour according as they receive disciplinary suffering. Dhorme has noted that here Elihu has summarized the thesis of Eliphaz with regard to the connection between return to God and happiness. (22.23-30). (99). This is expressed in 36.11 by a conditional sentence which is begun with the particle ׀א. The condition is defined by the imperfect שׁמַעַן 'listen' and the consequence is denoted by the imperfect conjunctive וְיַעֲבֹד 'serve'. The imperfect conjunctive then indicates the relationship which exists between listening to God and as a consequence then serving him.

No 1977

וְאִם לֹא יִשְׁמְעוּ בְשִׁלַּח יַעֲבֹדוּ וְיָמוּתוּ כִּנְבִלִי דַעַת

"But if they do not hearken,
they perish by the sword,
and die without knowledge". (36.12 RSV).

In the last example which was taken from the previous verse, it was noted that Elihu maintained that God treated men severely or with favour according as they accepted disciplinary suffering. The previous example dealt with the positive side of receiving such chastisement; this example deals with the negative side of it. As with the previous example this verse is also in the form of a conditional sentence which is likewise begun with the particle ׀א but since it

expresses the negative side the word לא is added. The condition is then expressed by the imperfect שמעו 'listen' which is further defined by the phrase יצברו בשלח 'perish by the sword'. The consequence to their failure to listen to the voice of God is then denoted by the imperfect conjunctive וינזעו 'expire'. This verb is of more than casual interest since at the beginning of this chapter it was noted how this particular verb was used to denote the concept of consequence either as an imperfect consecutive or as an imperfect conjunctive.

No 1983

יחלץ עני בעניו ויגל בלחץ אונם

"He delivers the afflicted by their affliction,
and opens their ear by adversity". (36. 15 RSV).

In this chapter Elihu expounds on the theme of how God treats men. He has stated that in the last resort it all depends on how men respond to God. By two conditional sentences he then shows what the positive and negative effects are. He now comes to a summary in the present verse and states that misfortune is a tool in the hands of God to effect salvation. This is expressed in the first instance by the imperfect יחלץ 'deliver' from the root חלץ, a term frequently used in the Psalms meaning 'to save'. Such salvation is effected by the instrumentality of suffering, a

fact which is indicated in the MT by use of the preposition ן. But God not only saves the poor by their poverty, he also opens their ear to his voice. This consequence of salvation is also denoted by the imperfect conjunctive ן'ול 'open', the apocopated form of the imperfect. Thus the imperfect conjunctive as used here denotes the nuance of consequence.

No 2020

אף לואת יחרד לבי ויתר ממקומו

"At this also my heart trembles,
and leaps out of its place". (37.1 RSV).

Towards the end of the previous chapter Elihu defines the greatness of God's creative activity and the present verse is something of an interpolation, interrupting the flow of the thought in chapters 36 & 37. It may be regarded as Elihu's personal reaction to the greatness of God which he has been describing. Dhorme has noted that אף 'so too' forms the link between 36.33 where the animals' presentiment of the storm was spoken of, and 37.1, where Elihu himself feels struck by the same terror. (100). The action of his heart to the storm is indicated by the imperfect יחרד 'tremble' and the parallel thought to יחרד is then denoted by the imperfect conjunctive ן'ול 'leap'. The ן must simply be regarded as being copulative.

אִזְרְךָ כְּאִישׁ וְהוֹדִיעַנִי

"Gird up your loins like a man,

I will question you, and you shall answer me" (38.3 RSV).

The chapters which are now under consideration (Chs 38-42) constitute the divine speeches and within these chapters there are some 15 examples of the imperfect conjunctive. The main point of the first speech is that Job in his ignorance has misrepresented God and this is put briefly in the challenging questions with which the speech opens (38.2) and closes (40.2). The main body of the speech (38.4-39.30), also consists for the main part of questions, and is designed to bring out the immensity of Job's ignorance and the greatness of God's knowledge and his beneficent use of it. These questions fall into two main groups, referring (1) to the inanimate world, its creation and maintenance, 38.4-38; and (2) to animals, and in particular wild animals, their maintenance and habits, 38.39-39.30.

In the verse now under consideration Job is told to prepare himself for intense questioning like a warrior who is prepared for battle. This is expressed in the first instance by the imperative אִזְרְךָ 'gird'. This verb is also used in Jer 1.17 where Jeremiah is told to prepare himself for a hard fight. The commands to Job continue and are

indicated by the imperfect conjunctive וְאָשַׁל 'ask', the ו of which construction is considered by Dhorme to be expletive. (101). Dhorme's judgement seems to be correct since this particular occurrence of the imperfect conjunctive does not parallel any other word and it certainly does not denote any nuance of consequence. In support of his interpretation mention may be made of the fact that when this sentence recurs in 40.7 it does so without the ו. It is also worthy of note that there are manuscripts in existence which omit the ו. (102).

No 2102

לֶאֱחֹז בְּכַנְפוֹת הָאָרֶץ וַיִּנְעֲרוּ רְשָׁעִים מִמֶּנָּה

"That it might take hold of the skirts of the earth,
and the wicked be shaken out of it" (38.13 RSV).

In this speech, as noted above the intent is to show the immensity of the ignorance of Job as well as to mark the exceeding greatness of God's power. This object is achieved by means of the questions that are put to Job. The first group of questions refers in detail to the creation of the world (vv4-7), and sea (vv8-11); the succession of night and day (vv12-15). From this analysis it can be seen that the example in 38.13 is taken from the group of questions which refer to the succession of night and day. Even from a cursory reading of the MT it is evident that לֶאֱחֹז 'in order to seize'

continues the thought of v12b and indicates the action that is to be accomplished by the dawn. Dhorme has noted that the earth is pictured as a carpet whose כַּנְפוֹת 'wings' are the four corners. On this carpet the wicked indulge in their evil courses during the night (24.13-17). The dawn arrives and in an instant seizes the four corners of the carpet and shakes it. (103). The action of the wicked being shaken off the carpet is denoted by the imperfect conjunctive וְנִנְעָר 'shaken off'. It should be noted that the niphal is used here which surely indicates that it is dust (ie., the wicked) that is shaken off the carpet. Had the qal been used it certainly would have indicated that the carpet in itself was being shaken. By using the niphal the poet has indicated that the consequence of the dawn seizing the skirts of the earth is that the wicked are shaken off it. Thus the imperfect conjunctive is used here to denote the concept of consequence.

No 2104

חַהֲפֵךְ כַּחֲמֵר חֹתֵם וְיִתְצַבֵּר כִּמוֹ לִבְנֹשׁ

"It is changed like clay under the seal,
and it is dyed like a garment". (38.14 RSV).

The immediate context of the example in 38.14 is exactly the same as that for the previous example. It is contained in the group of questions which refer to the succession of night and day. The

interpretation of this verse is, however, somewhat problematical. Jewish exegesis wants to understand this verse as referring to death and resurrection by taking the first hemistich to refer to the earthy colour of the corpse and the second as the aspect that it assumes when it rises to life again with its same clothes. (104). It is far simpler to take the first hemistich as depicting the awakening of nature in the first rays of dawn, the objects then assuming their distinct colours, like clay under a seal. The second hemistich would then represent the adornment of the earth in the light of day. Thus understood the subject of תתהפך is clearly הארץ of v13. The imperfect תתהפך is used to describe what the earth becomes in the first rays of dawn. The נ before the noun חמר gives to the verb the meaning of 'become like'. The phrase חמת חותם 'sealed clay' is of particular interest in the interpretation described above. Dhorme has noted that 'sealed clay' was a technical term in the ancient world the meaning of which was very precise. One of its characteristics was its red colour which caused it to resemble the pink hues of the earth at sunrise. So that what the poet is saying is that the earth has become like sealed clay. (105). The second hemistich is begun by the imperfect conjunctive ויתיצנו 'stand forth'. The plural form can only with difficulty stand beside נמו לנו . It seems best to follow the BHS and most modern scholars who emend the text to read : ועוצנו 'it is dyed'. This suggestion adds coherence to an otherwise difficult verse and if such a suggestion be adopted the ו prior to the imperfect must be regarded as being simply copulative preserving as it does the parallelism between the verbs in the two hemistichs.

No 2105

וַיִּמְנַע מִרְשָׁעֵיהֶם אֹרֶם וּזְרוּעַ רָמָה תִּשְׁבֵּר

"From the wicked their light is withheld,
and their uplifted arm is broken". (38.15 RSV).

The context to the example in 38.15 is exactly the same as for the two previous examples. It is contained in the group of questions which refer to the succession of night and day. Vv13-14 of this chapter have already shown the effect of the dawn upon the earth. In v15 the effect on human beings is described. The wicked regard the darkness as their light; for them night is day. So that when the light of dawn appears, it is as if the light of the wicked vanish. This is denoted in the first hemistich by the imperfect conjunctive וַיִּמְנַע 'withheld'. The use of the imperfect conjunctive here must be regarded as consequential since the effect of the dawn is that the wicked lose their light. Thus וַיִּמְנַע is to be regarded as denoting the consequence to לֹאחֲזוּ of v13a.

No 2142

הַחֲשֵׁלַח בְּרָקִים וַיִּלְכּוּ וַיֹּאמְרוּ לְךָ הֲנִנּוּ

"Can you send forth lightnings, that they may go
and say to you, 'here we are'" (38.35 RSV).

It has been shown above that the intent of the speech is to show the ignorance of Job and the greatness of God's power. This end is achieved by a series of challenging questions. The particular group of questions to which the example in 38.35 belongs is that of questions on the origin of the clouds and the lightning. (v34f). The question is begun by the interrogative particle ה and the imperfect שלח 'send'. In this context שלח has the meaning of 'unleash, release'. The lightnings are seen to be the servants of God, whose will they accomplish. The purpose of the lightnings being released is then denoted by the imperfect conjunctive וילך 'went' which by itself denotes the consequence of the lightnings being unleashed. This indicates the fact that the lightnings are unleashed so that they might flash forth and demonstrate the power of God. The point of the question is that God alone can do this, it is not the work of puny man. Since no 2143 also occurs in this verse it is convenient to deal with it here also. The second hemistich is begun by the imperfect conjunctive ויאמר 'say' which indicates that it is parallel to שלח. The point is that if Job can do this then the lightnings will flash forth and announce their presence to him.

No 2183

התבסח בו כי רב כחו ותעזב אליו יגיעך

"Will you depend on him because his strength is great,

and will you leave to him your labour"

(39. 11 RSV).

The same technique that was employed in chapter 38 is now employed in chapter 39 with the difference that the questions are no longer about the inanimate world but the world of animate creatures. The present example is contained in a group of questions about wild oxen. (39.9-12). Andersen has identified the animal in question as an *aurochs* which has been extinct since 1627. This animal was the most powerful of all hoofed beasts, exceeded in size only by the hippopotamus and the elephant. It is the standard symbol of strength in the Old Testament, where it is mentioned 9 times. (106). The question is begun in the first hemistich by the interrogative particle הַ which is attached to the imperfect תַּנְסֵהוּ 'depend'. The question reveals the fact that this enormous beast can not be made use of like a domestic animal. It has great strength but man cannot depend on his untamed character. The second hemistich is begun by the imperfect conjunctive וַתַּעֲזֹב 'leave' the וַ of which must be regarded as being copulative since it merely preserves the parallelism between תַּנְסֵהוּ & תַּעֲזֹב.

No 2200

יַחֲפֹרֵן בַּעֲמֶק וַיִּשְׁשֵׁן בְּנַח יָצָא לִקְרַאת נֹשֶׁק

"he paws in the valley, and exults in his strength;
he goes out to meet the weapons".

(39. 21 RSV).

The example in 39.21 has exactly the same context as the previous example with the exception that the questions are now about horses (39.19-25). The example under immediate consideration is however, not a question but a statement of the horse's behaviour. It is a description that is particularly applicable to the warrior horse. The description is begun in the first hemistich by the imperfect יַחַפֵּי 'paw'. The difficulty with the MT is that it preserves the form as a plural, whereas the description is of a single horse. It is best to follow G and emend the text as a singular יַחַפֵּי. The interpretation of the noun עַמְק 'valley' has received an alternative proposal in recent years. Blommerde has noted that it is possible to equate עַמְק with Ugaritic 'mq 2 'strength' and this produces the translation: "he paws violently". This proposal has the added attraction that it strengthens the parallelism of the first hemistich. (107). The next action of the horse is then indicated by the imperfect conjunctive פִּיִּיִּי 'exult' as at 3.22. The ו prior to the imperfect must be regarded as copulative since it simply preserves the parallelism between יַחַפֵּי and פִּיִּיִּי.

No 2216

סלע ישכנ ויחלונן על שן סלע ומצודה

"On the rock he dwells and makes his home
in the fastness of the rocky crag". (39.28 RSV).

With the example in 39.28 the object of the questioning has changed from horses to hawks and vultures (39.26-30). As with the previous example this is not so much a question as a statement of its behaviour. Andersen has noted the unusual construction of this verse, for instead of the usual construction which would give a verb followed by a noun (or vice versa) which, in synonymous parallelism would be corresponded by a verb and noun of a similar meaning, it has the parallel verbs in one colon and the parallel nouns in the second. (108). The first hemistich is then begun with the location of the eagle's home and this is indicated by the noun טלע 'rock'. This in turn is followed by the imperfect שׁוֹנֵן 'dwell' which is in turn followed by the imperfect conjunctive וְיִחַלְלֵנָּה 'spend the night'. The וְ prior to the imperfect hithpael is simply copulative and denotes the parallelism between the two verbs. The point of the statement is to show that such activity is outside Job's abilities.

No 2279

הַחֲשֹׁק בֹּרַח כַּצִּפּוֹר וְחִקְשָׁרְנוֹ לְנַעֲרוֹתַיִךְ

"Will you play with him as with a bird,
or will you put him on leash for your maidens"? (41.5 RSV).

In the consideration of this verse it should be noted that for easy reference to the text it seems best to follow the English verse numbering which differs at this point from the Hebrew Bible.

From the questioning of Chapters 38 & 39 on the animate world and on the animal kingdom there now follows a description of two monstrous animals whose strength are beyond man's power to tame. They are Behemoth (40.15-24), the fiercest land animal, and Leviathan (41.1-34), the most terrifying sea creature. Andersen has noted the source of the name Leviathan which is used in ancient Canaanite myths of a seven headed sea dragon. Scraps of this type of literature survive in the Old Testament, and are undoubtedly the source of the name used here. (109). Scholars seem to think that the description that is given is that of a crocodile. There are similarities to the speeches in Chs 38 & 39 here, since the discourse begins with a string of questions, aimed at convincing Job how helpless he is in the presence of such a creature. How could he catch him (41.1ff balanced by vv 7 & 8 by an introverted structure)? And even if he could what would he do with him? The suggestions are ridiculous. Make him a servant (41.4)----but what use would he be? A pet (41.5), or would he sell him (41.6)?

From the above analysis it can be seen that the example in 41.5 is taken from the section where God supposes that Job has captured Leviathan and ironically suggests that he should make him his pet. The questioning is thus continued as before with the interrogative particle ה used with the imperfect piel קחשח 'play'. Gordis has noted that נצפנר is a contraction for נצפנר 'as with a bird'. (110). The second hemistich is then begun with the imperfect conjunctive וחקקו 'leash' the ו of which must surely be regarded as

copulative preserving the parallelism between תְּקַשְׁרוּנוֹ & תִּשְׁחַק.

No 2292

מִי הִקְדִּימָנִי וְאֲשֶׁלֶם תַּחַת כָּל הַשָּׁמַיִם לִי הָרֹא

"Who has given to me, that I should repay him?

whatever is under the whole heaven is mine" (41.11 RSV).

The context of the example in 41.11 is exactly the same as that for the previous example. The latter has its context in the introduction to this poem about Leviathan (vv1-8), whereas 41.11 is set in what may be called the application of that description to Job. The rest of the poem (vv12-34) concentrates in describing the animal so that the application (vv9-11) is of supreme importance. Unfortunately the text is very difficult. While the second hemistich of this verse contains a very clear assertion that God owns everything in the world, and therefore Leviathan, the meaning of the first hemistich is somewhat obscure. Because of this fact and because this work is not primarily concerned with matters textual but with matters syntactic, it seems best to follow Dhorme in his reconstruction of the MT. Dhorme notes that the text of G appears to represent Hebrew וְיִשְׁלֵם, ie ' instead of χ. Now what he wants to do is to exchange the χ of וְיִשְׁלֵם with the ' of לִי, which obtains for the close of the second hemistich לֹא הָיָה לֵךְ 'that man does not exist'. He notes that as we had לִי־נִי instead of

לפניו in v2, so we have הקד'ימו instead of הקד'ימוני. The result is that by such reconstruction he has obtained a very readable Hebrew text which yields the translation: "Who has confronted him and has remained safe? No one under the whole heavens". (111). Having thus reconstructed the Hebrew text it is now time to examine the example of the imperfect conjunctive contained within it. The hiphil of קד has a meaning similar to the piel in 3.12; 30.27: "to go before, confront". The implication is that should one confront such an animal one would not survive the encounter and so the imperfect conjunctive קד'י 'remain safe' denotes the consequence of encountering this animal since the force of the question demands a negative reply. The imperfect conjunctive as used here denotes the concept of consequence.

No 2315

לבו יצוק כמו אבן ויצוק נפלו תחתיו

"His heart is as hard as a stone,
hard as the nether millstone". (41.24 RSV).

With the example in 41.24 the text now concerns itself with a detailed description of the animal. Along with many other scholars Driver/Gray apply this description to the bodily structure of a crocodile, and to the formidable powers with which it is possessed. (112). The description details the following aspects of Leviathan:

his strength (v12); his skin, described as a double coat of mail (v13); his mouth, fancifully called the doors of his face (v14); his scales, each of which is like a warrior's shield (vv15-17); his fiery breath (vv18-21); his neck (v22); his impenetrable hide (v23); his solid heart (v24); his contempt for every weapon (vv26-29); his spectacular movement through the water (vv30-32). From this analysis it will be seen that 41.24 concerns itself with describing his solid heart. It does so in the first hemistich by use of the imperfect קָצַץ 'hard' which is used in a sort of stative sense. The form is the hiphil of קָצַץ which means 'to press hard'. The same verb is used again in the second hemistich which is of course the example of the imperfect conjunctive with which I am concerned. The ׁ of this construction is merely copulative continuing as it does the force of the first occurrence of קָצַץ.

No 2324

כָּלֵב נִחְשְׁבוּ חֲוֹתָם וַיִּשְׁחַק לִרְצֵשׁ כִּידוֹן

"Clubs are counted as stubble;

he laughs at the rattle of javelins" (41.29 RSV).

The final example in the divine speeches is 41.29 and is concerned with the animal's contempt for every weapon. The example is embedded in this description (vv18-22 Heb., vv26-29 EVV).

Such contempt is expressed in the first hemistich by the niphal perfect ׀׀׀׀׀ 'considered' which is plural in form. Since however, the text provides us with a singular subject ׀׀׀׀ 'club' most modern scholars have followed the lead given by Houbigant and have emended the text to read: ׀׀ ׀׀׀׀׀ which produces a uniform text. (113). On the basis of the Assyrian *tartahu*, ׀׀׀׀ is understood by most scholars to mean 'club, javelin'. The second hemistich is then begun by the imperfect conjunctive ׀׀׀׀׀׀ 'laugh' which is surely best taken as denoting the consequence that the club is considered by him to be as stubble. Having made such a consideration he laughs at the rattling of javelins.

In this chapter we have examined some 89 examples of the imperfect conjunctive as used in the book of Job which are spread through Ch's 3. 1-20. 29; 32. 1-37. 24; and 38. 1-42. 6. Thus we have been able to trace how it works in different types of literature contained within the book of Job. It is now necessary to come to some sort of conclusion as to its use.

From the analysis of the examples considered in this chapter it seems to me that there are in fact four distinct usages of this construction in the book of Job. These are as follows:

(1) That the imperfect conjunctive is used in a very similar way to the imperfect consecutive to denote the concept of consequence and may be considered to be an alternative form which the poet has used for

the sake of variety. Thus one has to argue for an overlap of usage between the imperfect consecutive and the imperfect conjunctive. In chapter three it was noted that the imperfect consecutive was sometimes used as an emphatic construction but it must be stressed that the imperfect conjunctive is never used with this nuance.

(2) That the imperfect conjunctive is used in parallelism with other verbs in the colon whether they are imperfect or perfect and the ׀ in such examples is merely copulative preserving such parallelism.

(3) That the ׀ in the imperfect conjunctive is used to denote the dependant verb after the optative formula ׀ן' ׀ן 'who will grant'.

(4) That the imperfect conjunctive is also used much as it is in prose to express a purpose clause.

From what has been said (2), (3) & (4) must be considered to be how we might expect the ׀ to behave and to betray its conjunctive function. However, (1) is of interest since it functions as an alternative construction to the use of the imperfect consecutive when the poet wants to denote the concept of consequence.

Under these circumstances it becomes somewhat difficult to formulate any rules as to its exact usage from a syntactic point of view but we can note what seems to be its main usage in Hebrew poetry and in the book of Job in particular. Thus we can say that the use of the

imperfect conjunctive in poetry is to denote the concept of consequence as an alternative form to the imperfect consecutive but that it never denotes any emphatic action as the imperfect consecutive has been shown to do. Additionally one must expect the imperfect conjunctive to perform from a syntactic point of view as it does elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible.

NOTES

(1)	Waltke/O'Connor	<u>Biblical Hebrew Syntax</u>	1990		p562f
(2)	Gordis	<u>The book of Job</u>	1978		p 36
(3)	Driver/Gray	ICC <u>Job</u>	1921		p 20
(4)	Davidson	<u>Commentary on Job</u> Vol 1	1862		p 77, 78
(5)	Dhorme	<u>Commentary on Job</u>	1984		p 32
(6)	Blake	<u>Hebrew Tenses</u>	1968		p 45
(7)	Gordis	ibid			p 37
(8)	Driver/Gray	ibid			p 20
(9)	Davidson	ibid			p 48
(10)	Dhorme	ibid			p 34
(11)	Davidson	ibid			p 79
(12)	Dhorme	ibid			p 59
(13)	Gesenius	<u>Hebrew Grammar</u>	1910	\$120d	p386
(14)	Dhorme	ibid			p 81
(15)	Davidson	ibid			p104
(16)	Dhorme	ibid			p 82
(17)	Davidson	ibid			p105
(18)	Clines	WCC <u>Job</u>	1989		p195
(19)	Clines	ibid			p222
	Driver/Gray	ibid			p102
(20)	Clines	ibid			p250
(21)	Davidson	ibid			p160
(22)	Dhorme	ibid			p152
(23)	Gordis	ibid			p114
(24)	Dhorme	ibid			p153

(25)	Clines	ibid		p250
(26)	Clines	ibid		p222
(27)	Dhorme	ibid		p154f
(28)	Gordis	ibid		p121
(29)	Gordis	ibid		p122
(30)	Clines	ibid		p255
(31)	Gordis	ibid		p122
(32)	Clines	ibid		p292
(33)	Clines	ibid		p292
(34)	Clines	ibid		p279
(35)	Davidson	ibid		p187
(36)	Clines	ibid		p296
(37)	Dhorme	ibid		p186
(38)	Gordis	ibid		p145
(39)	Clines	ibid		p315
(40)	Tur-Sinai	<u>Book of Job</u>	1967	p227
(41)	Clines	ibid		p316
(42)	Blommerde	<u>North West Semitic Grammar & Job</u>	1969	p 68
(43)	Clines	ibid		p320
(44)	Tur-Sinai	ibid		p230
(45)	Gordis	ibid		p146
(46)	Andersen	T. O. T. C	<u>Job</u> 1976	p168
(47)	Clines	ibid		p321
(48)	Clines	ibid		p321
(49)	Dhorme	ibid		p192
(50)	Gesenius	ibid	\$109a	p321

(51)	Gesenius	ibid	\$109k	p323
(52)	Driver	<u>Hebrew Tenses</u>	1892	p213
(53)	Driver	ibid		p214f
(54)	Williams	<u>Hebrew Syntax</u>	1976	p 34
(55)	Calderone	'HDL 2 in Poetic Texts'	<u>CBQ</u> 23	p451- 460
(56)	Blommerde	ibid		p 70
(57)	Dhorme	ibid		p201
(58)	Dhorme	ibid		p206
(59)	Clines	ibid		p346
(60)	Gordis	ibid		p160
(61)	Clines	ibid		p348
(62)	Dhorme	ibid		p210
(63)	Driver/Gray	ibid		p 96
(64)	Dhorme	ibid		p214
(65)	Gordis	ibid		p162
(66)	Dhorme	ibid		p214
(67)	Gesenius	ibid	\$143d	p458
(68)	Clines	ibid		p362
(69)	Dhorme	ibid		p225
(70)	Clines	ibid		p376
(71)	Dhorme	ibid		p229
(72)	Clines	ibid		p390
(73)	Clines	ibid		p368
(74)	Clines	ibid		p396
(75)	Clines	ibid		p409
(76)	Gordis	ibid		p190

(77)	Driver/Gray	ibid	p117
(78)	Andersen	ibid	p189
(79)	Dhorme	ibid	p260
(80)	Gordis	ibid	p192
(81)	Clines	ibid	p438
(82)	Dhorme	ibid	p270
(83)	Clines	ibid	p428
(84)	Clines	ibid	p455
(85)	Dhorme	ibid	p281
(86)	Clines	ibid	p486
(87)	Clines	ibid	p488
(88)	Driver/Gray	ibid	p140
(89)	Gordis	ibid	p219
(90)	Clines	ibid	p472
(91)	Dhorme	ibid	p302
(92)	Dhorme	ibid	p484
(93)	Driver/Gray	ibid	p258
(94)	Gordis	ibid	p389
(95)	Driver/Gray	ibid	p300
(96)	Dhorme	ibid	p523
(97)	Gordis	ibid	p395
(98)	Dhorme	ibid	p538
(99)	Dhorme	ibid	p542
(100)	Dhorme	ibid	p559
(101)	Dhorme	ibid	p574
(102)	Driver/Gray	ibid	p298

(103)	Dhorme	ibid	p580
(104)	Dhorme	ibid	p581
(105)	Dhorme	ibid	p582
(106)	Andersen	ibid	p111
(107)	Blommerde	ibid	p135
(108)	Andersen	ibid	p284
(109)	Andersen	ibid	p289
(110)	Gordis	ibid	p481
(111)	Dhorme	ibid	p632
(112)	Driver/Gray	ibid	p364
(113)	Dhorme	ibid	p641

Chapter Five

The Use of the Imperfect

In this chapter we turn from a consideration of the use of the imperfect conjunctive to that of the simple imperfect. By the term 'simple imperfect' what is meant is the use of the imperfect on its own without any preceding γ . As we do so it is necessary first of all to note that the imperfect is the most commonly used tense in the book of Job and there are some 940 examples in Chs 3.1-20.29; 32.1-37.24; 38.1-42.6 compared with 314 examples of the perfect which will be dealt with in chapter 7. Clearly, within the compass of this study it will not be possible to treat all these examples and so it seems best to select some 133 examples which are representative of the imperfect as it is used in the above named chapters. It should be assumed that the interpretation of those examples which are not dealt with within the scope of this chapter correspond to those that are.

At the outset, however, it should be noted that we are not only presented with the bulk of the examples which require to be treated, but also with the question of how they should be treated. There is a certain unanimity in the interpretation of the imperfect in nearly all the grammars. The grammar of Gesenius is fairly typical in this respect:

"More precisely the imperfect serves-----1. In the sphere of past time: (a) To express actions which continued throughout a longer or shorter period-----very frequently alternating with the perfect, or when narration is continued by means of an imperfect consecutive.--(b) To express actions which were repeated in the past, either at fixed intervals or occasionally.

2. In the sphere of present time, again: (a) To express actions, events, or states, which are continued for a shorter or longer time. So especially to express facts known by experience, which occur at all times, and consequently hold good at any moment;

hence frequently in Job and Proverbs.----(b) To express actions which may be repeated at any time, including therefore the present, or are customarily repeated on a given occasion.----(c) To express actions which although, strictly speaking, they are already finished, are regarded as still lasting on into the present time, or continuing to operate in it.

3. In the sphere of future time. To express actions which are to be represented as about to take place, and as continuing a shorter or longer time in the future, or as being repeated;----(a) From the standpoint of the speaker's present time.----(b) In dependant clauses to represent actions which from some point of time in the past are to be represented as future.----(c) To represent a future exactum." (1).

The above statement, as McFall has noted in his study, is heavily dependant on the work of Ewald, for since the 17th edition of his Grammar Rodiger had adopted the former's grammatical terms, namely, Perfect and Imperfect. (2). It is also true to say that all the major works on Hebrew syntax such as Davidson, Driver, & Muller have also followed Ewald in his grammatical terms and in his interpretation of the tenses. What this in turn means is that the interpretation of tense which is presented in such works is heavily aspectual as Ewald's view itself was. Ewald's view is that:

"The perfect denotes that the speaker represents the action as finished and thus before him; the imperfect represents the action as unfinished and non-existent, but possibly becoming and coming." (3).

Here the tenses are interpreted not on the basis of time, but on the basis of whether from the point of view of the speaker the actions were completed or uncompleted. While there is strength in the theory which Ewald has proposed it has to be said that

the way in which his understanding of the Hebrew tenses has dominated the works on syntax has meant that the distinctive poetic nuances of tense have been obliterated. - Given that such is the situation as far as the interpretation of tense is concerned, on what basis can any study proceed which wishes to examine the poetic usage of the imperfect?

An approach which does commend itself is the one which is proposed by the Italian scholar Niccacci who, although he bases his remarks on Hebrew prose, considers that לִּפְנֵי is the tense of discourse in the same way that לִּפְנֵי can be considered to be the tense of narrative. (4). This chapter will therefore proceed to examine the use of the imperfect on the basis of his observation. Now this assumption has certain implications for the nature of the poetry of the book of Job. The poetry of the book of Job is, of course, not narrational in nature but it is the poetry of discourse. It should further be noted that the Hebrew Bible has very little narrational poetry such as we find in the work of Sir Walter Scott, whereas the poetry of Ugarit is heavily narrational in character. Thus the poetry of the Hebrew Bible may be considered to be the language of prayer, praise, lament, disputation, accusation, and of commitment. It is on the basis of such categories that a poetic syntax of the use of the imperfect will be formulated.

The approach that is being developed in this chapter is similar to that which Michel has used in his study but is independent of him.

His approach is as follows:

"Section 4: The Imperfect

- \$19: the imperfect in the designation of a dependent action
- \$20: the negative consequence
- \$21: the so called poetic aorist
- \$22: the corresponding occurrence
- \$23: the modal use of the imperfect
- \$24: the imperfect in the statement of repeated actions
- \$25 the imperfect in the expression of desires
- \$26 the imperfect after subjunctives." (5).

The difference between the approach that he has used and that developed in this chapter is that he has been concerned to show that the imperfect must designate an action which is not in itself meaningful, which stands in relation to something else and so is dependent; whereas the approach that is being developed here seeks to show that ἡ ἰσχυρὴ is above all the tense of discourse.

It therefore seems best to examine the use of the imperfect under the following categories:

- (a) The Narrational Imperfect
- (b) The Imperfect in the expression of prayer

- (c) The Imperfect in the expression of praise
- (d) The Imperfect in the expression of lament
- (e) The Imperfect in the expression of dispute
- (f) The Imperfect in the expression of accusation
- (g) The Imperfect in the expression of commitment

(A) The Narrational Imperfect

No 6

יָאבֹד יוֹם אֹלֶדְךָ בֵּן וְהַלַּיְלָה אָמַר הָרָה וְגַבֵּר

"Let the day perish wherein I was born,

and the night which said,

'a man child is conceived.'

(3.3 RSV).

At the outset it might be thought odd that since it has been argued above that Hebrew poetry is essentially engaged in discourse that the first category to be considered is that of the narrational imperfect. While Hebrew poetry is mainly engaged in discourse of one sort or another it has to be said that there are occasions where the poet uses the imperfect in a narrational sense and there are many such examples

in the book of Job Ch's 3.1-20.29; 32.1-37.24; & 38.1-42.6.

The first occurrence of the narrational imperfect is to be found in Job's introductory poem which may be classified as a "complaint" (Klage). In form this may further be divided thus: vv 3-10 the curse and vv 11-26 the lament. The occurrence of לָלַךְ is right at the beginning of the curse which has its motive clause in v10. Because Job here curses the past doubt has been thrown by certain scholars as to whether it is a true curse at all, but for the present purposes it will be considered to be such. לָלַךְ may be considered to be the beginning of a relative clause where לָלַךְ has to be understood and which gives the reasons as to why the day is to be cursed. How is the grammarian to understand the imperfect used here?

Having taken into account all the possibilities it seems that the best way of interpreting this example of the narrational imperfect is to consider it a true past tense and this is how Dhorme takes it and calls it a true aorist. (6). This particular example is similarly treated by R.J. Williams in his Hebrew Syntax (1976) who also notes that this form (the preterite) is preserved in the archaic language of poetry and that it also occurs in prose after such particles as $\text{וַ$, $\text{וְ$. He further notes that this is the form which occurs with the waw-consecutive. (7). T.L.Fenton has noted that in Ugaritic לָלַךְ is the regular form for denoting narration of events and that this form can be detected in the poetry of the Pentateuch and many of the Psalms. (8). What is therefore being argued for in these remarks is

the existence in Hebrew of a preterite לִּבַּר alongside a true imperfect לִּבֵּר and that such a distinction was obliterated by the Massoretes who also obliterated almost all differences of dialect. (9). That לִּבַּר is to be understood as a genuine archaism is also defended by Andersen in his commentary. (10).

Reference has already been made in this work to the question of the poetic use of the jussive and that there exists a very real possibility that the Massoretes have mispointed such jussives when they should have been pointed as preterites. (11). It would be unwise to be dogmatic on such issues but the evidence of the early poetry of the Pentateuch and good number of Psalms as well as the poetry of Ugarit do seem at the very least to point in this direction. It is instructive to note the other occurrences of the verb לִּבַּר in the book of Job where the poet makes reference to the act of birth. There are in fact 4 occurrences of this verb and these are: in the Niphal: No 503 (Ch 11.12); No 721 (Ch 15.7); No 2118 (Ch38.21); and in the Pual: No 125 (Ch 5.7). It has to be stressed that in none of these examples is the act of birth which is viewed as a past event denoted by means of a perfect, each one of these uses the imperfect which it seems best to understand as a preterite as with No 6. Michel following Bauer has described it in his study as the poetic aorist. (12).

No 26

למה לא מרחם אמות מנטן 'צאת' ואגוע

"Why did I not die at birth,
come forth from the womb and expire?" (3.11 RSV).

The literary genre of Job's first speech is as is noted above that of the "complaint". (Klage). It may further be divided into two parts: vv 3-10 the curse and vv 11-26 the lament. The occurrence of אמות is right at the beginning of the lament which may further be divided into two parts: vv 11-19 & 24-26 the self lament and vv20-23 the God lament. Thus, 3.11 may be considered to be the beginning of the self-lament, but what exactly is the use of אמות here?

Even a cursory reading of the Hebrew text shows that אמות must be rendered by a past tense and so is another example of the imperfect being used with a preterite meaning. Since Job is referring to his own birth and is asking why he did not die then, אמות cannot be rendered as a present or as future. It can only refer to the past and is clearly a preterite. This is how Dhorme has understood it and once again he labels it a true aorist. (13). It should be noted that Clines also comes to a similar conclusion. (14). The same kind of interpretation can also be applied to No 37 (אהיה) 3.16.

No 88

ואלי דבר יגנב ותקח אונני שמץ מנהו

"Now a word was brought to me stealthily,
my ear received the whisper of it." (4.12 RSV).

Vv 12-21 may be described as the second major part of Eliphaz's reply because in it he wants to draw attention to the fact that he too has received a vision. This whole verse is an emphatic construction. For the verse begins with וְגַלִּי 'even to me' and the poet wants to emphasize that Eliphaz too has a knowledge of the Deity. This action is further stressed by the positioning of the subject before the verb. The source of Eliphaz's vision is then denoted by the imperfect בָּגַלִּי 'be brought by stealth' which is best understood as a preterite as with 3.11, 16. The pual of בָּגַלִּי means 'to be stolen' and derivatively 'to be done or said stealthily'. Once again Dhorme notes that this imperfect is best understood in the sense of the aorist. (15). The imperfect בָּגַלִּי cannot be understood as a frequentative since the poet is not talking of a recurring experience, but of a solitary past experience. It is therefore, best taken as yet another example of the preterite. It should be noted that No 93 (יחלף) 4.15; No 94 (חסמר) 4.15; No 95 (יעמד) 4.16; No 96 (אניר) 4.16; & No 97 (אשמע) 4.16 may also be understood as conveying a preterite sense.

No's 445 & 446

הלא כחלב חתיכני ונגבנה חקפיאני

"Didst thou not pour me out like milk

and curdle me like cheese?"

(10.10 RSV).

This example is again located in Job's reply to Bildad where he expresses his feeling of powerlessness before God. Continuing the second major section of the speech, Job returns to the second person form of address, and throughout persistently addresses God. There is no doubt that parts of this speech could be classed in form-critical terms as an accusation. This second part of the speech may be divided into four parts: (a) programme for the speech (vv1-2); (b) possible motivations for God's treatment of Job (vv3-7); (c) the contradiction between the apparent and the hidden purpose of God in creating and sustaining Job (vv8-17); (d) appeal for release from God's oppressive presence (vv18-22). From this analysis it will be easily seen that 10.10 comes from the section where Job is examining an apparent contradiction, namely, God's creation of him and God's treatment of him.

Thus, in No's 445 & 446 Job dwells on God's creative power in fashioning him in the womb. As he does so he seeks to remind God that it is he who has made him (Job). This verse describes the activity of God behind the human acts of procreation and conception. This is expressed in the first hemistich by the imperfect ׁוַיִּזְרֹק 'pour out' which refers to action of semen being poured into the womb and likens it to milk, since it is a milk like substance. This thought is paralleled in the second hemistich by the imperfect ׁוַיִּבְרֹחַ 'curdle' which denotes that the semen coagulates

like cheese into the mother's embryo and it is to this foetus that flesh and bones are woven together. The imperfects חקפיאני & חתינני cannot be taken as anything else than preterites and it is noteworthy that they are understood by Dhorme to convey this nuance. (16). It should be noted that No 447 (חלבישני) & No 448 (חטנני) of the following verse should also be taken as denoting the same nuance and also may be understood as preterites.

No 723

הבטוד אלוה חשמע ותגורע אליך חנמה

"Have you listened in the council of God?

and do you limit wisdom to yourself?" (15.8 RSV).

Eliphaz's speech may conveniently be divided into two parts: (a) vv1-16 contain the address to Job in which he states that Job has spoken unwisely, self importantly, and aggressively, and in so doing has adopted a stance that ill becomes his piety. Because of this he is in need of correction. (b) vv17-35 describe the wicked man and his fate, which is for Job's instruction—the point being that Job is not such a man and therefore has good reason for confidence. The example in 15.8 comes clearly from the first division where Eliphaz addresses Job and asserts that he has adopted a stance that ill becomes his piety.

In vv7-10 Eliphaz replies to Job's assault on the friend's wisdom and does so in words which are meant to imply that wisdom is not Job's sole prerogative. He shows that Job is not the only man to possess wisdom and that such wisdom as he does possess is not superior to theirs by means of a number of questions which in themselves preempt the questions in the divine speeches cf 38.8,21. To show that Job is not one who has listened to the divine council the words אלוה הַבְּסוּר are placed before the verb to emphasize what Eliphaz is asking Job. The action of the question is then expressed by the imperfect תִּשְׁמַע 'hear,listen' which can either be taken as true imperfect or as a further example of the ancient preterite. If one takes the imperfect as a true imperfect, then the imperfect indicates that Job was a frequent listener at the divine council. If however, the imperfect is taken as a preterite, then the text indicates that this a reference to primal Adam who derived his supernatural wisdom by overhearing the council of God. (17). Since the previous verse has referred to the birth of the first man, it seems best to understand the imperfect in the latter sense and to take it as another example of the preterite.

No 743

אֲשֶׁר חֲכָמִים יְגִידוּ וְלֹא נִחְדָּו מֵאֲבוֹתָם

"What wise men have told,
and their fathers have not hidden," (15.18 RSV).

The context to the example in 15.18 is exactly the same as that of the previous example with the exception that 15.18 occurs in the second part of Eliphaz's speech where he gives a description of the wicked man. The second part of the speech begins with an elaborate introduction (vv17-19) which appeals to the wisdom of the ages. His claim to wisdom is that his experience is in line with the tradition of the Fathers. His wisdom is built upon the foundation stone of the wise men (sages) and the fathers in Israel. Here 'fathers' may be defined as including everyone in the tradition of the wise. Thus what he is about to teach Job has a sure foundation to it for it is based on the tradition of the Elders as Jesus called it. The first hemistich of the verse contains the imperfect ׀׀׀׀ 'declare, tell' which as with the previous example may be taken as a true imperfect or as a preterite. The MT is usually rendered "what wise men declare, without hiding it from their fathers". This however implies that either the sages teach wisdom to their fathers or that the fathers teach wisdom to the sages. Since this is unlikely it is better to consider that Eliphaz is now citing two sources of enlightenment, namely, the testimony of the sages and the wisdom of the ancients. Gordis has noted that this view is supported by the parallel use of the two verbs ׀׀׀׀ א׀, ׀׀׀׀ in Isa 3.9; this then means that the imperfect is taken as a preterite and is translated as a true past tense: the sages told and the ancestors did not deny. (18).

No 903

זֶה עָשָׂר פְּעָמִים תְּכַלֵּימוּנִי לֹא חַבְשָׁר תְּהַכְרִי לִי

"These ten times you have cast reproach upon me;
are you not ashamed to wrong me?" (19.3 RSV).

The content of Job's reply to Bildad may be analysed as follows: vv2-6 address to the friends in which Job protests against their persecution of him; vv7-12 and vv13-20 the reason of Job's downfall is developed as being brought about by God's direct hand; vv21-22 second address to the friends calling on them to stop persecuting him; vv23-27 the reason that they should do so is that Job is innocent and one day will be declared so; vv28-29 third address to the friends giving a note of confidence as well as a final warning of the judgement to come that will give them what they deserve.

From this analysis it will be noted that 19.3 occurs in the section where Job addresses the friends and in which he protests against their persecution of him. He does so in the first hemistich by asserting that these ten times they have insulted him. In this verse the phrase עָשָׂר פְּעָמִים 'ten times' is best taken as indicative of a round number as with most of the commentators. The action of the friends in so doing is denoted by the imperfect תְּכַלֵּימוּנִי 'humiliate, insult' which is best understood as another example of the preterite since the action is quite clearly past as may be understood from the context.

No 918

אָרַחַי גַּדְרִי וְלֹא אֶעְבֹּר וְעַל נַתִּיבוֹתַי חֹשֶׁךְ יִשָּׂא

"He has walled up my way, so that I cannot pass,
and he has set darkness upon my paths." (19.8 RSV).

The context to the example in 19.8 is exactly the same as that of the former example with the exception that 19.8 occurs in the section where Job demonstrates that his downfall has been brought about by God's hand. In vv7-12 this theme is developed by a series of assault images: the hapless citizen set upon by thugs (v7); the traveller who finds his pathway blocked (v8); the prince who is humiliated by an alien lord (v9); the plant that is pulled out of the ground (v10); the warrior compelled into single-handed combat (v11); the king or city surrounded by hosts of besieging enemies (v12). All these images are in fact an expansion of what Job says in 19.6. The image which v8 yields is that of the traveller who finds his pathway blocked. Since no-one would build a wall across a path this particular act may be understood as a deliberate act of frustration of Job's intentions. His path is his normal course of life which is hindered from developing. The initial action of blockage is expressed by the perfect גַּדַּר 'walled up' and the consequence to this action is indicated by the phrase אֶעְבֹּר וְלֹא 'so that I cannot pass' which in reality belongs to the same class as that treated in chapter 4, namely, the imperfect conjunctive; the only difference being

that the ך is separated by the negative ׁל. The action expressed by the perfect ךך is paralleled by the imperfect ך׳׳ 'set' of the second hemistich. ך׳׳ may best be understood as being indicative of the past tense and so may be considered to be a preterite conveying the nuance of a true aorist. The only caveat that can be made against such an interpretation is that both tenses are frequently used in parallelism to denote only one kind of action. Thus understood they are used identically from a syntactical point of view. However, it can also be argued that when the sequence perfect-imperfect is used in such a way to express past action as in the example in 19.8, the poet makes use of the the preterite ך׳׳ which in parallelism becomes syntactically equivalent to the perfect ךך. Thus ך׳׳ is best taken as yet another example of the ancient preterite.

The same kind of interpretation can also be applied to No 933 (תחשבוני) 19. 15.

No 1727

הן הוחלתי לדבריכם אזין עד תבונתיכם עד תחקרון מלין

"Behold, I waited for your words,
I listened for your wise sayings,
while you searched out what to say." (32.11 RSV).

The example in 32.11 is contained within the Elihu speeches (Ch's 32-37), but for textual and introductory matters relating to this section of the book of Job see remarks relating to this section in chapter 3. In these speeches, which may conveniently be divided into three parts, Elihu first of all explains to the three friends and to Job and to himself why or how he is going to intervene 32.6-33.7; he secondly cites or summarizes the words of Job three times, having done so he refutes the claim made by Job that he is righteous and does not deserve the sufferings inflicted on him by God 33.8-35.16; and thirdly he presents independently his own view of the greatness of God, of his creative activity, and of his government of men 36.1-37.24.

From this analysis it will be seen that the first example comes from the section where Elihu explains why or how he is going to intervene. He explains in 32.11 that he had kept silent out of conventional respect for the old men. He is now about to speak because having listened to their words there was not one of them who had succeeded in confuting Job. It is for this reason that he now speaks. The fact that Elihu has waited for the old men to speak is indicated by the perfect 'הוֹחֵלֵת 'wait' and the consequence of Elihu waiting is expressed by the imperfect שָׁמַע 'listen' which is best read as שָׁמַע cf GKC §681. The imperfect שָׁמַע is best taken as a preterite denoting Elihu's action of listening in the past. This form is followed by another imperfect שָׁחַט 'search out' which is also best taken as another example of the preterite. This interpretation of

the verbal forms in 32.11 is based upon the fact that the initial perfect is translated as a true perfect denoting action in the past tense. This means that the imperfect ׀א׀ן which follows the perfect must also be taken as a true aorist since the same subject is involved. For the sake of consistency it seems best to take the final imperfect ׀ן׀ק׀ן in this way also since it expresses what the old men did during the time that Elihu waited and listened. In his interpretation of the verbal forms, Dhorme however, translates the first two forms as past tenses and the final one as a true imperfect, expressing continuous action in the past. (19). There does not seem to be a need to follow him here as the poet was surely consistent in his reference to the past and consistent in the use of the tenses in 32.11 to denote such action.

No 1891

להביא עליו צעקה דל וצעקה עניים ישמע

"So that they caused the cry of the poor to come to him,
and he heard the cry of the afflicted". (34.28 RSV).

Chapters 33 & 34 of this speech are concerned with refuting the errors of Job. In chapter 34 Elihu turns his attention to Job's first complaint, namely, that Job is innocent and that God is unjust in his dealings with him. Thus chapter 34 really asserts that God is just in his dealings with men and Job in particular. In vv21-25 of

this chapter he asserts that because God knows all things he is able to chastise those who have become estranged from him without any investigation. This is followed in vv27-28 which are a causal clause in which Elihu gives the reasons as to why such judgement is executed by God. The reason for the judgement of God is thus defined as being that men have not followed God's ways and because of this they have by their unethical behaviour oppressed the poor so that they have cried to God for deliverance. This is expressed in the first hemistich of 34.28 by means of the infinitive construct לִהְיוֹת 'cause to come'. The result of the cry of the afflicted ascending into God's presence is indicated by the imperfect שָׁמַע 'hear' of the second hemistich. As with the previous example it is best to take the basis for a correct understanding of שָׁמַע from the previous verbal form, in this case the infinitive construct לִהְיוֹת which in itself is dependant upon the perfect סָרַח of v27. Since such is the case, the form שָׁמַע is best taken as being another example of the true aorist or preterite which denotes a past tense.

No 2120

הִבֵּאתְךָ אֶל אֲצִוּוֹת שֶׁלֵּג וְאֲצִוּוֹת בָּרֶךְ תִּרְאֶה

"Have you entered the storehouses of snow,
or have you seen the storehouses of hail?" (38.22 RSV).

The final example of the narrational imperfect is taken from the beginning of the divine speeches (chs 38-41) and is the only example in that body of literature. For matters concerning general introduction to these speeches see the remarks in chapter 3. Chapter 38 consists for the most part of questions which are designed to bring out the immensity of Job's ignorance and the greatness of God's knowledge and his beneficent use of it. The questions in 38.4-38 refer to the inanimate world, its creation and maintenance. Thus from this particular analysis Job is now asked about his knowledge of God's arsenal of snow and hail. The creation of these is not described here but the text supposes that God has them stored away in His treasuries, ready for use in time of war (cf Jos 10.11; 1 Sa 7.10). Thus יהוה asks Job if he has ever inspected these. This is expressed in the first hemistich by the perfect בא 'entered' which is paralleled in the second hemistich by the imperfect תראה 'seen'. The tense of the imperfect תראה is, as with the previous 2 examples, best derived from the perfect בא. Here the reference is clearly to the past and so it is best to consider the imperfect in a preterite sense conveying the nuance of a past tense. This verse is another example of how different tenses can be used in the same verse to convey an identical time period and so may be considered to be syntactically equivalent. When the imperfect is used as above to denote a true past tense, it is best to consider such to be examples of the ancient preterite which is regular in Ugaritic poetry and in the poetry of the Pentateuch.

(B) The Imperfect in the Expression of Prayer

Under this heading the imperfect is examined as being essentially the tense of prayer. But before proceeding to examine how the imperfect may be used in expressions of prayer it seems best to present suitable evidence to justify this assertion. There are a great many prayers recorded in the Hebrew Bible and one which seems to be appropriate to start with is that of Hezekiah located in 2 Kings 19.15-19. This prayer is the response of Hezekiah to the threatened invasion of Sennacherib, King of Assyria. It is noteworthy that all the petitions in this prayer are expressed by the imperative and not by the imperfect. They are as follows:

הִטָּה "incline"; שָׁמַע "hear"; פָּתַח "open"; רָאָה "see"; שָׁמַע "hear"; & הוֹשִׁיעֵנוּ "save".

Yet it should be noted that such is not always the case. A prayer which illustrates this point is the confession of David recorded in Ps 51. The initial petitions of this Psalm are expressed by the imperative as in the above example in 2 Kings 19.15-19. These are as follows:

חַנּוּנֵי "Have mercy"; מַחֵה "blot out"; נִבְטַנִּי "wash"; טַהַרנִי "cleanse".

However, it should be noted that the petitions of v9 are expressed by the imperfect and are as follows:

יִצְחָק "purge"; & יִבְשֹׁשׁ "wash".

What is of interest in the latter example is that the imperfect of the verb בָּשַׁח is used in v9 with the exact same meaning as the imperative of that verb has in v4. Their use is syntactically identical.

There are many examples of this use of the imperfect in the book of Psalms as Michel has noted in his study. (20). Because of the fact that the form of the jussive and that of the imperfect are in many cases identical (except for the hiphil), it seems best to group all the forms under the heading of the imperfect. Enough has now been said to show that the imperfect can be classed as the tense of prayer along with that of the imperative. None of this should surprise the grammarian, it is part and parcel of the nature of the jussive to be used in this way. This was noted by S.R. Driver

"50. In the same way the jussive assumes different shades of meaning, varying with situation or authority of the speaker: it is found----

(γ) To express an entreaty or request, a prayer or wish, and in particular blessings or imprecations----

Gen 9.27; 31.49 Yahweh יִצְחָק watch between me and thee! 44.33
אֲנִי יִבְשֹׁשׁ let thy servant remain, I pray. 45.5; Ex 5.21; Nu 12.12;
Deut 28.8; 1 Sa 1.23; 24.16; 1 Ki 10.9; 20.32; Ps 7.6; 27.9;
35.6; 69.26; 80.18; 109.12-15; 2 Chr 14.10." (21).

Since the case for the jussive to be recognised as the tense of prayer

is now established, it is now time to examine some examples of this construction in the book of Job. But what passages within the book of Job may be considered as prayers, petitions or wishes?

This question may be answered by adopting the definitions of Westermann who has worked through the book of Job in form-critical terms. (22). Westermann arranges the petitions and wishes encountered in the speeches of Job into four groups:

- (1). The wish to die (3.11-13, 21-22; 6.8-10; 7.15; an echo of this wish occurs in 10.18b-19).

- (2). The wish that God would leave Job alone
 - a) so that Job might be able to breathe freely (7.16b; 10.20b) or so that mankind might be able to breathe freely (14.6, 13-15).

 - b) so that Job might be able to address God (9.34-35; 13.21-22 [and hear God's answer]).

- (3). The wish that Job's cause might be heard and that he might find an advocate despite his death (13.5; 16.18-22; 17.3; 19.23-24).

- (4). The wish to encounter God (23.3-12; 31.35-37 [the summoning of God]). (23).

From the above list it will be noted that the last category which Westermann has detailed is outwith the remit of this study and accordingly \$4 will be laid to one side. It also has to be noted that in \$1 he has included 3. 11-13, 21-22 which it seems better to leave until \$D.

No's 182-192

מי יחן חבוא שאלתי ותקותי יחן אלוה
ויאל אלוה וידכאני יחר ידו ויבצעני
ותהי עור נחמתי ואסלדה בחילה לא יחמול
כי לא כחדתי אמרי קדוש

"O that I might have my request,
and that God would grant my desire;
that it would please God to crush me,
that he would let loose his hand and cut me off!
This would be my consolation;
I would even exult in pain unsparing;
for I have not denied the words of the Holy One." (6. 8-10 RSV).

These examples are to be found in Job's reply to Eliphaz. The first part (vv2-13) of which may be considered to be a monologue, in which Job speaks neither to the friends or to God who is spoken of in the third person. In this monologue Job insists that his words are fully justified (vv2-7), and expresses the wish that he would die (vv8-10).

Thus the prayer under immediate consideration is to be found in the expression of the wish by Job that he should die. At the outset it is worth noting that the examples of the imperfect conjunctives:

וַיֵּאָלֵם, וַיִּדְכָּא, וַיִּבְצַע, וַיִּחַה, וַאֲסַלְדָּה

have already been dealt with in Ch 4. (24). Thus the imperfects/jussives with which this examination is concerned are:

מִי יִתֵּן, תִּבְנֶה, יִתֵּן, יִתֵּן.

The prayer proper may be said to have begun with the optative formula יִתֵּן מִי 'who will grant' which as Dhorme has noted also occurs in 13.5; 14.13 & 19.23 and in these texts the formula is similarly followed by the imperfect although in 19.23 the imperfect which follows is preceded by a ך. (25). In v8 the optative formula יִתֵּן מִי is followed by the imperfect תִּבְנֶה which is here used with an abstract subject in the sense of 'come to pass' or 'be realised'. The force of the optative formula is then passed on to the imperfect תִּבְנֶה and so produces the rendering:

"O that I might have my request".

The force of the optative is then continued into the second hemistich by means of the ך which is attached to תִּקְוֶה and so the imperfect יִתֵּן also has the force of the optative and is rendered: "that God would

"Oh that thou wouldest hide me in Sheol,
that thou wouldest conceal me until thy wrath is past,
that thou wouldest appoint me a set time, and remember me!
If a man die, shall he live again?
all the days of my service I would wait,
till my release should come.
Thou wouldest call, and I would answer thee;
thou wouldest long for the work of thy hands." (14. 13-15 RSV).

In 14. 1-6 Job treated the theme of the brevity of human life and the hopelessness of mankind in general. In this section, which consists of vv13-17, he wishes that God would make Sheol, not a land of no remembrance to which in his anger he sends men forever, but an asylum while his wrath is abroad. For if such were true then he would have the privilege of fellowship with God renewed. In 14. 13 Job gives vent to such feelings of hopelessness.

The prayer or wish proper is begun by the optative formula יִן' יִן as in the previous example. Dhorme has noted that the optative formula here may be referred to as the interrogative of desire and is followed by the imperfect as in 6. 8; 13. 5. (26). As in the previous example the optative formula gives the force of "Oh that thou wouldest" to the prayer or wish in 14. 13. This is then followed by the imperfect יִתְּחַן 'hide' which is co-ordinate to יִן' יִן and thus continues its force. The thought is continued in the second hemistich by means of the imperfect יִתְּחַן 'conceal' which is also co-ordinate to the

optative formula and may be said to continue its force. The force of the wish is continued in the third hemistich by means of the imperfect $\eta' \eta$ 'set' and thus understood this form may be also said to be co-ordinate to the optative formula. The consequence to such a wish being granted is then denoted by the imperfect conjunctive as has been noted in Ch4. (27). From this grammatical analysis of the text it may be observed that the wish proper has been begun by the optative formula $\eta \eta' \eta$ which is followed by a string of imperfects. This observation in itself gives credence to the supposition that the imperfect is the tense that the poets use to express prayer and this deduction may be verified by a detailed analysis of the book of Psalms which naturally falls outside the remit of this work. The same kind of interpretation can also be applied to No 472 ($\eta' \eta$) 10.20b.

No's 417-420

יִסֵּר מֵעַלַי שִׁבְטוֹ וְאַמְחוֹר אֶל תִּבְעַתְנִי
 אֲדַבְרָה וְלֹא אִירָאֵנוּ כִּי לֹא כֵן אֲנֹכִי עֲמֹדִי

"Let him take his rod away from me,
 and let not dread of him terrify me.
 Then I would speak without fear of him,
 for I am not so in myself." (9.34-35 RSV).

The theme developed in Ch9 is that of Job's powerlessness before God

and the fact that he is trapped in his own private hell. In developing this theme of powerlessness before God, Job also expresses the need for vindication, and in 9.32-35 he sees the only possibility of obtaining such vindication is by means of a legal disputation. If only God would take away the awe inspiring fear then Job will be able to engage in such a dispute. The prayer which Job has uttered is one which if answered will allow him to freely engage in the dispute. The prayer proper is begun in the first hemistich by means of the jussive יסך 'remove', the subject of this verb is either God (as in RSV), or the mediator which produces the rendering: "who would remove (God's) rod". (28). On balance it seems best to retain the translation of RSV & NEB since what is to be removed is God's rod and only God can remove this. The prayer is continued in the second hemistich by means of the construction אל תבועתני 'let it not terrify me'. The jussive is again used in the second hemistich although it is negated by אל which is customary with the jussive. In this example the prayer has been expressed by the jussive alone without any optative formula which in reality is not required due to the nature of the jussive.

No's 825-831

ארץ אל חכמי דמי ואל יהי מקום לזעקתי
 גם עתה הנה בשמים עדי ושהדי במרומים
 מליצי רעי אל אלה דלפה עיני
 ויוכח לגבר עם אלה ובן אדם לרעהו

כִּי שָׁנוּחַ מִסֵּפֶר יֵאָחֵז וְאֵרַח לֹא אֲשׁוּב אֲהַלֵךְ

"O earth, cover not my blood,
and let my cry find no resting place.
Even now, behold, my witness is in heaven,
and he that vouches for me is on high.
My friends scorn me;
my eye pours out tears to God,
that he would maintain the right of a man with God,
like that of a man with his neighbour.
For when a few years have come
I shall go the way whence I shall not return." (16. 18-22 RSV).

The examples in 16. 18-22 are to be found in the third part of Job's speech where he envisages the possibilities of vindication. In considering such possibilities Job appeals for blood vengeance to be wreaked upon God by a heavenly vindicator. He expresses his faith in the heavenly vindicator in v19, but v20 seems to turn from that thought comforting as it must have been to the present reality that his friends mock him and this in turn causes him to pour out his tears before God.

As in the previous example the prayer proper is begun in the first hemistich with the jussive 'כַּסֵּה' 'cover' which has been negated by the particle לֹא as might be expected. The use of the jussive here forms part of Job's plea for vengeance. This is continued in the second

hemistich by means of the jussive 'ה' 'let it be' which like the previous verb has also been negated by the particle לא. The ו prior to the particle may be taken to imply that the second verb 'ה' is coordinate to the first וְהָיָה. Thus the prayer has been expressed in this example by the jussive alone and justifies the thesis that the jussive is the tense of prayer. Vv19-22 are taken up with demonstrating the reasons for Job's plea. The examples in 13.5 & 19.23 are to be understood on the basis of what has already been said in this subsection.

(C) The Imperfect in the Expression of Praise

As with the previous subsection it seems best to adopt Westermann's form critical analysis of the praise sections of the book of Job. (29). The following passages are identified by Westermann as containing the praise of God: (a) in the speeches of Job: 7.12; 9.4-13; 10.8-12; 12.10-25; (b) in the speeches of the friends: 5.9-18; 11.7-11. Westermann notes that in the Psalms the descriptive praise of God consistently orients itself around two foci: praise of God in his majesty and praise of God in his mercy. (30). He further notes however, that only the praise of God in his majesty shows up in the dialogue sections of the book of Job and as in the Psalms, this focal point is developed along two fronts: the majesty of God is revealed in nature (praise of God the creator), and it is also shown in the course of history (praise of the lord of history). (31).

It is however, necessary to make a further distinction between those passages which are strictly speaking hymns of praise and those passages in which praise motifs appear. An example of the latter in the speeches of Job is 7.12 and in the speeches of the friends 11.7-11. The hymns of praise which are thus due for consideration are in the speeches of Job: 9.4-13; 10.8-12; 12.10-25; and in the speeches of the friends: 5.9-18.

No's 342-366

חכם לבב ואמץ כח מי הקשה אליו וישלם
המצתיק הרים ולא ידעו אשר הפכם באפו
המרגיז אוץ ממקומה ועמודיה יתפלצון
האמר לחרץ ולא יורח ובער כוכבים יחתם
נטה שמים לבדו ודורך על במתי ים
עשה עש כסיל וכימה וחדרי תמן
עשה גדלות עד אין חקר ונפלאות עד אין מספר
הן יעבר עלי ולא אראה ויחלף ולא אבין לו
הן יחתף מי ישיבנו מי יאמר אליו מה תעשה
אלוה לא ישיב אפו תחתו שחחו עזרי רהב

"He is wise in heart, and mighty in strength

--who has hardened himself against him, and succeeded?--

He who removes mountains, and they do not know it,

when he overturns them in his anger;

who shakes the earth out of its place,

and its pillars tremble;
who commands the sun, and it does not rise;
who seals up the stars;
who alone stretched out the heavens,
and trampled the waves of the sea;
who made the Bear and the Orion,
the Pleiades and the chambers of the south;
who does great things beyond understanding,
and marvellous things without number.
Lo, he passes me by, and I see him not;
he moves on, But I do not perceive him.
Behold, he snatches away; who can hinder him?
Who will say to him, 'What doest thou'?
God will not turn back his anger;
beneath him bowed the helpers of Rahab." (9. 4-13 RSV).

The theme developed in this speech which consists of Job's reply to Bildad is that of Job's powerlessness before God and the fact that he is trapped in his own private hell. In developing this theme Job also expresses the need for vindication, a need he sees as being fairly hopeless. As he begins to express such a need in v4, he also affirms the attributes of God in a hymn of praise. In vv5-10 the poet uses the article with the participle and the participle alone to describe the works of God which is regarded by Clines as the obvious grammatical marker of hymnic style. (32). In Ch3 reference was made to the fact that when the

poet wants to praise the acts of God he more often than not uses the participle to do so. (33). An exception to this use is the hymn of praise in 10.8-12 and this will be commented upon later in this work. In the hymn now under consideration it should be noted that the participle is used to describe the works of God in vv5-10 and in one instance only the participle is used in parallelism with the imperfect to describe the works of God. The instance which is referred to is No 351 where the imperfect יִחַתֵּם 'seal up' is in parallelism to the participle הֶאֱמַר 'command'. In a further two instances the imperfect is used to indicate what is the consequence of the works of God which have been expressed by the participle. The instances which are referred to are No 348 יִתְפַּלְצוּן 'tremble' and No 350 יִזְרַח 'shine'. In both of these examples the imperfect denotes that in v6 the consequence of the earth being shaken out of its place is that its pillars tremble; and that the consequence of the sun being commanded by God is that it does not shine. A similar explanation may be applied to the hymn of praise in 12.16-25. In this latter example the participle and the imperfect are used in alternate stichs to describe the acts of God together with four examples of the imperfect consecutive in vv22-24.

No's 438-460

יֵדִיךָ עֲצוּבוֹנִי וַיִּעֲשׂוּנִי יַחַד סִבִּיב וַתְּבֹלַעֲנִי
 זָכַר נָא כִּי כַחֲמַר עֲשִׂיתָנִי וְאֵל עֶפְרַיִם תִּשְׁיִבֵנִי
 הֲלֹא כַחֲלֹב תַּחֲיִכֵנִי וְנִגְבַּנָּה חֲקֵפֵי אֲנִי

עור ובשר חלבישני ובעצמות וגידים תסננני
חיים וחסד עשית עמדי ופקדתך שמרה רוחי

"Thy hands fashioned and made me;
and now thou dost turn about to destroy me.
Remember that thou hast made me of clay;
and wilt thou turn me to dust again?
Didst thou not pour me out like milk
and curdle me like cheese?
Thou didst clothe me with skin and flesh,
and knit me together with bones and sinews.
Thou hast granted me life and steadfast love;
and thy care has preserved my spirit." (10.8-12 RSV).

The examples in 10.8-12 are located in Job's reply to Bildad where he expresses his feelings of powerlessness before God. In this the second major section of the speech, Job returns to the second person form of address, and throughout persistently addresses God. In vv8-17 he examines the contradiction between the apparent and hidden purpose of God in creating and sustaining himself. In this hymn of praise of the creative ability of God, unlike the other examples taken from the speeches of Job, the participle is not used at all. Instead in v8 the perfect is followed by the imperfect consecutive; in v9 the perfect is followed by the imperfect; in vv10-11 the imperfect is used throughout and in v12 the perfect is used in both hemistichs of the verse.

It should be further noted that the imperfects of vv10-11 (No's 445-448) have already been treated in this chapter in subsection A: The Narrational Imperfect, so there is no need to repeat what was said about them there. This only leaves the imperfect (No 444 תְּשִׁיבֵנִי) in v9 which the RSV has taken as an interrogative: "and wilt thou return me to dust again". But there is no necessity to do this and Clines has taken it as a true imperfect and translated it as a present.

(34). The poet's choice of the imperfect here may be due to the fact that he wished to emphasize what God was currently doing to Job, namely, that he was destroying the one he had created. In the first hemistich of this verse he has used the perfect עָשִׂיתָנִי to indicate God's creative activity, whereas in the second he has used the imperfect תְּשִׁיבֵנִי to denote God's negative work in returning Job to the dust. Thus the use of the tenses must be considered to denote the kind of work that God is carrying out, namely, positive and negative. It now seems appropriate to consider a hymn from one of Job's friends for the purposes of comparison.

No's 127-144

אולם אני אדרש אל אל ואל אלהים אשים דברתי
עשה גדלות ואין חקר נפלאות עד אין מספר
הנתן מסר על פני ארץ ושלח מים על פני חוצות
לשום שפלים למרום וקדרים שגבו ישע
מפר מחשבות ערומים ולא תעשינה ידיהם תושיה
לכד חכמים בערמם ועצת נפתלים נמהרה

יומם יפגשו חשך וכל ילה ימששו בצהרים
וישע מחרם מפיהם ומיד חוק אביון
ותהי לדל חקוה ועלתה קפצה פיה

"As for me, I would seek God,
and to God I would commit my cause;
who does great things and unsearchable,
marvellous things without number:
he gives rain upon the earth
and sends waters upon the fields;
he sets on high those who are lowly,
and those who mourn are lifted to safety.
He frustrates the devices of those who are crafty,
so that their hands achieve no success.
He takes the wise in their own craftiness;
and the schemes of the wily are brought to a quick end.
They meet with darkness in the day time,
and grope at noonday as in the night.
But he saves the fatherless from their mouth,
the needy from the hand of the mighty.
So the poor have hope,
and injustice shuts her mouth." (5.8-16 RSV).

These examples are to be found in the first speech of Eliphaz who makes his reply to the lament of Job as to why he was born. In 5.8-16 he presents a further discourse on God's contrasting dealings with

the righteous and with the wicked. This hymn, which primarily describes the acts of God, may have had its origin in cultic usage. As with the previous examples (9.4-13; 12.10-25), the acts of God are almost exclusively denoted by the use of the participle. Thus the hymn proper commences with the participle עֲשֶׂה in v9 and this force is continued by the participles הִנְחִין & לִשׁוּב in v10. In v11 the first hemistich is begun with the infinitive absolute לְשׁוּב which as Gordis has noted is translated by G with the participle ποιοῦντα . (35). Driver/Gray are influenced by the reading of G as well as by the fact that לְשׁוּב cannot possibly be regarded as the consequence of giving rain in v10 and so they propose to emend the MT to read עֲשֶׂה . (36). There is however, no requirement to do this as the infinitive absolute may be regarded as taking on the same tense as the finite verb preceding it in the passage (cf GKC 113.4a), in this case the participle. Since such is the case $\text{לְשׁוּב} = \text{עֲשֶׂה}$ and may be regarded simply as an alternate form for the sake of variety. In the second hemistich of v11 the poet has used the perfect שִׁבַּח 'lift'. The poet's choice of the perfect may have been influenced by the participle occurring immediately prior to it (קָרַיִם), or he may simply have used the perfect as an alternative form as he also did with the infinitive absolute.

In v12 the imperfect תִּעֲשֶׂינָהּ (No 137) is simply indicating what is the consequence of God's work, for if He frustrates the devices of the crafty the result must surely be that their hands achieve no success. This usage may be likened to No's 348 & 350 considered above. The

only two other examples of the imperfect which it is appropriate to deal with are No's 140 & 141 which are used in v14. In the previous verse Eliphaz has by means of the participles לָנָךְ and נִמְהָרָה given expression to the concept that God has taken the wise in their craftiness and quickly brought to an end the schemes of the wily. The consequence to this action of God is denoted by means of the imperfects יִפְּלֹא' and יִשְׁוּחֹ' which indicate that as a result of God frustrating them they meet with darkness in the daytime and grope at noonday as in the night. Thus from this analysis it may be seen that the imperfects used in this hymn of praise are very similar to the hymn in 9.4-13 already considered above.

(D) The Imperfect in the Expression of the Lament

As with the previous subsection it seems best to accept Westermann's form critical analysis of the book of Job. The following passages are identified by Westermann as containing the Lament:

6.4-20; 7.1-21; 9.17-31; 10.1-22; 13.20-14.22; 15.6-17.16; 19.7-20, 23, & 27. (37).

In addition the introductory lament of Ch3 and the concluding lament of Ch's 29-31 should be taken into consideration as well. This means in turn that the use of the lament must be defined as being the most prevalent formal element in the book of Job. But it should also be noted that Westermann would also divide the lament into 3 separate

categories: (a) The God Lament; (b) The Self Lament; (c) The Lament about Enemies. (38). This subdivision has the effect of making the speeches of Job more intelligible for it means that God, Job and the friends are each heard as a particular voice through one of the sub-categories of the lament in the dialogue section.

No's 5-25

יאבד יום אולד בו והלילה אמר הרה גבר
היום ההוא יהי חשך אל ידרשהו אלוה ממעל
ואל חופע עליה נהרה
יגאלהו חשך וצלמות חשכן עליו עננה יבעתהו כמרירי יום
הלילה ההוא יקחהו אפל אל יחד בימי שנה במספר ירחים אל יבא
יקבהו אררי יום העתידים ערו לויחן
יחשכו כוכבי נשפו יקו לאור ואין ואל יראה בעפעפי שחר
כי לא סגר דלתי בטני ויסתר עמל מעיני

"Let the day perish in which I was born,
and the night which said,
'A man-child is conceived.'
Let that day be darkness!
May God above not seek it,
nor light shine upon it.
Let gloom and deep darkness claim it.
Let clouds dwell upon it;
let the blackness of the day terrify it.

That night--let thick darkness seize it!
 let it not rejoice among the days of a year,
 let it not come into the number of months.
 Yea, let that night be barren;
 let no joyful cry be heard in it.
 Let those curse it who curse the day,
 who are skilled to rouse up Leviathan.
 Let the stars of its dawn be dark;
 let it hope for light, but have none,
 nor see the eyelids of the morning;
 because it did not shut the doors of my mother's womb,
 nor hide trouble from my eyes." (3.3-10 RSV).

These examples are to be found in Job's introductory poem which may be
 classes as a complaint (Klage). In form this may be further divided
 thus: vv3-10 the curse and vv11-26 the lament. In structure, this
 stanza is built upon the disjunction of 'day' and 'night', linked in
 v3, and then developed separately, the day in vv4-5, the night in
 vv6-9, with a pendant in v10. Day and night are to be denatured,
 day becoming dark as night, night to yield no pleasure and give place
 to no dawn. (39).

The curse or malediction is then begun in the first hemistich of v3 by
 means of the imperfect ׀לך' and is rendered as a volitional imperfect:
 "let the day perish." It would seem appropriate to consider :

אולד בו והלילה אמר הרה גבר

as an extended relative clause the purpose of which is to give the reason as to why this day should be cursed. When the relative clause is removed for the reason stated above, the curse is expressed by a chain of imperfects which all have a volitional nuance:

יאבד, יהי, ידרשהו, תופע, יגאלהו, תשנן, יבעתהו, יקחהו, יהד, יבא, יהי
תבא, יקבהו, יחשנו, יקו, יראה

The initial force of אבד is continued in the first hemistich of v4 by the jussive יהי 'let it be', the verbal force is continued in the second hemistich by the jussive ידרשהו 'may he not seek it' (negated by אל as is usual with the jussive), and the imperfect תופע 'let it not shine' continues the force of the initial imperfect in the third hemistich. The verbal thrust is continued in v5 by the imperfect יגאלהו 'let them claim it' which is here used with its normal meaning of 'claim, redeem'. The second hemistich continues the verbal force with the imperfect תשנן 'let them dwell' and this in turn is continued in the third hemistich by the imperfect יבעתהו 'let them terrify it'. The force of the initial imperfect is then continued into the first hemistich of v6 by the niphal imperfect יקחהו 'let -- seize it' and this is followed in the second hemistich by the imperfect יח 'let it not be counted' which with most commentators is best taken from יח 'be joined', a root which also occurs in parallelism with בוג in Gen 49.6. The third hemistich contains the jussive יבא 'let it not

come' and this verb has been negated as might be expected by לֹא. V7 is commenced by the jussive יִהְיֶה 'let it be' which can be said to renew the verbal thrust and is continued by the jussive אַל תֵּבֹא 'let it not come' which is also negated by לֹא. V8 is commenced by the imperfect יִקְנֶהוּ 'let those who curse it' which in itself is derived from קָנָה and is the sole imperfect in this verse. The imperfect יִהְשַׁכֵּנוּ 'let them be darkened' continues the verbal force into the first hemistich of v9 and this is followed by the jussive יִקְוֶה 'let it hope' and this in turn is followed by the longer form of the imperfect יִרְאֶה 'let it not see' which is here unusually negated by לֹא. There is no need to change יִרְאֶה into יִרְאֵה for as Dhorme has noted the imperfect is often used for the jussive in הִ'ל' verbs. (cf GKC 109a). (40). Thus the malediction or curse has been expressed by a chain of imperfects (some of which may be considered to be jussives) all of which express a sombre regret as to the day of Job's birth. Having then cursed the day of his birth in vv3-9, the malediction is rounded off by v10 which in substance is a motive clause. The motive stated by Job is that the day in question did not keep shut the doors of my mother's womb, nor did it hide trouble from my eyes. In the text this is indicated by the perfect שָׁטַח 'keep shut' the consequence of which is denoted by the imperfect consecutive יִסְתִּיר 'hide'. For full treatment of this latter form see remarks in Ch3 cf No 25. It is instructive in this context to compare the curse made by Jeremiah on the day of his birth. His curse is located in Jer Ch20.14-28. Apart from the fact that it is shorter by 3 verses, it only uses one jussive (יִהְיֶה v14) in the way that the

imperfects are used here. In Job 3.3ff the malediction is expressed by יָאָנֹךְ, whereas in Jer 20.14 the curse is expressed by the passive participle אָרוּךְ. The difference is not only due to style, it may also be due to the fact which Clines has noted, that in Job 3.3-10 we are strictly speaking not dealing with a true curse, but with the expression of a wish or malediction. (41).

No's 26-42

למה לא מרחם אמות מבטן יצאתי ואגוע
מדוע קדמוני ברכים ומה שדים כי אינק
כי עתה שנבתי ואשקוט ישנתי או ינוח לי
עם מלכים ויעצי ארץ הבנים חרבות למו
או עם שרים והב להם הממלאים בתייהם כסף
או כנפל סמון לא אהיה כעללים לא ראו אור
שם רשעים חדלו רגז ושם ינוחו יגיעי כח
יחד אסירים שאננו לא שמעו קול נגש
קסן וגדול שם הוא ועבד חפשי מאדוניו

"Why did I not die at birth,
come forth from the womb and expire?
Why did the knees receive me?
Or why the breasts that I should suck?
For then I should have lain down and been quiet;
I should have slept; then I should have been at rest,
with kings and counsellors of the earth

who rebuilt ruins for themselves,
 or with princes who had gold,
 who filled their houses with silver.
 Or why was I not as a hidden untimely birth,
 as infants that never see light.
 There the wicked cease from troubling,
 and there the weary are at rest.
 There the prisoners are at ease together;
 they hear not the voice of the taskmaster.
 The small and great are there,
 and the slave is free from his master." (3. 11-19 RSV).

These examples are to be found in the second part of Job's complaint which is his lament. The lament proper can be further broken down into two parts: vv11-19 & vv24-26 the self lament, and vv20-23 the God lament. Characteristic of the lament are the 'why' questions of vv11, 12, 16, & 20 and v23 where it is implied. The questions expressed in vv 11 & 20 are introduced by למה, while the question in v 12 is introduced by מן. V16 however, is introduced by ואלו which has made many commentators think that the verse has been misplaced and really needs to follow v12. What has to be remembered is that vv13-15 are an expression of a hypothetical situation which Job wishes had come about so that the ואלו of v16 is in reality picking up the מן of v12.

The only examples of the imperfect in this lament are: No 26 אמת;

No 30 אִינֶק; No 34 יָנוּחַ; No 37 אָהִיָּה; No 40 יִנּוּחוּ. It should be noted that No's 26 & 37 have already been treated under subsection A: The Narrational Imperfect and so are excluded from the present discussion. This then leaves no's 30; 34; & 40 for consideration here.

No 30

מָדוּעַ קָדְמוֹנִי בְּרַכְיִים וְמָה שָׂרִים כִּי אִינֶק

"Why did the knees receive me?

Or why the breasts that I should suck?" (3.12 RSV).

The questioning continues in v12 by means of מָדוּעַ which may be regarded as an alternate word to לָמָּה. The aim of the question is to the end that instead of the conditions of the sufferer's life being improved as is customary in the Old Testament, the life of Job should have been terminated after birth. In the first hemistich the perfect קָדְמוֹנִי 'receive' indicates that the knees of either his mother or his father had received him after he had been born. Clines notes the possibility that perhaps the mother's knees are being referred to since sitting on the mother's knees may be an alternative description of the child being fed, thus the point is easily made: Job wishes that he had not been nourished as an infant but left to perish. (42). This thought is confirmed in the parallelism of the second hemistich which has used the imperfect אִינֶק 'suck' in a purpose

clause to indicate that Job was nourished by being breast fed. Thus the use of the imperfect in 3.12 is that of an alternative tense to lament the fact that he was nourished and sustained as a child.

No 34

כִּי עַתָּה שָׁכַבְתִּי וְאֶשְׁקֹט יְשַׁנְתִּי אֲנִי נֹחַ לִי

"For then I should have lain down and been quiet;
I should have slept; then I should have been at rest," (3.13 RSV).

What Job's state in Sheol would now be if he had died at birth is now portrayed in vv13-15; the depiction of Sheol is continued further in vv17-19. Dhorme has noted that in the first hemistich the opening phrase כִּי עַתָּה 'for now' gives to the perfect שָׁכַבְתִּי 'lain down' the meaning of the conditional. (cf GKC 106p). (43). As is noted in Ch4 the consequence to this action denoted by the perfect is expressed by the imperfect conjunctive וְאֶשְׁקֹט 'been quiet'. (44). The second hemistich is then begun by the perfect יְשַׁנְתִּי 'sleep' which is in turn followed by the construction: אֲנִי נֹחַ לִי 'then it would be rest for me'. It has been noted in Ch4 where the imperfect conjunctive וְאֶשְׁקֹט was treated as No 32, that the construction אֲנִי נֹחַ לִי is virtually equivalent to a imperfect conjunctive form since אֲנִי often takes the place of וְ and as a result this latter construction certainly indicates what is the consequence of the perfect יְשַׁנְתִּי were such a condition to be realised. In 3.13 the imperfect אֲנִי נֹחַ לִי is used to

lament what would have been Job's condition had he died at birth.

No 40

שם רשעים חללו וגו' ושם ינוחו ג'ע' נח

"There the wicked cease from troubling,
and there the weary are at rest." (3.17 RSV).

What Job's state in Sheol would be if he had died at birth is now continued further in vv17-19. The picture that is presented here is not one which is normally associated with Sheol, for its usual connotation is that of a 'shadowy existence', while that which is proffered here is that of a place where all turmoil has ceased. This is indicated in the first hemistich by means of the perfect לן 'cease' which as Dhorme has noted is here used with the accusative instead of its intransitive use. (45). This thought is continued in the second hemistich by means of the imperfect ינוחו 'to be at rest' which may be regarded to be in parallelism with the perfect of the first hemistich. There is clearly no syntactic difference in the way that the perfect and the imperfect have been used here, they both refer to a present reality. Thus the imperfect has been used in 3.17 in conjunction with the perfect to lament a state which Job has not achieved.

למה יתן לעמל אור וחיים למרי נפש
המחכים למות ואיננו ויחפרהו ממסמונים
השמחים אלי גיל ישישו כי ימצאו קבר
לגבר אשר דרכו נסתרה ויסך אלוה בעדו
כי לפני לחמי אונחתי תבא ויתכרו כמים שאגותי
כי פחד פחדתי ויאתיני ואשר יגרחי יבא לי
לא שלותי ולא שקטתי ולא נחתי ויבא רגז

"Why is light given to him that is in misery,
and life to the bitter in soul,
who long for death, but it comes not,
and dig for it more than for hid treasures;
who rejoice exceedingly,
and are glad, when they find the grave?
Why is light given to a man whose way is hid,
whom God has hedged in?
For my sighing comes as my bread,
and my groanings are poured out like water.
For the thing that I fear comes upon me,
and what I dread befalls me.
I am not at ease, nor am I quiet;
I have no rest; but trouble comes." (3.20-26 RSV).

On the basis of the analysis given for the previous examples, the final section of Job's lament can be broken down further into the God lament vv20-23 and the final self lament vv24-26. The only examples of the imperfect in this lament are: No 43 יתן; No 47 ישיש; No 48 ימצאו; No 51 תנא; No 56 ינא.

No 43

למה יתן לעמל אור ורחיים למרי נפש

"Why is light given to him that is in misery,
and life to the bitter in soul," (3.20 RSV).

As has been noted above vv20-23 comprise what Westermann has called the God lament. (46). As in vv11, 12, & 23 the lament is begun with a question here introduced by למה, the purpose of which is to give voice to Job's complaint. Now the addressee of this complaint is the one who gives light to the troubled and life to the bitter in soul, namely, God himself. The imperfect יתן 'give' is here used as Clines has noted in an impersonal way, perhaps to avoid making any reference to the divine name. (47). Thus the imperfect יתן has been used here with God as the implied subject to lament the fact that God has given light and life to Job who here wishes that he could cease to live.

No's 47 & 48

השמחים אלי גיל ישישׁוּ נִי ימצאוּ קבר

"Who rejoice exceedingly,

and are glad, when they find the grave"? (3.22 RSV).

As with the previous occurrence of the imperfect, the examples in v22 are also to be found in what Westermann has called the God lament. The lament proper has been begun by the use of למה in v20 and it should be noted that vv21-23 are in reality an extended relative clause the purpose of which is to define the activity of those who are in bitterness of soul. Their activity may be described as a frantic search for death and is to be compared with those who dig for buried treasure. This concept is expressed in the first hemistich of the verse by means of the definite article ה which here acts as a relative pronoun plus the participle ׀׀׀׀׀׀ 'rejoice'. This construction is then intensified by use of the noun גיל and the first hemistich is best translated by use of the auxiliary verb 'would' since as Clines has noted the search for death is never fulfilled. (48). The force of the participle is continued into the second hemistich by means of the imperfect ישישׁוּ 'exult' which is here used in parallelism with the previous participle ׀׀׀׀׀׀. The hypothetical cause of such rejoicing is now noted in the remainder of the second hemistich. The cause is contained within a temporal clause which has been begun with the particle נִי 'when' and this is in itself followed by the imperfect

ימצא 'find' which as Clines has again noted is best taken as 'attain'
 rather than find. (49). Thus the use of the imperfects in this
 verse from the God lament are (a) ישיש' to parallel the force of the
 participle ימחש without indicating any kind of consequence or
 furtherance of action and (b) ימצא' to indicate what the cause of the
 rejoicing already indicated by the participle ימחש and imperfect
 ישיש' is. The use of the imperfects in v22 do not convey any special
 nuance of lament, but are used to describe the action of those whose
 lives are in bitterness of soul and whose lives are thus lamented by
 the construction יתן למה.

No 51

כי לפני לחמי אנוחתי תבוא ויתנו נמים שאגותי

"For my sighing comes as my bread,
 and my groanings are poured out like water." (3.24 RSV).

As noted above vv24-26 constitute a return to the self lament which as
 was already noted is also to be found in vv11-19. The self lament
 contained within vv24-26 constitutes a series of causal clauses which
 in themselves give the reason for the God lament of vv20-23. The
 reasons are thus spelt out by means of the particle 'כי' 'for' which
 occurs at the beginning of vv24 & 25. Clines has understood this
 verse to mean that Job's sighs and his groans have become his staple
 diet of food and drink and because such is the case his life is no

longer worth living. (50). Most of the commentators have understood 'פני' in the sense of 'like' in parallelism with 'פני' in the second hemistich and not in the usual sense of 'before'. It should be noted that it is a familiar image of the poet to depict one's tears as being one's food and as Westermann has noted it is a standard description of mourning. (51). In the first hemistich the term 'אנחתי' 'my sighing' could be indicative of both grief and physical suffering, although as used here the stress is on Job's mental and psychological anguish. The imperfect 'בא' 'come' is used to lament the fact that such is his state and must surely be translated by the present tense which may be said to give expression to his present state of mental turmoil. Thus the imperfect 'בא' is used in v24 to denote a state.

No 56

כי פחד פחדתי ויאתיני ואשר יגורתי יבא לי

"For the thing that I dread comes to me,
and what I dread befalls me." (3.25 RSV).

As noted above vv24-26 give expression once more to the self lament which was briefly interrupted by the God lament of vv 20-23. V25 may be said to parallel v24 since it also gives expression to the reasons for the God lament referred to above. The commentators, however, are divided as to whether this verse may be said to speak of Job's

past experience or a present reality. The balance of probability may be said to be in favour of considering this verse as a present state so that whatever fear he finds his imagination presenting himself with very soon turns into reality. This may be illustrated by Dhorme's translation:

"For if I fear a thing, it happens to me,
and what I apprehend befalls me." (52).

This explanation of this verse, however, is somewhat lacking since it does not make use of the more natural connection which this verse has to v24. With Clines the verse is better taken as expressing the reason for the sighing of v24. (53). Rather than taking this sentence as a hypothetical sentence as with Driver, Dhorme, it is better to take this sentence as a narrative clause which gives the reason for the sighing of v24 as with Gordis, Clines. (54). This understanding of the verse also has the advantage of giving clarity in the way the poet has used the tenses. The first hemistich has been begun with the perfect פָּחַדְתִּי 'fear' which may be regarded as a stative, the consequence to that action is then denoted by the imperfect consecutive וַיָּבֹאֵנִי 'come'; the second hemistich has also been begun with a perfect יָרַחְתִּי 'dread' and this form may be taken to be parallel to פָּחַדְתִּי both in meaning and the nuance it conveys, the consequence to this action of being in dread is expressed by the simple imperfect וַיָּבֹא 'come' which here laments the fact that the very thing which Job has feared has also become his present experience.

הן אצעק חמס ולא אענה אשוע ואין משפט
ארחי גדר ולא אעבור ועל נתיבותי חשך ישים
כבודי מעלי הפשיט ויסר עטרת ראשי
יתצני סביב ואלך ויסע כעץ חקותי
ויחר עלי אפו ויחשבני לו כצרו
יחד יבאו גדודיו ויסלו עלי דרכם ויחנו סביב לאהלי
אחי מעלי הרחיק וידעי אך זרו ממני
חדלו קרובי ומידעי שכחוני
גרי בית ואמהתי לזר תחשבני נכרי הייתי בעיניהם
לעבדי קראתי ולא יענה במו פי אתחנן לו
רוחי זרה לאשתי וחנתי לבני בטני
גם עוילים מאסו בי אקומה וידברו בי
תעבוני כל מתי סודי וזה אהבתי נהפכו בי
בעורי ובבשרי דבקה עמצי ואתמלטה בעור שני

"Behold I cry out, 'Violence!' but I am not answered,
I call aloud, but there is no justice.
He has walled up my way, so that I cannot pass,
and he has set darkness upon my paths.
He has stripped from me my glory,
and taken the crown from my head.
He breaks me down on every side, and I am gone,
and my hope he has pulled up like a tree.
He has kindled his wrath against me,

and counts me as an adversary.
His troops come on together;
they have cast up siegeworks against me,
and encamp round about my tent.
He has put my brethren far from me,
and my acquaintances are wholly estranged from me.
My kinsfolk and close friends have failed me;
the guests in my house have forgotten me;
my maidservants count me as a stranger;
I have become an alien in their eyes.
I call to my servant, but he gives me no answer;
I must beseech him with my mouth.
I am repulsive to my wife,
loathsome to the sons of my own mother.
Even young children despise me;
when I rise they talk against me.
All my intimate friends abhor me,
and those whom I have loved have turned against me.
My bones cleave to my skin and to my flesh,
and I have escaped by the skin of my teeth. (19. 7-20 RSV).

The content of Job's reply to Bildad may be analysed as follows: vv2-6 address to the friends in which Job protests against their persecution of him; vv7-12 & vv13-20 the reason of Job's downfall is developed as being brought about by God's hand; vv21-22 second address to the friends calling on them to stop persecuting him; vv23-

27 the reason that they should do so is that Job is innocent and will one day be declared so; vv28-29 third address to the friends giving a note of confidence as a well as a final warning of judgement to come that will give them what they deserve.

Clines has noted that a substantial amount of the material in the speech has been derived from the lament. (55). In terms of type the enemy lament has been used in vv6-13a while the self lament is to be found in vv13b-20. In the former the speaker depicts his enemy God under a controlling metaphor of assault: the enemy misjudges him as wicked (6a), refuses to answer his cries for justice (7), blocks the path of his journey (8), humiliates him as an alien ruler does a prince (9), uproots him like a plant (10), engages him in single handed combat (11), besieges him like a city (6b, 12). In the latter, the lamenter portrays almost exclusively his abandonment by his friends and relatives, with many specific examples depicted realistically (13-18), and a summary line in conclusion (19), followed by a corporal metaphor expressing the psychic reality (20). The function of the lament is to grant an elaboration and explanation of the assertion "*God has put me in the wrong*" (v6a).

One of the difficulties in treating the laments in the speeches of Job in this way is that they are not laments in the strict sense of that word. This has already been observed by Westermann:

"The passages here enumerated are laments in a wider sense; included are elements of petition, wish, motivation, avowal of trust---in other words, every sort of speech that gets addressed to God. The lament in the strict sense, namely, that which corresponds to the real lament portion in the Psalms of Lamentation, is in itself segmented." (56).

It is necessary to bear the above remarks in mind as the lament in 19.7-20 is treated.

No's 913-915

הן אצעק חמס ולא אענה אשוע וא'ן משפס

"Behold, I cry out, 'Violence!' but I am not answered;
I call aloud, but there is no justice." (19.7 RSV).

The first verse of the lament is in fact a conditional sentence in which הן is best understood as 'if' and not as behold as in the above translation from the RSV. The understanding of הן as 'if' is also to be found in Jer 3.1 etc., and may be construed as an Aramaism. The force of the particle הן is to be understood as extending to the second hemistich. The protasis is begun in the first hemistich with the imperfect אצעק 'cry' as is customary in conditional sentences. From the context it should be noted that the cry, is in fact a cry for deliverance and contains the word חמס cf Hab 1.2. But Clines has noted that here as in 16.18 the cry is not a cry for deliverance but for vindication. (57). The problem being that God has not only

put him in the wrong, but that he has kept him in the wrong and has ignored Job's protest of 13.20-23. The apodosis is also expressed here by the imperfect אַעֲנֶה וְלֹא which may have been used here since the sentiment that is expressed is a negative one. The second hemistich is begun with the piel imperfect אֶשׁוּב 'shout' which may be understood to be in parallelism with קָצַעַ. With the second hemistich the metaphor has now moved from the street to that of the law court and the speaker now complains that despite his shout there comes no legal decision which means that as far as he is concerned there is no justice.

No's 914-916

אֲרָחִי וְגַר וְלֹא אֶעֱבֹר וְעַל נִתְיַבֹּתִי חֹשֶׁךְ יִשָּׂא

"He has walled up my way so, that I cannot pass,
and he has set darkness upon my paths." (19.8 RSV).

The enemy lament may be said to have been continued in this verse by the use of the metaphor of the traveller who finds his way blocked. Clines has interpreted this act as a deliberate work of frustration to Job's legitimate intentions since one does not normally build a wall across a path. (58). The path on which the traveller is journeying may be considered to be Job's normal course of life which יְהוָה has hindered from developing. This is indicated in the first hemistich by means of the perfect גָּרַר 'wall up' and the consequence to this

action is denoted by the construction אעבור ולא 'so that I cannot pass'. It has already been noted earlier in this chapter that this construction may be considered to be identical to that of the imperfect consecutive since it conveys the same nuance only in a negative sense. The final imperfect יִשָּׁא has already been treated in subsection A of this chapter.

No's 919-921

יִחַצְנִי סוּבִיב וְאֵלֶיךָ וְיִסַּע כַּעֲץ חֲקוּמָה י'

"He breaks me down on every side, and I am gone,
and my hope he has pulled up like a tree." (19.10 RSV).

As with the previous examples the enemy lament may be said to be continued by the use of two metaphors: (a) The building that is demolished & (b) The tree that is uprooted. Clines has noted that the verb חָצַן is used of (i) destroying a house (Isa 22.10), (ii) a city wall (Jer 39.8), and (iii) an altar (Judg 2.2). (59). In the verse under immediate consideration however, it is not a building or a city wall that is being pulled down but Job himself. The act of thus destroying Job is denoted by the imperfect יִחַצְנִי 'pull down' which is here used to lament the fact that Job's life has been destroyed. As previously noted the enemy is in fact God himself. The consequence to this act of demolition is then indicated by the imperfect consecutive וְאֵלֶיךָ, a form which has been already treated in

Ch3.

No' s 924-926

יָחַד יָבֹאוּ גִדּוּדֵי וְיִסְלּוּ עָלַי דְּרוֹנִים וְיִחַנּוּ סָבִיב לְאַהֲלִי

"His troops come on together;
they have cast up siegeworks against me,
and encamp round about my tent." (19.12 RSV).

The present verse may be said to contain the last example of the enemy lament which is the king or city surrounded by hosts of besieging enemies. Yet, as Clines has noted the object of attack is not a great city or majestic king but the lonely tent of Job. (60). The aim of such irony is to show and to underline the disproportion of God's treatment of Job. The advance of God's troops is here denoted by the imperfect יָגַן' 'come' which is here used by the poet to lament that which God has done to him and is doing to him. However, when the imperfect יָגַן' is translated there enters the very real question as to what English tense should be used to render it. Clines has concluded that because there are waw-consecutive forms present in vv10-12 what we have before us is the form of a narrative and so the verbs should all be rendered by the past tense. (61). While this proposal does have the advantage of giving to the whole of the enemy lament a universal time location, it has the disadvantage of not recognising that the waw-consecutive has a distinct use in poetry as

opposed to prose and it seems better to treat all the verbs individually and render accordingly. With the example of the imperfect ׀נא׀ under immediate consideration it is clear that it could be translated either as a past (preterite cf subsection A), or as a present. The same may be also said of the imperfect ׀תצ׀ in v10 treated above. Since a true preterite has already been recognised in ׀ש׀ of v8, it seems appropriate to extend such a nuance to ׀תצ׀ of v10 and also to ׀נא׀ of the present verse. This would have the added effect of producing a translation in which all the verbs could be rendered as past tenses and which would avoid the tendency of many of the English versions to veer between past and present within the same verse. It appears that the English versions have all attempted to differentiate between the use of the perfect, imperfect consecutive and the simple imperfect. The recognition that the simple imperfect may be a preterite has the effect of sorting a verbal jungle into a coherent rendering which also shows that the poet had a design in the way that he used the tenses of his language.

No's 931-932

ואמהתִּי לֹדֶךָ חֲשׁוֹבֹנִי נְנֹרִי הִיִּחִי בְעֵינֵיהֶם

"My maidservants count me as a stranger;

I have become an alien in their eyes." (19.15 RSV).

With this example in 19.15 the form of the speech has changed from the

enemy lament to that of the self lament as noted above. In this section of the speech Job laments the fact that he has been abandoned by his friends and family and portrays that abandonment realistically by giving specific examples. In the self lament the poet has used the perfect almost exclusively, the only exceptions being the simple imperfects חֲשׁוּבְנִי v15; $\text{וְלֹא יְעִנֵהוּ, וְלֹא אֶתְחַנֵּן}$ v16; אֶקְרָא v18 and the imperfect consecutive וְאֶתְחַלֵּט which is used in v20. It will be demonstrated in Chapter 7 that the perfect is normally the tense that is used in the expression of the lament, the only exceptions being the examples that are discussed in this chapter.

In vv13-20 Job surveys the whole circle of his acquaintance and notes the abandonment of himself by his kinsfolk (vv13-14), his domestic servants (vv15), his wife and brothers (v17), the children of the neighbourhood (v18) and his intimates (v19). With Clines it seems best to take the initial phrase of the MT: $\text{וְגַם גִּבּוֹרֵי תִיָּרָא}$ as part of v14, since to do otherwise would be to overload v15. (62). In this verse Job observes that even those who formerly owed their position in the household to him have now regarded him as a stranger. This is denoted by the imperfect חֲשׁוּבְנִי 'consider' which is here used to lament the attitude of his servant girls to him. The occurrence of the imperfect in v15 may be considered to be for the sake of variety since it is not used in a different way syntactically to the perfects which occur in the same lament. As such it may be appropriate to consider that חֲשׁוּבְנִי is also another example of the preterite which was noted to have existed in the enemy lament.

No' s 933-935

לְעַבְדִי קִרְאתִי וְלֹא יַעֲנֵה בְּמוֹ פִי אַחֲחַנֵּן לוֹ

"I call to my servant, but he gives me no answer;

I must beseech him with my mouth."

(19.16 RSV).

In this verse of the self lament Job now observes that even his own male servant no longer pays any respect to him and is neglectful of him so that he has to verbalize his every need. The poet has put servant לְעַבְדִי in the emphatic position to emphasize what is actually expressed in this verse. The normal relationship between a master and his servant is noted in Ps 123.2 "*as the eyes of servants look to the hand of their master*". The text in the Psalm indicates that servants are expected to look to the gesture of their master to translate their merest hint into action. Job 19.16 notes the normal order of that relationship has been reversed. But the role is not only reversed, for the imperfect אַחֲחַנֵּן indicates that Job has to beg his servant to do what he has right to demand of him. Thus the imperfect is here used to lament this particularly humbling situation of Job. Gordis has noted that the second hemistich may be understood as co-ordinate as with RSV or as sub-ordinate: "even though I beseech him with my mouth". (63).

No' s 938-940

גם עוֹלָיִים מֵאָסוּר בִּי אֶקוּמָה וַיְדַבְּרוּ בִּי

"Even young children despise me;
when I rise up they talk against me." (19.18 RSV).

In this final example from the self lament, Job now notes that the children עוֹלָיִים have turned their backs on him. As has already been noted in Ch 3, this involves understanding דָּבַר in the sense of 'turn ones back on' which is cognate with Arabic *dabara* 'be behind'. The commentators are unsure whether עוֹלָיִים means the urchins of the street or the children of Job's own household. What the verse does express is that Job has been rejected by those who are emotionally and closest to him. This is denoted in the first hemistich by means of the perfect מֵאָסוּר 'scorn' which is used with בִּי before the person scorn is shown. The second hemistich has been begun with the cohortative אֶקוּמָה 'rise up' which is used as the protasis to a conditional sentence with out the particle אִם. (cf GKC §159e). The English versions all translate this form as a temporal clause but it is best taken as an 'if' clause and the translation 'when' must be understood in the sense of 'if/when'. The consequence to the action of Job rising up is then indicated by the imperfect consecutive וַיְדַבְּרוּ. Thus the cohortative is used to underline the lamentable position in which Job has found himself.

(E) The Imperfect in the expression of Dispute

As with the previous subsection it seems best to accept Westermann's form-critical analysis of the book of Job. Westermann has noted that the following passages contain the disputation motif: (a) in the speeches of the friends : Eliphaz 1 4.2-19; 5.1-27; Bildad 1 8.2-22; Zophar 1 11.2-20; Eliphaz 2 15.2-3, 14-35; Bildad 2 18.2-21. (b) in the speeches of Job: 13.4-13; 16.2-5; 19.2-6, 21-22.

In his introductory remarks on the form of disputational speech in the book of Job, Westermann has noted that it is a matter of some difficulty to recognize all the forms of speech within the disputational speech, since there is no one definite form in this genre and it in fact includes all the forms which one can use in opposition to another. (64). Despite this immediate difficulty, Westermann notes two apparent forms which do occur in these disputational speeches, namely, the reproof and the accusation. (65).

It seems appropriate to deal with the first of these categories under the current subsection and the latter under the next subsection.

The Form of Reproof in the Disputational Speeches.

Westermann has noted that this form is first of all to be observed in the speeches of Eliphaz. (66).

הנסה דבר אליך חלאה ועצר במלין מי יוכל
הנה יסרת רבים וידיים רפות תחוק
כושל יקימון מליך וברכיים כרעות תאמץ
כי עזה חבוא אליך ותלא חגע עדיך ותבהל
הלא יראתך כסלתך תקותך ותם דרכיך

"If one ventures a word with you, will you not be offended?

Yet who can keep you from speaking?

Behold, you have instructed many,

and you have strengthened the weak hands.

Your words have upheld him who was stumbling,

and you have made firm the feeble knees.

But now it has come to you, and you are impatient;

it touches you, and you are dismayed.

Is not your fear of God your confidence,

and the integrity of your ways your hope? (4.2-6 RSV).

Chapter 4 constitutes the first reply to Job by Eliphaz the Temanite. His reply, like all those in the dialogue, does not follow any fixed form, but contains a great variety of form critical elements. Vv2-6 may be classed as a first conventional speech preface. This preface contains the first reproof of Job by Eliphaz. With the exception of the perfect יסרת 'instruct', the speech is entirely expressed by the imperfect tense and the imperfect consecutive.

No's 63-66

הנסה דבר אליך חלאה ועצר במלין מי יונל

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

Yet who can keep you from speaking?" (4.2 RSV).

The reproof by Eliphaz begins in a conciliatory manner by a rhetorical question which is designed to show Eliphaz's sensitivity to Job's present anguish. Eliphaz is in a difficulty: he is afraid of Job's ability to bear (לאה) a weight of words and arguments in addition to his grief; yet on the other hand, he is unable to (מי יונל) to sit and say nothing. Such a sensitivity is expressed in the first hemistich by means of הנסה 'venture' which the RSV in common with most of the English versions has taken as 3rd sg Piel perfect of נסה 'attempt, venture'. But it should be noted that such is not the only interpretation of the MT, for both Clines and Dhorme have taken נסה as an orthographic variant for נשן. (67). In his commentary Clines has noted that נסה is sometimes written for נשן (cf Ps 4.7); נשן can have as object "proverb" (Job 27.1) or Psalm (Ps 81.3), and Aq, Symm, Theod took the verb in this sense. (68). In this case it is to be parsed as 1st per. Pl impf of נשן. This interpretation of the MT greatly enhances the translation since it gives coherence to Eliphaz's opening words which otherwise seem to be obscure and remote.

The RSV has taken the opening interrogative particle ה as extending to the second verb of the first hemistich הלאה and this proposal yields the translation: "will you be offended?". Dhorme however considers that the verb הלאה contains a reply, in the form of an objection, to the opening question and his proposal is a sound one. (69). It is also better to take הלא as meaning 'bear' with Gordis rather than to be impatient as it is usually taken. (70). Thus, the first hemistich can now be rendered: "Are we to speak one word to you? You cannot bear it."

The meaning of the second hemistich is clearer if it is taken not as referring to Job (cf RSV), but as to Eliphaz and his friends. This latter suggestion produces the translation: "But who could refrain from speaking?" Thus it can be seen at once from the analysis of the opening verse of Eliphaz's reproof that the imperfect is very much the tense that is used to express disputation.

No's 67-68

הנה יסרת רבים וידיים רפות חזק

"Behold, you have instructed many,
and you have strengthened the weak hands." (4.3 RSV).

Having commenced in a conciliatory manner, Eliphaz now reminds Job of his former position in life as one who has instructed many. The

first hemistich of the verse has been begun by the demonstrative particle הנה 'behold' which Clines has rendered as 'think back'. (71). A more appropriate translation might be that of 'consider' and this is how Dhorme has understood it. (72). The particular act that Eliphaz wants to draw Job's attention to is his former position as an instructor. This is indicated in the first hemistich by means of the perfect יִסְרֶה 'instruct'. The exact meaning of the verb יִסַּר in the piel is 'to correct', whether by words, whence 'teach', or by chastisement, whence 'punish'. The double meaning of 'teach' and 'punish' is found in מוֹסֵר 'lesson', 'warning', but also 'punishment'. Dhorme has noted that the opening הנה leads to a series of observations expressed by a perfect of habit, and continued in a series of imperfects. (73). Davidson, however, has understood the perfect יִסְרֶה as a perfect of a finished course, while the following imperfects contain the analysis of the instruction and its breaking up into the customary, life long actions and habits of a man. (74). It is more appropriate to take the perfect as a stative describing what Job's past function was, while the imperfects are in reality preterites which describe the effect or consequence of his role as a teacher.

Thus understood the second hemistich provides the first consequence of his teaching role: He has strengthened the weak hands. This is denoted by the imperfect יִחַזְקֵם 'strengthen' which as has been noted above is yet another example of the ancient preterite already noted to exist in subsection A of this chapter. That this is the result of

his function as a teacher is made more explicit by v4: "Your words have upheld him who was stumbling". Thus the preterite קָחַח indicates what is the result of his teaching ministry.

No's 69-71

נוֹשֵׁל יִקְיִמֶן מְלִיךְ וּבְרִנִּים נִרְעוֹת חֲאֲמָץ

"Your words have upheld him who was stumbling,
and you have made firm the feeble knees." (4.4 RSV).

The description of the resultant effect of Job's function as a teacher is continued in this verse. This is indicated in the first hemistich by the imperfect יִקְיִמֶן 'uphold' which as has been noted above may be considered to be another example of the preterite. His words are said to have upheld the man who was stumbling נוֹשֵׁל. Dhorme has noted that the verb נוֹשֵׁל is used specifically of the knees which give way and so of the man who is about to fall. (75). The Targum here clarifies the meaning of נוֹשֵׁל and נִרְעוֹת as that of falling into sin and it may be that Job's teaching has prevented such taking place. This concept is repeated in the second hemistich of the verse which may be regarded as being in parallelism to the first. In the second hemistich the thought is expressed by the preterite חֲאֲמָץ 'make firm' which conveys the 'poetic aorist'.

נִי עָתָה חָבוּא אֶלֶיךָ וַחֲלָא חֲנוּעַ עֲרִיךָ וַחֲנוּהָל

"But now it has come to you, and you are impatient;

it touches you, and you are dismayed." (4.5 RSV).

In this verse the mood changes from that which Job has been to that which Job is now. He is one who is plagued with suffering and the suffering that he is plagued with is that which he has helped others to avoid. The change in temperament is expressed by the construction נִי עָתָה 'but now' which Davidson has regarded as a particle of antithesis. (76). The arrival of Job's suffering is denoted by the imperfect חָבוּא 'come' which is best regarded as a preterite. The consequence to the arrival of Job's suffering is expressed by the imperfect consecutive וַחֲלָא 'bear', a form which has already been dealt with in Ch 3. Since the second hemistich may be regarded as being in parallelism to the first, the imperfect חֲנוּעַ 'strike, touch' may also be regarded as a preterite and rendered: "it has struck you"; this interpretation of the MT has the effect of bringing a universal translation from the point of view of time reference and also gives coherence to the way that the tenses are translated. The RSV quoted above translates the first imperfect as a past tense but the second as a present! The consequence to the preterite חֲנוּעַ is indicated by the imperfect consecutive וַחֲנוּהָל 'terrify', a form which has also been dealt with in Ch 3.

Having considered an example of reproof from the first speech of Eliphaz, it seems appropriate to examine a further example from his second speech.

No's 710-714

החכם יענה דעת רוח וימלא קדים בסנן
הרוח בדבר לא יסכרן ומלים לא יועיל בם

"Should a wise man answer with windy knowledge,
and fill himself with the east wind?
Should he argue in unprofitable talk,
or in words with which he can do no good?" (15.2-3 RSV).

Eliphaz's speech may conveniently be divided into two parts: (a) vv1-16 contain the address to Job in which he states that Job has spoken hastily, haughtily, and arrogantly, and in so doing has adopted a stance that ill becomes his piety. Because of this he is in need of correction. (b) vv17-35 describe the wicked man and his fate, which indeed is for Job's instruction-the point being that Job is not such a man and therefore has good reason for confidence. From this analysis it can be seen that the above reproof is contained in the first section in which Eliphaz states that Job has spoken unwisely.

As always, Eliphaz has begun with a question (cf 4.1; 22.1), the question being from a formal point of view, the introduction to a disputation speech. The question is given force in the first hemistich of v2 by the interrogative particle ה. Job has boasted of his own wisdom and in his question Eliphaz has turned it into derision: "Does a wise man answer with windy knowledge?" This is expressed in the first hemistich by means of the imperfect ה'צנ 'answer' which is best translated as a present as with the RSV. His answer is defined as being ה'צנ 'windy knowledge' which Clines has defined as being that which is tempestuous and violent. (77). He arrives at such a conclusion on the basis of ה'צנ of the second hemistich which is the Sirocco or Khamsin and is the hot violent wind from the desert. Thus on the basis of this etymology he deduces that Job has spoken with passion, unbecoming in a sage. The second hemistich asserts that he has filled himself with such a wind and so he has become intemperate. This is expressed in the second hemistich by means of the imperfect conjunctive ה'מל 'fill' which is best regarded as being in parallelism to ה'צנ, the ה of the former construction being merely copulative. From this consideration it can be easily observed that in this verse the imperfect is the tense of reproof.

The questioning is continued in the first hemistich of v 3 where the interrogative particle of v 2 has to be understood. The first hemistich has been begun by the infinitive ה'נח and this form has been understood by Dhorme to play the

part of an explanatory adverb (cf GKC §113h). (78). Here the infinitive אָנַח has the meaning of 'argue'. What Eliphaz is apparently objecting to is that Job's words are unprofitable. This concept is expressed in the first hemistich by the imperfect אָנַח 'to be useful', a root which is peculiar to the book of Job (cf 22.2; 35.3). Clines has noted that Eliphaz may have regarded Job's words to be useless not because his words are directed against God, but because it is useless to argue with God. (79). Such uselessness is expressed in the second hemistich of v3 by means of the imperfect אָנַח 'profit' which has the same connotations as אָנַח. The root אָנַח is especially used by the Hebrew Bible to denote the uselessness of false gods. The relative אֲשֶׁר has to be understood before אָנַח אֲשֶׁר and אָנַח אֲשֶׁר. The third verse also renders the evidence that the imperfect is the tense that the poet has used to express the reproof.

(F) The Imperfect in the Expression of Accusation

In reality this is not a new subsection but an extension of the former one which dealt with the use of the imperfect in the disputational speeches. In that subsection it will be remembered that among many possible forms belonging to such speeches, Westermann had recognized two, namely, reproof and accusation. As reproof was dealt with under the former subsection it will now be appropriate to consider the accusation.

The Form of Accusation in the Disputational Speeches

As with the reproof, Westermann has noted that this latter form is first of all to be observed in the speeches of Eliphaz. (80). While the final form of the accusation is not to be observed until Ch 22 which lies outside the remit of this work, it is to be observed initially in Ch 15 where it refers only to the current utterances of Job and not to the earlier events of his life.

No's 715-720

אף אתה תפר יראה ותגרע שיחה לפני אל
כי יאלף עונך פיך ותבחר לשון ערומים
ירשיעך פיך ולא אני ושפתיך יענו בך

"But you are doing away with the fear of God,
and hindering meditation before God.

For your iniquity teaches your mouth,
and you choose the tongue of the crafty.

Your own mouth condemns you, and not I;
your own lips testify against you."

(15.4-6 RSV).

The context to the above speech has been defined in the previous subsection so there is no need to repeat it, save to say that the rhetorical questions which are contained in these verses, are in themselves the accusation.

The accusation is begun in the first hemistich of v 4 by the emphatic particle $\eta\lambda$ which as Dhorme has noted qualifies the whole clause.

(81). The emphasis continues with the personal pronoun $\eta\lambda\alpha$ 'you' which reinforces the action that Job is being accused of. The action in itself is indicated by the imperfect $\eta\lambda\alpha$ 'break, violate' from the root $\eta\lambda\alpha$. Now what Job is accused of by Eliphaz is that of having a wrong attitude to God. This is denoted by the object of $\eta\lambda\alpha$, namely, $\eta\lambda\alpha$ 'fear'. Most commentators have considered this word used by itself to be an abbreviation for the "fear of Yahweh" which is the principal part of wisdom (Prov 9.10). Clines, however, considers that when this word is used by itself what Eliphaz has in mind is specifically reverence for God and it is this that Job has violated by speaking in the way he has. (82). The second hemistich of v 4 may be considered to be parallel to the first. The consequence to Job's dreadful action is here expressed by the imperfect conjunctive $\eta\lambda\alpha$ 'diminish' which indicates what the outcome of Job speaking in the way that he has is, it is that he has dissuaded the pious from their meditation before God.

The first hemistich of v 5 is begun by the particle $\eta\lambda$ 'for, since', which indicates that the clause of v5 is subordinate to that in v 6. The sentiments thus expressed in v 5 naturally lead on to the final accusation of v 6: "Your own mouth condemns you and not I". The accusation is continued by the imperfect $\eta\lambda\alpha$ 'teach, instruct' but that which is taught is ambiguous in the text of the MT. There are two possible interpretations of the Hebrew text here, just as

there are two possible interpretations of a similar ambiguous statement in Jer 2.33. The two possibilities are : (a) "Your iniquity teaches your mouth" or (b) "your mouth teaches your iniquity". However, in the latter case the verb הִלֵּךְ would then have to mean 'reveal, evince' a meaning which the piel of this verb does not carry. A third possibility is also noted by Blommerde who translates the verb הִלֵּךְ as 'increase a thousandfold' a meaning which is to be found in Ps 144.13. He has taken הִלֵּךְ as a denominative verb from the noun הֵלֶךְ meaning 'thousand'. (83). This proposal has also been adopted by Andersen and so it remains a very real possibility since it also gives the speech organs--mouth, tongue and lips--as the subjects of four parallel clauses. (84). The second hemistich once again expresses the consequence to this action by means of the imperfect conjunctive וַיִּבְחַר 'choose' which means that as a result of allowing his mouth to increase his iniquity, he also adopted the language of the crafty--a stance he should not have permitted since it does not come naturally to him.

The accusation is continued in the first hemistich of v 6 which is closely allied to v 5. Eliphaz brings his accusation of Job to its height by using Job's own words against him. In 9.20 he had stated : 'רִשְׁעוֹנִי אֲצַדֵּק אֲנִי--"Though I am innocent, my own mouth would condemn me". In the first hemistich Eliphaz has used the same vocabulary that Job used and this is to be noted by his use of the imperfect יִרְשָׁע 'condemn' but Eliphaz has used it in a different way

to the way in which Job used it. Job used it to express an arbitrary condemnation since it occurred when he was righteous; but Eliphaz has used it as being the concrete result of words which have been inspired by iniquity. The thought is paralleled in the second hemistich of v 6 by means of the imperfect יִעֲנֶן 'testify' which as Dhorme has noted is used with אַ before the complement to indicate the person testified against and is part of juridical vocabulary. (85). The subject of the imperfect is שֵׁפֶתַי 'lips' which although feminine generally requires a verb in the masculine plural (cf GKC §145u). From this analysis of the accusation contained in 15.4-6 it can be seen that the imperfect is the tense which gives expression to this part of the disputational speech.

No's 728-731

מֵה יִקַּח לִבְךָ וּמֵה יִרְוּמוֹן עֵינֶיךָ
 כִּי תִשֵּׁב אֶל אֵל אֶל רוּחְךָ וְהִצַּאת מִפִּיךָ מִלִּין

"Why does your heart carry you away,
 and why do your eyes flash,
 that you turn your spirit against God,
 and let such words go out of your mouth?" (15.12-13 RSV).

The context to the accusation contained in these verses is exactly the same as the former passage which was dealt with above. The accusation is expressed in the first hemistich of v 12, initially by

the pronoun מָה which is here used in the sense of 'why'. Thus the accusation here is as elsewhere in the form of a question which is to be seen in the use of the imperfect תִּקַּח 'carry away'. As Dhorme has noted the verb קָלַח implies 'to be unhinged with passion', 'to be carried away by passion beyond the bounds of good sense' and so he translates: "Why is your heart enraged"? (86). Thus the imperfect states that Job is being carried away by the impulses of his heart. Blommerde, however, suggests that the suffix is dative, and so renders: "What has taken from you your mind"? (87). In so doing he has adopted the translation of Pope and he has also noted a similar phrase (קָלַח לְךָ) in Hos 4. 11-12; and Song of Songs 4. 9. While this is an attractive rendering it must be rejected as it means taking מָה as having the meaning 'what' in the first hemistich and 'why' in the second. The second hemistich may be regarded as being parallel to the first since it also commences with the pronoun מָה . This is followed by the imperfect יִרְמָזוּן 'flash'. The root רָמַז only occurs here in the Hebrew Bible and has no evident cognates. G here has ἐπὶ ἤνεγκαν which presupposes a Hebrew text which read יִרְמָזוּן 'are high, haughty' but this proposal is less likely and is probably more due to the Greek translator who had the same difficulty with the Hebrew text that we ourselves have. The root רָמַז is explained by Dhorme to correspond to the Aramaic root רָמַז and is simply a case of metathesis which has already been noted at his comment on 6. 17. (88). The root has been understood to convey this meaning by the Targ and Syr. The meaning of רָמַז in Aramaic, Syriac and Mishnaic Hebrew is to 'blink, wink' and may be considered to be equivalent to the Greek

διανεω or νεω. The meaning of the second hemistich is that Job's disordered impulses are also to be seen in his eyes in the sense that his eyes flash with anger. This is the Hebraic way of saying that the eyes are the mirror of the soul.

The first hemistich of v 13 is begun by the particle ׀ 'that, when' which indicates that v 13 is subordinate to v 12. The particle ׀ indicates that what is to follow is a resultant clause which gives the result of Job's eyes flashing with anger, it is that he turns his Spirit against God. The result is thus expressed by the imperfect ׀׀׀׀ 'turn' which indicates that he has turned his spirit against God. In fact what he has unleashed against God is not so much his spirit, but his anger and this is how G has interpreted the word ׀׀׀׀. That ׀׀׀׀ can be used in the sense of anger is made clear by such texts as Judg 8.3; Prov 16.32. The consequence to this state of Job's mind is then denoted by the second hemistich by means of the perfect consecutive ׀׀׀׀׀׀ 'proceed', a form which has been fully treated in Ch 6. The consequence is that he has allowed such speech to proceed from his mouth and has offended God. Thus once again it can be seen from this further example of the accusation from the second speech of Eliphaz that the imperfect is the tense which expresses this form of disputational speech.

In the current and former subsection the examples have been drawn exclusively from the speeches of Eliphaz. Before leaving this subsection of the accusation in the disputational speech it seems

appropriate to draw at least one example from the speeches of Job. Since the only extended disputational speech by Job does not occur until Ch 21, and therefore lies outside the remit of this study, the only other possibility that is open to this work is to deal with a shorter example which occurs in Ch 13.4-12. This latter speech is contained within the first division of Job's speech which is a wisdom disputation speech addressed to the friends. It should be noted that this speech contains both the forms of reproof and accusation.

No's 587-606

ואולם אחם ספלי שקר רפאי אלל כלנם
מי יתן החרש תחרישון ותהי לכם לחנמה
שמעו נא תוכחתי ורבות שפתי הקשיבו
הלא לדברו עולה ולו לדברו רמיה
הפניו תשאון אם לאל תריבון
הטוב כי יחקר אתכם אם כהתל באנוש תהתלו בו
הוכח יוכיח אתכם אם בסתר פנים תשאון
הלא שאתו תבעת אתכם ופחדו יפל עליכם
זכרניכם משלי אפר לגבי חמר גביכם

"As for you, you whitewash with lies;
worthless physicians are you all.
Oh that you would keep silent,
and it would be your wisdom!
Hear now my reasoning,

and listen to the pleadings of my lips.
Will you speak falsely for God,
and speak deceitfully for him?
Will you show partiality toward him,
will you plead the case for God?
Will it be well with you when he searches you out?
Or can you deceive him, as one deceives a man?
He will surely rebuke you
if in secret you show partiality.
Will not his majesty terrify you,
and the dread of him fall upon him.
Your maxims are proverbs of ashes,
your defences are defences of clay." (13.4-12 RSV).

Before Job will begin to address God, he has something to say to the friends who believe that they have already been addressing Job as on God's behalf. Job regards the friends as bearing false witness against him (accusing him of wrongdoing) on behalf of God, whose side they believe they have taken in this dispute. Job for his part, believes that God must disapprove of such behaviour and will surely punish them for their 'partiality' towards himself and their lack of objectivity.

His reproof of them may be said to have begun in v 4, but since that verse is composed of mainly nominal elements, our investigation will begin with v 5. The first hemistich is begun by the optative formula

יתן 'oh that', a construction which has already been dealt with in subsection B of this chapter. The optative formula is followed by the infinitive absolute שררה which in turn is followed by the imperfect תררה 'keep silence', a construction which is emphatic and yields the rendering: "Oh that you would certainly keep silence'. Dhorme has noted that the hiphil has not here its usual causative sense as in 11.5, but its normal meaning 'keep silence'. (89). The second hemistich is begun by the imperfect conjunctive ותרה, a form which has already been dealt with in Ch 4 and which denotes the consequence to the wish expressed by the first hemistich. The imperfect conjunctive ותרה while expressing the consequence to the wish, may also be said to continue the force of the optative formula יתן which would produce the literal rendering 'and that it may be wisdom to you'.

Job's reproof of the friends is continued in v 6 by means of an appeal which is expressed by the two imperatives שמעו & הקשיבו 'listen & be attentive', which as Dhorme has noted are in parallelism to each other as they are in 33.31a. (90). That to which Job wants the friends to listen is indicated by the two nouns תונחת 'my disputation' and רבות 'my arguments'. Clines has taken these two nouns to express not what Job is about to say to them directly (13.7-12)--that is parenthetical--but to that which he will say to God and about God (13.13-14.22). (91).

With verse 7 there is begun a series of questions which are

articulated by the interrogative particle ה. These are to be noted in vv 7-9 & 11. Gordis considers that the questioning is also present in v 10 and so translates: "Will he declare you in the right--?" which is based upon his contention that ה'נ'ן can be used 'declaratively'. His evidence for so saying is based upon his examination of 13.15; 19.5; Gen 24.14,44, but this proposal is to be rejected as it has a somewhat doubtful air to it. (92). This series of questions is begun in the first hemistich of v 7 by the interrogative particle ה and is followed by the imperfect י'נ'ן 'speak', a verb which occurs in both hemistichs of the verse. The point of this question is that are they aware that they are speaking lies on God's behalf? The implied conclusion to this question is that they have no further justification in speaking.

A further question is begun in the first hemistich of v 8, once again by means of the interrogative particle ה. The particle is joined to the noun י'נ'ן 'his face' which may be regarded as a surrogate for God and is in the emphatic position. The noun is followed by the imperfect י'נ'ן 'show partiality' which when used with the noun י'נ'ן means to show favour to one person to the detriment of others. Here it means to take sides with someone. The question is renewed in the second hemistich by means of the particle ה'נ'ן 'will you' which is immediately followed by the noun ה'נ'ן 'for God' which in turn is followed by the imperfect י'נ'ן 'plead someone's case'. By this question Job is indicating that the friends cannot have any partiality when it is a question of justice. They must now play the part of

unprejudiced witnesses who are committed to speaking the truth.

A third question is introduced in the first hemistich of v 9 by means of the interrogative particle ה. The formula הַטוֹן is immediately followed by the particle ךִּי which introduces the subordinate clause. The particle ךִּי is followed by the imperfect יִחַקֵּר 'search, examine' which indicates that Job's friends have exposed themselves to the searching scrutiny of the sovereign Judge by intervening and not remaining silent. The question is renewed in the second hemistich of the verse, once again by the particle אַ 'will you' as in v 8. This particle is followed by the construction : וְנִהְיֶה בְּאִנּוּשׁ תִּהְיֶה לּוֹ בּוֹ 'as one deceives a man, will you deceive him?' Dhorme has noted that נִהְיֶה (infinitive) and תִּהְיֶה (imperfect) are both derived from the root הָלַח which in the hiphil retains the ה as in Jer 9.4 יִהְיֶה לּוֹ (cf GKC §53q). (93). The question of the second hemistich is to reinforce the idea already expressed in the first hemistich that if they are examined by the sovereign Judge they will not be able in any way to deceive him.

As already noted there is no interrogative particle at the beginning of v 10 as there is in vv 7-9 & 11. The first hemistich has been begun by the infinitive absolute הַחֲנִיף which in its position prior to the imperfect has the effect of emphasizing the following imperfect. The imperfect יִחַיֵּב 'rebuke' follows and the first hemistich may be said to be in the form of a warning if the condition of the second hemistich is not observed. The second hemistich is begun by the particle אִם which has its normal meaning of 'if'. The location of the

action of the condition is denoted by the noun $\eta\eta\theta$ 'secretly' which Dhorme regards as suggesting a guilty action. (94). The second hemistich is concluded by the formula $\eta\eta\theta\eta \eta\eta\eta$ 'show partiality'. Thus the contents of v 10 may be regarded as a severe warning which Job has issued to his friends because of their accusation of him which he regards as being untrue.

V11 is commenced once again by the interrogative particle η . The first hemistich contains another surrogate for God in the form of the noun $\eta\eta\theta$ which is usually taken as the infinitive construct of $\theta\eta$ 'lift up', and this is reflected in the translations of the English versions: "excellency" (RV), "majesty" (RSV, NEB), & "Splendour" (NIV). Pope, however, suggests that the noun $\eta\eta\theta$ be revocalized to read 'his fear' and this has the added attraction of being in parallelism to the noun $\eta\eta\theta$ 'his fear' in the second hemistich. (95). The imperfect $\eta\eta\theta$ 'terrify' follows which is one of the characteristic words of the book of Job. The force of the initial interrogative particle η is continued into the second hemistich whose imperfect is $\eta\eta$ 'fall' and it may be regarded as being in parallelism to $\eta\eta\theta$. The contents of v 11 are to be regarded as being an extension to the warning already expressed in v 10. For if they will but contemplate what it means to being exposed to the divine fear they will surely desist from such action.

From this extended examination of the only disputational speech of Job which is within the remit of this work, it can be seen that the

tense that has expressed the disputation is that of the imperfect, since not a single example of the perfect has been used.

(G) The Imperfect in the Expression of Commitment

As with the previous subsections it seems best to accept Westermann's analysis. He noted that only the following two passages contain the expression of commitment or as he calls it the avowal of trust:

16.19-21; & 19.25-27. As the former passage expresses its avowal of trust by mainly nominal elements, this subsection will concentrate on examining the latter passage.

No's 958-964

וּאֲנִי יָדַעְתִּי גַּאֲלִי חַי וְאַחֲרָיוֹן עַל עַפְרֵי יִקּוּם
וְאַחַר עוֹרִי נִקְפּוּ זֹאת וּמִבְּשָׂרִי אַחֲזָה אֱלֹהִים
אֲשֶׁר אֲנִי אַחֲזָה לִי וְעֵינַי רְאוּ וְלֹא זָר
כֹּל כִּלְיֹתַי בַּחֲקִי

"For I know that my redeemer lives,
and at last he will stand upon the earth;
and after my skin has thus been destroyed,
then from my flesh I shall see God,
whom I shall see on my side,
and my eyes shall behold, and not another.

My heart faints within me!"

(19.25-27 RSV).

The content of Job's reply to Bildad may be analysed as follows: vv2-6 address to the friends in which Job protests against their persecution of him, vv7-12 and vv13-20 the reason of Job's downfall is developed as being brought about by God's direct hand, vv21-22 second address to the friends calling on them to stop persecuting him, vv23-27 the reason that they should do so is that Job is innocent and one day will be declared so, vv28-29 third address to the friends giving a note of confidence as well as a final warning of the judgement to come that will give them what they deserve.

From this analysis it will be noted that 19.25-27 occurs in a section where Job articulates his belief relative to his final vindication. All of the above verses are difficult and all that can be attempted here is to note the varying problems as well as their possible solutions. For a full discussion of all the issues involved as well as bibliography see the relevant chapter in Clines. (96).

No's 958-959

וְאֲנִי יָדַעְתִּי גֹאֲלִי חַי וְאַחֲרָיון עַל עַפְרָיִם קוֹם

"For I know that my redeemer lives,
and at last he will stand upon the earth;"

The first hemistich is begun by the conjunction ׀ which is attached to

the personal pronoun 'אני. The conjunction ו is understood by Clines to be contrastive in the sense that it marks off the wish expressed by him in vv23-24 that there could be a permanent record of his innocence on earth from that which Job actually believes, namely, that his vindicator lives. (97). His belief is given articulation by means of the perfect 'יָדַעַתִּי 'know' which is a true stative akin to יָדַעַתִּי, וְיָדַעַתִּי, and is also found in other verbs which denotes affections or states of mind: אָבַטַּתִּי = to trust, זָכַרְתִּי = to remember. The verb יָדַעַתִּי is normally translated by the English present which in itself may indicate that the original function of the perfect tense was not so much to indicate a tense but a state as in the Accadian permansive. (98). Job's actual belief is expressed in the formula 'אֵלֹהֵי מִשְׁפָּחִי 'my vindicator lives'. These words are the subject of much controversy since the word 'אֵלֹהֵי has often been mistranslated 'my redeemer' (as in the KJV) which of course has Christian connotations of a heavenly deliverer. The basic meaning of אֵלֹהֵי is 'to make a claim for a person or thing'. (99). The word can be used in 4 ways: (a) Property law--to buy back a house which has been sold--Lev 25.33; (b) To describe the duty of the male relative of someone who has died leaving a childless widow to deliver her from childlessness by marriage --Ruth 4.4-6, the man in question being called a אֵלֹהֵי 'deliverer--Ruth 2.20; (c) To describe the avenger of blood (who, by killing the murderer of one's relative clears away the crime)--1 Kings 6.11; (d) To lay claim to : (i) subject: darkness--Job 3.5; (ii) subject: God--redeem, ransom, -- object: Israel--Ex 6.6; Widows and Orphans--Prov 23.11. In this text אֵלֹהֵי is translated by ἐκλῦειν in G which means to

loose or set free and is therefore a quite different meaning to that which is found in לָחַץ whose basic meaning as noted above is to 'lay claim to'. Thus the word ἐκλυεῖν, may be judged as being a word which does not correctly describe the varied functions implied by the Hebrew word לָחַץ. Dhorme, basing his remarks on Prov 23.10-11 asserts that the correct translation of 'לָחַץ is "my vindicator" since the לָחַץ quite naturally, becomes the defender of justice, he who vindicates the rights of the oppressed. He notes that it is often in this role that God is invoked in the Psalms as the לָחַץ of his people or of the Psalmist. Thus, according to Dhorme, it is the living God who is the vindicator of Job. (100).

Clines, however, translates 'לָחַץ as 'my champion' and this is certainly a word which gives a better understanding of the Hebrew לָחַץ, since as noted above 'redeemer' has the effect of suggesting an interpretation which must be identified with the Christian Redeemer of the NT, and which does not accurately describe the functions denoted by לָחַץ in the varied contexts the OT uses it in. (101). It should be noted that Clines comes to a different conclusion as far as the identity of the לָחַץ is concerned. Basing his remarks on the similarity between 19.25-27 and 16.18-21, he asserts that the לָחַץ of 19.25 is the same as the "witness" (עֵד), the "advocate" (בִּלְעָד), and the "spokesman" (דַּבָּרֵי) of 16.18-21. He further notes that in 16.18-21 Job's cry (עָרַב) is explicitly identified with his "spokesman", and so by implication with his advocate and witness. This leads him to conclude that if in Ch 16 his "cry" is personified as witness,

advocate and spokesman, it is perfectly intelligible that it should in Ch 19 be called "champion". Thus his cry is his witness in heaven and his champion which will vindicate him in the end. He has come to this conclusion because the lawsuit here stands in the context of a dispute with God, and so it seems unlikely that God himself would appear as vindicator and legal attorney against himself. (102). While the translation of 'לָל as "my champion" can be accepted and applauded, it seems that his identity of the לָל is less than satisfactory. For in his attempt to provide a role for the לָל which is consistent with the legal context of the book of Job, he has concluded that as there must be a division of roles in the human court to evade the ever present danger of unfairness or partiality, so it must also be in the divine court. But such is not necessarily the case as such division of roles is superfluous in the heavenly assizes where all the roles are performed by God himself. Thus it seems correct to conclude that Job's champion is none other than God himself who is truly the avenger of wrong (cf Ps 119.154). The first hemistich of v 25 defines the belief of Job in the one who will vindicate him at the last.

The second hemistich is begun by the adjective לַאֲחֵר 'last' which is also of uncertain interpretation. The interpretation of לַאֲחֵר revolves round the question whether the word is a synonym for 'לָל or whether it is a title of God. Dhorme has noted the proposal that לַאֲחֵר should be taken as a synonym for 'לָל and given the translation "afterman", he who takes upon himself the responsibility of another.

(103). Such a proposal has been adopted by Pope in his commentary who gives the translation: 'guarantor'. (104). This proposal, although attractive, is to be rejected since if such was the case we should have expected a Hebrew text which read 'אחרון in parallel to 'אל, but the more convincing argument of all is that nowhere in the Hebrew Bible is the root אחר used in this way. Driver/Gray have concluded that such a proposal is neither proved nor provable. (105). On the basis of Isa 48.12 both Gordis and Dhorme have taken אחרון as a title for God as "the last" and have defined the word as an epithet which qualifies 'אל. Clines has proposed an attractive solution of a similar sort in his commentary where he takes אחרון as a title "the last" but gives to it a legal setting. Following G. R. Driver (NEB "He will rise last to speak in court") he proffers the translation: "and he will rise last to speak for me on the earth". His argument is based upon the supposition that the "last" אחרון to rise in a lawsuit is presumably the winner of the dispute, and so Job believes that his defence counsel is the one who will have the last word. (106). This view has the added attraction of bringing out the legal linguistic background upon which the book of Job is based but the drawback that there are no real parallels to such a use in the Hebrew Bible. While the view may be said to have a definite weakness, it is, nevertheless, deserving of further attention. אחרון is followed by the phrase על עפר 'upon the dust', to which attention must now be given. G. R. Driver has considered that the phrase על עפר 'upon the dust' is to be interpreted as meaning 'in court', since justice was done in the threshing floor or in the gate, both very dusty places.

(107). It seems best, however, to reject this view as being an unlikely interpretation of the MT which is also without support in the Hebrew Bible. This phrase is to be interpreted according to its natural meaning, ie., on the earth. The second hemistich is concluded by the imperfect ׀קו' 'stand', and it is to be noted that this root ׀ק is well attested in a legal setting: in 16.8 Job's leanness "rises up" as a witness against him, and it is also used to describe God as rising up to mete out justice to the lowly of the earth (Ps 76.10).

No's 960-961

ואחר עור' נקפו זאת ומבשר' אחזה אלוה

"And after my skin has thus been destroyed,
then from my flesh I shall see God," (19.26 RSV).

It is the opinion of most commentators that the first hemistich of this verse is notoriously difficult and may be incapable of a grammatical interpretation. The difficulties may be defined as follows: (a) The word אחר which can be an adverb 'afterwards', a preposition 'after' or 'behind', or a conjunction 'after'. (b) The verb נקפו which may be from either קפו 1 'to strike down' or from קפו 2 'to be around'.

No help is to be obtained on this difficult verse from the versions

because their translators were equally perplexed by the Hebrew text and so each one has produced a different meaning. Dhorme has considered that the verb $\eta\eta\eta$ is to be read as $\eta\eta\eta$ on the basis that the letter η has accidentally been misplaced. He arrives at this deduction by neglecting the *matres lectionis* (η & χ) and rearranges the consonants to arrive at $\eta\eta\eta$, which is the niphal form of $\eta\eta$ 'stand erect', and of which the meaning will be 'I will stand erect'. On the basis of Song of Songs 2.9 he gives to the preposition $\eta\eta\chi$ the meaning of 'behind' and so renders: "behind my skin, I shall stand erect" which means that the skin is a curtain which may be drawn aside for a moment in order to see God. In other words what Dhorme is postulating is that Job sees the vision of God vividly within his own person. (108). However, when this view is examined it seems to create more difficulties than it actually solves. It should be noted that the verb $\eta\eta$ 'raise up' only occurs twice in the Hebrew Bible (Ps 145.14, 146.8) and then only in the gal, the niphal is not attested. It is also fairly certain that to introduce the verb $\eta\eta$ into the verse is to introduce concepts which were foreign to the poet's thoughts since whatever the Hebrew means it must be something to do with the destruction of Job's flesh because Job believes that his case will only be resolved after death.

Because of the very great difficulties attached to this clause it seems that the best course of action is make what we can of the existent Hebrew text. It seems appropriate to take the word $\eta\eta\chi$ in its usual sense of 'after'. The verb $\eta\eta$ 'strip off' is only found

elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible at Isa 10.34 where it refers to the cutting down of thickets in a forest. KB 3 has suggested 'flay' for the passage here in the book of Job. The verb **נִקְּוָה** is to be parsed as a 3rd pers Pl perf piel of **קָוָה** 1 'To strike down'. But what is the subject of this verb? GKC has noted that the subject here must be "persons unknown", equivalent to a passive and so the verb is used impersonally. (109). If the poet is referring to the destruction of Job's skin in the grave, then the KJV translation: "worms destroy this body" may not be so very far from the mark although the Hebrew text does not by itself provide a subject such as 'worms'. The noun **עוֹרִי** 'my skin' is of course a masculine noun which finds its parallel in **בְּשָׂרִי** 'my flesh' of the second hemistich. **כֵּן** (feminine) has been understood as an adverb of manner (cf RSV): 'thus', but in order to substantiate such a translation a simple emendation is required to **כֵּן־כֵּן**: 'thus. All of the above proposals in fact underlie most of the English translations: "After my skin will have been peeled off" NJPS; "and after my skin has thus been destroyed" RSV. Now it should be noted that all such translations can be interpreted in two different ways: (1) as a reference to the destruction of Job's skin at death; or (2) as a reference to his disease as consuming his skin by the spread of sores over the skin which could be naturally defined as a "stripping off" or "flaying" of the skin.

The second hemistich is begun by the noun **מִבְּשָׂרִי** 'from my flesh', which as noted above is parallel to **עוֹרִי** 'my skin'. The attached preposition **מִן** indicates the view-point, the position from which one

looks. But it should be noted that מְנַשְׂרִי could also mean 'without my flesh', which presumably is a reference to the state of things after the death of Job. If it be accepted that that the first hemistich is a reference to the destruction of Job's flesh at death as in (1) above, then clearly this must be the reference point of the second hemistich also and the translation must clearly be: "without my flesh". If however, the interpretation of (2) above be accepted then the translation is "in my flesh" and the only objection that may be made to it is that it is a fairly obscure way of saying "while I am still alive". The noun is followed by the imperfect אֶחֶזֶה 'see' which as Clines has noted should be taken either as a modal imperfect (GKC § 107 m-n) or as a cohortative (GKC § 48 b-e), expressing a will or desire rather than a simple prediction, "my desire is to see God". (110).

No's 962-964

אֲשֶׁר אֲנִי אֶחֶזֶה לִי וְעֵינַי רְאוּ וְלֹא זָר כִּלּוֹ כְּלִיטִי בַחֲקִי

"Whom I shall see on my side,
and my eyes shall behold, and not another.

My heart faints within me!" (19.27 RSV).

The first hemistich of v 27 may be taken as being a repetition of v 26 in emphatic terms. V 26 simply has אֶחֶזֶה אִלָּיָהּ, but in v 27 these words are repeated with the addition of אֲשֶׁר אֲנִי for emphasis. The

complement 'ל 'for myself' refers to the subject, just as we say in English: I shall see for myself. The complement, however, has been interpreted by the RSV as "on my side" meaning that God will in the day of vindication be on his side. But it seems better to take 'ל as a natural reference again to the subject in an emphatic way to reinforce that it is Job who will see God. Thus the whole of the first hemistich may be regarded as an emphatic construction.

The second hemistich may be regarded as another emphatic construction whose purpose is to underline the first. The subject of the second hemistich is again Job but is referred to in the figure of 'his eyes'. Dhorme has noted that the phrase רָאָה עֵינָי is but a foreshadowing of the final theophany where Job states רָאָתְךָ עֵינָי "my eyes have seen you". (111). The perfect רָאָה could equally well be a permansive, and so is strictly parallel to אָחַזָה and as such does not require any further emendation. אֲוֵי does not have the meaning of 'enemy', but implies simply 'other' as in Prov 27.2.

The purpose of the third hemistich is, as Clines has noted, to convey the emotion with which this desire has been expressed. (112). The words נִלְלָה and נִלְיָתָ attract each other by alliteration. It is best to regard נִלְיָתָ 'kidneys', a word which is often found in parallelism with לֵב, as being the seat of the emotion or the feelings in general (cf Ps 73.21). When נִלְיָתָ is used with the verb נִלְלָה 'come to an end', what is really meant is that Job is exhausted by longing or in other words he is emotionally drained. The expression בָּחֻקַי 'in

my breast' is simply equivalent to 'within me'. Thus Job has been exhausted by the intensity of his feelings. This extended examination of these somewhat difficult verses is sufficient to show that the imperfect has a use in Hebrew poetry in giving expression to the avowal of trust or commitment.

In this chapter we have examined some 133 examples of the imperfect which in this case are drawn only from Job Ch 3.1-20.29. The reason for so doing is simply the special requirements of this work, but it is believed that the uses of those examples of the imperfect which have not been treated fall within the ones which have. It is now necessary to come to some sort of conclusion as to its use. From the analysis of the examples considered in this chapter it seems that there are in fact seven distinct usages of this form in the book of Job. These are as follows:

(1) That the imperfect is used to denote narration in a similar fashion to the way that it is used in Ugaritic poetry and the archaic poems of the Pentateuch. One of the best examples noted in subsection A was the form לָלַח in Job 3.3. Although only 31 examples were considered in that subsection, there are in fact many such examples to be found in the book of Job and this aspect of the use of the imperfect is deserving of further study. Thus the form לָלַח to denote narration may be regarded as a genuine poetic usage of the imperfect.

(2) That the imperfect is used to express the language of prayer. In the examples that were considered this was particularly the case in those examples which began with the optative formula ׀ן' ׀ן which was immediately followed by the imperfect. It was also noted that the jussive in particular was used in this way and it was also demonstrated that the use of the jussive to express a petition was part and parcel of the use of the jussive.

(3) That the imperfect is used to express the language of praise. In this case the imperfect does not have a principal position to play but a subordinate one. The reason for this is that in the book of Job the mighty acts of God are always described by the article + participle. This usage had already been noted in Ch 3. Therefore the use of the imperfect in such hymns of praise is a subordinate one which is to denote the consequence of such acts of God and in 1 case only the imperfect is used in parallelism with the participle to describe one of God's mighty acts.

(4) That the imperfect is used to describe the language of the lament. As with (3) above the imperfect does not play a principal role in expressing the lament for this is a role which is reserved for the perfect as will be demonstrated in Ch 7, but the role it has is very much a subordinate one. Thus the imperfect is only once used in the way that the perfect normally is in this genre, cf 19.10 and this use may be due to nothing less than poetic variety. It is also used in a purpose clause, to indicate the consequence of a previous

perfect, in parallelism with the perfect, in a question after ׀׀), in parallelism with a participle, in a temporal clause, in a causal clause, in conditional sentences and as a stative. When this list of the subordinate roles of the imperfect is analysed, it will be conceded that most if not all of them are the kind of constructions in which the imperfect might be expected to be used.

(5) That the imperfect is used to express the language of the dispute. In this subsection we saw that one of the forms of the dispute was that of the reproof. In this form the imperfect is used in questions which are begun by the interrogative particle ׀, it is used to qualify a perfect of habit, and it is also used in this form in resultant clauses.

(6) That the imperfect is used to express the language of accusation. In reality this is not a different genre of speech from (5) above, but is a secondary part of it. In this form the imperfect is used in emphatic statements, in questions which are begun by the interrogative pronoun ׀׀, and in conditional sentences.

(7) That the imperfect is used to express the language of commitment. In the only example of this genre to be found within the book of Job (19.25-27), it was noted that the imperfect was used in a modal sense to express desire.

NOTES

- (1) Gesenius--Hebrew Grammar 1910 §107b1 p314
- (2) McFall--Enigma of the Hebrew Verbal System 1982 p 2
- (3) Waltke/O' Connor--Biblical Hebrew Syntax 1990 p463
- (4) Niccacci--The syntax of the Verb 1990 p181
- (5) Michel--Tempora und Satzstellung in den Psalmen 1960 p 11
- (6) Dhorme--Commentary on the book of Job 1967 p 24
- (7) Williams--Hebrew Syntax 1976 §176, 177 p 32
- (8) Fenton--'Hebrew Tenses in the light of Ugaritic' p 33
- (9) Driver, G. R. The Problem of the Hebrew Verbal System p 97
- (10) Andersen--Job 1976 p102
- (11) Gosling No 639 p212
- (12) Michel--ibid p132
- (13) Dhorme--ibid p 32
- (14) Clines--WBC-Job 1989 p 72
- (15) Dhorme--ibid p 49
- (16) Dhorme--ibid p150
- (17) Gordis--The Book of Job 1978 p161
- (18) Gordis--ibid p162
- (19) Dhorme--ibid p477
- (20) Michel--ibid p157
- (21) Driver, S. R. --Hebrew Tenses 1892 §50 p 55
- (22) Westermann--The Structure of the book of Job 1981
- (23) Westermann--ibid p 67
- (24) Gosling No's 185, 189 above, pp183, 185
- (25) Dhorme--ibid p 80

(26)	Dhorme--ibid		p201
(27)	Gosling	No 680	p216
(28)	Clines--ibid		p243
(29)	Westermann--ibid		p 77
(30)	Westermann--ibid		p 71
(31)	Westermann--ibid		p 71
(32)	Clines--ibid		p296
(33)	Gosling	No 142	p101
(34)	Clines--ibid		p215
(35)	Gordis--ibid		p 56
(36)	Driver/Gray--ICC <u>Job</u>	1921	p 30
(37)	Westermann--ibid		p 31
(38)	Westermann--ibid		p 31
(39)	Clines--ibid		p 81
(40)	Dhorme--ibid		p 28
(41)	Clines--ibid		p 81
(42)	Clines--ibid		p 90
(43)	Dhorme--ibid		p 34
(44)	Gosling	No 32	p179
(45)	Dhorme--ibid		p 36
(46)	Westermann--ibid		p 37
(47)	Clines--ibid		p 99
(48)	Clines--ibid		p100
(49)	Clines--ibid		p100
(50)	Clines--ibid		p102

(51)	Westermann--ibid	p 37
(52)	Dhorme--ibid	p 40
(53)	Clines--ibid	p 75
(54)	Gordis--ibid	p 39
(55)	Clines--ibid	p437
(56)	Westermann--ibid	p 31
(57)	Clines--ibid	p443
(58)	Clines--ibid	p443
(59)	Clines--ibid	p444
(60)	Clines--ibid	p444
(61)	Clines--ibid	p444
(62)	Clines--ibid	p429
(63)	Gordis--ibid	p202
(64)	Westermann--ibid	p 20
(65)	Westermann--ibid	p 20
(66)	Westermann--ibid	p 20
(67)	Dhorme--ibid Clines--ibid	p 42 p108
(68)	Clines--ibid	p108
(69)	Dhorme--ibid	p 42
(70)	Gordis--ibid	p 46
(71)	Clines--ibid	p106
(72)	Dhorme--ibid	p 43
(73)	Dhorme--ibid	p 43
(74)	Davidson-- <u>Commentary on the book of Job</u> 1862	p 65
(75)	Dhorme--ibid	p 43
(76)	Davidson--ibid	p 65

(77)	Clines--ibid		p347
(78)	Dhorme--ibid		p209
(79)	Clines--ibid		p347
(80)	Westermann--ibid		p 23
(81)	Dhorme--ibid		p209
(82)	Clines--ibid		p347
(83)	Blommerde-- <u>Northwest Semitic Grammar and Job</u>	1969	p 73
(84)	Andersen--ibid		p176
(85)	Dhorme--ibid		p210
(86)	Dhorme--ibid		p212
(87)	Blommerde--ibid		p 73
(88)	Dhorme--ibid		p213
(89)	Dhorme--ibid		p183
(90)	Dhorme--ibid		p184
(91)	Clines--ibid		p307
(92)	Gordis--ibid		p142
(93)	Dhorme--ibid		p184
(94)	Dhorme--ibid		p185
(95)	Pope--Anchor Bible <u>Job</u>	1965	p 94
(96)	Clines--ibid		p426
(97)	Clines--ibid		p458
(98)	Driver, G. R. --ibid		p112
(99)	Holladay-- <u>Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon</u>	1971	p 52
(100)	Dhorme--ibid		p283
(101)	Clines--ibid		p459
(102)	Clines--ibid		p459
(103)	Dhorme--ibid		p283

(104) Pope--ibid		p135
(105) Driver/Gray--ibid		p127
(106) Clines--ibid		p460
(107) Driver, G. R. --'Problems in the Hebrew text of Job' 1955		p 74
	<u>VTS</u> 3 pp72-93	
(108) Dhorme--ibid		p285
(109) Gesenius-- <u>Hebrew Grammar</u>	\$144g	p460
(110) Clines--ibid		p461
(111) Dhorme--ibid		p286
(112) Clines--ibid		p462

Chapter Six

The Use of the Perfect Conjunctive

This chapter deals with the perfect conjunctive. It is necessary first of all to note that the use of the perfect conjunctive is rarer than that of the imperfect conjunctive, there being 38 occurrences in Chs 3.1-20.29; 32.1-37.24; 38.1-42.6, compared to 89 occurrences of the imperfect conjunctive. As such it is the rarest tense which is used in the book of Job.

At the outset it is further necessary to note that this chapter corresponds to chapters 3 and 4 which dealt with the imperfect consecutive and the imperfect conjunctive respectively since the pointing of the ׀ which is attached to the perfect conjunctive and the perfect consecutive is identical. The chapter thus covers the same ground as chapters 3 & 4, the difference being that it is concerned with the perfect.

The perfect tense is hardly mentioned by the grammars. Gesenius-Kautzsch does not cover it, but relevant sections can be consulted in Davidson (§58), Driver (§130-133), and by Waltke/O'Connor (§ 32.3). It is not referred to by Michel who also makes no reference to the imperfect conjunctive. (see above p 177).

The use of the perfect conjunctive is thus defined by Davidson:

"In the classical language, however, ׀ with perfect occasionally expresses an action not consequential or successive to what precedes, but co-ordinate with it. (a) When the second verb merely repeats the idea of the first, being synonymous, or in some way parallel with it.----- (b) When the second verb expresses a contrast.----- (c) But there are many cases where ׀ with perfect appears in simple narrative, and is merely copulative. The usage becomes more common as the language declines, and comes under the influence of Aramaic." (1).

S. R. Driver also makes the following observations:

"Although in Hebrew the continuation of a historical narrative is most usually expressed by the imperfect with ׀, we find, occasionally in the earlier books of the Old Testament, and with increasing frequency in the later ones, that this idiom, which is so peculiarly and distinctively a creation of the Hebrew language, has been replaced by the perfect with the simple or weak ׀. Generally, indeed, as we saw in the last chapter, and invariably when the verb to which the perfect is annexed is a bare imperfect, the ׀ prefixed to the perfect is consecutive, and the sense consequently frequentative: but a certain number of passages exist in which this signification is out of place; in these, therefore, we are compelled to suppose that the ׀ is the mere copulative, and that it no longer exerts over the following verb that strong and peculiar modifying influence which we term conversive". (2).

With these remarks in mind we shall now begin our survey of the use of the perfect conjunctive in the book of Job, noting that the term is used to cover both consecutive and conjunctive usage; 38 e. g., have been identified:

No 122

אשר קצירו רעב יאכל ואל מצנים יקחהו ושאר צמים וילם

"His harvest the hungry eat,
and he takes it even out of thorns;
and the thirsty pant after his wealth". (5.5 RSV).

This example is found in the third main section of Eliphaz's first speech where he discourses with Job on the fate of the fool. The theology of the fate determining deed and the proverb-like conclusion to these verses (vv1-7), confirm its wisdom derivation. In v 4 Eliphaz defines not only the fate of the fool but also that of his sons. The focus of attention has shifted in this and the previous verse to the sons of the fool, since he is apparently dead and as a result he has left his sons in a miserable condition. Despite difficulties in the Hebrew, the sense of the verse is plain: the fruits of the fool's labours are enjoyed by others, and his own children are left in want.

The first hemistich opens with the phrase $\text{רָשָׁע קָצַר$ which translates literally: "whose harvest" and this may be interpreted as referring back to the fool of v3. However, as has been noted above v4 & v5 are not concerned with the fool but with his children who are referred to by the suffix of בָּנָיו . Dhorme here has noted that the text of G reads: $\alpha \gamma \alpha \rho \epsilon \chi \epsilon \iota \nu \circ \iota \sigma \upsilon \nu \eta \gamma \alpha \gamma \circ \nu$ which by itself presupposes a Hebrew text which had רָשָׁע instead of the MT's רָשָׁע .

(3). The same reading is further presupposed by the Peshitta which has ܩܘܨܝܢܐ .

Because of the foregoing evidence there is no difficulty in adopting the reading וְאֵלֶּיךָ since it not only gives coherence to an otherwise difficult verse but also produces a verbal pattern of perfect-imperfect, imperfect-perfect. The emendation thus proposed yields the translation: "what they have reaped". The sons of the fool are then bereft of any food, for what they have reaped is then eaten by the hungry. This is indicated by the imperfect $\text{אָכַל$ 'eat'. The second hemistich of this verse has given some difficulty to commentators because of the word מִן־תְּנִינִים 'out of thorns'. It appears to be composed of the preposition מִן and the noun תְּנִינִים 'thorns' (cp. Prov 22.5). It seems best to follow Dhorme here who because of the extraordinary ingenuity required to translate the MT reads the noun מִן־מְצִיטִים 'hiding places' instead of מִן־תְּנִינִים and translates: "and carry away to hiding places". The act of the hungry carrying away their precious food to hiding places is then expressed by the imperfect $\text{לְקַחֵם$ 'carry away'. The third hemistich then begins with the perfect conjunctive $\text{וְאָכַל$ (אָכַל 'eat'). The subject of this verb is מִן־צָמָא which is best understood as a defective spelling of מִן־צָמָא 'thirsty'. Because of the presence of the plural subject Dhorme wants to emend the verb to read as a plural וְאָכְלוּ , but according to GKC §1450 the use of a singular verb here is not indefensible. (4). The perfect conjunctive $\text{וְאָכַל$ is understood by S. R. Driver to be an example of the perfect consecutive which denotes frequentative action (5), but it seems better to take the ו as adversative 'but' and to take the perfect $\text{אָכַל$ as being used to denote the change of the subject, a use which is attested of the perfect in

Ugaritic. (6). In this verse there are in fact three subjects, the sons of the fool indicated by the perfect קצרו, the action of the hungry which is expressed by the imperfects יאכל--יקחהו, and the thirsty whose action is denoted by the perfect conjunctive ושאף. On the basis of this analysis it seems best to take the perfect conjunctive as denoting a further change of subject in describing what happens to the fool's children. It should be stressed that the ׀ of the perfect conjunctive cannot be regarded as being copulative since the subject of both verbs is altogether different.

No 160

וידעת כי שלום אהלך ופקדת נורך ולא תחסא

"You shall know that your tent is safe,
and you shall inspect your fold and miss nothing". (5.24 RSV).

This example is located in the first speech of Eliphaz who is making his reply to the lament of Job as to why he was born. In 5.17-27 Eliphaz introduces the fifth major element in the speech, namely, that suffering is educational in nature and must be considered as a positive act of God for the sufferer. V 24, in which the example occurs, defines the complete security enjoyed by the man who puts his trust in God. The first hemistich is begun by the perfect conjunctive וידעת 'know'. Davidson notes that the ׀ of this construction is used to denote the concept of consequence and if so

understood would mean that we have yet another construction which indicates the nuance of consequence. (7). Before coming to any hasty conclusions as to the use of the perfect conjunctive here, it is advisable to note the verbal form which was used in the previous verse. That verse describes the blessedness of the man who puts his trust in God. The blessedness is to be found in the fact that he will have a pact with the stones of the field. This is conveyed by the nominal form בְּרִיתְךָ 'your pact' which is used to convey a verbal meaning. The second hemistich of this verse expresses the fact that such a man will be at peace with the beasts of the field, a state which is expressed by the hophal perfect הִשְׁלַחַה 'be at peace', a form which occurs only here in the Hebrew Bible. The consequence to such a man being at peace with the beasts of the field is then denoted by the perfect conjunctive יָדַעַתְּ 'know' which expresses the concept that such a man has a deep seated knowledge of his own security. In turn this means that there are three distinct forms which the poet has used to denote the concept of consequence. While all of these forms are used in an identical way from a syntactic point of view, they are nevertheless, quite different from a morphological point of view. How then is the grammarian to distinguish between them?

First it has to be confessed that there is no easy answer to this question. It could be argued that while all the forms are used in an identical way syntactically they could be regarded as conveying the concept of consequence by a different tense. However,

when the forms are analysed from the point of view of what tense they convey, it seems that they all more or less convey the same tenses. In his study of the problem, McFall has shown that the imperfect consecutive is used to convey the past and present senses, the imperfect to convey past, present, and future senses while the perfect conjunctive also expresses the sense of past, present, and future. (8). The difference cannot therefore be attributed to tense. The explanation which is based upon the dictates of tense falls to the ground. Michel has sought to explain the difference in usage of imperfect consecutive, imperfect and perfect by the following rule which is based in his analysis of Psalm 1:

"a) In brief: Actions designated by the perfect are of a chance nature, with regard to the person engaging in them.

b) As concerns the subject of the action, actions designated by the imperfect are material in character." (9)

It has already been argued in chapter one that while one can applaud Michel's work because he has collated all the extant forms in the book of Psalms, the interpretation he gives on how the tenses are used is far too bland to be of any practical value. As one examines the tenses that are used in the Hebrew Bible one finds that while the imperfect represents acts which are substantial in character, acts which proceed from the person, it does not always do so. (10). Thus Michel's explanation which is based upon philosophical concepts also falls to the ground.

Is there indeed any explanation which can lift the veil on how these forms are used in Hebrew poetry? An approach which does commend itself is that of P.P.Saydon in his article The Use of The Tenses in Deutero-Isaiah (1959) which itself is dependant upon G.R.Driver's seminal study entitled Problems of the Hebrew Verbal System (1936). Driver's explanation of the complexities of the Hebrew verbal system is based upon the theory of a mixture of languages. With regard to tense he came to the following conclusion:

"Thus the consecutive constructions are connected with the East-Semitic (Accadian) and the ordinary construction with the West-Semitic (Aramean) verbal system, and the two have survived side by side in the classical language". (11).

This deduction is the one used by Saydon in his treatment of the tenses in Deutero-Isaiah:

"Basing our researches upon the results of G.R.Driver's study of the Hebrew tenses we distinguish two לִבֵּן and two לִבֵּן ' forms. לִבֵּן accented on the first syllable denoted a present-future tense, and לִבֵּן , accented upon the last syllable, denoted a past tense. Similarly לִבֵּן ' represents both an original לִבֵּן ' with a present-future meaning, and לִבֵּן ' with a preterite meaning. In pre-Massoretic times Hebrew pronunciation still distinguished these forms, but the Massoretic accentuation has levelled down all these differences and almost completely obliterated the distinction between לִבֵּן and לִבֵּן , and between לִבֵּן ' and לִבֵּן '". (12).

While the solution proposed by G.R.Driver has been questioned on a number of grounds it does seem that not all of his work need be discarded since the solution he proposed, and which was developed by Saydon, at the very least produces a rational explanation as to why

forms which are morphologically different are used in an identical way syntactically.

Since No 161 also occurs in this verse it seems convenient to deal with it here. The second hemistich of this verse begins with the perfect conjunctive וַיִּבְרַח 'inspect' which is best taken to denote the consequence of the previous perfect conjunctive וַיִּדְעַם, the idea being that because a man has such a deep seated knowledge of his own security he goes on to inspect his flock and finds that not one of them is missing. Without further elaboration it is proposed to level the same kind of explanation for No 163 as for No 160 since it is used in an identical way syntactically and is also morphologically equivalent.

No 246

אם שכנתי ואמרתי מתי אקום ומדד ערב ושבעתי נדדים עמי נשף

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

But the night is long,

and I am full of tossing until the dawn" (7.4 RSV).

The example in 7.4 is located in Job's reply to Eliphaz. Job describes the misery and futility of his life. God, although not mentioned by name in 7.1-6, is clearly the addressee, a fact that is made clearer by the imperative 'remember' of v7. Here Job describes

the nights of misery of v3. He does so in the form of a hypothetical sentence which is begun by the particle אַם 'if'. The condition is then expressed by the perfect שָׁנַנְתָּ 'lie down' which is then followed by the perfect consecutive וְאָמַרְתָּ 'say' which introduces the apodosis in a frequentative sense. (13). This type of conditional sentence is dealt with by Driver in his Hebrew Tenses: §138 i (a) and by GKC in §112gg. Dhorme has noted that וְאָמַרְתָּ should not be made dependant on the conjunction אַם. The main clause is introduced by the copulative וְ, exactly as it stands in Gen 38.9; Num 21.9b; and Judg 6.3. (14). Thus the perfect conjunctive וְאָמַרְתָּ may be understood as denoting the beginning of the apodosis and is best translated by a present since it is frequentative in nature. Since No 248 also occurs in this verse it is best to treat it here. The third hemistich of this verse is begun by the perfect conjunctive וְשָׂבַעְתָּ 'satiated' which Dhorme has noted to be adjectival in character. (15). Gordis however, wants to treat the וְ of this construction to indicate its parallelism with אָמַרְתָּ and to show that the closing stich is a virtual quotation with the verb אָמַרְתָּ understood, which then yields the translation: "The night was extended and I said, I have had my fill of tossings". (16). It seems better to regard the perfect conjunctive וְשָׂבַעְתָּ as denoting the fulfilment of the condition first posited by אַם שָׁנַנְתָּ. In that sense the perfect conjunctive may be regarded as expressing resultant language. If Job lies down he will have a night full of misery and sleeplessness.

No 272

וּחַתַּחֲנִי בַחֲלֻמוֹת וּמַחֲזֵינֹת תִּבְעַתְנִי

"Then thou dost scare me with dreams,
and terrify me with visions" (7.14 RSV).

In vv11-21 of this chapter Job pours out his soul in a complaint against God. He complains that God is harassing him and he also makes an appeal that God should desist from this action. In vv13-14 he complains about the way God harasses him, i.e., by nightmares. This is cast in the form of a conditional sentence which is begun in v13 by the phrase נִי אֲמַרְחִי which Dhorme considers to be an alternate form for אִם אֲמַרְחִי which is usually used in the Hebrew Bible. The protasis proper is then contained in v13, while the apodosis is contained in v14. The apodosis is then begun by the perfect consecutive וּחַתַּחֲנִי 'terrify' and as in v4 the ו introduces the main clause. The perfect conjunctive then denotes the fulfilment of the condition originally expressed by נִי אֲמַרְחִי. The piel of חַתַּח only recurs in Jer 51.56 where the form is doubtful.

No 293

וּמָה לֹא חָשָׂא פִשְׁעֵי וְתַעֲבִיר אֶת עֹנֵי
נִי עַתָּה לַעֲפָר אֲשַׁכֵּב וּשְׁחַרְחֲנִי וְאֵינְנִי

"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". (7.21 RSV).

Here Job appeals to God to leave him alone and then gives the rationale for God to do so, the rationale being that God should forgive the sins of Job and stop making him his mark. From the way that the question is couched it is evident that Job does not expect such an appeal to be heeded. The question is begun in the first hemistich by the particle מָה 'why' and is followed by the imperfect אָפֵן which here has the sense of forgive. The consequence of this action of forgiveness is then denoted by the imperfect conjunctive וְנָסַח which indicates that once God has forgiven sin he then removes it from his sight. The third hemistich is then cast in the form of a consequential clause which refers back to Job's choice of v15. The final hemistich is in fact a conditional sentence although none of the English versions translates it as such. This kind of conditional sentence is defined by GKC §159g where it is noted that it is composed of the perfect consecutive in the protasis and a noun clause in the apodosis. Thus the condition is expressed by the perfect conjunctive וְיִתְחַנֵּן 'seek' the ו of which construction may be understood in the sense of 'so'. The perfect then almost has the meaning of a subjunctive and may be rendered: "so should you seek me, then I shall not be". The REB comes closest to this rendering: ("you may seek me"). Thus the perfect

conjunctive here denotes the protasis and is used to express an action whose accomplishment is conceived of as being merely possible in the future. (18).

No 304

אם זך וישר אתה כי עתה יעיר עליך ושלם נוח צדקך

"If you are pure and upright,
surely then he will rouse himself for you
and reward you with a rightful habitation". (8.6 RSV).

This example belongs to the second speech, that of Bildad the Shuhite. Bildad argues that the suffering which Job endures is a punishment. The basis of Bildad's argument is the conventional doctrine of retribution which he applies to Job and his children in the first seven verses. In v6 Bildad repeats the counsel of Eliphaz (5.8), who recommended seeking the help of God, who is in a position to restore Job to his former state of life and to an even better situation. This is begun in the first hemistich by a conditional clause initiated by אם. It should be noted that as the text stands the protasis consists of three hemistichs (v5ab, v6a). Dhorme noted, however, that many modern scholars have recognised that v6 contains one hemistich too many, and the proposal made to cut out the second. He notes that the real subject of יעיר and שלם is of course God who was last mentioned in v5

under the names לך and 'ך. Consequently it can be seen that the 1st hemistich "If you are pure and upright" introduces an element which is alien to the main theme. Thus Dhorme proposes to delete the 1st hemistich as a gloss. (19). While it may be conceded that his proposal if adopted produces a more even text with a protasis consisting of two hemistichs and an apodosis of the same length, the 1st hemistich might just as well be retained and understood as secondary condition. The apodosis is then introduced in the 2nd hemistich by the phrase נ' עתה 'surely then'. In this construction the particle נ' is emphatic, a use which has been shown to be regular on the basis of Ugaritic parallels. (20). The first part of the apodosis is indicated by the imperfect י'ע'ר 'rouse himself' and the consequence to this action is then denoted by the perfect consecutive ׀ל׀ 'reward' cf GKC §112p. The perfect consecutive denotes the consequence of God rousing himself since if he does then he will also reward Job with a rightful habitation. The verb ׀ל׀ could also be understood in the sense of 'restore'. The ׀ of the perfect consecutive then indicates what is the main clause and that it is now expressing the fulfilment of the condition begun in v5a by ׀א.

No 305

והיה ראשיתך מצער ואחרייתך ישובה מאד

"And though your beginning was small,
your latter days will be very great". (8.7 RSV).

The context of the example in 8.7 is exactly the same as the previous example. It was noted above in the last e.g., that Bildad gives counsel to Job to seek God and repent for if he does so he will avert the judgement of God. The verse here may be construed as indicating the result of such seeking: his latter days will be great. The first hemistich is then begun with the perfect conjunctive $\eta\eta\eta$ 'will be' which is understood by Davidson as continuing the apodosis of the previous verse. (21). Gordis has the same view. (22). The difficulty with it is that it makes the apodosis unnecessarily large. It is surely better taken as a resultant clause in which the poet sums up the thought expressed by the conditional sentences of vv5-6. The NEB has understood it in this way: "Then, though your beginnings were humble, your end will be great". If such is the case the perfect conjunctive $\eta\eta\eta$ is best seen as continuing the force of the protasis of v6 and being in parallelism to $\eta\eta\eta$. Many commentators are troubled by the fact that the perfect conjunctive is a masculine verb while the subject is feminine. While it is a fact of grammar that the use of a masculine verb in spite of a feminine subject is not unusual when the verb precedes the subject cf GKC 145o, it could also be argued that the masculine verb has been used here due to its parallelism with $\eta\eta\eta$. Thus the η before the perfect must be regarded as being copulative in

nature, since its use is to indicate the parallelism between the above two mentioned verbs.

No 327

אם יבלענו ממקומו ונחש בו לא ראיתיו

"If he is destroyed from his place,

then it will deny him, saying,

I have never seen you".

(8.18 RSV).

The example taken from 8.18 is found in the second part of Bildad's speech. The speech itself can be analysed as follows: vv1-7 concern the application of the doctrine of retribution to Job and his children, vv8-19 the fate of the wicked, and vv20-22 the happy future in store for Job. From this analysis it can be seen that 8.18 occurs in the section where Bildad deals with the fate of the wicked. The function of this speech is that it is not meant to be a threat to Job, rather it is intended as encouragement that he should seek God and by so doing make the prospect of his future a bright one. Bildad thus has discoursed on how the hope of the godless man perishes. This is expressed in 8.18 in the form of a conditional sentence, the first hemistich of which is begun by the particle אם 'if'. This is then followed by the imperfect יבלענו 'remove', whose subject as Dhorme has noted is impersonal. (23). This is followed by the perfect consecutive ונחש 'deny' which is best understood as

denoting the beginning of the apodosis: 'then it will deny'. Thus the perfect consecutive is used here as one might expect in a conditional sentence. (24). The conditional sentence indicates that the godless man leaves neither trace or memory.

No 378

אֲשֶׁר בְּשַׁעֲרָה יִשְׁוֹפְנֵי וְהָרְבָה פִּצְעֵי חַנָּם

"For he crushes me with a tempest,
and multiplies my wounds without cause"; (9.17 RSV).

The speech itself, which consists of Job's reply to Bildad and extends over two chapters, can be broken into two parts: (a) 9.2-24, although it is not clear whether this is a monologue or an address to the friends, but God is spoken of in the third person. (b) 9.25-10.22 God is now addressed in the second person. The theme developed here is that of Job's powerlessness before God and the fact that he is trapped in his own private limbo. In developing this theme of powerlessness before God, Job also expresses the need for vindication, a need he considers is fairly hopeless. This is expressed in v17 by affirming that Job and God are not equal before the law: God's assaults upon Job make it impossible for Job to reach even the first phase of a formal attempt to gain vindication. The verse thus describes the assaults that God makes upon Job. This thought is expressed in the first hemistich which is begun by אֲשֶׁר

which is best taken as a conjunction 'for'. The next word **בַּשְׂעָרָה** has presented the commentators with difficulty. The RSV has translated it as 'tempest' although the normal spelling would have been **שַׂעָרָה**. Dhorme has noted that while we do find **שְׂעָרָה** in Nah 1.3, both Targ. and Syr have recognised the word **שְׂעָרָה** 'hair' and it seems logical to adopt this rendering since it makes excellent parallelism with **חִנָּם** 'for no reason' in the second hemistich. (25). One would then translate: "for he crushes me with a hair" i.e., for a trifle. The idea of God crushing Job is indicated by the imperfect **שִׁוֵּפְנִי** which is also used in Gen 3.15 with the meaning of 'crush, bruise'. The second hemistich is then begun by the imperfect consecutive **וְהִרְבָּה** 'multiply' which as Davidson has noted carries on the process a stage further and so must be taken as denoting the consequence of God crushing him for a trifling matter. (26). One could of course argue that the **ו** of this construction merely indicates that the verb in question parallels the verb of the first hemistich, but if such were the case then one would have expected a synonym of **שָׁוַף** 'crush' and not **הִרְבָּה** 'multiply'.

No 410

אם התרחצתי במלך שלג והזנתי בני כפי

"If I wash myself with snow,
and cleanse my hands with lye," (9.30 RSV).

According to the above analysis the example in 9.17 occurs in the second section of the speech where the monologue gives way to the address which is directed to God in the second person. A brief reflection on the brevity of life centres upon the perpetual misery of his days (vv25-26). He cannot pretend his misery does not exist, for his sufferings are a constant reminder that God regards him as guilty (vv27-28), and is determined to continue to do so, regardless of Job's efforts to exculpate himself (vv29-31). What Job expresses in vv30-31 is a feeling of utter helplessness that no matter what he does he will still be in the wrong so that there is no way for him to establish his innocence.

In reality vv30-31 form one conditional sentence of which v30 is the protasis and v31 is the apodosis. The condition which Job posits is that even if he attempts to use the finest cleansing agents of his world the result is still the same, he is still considered guilty by God. The condition is expressed in the first hemistich as is usual with the particle אִם 'if' which is then followed by the perfect וָחָטַטְתִּי 'wash myself'. The hithpael of חָטַטְתִּי is considered by Andersen to be understood in an iterative not reflexive sense. (27). The sense which the hithpael is then expressing is that this is an act which Job has tried time and time again but failed in doing so. All the commentators have found difficulty with בְּנֶחֱלִי 'with snow' due to the fact that the Qere here reads: בְּנֶחֱלִי מַיִם 'with snow water'. The latter reading is also adopted by the Peshitta and Targ but is to be rejected since the water from melted snow is not especially white.

It is better to see in the use of לָוַה an equivalent to Mishnaic לָוַה and Talmudic לָוַה 'soap, soapwort' which has the added benefit of making good parallelism with לָוַה 'lye'. So the first hemistich reveals that Job has failed in his use of לָוַה to cleanse himself. The second hemistich begins with the perfect conjunctive וְהִזְנוֹתִי 'cleansed', the ו of which construction is best understood as being merely copulative since it preserves the parallelism between הִזְנוֹתִי & הִזְנוֹתִי . No 412 may be dealt with at this point because it occurs in the second half of the same conditional sentence. The first hemistich of the apodosis is begun by the particle אָז 'then' which as Driver has noted is very rarely used to introduce the apodosis and usually where special emphasis is desired. (28). Many commentators have followed the the text of G which read ἐν γαργαλίῳ 'in filth' which suggests a revocalized Hebrew text בַּשִּׁחַת , but G may well have read the Hebrew exactly as MT, which should also be followed here. The verbal action of the first hemistich is then expressed by the imperfect תִּטְבַּלְנִי 'plunge' and the consequence to this action is denoted by the perfect conjunctive וְהִצְנוּנִי 'abhor'. The second hemistich indicates what God does to Job when he tries to cleanse himself: he plunges him into a filthy pit so that when he tries to put on his garments the result is that they abhor him.

No 454

אם חטאתי ושמרתני ומצוני לא תנקני

"If I sin, thou dost mark me,
and dost not clear me of my iniquity". (10.14 RSV).

This example is again located in Job's reply to Bildad where he expresses his feeling of powerlessness before God. Continuing the second major section of the speech, Job returns to the second person form of address, and throughout persistently addresses God. There is no doubt that parts of this speech could be classed in form critical terms as an accusation. This second part of the speech may be divided into four parts: (a) programme for the speech vv1-2; (b) possible motivations for God's treatment of Job vv3-7; (c) the contradiction between the apparent and the hidden purpose of God in creating and sustaining Job vv8-17; (d) appeal for release from God's oppressive presence vv18-22. From this analysis it may be seen that 10.14 comes from the section where Job is examining an apparent contradiction, namely, God's creation of him and God's treatment of him.

Behind the expression of the conditional sentence in v14 lies the thought that God's purpose in preserving him was utterly perverted; he has done so only to find fault with him. As is the custom in Hebrew the conditional sentence is begun in the first hemistich by the particle אִם 'if' which is then followed by the perfect חָטָא 'sin'. The use of the perfect in the protasis is noted by Davidson as being due to the mental conception of the author although he does concede that there is a possibility here that it is due to the style of the

poet since he uses the perfect in the protasis throughout Job ch 31. (29). Rather it may be that the use of the perfect in the protasis is due to the fact that Job describes a state but see the remarks in chapter seven about such a use. The perfect 'אָטאָן is then followed by the perfect consecutive 'וַשְׁמַרְתָּנִי 'watch'. The perfect consecutive thus denotes what is the consequence or result of the condition which is postulated by the perfect 'אָטאָן, a use which may be regarded as fairly standard in conditional sentences. Gordis in his treatment of this verse wants to take 'וַשְׁמַרְתָּנִי to mean 'bear a grudge' and while there is no evidence of שָׁמַר conveying such a sense, it is nevertheless a proposal that is worth bearing in mind. (30). Since No 457 occurs in close proximity to the above treated example it seems best to deal with it here.

V15 may be said to carry on the same kind of thoughts as were expressed by v14, since v15 is also cast in the form of a conditional sentence which is likewise begun with אָ. The particle אָ is, as in v14, followed by the perfect 'רָשָׁעִיתִי 'wicked' which is used in an identical way to the perfect in the protasis of v14. The second hemistich is then begun with the perfect conjunctive 'וַיְצַדֵּק־נִי 'righteous', the וַ of which construction is best taken in the sense of being copulative as well as continuing the force of אָ. Thus the perfect conjunctive is best understood as being parallel to the 'רָשָׁעִיתִי of the first hemistich in an antithetic sense.

אם אהה הכינות לבך ופרשת אליו כפך

"If you set your heart aright,
you will stretch out your hands toward him". (11.13 RSV).

Zophar's speech may be evenly divided into three parts which are appropriately marked in the RSV: vv2-6; vv7-12; and vv13-20. Each of these divisions contains a different subject matter and this may be noted as follows: in vv2-6 Zophar reproaches Job for his claim to innocence; in vv7-12 he affirms the inscrutability of God; in vv13-20 he counsels Job on the right way to behave and offers him hope if he will take Zophar's advice. The example here comes from the third of these divisions and is found in 11.13. In these verses Zophar counsels Job as to how he ought to respond to God and he does so in the language of conventional disputation. This is yet another example of the conditional sentence which is begun in the first hemistich by the particle ׀. But there is a very real question as to how far the influence of ׀ extends, for as the verse is understood by the RSV the first hemistich is the protasis while the second is the apodosis. Yet it seems that the RSV is alone here for nearly all the commentators follow Davidson who regards the ׀ of the perfect conjunctive of the second hemistich not as apodotic but as copulative. (31). This then means that the influence of ׀ extends to both the first and second hemistichs and that the entire verse

together with the following one is to be understood as the protasis (or as a parenthesis). The ׀א of the first hemistich is then followed by the perfect הנינוח 'set your heart aright' which here occurs with the complement לב exactly as in Ps 78.5. The perfect here may be parsed as the hiphil of the root נון. The condition is then continued in the second hemistich by the occurrence of the perfect conjunctive ופרשח 'stretch out'. In accordance with the above remarks the ׀ is best taken as being merely copulative and as carrying on the force of the condition marked by ׀א. Thus the perfect פרשח is best regarded as being in parallelism to הנינוח and further denotes a second condition of not only of setting one's heart right but also of maintaining a right attitude of prayer. Yet in the use of these two perfects there is a connective or consequential force since the natural corollary of setting one's heart aright is to be in an attitude of prayer.

No 509

כִּי אִז חֶשֶׁא פִּנִיךְ מִמֶּרֶם וְהֵיית מְצֻק וְלֹא תִירָא

"Surely then you will lift up your face without blemish;
you will be secure, and will not fear". (11.15 RSV).

The context of the example in 11.15 is identical to that of the previous example so there is no need to repeat what was said there. One has to note however, that 11.15 comprises the apodosis to the

conditional clause of 11.13. The apodosis is here begun with וְיָ which is here used to denote the absolute certainty of the result of Zophar's counsel if it is followed by Job. Cf GKC §159ee. Davidson has noted that this kind of apodosis is common in the book of Job. (32). The action of the apodosis proper is then begun in the first hemistich by the imperfect אָשׁוּב 'lift up' and this statement may be an allusion to Job's own words in 10.15 ("I do not lift up my head"). Thus if Job will only follow Zophar's advice he will no longer need to lower his head in shame. The second hemistich is begun with the perfect consecutive וְהָיָה 'will be' which surely denotes the continuance of the action begun by the imperfect אָשׁוּב . It may also be said to denote the consequence of Job lifting up his face and being in a state of blessing since if Job responds to the counsel of Zophar he will not only lift up his face but he will also be secure (בְּאָמֶן).

No 517

וְנִסַּחְתָּ כִּי יֵשׁ תְּקוּוּהָ וְחַפְרָתָהּ לְבֹטָח תִּשָּׂנֵב

"And you will have confidence, because there is hope; you will be protected and take your rest in safety". (11.18 RSV).

The context of the example in 11.18 is exactly the same as the former two examples. In the third part of Zophar's speech he gives counsel to Job on how he ought to behave and offers him hope if he does so. Vv16-20 may be considered the conclusion of the application which

Zophar makes in his speech. The conclusion is marked by ׀ which is located in the first hemistich of v16, concerns confidence for the present and hope that this state of affairs will extend into the near future. This is expressed in the first hemistich by the use of the perfect consecutive ׀׀׀׀׀׀ 'have confidence' which is best taken as denoting the continuance of action indicated by the imperfects of vv16-17. In this sense it may be said to denote the consequences of the actions expressed by the imperfects since if Job's life becomes brighter than the noon-day the consequence must surely be that he will have confidence. But is 'have confidence' the best way to translate ׀׀׀׀׀? Gordis has suggested that it is best translated with its original concrete meaning of 'lie down' (cf Arabic *bataha*). (33). If adopted this would mean that the concept of lying down would have been expressed in vv18a, 18b, & 19a which in itself makes it rather a weak proposal. Since this is the case it seems best to retain the usual meaning of 'confidence'. No 518 also occurs in this verse it may be treated at this point.

The second hemistich is begun by the perfect consecutive ׀׀׀׀׀׀ 'dig' a meaning which hardly suits the context. Gray understood 'searching around, before going to rest for the night, finding nothing amiss, Job will lie down with a sense of security'. (34). Clines has noted that such an interpretation is strained, and it is better to adopt Ehrlich's proposal of a verb ׀׀׀׀ 3, cognate with Arabic *hafara*, 'protect' and vocalize as a pual. This proposal has

been followed by RSV, NEB, and Dhorme. (35). The ך of the perfect consecutive must be considered to be copulative, preserving as it does the parallelism between the two verbs of this verse. As with the above example the perfect חָפַצְתָּ 'be protected' must also be seen to be the consequence to the imperfects of vv16-17 since if Job's life will be brighter than the noonday he will be protected. In conclusion it should be noted that the perfect conjunctive thus used is descriptive of a state, the state of Job being protected; further comments on this topic will be reserved for chapter 7.

No 520

וְרַבְצַת וְאֵין מַחַרִּיד וְחָלָו פְּנִיךָ רַבִּים

"You will lie down, and none will make you afraid;
many will entreat your favour".

(11.19 RSV).

The context here is the same as the former verse. It is part of the conclusion to Zophar's speech which had started with ך in v16. In the conclusion Zophar offers Job confidence for the present and the hope that this state of affairs will extend into the future. Such a hope has already been expressed by the perfect conjunctives that are used in v18. How then are we to understand the use of the perfect conjunctive in this verse? The verb in question is ך 'lie down' and it has already been noted that the concept of lying down has also

appeared in v18 with the verb **נָנַח** and if Gordis' proposal is accepted it is also in the verb **נָסַח**. That noted, it is clear that the first hemistich merely repeats the idea present in v18b and it is on these grounds that scholars such as Duhm, and Fohrer would delete it. Repetition alone is not sufficient grounds for the first hemistich to be deleted for as Clines has noted, the same wording **וְנָסַח אֵין מְחַרְרִיךְ** also occurs in Isa 17.2; and Zeph 3.13. (36). The concept of security which may be said to be the chief attraction of the future life is being reinforced in this verse by means of a current expression which conveys this idea. The verb which is used in v 18 to describe this idea is the imperfect of **נָנַח**. Although the perfect conjunctive is used in the verse under consideration, there cannot be any difference in the tense conveyed by these respective verbs. To suggest such would be to make a mockery of the poet's language. Therefore, it seems best to take the perfect conjunctive here as being merely copulative, the **ו** of this construction preserving as it does the parallelism between v18b & 19a. Since No 522 also occurs in this verse it seems best to deal with it here.

At first sight it is difficult to see the connection between the first and second hemistichs of this verse, but as Clines has noted, the concept of security which is present in the first hemistich is carried over into the second because such security must also include the esteem of those whom they have been accustomed to leading. (37). This is conveyed by the phrase **וְנָסַח אֵין מְחַרְרִיךְ** 'entreat good favour'

which is used of entreating the favour of God. When it is used of petitioning men it simply means to sway them by flatteries. (38). Thus the picture that Zophar has given to Job of his restoration is that not only will he be secure as far as his property is concerned but his rank and position will be honoured. Since such is the case it seems best to take the perfect conjunctive וְנִלְוֶה as denoting the nuance of consequence, the consequence being that because he is secure in his God he will also be honoured by those who are his acquaintances.

No 664

מִרִיחַ מַיִם יִפְרֹחַ וְעֵשֶׂה קִצְיָר כַּמֶּרְוֶה נֹסֵעַ

"Yet at the scent of water it will bud
and put forth branches like a young plant" (14.9 RSV).

In his legal disputation addressed to God himself, Job considers mankind in general, although he is also thinking of his own experience, and the point that he is making to God is that of the insignificance of mankind and in so doing he discourses on the fate and hope of mankind. In vv 7-12 Job compares the hope of a tree which, though it be cut down may yet again spring to life, with the hope of man who if he dies has no hope of returning to live again. The verse now under consideration details the revival of the tree by means of the scent of water. The tree's revival is expressed in the

first hemistich by the imperfect hiphil יִפְרוּ 'bud, blossom' which Dillman would want to repoint as a qal. But there is in fact no need to do this since the hiphil form provides a good parallel to עָשָׂה קִצְיָר in the second hemistich. (39). The perfect consecutive וַעֲשֶׂה 'put forth' is best taken as denoting the logical consequence of the tree beginning to bud again and this is the way that Gesenius has understood it in his grammar. (40).

No 670

אֲזָלוּ מַיִם מִנִּי יָם וְנָהָר יִחְרַב וְיִבֹשׁ

"As waters fail from a lake,
and a river wastes away and dries up," (14.11 RSV).

The context to this particular example is exactly the same as that of No 639 in that it comprises part of the comparison between the revival of a tree and the absence of any similar hope for man. This verse together with the following one, draws a comparison between water that evaporates or drains away and the human being who sinks down into the dust of death. A quite different interpretation is presented by Dhorme who translates: "The waters will have fled from the sea, And a river will have dried up and drained away". He considers that the image presents an impossible situation, like that in v12b of the heavens disappearance. The waters of the sea (יָם in its usual sense) may disappear and a mighty river dry up, but even then the human

person, once at rest in the grave, will never rise. Clines has noted that this interpretation is ruled out by the ך at the beginning of v12, which can only be the ך of comparison (waw adaequationis cf GKC § 161a). (41). In the first hemistich ך' is best understood in the sense of a lake (cf BDB 411 § 3,4) and the failure of its waters is expressed by the perfect ךזל 'go away' which is an Aramaic word used mainly in Hebrew poetry. The verse is identical to Isa 19.5 and on that ground it has been deleted by Duhm as unauthentic. However, it seems that there is no good reason for deletion since quotations from Isaiah and Psalms have already been noted in the treatment of 12.13-25. It is also worth noting that only the second hemistich is a copy of Isa 19.5b as the the first hemistich of Isa 19.5 has ךזל instead of ךזל and ךזל instead of ךזל. That said it seems best to take the perfect consecutive ךזל to denote the result of the action already expressed by the imperfect ךזל. Both Davidson and Dhorme have understood the use of the perfect consecutive in this way. (42).

No 731

כי תשיב אל אל רוחך והצאת מפיה מלין

"that you turn your spirit against God,
and let such words go out of your mouth"? (15.13 RSV).

With this example we now come to the beginning of the second cycle of

speeches (ch's 15-21), which is introduced by the discourse of Eliphaz the Temanite. Eliphaz's speech may conveniently be divided into two parts: (a) vv1-16 contain the address to Job in which he states that Job has spoken unwisely, self importantly, and aggressively, and in so doing has adopted a stance that ill becomes his piety. Because of this he is in need of correction. (b) vv17-35 describe the wicked man and his fate, which indeed is for Job's instruction—the point being that Job is not such a man and therefore has good reason for confidence. The example is taken from the first division in which Eliphaz has stated that Job is in need of correction. In this verse Eliphaz reproves Job for speaking in the manner that he has and this is expressed in the verse by וְלִי 'words'. The first hemistich has been begun by the particle כִּי 'that' which indicates that what follows is a causal clause to the question that has been expressed in v12. Driver in his work on Hebrew Tenses notes that the perfect consecutive is to be expected after the imperfect which is prefaced by כִּי. (43). The perfect consecutive is best taken as once again denoting the consequence of Job turning his spirit against God which is that he speaks reproachful words against God.

No 823

שָׁק חִפְרָתִי עָלַי וְלִלְלָתִי בַעֲפָר קָרְנִי

"I have sewed sackcloth upon my skin,
and have laid my strength in the dust". (16.15 RSV).

It seems best to follow Clines who sees three major divisions in this speech which is Job's reply to Eliphaz: (a) vv2-6 Job addresses the friends with criticisms of their words; (b) vv7-17 he begins to soliloquize, first lamenting the attacks of God; (c) vv18-22 he envisages the possibilities for vindication. Following on from this analysis of the content of Ch16 it can be seen that 16.15 is part of the second division in which he laments the attacks of God. In 16.15 Job reverts from describing the attacks of God to the description of his present state which he referred to in v6. The subject now under consideration is not the immediate effects of the attacks upon him, but the necessity for lamentation that they impose upon him. The present verse then describes Job's state of mourning and lamentation. The intensity of Job's state of mourning is then expressed by the perfect 'תָּפַח 'sew' which indicates that the sackcloth that he has put upon his skin cleaves to it as though it were sown on it. It is worth noting that the verb תָּפַח only occurs in the Hebrew Bible in Gen 3.7; Eccl 3.7; and in the piel in Ezk 13.18. Sackcloth was worn only in times of extreme grief and placed directly upon the skin. This thought is intensified by the second hemistich which describes the extremity of the moral depression of Job by use of the perfect conjunctive 'וַעֲלַחְתִּי 'thrust in'. The poel of the root עָלַח means to 'put in, thrust in' and is here used as Dhorme has noted to describe the antithesis of raising one's horn which in itself is a

sign of pride and exaltation. (44). The perfect conjunctive of the second hemistich is best taken as denoting his state of abasement which in itself is a direct consequence of the attacks of God upon him. Understood in this way the perfect conjunctive here indicates the nuance of consequence.

No 842

והצגני למשל עמים ותפת לפנים אהיה

"He has made me a byword of the peoples,
and I am one before whom men spit". (17.6 RSV).

In chapter 16 and in particular from vv7-17 Job expressed a lament about God's attacks on him. In this chapter Job continues to lament but this time in words addressed to his friends although God is addressed in vv3-4. The friends are thus addressed in vv1-10 and in vv11-16 he utters a lament about his death without vindication. 17.6, therefore, comes from the first section which is addressed to the friends. The language that is used here is still the language of emphasis denoting Job's state as a result of his sufferings. In this verse he returns to his state which he had also described in v2. The previous verse may be regarded as his comment on the activity of the friends. Because of this it is not possible to understand the perfect conjunctive as being in parallel to their activity although Driver has noted that Budde would reposit the perfect conjunctive as

3rd person plural which may be understood as a scholarly attempt to provide such continuity. (45). On the basis of G which reads εἶθου δε με, Duhm read וְנִצְּנִי (an imperfect consecutive), which again may be regarded as an attempt to normalise the text on the basis of previous usage. However, all such emendations are to be rejected since the former proposal by Budde makes Job's state the work of his friends and this is hardly likely, while the latter one by Duhm is also to be rejected since it has very little versional support. It seems best to take the perfect conjunctive וְנִצְּנִי as an emphatic construction indicating a contrast between what the friends have done and that which God has done. In his lament Job has considered God to be the source of his present state, while what the friends have done is merely to make that state worse and the contrast is indicated by an emphatic use of the perfect conjunctive.

No 882

סָבִיב בַּעֲתָהּוּ בְּלִהּוֹת וְהִפְיָצָהוּ לְרַגְלָיו

"Terrors frighten him on every side,
and chase him at his heels". (18.11 RSV).

The example in 18.11 is taken from the second speech of Bildad the Shuhite which may be analysed as follows: (a) vv2-4 an exordium addressed directly to Job; (b) vv5-21 a wisdom-type instruction on the fate of the wicked. In this speech Bildad undoubtedly casts

Job as one of the wicked who will inevitably suffer the fate here portrayed. On the basis of the above analysis it can be seen that 18.11 is to be found in the second section of the speech which may be conveniently thought of as a wisdom-type instruction on the fate of the wicked. In the previous three verses six different words are used for the trap, the purpose being to indicate that the wicked man is inevitably ensnared by death. The terrors which he now experiences are the evident signs of the encroachment of death, namely, hunger and disease (vv12-13). This is indicated in the first hemistich by the use of the perfect בַּעַתְּהוּ 'frighten', which is a favourite word of the book of Job. The second hemistich may be seen to be merely parallel to the first so in that sense the perfect conjunctive וְהַפִּי'צָהוּ may be regarded as being parallel to בַּעַתְּהוּ . Since such is the case the ו of this construction is best regarded as being merely copulative preserving as it does the parallelism between the two verbs. The verb of the perfect conjunctive פִּי'צָהוּ has proved a difficulty to commentators but since none of the emendations is plausible it is best to retain the difficulty and read the MT as it stands. The perfect conjunctive is best seen as simply repeating the thought of the first verb which is in itself a common feature of Hebrew poetry.

No 939

$\text{רוּחִי זָרָה לְאַשְׁחִי רִחְוֵתִי לְבִנִי בְּטָנִי}$

"I am repulsive to my wife,
loathsome to the sons of my own daughter". (19.17 RSV).

The content of Job's reply to Bildad may be analysed as follows:
vv2-6 address to the friends in which Job protests against their
persecution of him; vv7-12 and vv13-20 the reason of Job's downfall
is developed as being brought about by God's direct hand; vv21-22
second address to the friends calling on them to stop persecuting him;
vv23-27 the reason that they should do so is that Job is innocent and
one day will be declared so; vv28-29 third address to the friends
giving a note of confidence as well as a final warning of judgement to
come that will give them what they deserve.

From this analysis it will be noted that 19.17 occurs in the section
where Job states that his downfall has been brought about by God's
hand. It is best to take vv7-12 as referring to Job's physical
sufferings which have been brought about by God's hand and vv13-20 as
referring to the consequence of his physical state with his repulsive
appearance and loss of status. There is some doubt by scholars as to
the meaning of the first hemistich but most would interpret it as
meaning that Job is complaining that his bad breath, caused by his
disease, sickens his wife. This is indicated in the first hemistich
by the verb $\eta\eta$ which is derived from the root $\eta\eta$ 'to stink, be
loathsome'. This verb is only used here in the Hebrew Bible and is
intransitive in meaning and is expressive of a stative meaning. This
thought is then repeated in the second hemistich by

means of the perfect consecutive 'תַּנְתַּן the ך of which construction may be taken as being merely copulative preserving as it does the parallelism between the two verbs. The verb 'תַּנְתַּן is derived from the root תַּנַּן 2 'be loathsome' and is only attested here in the Hebrew Bible. Although the versions take this to be the root תַּנַּן 1 'be gracious' all scholarly attempts to find this root in the verse have proved fruitless. The perfect consecutive is best taken in a copulative sense, since it is in parallelism with תַּנַּן. It should be noted that the RSV offers a somewhat bland translation of the first hemistich. ("I am repulsive to my wife").

With the treatment of No 939 the consideration of the examples in the first section of the book of Job (3.1-20.29) is completed and the following examples are taken from the Elihu speeches.

No 1739

וְהוֹחַלְתִּי כִּי לֹא יִדְבַר כִּי עֲמֹד לֹא עֲנוּ עוֹד

"And shall I wait, because they do not speak,
because they stand there, and answer no more?" (32.16 RSV).

In these speeches, which for the sake of convenience may be divided into three parts, Elihu first of all explains to the three friends and to Job and to himself why or how he is going to intervene (32.6-

33.7); secondly, he cites or summarizes the words of Job three times, and having done so refutes the claim made by Job that he is righteous and does not deserve the the sufferings inflicted on him by God (33.8-35.16); thirdly, he presents independently his own view of the greatness of God, his creative activity, and his government of men 36.1-37.24.

From the above analysis it will be seen that the first example comes from the section in which Elihu offers an explanation as to how or why he is going to intervene. In the verses immediately preceding this example Elihu has stated that he intervenes at this juncture because the friends have not succeeded in gainsaying Job. Because of this the friends are left speechless. The first hemistich of the verse begins with the perfect consecutive 'וְהוֹחַלַתִּי which is derived from the root חָלַת' 'wait'. According to Gordis the use of the perfect consecutive here is to introduce a question. (46). Driver understood the perfect consecutive in the same way. (47). This view is rejected by Dhorme because he regards 'וְהוֹחַלַתִּי 'and I have waited' as an independent clause, the purpose of which is to show that Elihu has practised patience. (48). It seems that this latter view is correct (contra RSV, NEB) for the reasons Dhorme has stated. If such is the case how is one to interpret the perfect consecutive? It seems best to take 'וְהוֹחַלַתִּי as an emphatic construction used by the poet to underline the fact that Elihu has been patient. It cannot be regarded as being in parallelism since the subject of the verbs is

altogether different. For the same reason it cannot be regarded as denoting any nuance of consequence. It is best taken in the sense of denoting contrast and emphasis since the same verb has also been used with this meaning in v11.

No 1793

והונח במכאוב על משכבו וריב עצמיו אתן

"Man is also chastened with pain upon his bed,
and with continual strife in his bones"; (33.19 RSV).

The example in 33.19 comes from the section in which Elihu cites the words of Job and refutes the claims made in them. In Ch 33 the two complaints of Job are noted: (a) That he is innocent and yet God persecutes him (33.8-11); (b) That God does not answer him (33.12,13). It is this latter complaint that Elihu deals with first. In vv 14-30 Elihu asserts that God does speak sometimes in dreams and apparitions (vv15-16), and sometimes by pain and illness which are the gates of death (vv19-22). The purpose of the illness is then defined in v19: it is that through suffering of this kind God can discipline and chasten man. Elihu's statement thus counters Job's contention that God does not speak to him. The concept that God speaks to man by chastening him with illness is then introduced for the first time in v19 by means of the perfect consecutive הוֹנִיחַ 'chastened' which as the MT is read is a hophal. Dhorme here opts

for the reading of G which is similar to all the versions with the exception of Targ. This reading changes the passive hophal into the active hiphil and involves no alteration of consonants but merely that of vocalisation. It has the added attraction that it provides a continuity of subject between v18 & v19 and so clears up a difficulty in the Hebrew text. But it could well have been that the translators of G read the same Hebrew text which we ourselves have and took the opportunity of making the text more uniform in that respect. Since in many respects the Peshitta follows G it is best not to rely too much on it. Consequently it seems best to follow the MT as we have it and read a passive hophal. Having said this the best course is to take the perfect consecutive as an emphatic construction underlining how man is spoken to through such illness. It cannot be regarded as denoting any concept of consequence nor of parallelism since the subject of v18 is altogether different from that of v19. It is therefore, another example of this construction being used in an emphatic way.

No 1796

וזהמתו ח'תו לחם ונפשו מאכל תארה

"So that his life loathes bread,
and his appetite dainty food." (33.20 RSV).

The context of 33.20 is the same as that of No 1796. Here Elihu assures Job that God often speaks to man by means of illness to discipline and chasten him. The verse under consideration defines the condition of chastening. So chastened he loses his appetite. This is indicated in the first hemistich by means of the perfect consecutive וְזָהַמְתָּ 'loathe' which as Gordis has noted is both factitive, 'make foul' and declarative, 'consider foul'. (49). Dhorme here wants to emend the Hebrew text to read וְזָהַמְתָּ in order to excise the difficult suffix ך. (50). It is however, best regarded as an ethical dative and may be translated literally "and his soul loathes food for itself". Both RSV and Gordis translate this verse as a purpose clause 'so that' and this seems in order. The use of the perfect consecutive is then best taken as denoting the nuance of consequence, since what the poet describes is the consequence of man being chastened.

No 1850

וְאִרְחַל לְחִבְרָה עִם פְּעֻלֵי אֹרֶן וְלִלְכַת עִם אֲנָשֵׁי רָשָׁע

"who goes in company with evildoers

and walks with wicked men". (34.8 RSV).

Chapters 33 & 34 of Elihu's speech are concerned with refuting Job's errors. In Ch 33, Elihu has been concerned in meeting Job's claim that God neither speaks to him nor answers him. In Ch 34 he treats Job's first complaint, namely, that Job is innocent and that God is unjust in his dealings with him. He underlines the assertion that God is just in his dealings with men in general and with Job in particular. Job's claim to be righteous is taken up and Elihu addresses himself first to the wise and argues that Job is wicked and that God is not a subverter of right. Thus in vv 7-9 he asserts that Job is a sinner and that his claim to be righteous is false. V8 claims that the true character of Job is to be seen in the kind of company that he keeps and is underpinned by means of the perfect consecutive וָאָרַח 'go about' which is best interpreted as denoting the consequence to the imperfect יִשָּׂה 'drink' of the previous verse. It is understood in this way by both Driver and Dhorme. (51).

No 1885

לִכְן יִכְיֹר מִצַּבְדֵיהֶם וְהִפֵּךְ לַיְלָה וַיִּדְכָאוּ

"Thus, knowing their works,
he overturns them in the night,
and they are crushed." (34.25 RSV).

The example in 34.25 shares the same context, with the exception of vv 21-25 where Elihu asserts that because God knows all things He is able to chastise those who have become estranged from him without any investigation. This is the sentiment of 34.25. The first hemistich expresses the concept of the omniscience of God by means of the simple imperfect יָנִיחַ 'know, recognise' which is best translated in English by a present tense. God continually knows the deeds of the wicked. The consequence to this action is denoted by the perfect consecutive וְהִפֵּךְ 'overturn'. The fact that God overturns the wicked in the night is consequent upon his knowledge of their deeds.

No 1931

אִם חִטָּאת מֵה תַּפְעַל בּוֹ וְרָבוּ פִּשְׁעֵיךָ מֵה תַּעֲשֶׂה לוֹ

"If you have sinned, what do you accomplish against him?

And if your transgressions are multiplied, what do you do to him"

(35.6 RSV).

In chapter 35 Elihu, as it were, starts his argument all over again with a summary of the arguments which he supposed Job to have maintained, namely, that righteousness does not pay or benefit him in any way. He then argues in vv5-7 that God is too exalted to derive any benefit from Job's righteousness even if this were true. However, in v6 the reverse of this concept

is also stated: that God is also too exalted to be injured in any way by the sins of men or of Job in particular. Two conditional sentences express this sentiment in v6. The question is then begun in the first hemistich by means of the particle ׀א 'if'. The force of the question is then conveyed by the perfect אטח 'sin' which is followed by a 'what' clause denoted by הן with the imperfect תפעל 'do'. The force of the initial ׀א carries over into the second hemistich as is usually the case in Hebrew poetry. As the second hemistich must be regarded as being parallel to the first, the second hemistich merely repeats the concepts of the first but in different words. This is begun in the second hemistich by the perfect conjunctive וררן 'multiply' the ׀ of which construction is best regarded as being merely copulative since it preserves the parallelism between the first and second hemistichs. Thus this example of the perfect conjunctive is best understood as being parallel to אטח.

No 2052

החדע בשום אלוה עליהם והופיע אור עננו

"Do you know how God lays his command upon them,
and causes the lightning of his cloud to shine?" (37. 15 RSV).

In this chapter, as previously, Elihu talks about the greatness of God and his creative activity. Here he notes that God is the author of all meteoric activity: rain, storm, snow, showers, cold, ice,

lightning and thunderbolts. This is followed in vv 14-20 by a series of questions similar to the manner of the questions of the divine speeches which are designed to show that Job has not the knowledge of such works and so by implication cannot perform them. The questions themselves in vv14-16 are begun by the interrogative particle ה. This is followed in the first hemistich by the imperfect וְיָדַע 'know' and it should be noted that the force of the initial particle as well as that of the imperfect extend to the second hemistich. The wording of the first hemistich is difficult because the imperfect is followed by the infinitive construct וְיָשַׁב 'put' the nearer object of which is desiderated. This has caused Duhm to prefer the text of G which has: οἶδαμεν ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ἐθετο ἔργα αὐτοῦ and so to read וְיָשַׁב for וְיָדַע. There is however no need to make the transposition because as Dhorme noted the complement 'his deeds' does not fit with וְיָשַׁב 'place, dispose'. (52). It is therefore, best to retain the MT despite its obvious difficulties. The second hemistich begins with the perfect consecutive וְיִהְיֶה 'cause to shine' which is best taken as being parallel to וְיָשַׁב since it carries on its thought and is the second part of the question on the acts of God. (53).

No 2162

תִּסְפֹּר יִרְחִים חֲמֵלָאֵנָה וְיִדְעַת עַת לְדַתְנָה

"Can you number the months that they fulfil,
and do you know the time when they bring forth?" (39.2 RSV).

As far as the perfect conjunctive is concerned there are only two examples attested within these chapters (38.1-42.6) which constitute the divine speeches, the first of which is dealt with here. The main point of the speech is that Job in his ignorance had misrepresented God and this is put briefly in the series of challenging questions with which the speech opens (38.2) and closes (40.2). The main body of the speech (38.4-39.30) also consists for the most part of questions, and is designed to bring out the immensity of Job's ignorance and the greatness of God's knowledge and his beneficent use of it. These questions fall into two main groups, referring (1) to the inanimate world, its creation and maintenance, 38.4-38; and (2) to animals, and in particular wild animals, their maintenance and habits, 38.39-39.30. Thus, from this particular analysis Job is now asked about his knowledge of wild animals as far as the time of the birth of their young is concerned. As these questions are asked to show up the ignorance of Job, there is in all of these questions an implied negative. The questioning proper starts in 39.1 with the interrogative particle ה and the perfect יָדַע 'know'. The force of this particle is carried on into the first hemistich of v2 with the imperfect תִּסְמַךְ 'number' which refers to Job's ability to count the time of the animal's pregnancy. The second hemistich merely repeats the question in different language and is begun by the perfect conjunctive וְיָדַע 'know'. The perfect

conjunctive is surely best interpreted as being parallel to וְיָסַר of the first hemistich and its ו is simply copulative preserving the parallelism between the two verbs. It is noteworthy that the imperfect of עָרַב is used in 37.15 with no syntactical difference as in the Targum of Job from Qumran. (54).

No 2347

עַל כֵּן אֶמְאָס וְנִחַמְתִּי עַל עַפְרָי וְאֶפְרָי

"Therefore I despise myself,
and repent in dust and ashes". (42.6 RSV).

The final example of the perfect consecutive is located in 42.6 which in itself is the final verse of Job's response to the divine speeches. As such it may be considered to be parallel to a similar response in 40.4,5. The natural sequel to 41.26 would be 42.7. But the poet wished to bring on to the scene for the last time the hero of the story. Just as 40.3-5 formed the conclusion of the first of the divine speeches, so 42.1-6 concludes the last speech. (55). His response is contained in the first hemistich by means of the imperfect עָרַב 'recant' which as Pope has observed has no object. (56). The KJV and RSV follow the text of G which supplies an object in the word ἐμαυτον 'myself' but this is unlikely since the verb עָרַב is not used in the sense of loathing oneself. JPS supplies 'my words' and this is doubtless correct since what Job despises is not himself but the

utterances which he made. This is followed by the perfect consecutive '𐤍𐤍𐤍𐤍' 'repent' which surely must be interpreted as denoting the consequence of loathing his utterances, which is that he repents with dust and ashes.

In this chapter we have examined some 38 examples of the perfect conjunctive/consecutive as used in the book of Job which are spread through Ch's 3.1-20.29; 32.1-37.24; 38.1-42.6. Thus we have been able to trace how it works in different types of literature contained within the book of Job. It is now necessary to come to some sort of conclusion as to its use.

From the analysis of the examples considered in this chapter it seems to me that there are in fact four distinct usages of the construction in the book. These are as follows:

(1) The perfect conjunctive/consecutive is used in one case only to denote a change in the subject of action in the passage. As has been stated this is in accord with a use of the perfect in Ugaritic.

(2) The perfect conjunctive/consecutive is used in a very similar way to the imperfect consecutive & imperfect conjunctive to denote the concept of consequence and may be considered to be an alternative form which the poet has used for the sake of variety. Thus one has to argue for an overlap of usage between the imperfect

consecutive, the imperfect conjunctive and the perfect conjunctive/consecutive.

(3) In a way similar to the imperfect consecutive, the perfect consecutive is used emphatically to underline a particular action chosen by the poet.

(4) The perfect conjunctive/consecutive is used in parallelism with other verbs in the colon whether they are imperfect or perfect and the γ in such examples is merely copulative preserving such parallelism.

Under these circumstances it becomes somewhat difficult to formulate any rules as to its exact usage from a syntactic point of view but we can simply note what seems to be its main usage in Hebrew poetry and in the book of Job in particular. Thus we can say that the use of the perfect conjunctive/consecutive in poetry is to denote the concept of consequence as an alternative form to the imperfect consecutive and to the imperfect conjunctive. It is also used to express any emphatic action which the poet wished particularly to draw attention to and may be considered to be an alternative form to the imperfect consecutive.

(22)	Gordis	ibid		p .89
(23)	Dhorme	ibid		p123
(24)	Davidson	<u>Hebrew Syntax</u>	\$130a	p176
(25)	Dhorme	ibid		p137
(26)	Davidson	<u>Commentary on the book of Job</u>		p146
(27)	Andersen, F.	<u>Job</u> T. O. T. C.	1976	p150
(28)	Driver	<u>Hebrew Tenses</u>	\$136a	p175
(29)	Davidson	<u>Hebrew Syntax</u>	\$130b	p177
(30)	Gordis	ibid		p114
(31)	Davidson	<u>Commentary on the book of Job</u>		p172
(32)	Davidson	<u>Hebrew Syntax</u>	\$131rr	p180
(33)	Gordis	ibid		p125
(34)	Driver/Gray	ibid		p110
(35)	Clines, D. J. A.	WBC <u>Job</u> 1989		p256
(36)	Clines	ibid		p270
(37)	Clines	ibid		p270f
(38)	Dhorme	ibid		p167
(39)	Dhorme	ibid		p199
(40)	Gesenius	ibid	\$112m	p332
(41)	Clines	ibid		p329
(42)	Davidson	<u>Commentary on the book of Job</u>		p201
	Dhorme	ibid		p200
(43)	Driver	<u>Hebrew Tenses</u>	\$111. 4	p132
(44)	Dhorme	ibid		p238
(45)	Driver/Gray	ibid		p111
(46)	Gordis	ibid		p369
(47)	Driver	<u>Hebrew Tenses</u>	\$119g	p141

- | | | | | |
|------|--------------|----------------------|-----------------------|------|
| (48) | Dhorme | ibid | | p482 |
| (49) | Gordis | ibid | | p376 |
| (50) | Dhorme | ibid | | p498 |
| (51) | Driver/Gray | ibid | | p253 |
| | Dhorme | ibid | | p511 |
| (52) | Dhorme | ibid | | p568 |
| (53) | Driver/Gray | ibid | | p293 |
| (54) | Sokoloff, M. | <u>Targum to Job</u> | 1974 | p 90 |
| (55) | Dhorme | ibid | | p645 |
| (56) | Pope, M. H. | <u>Job</u> | The Anchor Bible 1965 | p289 |

Chapter Seven

The use of the Perfect

This chapter deals with the simple perfect. By this term is meant the use of the perfect on its own without any preceding ל . It is necessary first of all to note that the perfect is the second most common tense used in the book of Job: there are some 314 examples in Chs 3.1-20.29; 32.1-37.24; 38.1-42.6 compared with 940 examples of the imperfect which has already been dealt with in chapter 5. Clearly, within the compass of this study it will not be possible to treat all the examples and so some 73 examples have been selected as representative of the perfect as it is used in the above chapters. It is assumed that the interpretation of those examples which are not dealt with here correspond to those that are.

At the outset, however, it should be noted that we are not only presented with the bulk of the examples which require to be treated, but also with the question of how they should be treated. As with the imperfect, there is a certain unanimity in the interpretation of the perfect in nearly all the grammars. The grammar of Gesenius may be considered to be fairly typical in this respect:

"More particularly the uses of the perfect may be distinguished as follows:

1. To represent actions, events, or states, which, after a shorter or longer duration, were terminated in the past, and hence are finally concluded, viz:

(a) Corresponding to the perfect proper in Latin and the English perfect definite, in assertions, negations, confirmations, interrogations, &c.,----

(b) As a simple tempus historicum (corresponding to the Greek aorist) in narrating past events,----

(c) To represent actions, &c., which were already completed in the past, at the time when other actions or conditions took place (pluperfect), ----. This is especially frequent, from the nature of the case, in relative, causal, and temporal clauses, when the main clause contains a tense referring to the past,----. So also in clauses which express the completion or incompleteness of one action, &c., on the occurrence of another.

2. To represent actions, events, or states, which, although completed in the past, nevertheless extend their influence into the present (in English generally rendered by the present):

(a) Expressing facts which were accomplished long before, or conditions and attributes which were acquired long before, but of which the effects still remain in the present (present perfect)---. This applies particularly to a large number of perfects (almost exclusively of intransitive verbs, denoting affections or states of the mind) which in English can only be rendered by the present, or, in the case mentioned above under (c), by the imperfect.

(b) In direct narration to express actions which, although really only in process of accomplishment, are nevertheless meant to be represented as already accomplished in the conception of the speaker,--.

(c) To express facts which have formerly taken place, and are still of constant recurrence, and hence are matters of common experience (the Greek gnomic aorist),---

3. To express future actions, when the speaker intends by an express assurance to represent them as finished, or as equivalent to accomplished facts:

(a) In contracts or other express stipulations (again corresponding to the English present, and therefore closely related to the instances noted under 2 (b)),----Especially in promises made by God.

(b) To express facts which are undoubtedly imminent, and, therefore, in the imagination of the speaker, already accomplished (perfectum confidentiae),---. This use of the perfect occurs most frequently in prophetic language (perfectum propheticum). The prophet so transports himself in imagination into the future that he describes the future event as if it had been seen or heard by him,---. Not infrequently the imperfect interchanges with such perfects either in the parallel member or further in the narrative.

(c) To express actions or facts, which are meant to be indicated as existing in the future in a completed state (futurum exactum),---

4. To express actions and facts, whose accomplishment in the past is to be represented, not as actual, but only as possible (generally corresponding to the Latin imperfect or pluperfect subjunctive),---in the apodosis of a conditional sentence,---. Finally, also in a question indicating astonishment." (1).

As was noted in Ch 5, the above statement is heavily dependant upon the work of Ewald; for since the 17th edition of his grammar Rödiger had adopted the grammatical terms Perfect and Imperfect. (2). It was also noted in Ch 5 that all the major works on Hebrew syntax such as Davidson, Driver and Müller have also followed Ewald in his grammatical terminology and in his interpretation of tenses. Since Ewald's view may be described as being heavily aspectual in character (as noted in Ch 5) it further means that the interpretation of tense which is to be found in such works is also of that same character. The effect of this as far as the syntax of Hebrew poetry is concerned is that the distinctive poetic nuances of tense have been obliterated. Given that such is the situation as far as the interpretation of tense is concerned, on what basis can any study proceed which wishes to examine the poetic usage of the perfect?

An approach which does commend itself is to be found in the work by F. R. Blake which is entitled A Resurvey of Hebrew Tenses (1951). In the conclusion to his work, Blake discusses the probable development of Hebrew verbal syntax and formulates the following conclusion:

"\$68. The development of the complicated mechanism of the Hebrew verb system as presented in the Hebrew text is perhaps to be visualized as follows:

1. Archaic period:

Imperfect an omnitemporal form

Perfect a predicate adjective form with present meaning." (3).

In the production of his work Blake confesses his reliance on the work of H. Bauer, who, it may be said was also responsible for inspiring the studies of G. R. Driver and G. W. Thacker. (4). Thus what Blake attempted to do in his work was to formulate a syntax of the Hebrew verb system based upon its probable original function in proto-semitic. While it falls outside the remit of this work to discuss the sources of the Hebrew verbal system as developed in the works of the above scholars, it does seem appropriate to give a short account of the evidence which Blake uses.

For Blake, as well as for H. Bauer & G. R. Driver, the original relation of the two forms (perfect and imperfect) is best represented by the situation in Akkadian which is regarded virtually as being equivalent to proto-semitic by these scholars. Akkadian possesses two forms of the verb with preformatives, e. g., in the simple form (conjugation) *ikassad* used as a present-future and *iksud* used as a preterite, and a form with affirmatives (permansive) e. g. *kasad*, *kasud*, *kasid*, which are intransitive and denote state. (5).

Since this chapter is mainly concerned with the use of the perfect,

it is best to concentrate on its development and use. Blake has noted that in the other semitic languages an active form with generally preterite meaning has developed from the *a* form of the originally stative perfect, e.g., 𐤁𐤏𐤍, while the forms *qatil* and *qatul* and sometimes *qatal* retain for the most part their originally stative present meaning. (6). He has further noted that the original present meaning of the perfect is preserved in Hebrew stative verbs and in the prophetic perfect and perhaps in what he has called the converted perfect, and in the use of the perfect in Arabic in wishes and future conditions. (7).

Thus, in his analysis of the original function and use of the perfect, Blake has drawn from the verbal systems of Akkadian and Arabic as providing supportive evidence of that function. He has not, however, paid any attention to the use of the verb forms in Ugaritic and this is a flaw in his scholarship. One scholar who has is T.L.Fenton in his study The Ugaritic Verbal System (1963). Fenton has abbreviated the results of his findings in a short article entitled The Hebrew Tenses in the Light of Ugaritic (1973) and it is to this latter study that reference will be made. In his work, Fenton has argued that the perfect 𐤁𐤏𐤍 in the Ugaritic poems, apart from its narrative usage, also has the function of the Akkadian stative (permansive) and the Hebrew so-called "stative perfects". In addition to this stative function, it also possesses a narrative usage which Fenton regards as more frequent than its stative usage. Fenton has noted four circumstances in which 𐤁𐤏𐤍 replaces 𐤁𐤏𐤍' as the

narrative form. (1) If the same verb is used in a narrative passage, in both members of a parallelistic unit, it may appear once in the לִּבְּרַת form, once in the לִּבְּרַת form. (2) In reporting the fulfilment of a command issued in the imperative (לִּבְּרַת) form (as distinct from לִּבְּרַת) the narrative form may be לִּבְּרַת ---but if the command was in the form of לִּבְּרַת the report of its fulfilment is in the form לִּבְּרַת . (3) In conversations, that is, when the "characters" of the poems address each other, they refer to, or inform of, past events in the לִּבְּרַת form, not לִּבְּרַת . (4) When a significant stage in the narrative is reached, when there is a change of subject matter, or when the narrative turns to a "character" who has not been the focus of attention in the preceding lines, the first verb or verbs of the new episode may be in the לִּבְּרַת form before the narrative returns to לִּבְּרַת . (8).

While all of the above usages noted by Fenton apply to the narrative poetry of Ugarit, his definitions are helpful to us in our attempt to define the use of the perfect in Hebrew poetry which as has been already noted in Ch 5 is the poetry of discourse, prayer, praise, lament, disputation, accusation, and of commitment. In other words the character of Hebrew poetry is that of the language of piety in a way that the poetry of Ugarit is not. It is from such language that a syntax of the use of the perfect will be formulated.

As with Ch 5, the approach that is being developed here is in some ways similar to that which Michel has used in his study, but is

independent of him. His approach is as follows:

"Section 2: The Perfect

- \$ 6 the perfect in the portrayal of distress in the lamentations and songs of deliverance.
- \$ 7 the perfect in reporting deliverance.
- \$ 8 the perfect in the portrayal of past action.
- \$ 9 the perfect in the expression of pluperfect action.
- \$10 the perfect in the portrayal of present action
- \$11 the perfect in the expression of future action.
- \$12 the declared perfect.
- \$13 explanation by means of the perfect." (9).

The difference between this approach and the one developed here is that his concern was to show that the perfect must designate an action which is in itself meaningful, which does not stand in relation to something else and so is independent; the approach developed here seeks to show that לִבַּר has as a poetic nuance allied to its original stative function in its use in the discourses of the book of Job.

It therefore seems best to examine the use of the perfect under the following categories:

- (a) The Stative use of the Perfect.

(b) The Perfect used to express Distress in the Lamentations.

(c) The Perfect used as an Alternative Tense.

(d) The Perfect used to denote the concept of Consequence.

(A) The Stative use of the Perfect

The stative use of the perfect has already been noted by S. R. Driver:

"\$11. (5) Closely allied to (3) is the use of the perfect with such verbs as 'יָדַעַתִּי' 'I know'; וַיִּזְכְּרוּ 'We remember'; and אָהַב 'he loves'. In verbs like these, expressive of a state or condition, whether physical or mental, which, though it may have been attained at some previous time, nevertheless continues to exist up to the moment of speaking, the emphasis rests so often upon the latter point, that the English present most adequately represents the the force of the original perfect." (10).

The difficulty with this definition is that it is attempting to explain the use of the perfect in describing such states from an aspectual point of view, instead of interpreting such perfects in a way that brings out the original permansive function of the perfect as preserved in early Hebrew poetry, in the wishes of Arabic, in the Akkadian permansive and in the poetry of Ugarit.

It seems best to proceed to examine the stative use of the perfect not as has formerly been done by an exhaustive examination of the texts in

which verbs occur, but by classifying the stative verbs that do occur in the book of Job and seeing in what contexts they occur. The following list of stative verbs has been compiled from the works of Driver and Gesenius:

אהב to love; בטח to trust; בקש to seek; גבה to be high; גולל to be great; דמה to be like; ונר to remember; זקן to be old; חסה to take refuge; חפץ to delight; טובה to be good; טהר to be clean; יגע to be weary; ידע to know; יכל to be able; ירא to fear; מאן to refuse; מאס to despise; מלא to be full; עלץ to exult; צדק to be just; נקד to requite; קוה to wait; קטן to be small; רוב to be many; רחק to be aloof; שבע to be full; שמח to rejoice; שנא to hate; שנא to abhor. (11).

Although this list incorporates the more commonly used verbs it is by no means exhaustive, and as a result is not comprehensive enough to include the roots which are used in the book of Job with a stative function. It has therefore, seemed appropriate to formulate a list of all of the verbs which have such a function in the book of Job:

אבר to destroy; אחז to seize; אכל to eat; בוא to come; בלע to swallow; בעת to terrify; ברח to flee; גולל to tear away; גלה to reveal; דבק to cleave; דבר to speak; הלך to go; הפך to overturn; חל to hide; זך to be pure; חטא to sin; חיה to live; חפץ to delight in; חפר to search out; חקר to explore; חשב to account; חשך to grow dark; טבע to sink; טמה to be obstructed;

יָבֵשׁ to be dry; יָדַע to know; יָחַל to wait; יָנַח to reprove; יָלַד to bear; יָרָה to shoot; נָוֵן to establish; נָוַב to lie; נָחַד to hide; נָסַה to cover; לַעַץ to talk inconsiderately; מָלֵא to be full; מָלַל to speak; מָצָא to find; מָרַץ to be painful; נָגַד to declare; נָגַע to touch; נָטַה to stretch out; נָכַר to recognise; נָטַע to pull out; נָפַח to blow; נָשָׂא to lift; נָשָׂה to forget; נָתַע to be broken out; סָגַר to shut; סָוֵר to turn aside; סָפַק to smite; עָבַר to pass by; עָוָה to do wrong; עָוַת to pervert; עָזַב to forsake; עָלַם to rejoice; עָמַד to stand; עָרַךְ to arrange; עָשָׂה to do; עָתַק to break up; פָּדָה to redeem; פָּחַד to fear; פָּלַג to cleave; פָּקַד to visit; פָּתַח to open; צָדִיק to be righteous; צָוָה to command; צָוַק to oppress; צָפַן to hide; קָדַם to be in front; קָלַל to lighten; קָפַץ to shut; קָרָא to call; קָרַץ to be shaped; קָשָׂה to harden; קָשַׁח to harden; רָאָה to see; רָיַב to contend; רָצַץ to break; שָׁבַב to be high; שָׂם to set; שָׁוָה to go astray; שָׁוַב to return; שָׁוָה to be like; שָׁוַי to see; שָׂית to place; שָׁחַח to bow down; שָׁלַח to send; שָׁלַם to remain sound; שָׁלַף to draw; שָׁמַם to be desolate; שָׁמַע to hear; שָׁפָה to sweep bare; שָׁעָה to stagger.

It will not be possible to consider all the verbs tabulated above due to the limitations which have been placed upon this study, however a selection will be examined which it is believed will exemplify the stative function of the perfect within the book of Job.

Before embarking on this enquiry however, it is necessary to define the term "stative verb". This term may be defined as the function of a verb whose action relates more to the subject than any supposed object. For this reason they have often been described as "intransitive verbs" although this definition in itself is not fully appropriate. (12). The reason is that not every stative verb is intransitive and consequently the term is only used loosely. Nevertheless, the definition given above is believed to be an accurate description of its function, since it declares more about the subject's mental state and emotion and thus may be a genuine archaism preserved in Hebrew Poetry.

The Verb אָנָה

This verb occurs in the book of Job in the qal in Ch 4.7, 11.20, 18.17; and in the hiphil in Ch 14.19.

No 77

וְכִּי לֹא מִי הָיָה נִקְיָא אֲבָד וְאִיפָה יִשְׂרָאֵל נִנְהָתוּ

"Think now, who that was innocent ever perished?

Or where were the upright cut off? (4.7 RSV).

Chapter 4 constitutes the first reply to Job by Eliphaz the Temanite. His reply, like those in the dialogue, does not follow any fixed

form, but contains a great variety of form-critical elements. The first major strophe (vv 2-11) may be said to contain a conventional "speech preface", in which reference is made to "words", either the imminent words of the speaker, or those of his interlocutor. This preface is immediately followed by a highly stylized description of the fate of the wicked of which v 7 is the introductory statement. The description of the fate of the wicked begins in the first hemistich by means of the imperative א] רנ] 'think now' the purpose of which is to cause Job to recall and reflect upon a truth which Eliphaz views as being self evident. A more appropriate rendering of the imperative א] רנ] might be that of the REB's "consider" as Job is being asked to give acquiescence to a self evident truth which is that although the righteous suffer they never actually perish. This concept is expressed in the first hemistich by means of the perfect רנ] 'perish' which is here used with a stative nuance since the verbal action describes that which the righteous are never allowed to do. That the perfect is used with such a nuance in the first hemistich is borne out by the parallel use of the perfect niphal רנ] 'cut off' which of course is used with a reflexive meaning.

It was noted above that vv 7-11 contain a description of the fate of the wicked which as Clines has noted is meant to function as an assurance to Job. (13). In these verses the verb רנ] 'perish' actually occurs 3 times: in v 7 as a perfect; in v 9 as the imperfect; and in v 11 as a participle. An examination of the text reveals that the perfect is only used here with a reference to the

righteous as subject, while the imperfect and participle serve to describe the fate of the wicked. It could of course be argued that the difference in perfect/imperfect is to be explained on the strict dictates of tense. However, it seems better to explain such a difference as being due to what might be called the ethical usage of לָבַט--לָבַט'. What this means is that in such contexts the perfect is used to describe either the state or actions of the righteous, while the imperfect is used to describe the state or actions of the unrighteous. Fensham came close to such a definition in his examination of the tenses as they were used in a few selected Psalms. (14). The function of tense referred to above may be described as being a genuine poetic usage and the book of Psalms is replete with examples of it, although Michel has not examined such in his study.

The Verb לָבַט

The perfect of this verb only occurs in the qal in 9.25.

No 396

וַיִּמְּוּ קָלוּ מִנִּי רַץ בִּרְחוּ לֹא רָאוּ טוֹבָה

"My days are swifter than a runner;

they flee away, they see no good." (9.25 RSV).

The speech itself, which consists of Job's reply to Bildad and extends over two chapters, can be broken into two parts: (a) 9.2-24 it is not clear whether this is a monologue or an address to the friends, but God is spoken of in the third person. (b) 9.25-10.22 God is now addressed in the second person. The theme developed here is that of Job's powerlessness before God and the fact that he is trapped in his own private hell. In 9.25 the monologue gives way to the address and Job now addresses God in the second person in speech that has some similarities to the lament form. In vv 25-26 he has given a brief reflection on the brevity of his life. He expresses this concept in the first hemistich of v 25 by means of the perfect לָקַח 'swifter' which is surely used with a stative nuance since it describes the shortness of his days, the subject which has been placed in emphatic position at the beginning of the first hemistich. The verb לָקַח is followed by the first of three striking images of the swiftness of the days of his life, namely, רָץ 'runner' which denotes the swift carrier who brings news (cf Isa 41.27). The second hemistich carries on the thought of the swiftness of Job's days by means of the verb $\text{נָסוּ$ 'flee' which is once again used with a stative nuance. These remarks are equally applicable to the following verb רָאָה 'see'. The first two verbs are used with an intransitive sense to indicate the swiftness of Job's days.

The Verb לָקַח

The perfect of this verb only occurs in the gal in 32.6.

No 1713

ויען אליהוא בן ברנאל הנוזי ויאמר
צעיר אני לימים ואחם ישישים
על כן זחלתי ואירא מחות דעי אחכם

"And Elihu the son of Barachel the Buzite answered:

I am young in years and you are aged;

therefore I was timid and afraid

to declare my opinion to you."

(32.6 RSV).

The critical matters relative to the date and composition of these speeches have already been noted in Ch 3 and so there is no need to repeat them here. Vv 1-5 of this chapter may be regarded as a short prose introduction in which he explains why he has so far remained silent. In these verses Elihu also gives his genealogy, country and family. He has refrained from speaking because he was young in years compared to the friends who are held in esteem because they are aged, but at the end of their speeches they have given no answer and therefore he now speaks because he believes he is constrained to do so. V 6 may be considered to be the opening statement of a long exordium on the failure of the sages and their respective wisdom.

The intervention of Elihu is indicated by the conventional prose

beginning with the imperfect consecutive וַיַּעַן 'answered' which is followed by the pausal וַיֹּאמֶר which generally indicates that direct speech follows on. In his speech he first of all gives the reason for his reticence in speaking, namely, his youth which is expressed by nominal elements. Dhorme has noted that v 6 is actually composed of two verse each of which has two hemistichs. (15). The second verse is linked to the first by the compound particle וְלָכֵן 'therefore' which is followed by the perfect וַיִּחַל 'timid' and is used here with a stative nuance. Tur-Sinai has noted that the derivation of וַיִּחַל should not be taken from the common Hebrew verb וַיִּחַל 'creep', but from the Old Aramaic וַיִּחַל 'be afraid' which also occurs in the inscription of Zakir, 1. 13. (16). This root only occurs here in the Hebrew Bible and is immediately followed by the imperfect consecutive וַיִּירָא 'afraid' which may be considered to convey the concept of consequence, namely, that his state of fear was the consequence of his state of timidity. Thus, the perfect וַיִּחַל describes the state of Elihu which prevented him from speaking earlier in the process.

The Verb וַיִּירָא

The only occurrence of the perfect of this verb is located in 15. 15.

No 735

הֵן בְּקִשּׁוֹ לֹא יֵאמְרוּ וְשָׂמִים לֹא זָכַר בְּעִינָיו

"Behold, God puts no trust in his holy ones,
and the heavens are not clean in his sight." (15.15 RSV).

This example is contained in the discourse of Eliphaz the Temanite which also may be said to introduce the second cycle of speeches (Ch's 15-21). His speech may conveniently be divided into two parts: (a) vv 1-16 contain the address to Job in which he states that Job has spoken unwisely, self importantly and aggressively, and in so doing has adopted a stance that ill becomes his piety. Because of this he is in need of correction. (b) vv 17-35 describe the wicked man and his fate, which is for Job's instruction--the point being that Job is not such a man and therefore has good reason for confidence. The example that is now being considered comes clearly from the first division of the speech where Eliphaz states that Job has spoken unwisely.

In vv 14-16 Eliphaz states the doctrine of human depravity, the substance of which had already been revealed to him earlier (4.17-21). This doctrine has been rejected by Job, although Eliphaz is convinced that Job needs to hear it again for his own good. Eliphaz is attempting to prove Job's guilt by showing that the words he has uttered are a symptom of his own depravity. In v 15 he states that such depravity is not only the plight of man, but of the heavens and his holy ones. This thought is expressed in the first hemistich by means of the hiphil imperfect י'אָא' 'trust' the subject of which is God himself. The first hemistich thus declares that God does not

even put such trust in his holy ones which some commentators have taken as a reference to Angels. The second hemistich conveys the thought that the "heavens" are not clean in his sight. Clines has noted that the "heavens" may signify the heavenly bodies who are regarded as beings, the "host" or "army" of heaven who are morally imperfect and unclean like the "holy ones". (17). The impurity of the "heavenly beings" is denoted by the perfect וְנָן 'be pure' which is surely used with a stative nuance here as elsewhere in the book of Job, since the perfect וְנָן makes an affirmative statement about the heavenly beings who are also to be regarded as depraved in the sight of God. Outside the book of Job (15.15; 25.5) the verb וְנָן only occurs in Lam 4.7 where it conveys the sparkle and purity of snow. It should be noted that in all of its occurrences it is used with a stative nuance.

The Verb וְנָן

This verb occurs in the qal in 7.20; 8.4; 10.14; 33.27 & 35.6.

No 285

חֲטָאִי מֵה אֶפְעַל לְךָ נֹצֵר הָאָדָם לִמָּה שִׂמְחֹנִי לִמְפֹנֵעַ לְךָ
וְאֵהִיָּה עָלַי מִשָּׂא

"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?"

(7.20 RSV).

In vv 11-21 of this chapter Job pours out his soul in a complaint against God. He complains that God is harassing him and he also makes an appeal that God should desist from this action against him. Clines has noted that what Job expresses here is the irony of disproportion. Can the alleged sin of one dying man be so harmful to God that he must spend all his energies on the harassment of such a man? (18). The translation of the first hemistich begins in the RSV with the word "if", a word which is not to be found in the MT at all. Andersen here argues that the word should not be supplied since the act of supplying it gives to Job an air of self-righteousness. (19). However, it should be noted that the word is supplied by most of the versions (including G and Syr.) and it is further supported by an almost identical line in the mouth of Elihu (35.6). The act of Job's sins is indicated by the perfect 'נחטת 'sin' which is used here as elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible with a stative nuance and is best translated by the English present tense. The perfect of חטת is used by Job in his confession of his sinful state.

The Verb יָטָא

This verb is the most widely used stative verb in the book of Job and occurs in the qal in 9.2, 9.5, 9.28, 10.13, 11.11, 12.9, 13.2, 13.18,

15. 9, 15. 23, 18. 21, 19. 25, 20. 4, 20. 20, 32. 22, 34. 33, 35. 15, 38. 4,
38. 18, 38. 21, 38. 33, 39. 1, 39. 2, 42. 2; in the piel in 38. 12 and in
the hiphil in 10. 2, 13. 23.

No 337

אָמַנְם יִדְעָתִי כִּי כֵן וּמָה יִצְדַּק אֱלֹהִים עִם אֵל

"Truly I know that it is so:

But how can a man be just before God?" (9. 2 RSV).

Job's reply to Bildad which extends over two chapters, can be broken into two parts: (a) 9.2-24 it is not clear whether this is a monologue or an address to the friends, but God is spoken of in the third person; (b) 9.25-10.22 God is now addressed in the second person. The theme developed here is that of Job's powerlessness before God and the fact that he is trapped in his own private hell. In vv 2-4 Job expresses his need for vindication, but in these verses he also expresses his distress that he has no way of compelling God to grant it. Most commentators take Job's opening words:

אָמַנְם יִדְעָתִי כִּי כֵן "truly I know that it is so" as Job's ironic agreement to Bildad's assertion that God does not pervert justice, although, as Clines has noted it is possible to take v 2b "How can a man be just with God?" as the truth to which v 2a assents. (20).

Whichever way the two parts of the verse are to be understood the primary issue which is being dealt with here is that of the use of the

perfect 'יָדַעַתְּ' 'know'. The perfect יָדַעַתְּ is clearly used with a stative nuance since what the verb expresses is not the content of Job's faith but the fact that he mentally is in a state of knowing that such is the case. This is completely in line with the way this verb is used throughout the Hebrew Bible.

The Verb יָדַעַתְּ

This verb occurs in the qal in 14.2, 38.29, 39.4; and in the hiphil in 10.18.

No 645

כִּי־יֵצֵא וְיִמַּל וְיִבְרַח כַּצֵּל וְלֹא יִצְמַח

"He comes forth like a flower, and withers;
he flees like a shadow, and continues not." (14.2 RSV).

In his legal disputation addressed to God himself, Job considers mankind in general, although he is also thinking of his own experience, and the point that he makes to God is that mankind in its insignificance does not merit the kind of divine surveillance that he himself is being subjected to. He now proceeds to show how insignificant man is by giving some thoughts on the brevity of life. This he does by supplying two images of the brevity of life, namely, the flower and the shadow. The image of the flower as being short

lived is well attested in the Hebrew Bible: cf. Ps 103.15-16; Isa 28.1, 4; 40.6-8; etc. In the first hemistich the growth of the flower is denoted by the perfect $\chi\psi'$ 'go forth' which is used with a stative nuance here since it indicates the flower's growth and development. This verb is elsewhere used of plants in 1 Kings 5.13; Isa 11.1. Here the verb $\chi\psi'$ may be said to define the action of the subject as has been noted in previous examples.

The Verb $\chi\psi'$

This verb occurs in the qal in 20.11, 32.18, 36.16, & 36.17.

No 990

עצמותיו מלאו עלומו ועמו על עפר תשנב

"His bones are full of youthful vigour,
but it will lie down with him in the dust." (20.11 RSV).

Zophar's second speech divides conveniently into sections: after the conventional introduction (vv 2-3), his speech on the fate of the wicked can be divided into three sections: (a) the utter annihilation of the wicked (vv 4-11), (b) the futility of wrongdoing (vv 12-23), and (c) the inescapable end of the wicked (vv 24-29). From this analysis it can be seen that the example which is being treated here comes from the first section of his speech, namely, the

utter annihilation of the wicked. The primary theme would appear to be "the disappearance of the wicked" since that is the most sustained metaphor which occurs in vv 7-9 and reappears in v 11 with the idea that though he is strong he will become weak and so disappear. Clines has noted that it is better to take the first clause concessively: "though his bones are full of youthful vigour". (21). Thus the thought of v 11 would appear to be the premature death of the wicked, since the wicked does not die when his bones are frail and brittle, but when they are still strong with vigour. Dhorme has noted that this state of youthful vitality is expressed by the noun עַלְוֹתָא which has the meaning of 'puberty' then 'youth'. (22). The verb מָלַא carries the basic meaning of 'being in a state of puberty, virile, with manly strength'. In the light of the above noted context it is clear that it is the idea of youthful virility that is expressed. The subject of this description is the wicked man and the perfect מָלַא 'full' indicates that his bones are full of youthful vitality. Thus the perfect מָלַא here describes the state of the wicked man.

The Verb מָלַא

The occurrences of this verb in the qal are: 11.16, 15.19, 17.11 & 37.21.

No 513

כִּי אַתָּה עָמַל תִּשְׁכַּח כַּמִּים עָבְרוּ תִזְכֹּר

"You will forget your misery;

you will remember it as waters that have passed away." (11.16 RSV).

Zophar's speech may be evenly divided into three parts which are appropriately marked in the RSV's typography: vv 2-6, vv 7-12 & vv 13-20. Each of these divisions contains a different subject matter and this may be noted as follows: in vv 2-6 Zophar reproaches Job for his claim to innocence; in vv 7-12 he affirms the inscrutability of God; and in vv 13-20 he counsels Job on the right way to behave and offers him hope if he will take Zophar's advice. The example in 11.16 is located in the last of these divisions where he counsels Job to remove iniquity from his heart and to lay hold of the hope of repentance. In v 16 the hope is defined as being able to forget his suffering as a pain that is past and gone. The first hemistich begins with the particle כִּי 'for' which indicates that what follows is in reality a causal clause, ie., it gives the reasons for the feeling of security. In the first hemistich this concept is expressed by the imperfect תִּשְׁכַּח 'forget' which has previously been emphasized by the pronoun אַתָּה 'you'. Clines has noted that this pronoun אַתָּה has proved a real problem to commentators since there is no apparent reason for it unless it is taken as emphasizing Job's conditional ability to forget his sufferings. (23). The emendation to עַתָּה 'now' while attractive is to be rejected because it lacks versional support. The second hemistich begins with a short relative clause from which the

pronoun **אָ** has been omitted. The waters are further defined by means of the perfect **עָנָה** 'pass away' which is used with a stative nuance since it defines the kind of waters that Job's suffering is to be like. Waters, especially flood waters are frequently images of trouble; but the time when they pass over is itself the very time of distress. The NJPS has interpreted the waters here as waters that have flowed past and are forgotten, once they have flowed past they are gone irrevocably.

The Verb עָנָה

The occurrences of this verb in the qal are: 13.18, 32.14, & 33.5.

No 1734

וְלֹא עָנָה אֵלַי מִלִּין וְנֹאמְרֵיכֶם לֹא אֲשִׁיבוּ

"He has not directed his words against me,
and I will not answer him with your speeches." (32.14 RSV).

The critical matters relative to the date and composition of the Elihu speeches have been referred to above and in Ch 3. In this chapter Elihu does not address Job but the friends and explains to them why he had kept silent hitherto and why he is now speaking (vv 6-14). In vv 15-22 he soliloquizes on the same theme and concludes that he must speak because of their failure. From the above analysis it can be

seen that the example in 32.14 comes from the first section and must be regarded as a conclusion to it. However, it should be noted that nearly all the commentators have found difficulty with this verse since it is not clear how the two hemistichs relate to each other and how the whole verse relates to the preceding one. Because of a logical inconsistency that occurs between the translation "and he has not drawn up words against me and by your words I shall not answer him" and the fact that he has not taken part at all in the discussion so far, (the text implies that he has taken part but the facts indicate that he has not), Dhorme here proposes to reconstruct the text with help of G and Syr. He notes that the Syr supports reading the imperfect אַעֲרֹק and that this mistake is due to haplography, i.e., אַעֲרֹק instead of אַעֲרֹק אַעֲרֹק. He further notes that G read מַלִּין נֹאֲלָה and that this change in the text is further due to haplography, i.e., אַעֲרֹק נֹאֲלָה instead of אַעֲרֹק אַעֲרֹק. His reconstructed Hebrew Text is therefore: מַלִּין נֹאֲלָה אַעֲרֹק אַעֲרֹק and is to be translated as: "Hence I shall not marshal my words in order as they did." (24). While his reconstructed text gives coherence to an otherwise difficult Hebrew text and produces parallelism with the second hemistich, the changes he proposes are not really required since as both Gordis and Tur-Sinai have noted all that is required is to re-vocalize אַעֲרֹק as the conditional particle 'if' which then produces excellent sense in the form of a conditional sentence: "If Job had addressed me, I would not have answered him as you have." (25). In support of this interpretation of the MT, it should be noted that the particle אַעֲרֹק occurs with this meaning in 16.4.

Since the meaning of the MT has now been established it is now time to treat the perfect עָרַךְ 'arrange'. As noted above the first hemistich is to be treated as a conditional sentence in which the perfect denotes the hypothetical actions of Job, who has not addressed his words to Elihu in the discussion so far. Thus, the perfect עָרַךְ is used with a stative nuance since it describes the actions of its subject, namely, Job. The verb עָרַךְ 'arrange in order' carries the meaning of 'to arrange and classify' and so with the setting forth of words in order the meaning can be inferred of 'drawing up a case'.

The Verb עָשָׂה

This verb occurs in the gal in 10.9, 10.12, 12.9, 14.5, 33.4, 40.15.

No 543

מִי לֹא יָדַע בְּכֹל אֱלֹהֵי נִי יְדֵי יְהוָה עָשָׂה זֹאת

"Who among all these does not know

that the hand of the Lord has done this." (12.9 RSV).

This is part of Job's reply to Zophar, a speech which will be spread over three chapters (Ch's 12-14), only to be exceeded by the closing speech of Job himself which consists of four chapters. It marks the end of the first cycle and leads on to the second. In this position, it serves both as a first reply to the friends collectively and as a

precipitating cause of the ensuing cycle of speeches.

The critical matters relative to the genuineness or otherwise of portions of this chapter have already been commented upon in Ch 3. The content of the speech has seemed plain to most scholars, who have divided it into three sections, usually corresponding to the chapter divisions. Clines however, sees only two main sections, making the transition from Job's address to his friends to his address to God the major dividing line in the speech and so analyses it as follows:
12.2-13.19 a wisdom disputation speech addressed to the friends, and
13.20-14.22 a legal disputation speech addressed to God. (26). It is in this speech that Job for the first time invites God to enter the disputation with him.

The speech proper begins with Job commenting on their collective wisdom which he regards as being so superficial that it has nothing to teach him. In v 7f he asserts that the wisdom which they claim is their sole possession is in fact so commonplace that even the animals share it. In vv 7-8 he defines that their wisdom, is also known by the beasts and the birds (v7) and the plants and the fish (v8). In the first hemistich of v 9 he then concludes by asking "who among all these does not know?" The first hemistich used the verb יָדָע 'know' which is used here with a stative nuance since it asserts that the created order is in a state of knowing. The second hemistich begins with the particle כִּי 'that' which introduces the complement of יָדָע. The subject is introduced as:

יְהוָה יָד 'the hand of the Lord' and it should be noted that יְהוָה is used here contrary to the whole of the poetic portions of Job which have used אֱלֹהִים and it may be that the text has been altered because in substance it repeats the elements of Isa 41.20b and that originally the text had אֱלֹהִים. The action of the subject is denoted by the perfect עָשָׂה 'done' which is surely used with a stative nuance since it clearly expresses the actions of יְהוָה. Thus that which every created species is able to teach Job's friends is that whatever is done in this universe, has in fact been done by the hand of God and that this is denoted in 12.9 by the stative use of the perfect עָשָׂה.

The Verb עָשָׂה

The occurrences of this verb in the gal are: 9.15, 10.15, 33.12, 34.5, & 35.7.

No 369

אֲשֶׁר אִם צִדְקָתִי לֹא אֶעֱנֶנּוּ לְמַשְׁפָּטַי אֲחַחֲנֶנּוּ

"Though I am innocent, I cannot answer him;

I must appeal for mercy to my accuser." (9.15 RSV).

The example in 9.15 is contained in Job's reply to Bildad which extends over two chapters and can be broken into two parts: (a) 9.2-24 it is not clear whether this is a monologue or an address to the

friends, but God is spoken of in the third person; (b) 9.25-10.22 God is now addressed in the second person. The theme developed here is that of Job's powerlessness before God and the fact that he is trapped in his own personal grief. In developing this theme of powerlessness before God, Job also expresses the need for vindication, a need which he sees as being fairly hopeless. In vv 14-16 the thought focuses on the impossibility of a legal disputation with God. In v14 he states that if the cross-examination should centre upon him, he could not withstand the strength of God's interrogation. In v 15 he gives utterance to the fact that even if right were on his side, he could not withstand God's verbal onslaught any more than he has withstood his physical assaults. In the first hemistich of v 15 Job's state of innocence is expressed in hypothetical terms by means of the particles אַ אֲשֶׁר 'though' although Job does not doubt that he is in the right. The hypothetical particles are followed by the perfect 'נִקְרָא 'innocent' which is certainly used with a stative nuance since it gives articulation to the state of innocence which Job believes himself to be in. Dhorme has noted that the verb קָרָא 'to be righteous' has equally the sense of 'to be in the right' in a debate or lawsuit and it is this latter meaning which best suits the context here. (27).

The Verb קָרָא

The occurrences of this verb in the qal are: 7.6, 9.25, 40.4.

No 2227

הֵן קִלְתִּי מֵהָ אֲשִׁיבְךָ יְדֵי שִׂמְחָה לִמְנוּ פִּי

"Behold, I am of small account;

what shall I answer thee?

I lay my hand upon my mouth." (40.4 RSV).

The example in 40.4 is contained in the first reply of Job (40.3-5) to the divine speech of יְהוָה in 38.1-39.30. The first divine speech has concluded in a similar fashion to the way in which it began, namely, with a challenge. Job is now challenged to answer the questions which יְהוָה has put to him, or to cease if he cannot do so since he has no right to criticise and reprove. His response to this challenge is contained within his first response which takes the form of a confession. In his confession Job acknowledges that he is of small account compared with God and so he has in fact no answer to give. His state is defined in the first hemistich of v 40 by means of the perfect קָלַת 'light, small' which is certainly used here with a stative nuance since it describes Job's actual state in the presence of the Lord of creation, he is of small account.

The Verb קָלַת

This verb occurs in the gal in 3.16, 5.3, 8.18, 9.25, 13.1, 19.27, 37.21 & 42.5.

No 114

אני ראיתי איל משריש ואקרב נוהו פתאם

"I have seen the fool taking root,
but suddenly I cursed his dwelling." (5.3 RSV).

The example in 5.3 occurs in the third main section of Eliphaz's first speech in which he discourses with Job on the fate of the fool. The theology of the fate-determining deed and the proverb-like conclusion to these verses (vv 1-7), confirm its wisdom derivation. In the first hemistich of this verse Eliphaz appeals to his own experience (as he has also done in 4.8) and claims that he has seen the fool taking root, i.e., becoming prosperous and flourishing, like a plant or tree. The appeal to his own experience is expressed in emphatic terms as the verb is actually preceded by the pronoun אני 'I'. The verbal action is denoted by the use of the perfect ראיתי 'see' which is surely used with a stative nuance since it describes the state of Eliphaz actually seeing the tragic deeds of the fool. Thus, the perfect הראי is used here to express Eliphaz's sense of sight which as elsewhere in his speeches he is fond of using to back up his arguments.

The Verb הראי

The only occurrence of this verb is in the speeches of Elihu in 33.27.

יִשָּׁר עַל אַנְשִׁים וַיֹּאמֶר הִטְאַתִּי וַיִּשָּׁר הַצְּרִיחִי וְלֹא שָׁוָה לִי

"and he sings before men, and says:

I sinned, and perverted what was right,

and it was not requited to me." (33.27 RSV).

The example in 33.27 is located in the speech of Elihu where he attempts to refute Job's idea that God did not answer him at all. In 33.26 the results of the sick man praying the prayer of contrition are defined and it is that he comes into the presence of God with joy. In v 27 that definition is expanded by noting the song that the forgiven man sings as a result of God's pardon of his sins. In the first hemistich the song is introduced by the conventional formula וַיֹּאמֶר--יִשָּׁר which is also used in Ex 15.1. As has been noted in chapter three the imperfect consecutive וַיֹּאמֶר does little more than act as inverted commas and so introduces the words that are to be sung. The words of the song are expressed by three perfects contained in the second and third hemistichs respectively. The first is the verb הִטְאַתִּי which is used with a stative nuance as has been noted above. The second is the verb הַצְּרִיחִי 'pervert' which is also used with a stative nuance since it denotes that which the forgiven man has done: he has perverted that which was right. The forgiven state is expressed by the third perfect of the third hemistich שָׁוָה 'to be like, equal to' which is also surely used with a stative nuance since it indicates the fact that his sin has not been requited of him. Dhorme has noted that it is best to take the verb שָׁוָה as conveying an

impersonal sense similar to the Latin expression: *par pari refertur*
and to translate: "it has not been requited to me". (28).

The Verb תחז

The only occurrence of this verb is located in 9.13.

No 365

אלוה לא ישיב אפר תחזו תחזו עורי רהב

"God will not turn back his anger;

beneath him bowed the helpers of Rahab." (9.13 RSV).

The example in 9.13 is contained in the first part of Job's reply to Bildad which as has been previously noted deals with Job's powerlessness before God and the fact that Job is trapped in his own private hell. In vv 11-12 Job notes that the barrier to gaining vindication from God is one of establishing contact with him. In v 13 a further cause is noted, it is that of God's anger which has not receded in any size or form. Since God is permanently hostile to Job, there is no possibility of wresting vindication from him. This is indicated in the first hemistich by the hiphil imperfect ישיב 'to cause to turn back'. The same verb is used in Ps 78.38 where it indicates the concept of divine pity: "he restrained his anger often". Here in 9.13 it is used to indicate the fact that God's

anger is unbridled. One of the proofs of the permanence of God's anger is defined in the second hemistich which indicates that "beneath him the helpers of Rahab are bowed". Dhorme has noted that the monster Rahab has affinities with Leviathan and with Tannin. It is a symbol of the sea (26.12), in particular of the Red Sea, like Tannin in Ps 74.13. Thus Rahab is used by the Hebrew Bible as a symbol of Egypt (Isa 30.7), but originally it was the untamed sea which God had subjugated at the moment of creation. (29). Clines has also noted that in the Babylonian creation epic, *Enuma elish*, the chaos monster Tiamat is also depicted as being subdued along with her helpers. (30). Thus the second hemistich denotes that the most fierce of mythical monsters has been defeated by the all powerful anger of God. This is expressed by the perfect קָנַח 'bowed down' which is used with a stative nuance since it indicates what the state of God's enemies are, they lie crushed beneath his feet.

The Verb קָנַח

This verb occurs in the qal in: 3.18, 5.27, 13.1, 16.2 & 42.5.

No 580

הן כל ראתה עיני שמעה אזוני וחבון לה

"Lo, my eye has seen all this,
my ear has heard and understood it." (13.1 RSV).

As noted previously, this speech may be divided into two parts, the first part of which (12.1-13.19) is a wisdom type disputation addressed to the friends. Here Job refers back to 12.2-3 and introduces a new direction for the speech to develop. He begins by calling attention to the fact that he has personally experienced the acts of God which he has catalogued in 12.14-25. The first hemistich begins with the noun הן 'behold' which was also used in 8.19, 20. In the first hemistich the word כל 'all' refers to all the truths that have just been expounded. He asserts that his eye has seen all this and in so doing he uses the perfect ראה with the noun עין as was also done in 7.7. The perfect ראה 'see' must be considered to convey a stative nuance as elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible since it reports the sight sense of Job's eyes. This is paralleled in the second hemistich by means of the perfect שמע 'hear' which is used with the noun אזן. The second perfect שמע must also be considered to convey a stative meaning since it reports the hearing sense of Job's ears. Dhorme has noted that in 29.11 the two expressions 'the ear heard' and the 'the eye saw' are to be found again with the exception that they are in the reverse order. (31).

The above review of the use of the perfect has shown that it does indeed convey a stative nuance since in the examples treated the perfect has been used by the poet to define the state of the verb's subject. It must not be thought however, that this chapter is attempting to assert that every perfect is being used with such a nuance in the book of Job, such is clearly not the case. It is

however, being asserted that the perfect more often than not does convey such a nuance sometimes with a clear reference to its subject and sometimes with an object in mind, a fact which the examples bear out. Where the perfect relates an action or state and such a verb has an object, the perfect denotes that the action is transferred to the object or its complement and usually does so in terms which are translated in English by the present tense. At the beginning of this chapter attention was drawn to the description by Blake of the perfect in ancient Hebrew poetry acting as a predicate adjective form with a present meaning. (32). It is believed that the above examination of the perfect supports his proposition.

(B) The Perfect used to express Distress in the Lamentations

The use of the perfect to be considered under this head is in fact very similar to that considered under the previous one. It may be described as being a particular application of the stative use of the perfect to the situation of distress in which various experiences are being reported in lament with a view to moving Yahweh to involvement in the supplicator's position.

This use of the perfect is noted by Michel when he treats the perfects in Ps 79. 1-4:

"Vv 1-4 form the complaint of Ps 79. In vv 1-3 we find five verbal clauses reporting the enemy's actions, and in v 4 one verbal clause describing the supplicants's condition. There is a perfect at the

beginning of all the clauses, with no linking λ . Vv 1-3 probably cite events from the past; one can be in two minds about v 4, depending on whether one translates $\eta' \eta$ by "are", or by "become." The essential thing is that there is obviously not now going to be a continuation of the report. The enemy has assuredly not first laid waste the temple, then defiled the corpses, and only then spilt their blood. Rather events are enumerated here which are intended to move Yahweh to involvement, and each of these has its own importance in this. Therefore, the unlinked, adjacent perfects are here enumerating, and each time, indeed, it concerns a well-established fact." (33).

Michel has noted that when the poet wants to describe the condition of the supplicant in these poems or laments, he uses the perfect in Hebrew to describe such a condition of distress. As was noted above this in reality is just an extension of its stative nuance, since the poet is using the perfect to denote the condition of distress within a defined genre of literature.

It seems best (as was the case in Ch 5) to accept Westermann's definitions of those portions of the book of Job which may be classed as Laments. He defines the following portions as Laments:

3. 11-26; 6. 4-20; 7. 1-21; 9. 17-31; 10. 1-22; 13. 20-14. 22; 16. 6-17. 16; 19. 7-20, 23, 27. (34).

Before embarking on an examination of the above noted passages and the perfects contained within them, it seems best to publish a list of those perfects which are actually used by the poet to express the concept of distress in the laments as was done with subsection A above.

אָבד to perish; אָהב to love; אָזל to go away; אָנל to devour; אָנר to act
treacherously; אָוא to come; אָנש to be ashamed; אָטח to trust; אָרר to
flee; אָרר to wall up; אָרר to cleave; אָרר to be; אָרר to overthrow; אָרר
2 to turn away; אָרר 3 to be loathsome; אָרר to act corruptly; אָרר to
cease; אָרר to sin; אָרר to pass by; אָרר to grind; אָרר to tear; אָרר to
fear; אָרר to know; אָרר to shine out brightly; אָרר to go forth; אָרר to
sleep; אָרר to cease; אָרר to be weary; אָרר to clothe; אָרר to refuse;
אָרר to despise; אָרר to count; אָרר to be obstinate; אָרר to wield; אָרר
to rest; אָרר to take possession of; אָרר to descend; אָרר to smite; אָרר
to give; אָרר to tear away; אָרר to go around; אָרר to hide; אָרר to pass
by; אָרר to fashion; אָרר to do; אָרר to fear; אָרר to open wide; אָרר to
open; אָרר to unleash; אָרר to annihilate; אָרר to hide; אָרר to lead the
way; אָרר to wait; אָרר to loathe; אָרר to lighten; אָרר to call; אָרר to
see; אָרר to be soothed; אָרר to wash; אָרר to be far away; אָרר to
spread; אָרר to sink; אָרר to be guilty; אָרר to place; אָרר to be
untroubled; אָרר to wear away; אָרר to lie down; אָרר to forget; אָרר to
be desolate; אָרר to hear; אָרר to keep; אָרר to enjoy peace; אָרר to
abhor; אָרר to sew.

Having defined the verbs which are actually used in the laments in the
book of Job, it now simply remains to examine each of them in their
respective contexts in conformity to previous practice in this study.

No's 27-59

למה לא מרחם אמות מבטן יצאתי ואגוע
 מדוע קדמוני ברכים ומה שדים כי אינק
 כי עתה שכבתי ואשקוט ישנתי או ינוח לי
 עם מלכים ויעצי ארץ הבנים חרבות למו
 או עם שרים זהב להם הממלאים בתיהם כסף
 או כנפל סמון לא אהיה כעללים לא ראו אור
 שם רשעים חדלו רגז ושם ינוחו יגיעי כח
 יחד אסירים שאננו לא שמעו קול נפש
 קטן וגדול שם הוא ועבד חפשי מאדניו
 למה יתן לעמל אור וחיים למרי נפש
 המחכים למות ואיננו ויחפרהו ממסמונים
 השמחים אלי גיל ישישו כי ימצאו קבר
 לגבר אשר דרכו נסתרה ויסך אלוה בערו
 כי לפני לחמי אנחתי תבא ויחכו כמים שאגתי
 כי פחד פחדתי ויאתיני ואשר יגורתי יבא לי
 לא שלוחי ולא שקטתי ולא נחתי ויבא רגז

"Why did I not die at birth,
 come forth from the womb and expire?
 Why did the knees receive me?
 Or why the breasts that I should suck?
 For then I should have lain down and been quiet;
 I should have slept; then I should have been at rest,
 with kings and counsellors of the earth
 who rebuilt ruins for themselves,
 or with princes who had gold,

who filled their houses with treasure.
Or why was I not as a hidden untimely birth,
as infants that never see the light.
There the wicked cease from troubling,
and there the weary are at rest.
There the prisoners are at ease together;
they hear not the voice of the taskmaster.
The small and great are there,
and the slave is free from his master.
Why is light given to him that is in misery,
and life to the bitter in soul,
who long for death, but it comes not,
and dig for it more than for hid treasures;
who rejoice exceedingly,
and are glad when they find the grave?
Why is light given to a man whose way is hid,
whom God has hedged in?
For my sighing comes as my bread,
and my groanings are poured out like water.
For the thing that I fear comes upon me,
and what I dread befalls me.
I am not at ease, nor am I quiet;
I have no rest; but trouble comes." (3. 11-26 RSV).

The contents of this chapter of the book of Job can be divided into two parts: (a) vv 3-10 the curse; (b) vv 11-26 the lament. It is

important to note that the lament itself can be further divided: vv 11-19 & vv 24-26 the self lament, vv 20-23 which may be called the God lament. Characteristic of the lament are the 'why' questions in vv 11, 12, 16, 20 and v 23 where it is implied. The questions expressed in vv 11 and 20 are introduced by למה, while the question in v 12 is introduced by מן. V 16, however, is introduced by אך which has made many commentators think that the verse has been misplaced and really needs to follow v 12. What should be remembered is that vv 13-15 are an expression of a hypothetical situation which Job wishes had come about so that the אך of v 16 is in reality picking up the מן of v 12. The questioning is then resumed in v 20 by למה and is immediately followed by a relative clause in vv 21-22 which describes the character of those who are in bitterness of soul. The questioning is also implied in v 23 by means of the preposition ל. The lament concludes with a depiction of the lamenter's sorry state in vv 24-26.

However, it should be noted that the lament in 3.11-26 is in fact a free variation on the conventional lament or "Klage". Westermann has observed that normally a lament is cast in the second person and addressed to God, but here this form is avoided and God is spoken of only indirectly. (35). It also has to be stressed that normally a lament has the aim of improving the lamenter's lot, but that aim is strangely absent here.

At the outset it has to be stressed that the laments which are contained in the book of Job are somewhat different to their

counterparts in the book of Psalms, in the sense that while the laments draw upon conventional terms they do not do so exclusively, a fact noted by Clines. (36). Thus, it seems best to treat only those parts of this lament which can be defined as being in conformity to the conventional lament as to do otherwise would result in failure since no objective comparison could be made. Accordingly, in this section of the work vv 11, 12, 16, 20, 23 & 26 will be examined since vv 13-15 may be considered to be a relative clause, vv 17-19 a nominal clause describing the nature of אָגַל, vv 21-22 a further relative clause and vv 24-25 a causal clause.

Job 3.11

The lament proper may be said to begin with the interrogative pronoun לָמָּה 'why' in the first hemistich of the verse. That which is being lamented is the day of Job's birth which as Westermann has noted replaced the usual enemy lament. (37). In this verse Job gives expression to the wish that he had not been born. This wish is expressed in the first hemistich by the expression: לֹא מָרַחֵם אִמּוֹת "did I not die at birth". Gordis has noted the nominal element: מָרַחֵם is capable of the interpretation: "while in the womb" and that this rendering is attested by G. For the adoption of this rendering it is not necessary to emend the text to read מָרַחֵם since the preposition מִן is understood as the "Mem of condition". (38). The nominal element is followed by the imperfect אָמַת 'die' which Dhorme has understood to be a 'true aorist'. (39). The sentiments of his wish are then made

more precise by the second hemistich. The nominal element מִבֶּטֶן 'from the belly' is of course to be seen in parallelism with מִרְחֵם of the first hemistich and the negative לֹא לִמָּה is to be considered as applying to the second hemistich also. The nominal element is followed by the perfect 'צָאָה' 'come forth' which is in turn followed by the imperfect conjunctive וְאָלוּעַ which has already been treated in Ch 4 of this study. In the context of this self lament, the perfect צָאָה is being used to lament a state, the state being that he has survived his birth and has been brought into the world.

Job 3.12

In this verse Job is still lamenting the day of his birth, but he expands on the theme to include his nourishment as an infant. He thus gives gives expression to the wish that he had not been nourished as a child. This desire is expressed in the first hemistich by means of the interrogative pronoun מָדוּעַ 'why' which is here used as a poetic alternative to לִמָּה. The pronoun is immediately followed by the perfect piel קָדַמְוֹנִי 'receive' whose subject is the noun בְּרִינִים 'knees'. The custom that is being referred to here is that of receiving the child after its birth as a recognition of parenthood. Commentators have noted that it is uncertain from the text as to which parent is receiving the child, but since the mother is mentioned in the second hemistich the possibility exists that it was she who was being referred to. The use of the perfect קָדַם in the first hemistich is to lament the fact that Job as a newly born child was now brought by his

mother into a position suitable for nourishment. Thus the perfect is used as elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible to lament a state.

Job 3.16

The image expressed in this verse is somewhat different from that of v 11; there it was the child who dies soon after birth, here it is the still-born fetus. The first hemistich begins with the word אָן 'or' which as noted above picks up the לָמָּה of v 11 and the מָרוּעַ of v 12. Thus the force of the interrogative particle is carried on by אָן. The image of the still-born fetus is denoted in emphatic terms (by reason of position) by the nominal expression סְמוּן נִפֵּל literally 'as one fallen from the womb in secret'. The noun נִפֵּל conveys the thought of the abortion which falls from the womb before the time is right. The noun is qualified by the epithet סְמוּן 'hidden' which as Dhorme has noted is appropriate to abortion because it comes in vain and goes into darkness and in darkness its name is covered. (40). The verbal element is contained at the end of the first hemistich הֲאֵינִי לֹא 'was I not' and gives expression to Job's wish that he had been aborted before birth. As was noted in Ch 5 SA the imperfect הֲאֵינִי is best regarded as an example of the preterite. The nominal element is again prominent in the second hemistich and the noun עֲלָלִים 'nurslings' is a general description for children and infants in particular. Following the noun, there follows a short relative clause from which וְאֵין has been omitted as is the practice generally in Hebrew poetry. The perfect רָאָה 'see' thus describes the

desirable state of death (from Job's point of view) because such aborted children not only never live, but also never see light. Thus the perfect is used in this self lament to describe the state of death.

Job 3.20

As there are no examples of the perfect attested within this verse consideration of it will be passed over for the moment.

Job 3.23

After having spoken of those in bitterness of soul and misery in general terms he now returns to speak of his own individual case. Once again the preposition ל of the first hemistich picks up the interrogative למה of v 20 and so the force of the expression למה יתן אור is continued from v 20 to v 23. Thus the complete translation of the first hemistich is: "Why is light given to a man whose way is hid?" The noun יָנוּן 'man' is qualified by a short relative clause from which אֲשֶׁר has not been omitted, a somewhat unusual practice in Hebrew poetry (cf v 16). In this short relative clause the noun דַּרְכֵי יָנוּן 'his way' is qualified by the niphal perfect נִסְתָּרָה 'hidden' which has surely been used to describe the state of Job and by which he has drawn attention to his pitiable situation.

Job 3.26

In this final verse of the self lament, Job now gives a description of the thing which he has dreaded and which has come about, namely, the advent of turmoil. He has done so in terms which come closest to the individual type of lament that is to be found in the book of Psalms. He has described his state by means of three perfects which are used in conformity with the use of the perfect in laments of Ps 79.1-4. This verse contains three descriptions of Job's state, each of which is negated by אֵל. Two of these are to be found in the first hemistich, while the third is located in the second. The first perfect which the poet uses to describe Job's state is שָׁלוֹחַ 'be quiet'. Dhorme has noted that this is the only one of the ל'ה type verbs which retains in the qal the original ל. (41). It is used here to indicate Job's lack of rest of mind. The second perfect is שָׁקֵט 'be at peace' and is here used to indicate Job's lack of physical rest. The third is נָחַח 'be at rest' which here indicates rest of every sort. These three perfects are used by the poet not only to denote Job's state, but also to lament it.

No's 196-216

למס מרעהו חסד ויראת שדי יעזוב
אחי בגרו כמו נחל כאפיק נחלים יעברו
הקדרים מני קרח עלימו יתעלם שלג
בעת יזרבו נצמתו בחמו נדעכו ממפומם

ילפתו ארחות דרכם יעלו בטהו ויאבדו
 הביטו ארחות תמא הליכת שבא קרו למו
 בשו כי בטח באו עדיה ויחפרו
 כי עתה הייתם לי תוארו חתת ותיראו

"He who withholds kindness from a friend
 forsakes the fear of the Almighty.
 My brethren are treacherous as a torrent-bed,
 as freshets that pass away,
 which are dark with ice,
 and where the snow hides itself.
 In time of heat they disappear;
 when it is hot, they vanish from their place.
 The caravans turn aside from their courses;
 they go up into the waste and perish.
 The caravans of Tema look,
 the travellers of Sheba hope.
 They are disappointed because they were confident;
 they come thither and are confounded. (6.14-20 RSV).

These examples are set in Job's reply to Eliphaz. The structure of
 the speech may be divided into three parts: (1) vv 2-13: Job is
 evidently uttering a monologue, speaking neither to the friends or to
 God who is spoken of in the third person; (2) vv 14-20: Job is
 clearly addressing himself to the friends although they were referred
 to in the third person as though they were not there, but there can

be no doubt that these lines can be addressed to them; (3) vv 21-30 Job addresses his friends directly in every verse except the last. From the above analysis it can easily be seen that most of the examples which fall to be treated here come from the second division of the speech where Job addresses the friends in the third person.

Clines has noted that the form of this speech as a whole belongs to the appeal (often called the lament). (42). The appeal is comprised of many elements among which is the depiction of enemies; the fact that those who function as enemies to the lamenter are supposed to be his friends, or have turned from friends into foes, is itself a common Psalmic motif.

Job 6.15

V 14 has noted that Job feels a great sense of disappointment in the fact that his friends have not given him the kind of support that he needs. V 15 may be said to build upon that evaluation of his friends and here he likens the unreliability of his friends to the desert wadis whose water cannot be relied upon from one season to the next. This sentiment is contained in the first hemistich of the verse which is commenced by the term 'אח 'my brothers'. The friends are not related to Job by blood but by some kind of mutual agreement. Clines has noted that the contrast between the two words "brothers" and "treacherous" could not be sharper, for brotherhood implies an agreement,

and treachery denotes the dishonouring of an agreement. (43). Their treacherous act is indicated in the first hemistich by means of the perfect לָרָגַל 'be treacherous' which is not only used with a stative nuance, but is also used to lament their lack of brotherhood.

Job 6. 17

The image is further expanded by two couplets depicting the wadi in winter (v16) and summer (v17). In summer, because of the arrival of extreme heat the water retreats into its channels, and then ultimately dries up altogether, and vanishes. This is indicated in the first hemistich by the temporal description בְּעֵת הַחֶמֶד 'in the time of heat' which is then qualified by the niphal perfect נִצְמָחוּ 'disappear'. The niphal perfect נִצְמָחוּ is here used to denote a state, namely, the state of the wadi in summer. The temporal expression is paralleled in the second hemistich by בְּחֶמֶד 'when it is hot' and is again qualified by the niphal perfect נִדְעָנוּ 'vanish' which is also used to denote the same state, namely that the wadi vanishes in summer. This state of unreliability of the wadi has been likened by Job to the friends' treacherous act.

Job 6. 19

Vv 19-20 describe the acts of the caravaneers from Tema and Sheba who are disappointed in their search for water when they find nothing but dried-up wadi beds. In v 19 caravans from two famous trading centres

are mentioned. Tema, here spelt תַּמָּה instead of the usual תַּמָּה, is an oasis in northern Arabia, c250 miles southeast of Aqaba, and a station on the route from Medina, 200 miles to the south, to Damascus in the far north. Sheba is an even better known market city located in southwestern Arabia. In the first hemistich the caravans (אֲרָחִים) from Tema are said to look and this action is denoted by the hiphil perfect הִנִּיחַ 'look, watch' which is used here with a stative nuance. In the second hemistich the action of the travellers from Sheba is expressed by the piel perfect הִקִּיחַ 'hope' which is also used with a stative nuance. Thus what is postulated in these verses is that the caravaneers are on the lookout for the desert wadis and have placed their hope in such as a place of refreshment in the wilderness. The result of their hopeful search is indicated in v 20.

Job 6.20

The hopeful search of the caravaneers has ended in failure and this is denoted in the first hemistich by the perfect הִכָּזַח 'disappointed' which is then qualified by a causal clause כִּי הֵיטִיב 'because they were confident'. Dhorme has noted that although the subject is plural the verb is in the singular because no ambiguity is possible. (44). The first hemistich of this verse is wholly stative in its function since it describes the state of the caravaneers when their search ended in failure: they were disappointed. The description is continued in the second hemistich by means of the phrase הֵיטִיב 'they come thither' which is also stative in its function since it

parallels the description of the travellers already given in the first hemistich. Thus the perfect נָאָן 'enter' is used with a stative nuance here also.

Job 6.21

The application of the image of the wadi is now given. This is indicated in the first hemistich which is beset with textual problems. The first hemistich begins with the phrase עַתָּה נִי 'now that' which is best emended to עַתָּה נֵן 'thus now' as with RSV. On the basis of G and Syr it is further necessary to emend לָא to לִי 'to me' to make proper sense of this verse. The application of the image to the friends is conveyed by the perfect הָיָה 'become' which is surely used with a stative nuance as is the case with the previous examples. The image of the dried up wadi applies to Job's experience with his friends: not only has he found them unreliable and inconsistent, he has felt himself deceived by them. Like the caravaneers of the desert trail, he suffers not only a disappointment of expectation but a danger to life itself.

No's 243-253

כֵּן הִנְחַלְתִּי לִי יְרֵחִי שׁוֹא וּלְיֵלוֹת עֲמַל מִנּוּ לִי
אִם שָׁכַבְתִּי וְאִמְרַתִּי מִתִּי אֶקֶוֹם וּמִדָּד עֲרַב וְשִׁבְעַתִּי נִדְדִים עָרִי נִשְׁפָּן
לְבַשׁ בְּשָׂרִי רִמָּה וּגִישׁ עֵפֶר עוֹרִי רֹגַע וְיִמָּאֵס
יָמֵי קְלוּ מִנִּי אֲרֹג וְיִכְלוּ בְּאִפְסֵי תְקוּוָה

"So I am allotted months of emptiness,
and nights of misery are apportioned to me.
When I lie down I say, 'When shall I arise?'
But the night is long,
and I am full of tossing until dawn.
My flesh is clothed with worms and dirt;
my skin hardens, and then breaks out afresh.
My days are swifter than a weaver's shuttle,
and come to their end without hope." (7.3-6 RSV).

The context to these examples is exactly the same as to that of the previous passage considered above. As has been noted above, the form of this speech is that of the appeal (often called the lament) whose constituent parts include the complaint. In this form the speaker sets forth particulars of his own sorry state as a ground for the fulfilment of the appeal.

Job 7.3

The image of the labourer is now viewed from a somewhat different angle. In v 1 life is seen simply as hard labour, while in v 2 it is seen as labour that strives to reach its end. In v 3 it is seen as futility. So that if Job is asked to what end the labour of his life is tending, he finds out that there is no end in sight. This concept is expressed in the first hemistich by the hophal perfect 'הַנְּחַלְתִּי 'allot' which is certainly used with a stative nuance here as

might be expected of the hophal. The hophal perfect asserts that Job is allotted months of futility which in effect means that if Job sees himself as a hired labourer, he finds that he has been engaged for no wages at all! In the second hemistich this thought is paralleled by means of the piel perfect ׀׀׀ 'apportion' which denotes that if he sees himself as a hard pressed slave, he finds that his evenings which should be times of relief, are in fact no relief at all! Thus the piel perfect ׀׀׀ is also used with a stative nuance since it clearly describes Job's own state. Dhorme has noted that it is unnecessary to repoint it as a pual following G and Syr since the perfect piel is used impersonally. (45).

Job 7.4

The "nights of misery" are now defined. His sleeplessness is not only a normal symptom of depression, but may also be due to the irritation of his skin by the disease he is suffering from. The verse is composed of three hemistichs of which the first two have been subject to emendation. On the basis of Deut 28.67 and the text of G which reads ε̂αν κοιμηθω, λεγω Ποτε ημερα; ω̂ς δ̂ αν̂ αναστω, παλιν Ποτε ε̂σπερα; Dhorme wishes to reconstruct the MT by adding ׀׀׀ after ׀׀׀ and to replace ׀׀׀׀ by the intelligible ׀׀׀׀. These proposals if adopted have the effect of restoring the original of G and produce the rendering: "If I lie down, I say: 'When comes the morning'? If I rise up, I say: 'How long till evening'? (46). This has the effect of producing a uniform text, but as it is one

that has been reconstructed on the basis of Deut 28.67 the proposals should be rejected since it seems to be best to retain the MT and to attempt to elucidate it as it stands. Job thus dreads the night for as he lies down he thinks only of when he will arise. This is indicated in the first hemistich by the perfect שָׁנַח 'lie down' which is used with a stative nuance since it indicates Job's state of rest. The perfect conjunctive וְאָמַרְתָּ is best regarded as denoting the consequence of Job lying down, it is that he is full of thoughts about the arrival of the morning. His thoughts are expressed by the phrase: מָה יִקְוֶה "when shall I rise up?" The condition of the night is defined in the second hemistich by the piel perfect נָמַד 'be lengthened' which is again used to denote the condition of the night and thus conveys a stative nuance. The consequence of this state of restlessness is then indicated by the perfect conjunctive וְשָׂבַע 'be full' which also carries a stative nuance.

Job 7.5

The cause of his sleeplessness is now defined as being due to the symptoms of his physical complaint. His body is covered with either open sores that exude with pus or with scabs of sores that are apparently in the course of healing. The skin grows firm and then breaks out again as if the healing process were set in reverse. This process is indicated in the first hemistich by the perfect שָׁבַע 'clothe' which at first sight may seem an odd word to describe a skin complaint, but Clines has noted that such an image is used in more

than one Babylonian text. (47). Since the image is attested in the cognate literature it seems best to regard the perfect as indicative of a state, since it describes the state of Job's skin. A further state of Job's skin is expressed in the second hemistich by the perfect פָּלַח 'harden' which is taken by Dhorme to mean: "my skin splits" on the basis of the same root occurring in 26.12. In 26.12 it is in parallelism with פָּרַח 'shatter' and after examining its use in the Hebrew Bible he concludes that the best meaning is that of 'split'. (48). Thus the perfect פָּלַח 'split' conveys a stative nuance since it denotes the condition of Job's skin which because of its sores is also said to exude with pus, a fact indicated by the imperfect consecutive פֹּלַח as has been noted in Ch 3.

Job 7.6

In 7.6 Job's thoughts move on from the depiction of his painful skin condition to a reflection upon the brevity of his existence. In the first hemistich of the verse he speaks of his days by the noun יָמַי 'my days' which may be said to occupy an emphatic position in the verse. To express the swiftness of his days he uses an image from the craft of weaving. As rapidly as the shuttle (אֶבְרָת) flies from one side of the web to the other, so rapidly have the days that have made up his entire life passed. This is denoted by the perfect אֶבְרַת 'swift' which is clearly used with a stative nuance here since it describes the passing state of Job's days. Originally the verb אָבַר meant 'to be light' and then 'to be rapid' and it is this latter meaning which the

poet intends here. Thus the verse expresses the swiftness of Job's days.

No's 796-821

אך עתה הלאני השמות כל עדת
וחקמטני לעד היה ויקם בי כחשי בפני יענה
אפו סרף וישטמני חרק עלי בשניו צרי ילשוש עיניו לי
פערו עלי בפיהם בחרפה הכו לחיי יחד עלי יתמלאון
יסגירני אל אל עויל ועל ידי רשעים ירסני
שלו הייתי ויפרפרני ואחו בערפי ויפצפצני
ויקימני לו למסרה
יסבו עלי רביו יפלח כליות ולא יחמול ישפך לארץ מורתי
יפוצני פרץ על פני פרץ ירץ עלי כגבור

"Surely now God has worn me out;
he has made desolate all my company.
And he has shrivelled me up,
which is a witness against me;
and my leanness has risen up against me,
it testifies to my face.
He has torn me in his wrath, and hated me;
he has gnashed his teeth at me;
my adversary sharpens his eyes against me.
Men have gaped at me with their mouth,
they have struck me insolently upon the cheek,

they mass themselves together against me.
God gives me up to the ungodly,
and casts me into the hand of the wicked.
I was at ease, and he broke me asunder;
he seized me by the neck and dashed me to pieces;
he set me up as his target,
his archers surround me.
He slashes open my kidneys, and does not spare;
he pours out my gall on the ground.
He breaks me with breach upon breach;
he runs upon me like a warrior." (16.7-14 RSV).

The commentators all note how disjointed Job's reply to Eliphaz is. It seems best to follow Clines who sees three major divisions in this speech: (a) vv 2-6 Job addresses the friends with criticisms of their words; (b) vv 7-17 he begins to soliloquize, first lamenting the attacks of God; (c) vv 18-22 he envisages the possibilities for vindication. (47). From the above analysis it can be seen that the examples in 16.7-14 are part of the the second division where he laments the attacks of God.

In this enemy lament Job speaks as an oppressed and persecuted man, who seeks to drive home the enormity of his maltreatment by assembling a catalogue of assaults as they would be perpetrated by many different kinds of opponent: a wild animal (vv 9-10), a traitor (v 11), a wrestler (v 12), an archer (vv 12c-13a), & a swordsman (vv 13b-14).

Job 16.7

The commentators all note that vv 7-8 present numerous difficulties. These difficulties may be noted as follows: (a) the alternation of the 3rd person הִלְאֵנִי with the second person הִשְׁמִיחַ and וַתִּקְחֵנִי (in v8); (b) the length of the second hemistich of v 8 after the very short hemistichs of v 7; (c) the strangeness of the meanings which result from a strict adherence to the MT. Dhorme has noted that all of these factors are indications of a defective text. (50). The first task is to find a subject for the verb הִלְאֵנִי 'wear out' of the first hemistich. There have been many proposals: (a) my pain; (b) Eliphaz; (c) the jealous or malicious man; (d) God. Of these proposals it seems best to adopt (d) since the subject of the second verb הִשְׁמִיחַ is certainly God whether it is subject to emendation or not. It therefore seems best to accept that God is the subject of the first verb also. The second problem is to deal with the verb הִשְׁמִיחַ 'make desolate'. An entirely different solution to this and the other difficulties is to be found in Dhorme's commentary. On the basis of a postulated root שִׁמַּח 'rejoice at the fortunes of others' which is said to be cognate with Arabic *samita*, he revocalizes הִשְׁמִיחַ to form a noun 'jealous man' from this root and which now becomes the subject of הִלְאֵנִי. (51). Thus his emended text produces the translation: "For now the jealous man has wearied me". He further emends כָּל עַדְתּוֹ to כָּל עַדְתּוֹ 'all of his company' which now becomes the subject of וַתִּקְחֵנִי 'take hold of' and he also seeks to redistribute וַתִּקְחֵנִי to be part of v 7. This has the effect of restoring the

balance between the hemistichs of v 7 & v 8. Under these proposals it should be noted that the first hemistich finishes at 'הַשְׁמִרָה, the second at 'וְנִשְׁמְרָה, the third at 'נ' of v 8. Dhorme has noted that one of the main reasons for adopting this proposed redistribution of hemistichs is that the phrase 'עַתָּה כָּל' 'all of my company' sounds odd in the mouth of Job. (52). Yet it is not simply a question of the redistribution of hemistichs, it is more a question of a complete change of subjects in v 7 which does have the added effect of sorting out the changes between the alternation of 3rd person and 2nd person in the verbs of vv 7-8. While Dhorme's solution to the above noted textual problems has much to commend it, it is one which has no versional support whatsoever and although it clears up the difficulty as to the verbal alternation between 3rd and 2nd persons, it in fact creates a new set of difficulties relative to the subject of the following verses and as such is to be cautiously rejected. In these circumstances it seems best to adhere to the MT.

The first hemistich is commenced by the emphatic construction 'אָךְ עַתָּה' 'but now' which has the effect of strengthening the idea of the immediate present: 'For now'. As has been noted above there is no subject noted for the hiphil perfect 'הִלַּחֲנֵנִי' 'wearied me', but for the above stated reasons it is best to take the subject of these actions as God himself who is said to have wearied Job out. Putting the question of the person of the verb to one side for the moment, it seems appropriate to understand this verb to convey a stative nuance since it describes what God has done to Job. The second hemistich is

commenced by the hiphil perfect הִשְׁחַח 'desolated' which also conveys a stative nuance since it describes what God has done to Job's family who are denoted by the phrase: 'עַדָּה נָל' 'all of my family'. Thus the perfects are used in this verse not only with a stative nuance but also to lament the state which God has brought upon Job and his immediate family. Clines has noted that עַדָּה 'company' actually refers to Job's household, comprising both his children and servants and not to the ideological group of the godless. (53).

Job 16. 8

V 8, despite the textual uncertainties which are to be found in it, would seem to show that Job's emaciated condition, for which God is responsible, serves as proof--to everyone but Job--that Job is a dreadful sinner. This is asserted in the first hemistich by means of the imperfect consecutive וְהִקְמַטְנִי 'shrivelled up' which is surely best understood as an emphatic construction that denotes that which God has done to him as has been noted in Ch 3. It is necessary to emend וְהִקְמַטְנִי to read וְיִקְמַטְנִי in order to preserve the sense which was begun with 'וְהִלַּאנִי' of v 7. The root קִמַּט only occurs here and in 22.16 and has the meaning of 'seize' but may also mean 'to wrinkle', a meaning suggested by Syriac and Rabbinic Hebrew as is noted by Gordis in his commentary. (54). This latter sense is not recognized by BDB or KB3. The imperfect consecutive וְיִקְמַטְנִי is also qualified by a short relative clause הִיא לְעָד 'which is a witness against me'. The relative clause defines that Job's condition which has been brought

about by God's own hand, has become a testimony against him. It is a testimony against him so long as the doctrine of exact retribution remains operative. The perfect ה'ה is used to denote the state of such a testimony, but it is also used to lament that such has taken place at all.

Job 16.9

In this verse God's attack on Job is described by the image of a wild beast's attack. Clines has noted that it is a convention of the Psalm of lament to depict one's human opponents as animals (e.g., Ps 7.3; 10.9; 17.12; 22.13-14), the point of comparison being their super-human power and death threatening assault. (55). To describe this action Job uses cultic language depicting enemies to apply to God. This concept is expressed in the first hemistich by the perfect ה'ה 'tear', a verb which usually denotes the action of the wild beast who finds a prey and tears it. The perfect here conveys as with the other perfects that are used in the laments a stative nuance, but once again its importance is that it is used by the poet to lament a situation which God has brought on Job. The idiom ה'ה ה'ה also occurs in Amos 1.11 where the noun is used with the imperfect consecutive. The first hemistich is concluded by the imperfect consecutive 'ה'ה'ה 'hate, persecute' which as has been noted in Ch 3, is best taken as denoting emphasis since the condition of hate cannot be in any sense the consequence of tear. Gordis has noted that this unusual verb order may be a case of hysteron proteron and is

therefore: "He hated me and in his anger he tears me apart". (56). The concept of the animal's attack is continued in the second hemistich by the perfect קרק 'gnash, grind' which is not elsewhere used of animals. The verb is again used to lament that which God has done to Job, and conveys the concept of the grinding of teeth, by itself a sure threat to the prey of its imminent devouring.

Job 16.10

In v 10 there is an apparent subject change from that which God has done to that which humans have done. They are not specified as the "godless" or "my enemies", but that is what they obviously are. In a sense there is no real change of subject since human hostility is the direct consequence of God's attacks. The image of the wild beast is again used in v 10 since the description is that of wild beasts who mass and surround the prey. This concept is denoted by the perfect פתח 'open wide' which usually conveys that the mouth is widely opened, whether in expectation of something or as here to swallow something up. (57). The perfect is once again used by the poet to lament that which men have done to Job. The ן of the ןפיהם must be regarded as expletive. Clines has noted the distinct possibility that the perfect is here used to express the gesture of mockery. (58). The concept is continued in the second hemistich by the perfect הני 'smite' and is qualified by the expression בחרינה 'insolently'. This act which the perfect expresses, is an act of derision, and as previously the perfect is used to lament that such

has happened to Job.

Job 16.12

In this verse the image of a wrestler is used to describe the attack of God on Job. Apparently this attack took Job by surprise since he states that "I was at ease" and then God broke him asunder, the latter action being indicated by the imperfect consecutive וַיִּפְרֹץ which has been used emphatically as has been noted already in Ch 3. The expression הָיִיתִי שָׁלוֹם 'I was at peace' is similar to the Aramaic construction הָוִיתָ שְׁלָמָה 'was at ease' in Dan 4.1. The perfect הָיִיתִי is clearly used here to convey a stative nuance since it describes Job's state before he was attacked by God.

No's 822-824

שָׁק תִּפְרֹחַ עָלַי גִּלְדִי וְעַלֹּלְתִי בַעֲפֹר קֶרְנִי
פָּנַי חֲמֹרְמֹרָה מִנִּי בְנִי וְעַל עַפְעָפִי צַלְמוֹת

"I have sewed sackcloth upon my skin,
and have laid my strength in the dust.
My face is red with weeping,
and on my eyelids is deep darkness." (16.15-16 RSV).

The context to the examples contained in these verses is exactly the same as those considered above, with the exception that the form of

16.15-16 is that of the self-lament whereas that of the previous examples was that of the enemy-lament. In 16.15-16 Job reverts to the description of his present state that he had formerly spoken of in v 6. The subject that is being considered in the verses under immediate consideration is that of the necessity for lamentation that the effects of the assaults have imposed upon him. Thus it is with words and tears that Job will dispute for his disregarded rights. The state of mourning is depicted in the first hemistich by means of the perfect 'תָּפַרְתָּ 'sew' which only occurs in the qal here and in Gen 3.7; Ecc 3.7; and in the piel in Ezk 13.18. As Clines has noted, what is depicted here is that Job speaking metaphorically, means that he has stitched himself into his garb of mourning until the day of his death. (59). Thus the perfect as used here conveys in a very real sense a stative nuance, but it is also used to lament that such is the case.

The concept of the state of mourning is continued in the first hemistich of v 16 by the poalal perfect חָמְרָה 'be reddened', the root of which is חָמַר 2 and only occurs here and in Lam 1.20; 2.11. The root חָמַר carries the meaning of 'to be red' and indicates that Job's face is red with grief. Dhorme has noted that the feminine singular is used with the masculine plural when the subject is the name of something. cf GKC §145k. (60). The perfect has been used here by the poet to lament Job's state of weeping.

No's 832-833

רוחִי חבלה ימי נזעננו קנרִים לי

"My spirit is broken, my days are extinct,
the grave is ready for me."

(17.1 RSV).

The structure of the speech contained in this chapter would seem to be as follows: vv 1-5 Job addresses God, in vv 6-10 he addresses the friends, and in vv 11-16 he addresses himself. The form of the examples that are taken from this chapter is that of the self-lament and this is expressed in a contrast between "death" and "hope". This chapter presents Job as psychologically in the grip of death and so in the first verse he once again laments his own condition. Dhorme has noted that instead of two hemistichs, the verse is composed of three short phrases similar to that which is employed in French poetry. (61). In the first he asserts that 'his spirit is broken' by the phrase: רוחִי חבלה. It is important to realise that רוח is not the spirit from the point of view of the mental faculties but from the point of view of vitality. The nature of Job's condition is denoted by the pual perfect חבל 'be broken' which is used by the poet to lament Job's condition as previously noted. The second phrase expresses what this means for Job, namely, that his days have faded out. This concept is expressed by the niphal perfect נזעננו 'be extinguished' which as Dhorme has noted is the Hebraic form of the Aramaic נעך 'be extinguished'. (62). The latter verb is usually used of extinguishing the light of the wicked and of enemies being extinguished. Here the idea is that Job's days have faded out and

this is indicated by the poet's use of the perfect to lament Job's situation as is the custom in this genre.

No's 852-860

ימי עברו זמתי נתקרו מירשי לבבי
לילה ליום ישימו אור קרוב מפני חשך
אם אקוה שאול ביתי בחשך רפדתי יצועי
לשחת קראתי אבי אתה אמי ואחתי לרמה
ואיה אפר חקוטי וחקוטי מי ישורנה
בדי שאל חרדנה אם יחד על עפר נחת

"My days are past, my plans are broken off,
the desires of my heart.
They make night into day;
'The light', they say, is near to the darkness.
If I look for Sheol as my house,
if I spread my couch in darkness,
if I say to the pit, 'You are my father,'
and to the worm, 'My mother,'
or, 'My sister,'
where then is my hope?
who will see my hope?
Will it go down to the bars of Sheol?
Shall we descend together into the dust?" (17.11-16 RSV).

Job 17.11

The context to these examples here is exactly the same as that of 17.1 considered above with the exception that here Job addresses himself in a kind of monologue. The form is once again that of the self-lament. In this passage Job laments his hopelessness and lack of vitality. All the commentators have noted that this is a very difficult verse and has been subject to many emendations. What the critics have found difficult is the rhythm of the verse. Clines has noted that a tricolon is comparatively unusual, especially when the third colon has no verb. But a very similar verse opens the strophe vv 1-5; there also, there is no verb in the third colon, and the general sense is similar. (63).

In the first colon of 17.11 Job expresses his despair about the future by the perfect עָנָן 'pass by' which is surely used by the poet to lament the fact that Job has no future. Gordis takes עָנָן as transitive, "my days have passed my hope", i. e., my life has lasted longer than my hopes. (64). However, it should be noted that עָנָן in the sense of 'pass beyond' is quite rare and it is never used by the Hebrew Bible in this metaphorical sense. The sense of hopelessness is continued in the second colon by the niphal perfect נִקְנַן 'break off' which has once again been used by the poet to lament Job's lack of hope. The verb נִקְנַן is used to denote the snapping of cords or the tearing up of roots. Thus the theme of hopelessness is firmly established by the use of the perfect נִקְנַן.

Since the remainder of this lament is composed of rhetorical questions, which although typical of the lament proper, do not contain examples of the perfect being used as described above, it seems best not to consider it further at this point.

No's 913-947

הן אצעק חמס ולא אענה אשוע ואין משפט
ארחי גדר ולא אעבור ועל נתיבותי חשך ישים
כבודי מעלי הפשיט ויסר עסרת ראשי
יתצני סביב ואלך ויסע כעץ חקותי
ויחר עלי אפו ויחשבני לו כצורו
יחד יבאו גרודיו ויסלו עלי דרכם ויחנו סביב לאהלי
אחי מעלי הרחיק וידעי אך זרו ממני
חדלו קרובי ומידעי שנחוני
גרי ביתי ואמהתי לזר תחשבני נכרי הייתי בעיניהם
לעבדי קראתי ולא יענה במו פי אתחנן לו
רוחי ורה לאשתי וחנת לבני בסני
גם עוילים מאסו בי אקומה וידברו בי
תעבוני כל מתי סודי וזה אהבתי נהפכו בי
בעורי ובבשרי דבקה עצמי ואתמלטה בעור שני

"Behold, I cry out, 'Violence!' but I am not answered;
I call aloud, but there is no justice.
He has walled up my way, so that I cannot pass,
and he has set darkness upon my paths.

He has stripped from me my glory,
and taken the crown from my head.
He breaks me down on every side, and I am gone,
and my hope he has pulled up like a tree.
He has kindled his wrath against me,
and counts me as his adversary.
His troops come on together;
they have cast up siegeworks against me,
and encamp round about my tent.
He has put my brethren far from me,
and my acquaintances are wholly estranged from me.
My kinsfolk and my close friends have failed me;
the guests in my house have forgotten me;
my maidservants count me as a stranger;
I have become an alien in their eyes.
I call to my servant, but he gives me no answer;
I must beseech him with my mouth.
I am repulsive to my wife,
loathsome to the sons of my own mother.
Even young children despise me;
when I rise up they talk against me.
All my intimate friends abhor me,
and those whom I loved have turned against me.
My bones cleave to my skin and to my flesh,
and I have escaped by the skin of my teeth." (19.7-20 RSV).

The content of Job's reply to Bildad may be analysed as follows: vv 2-6 address to the friends in which Job protests against their persecution of him, vv 7-12 and vv 13-20 the reason of Job's downfall is developed as being brought about by God's direct hand, vv 21-22 second address to the friends calling on them to stop persecuting him, vv 23-27 the reason that they should do so is that Job is innocent and one day will be declared so, vv 28-29 third address to the friends giving a note of confidence as well as a final warning of the judgement to come that will give them what they deserve. From this analysis it can be seen that the examples under immediate consideration come from the sections where the reason of Job's downfall is developed as being brought about by God's direct hand. In vv 7-12 that downfall is developed by a series of assault images which are in fact an expansion of what Job says in 19.6. As to form the verses may be defined as follows: vv 7-13a the enemy lament, vv 13b-20 the self lament. The verses containing pertinent examples will now be discussed in detail.

Job 19.8

In v 7 Job has uttered a cry for deliverance which has not been answered, not only is there no salvation for him in the street, but there is also no justice for him in the law court. In v 8, however, God's actions are taken a step further in that as a deliberate act of frustration he has built a wall across Job's path. The image used here is that of the traveller who finds his way blocked. The path

אָרַח 'path' is Job's normal course of life which is hindered from developing. This deliberate action of God upon Job is denoted by the perfect וָרַחַק 'wall up' which is clearly used by the poet to lament that which God has done to Job. This is an abnormal act since no one in normal circumstances would build a wall across a path. This abnormal act of God upon Job is expressed by the perfect as is the custom in the laments.

Job 19.9

In v 9 a different image is used and it is that of the prince who is humiliated by an alien lord. The initial action of humiliation is expressed in the first hemistich by the hiphil perfect וְשָׁרַף 'strip' which indicates that God has stripped Job of his glory. The perfect is used by the poet once again to lament that which God has done to Job. The verb asserts that God has stripped Job of his "glory" or "honour" which is his righteousness. Job's righteousness was worn by him like a garment (29.14); by being visited with calamity and clothed instead with sackcloth (16.15), Job has been marked out as an evildoer for all the world to see.

Job 19.13a

There is now a sudden transition from the metaphorical speech of vv 7-12 to the wholly concrete speech of vv 13-19. In this latter speech he shows how God has alienated all of Job's kinsfolk. Thus vv 13-19

may be regarded as the direct consequence of his physical sufferings depicted in vv 7-12 by the series of assault images. In the first hemistich of v 13 the consequence of the images of assault is at once shown, it is that God has been instrumental in putting all of his brethren far away from him. This is expressed by the hiphil perfect קָרַח 'to put far away' which is used once again by the poet to lament that which God has done to Job. He has split up his family and community and as a result Job has suffered the consequent loss of status. It should be noted that the first hemistich of v 13a represents the conclusion of the enemy lament.

Job 19.13b

In v 13b the self-lament is commenced in the second hemistich by means of a statement that his acquaintances are estranged from him. It should be noted that this particular state of affairs is not attributed to the hand of God as for example the statement in the first hemistich very clearly is. In the second hemistich the poet has changed from the enemy lament to the self lament and so what he now describes are a series of states which are lamented by use of the perfect tense in poetry in the same way that he used the perfect in the enemy lament. Thus in the second hemistich the perfect קָרַח 'estranged' is used to denote this lamentable state of the lack of family loyalty. This action or state is emphasized by the particle אֲשֶׁר 'nothing but'. This idea is a commonplace in the Psalms of lament: Ps 31.12; 38.12; 88.9.

Job 19.14

The concepts expressed in v 13b are now extended to his kinsfolk and his close friends. In this verse they are said to have failed him and this is expressed by the perfect חָלַל 'cease, fail' which is certainly used by the poet to lament this action of his kinsfolk and close friends. Those who are said to have done this are חֵידְעֵי 'my kinsfolk' and קָרְבָּנִי 'my close friends'. Clines has noted that it is necessary to transfer בִּיתִי בְּרִי from v15, which is too long, to v 14, which is too short. (65). This change is supported by BHS and most translations except KJV, RV, NJPS, NIV. The restored text thus makes חֵידְעֵי into a second subject for חָלַל and makes בִּיתִי בְּרִי the subject of שָׁכַח 'forgotten'. This latter verb indicates that the guests of his house have ignored Job and is used by the poet to lament this action.

Job 19.15

In the first hemistich the circle of those who have ignored Job is extended to include his maidservants. They are said to consider Job as a stranger, a fact which is expressed by the imperfect חָשַׁבְנִי as a stranger which has been used with the preposition לְ as in 13.24. The consequence of this action of the maidservants is denoted in the second hemistich by the perfect הִיִּיתִי 'be' which denotes that Job has become as a barbarian in their eyes. The verb is certainly used in conformity to the use of the perfect in laments noted above.

Job 19.17

The circle of those who have found Job repulsive now moves from his servants to that of his wife. Most commentators are agreed that Job is here complaining that his bad breath, presumably caused by his disease, disgusts his wife. This is expressed by the noun 'נַנִּי 'my breath', but since there are no parallels to נַנִּי meaning sweet or bad breath, Clines has suggested that it may be that נַנִּי is here used in the sense of one's vitality, i.e., one's life. (66). Whatever the noun is taken to mean, the concept is in fact denoted by the perfect נַנִּי 'be repulsive to' which is best taken from the root נָנַי 'to stink' and is only used here in the Hebrew Bible. The perfect is therefore used to lament the fact that Job has become repulsive to his wife. In the second hemistich this concept is paralleled by the use of the perfect conjunctive נַנִּינַי 'be loathsome' which is surely used here in a copulative sense.

Job 19.18

This verse may be considered to be an addendum to the concepts expressed in v 17. In v17 his wife had been repulsed by him, now it is the young children (בָּנָיו) who have in a like manner rejected him. This is expressed by the perfect נִסְאָם which as Dhorme has noted is used with the preposition אֶל to indicate the person to whom scorn is shown. (67). The perfect נִסְאָם expresses the fact that the children despise him and is certainly used by the poet to lament that such has

taken place. It is impossible to know whether עוֹלָלִים indicates the urchins of the street or the small children of Job's own household.

Job 19.19

This verse acts as a kind of summary of all that has been indicated in vv 13b-18. Clines has noted that מִנְּחָמֵי 'my intimates' are perhaps roughly identical to the friends and relatives of vv 13-14. (68). In the first hemistich they are said to abhor Job, a state which is expressed by the piel perfect תַּעֲרֹבְנִי 'have a horror of' which is once again used to lament this desperate action of his household.

Job 19.20

Clines has noted that this is one of the most problematical verses in the whole of the book of Job and it seems best to follow him in his interpretation of the MT. (69). The difficulties of this verse are too great to cover within the compass of this work but they may be summarized as follows: (1) after speaking for seven verses about his isolation from his fellow humans it is strange that Job should suddenly be concerned about his physical distress; (2) it is curious that he should complain that his bones are 'cleaving to his flesh', since that seems to be a very satisfactory situation anatomically; (3) the first half of the line seems overlong (four stressed words instead of the usual three); (4) it is strange that Job should say that he has escaped (הִתְפַּאֵל hithpael), since that seems to be the last

thing he would claim is his experience. (70).

The solution which Clines proposes is one which has much to commend it since it is based on an understanding of the MT as we have it while the solutions proposed by other scholars are all based on the emendation of the text so that Dhorme, e.g., wants to adopt the reading found in G. Clines notes that the crucial word in the first hemistich is קָלַף 'cleave'. Observing that the usual meaning is that of one thing clinging or sticking to another, he adopts the meaning 'hang' following E. W. Hengstenberg in the book of Psalms (vol 3 p 216). Thus what he is proposing is a picture of the weak man whose bones appear to hang from his skin and flesh. Such a proposal involves taking the preposition מִן as 'from', but he has already suggested such a translation for No 942. He then notes that this is not literal but metaphorical language which gives the picture of Job's overpowering sense of weakness. Thus understood the verse gains a coherence and follows on naturally from the previous statements. On the basis of this solution it can be seen that the poet has used the perfect קָלַף 'hang' to lament Job's physical condition. Thus the perfect is used in complete conformity to its use in the laments of Hebrew poetry.

(C) The Perfect used as an Alternative Tense

In this section attention will be drawn to one of the better known uses of tense in Hebrew poetry, namely, the use of לָקַף and לָקַף to

describe the same tense in parallel lines, there is no difference syntactically to the way the tenses are used---they both describe the one and the same event. A short account of such a usage is noted by Niccacci:

"§172. (2) Characteristic of Canaanite and Biblical poetry is the use of the forms YIQTOL and QATAL for the same tense in parallel lines. Previously this was considered suspect and often corrected by scholars; but the poetry of Ugarit has shown it to be perfectly legitimate.

Cassuto drew attention to several examples of the pairing of the verb forms YIQTOL/QATAL or QATAL/YIQTOL from the same verbal root: Hos 5.5; Ps 38.12; 93.3; Isa 60.16; Amos 7.4; Ps 29.10. Held has added another example to those collected by Cassuto: Prov 11.7.

In addition, Gevirtz has shown that this characteristic alternation of YIQTOL/QATAL also occurs in the Amarna letters written by the city rulers of Palestine, Phoenicia, and Syria in Akkadian (the diplomatic language of that period, the 14th century BCE) influenced by peculiarities of the local language which was Cananite.

Finally, it can be noted that the alternation YIQTOL/QATAL or QATAL/YIQTOL is of course also attested between verbs of different roots." (71).

In this section 4 examples will be examined which it is believed will show the validity of this classification of the perfect. It should be noted that from the point of view of completeness such a classification should have also occurred in CH 5 which dealt with the imperfect, but pressure of space prevented these examples being noted.

No 8

וְאֵן יוֹם אֲוֹלַד בִּן וְהַלַּיְלָה אֲמַר הָרָה וְנָר

"Let the day perish wherein I was born,
and the night which said,

'A man-child is conceived.'" (3.3 RSV).

The first occurrence of the imperfect alternating with the perfect is to be found in Job's introductory poem which may be classified as a "complaint" (Klage). In form this may further be divided thus: vv 3-10 the curse and vv 11-26 the lament. The subject of the curse is the day of Job's birth and the night in which he was conceived. The day is cursed in vv 3-5 and the night in vv 6-9. In the first hemistich Job curses the day of his birth and refers to it by the niphal imperfect אֲוֹלַד 'was born' which as Dhorme has noted is a true aorist. (72). The expression בִּן יוֹם אֲוֹלַד 'the day in which I was born' corresponds to בִּן יוֹם הָוֹלַד in Hos 2.5; Eccl 7.1. In the second hemistich Job curses the night of his conception. At first sight it seems that poet has not preserved a logical order here since of necessity conception must come before birth, but such an order is also to be found in Ps 51.7. In the second hemistich Job refers to the night of his conception by the pual perfect הָרָה 'be conceived' which is considered by GKC §52e to be a passive gal. There is clearly no difference syntactically to the way in which imperfect and perfect are used in this verse, the sequence אֲוֹלַד--הָרָה

refers to the same event, namely, the birth process of Job. Thus this particular sequence has a reference to past events and is used to denote such.

No 67

הנה יסרת־י רבים וידיים רפות תחזק

"Behold, you have instructed many,
and you have strengthened weak hands." (4.3 RSV).

Chapter 4 constitutes the first reply to Job by Eliphaz the Temanite. His reply, like those in the dialogue, does not follow any fixed form, but contains a great variety of form critical elements. In the first major strophe we have first a conventional "speech preface", where reference is made to "words", either the imminent words of the speaker, or those of his interlocutor. In the verse in which the alternation between perfect and imperfect occurs, Eliphaz refers to Job's position as a teacher and how he has helped many.

Strictly speaking, the examples in 4.3 do not belong to the sequence of imperfect-perfect, but to the reverse of that sequence, namely, perfect-imperfect. In the first hemistich Job's teaching activity is denoted by the piel perfect יסרת־י 'instruct' which Dhorme has considered to be a perfect of habit. (73). The verb יסר is usually used of instructing the wise and is sometimes accompanied by physical

punishment; cf מוֹסֵר 'lesson, chastening'. Gordis has considered that טָר is a metaplastic form of אָסַר 'bind, strengthen' and has noted that the two terms טָר and חָזַק occur together in Hos 7.5. (74). His proposal, however, should be rejected since the term אָסַר would be inappropriate as the first verb to describe Job's former functions. In the second hemistich another of Job's former functions is indicated by the imperfect חָזַק 'strengthen' which describes the effect of Job's function as a teacher as already noted in Ch 5. As to the use of the imperfect here it has to be conceded that its function is to express in parallelism with טָר the teaching function of Job. There is clearly no difference in its use syntactically since both terms refer to the same event and is a good example of the alternation between perfect and imperfect described above.

No 722

הֲרֵאִשׁוֹן אָדָם חוֹלֵךְ וּלְפָנַי גְּבוּעוֹת חוֹלְלֹתִי

"Are you the first man that was born?

Or were you brought forth before the hills?" (15.7 RSV).

The second cycle of speeches is introduced by the discourse of Eliphaz the Temanite. Eliphaz's speech may conveniently be divided into two parts: (a) vv 1-16 contain the address to Job in which he states that Job has spoken unwisely, self importantly, and aggressively, and in doing so has adopted a stance that ill becomes his piety.

Because of this he is in need of correction; (b) vv 17-35 describe the wicked man and his fate, which indeed is for Job's instruction-- the point being that Job is not such a man and therefore has good reason for confidence. The example that is now under consideration comes from the first section of the speech in which Eliphaz asserts that Job has spoken unwisely and in so doing has adopted a stance that ill becomes his piety.

Job has claimed superior wisdom and Eliphaz seeks to reject any implication that Job alone is wise. He does this in vv 7-16 by a series of questions which are designed to show Job that his wisdom is not higher than any one else's. The question in v 7 is intended to show Job that he was not the first man to be born. Clines has noted here that the poet makes a reference to the myth of the first man, although not actually narrated in the Hebrew Bible it has nevertheless formed the quarry for the depiction of the king of Tyre in Ezk 28. 11-19 and perhaps also for the portrait of wisdom in Prov 8. (75). This myth apparently told of his creation before the world, his perfect wisdom and beauty, and his participation in the council of God. Eliphaz has asked Job if he is such a man, presumably to show that his wisdom is not superior to that of the friends. The act of the creation of the first man is denoted in the first hemistich by the niphal imperfect וַיֵּלֵד 'be born' and in the second by the polal perfect וַיִּבְרָא 'be brought forth'. There can be no question as to the use of the imperfect--perfect sequence here, since both imperfect and perfect refer to the same event their use must be considered to be

syntactically identical. This is a good example of how such a sequence of tenses can be used to describe one event.

No 744

אשר חכמים יגידו ולא נחדו מאבותם

"What wise man have told,
and their fathers have not hidden," (15.18 RSV).

The context to this particular example is exactly the same as that of the former one treated above with the exception that 15.18 comes from the second section of the speech where Eliphaz describes the wicked man and his fate. The speech proper may be said to begin at v 20 and is prefaced by an elaborate introduction in which he appeals to the wisdom of the ages. In v 17 he appeals as previously to his own experience and to that which he has seen. In v18 he shows that his experience is in line with traditional wisdom and in so doing he refers to the two sources of wisdom, namely, the sages and their spiritual fathers. His experience is buttressed by their teachings. The expression of their teaching is indicated in the first hemistich by the hiphil imperfect יגידו 'declare' and in the second by the piel perfect נחדו 'withhold'. As with the previous examples the two forms are used to describe the expression of teaching by the generations of the sages so that there is no difference in their syntactic use.

While only 4 examples of this well attested feature have been considered, this is only because of space and not because these are the only examples that can be detected.

(D) The Perfect used to denote the concept of Consequence

It has already been shown in this study that the concept of consequence is denoted in the first instance by the imperfect consecutive and by the imperfect conjunctive. As might be expected it is also indicated by the perfect consecutive/conjunctive, but there are a few examples of this concept being expressed by the perfect alone and 2 have been selected to confirm such a usage.

No 139

לכד חכמים בערמם ונצת נפתלים נמהרה

"He takes the wise in their own craftiness;
and the schemes of the wily are brought to a quick end." (5.13 RSV).

In the third main section of Eliphaz's first speech, Eliphaz discourses with Job on the fate of the fool. In vv 1-7 Eliphaz again concentrates on the fate of the fool and introduces the topic with a proverb (v2). The proverb-like conclusion to these verses (vv 1-7) confirms its wisdom derivation. In vv 8-16, however, the speech has a hymnic cast. After its introductory "confession" (v8), which

functions as advice rather than as testimony, the strophe has the form of a "doxology". The purpose of this "doxology" is advisory to Job rather than as directly as praise to God. Thus the example in 5.13 occurs in the midst of Eliphaz' doxology. Here Eliphaz concentrates on God's activity which is to be seen in his readjustment of the moral and social order. The judgement of those who are wise in their own eyes is therefore indicated by the gal participle לָנָה 'takes' which denotes that God uses their own craftiness to bring them to their own demise. The consequence to this action is indicated in the second hemistich by the niphal perfect נִמְהָרָה 'to be done speedily' which demonstrates that God by defeating the wicked also brings their schemes to a swift end. In this context the conjunction ׀ by which the second hemistich is introduced, would better taken as an indicator of purpose 'so that' which would have the added effect of making the expression of purpose clearer.

No 912

דַּעַן אֲפֹן כִּי אֱלֹהִים עָוֹתַי וּמְצֹדֵדוֹן עָלַי הִקְיָה

"Know then that God has put me in the wrong,

and closed his net about me."

(19.6 RSV).

It has been previously noted that Job's reply to Bildad contains five sections of which the first (vv 2-6) contains an address to the friends in which Job complains of their persecution of him. This

first section is concluded by v 6 in which Job articulates his belief that it is God who has put him in the wrong. This concept is indicated in the first hemistich by the piel perfect 'עוֹת 'pervert' which is used with the direct complement of the person to mean 'do wrong' to some one (Ps 119.78). Dhorme has noted that the verb עוֹת has been deliberately chosen in reply to Bildad who used it in his first speech and precisely with reference to God: "Does God distort the right?" (76). Thus Job believes that God has acted unjustly towards him. The consequence to this action is denoted in the second hemistich by the hiphil perfect יִקְרֶה 'To make something turn around someone'. But what is it that is denoted by the noun מְצוֹרֹת? According to most commentators the metaphor is the of the net (cf RSV), but Clines has argued that such a metaphor is out of place here and that it should be that of siegeworks. The image of siegeworks is more appropriate in the light of vv 7-12 which uses the images of assault at some length. (77). The meaning of 'siegework' for מְצוֹרֹת may be attested in Eccl 9.14. Thus the second hemistich very clearly defines the consequence of God having put Job in the wrong, it is that God has erected siegeworks around him like a besieged city.

In this chapter we have examined some 73 examples of the perfect as it is used in the book of Job which are spread through Ch's 3.1-20.29; 32.1-37.24; 38.1-42.6. Thus we have been able to trace how it works in different types of literature contained within the book of Job. It is now necessary to come to some sort of conclusion as to its use.

From the analysis of the examples considered in this chapter it seems that there are in fact four distinct usages of this form in the book of Job. These are as follows:

(1). That the perfect has a widespread use as a stative verb. In such examples the verb qualified the subject more often than not and is always translated by the English present tense. It was noted that such was its use in the archaic poetry of the Hebrew Bible and that it acted as a predicative adjective which was descriptive of its subject.

(2) That the perfect was used to denote conditions of distress in the laments of the book of Job. It was noted that this usage was in reality an extension of (1) since what was being expressed was a series of states that the lamenter wished God to intervene in.

(3) That the perfect was also used in alternation with the imperfect to describe an action or series of actions. It was noted that this was one of the more widely attested features of tense usage in Hebrew poetry and that such a usage had also been documented in Ugaritic.

(4) That the perfect was also used to denote the concept of consequence. It was noted that this was a much rarer use of the perfect than any others considered in this chapter since such concepts were usually denoted by either the imperfect consecutive/conjunctive or the perfect consecutive/conjunctive.

NOTES

(1)	GKC	<u>Hebrew Grammar</u>	\$106b-p	p309
(2)	McFall, L.	<u>Enigma of the Hebrew Verbal system</u>		p 2
(3)	Blake, F. R.	<u>Resurvey of Hebrew Tenses</u>		p164
(4)	Blake	ibid		pref.
(5)	Blake	ibid		p 3
(6)	Blake	ibid		p 3
(7)	Blake	ibid		p 3
(8)	Fenton, T. L.	"Hebrew Tenses in the light of Ugaritic"		p 35
(9)	Michel, D.	<u>Tempora und Satzstellung in den Psalmen</u>		p 1
(10)	Driver, S. R.	<u>Hebrew Tenses</u>	\$ 11	p 15f
(11)	Driver, S. R.	ibid	\$ 11	p 16
	GKC	ibid	\$106g	p311
(12)	Mauchline, J.	<u>Hebrew Grammar</u>	\$ 19	p 90
(13)	Clines, D.	<u>WBC--Job</u>		p120
(14)	Fensham, C.	"The use of the Suffix Conjugation"		p 16
(15)	Dhorme, E.	<u>Commentary on the book of Job</u>		p475
(16)	Tur-Sinai	<u>The Book of Job</u>		p458
(17)	Clines	ibid		p353
(18)	Clines	ibid		p194
(19)	Andersen, F.	<u>TOTC--Job</u>		p138
(20)	Clines	ibid		p227
(21)	Clines	ibid		p488
(22)	Dhorme	ibid		p294
(23)	Clines	ibid		p256
(24)	Dhorme	ibid		p481

(25)	Gordis Tur-Sinai	<u>The Book of Job</u> ibid	p369 p461
(26)	Clines	ibid	p285
(27)	Dhorme	ibid	p135
(28)	Dhorme	ibid	p505
(29)	Dhorme	ibid	p134
(30)	Clines	ibid	p233
(31)	Dhorme	ibid	p182
(32)	Blake	ibid	§68. 1 p 77
(33)	Michel	ibid	§ 6 p 52
(34)	Westermann, C	<u>The Structure of the book of Job</u>	p 31
(35)	Westermann	ibid	p 37
(36)	Clines	ibid	p 77
(37)	Westermann	ibid	p 37
(38)	Gordis	ibid	p 36
(39)	Dhorme	ibid	p 32
(40)	Dhorme	ibid	p 33
(41)	Dhorme	ibid	p 41
(42)	Clines	ibid	p168
(43)	Clines	ibid	p178
(44)	Dhorme	ibid	p 89
(45)	Dhorme	ibid	p 98
(46)	Dhorme	ibid	p 99
(47)	Clines	ibid	p185
(48)	Dhorme	ibid	p100
(49)	Clines	ibid	p376
(50)	Dhorme	ibid	p231

(51)	Dhorme	ibid	p233
(52)	Dhorme	ibid	p232
(53)	Clines	ibid	p387
(54)	Gordis	ibid	p176
(55)	Clines	ibid	p382
(56)	Gordis	ibid	p176
(57)	Dhorme	ibid	p235
(58)	Clines	ibid	p383
(59)	Clines	ibid	p386
(60)	Dhorme	ibid	p238
(61)	Dhorme	ibid	p242
(62)	Dhorme	ibid	p243
(63)	Clines	ibid	p374
(64)	Gordis	ibid	p183
(65)	Clines	ibid	p429
(66)	Clines	ibid	p448
(67)	Dhorme	ibid	p279
(68)	Clines	ibid	p449
(69)	Clines	ibid	p450
(70)	Clines	ibid	p450
(71)	Niccacci, A.	<u>The Syntax of the Verb</u>	p194f
(72)	Dhorme	ibid	p 24
(73)	Dhorme	ibid	p 43
(74)	Gordis	ibid	p 46
(75)	Clines	ibid	p349
(76)	Dhorme	ibid	p272
(77)	Clines	ibid	p428

Chapter Eight

Conclusion

The object of this analysis has been to demonstrate that there is a specific syntax of Hebrew poetry as opposed to prose and that this syntax is best illustrated by the use of tense in Hebrew poetry. Reference has also been made to some of the better known features of this syntax such as the interchange of prepositions and the emphatic use of particles, but it is believed that the most difficult part of that syntax is the use of tense. In the main body of the work the different categories of tense that are used in the Hebrew language have been examined and some tentative conclusions arrived at. These have now been collated together in the final chapter to serve as a main conclusion to the work.

In Chapter 3 the use of the imperfect consecutive was examined. There it was shown that its main use in Hebrew poetry was to denote the concept of consequence as initially expressed by another verbal form or by a chain of imperfect consecutives. It was noted that Michel in his study had first noted this distinctive use of the waw consecutive in Hebrew poetry. It was further noted that such was not its only use since it was also used by the poet to indicate emphasis where such was felt to be desired. This latter use has not been commented on by Michel.

In Chapter 4 the use of the imperfect conjunctive was considered. Initially it was observed that this was a construction which Michel had not dealt with in his study. From the examples which were considered, it was found to have a three fold use: (a) that the imperfect conjunctive is used in a very similar way to the imperfect

consecutive to denote the concept of consequence and may be considered to be an alternative form which the poet has used for the sake of variety; (b) that the imperfect conjunctive is used in parallelism with other verbs in the colon whether they are imperfect or perfect and the ׀ in such examples is merely copulative preserving such parallelism; (c) that the ׀ in the imperfect conjunctive is used to denote the dependant verb after the optative formula ׀ן' ׀ן 'who will grant'.

In Chapter 5 the use of the imperfect was examined. As a prelude to its examination it was noted that the nature of the poetry of the book of Job was that of discourse as opposed to Ugaritic poetry which was heavily narrational in character. From the examples which were examined its use was found to be as follows: (a) that the imperfect is used to indicate narration in a similar fashion to the way that it is used in Ugaritic poetry and the archaic poems of the Pentateuch; (b) that the imperfect is used to express the language of prayer. It was observed in this subsection that the jussive in particular was used in this way and it was noted that the use of the jussive to express a petition was part and parcel of the use of the jussive; (c) that the imperfect is used to express the language of praise. It was noted that in this category the imperfect does not have a principal role but a subordinate one. The reason for this is that in the book of Job the mighty acts of God are always described by the article plus participle; (d) that the imperfect is used to express the language of lament. As with (c) above its role here is that of a subordinate

one since the perfect is usually used to indicate situations of distress which the lamenter wishes to draw attention to. Its use in this category may be due to nothing more than poetic variety; (e) that the imperfect is used to express the language of dispute. Its use here was usually in questions which were begun with the interrogative particle η ; (f) that the imperfect is used to express the language of accusation. It was noted that the imperfect was mainly used in this genre in emphatic statements, in questions which are begun with the interrogative pronoun $\eta\eta$, and in conditional sentences; (g) that the imperfect was used to express the language of commitment. In this connection it was noted that the imperfect was used in a modal sense to express desire.

In Chapter 6 the use of the perfect conjunctive/consecutive was examined. From the examples that were considered its use was seen to be four fold: (a) that the perfect conjunctive/consecutive is used to denote a change of subject and it was observed that its use here was in accord with the use of the perfect in Ugaritic; (b) that the perfect conjunctive/consecutive is used in a very similar way to the imperfect consecutive & imperfect conjunctive to denote the concept of consequence and may be considered to be an alternative form which the poet has used for the sake of variety; (c) that the perfect conjunctive/consecutive is used emphatically in a similar way to the imperfect conjunctive/consecutive to underline a particular action chosen by the poet; (d) that the perfect conjunctive/consecutive is used with other verbs in the colon whether they are imperfect or

perfect and the ׀ in such examples is merely copulative preserving such parallelism.

In Chapter 7 the use of the perfect was considered. From the examples which were examined its use was noted to be four-fold: (a) that the perfect was used in the sense of a stative verb. It was noted that many of the verbs considered actually were descriptive of their respective subjects and were always translated by the English present tense. This use was noted to be in line with the way the perfect is used in the archaic poetry of the Hebrew Bible where it acts as a predicative adjective; (b) that the perfect was used to describe the distress in the laments of the book of Job. This use was noted to be nothing less than an extension of use (a) noted above since it in reality was describing a series of conditions that the lamenter wished to draw attention to; (c) that the perfect was used as an alternative tense with the imperfect in either the sequence $\text{לֹּבֵן} \text{---} \text{לֹּבֵן}$ or the sequence $\text{לֹּבֵן} \text{---} \text{לֹּבֵן}$ in which its use was syntactically identical to the other tense. It was noted that such a use was regular in the poetry of the Hebrew Bible and in Ugaritic; (d) that the perfect was used (rarely) to denote the concept of consequence in a similar way to either the imperfect consecutive/conjunctive or the perfect consecutive/conjunctive and must be considered to be an alternative tense which the poet has used for the sake of variety.