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The Early Arabic Versions of Job (first millennium C.E.)

Abstract

This work makes a contribution to the history of the interpretation of Hebrew scripture by examining the earlier texts, produced by the linguistically cognate communities of Arabic-speaking Jews, Christians, and Muslims, of one of the more theologically controversial and linguistically difficult texts of the Judeo-Christian canon: the Book of Job.

Analysis relates portions of five pre-1000 C.E. Arabic versions to the Masoretic Text as well as to the Targum, Septuagint, Peshitta, Syro-Hexaplaric, and Coptic. Subtleties encountered in the course of translation, including theological emphases, inter-religious and inter-cultural influences, as well as paraphrastics and other form-literary concerns, are treated.
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### Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANE</td>
<td>ancient Near East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BDB</td>
<td>Brown, Driver, &amp; Briggs' <em>Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHS</td>
<td><em>Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM</td>
<td>De Baudissin's edition of the first portion of Job, the ms of which is catalogued as British Museum arab 1475 / Add. 26,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Common Era, equivalent to <em>Anno Domini</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cp</td>
<td>Coptic version of Job as edited and translated by Tattam (1846)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>Fatyūn ibn Ayyūb's unedited version of Job, British Museum arab Supplement 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>The Septuagint Version of the Hebrew Bible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>Masoretic Text of the Hebrew Bible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>New Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT</td>
<td>Old Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pesh</td>
<td>The Peshitta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>Sa'adiah Ga'on's translation of Job, edited by Qafaḥ (1970)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S–H</td>
<td>Codex Syro–Hexaplaris Ambrosianus, edited by Ceriani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>The unedited completion of BM, catalogued as Mt. Sinai arab 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>Țomâ al–Fuștâţi's translation of Job, catalogued as Mt. Sinai arab 514, edited by 'Iyyâd (1967)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tg</td>
<td>The Targum; Aramaic texts were those of Stec (1994); the edition of Mangan (1981) served as the English language reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>Ibrahim al–Tha'labî's <em>Qiṣaṣ al–anbiyā‘</em> as published 1298 A.H., Cairo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The story and character of Job are part of a tradition and heritage common to various peoples of the Near East, most especially the Jewish, Christian, and Muslim communities. Each century, each community, and each linguistic tradition have added their own elaborations and nuances to the stories of Job: all three have chosen to preserve the memory of a righteous person upon whom calamities are visited. This is indicative of an interaction among the communities involved, an interaction rooted in common historical experience and a common exaltation of scripture.

Only those Arabic treatments of the Book of Job composed by the end of the first Christian millennium were chosen for this analysis. After 1000 C.E., there is a long period of silence as far as Job and the Arabic language are concerned. In the West, this silence is broken only in the 17th century C.E. by the appearance of the Paris (1645) and London (1657) polyglots, as well as a translation prepared by the Church of Rome (1671). These works signal a new history in the Arabic versions of Job: while the Paris and London polyglots make extensive use of Arabic sources composed by and for Arabic speaking Jews and Christians, the Propaganda version of Rome is the product of an institution essentially external to the Arabic-speaking Middle East. From that time forward, various denominations and orders would translate Job, along with the rest of scripture, for purposes that were essentially missiological. In the Muslim world, the break is only half as long, but is no less significant, given the rapid literary developments taking place during the period in question. Indeed, the earliest second millennium C.E. Arabic version of Job to come out of the Muslim community is a 14th century C.E. work of ibn Kathîr. As such, it is removed in time from the 'canonical' versions by a factor of four when
compared to that of al-Tha'labi, composed near the end of the first millennium C.E.

The only Arabic\(^1\) translation of Job of the first millennium to come out of the Jewish community is a 10th century C.E. work by Sa'adiah Ga'on (SG), completed as part of his translation of the entire Hebrew canon into Arabic. SG's version of Job has been extensively edited in the modern period, most notably by Derenbourg (1899) and Qapah (1970); numerous commentaries on SG's translation of Job have also been produced, most recently by Goodman (1988). Intent on combatting the Kara'ite sect of Judaism, SG took pains to elucidate obscure passages by means of an accompanying commentary; however, he was not averse to clarifying meaning through the text itself, albeit in a conservative, measured manner.

Another translation is anonymous, though it is obviously the product of the Christian community. Thought to date from the early 9th century C.E.,\(^2\) the first portion, British Museum arab 1475 / Add. 26,116 (BM), was edited and translated into Latin by de Baudissin (1870). Material from the middle of 5:19 through the beginning of 6:26 has been lost, and the ms ends within 28:21b.

The completion of BM was discovered at St. Saba monastery near Jerusalem.\(^3\) This final portion of Job, SS, now makes up the first dozen of a volume of 148 folios.\(^4\) As such it was catalogued by the Library of Congress as Mt. Sinai arabic 1; it is entirely unedited and untranslated.

Yet another Christian translation is a 9th century C.E. product of an Egyptian monk, Tômä al-Fušṭāṭī (TF). Located towards the end (folios 143b through 159b) of a 175 folio volume of hagiographical works catalogued by the Library of Congress

\(^1\) Technically, the language used is Judeo-Arabic, \textit{i.e.}, Arabic written in Hebrew characters.

\(^2\) Graf (1944), p. 126.

\(^3\) Ibid.

\(^4\) Immediately following the completion of the Book of Job there appears an Arabic translation of the Book of Daniel.
as Mt. Sinai arabic 514, TF's work was published by 'Iyyad (1967) without apparatus or comment beyond a few introductory paragraphs.

The final translation is a mid-9th century C.E. work characterized by Graf (1947) as a "paraphrase" by the "interpreter" Fatyūn ibn Ayyūb, a Christian monk of Mesopotamia. This work, FA, which is also entirely unedited, is identified as British Museum arab Supplement 1, folios 173b through 183a. The work is divided into 15 chapters (rather than the traditional 42).

While SG, BM, SS, and TF are clearly close translations reaching back to the Hebrew canon, with FA only being marginally less so, the final Joban work of the first millennium C.E. to be considered in this study is clearly of a different literary type: it is clear that İbrahîm al-Tha'labî's 'Discourse in Mention of the Prophet of God Ayyūb and of His Trials', or TH, is not a translation of the canonical tale. But it is far more than the treatment that Job receives in the Qur'an, where he is but a pale reflection of the character by that same name of the Hebrew scriptures. That Job was an important figure for Islam as one of the Qur'anic prophets is attested by the fact that Job merited inclusion in what Macdonald has characterized as the literature of the "history of revelation" (p. 145). TH, then, is the final composition on Job from the first millennium C.E. that will be included in this study.

Methodology and Presentation

Eight voices from the Book of Job are discerned, and a representative chapter from each has been arbitrarily selected for analysis: from the Prose narrative, Chapter 1; Job's Soliloquy, Chapter 3; from the first speech cycle, Chapter 11 (Zophar's Argument); from the second speech cycle, Chapter 18 (Bildad's Assertion); from the

---

5 Pp. 107-08.
6 Ibid.
7 Muslim scripture has only four explicit references to Job, and all are cursory, occurring at 4:163, 6:75, 21:83-84, and 38:42 (versification according to Pickthall [n.d.]).
third speech cycle, Chapter 22 (Eliphaz' Indictment); the Ode or Hymn to Wisdom, Chapter 28; from the Elihu material, Chapter 32; from the divine speeches, Chapter 38.

Analysis proceeds linguistically and theologically. The Arabic versions are first contrasted in terms of vocabulary, grammar, and style. Some of the variations observed in the Arabic translations are then examined in view of the earlier canonical versions of the tale, including the MT, which is the first text cited for the discussion of any given passage. In addition, various mss of the Tg, as reproduced by Stec (1994) and edited by Mangan (1991) are consulted, as are the two Syriac translations, viz., the S-H and Pesh. Of course, from the non-Semitic languages, potential source texts consist of the LXX as well as the Cp. These are collectively referred to as 'the predecessor versions'.

Not all peculiarities of the Arabic versions can be accounted for, however, merely on the basis of these predecessor versions. Translators often bring their own agenda to the work at hand, and thus each Arabic text is individually analyzed for any specific characteristics it may betray. Indeed, the translators are often found to have brought their own idiom and personality to their task.

Theological analysis proceeds from the linguistic. While differences in literary dependence often result in diverse theological outlooks, the individual backgrounds of the translators will also be seen as contributing significantly to the theological bent of the translations themselves.

In addition to the MT, the four Arabic canonical versions (SG, BM/SS, TF, and FA) are presented in their entirety as analysis proceeds, the non-canonical TH being cited only when his rendition approximates that of any of the other Arabic versions, or the MT's general storyline. Texts in Hebrew, Judeo-Arabic, and Arabic are presented without benefit of diacritical markings.
Before either linguistic or theological characteristics of the individual versions are discussed, general observations on each passage may be warranted. Then, SG is generally the first version treated, due to the fact that it is his religious community which produced the original canonical version of Job. Of the Christian versions, BM/SS is next presented, followed immediately by TF, given the high degree of linguistic convergence between these two versions. Finally, FA's translation, which borders on paraphrase, is cited. Presentation is usually made on a stich-by-stich basis, though occasionally by couplets, during the poetic sections. Traditional intra-verse divisions are not necessarily adhered to in the discussion of the prose sections.

It is not the intention of this study to produce a full editing of those documents (SS, TF, FA), which have not been subjected to full editorial analysis heretofore. However, occasional emendations to the mss in question are proposed as linguistic and theological analysis suggests.

Single quotation marks indicate translations made expressly for this study, while double quotation marks are used to cite the work of published authors and translators. Unless otherwise noted, translations of the MT are those of the commentary of Habel (1985); for the Tg, Mangan (1991); for the LXX, Brenton (1870); for the Pesh, Lamas (1985); for the Cp, Tattara (1846). None of the other predecessor versions has been translated into English. Of the Arabic versions themselves, only two have been translated into English. Unless otherwise noted, translations cited of SG are taken from Goodman (1988); for TH, the translator is Macdonald (1898).
The Early Arabic Versions of Job (first millennium C.E.): Prose Passage (Job 1)

Verse 1

MT

אֶשׁ הַד הַבָּאִים אִבּוֹת שְׁפָת
הַד הַאָמָּה הָיוּ בְּרֵא שָׁפָר אֵלָה אֵלָה וַעֲרֵפּ

SG

כָּאָלָה לְחָלוֹּת בְּרֵא שִׁית אֵלָה
כָּאָלָה לוֹּתָתָהּ מְסַפְּקֵיהָ מְסַפְּקֵיהָ אֵלָה אֵלָה וַעֲרֵפּ

TF

כָּאָלָה לְחָלוֹּת בְּרֵא שִׁית אֵלָה אֵלָה וַעֲרֵפּ
וַאֲנָה בָּרָא אֱלֹה עַל עַמֶּה אֵלָה

While SG clearly follows the MT most closely, with FA not much further away, TF ignores the canonical opening of the story, identifies Job with the epithet 'the Righteous', and glosses the location of Job's birth, all the while betraying a number of grammatical errors or textual corruptions. Salient among the last are the lack of indefinite accusative markers in 1b and what is apparently an incorrectly transcribed final consonant to the final word (for the scribe has recorded 'the scribe has recorded'). A discussion of some of these factors follows:

TF's identification of 'Uz with 'al-Bataniyyah' is clearly within the Islamic tradition. While midrashic texts have sought to identify 'Uz with a variety of locations, from Aram-Naharayim (Mesopotamia) to Edom, the land of al-Bathaniyyah (immediately north of Gilead and therefore not unknown to the Jews) was apparently not an option considered by the midrash, unless SG's reference in his commentary to al-Ghūtah as referencing 'Uz is to be considered identical to

---

9 Cf., inter alia, Ginzberg (1909).
However, TH reports that Job owned 'al-Thaniyyah', a textual corruption of al-Bathaniyyah according to Macdonald (1895). Brinner's 1987 translation of the second volume to Tabari's third century AH history, also attests to this possession of Job's.

FA's rendering of the grammatical subject of la ('man') as a predicate noun of كان at first appears to be a simple grammatical error. However, the facility which FA displays with Arabic elsewhere in his translation of the poetic passages of Job suggests two alternatives to this conclusion: a possible scribal error (the same phrase begins 1b), or an actual variant reading: 'He was a man in the land of 'Us...'. Unfortunately, solving the grammatical problem in this manner creates a stylistic one: the word order of the Arabic is unlikely given that the prepositional phrase should precede an indefinite subject, and the presence of a pronominal reference without an antecedent shows a lack of elegance.

The Pesh and S–H may hold a clue here in their attempt to particularize the person in question: the Pesh reads 'There was one man...' (using the numeral to emphasize what could have been stated by avoiding the definite article) while the S–H renders the passage 'There was a particular man...' (cf. the LXX: ἄνθρωπος τῷ ἤν... and Cp: 'There was a certain man...'). Thus FA's translation may be an attempt to approximate this reading, which is apparently rooted in the MT's inversion of the standard Hebrew (and Arabic) verb–subject word order.

FA, to make sure his readers get the point, gives an extra predicate adjective regarding Job's character. This extra vocabulary item, while not adding appreciably

---

11 P. 87.
12 P. 146, n. 7.
13 P. 140.
to an understanding of the text as a whole, lends emphasis to the quality in question.

This internal glossing is a characteristic that will be found throughout FA's version of Job.

Verse 2

MT: יָרָהּ לֹא שְׂבֻּתָּנוּ בִּנְיָמִין וְשָׁלֹשׁ בָּנוֹת
SG: וַאֲשֶׁר הֵן בְּגִיאָהוֹן מִנְיָמִין וְשָׁלֹשׁ בָּנוֹת
TF: זְבֵזְהָוּ בָּנוֹתִים וְשָׁלֹשׁ בָּנוֹת
FA: זְבֵזְהָוּ בָּנוֹת וַאֲשֶׁר הֵן בְּגִיאָהוֹן מִנְיָמִין וְשָׁלֹשׁ בָּנוֹת
TH: וַאֲשֶׁר הֵן בְּגִיאָהוֹן מִנְיָמִין וְשָׁלֹשׁ בָּנוֹת

All the canonical versions are in very close parallel, while TH is not far removed from any of the Arabic versions. FA betrays complete confusion on the issue of reverse agreement of numerals, common to Hebrew, Arabic, and Syriac, while TF gets it half right. Both versions, along with the Pesh and S-H, avoid the verb 'be born', preferring the possessive expressed by ל plus the pronominal suffix.

Verse 3α

MT: וְזָרַדְתִּי קָרָה יִשְׁפָּהָהּ אלֶפֶּר יִשְׁפָּהָהּ אֲלֵפֶּר נָטָלָה
SG: וְזָרַדְתִּי קָרָה יִשְׁפָּהָהּ אלֶפֶּר יִשְׁפָּהָהּ אֲלֵפֶּר נָטָלָה
TF: וְזָרַדְתִּי קָרָה יִשְׁפָּהָהּ אלֶפֶּר יִשְׁפָּהָהּ אֲלֵפֶּר נָטָלָה
FA: וְזָרַדְתִּי קָרָה יִשְׁפָּהָהּ אלֶפֶּר יִשְׁפָּהָהּ אֲלֵפֶּר נָטָלָה
TH: וְזָרַדְתִּי קָרָה יִשְׁפָּהָהּ אלֶפֶּר יִשְׁפָּהָהּ אֲלֵפֶּר נָטָלָה

There is complete agreement on the numbers of the stock among the canonical versions, though the same words are not employed in the translations of animal types.
FA continues exhibiting difficulties with the numerical system of classical Arabic, and with TH introduces the verse with a gloss (parallel to the S-H but not Pesh or Cp), making certain the reader understands that Job was possessed of much wealth. TF and FA add some special glosses regarding the female portions of the stock: the former notes that the asses are capable of bearing young, while the latter characterizes not only the donkeys as such (through the employment of other lexical items in a differing grammatical construction), but also noting that the camels are capable of bearing young as well:

FA has another minor peculiarity: his oxen are not yoked. Perhaps he has mis-read the ending (which is part of the broken plural) as a dual ending expressing the concept of 'yoke' or 'team'. This would obviate the need for an enumerative noun to close the phrase.

Verse 3αβ, β, ε

As with the animals, terminology referring to humans differs among both the canonical and non-canonical Arabic versions, whether regarding servants (عبد) vs. غلمان vs. خدم or the circumlocution for 'easterners', where SG's desire to remain close to the MT causes him to misinterpret the Hebrew כָּפַר as a

---

14 The LXX makes a similar addition, but inserts it later in the verse, immediately preceding the reference to the 'sons of the east': καὶ ἔγραφα μεγάλα τῷ αὐτῷ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.
15 Such a reference is missing from TH.
proper place name.

TF adds to Job's possessions many lands, أعمال, a word that literally means 'activities', but which in North Africa has a secondary denotation regarding territory. FA parallels this in his insertion of الجوار, 'land areas', here. Such an addition at 3b is attested to in neither Syriac version, nor the LXX. The Tg, however, contains a phrase reminiscent of TF and FA in 3c, referring to Job as being 'greater in property' rather than speaking to his noble status.

Both TF and FA also depart from the MT and SG, which are in close parallel, in that their descriptions of Job's character are more extravagant. While SG's jill simply makes Job venerable, TF uses krm in a construct to describe Job as being 'most honorable of noble descent'. FA adds to the characterization of Job as distinguished, from srf, a gloss from 'zm, 'mighty'. Again, the Pesh and S-H are silent in this regard, staying close to the MT.

TH's language regarding Job is even more effusive. The passage in which it occurs does not parallel any of the canonical versions, however, reading "he was compassionate to the poor, aiding widows and orphans, honoring the guest and advancing the traveler on his way. He was grateful for the favor of God Most High..." (p. 146). This passage, of course, is reminiscent of the injunctions in the O.T. regarding behavior towards those who are ill-favored in life. So even if there is no clear textual parallel with the canonical versions, TH definitely stands within the canonical tradition at this point.

Verse 4a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>עלהו בכני ערש משחתה בות ארש ימי</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>תמאו בכם ימלachs מלכסא כל ים שונים א хаר מלכסא</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16 This is indeed the understanding of the Cp.
17 The phrases in question are and חיריר מין רא בכנכס מין.
FA elaborates on the nature of the regular gatherings of Job's children by means of a third verb: 'they enjoyed themselves'. This departure is not attested to in other Arabic versions, the LXX, Pesh, S-H, or Cp. TF avoids verbs in this description of the feast, preferring the use of the verbal noun as the object of a preposition. The MT and SG use simply 'feast' (מְשָׂה and מְשָׂה, respectively), though SG elaborates on the activities of Job's sons by adding the verb, רָבָּה, 'go about', before the main verb of the clause. TF incorrectly uses the perfect of 'be' with the subjunctive to express past imperfect/habitual action: the indicative is called for in such instances.

There is no mention in TH of the feasting of Job's children until calamity strikes them. The description thereof is particularly gruesome: "they are thrown head downwards with their blood and brains flowing from their nostrils and their lips, and if thou wast to see how their bellies are split and their entrails scattered, verily thy heart would cease to beat!" (p. 149). Clearly TH is intent on heightening the dramatic effect to a degree unknown in the canonical versions of the tale.

Verse 4b

SG's adherence to the MT could not be closer. FA is more generalized in his description of the invited guests at the feasts, mentioning 'their friends and relations' rather than 'their sisters'. He does not draw upon either Syriac version, LXX, or Cp
here in this regard.

Verse 5aα

MT

ורו בים תֶּהֶשֶׁת רֹשהֶת Aviv יִקְרֵה

and the calf was taken by the sea, it was brought to Aviv.

SG

ולאֶזֶא אֲנָמָא אַלְמָאָה עֲלֵהֶת Aviv פרְפַרְפַרְדּוּה

And this one, when it went up, it was brought to Aviv, it went up on it.

TF

וְוָקָא אֶזֶא אָנָמָא אַלְמָאָה עֲלֵהֶת Aviv בְּאָוָא פְּרַפְּרַפְּרַדּוּה

And it was like this one when it went up, it was brought to Aviv, it went up in the boat.

FA

וְוַּעֲקָא אֶזֶא אָנָמָא אַלְמָאָה עֲלֵהֶת Aviv בְּאָוָא פְּרַפְּרַפְּרַדּוּה

And it was like this one, when it went up, it was brought to Aviv, it went up in the boat.

TF shows evidence of scribal error: for should be read غادة. But more importantly, he then differs from the other Arabic versions in adding, in tandem with the S–H as well as LXX and Cp, an extra phrase: 'and one calf for the sins of their souls'. This harmonizes Job's practice with conventional Israelite practice.

FA opens the verse with poetic license: 'And when they showed evidence of their boisterousness, Job sent for them...', a reference to the rowdiness of his children's merry-making. In this reading, FA stands alone among the versions, Arabic or otherwise.

Verse 5aβ, b

MT

כִּי כְּעָר אָבֵיָּהוֹ אֵלֵיָּהוֹ בֶּן וֹעָרָי אֵלֵיָּהוֹ בָּלֶמֶשׁ

For the city of Eben Ezer of Eliezer, son of Aray of Belemesh.

SG

לָאֵמָא בָּנָה יָכוֹל לְלַעֲלָא כְּפָלָא גַּםְוָא עֲלֵהֶת Aviv מִכְּנָסָה

And this one, when it was taken by the sea, it was brought to Aviv, it went up in the boat.

TF

לָאֵמָא בָּנָה יָכוֹל לְלַעֲלָא כְּפָלָא גַּםְוָא עֲלֵהֶת Aviv מִכְּנָסָה

And this one, when it was taken by the sea, it was brought to Aviv, it went up in the boat.

FA

לָאֵמָא בָּנָה יָכוֹל לְלַעֲלָא כְּפָלָא גַּםְוָא עֲלֵהֶת Aviv מִכְּנָסָה

And this one, when it was taken by the sea, it was brought to Aviv, it went up in the boat.

None of the Arabic versions display the same sensitivity to cursing God as the MT's.
euphemism. However, TF's explanation for Job's behavior regarding provisional sacrifices for his children differs from the rest of the versions, including the LXX and Pesh: 'May they neither be, nor may servants [of God] contemplate, evil before God.' Nor do the Arabic versions agree on the same idiomatic expression for translating the MT's 'all the days', though TF and FA resort to the same construct and root, whereas SG's Arabic is more rarified.

This verse completes the setting of the earthly stage of the story. While there have been linguistic differences among the versions, they all generally concur with one another concerning the general outline of the MT’s setting. What is perhaps most striking has been the lack of unanimity among the Arabic versions themselves, despite this general agreement on the MT’s outline: the Arabic versions lack commonality in vocabulary and syntax. This would appear to be the result of having an embarras de richesses in terms of possible textual sources (Tg, LXX, Pesh, S-H, and Cp). In addition, differences of geographical venue (Egypt and Mesopotamia) have an influence, in turn, upon variations in Arabic usage.

Verse 6a

| MT | ויהי זכרו שלמה בן האלוהים חיווהו | ولما كان ذات يوم اجتمعوا الملاكية ليقوموا قدم الرب |
| SG | נזכאים זכרו שלמה בן אלוהים פאולנו בם יזוח | وفي بعض الأيام جاءت ملاكوت الله للمقام قدم الرب |
| TF | * | *
| FA | * | *

Only TF, like the MT, makes this passage a complete sentence; SG and FA both use a subordinate adverbial clause, with the main portion of the sentence following in 6b. As for the MT’s phrase ‘sons of God’, SG renders it ‘the beloved of God’, using a word which was developing a specialized meaning in Shi’ite contexts (‘Ali was considered الله ولي). Later it would also be used in reference to Sufi saints. TF and FA both refer to these beings as 'angels'. Finally, SG avoids a direct reference to
the Tetragrammaton by uncharacteristically using an anthropomorphism: יְהֹוָה.

Verse 6b

| MT | רִבְרוֹן נֹמְרָה אֲשֶׁר בָּרֹא |Throwable Matanor "who made"
| SG | חַלֶּר מַסְיָר אֵלֹהֵינוֹ |Guarder Massyer "our God"
| TF | וְהָאֹשְׁחִי נַעֲרֵיהֶם |And the adversary of them
| FA | فِجَا الشَّيْطَانُ وَدَخَلَ بِهِمْ وَقَفَ قُدَمَّ الْرَّبٌ * |suddenly Satan entered them and stood before the Lord
| TH | وصَاعَدَ سَرِيعًا فِي صَعِدٍ مَّعَهُ مُوقَفًا كَانَ يَقَفُهُ |He went up quickly on a steep path, standing

While TF and FA simply translate the MT's רִבְרוֹן with Satan, SG glosses it by substituting his interpretation, 'the adversary of Job'. His commentary on this phrase is rather extensive here, concluding that this adversary is less than supernatural.

Of course, one issue that SG does not directly address, but which is of interest to Semiticists and theologians, is the question of what is meant in Hebrew and Arabic by the word 'satan', the semantic area of which shifts considerably with the addition of the definite article. It is apparent in the MT both here and in Zechariah 3, that the insertion of the definite article signals usage of 'satan', or rather 'the satan', as an epithet rather than a proper name, as found at I Chronicles 21:1, where the word occurs without the definite article. The question for Arabic, however, is complicated by two issues.

The first of these is the extent to which the translator has been influenced by the appearance of the definite article in the Hebrew. If the translator uses it in Arabic, then one might be tempted to conclude that this could very well be an instance of simply using a cognate, and cognates do not always carry the originally intended meaning, thus being known as false cognates. The second of these issues is the extent to which Islamic tradition has affected Arabic usage and the meaning of the term 'satan' itself.

The LXX at this point simply refers to ὁ ἄραβος, thus duplicating the MT's
use of the definite article. Indeed, MT usage is paralleled in this regard in
Zechariah 3 and I Chronicles 21:1 as well.

As will prove to be the case in the analysis of the proper names that occur in
subsequent chapters of this study, the account of TH should be noted even though
the reports he transmits do not strictly parallel the canonical Arabic versions under
consideration. Indeed, in the portion of TH's account said to be based on the
testimony of Wahb\textsuperscript{18} the satanic element throughout this portion of the story is
stronger than in any of the other Arabic versions. Wahb's version in TH multiplies
the number and types of demonic personages, citing the participation of

\begin{align*}
\text{شياطين}
\end{align*}

and

\begin{align*}
\text{شياطين}
\end{align*}
in the episodes concerning the afflictions, both material and personal,
visited upon Job. There is no doubt that these are names of classes of beings, not of
individual personages.

But when it comes to the dramatic protagonist of this cast of devilish
characters, TH cites the Islamic proper name of the one to whom he refers as "the
eady of God", namely \textit{Iblis}, "Iblis". This character directs the nefarious
activities of the lesser agents of evil. Thus here there is no longer any ambiguity as
to whom reference has been made, since the Islamic tradition provides a proper
name quite different in its root from the title 'satan'.

Thus does TH show that the appearance of the definite article signals not an
epithet, as does the Hebrew of the MT, but a proper name. This is due to the fact
that the word in question, without the definite article, signifies a class of beings as
do

\begin{align*}
\text{شياطين}
\end{align*}
and

\begin{align*}
\text{شياطين}
\end{align*}
as noted earlier. Clinching this view most conclusively is
the shift seen in Arabic semantics between the words \(\text{الله} \) and \(\text{'(a) god'}\) and
'(the) God': a similar phenomenon occurs in the shift between '(a) satan' and 'Satan'.

Apart from the questions concerning 'satan', there are other points that bear

\textsuperscript{18} Macdonald (1898), beginning on p. 147.
notice. TF leads this section with an accusative of manner: 'On good terms, in a
friendly manner', though one is tempted to read here توبة for توبة, giving the
translation, 'In repentance, the satan had come...’ The first reading could have two
possible motivations, the first being to remind the listener that the satan had every
right to approach the heavenly throne, the second being that one might assume
under the guise of friendliness a certain (satanic) duplicity or deceit. The second
reading might be seen as complementing the theological attitude of the first of the
two previous suggestions: the satan, in order to approach the heavenly throne,
needed to do so in the proper manner, though obviously no change of inner nature
would be even remotely suggested.

FA independently adds an extra phrase stating not only that the satan entered
with the angels, but [also] stood before the Lord. His classical grammar fails him at
this point, since one would either expect a conjunction directly preceding the final
verb, or an active participle in the circumstantial accusative in place of the verb
itself. Of course, a transcriptional error consisting of a dropped 
would also
explain the difficulty.

By this point in the story, TH had already made note that Iblis had his
appointed place in the heavenly court. Here, an eavesdropping Iblis repairs to
heaven out of envy and jealousy against Job. It should be noted that FA and TH
share the root wqf, 'stand', in describing the Satan's / Iblis' role at court.
Besides a lack of consensus on the usage of nouns as opposed to pronouns, as well as confusion as to whether the Deity should be given a generic rather than a proper name, the Arabic versions differ in their formality, with FA being the most formal (and closest to the Hebrew), TF the least. SG's language is also close to that of the MT, though he does insert a circumstantial accusative: 'open, begin with'.

TH's version is in direct contradiction here to the canonicals. The first reported speech in heaven concerning Job is not from God, but from Iblis. Yet the language of Iblis is reminiscent of the canonical versions of the story at 8a: "O my God, I have considered the case of Thy creature Ayyüb..." (p. 147).

Verse 7b

MT

SG

TF

FA

TF's added phrase at the end of this verse is either directly dependent upon the S–H or Cp, this addition not being attested elsewhere. The only other departure of note from the MT is by SG, who particularizes the locus of Satan's travels to 'this country,' presumably the land of Job. His commentary defends this change, based largely on his characterization of Satan as an ordinary human (see above, 6b).

Verse 8a

MT

SG

TF

FA

While the versions display continuing disagreement concerning God/Lord/He and
'the Satan/him (see 7a; the problem continues throughout the chapter), the major departure in this verse is taken by FA, following the S–H. While the MT is fairly neutral in its question 'Have you considered (set your heart/mind)...', which SG changes to an equivalent Arabic idiom 'make-up / give your mind/attention', FA uses the verb َنْوي, 'intend/resolve,' and continues his translation by making explicit that the Lord has divine foreknowledge that the Satan has his mind set on mischief, thus: 'Have you determined to do malice/injury, and thought to harm my servant Job?' The S–H reads, 'Is it in your mind to bring harm to my servant Job?'

Verse 8b

| MT | كَلِ أمَنَتمُ بِأَمْرِي لَيْسَ رَأَيْتُمُ الَّذِي أَلَهَا الْأَرْضُ مَرَضً |  
| SG | لَيْسَ مِثْلُهُ فِي الْأَرْضِ |  
| BM | رجل غَيْرِ مَلَّامٍ صِدْقٍ مُتَقِىٌ اللَّهِ مَعْتَزِلٌ مِنْ كُلِّ السَّيَاتِ |  
| TF | قد رضيت عملت ليس مثله تحت السماء |  
| FA | لَأَه لَيْسَ مِثْلُهُ فِي الأَرْضِ |  

The text of BM beginning at this point shows fairly close agreement with TF (though not as close as will be seen in subsequent poetic chapters). For example, these two contain the phrase 'below the heavens' while SG is consistent in using 'the country' here; FA is the most prosaic, and is closest to the MT in translating the phrase in question 'in the earth'. BM/SS and TF resort repeatedly to this interesting phrase, َمَتَقَىِ اللَّهِ مَعْتَزِلٌ مِنْ السَّيَاتِ, to translate the MT's َمَتَقَىِ اللَّهِ. Such wording has already been encountered in TF at 1:7b, and will be found in both TF and BM/SS at 18:4a, 18:19, 28:24a, 38:24b, and 38:33b. The appearance of this expression is indicative of the dependence of these two Arabic versions on the LXX, presumably via the S–H, where an equivalent periphrasis is found in the Greek and
Verse 9

The S-H’s idiom 'before the Lord' is found in all the Arabic script versions, though not in SG. Perhaps it is an attempt to translate the Hebrew's direct-object marker, which may have been misunderstood as a preposition.

As for the Hebrew expression בְּפִקְרֵי הָאָדָם in the second portion of the verse, none of the Arabic versions agree on a formula for translating the idiom, but all come up with satisfying phrasing, with FA being the loosest in his wording: 'Why shouldn’t Job fear God?'

Verse 10a

BM and TF share large amounts of vocabulary. But they group words and idioms in different order, thus either betraying different sources, or displaying considerable willingness to play with what might be a common source. Of the possible sources that they may have used, neither the Tg nor LXX shows any affinity with any of the Arabic script versions. The Pesh is closer to all of those versions, especially to FA; the S-H also betrays some affinities with FA in matters of vocabulary, e.g., the
common use of the verb from the root *str*. But by far the closest of all the predecessor versions to FA is the Cp, with which it shares not only a common vocabulary, but also a common sentence structure.

Verse 10b

| MT | מעשה דידי ברחה ומקנה פנים ביצים |
| SG | ובארכת לה פי יעל ירח יʱו פלابل דפ מארחא |
| BM | ואعمال ידיה בארקת ודוואב אкции |
| TF | לעعمال ידיה בארקת ولדוواب אっこור |
| FA | וbaarקה له ופי קולמה تعمل ידה |

While SG and FA agree on the root *mšy, 'go on foot',* to express that which BM and TF express commonly through *dbb, 'go on all fours',* the parallels between SG and FA on the one hand, with BM and TF on the other, are borne out in other manners: the former pair display more affinity to the MT (along with the LXX, Tg, Pesh, and to a lesser extent S-H and Cp) in such matters as the inclusion of a final prepositional phrase 'in the earth / in the country / in the earth'. BM and TF not only eliminate such phrases but also express the remainder of the half-verse virtually synonymously, though TF uses the preposition ל plus an object, rather than employing, as does BM, direct objects for the two verbs in question.

Verse 11a

| MT | אאלאם שלוחה ידר וני בבליסט של |
| SG | לדם מלה דר אאמ אל ש מדם |
| BM | ولكن שלח ידיק منه עד אספב כל מה ישיך |
| TF | ولكن שלח ידיק عنه אספב כלما ישיך |
| FA | ولكن מידך ali כל שיך له פאהב |

BM and TF, which follow each other fairly closely, differ from the other versions in that they understand the divine action to be one of withdrawal rather than
intervention: 'take your hand(s) from him...'. This departure presages yet another divergence regarding the manner in which the stich’s second verb form is to be understood. While the MT proposes a second imperative, 'strike', the occurrence of the synonymous particles حتى (BM) and ل (TF), both of which govern the subjunctive, shift the subject from the Lord to the Satan in those two Arabic script versions, thus: 'so that I may strike'.

It is possible that this reading, unsupported though it be in the Tg, LXX, Pesh, S–H, and Cp, serves as the basis for TH’s understanding of Iblis’ augmented role in bringing about Job’s afflictions. Yet textually the connection between TH and the canonical versions is tenuous at this point; although TH’s version generally tracks the other Arabic versions and the MT, the actual interchange between God and Iblis is somewhat more explicit: "if Thou molest him by trial" (p. 147).

Verse 11b

MT

SG

BM

TF

FA

TH

In this half-verse, SG avoids an MT anthropomorphism, 'to your face', and also avoids one of its euphemisms, 'bless you'. Thus: 'lest he approach you and curse you'. All the other canonical versions retain the anthropomorphism, which is not only warranted from the point of view of translation, but also from a stylistic perspective. However, they all agree with SG in avoiding the MT’s euphemism, though the verbal root used differs among them all (with the exception of jdf, 'curse, blaspheme', common to both BM and TF), leading to some nuanced meanings.

The most interesting variation is found in FA, where cursing is merely a
secondary meaning to his root *fr.* Primarily, this comes closer to expressing the idea of making false accusations or bringing trumped up charges. Such an interpretation (FA, it is clear, has gone beyond mere nuance here) is not supported by the Tg, LXX, Pesh, S-H, and Cp. However, it makes a fine theological point: the Lord is thus seemingly absolved of any real responsibility for the afflictions of Job, since to hold the Lord responsible for evil would make for poor theology.

It can also be noted that the concept of slandering the Lord rather than cursing Him *per se* would fit in well with TH’s understanding of Iblis’ role in the afflictions for which Job may hold the Lord responsible. TH’s language at this particular point, however, does speak in most emphatic terms of Job’s possible renunciation, from *kfr,* 'blaspheme [God],' and forgetting, from *nsy,* 'forget,' of his divine Benefactor.

Verse 12a

MT

SG

BM

TF

FA

TH

All the Arabic versions show marked independence from the MT as well as from each other in terms of vocabulary, triliteral roots employed, and general phraseology. Yet, in the end, all versions, including TH, express the meaning of the MT very clearly. For example, SG characteristically avoids the MT’s anthropomorphism, but only BM approximates the MT’s usage. This is in marked contrast to verse 11b, where all the versions restored the MT’s anthropomorphic phraseology.

In one of the few instances of agreement, BM and FA both use *df* to express the Lord’s transference of power over Job’s belongings. However, BM uses the
active participle, which in Arabic often conveys an imperfect sense, while FA employs the perfect. This may explain BM’s later insertion of the perfect for ‘be’ in describing Job’s possessions: if the Lord has already surrendered them to the Satan, then Job cannot be said to continue to exercise control over them.

TH’s text adds to God’s command “Depart unto him” (p. 147). This is not entirely unprecedented, since TF adds a simple imperative ‘Go!’ Another even more obvious point of contact with TF occurs immediately after the imperative, where the final four words of TF’s 12a are identical with TH.

Verse 12b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>רְמָא אֵלֵיהָ אֶלֶּהָ יְרֵא</th>
<th>טָרֵם אֵלֵיהָ לְאֵלֶּה מְרָאָה</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>ולכְּכַלָּה לְאֵלֶּה מְרָאָה</td>
<td>ולא יֵבַּדִּיק אֵלֶּה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM</td>
<td>יְרֵא</td>
<td>ולא יֵבַּדִּיק אֵלֶּה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>וְאָמַּה הוֹיַּלְּסַי אֵלֶּה סְבִּיל</td>
<td>ולא יֵבַּדִּיק אֵלֶּה</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| FA | פָּאַּמּ הָיָּסְדַּי אֵלֶּה תָּמְד יֵדַּד אֵלֶּה וְלָא יִתְּפַּרְשֵּׁי | *

All the canonical Arabic versions follow the same basic word order, with TF’s version representing the freest rendition while FA introduces a second imperative. However, all four differ on the manner in which Job himself is referred to by the Lord. TH, however, ignores this portion of the divine command completely, perhaps since it is implicit in the text of 12a.

SG has the most direct translation of the MT’s preposition followed by an enclitic pronoun (שָּׁם); TF is the only other Arabic version to use a pronoun as object of a preposition, doing so twice: the second occurrence parallels the MT’s syntax; the first uses the independent pronoun as subject of a topic-comment construction. FA, however, departs even further from the MT through the introduction of Job’s person by the phrase ‘his flesh’, followed later in the verse by the familiar preposition plus enclitic pronoun of the MT. Of all the versions, only
BM names Job outright. In fact, the naming of Job is not indicated in any of the predecessor versions.

FA’s unfamiliarity with classical Arabic is evident at two points: the failure to use the oblique case for the direct object of the first negative imperative, for which Arabic uses the jussive, and a misspelling of the second negative imperative.

Verse 12c

This closure of the heavenly setting (SG’s reservations notwithstanding) shows FA adding 'and (thus) passed that day / and it came to pass that day' to the close of the stich. A like phrase opens the following verse in the MT as well as the other Arabic versions, with the exception of TF and TH, which omit any such thought pattern entirely. The predecessor versions, with the exception of the Cp, include similar phrasing, though some mss of the Tg are less than clear at this point.

TH uses Form VII of *qdd*, which can be translated as 'fall / tumble / swoop down' to describe the departure of "the enemy of God" (p. 147); all the canonical versions employ a more neutral *xrj*, 'exit'.

Verse 13

34
While some of the variations here might seem relatively minor, their differences in terms of parallelisms, verbal/participial constructions, and departures from the MT merit attention.

The MT, which mentions what is being drunk, but not what is being eaten, is stylistically corrected by SG through the introduction of a second indefinite direct object. FA also introduces parallelism in the same phrase, but does so by deleting the direct-object reference to wine in opposition to the Cp. Given the appearance in FA of various Islamicisms as interpolations, perhaps this deletion might be seen as further Islamic influence, since the drinking of wine is frowned upon by Muslims. Yet, two caveats might be raised here: (1) a minority of mss upon which the LXX and S–H are based also delete the reference to wine, doing so without necessarily betraying other possible Islamic influences, and (2) since wine is forbidden in Islam, it would have made some sense to leave the reference in, helping to account in some manner, perhaps, for the calamity. BM refers only to 'drinking', not 'eating', thus destroying the already imperfect MT parallel completely (as do the LXX and S–H). TF treats the 'eating and drinking' phrase by deleting references to both activities, stating that what was going on was 'merrymaking'. Interestingly, TF is also the only Arabic version to delete the reference to 'sons and daughters', which is replaced by 'offspring'.

Only SG preserves the MT's use of participles with reference to the activities of Job's sons and daughters, and only SG uses the cognate root to the MT's in referring to the eldest brother: $bkr$; the other versions all agree on using a more prosaic relative adjective, derived from $kbr$.

The only other purely grammatical notes of any importance are that TF's knowledge of classical Arabic is once again shown to be wanting: the case ending
of his object of the preposition 'at (the place of)' is nominative rather than genitive. In addition, his verb–subject agreement is non–classical, as is FA's.

Structurally, TH shows complete independence from the canonical versions. First, "the enemy of God" gathers his demonic allies to give them their orders on afflicting Job. Secondly, the afflictions do not occur in the same order as those of the canonicals. In fact, in TH only one calamity\(^9\) befalls Job before he utters "Naked came I out of my mother's womb and naked do I return to the grave and naked am I gathered to my Lord" (p. 148).

In this verse TF makes a major theological departure from the MT and all the other versions, but not from the Muslim account as transmitted by TH. The personage whom the MT characterizes as a 'messenger', SG as an 'envoy/emissary', and BM and FA as an 'informant/reporter' becomes, for TF, 'the Satan in disguise' from \(s\)bh, 'resemble'. The equivalent phrase in TH is 'Satan presented himself [as] from Form V of \(m\)\(\theta\)l, 'make oneself similar'.

It is not surprising that TF's grammar is wanting here, as elsewhere: presumably 'disguise' should either carry the definite article as a modifying participial adjective, or should have an indefinite accusative ending, as the Arabic circumstantial phrase calls for. But TF's theological interpretation shows insight,

\(^9\) The destruction of his cattle and herdsmen by fire.
even if by the standards of the canonical Job it is incorrect: it is the Satan who is
the immediate agent of the evils befalling Job. For TF, then, it is clear that if
something evil occurs, then somehow the Satan is behind it.\textsuperscript{20}

All other grammatical points pale in comparison. Introductory adverbial
conjunctions in SG, BM, and TF, and the incorrect usage in BM of the verb 'say'
taking the direct object to express the person to whom one speaks, all represent
grammatical shortcomings in various versions. But none of these carry significant
theological, or even semantic, import.

\textbf{Verse 14b}

\begin{tabular}{|l|}
\hline
MT & הָבְּךָ֣ר וּוּרָשָׁתָ֖ו רַעְאָתָ֑ו רַעְּיָתָ֖ו עַלְיִֽוּדִיִּֽים: \\
SG & ואֲלוֹנָֽהּ וּאֲלוֹנָֽהּ וּאֲלוֹנָֽהּ 활ָֽו עַלְיִֽוּדִיִּֽים: \\
BM & אֵֽנְּ הָֽנוֹדָֽדִיִּֽים הָבָֽךְ וְהָֽדַֽאָתָֽו הָֽדָֽאָתָֽו הָֽדָֽאָתָֽו הָֽדָֽאָתָֽו \\
TF & ואֵֽנְּ הָֽנוֹדָֽדִיִּֽים הָבָֽךְ וְהָֽדָֽאָתָֽו הָֽדָֽאָתָֽו הָֽדָֽאָתָֽו \\
FA & אֵֽנְּ הָֽנוֹדָֽדִיִּֽים הָבָֽךְ וְהָֽדָֽאָתָֽו הָֽדָֽאָתָֽו הָֽדָֽאָתָֽו \\
TH & אֵֽנְּ הָֽנוֹדָֽדִיִּֽים הָבָֽךְ וְהָֽדָֽאָתָֽו הָֽדָֽאָתָֽו הָֽדָֽאָתָֽו \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

The compact, economical expression of the MT is echoed by SG as well as the Tg,
LXX, and Pesh but not by any of the Arabic script versions. FA is especially more
in tune with the S–H, which introduces the concept of 'yokes' of oxen, as do BM
and TF as well as Cp.\textsuperscript{21} Yet the further elaborations of BM and TF far surpass
those of the S–H. BM has the yokes of oxen die,\textsuperscript{22} and, with TF, multiplies the
variety of cattle involved, though the latter fails to add the adverbial prepositional
phrase 'nearby' found in the MT and the other Arabic versions, as well as the Tg.

\textsuperscript{20} SG, of course, would beg to differ here, since even during the scene at the
heavenly court, he comments that Job's 'accuser' is a mere mortal.

\textsuperscript{21} However, it should be noted that TF, along with the MT, speaks of 'yokes' of
oxen in verse 3, and FA's Arabic is suspect here (see above, verse 3).

\textsuperscript{22} Perhaps this confusion as to what has happened is linked to the mis–statement of
verse 15a; see below.

TH only refers to camels. The conflation of calamities becomes evident here and in subsequent passages, since this disaster is by fire, not by enemy attack. Indeed, no earthly enemies of Job are mentioned at any point in TH.

In terms of grammar, BM agrees with SG in using an active participle to describe the activity of the she-asses and camels; TF and FA prefer the past imperfect. These are roughly synonymous. TH makes exclusive use of the perfect in all parts of this passage.

Verse 15a

As noted by De Baudissin (1870), BM is confused at this point, having dropped a verb and substituted an entire phrase describing the nature of the calamity from verse 19. But the other Arabic script versions give interesting glosses regarding information upon which the MT and SG agree concerning the base of the attacking force: TF has the intruders hail from Palestine, while FA places their home in the Yemen. Such glosses potentially provide clues concerning enemies contemporaneous with the communities of the translators involved.

---

23 This mode of destruction is reserved for the sheep and herdsmen in the canonical version of the tale.

24 p. 21, nn. 8 and 9.

25 Perhaps the verb in TF, if it were the same as in BM, would give a clue as to this confusion: both calamities 'arrive' through use of the root qbl.

26 Interestingly, the Pesh does not give an ethnic origin for the raiders, but simply describes them, as does the LXX, as 'robbers/spoilers', while the Cp is similarly silent. The S–H, however, retains the reference to Sabaeans.
Given TF's origins in Lower Egypt, enemies from Palestine are not surprising, since any attack by land, whether of Palestinian origin or not, would most likely pass through that territory. As for FA, he was from Baghdad, or at least produced his work there. The reason for describing the origin of the raiders as Yemenite is less clear, then. Perhaps the Yemenites, being located to the south of Mesopotamia, were more credible than Sabaeans to FA’s contemporary audience.

Alone of all the versions, FA departs from the MT in neglecting to include the prepositional phrase mentioning the instrument of the servants' death. However, in its place this text substitutes the reference that the servants involved were those who were with the cattle which were driven away. In so doing, FA makes first use of what will prove to be one of his favorite grammatical devices throughout the Book of Job: the relative clause.

Verse 15b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>נָשַׁלָם הַרְכָּמִים לֵבֶּר לְחֵנִי לְךָ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>טֵפִלְתָּנוּ נַעֲמָה וּזְרֹר לַעֲבָרָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM</td>
<td>וָסַלְמֵנִי נַחֲדֵי וּזְכַי לַאֲדֵם</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>וָאֵנִי וּנָחֲדֵי אֲפַלְּעִי וּזְכַי לַאֲדֵם</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>וָנֶבָעֵנִי נַחֲדֵי וּזְכַי לַאֲדֵם</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is the first occurrence of the MT's refrain used to create the drumbeat of relentless disasters. While all the Arabic versions agree on the verb 'inform', and the Arabic script versions all add a second perfect indicative active, 'I came' before the infinitive, all four versions have their own translation of 'I escaped', based on entirely different triliteral roots. The word order in this phrase is not entirely consistent among these three versions, with TF adding extra emphasis through use of

---

27 The Tg, LXX, Pesh, S–H, and Cp all include the instrumental phrase here.
28 This thematic device is completely missing from TH.
29 As does the LXX, S–H, and Cp, but not the Tg or Pesh.
the personal pronoun before the verb.

Verse 16a

TF forgets that the informant coming to tell Job of his losses is really 'the Satan in disguise', and echoes the other Arabic script versions in describing the newcomer as simply 'another informant'. This is in contrast to the MT and SG, which are vague as to the identity of the next speaker. The Arabic script versions also share the peculiarity of reminding us that this other informant is speaking to Job, and none other. BM and TF (with the LXX, S-H, and Cp) mention the hero by name, while FA (with the Pesh) relies upon a pronoun to add this extra bit of information. The Tg agrees with the MT and SG in omitting such a reference entirely.

Verse 16b

The differences in grammar, vocabulary, and usage are relatively minor here. None of the Arabic versions attributes the fire from the sky to God. This could be due to

30 The narrative of TH makes explicit that the subsequent messengers are all various satans in disguise, members of a veritable army of demons, jinn, and other malevolent beings which bring, and then announce, the disasters which befall the hero.
a number of factors: perhaps giving the heavenly origin of the fire is attribution enough; perhaps describing an instrument which brings evil as godly is undesirable; perhaps dependence on a source text such as the LXX, S–H, or Cp (but not the Pesh or Tg, which reproduce the divine attribution) explains the omission.

BM is the only Arabic version that has the informant salute Job by name; TF is somewhat formal in his address, beginning his speech with 'I inform you that...', thus breaking the supposedly mounting tension; 31 FA, alone among of the Arabic versions, uses the root *nzl*, 'descend' to describe the advent of the heavenly fire, the other versions all using *wq‘, 'fall / befall / occur'. All three Arabic script versions rely on the root *hrq* to describe the fire's burning, though only BM (with the Tg, LXX, Pesh, S–H, and Cp) adds a second verb regarding the consumption of those tending the flocks.

Verse 16c

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>הָאִמַּלָּחַת רּוֹקֵטָן לָבַּר לָהֵון לְךָ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>תַּחְלַחַת אַנָּא וָחָדִי וּוֹמֶת לַאָגוּרָק</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM</td>
<td>וּמוֹלַמְת אָנָא וָחָדִי וּוֹמֶת לַאָגוּרָק</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>וּמוֹלַמְת אָנָא וָחָדִי וּוֹמֶת לַאָגוּרָק</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>וֹנָגוּוֹת אָנָא וָחָדִי * וּוֹמֶת לַאָגוּרָק בְּזֶדֶק *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TF changes his word order from that 15b, coming in line with the other Arabic versions. He also changes his verb, thereby coming into agreement with BM. Thus does his usage further break the drumbeat of mounting tribulations to which Job is subjected. The other Arabic versions evince no changes from their original formulae.

31 Perhaps the exalted status of Job is the source of what might be described as such obsequiousness. If TF has in mind the satanic nature of the informant, as verse 17a would suggest, then such deference could be interpreted as sarcasm tinged with irony.
Verse 17a

This verse represents another formulaic phrase which might be expected to be repeated word-for-word by each version. However, at this point TF reminds the listener (though he neglected to do so in the previous parallel at verse 16a) that the messengers bringing news of the calamities to Job are satans, not mere mortals.

TF is not the only version to break the repetitive wording here: BM has a number of minor variations. While the change in the verb from past imperfect at 16a to the perfect at 17a might be defended on the basis of semantics, the alteration of the ending of the phrase unnecessarily breaks the formulaic quality of the passage.

Happily, both SG and FA have a better understanding of the stylistic issue here: FA changes only one conjunction (from و to ف) and SG reproduces the formula exactly.

Verse 17b

It is clear that all the Arabic versions, with the exception of BM, agree as to who is the enemy in question. Curiously, BM’s refusal to name the enemy is consistent with the situation in verse 15a (see above), but possibly for entirely different reasons.

BM’s text at this point is not corrupt, but three predecessor texts, the LXX, S–H,
and Cp, are also silent here on the ethnic identity of the horsemen. In a departure from 15a, TF agrees here with BM, failing to identify the enemy in terms of ethnicity. Otherwise, the Arabic versions are internally consistent: BM has the messenger salute Job formally with the vocative, while TF continues its own version of formality with its satanic, introductory formula, 'I inform you that…’

Verse 17c

MT

لاهتجهتموه في تفتيت دوره

SG

كحلال أفلامهم الكاملة

BM

والعبيد قتلت بالسيوف

FA

وقتًلا العبيد الذين كانوا معها *

Inexplicably, TF drops the remainder of the verse. Otherwise, the other versions contain no surprises, though FA makes unique use of a relative clause.

Verse 17d, 18a

MT

ناملها بكم يذكر ليهم كله: أن عبد فتى وجد ناس

SG

وأتلاهتم أن ازهر لِلأخبر: نمام ما تكمله ود رآم

BM

وصلت أنا وحدي وجه لاخبرك

TF

ويعدم هل هذا ما خبر آخر إلى أيوب وقال له

FA

وجيت أنا وحدي * وجيتو لأخبرك بذلك * وفيما هو يخطب ذلك الرجل أتاه مخبرا آخر * وقال له

With the exception of TF’s missing text at 17d, the Arabic versions settle down, at least for the moment (FA will eventually prove to be the exception), to repeating their own versions of what the MT clearly meant to be repetitive, formulaic texts.

---

²²In this the LXX and Cp are internally consistent, while the S–H and Pesh are not; the witness of the Tg are variegated.
Given the lack of close agreement despite a similar opportunity at v. 4, it is surprising that the three Arabic script versions, after varying in their opening adverbial expressions, are almost word-for-word in parallel: even when subject-verb word order is reversed (FA agrees with the MT and SG in keeping the subject first, apparently due to the MT’s usage of active participles instead of the imperfect), the respective vocabulary items match. BM displays the most independence in terms of word order; but as for vocabulary, the coincidence is complete, even if BM does not understand that in classical Arabic the subject of ‘be’ is nominative, not accusative.33

All the Arabic script versions agree to omit any explicit reference as to what is being eaten and drunk; thus some of these versions are internally inconsistent in view of their wording of v. 4. SG, however, characteristically preserves his internal consistency with his own phrasing of v. 4.

33 In Middle Arabic the regular masculine plural of the nominative is indistinguishable from that of the oblique cases; cf. Blau (1966–67).
TF adds a perceptive nuance here, saying that the wind fell upon 'us' instead of 'them', thus including the (satanic) messenger in the disaster. This could be an attempt to hide from Job the source of the disaster, since the victim of an act would hardly ever be identified as the perpetrator thereof. It could also be evidence of an added bit of realism and internal pronominal consistency, since the verse closes with the first-person phrase 'and I alone am escaped...'.

In what is now clearly a rare event, the Arabic versions are in complete agreement on the vocabulary for the phrase 'the four corners of the house', even if they cannot agree on the verb to describe what the wind did, though BM and TF do employ the same verb in this instance, and despite other differences, are fairly close here. The same rare convergence of vocabulary is found among the Arabic script versions for the phrase 'violent wind', though BM adds that the gale came 'suddenly'. In addition, BM alone among the Arabic versions employs two separate verbs to describe the gale's activity; coincidentally, one of those verbs is used by SG, the other by TF.

**Verse 19a-b**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>وهبتي قد ريح عافص من أقطار البرية * وهبطت أربعة زوايا البيت *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>وهبتي قد ريح عافص من أقطار البرية * وهبطت أربعة زوايا البيت *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM</td>
<td>وهبتي قد ريح عافص من أقطار البرية * وهبطت أربعة زوايا البيت *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>وهبتي قد ريح عافص من أقطار البرية * وهبطت أربعة زوايا البيت *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>وهبتي قد ريح عافص من أقطار البرية * وهبطت أربعة زوايا البيت *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FA uses only a pronoun to refer to the children of Job, whereas the MT and the other Arabic versions use either one noun or two. The continued close agreement of BM and TF is striking, though the latter is the only version to use two nouns ('your sons and your daughters') to refer to Job's offspring.
As for the closing formula, SG, BM, and TF continue their internal consistency; FA, however, drops the first person pronoun ('and I alone escaped...').

Verse 20αα

| MT | יָקוּךְּ אַחְזָה וְכָלֶּה שָׁאָרָהּ | פְּקַעְתָּ אַחְזָה לְכָלֶּה מַשֵּׁרָהּ |
| SG | יָקוּךְּ אַחְזָה וְכָלֶּה שָׁאָרָהּ | פְּקַעְתָּ אַחְזָה לְכָלֶּה מַשֵּׁרָהּ |
| BM | וַעֲנַדָּוָּתָּ אֶל בֵּיתַּיָּבָּא | עַנְדָּוָּתָּ אֶל בֵּיתַּיָּבָּא |
| TF | וַעֲנַדָּוָּתָּ אֶל בֵּיתַּיָּבָּא | עַנְדָּוָּתָּ אֶל בֵּיתַּיָּבָּא |
| FA | וַעֲנַדָּוָּתָּ אֶל בֵּיתַּיָּבָּא | עַנְדָּוָּתָּ אֶל בֵּיתַּיָּבָּא |

This is the first instance where there is any indication of Job’s reaction now that this first set of calamitous events is complete. BM and TF, unlike the MT or the other Arabic versions, begin with an adverb, at which point BM strikes off on its own: Job’s rising is not mentioned, and rather than keeping implicit the idea that Job’s actions are due to the preceding reports, BM explicitly mentions that Job acted only upon hearing of the events. In this BM is not supported by any of the source texts under consideration, all of which stay fairly close to the MT.

Verse 20αβ

| MT | וַרְני אֲרָרָהָּשׁ שֶׁפֶלֶת אֲרָרָהָּשׁ יָשָּׁרָהָּ | ולַא מִשְׁפַּרְתֶּ נְשָׁרָהָּ וְכָלֶּה יָשָּׁרָהָּ |
| SG | וַרְני אֲרָרָהָּשׁ שֶׁפֶלֶת אֲרָרָהָּ | ולַא מִשְׁפַּרְתֶּ נְשָׁרָהָּ וְכָלֶּה יָשָּׁרָהָּ |
| BM | וַרְני אֲרָרָהָּשׁ שֶׁפֶלֶת אֲרָרָהָּ | ולַא מִשְׁפַּרְתֶּ נְשָׁרָהָּ וְכָלֶּה יָשָּׁרָהָּ |
| TF | וַרְני אֲרָרָהָּשׁ שֶׁפֶלֶת אֲרָרָהָּ | ולַא מִשְׁפַּרְתֶּ נְשָׁרָהָּ וְכָלֶּה יָשָּׁרָהָּ |
| FA | וַרְני אֲרָרָהָּשׁ שֶׁפֶלֶת אֲרָרָהָּ | ולַא מִשְׁפַּרְתֶּ נְשָׁרָהָּ וְכָלֶּה יָשָּׁרָהָּ |

The use by all of the Arabic versions of the circumstantial accusative of the active participle from the root *sd*, 'be prostrate', is noteworthy. SG’s construct, 'the hair of his head', is not found in the three Arabic script versions: BM and TF refer simply to 'his hair' while FA mentions only 'his head'.

BM uniquely uses two circumstantial accusatives to describe Job’s prostration.
FA's verb here uses the root of the first of these participles, thus avoiding the verb from *wq*’, 'fall', employed by all the other Arabic versions in a phrase common to them: 'he fell upon the earth'.

Verse 21aα

| MT | يَاخَصَّرُ العَرْقَاءِ عَلَى مَعْمَةَ أَقَامَ لَيْنَ فِي مَنتَحَلَّهُمْ | نَصَّرَ العَرْقَاءِ عَلَى مَعْمَةَ أَقَامَ لَيْنَ فِي مَنتَحَلَّهُمْ |
| SG | وقال عريان خرجت من بطن أمي وعريان انطلق إلى الله | وقال عريان خرجت من بطن أمي وعريان انطلق |
| BM | وَقَالَ عَرِيَانُ خَرَجَتْ مِنْ بَطِنَ آمِي وَعَرِيَانُ أَنْطَلَقَ إِلَى الْلَّهِ | وَقَالَ عَرِيَانُ خَرَجَتْ مِنْ بَطِنَ آمِي وَعَرِيَانُ أَنْطَلَقَ إِلَى الْلَّهِ |
| TF | وَقَالَ عَرِيَانُ خَرَجَتْ مِنْ بَطِنَ آمِي وَعَرِيَانُ أَنْطَلَقَ إِلَى الْلَّهِ | وَقَالَ عَرِيَانُ خَرَجَتْ مِنْ بَطِنَ آمِي وَعَرِيَانُ أَنْطَلَقَ إِلَى الْلَّهِ |
| FA | وَقَالَ عَرِيَانُ خَرَجَتْ مِنْ بَطِنَ آمِي وَعَرِيَانُ أَنْطَلَقَ إِلَى الْلَّهِ | وَقَالَ عَرِيَانُ خَرَجَتْ مِنْ بَطِنَ آمِي وَعَرِيَانُ أَنْطَلَقَ إِلَى الْلَّهِ |
| TH | عَرِيَانُ خَرَجَتْ مِنْ بَطِنَ آمِي وَعَرِيَانُ أَنْطَلَقَ إِلَى الْلَّهِ | عَرِيَانُ خَرَجَتْ مِنْ بَطِنَ آمِي وَعَرِيَانُ أَنْطَلَقَ إِلَى الْلَّهِ |

This verse consists largely of poetry. It is perhaps due to this shift in stylistics that BM contains a gap after the introductory verb, suggesting that the verse may have been set off from the rest of the text, a common practice in Arabic manuscript production. De Baudissin (1870), however, suggests that the blank space in the ms is due to an erasure of the first person singular personal pronoun.

The fame of this poetic passage was so widespread that TH's verse is easily recognizable as a close paraphrase of its canonical counterpart. TH, however, reverses the order of its two main thoughts in v. 21, first having Job bless the name of the Lord, whereupon Job then reflects upon his human condition: "Naked came I..." (p. 148).

Several phrases stand out in 21a due to their similarities in all the Arabic versions. For example, they all agree completely on the wording for 'I came from my mother's womb', and they all use the same word for 'naked', although they do not agree on its grammatical role or its placement in the stich: TH uses the circumstantial accusative, while the other versions use a nominative predicate adjective. No appreciable difference in meaning results therefrom.
The second stich does not display the same overall agreement among the versions as the first, but the parallels continue to be striking nevertheless. SG and TH employ the same closing phraseology: 'to the grave' as an elaboration upon the MT's 'thither'. The other Arabic versions use similar devices, except for TF, which is the most economical in his wording, omitting any adverb whatsoever. FA's is the only version to use an active participle in this second stich, the other versions and the MT using an imperfect indicative active verb. These are semantically equivalent.

Verse 21aßb

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>BM</th>
<th>TF</th>
<th>FA</th>
<th>TH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ידוח לך רוחה לخوف יד יש יהוד מברך:</td>
<td>עלאך עלאך עלאך עלאך עלאך עלאך עלאך עלאך עלאך עלאך עלאך עלאך עלา:</td>
<td>הר געוה ורבח אמת וקמה אבב הבאר ו</td>
<td>קדם וקמן שם המרבק לה אדאת</td>
<td>פום אנטני העב אמת וקמה אמב ברק</td>
<td>פום אנטני המרב לה אדאת</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BM's and TF's versions of 21aß follow either other exactly with the exception of the third verb, which is missing from the MT, SG, and FA, but present in TH, albeit in a variant word order. BM, however, adds an extra adverb, 'forever'; such is missing from all the other versions, including the MT. The wording of both the LXX and S–H is similar here, and may serve as the inspiration behind TH's additional phrase 'when He wished'.

FA shows affinities with SG and TH. With the latter, he adds a direct object first person pronominal suffix to the verb 'has given', though unlike TH, FA neglects to preserve the parallel by adding a similar suffix to 'has taken'. With regard to SG, FA's text shares his economy of expression, but, as seen earlier, agrees with the MT over against SG on the usage of 'the Lord' as opposed to 'God'.
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Verse 22a

From the simplicity of the MT to the wordiness of TF, all the versions essentially agree in terms of semantics. The versions unanimously employ the root cognate with the Hebrew xt' for the verb 'sin'. Both BM and TF are explicit in terming the foregoing happenings, with the Pesh, as 'disasters', and, with the S-H, add the phrase 'before the Lord / before God'. SG and the LXX expand on the MT, but are more neutral in their characterization of all that had occurred, describing them as mere 'events'.

Verse 22b

BM and TF, with the S-H, both add a bodily metaphor, 'his lip(s)'. There is no agreement among the Arabic versions on the question of how Job might have sinned: he did not 'blaspheme' (SG), 'curse' (BM), 'speak against' (TF), 'falsely accuse' (FA). Only BM and FA are internally consistent here, picking up the equivalent vocabulary item from the mouth of the Satan in verse 11b: even the MT does not display such a stylistic concern.
The Early Arabic Versions of Job (first millennium C.E.):  
Job's Soliloquy (Chapter 3)

Verse 1a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>أَهْوَىَ السَّهْلَ فَمَتَّهَا أَذْرَقَتْهَا</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>بِعَرْقٍ أَلَّا فَمَتَّهَا أَذْرَقَتْهَا</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM</td>
<td>ومن بعد ذلك فتح أيوب فاه</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>ومن بعد ذلك فتح أيوب فمه</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>ومن بعد ذلك فتح أيوب فاه</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is remarkable unanimity among the Arabic versions. Only two differences occur, carrying little or no ramifications for semantics, and none for theology:

Firstly, the Arabic script versions add a partitive at the opening of this stich, thus transforming the preposition of the MT, which SG faithfully reproduces, into a compound preposition; while not changing the meaning appreciably, the very same construction is used in the Pesh, where the cognate Syriac partitive begins the verse.

Secondly, the Arabic word for 'mouth' appears in its Middle Arabic form in TF, while the other Arabic versions retain the classical.

Verse 1b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>يُكِلِّلَ الْمَاءِ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>لَمْ يَرَهُمَّ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM</td>
<td>ومن يومه</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>ولعن يومه</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>ولعن اليوم الذي ولد فيه</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the Arabic script versions remain lexically in tandem (though FA, with the Pesh, adds a relative clause; this practice will prove to be a common one throughout the poetic passages of Job), choosing to understand the Hebrew root qll, here in the

---

34 This obviates the need for mastery of declensional endings, since in its construct form of the classical this word would require consonantal change for each case.
pi'el, as 'curse',35 SG is not as blunt. Perhaps sensing that the Hebrew root has as much to do with 'belittling' as 'cursing', he avails himself of a pre-Islamic poetic classicism36 whose meaning has more to do with 'hold in contempt' or 'censure'. Thus SG's sensibility to avoid any possible imputation of impiety to Job is satisfied.

Similarly, the Arabic script versions simply, and perhaps in the end unimaginatively, adopt the cognate of the Hebrew for 'day', while SG, completing his poetic classicism, opts for the root dhr, which carries overtones of fatalism.37 Fatalism, to be sure, is a topic with which Judaism, Islam, and Christianity have all had to deal.38 But SG is not interested in making a general theological observation here; rather, even though our protagonist is ignorant of the nature of the arrangement between a Sovereign God and Job's Accuser, SG's translation allows the speaker a certain intuition concerning the turn of events which has brought him to this low point.

**Verse 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>BM</th>
<th>TF</th>
<th>FA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>פַּרְעָה רַעַם</td>
<td>וַיְנַאֲכָּל</td>
<td>וַיַּאֲמִר</td>
<td>وقال</td>
<td>וַיַּאֲמִר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>وبֵּית אָבוֹ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BM and TF betray their common dependence on the LXX by their brevity, whereas SG and FA, like the MT, both use two verbs for this stich. However, their opening verb is not a slavish translation of the Hebrew 'he answered', since Job is literally not replying to anyone. Accordingly, both SG and FA employ the root bd', 'begin',

---

35 This root carries the basic meaning of 'be slight / swift / trifling'.
38 Cf., inter alia, the discussion of 22:3 (p. 153).
more accurately reflecting Job's activity, to which FA gratuitously adds that which Job is about to begin, i.e., 'speech'.

Verse 3a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>יאכל יומ אלאל ובו</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>יבר יומשלח פרת מannel 베파</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM</td>
<td>๑ךל יום الذي ولدت فيه</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>ךל יום الذي ولدت فيه</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>לךנל יום الذي ولدت فيه</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Perhaps SG did not need the model provided by the Tg for adding an extra, explanatory prepositional phrase, 'by my death', for his version: literal clarity is his goal, and the Targumic interpolation, 'the angel who registered the conception', placed between the two objects of curse as found in the MT, is fantastical.

By comparison, the Arabic script versions adhere much more closely to the original. BM and TF read identically, softening the opening curse in accordance with the LXX, Pesh, S-H, and Cp. FA, however, is not squeamish here, retaining the full strength of the expression. Grammatically it should be noted that alone among the Arabic versions, FA is careful to employ the passive perfect for the opening verb: curses and blessings in Arabic are invoked in the perfect, since their mere utterance is considered tantamount to their fulfillment.

Verse 3b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>והלאה על נפש נבר</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>והלאה על נפש רחל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM</td>
<td>הלילה التي قالوا فيها هذا ذكر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>הלילה الذي قالوا قد ولد غلام</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>הלילה الذي قيل أنه قد حُيل بانسان</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

99 This passive is found only in classical Arabic, and FA's vocalization has made clear his intention that the passive perfect be understood here.
Grammatically, FA is careful to continue his use of the passive for both verbs in this stich; in this he is joined by SG. However, BM and TF are content to use the third person masculine plural to impersonalize the first verb in question, 'say'. The second verb, 'be born', must be understood as a passive in TF; BM fineses the difficulty by avoiding the passive and reading, in effect, 'It's a male!' An additional grammatical difficulty occurs in the disagreement between the gender of 'night' and the relative pronoun of the following clause in both TF and FA.

Finally, regarding the birth itself, SG cites 'man', BM 'male', TF 'youth', and FA 'person', with TF being closest in spirit, though not in literalness, to the sense of what is being expressed in the MT.

**Verse 4a**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>ידומים זהות יהודים לשון</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>לילה אֵלֶָיָוים גִּבֵּּוֵי שֶׁמֶּה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM</td>
<td>تلك الليلة تكون ظلامة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>تبيد تلك الليلة وتكون ظلامة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>ذلك اليوم يكون ظلما</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TF strikes out on its own, adding an extra opening verb to the stich: 'perish'. This not only parallels the opening verb at 3a, but duplicates the root, byd, used by SG there. In addition, there is some confusion as to whether the topic of discussion is 'day' or 'night'. Despite this confusion, however, the Arabic versions stay rather close to each other, agreeing, for example, on a common root, ẓlm, 'be evil / dark'.

---

40 The discussion of 28:2b (p. 204) makes further reference to the stylistic variations involving passives and third person plurals in Arabic.

41 TF's style is the least exacting, dropping the prepositional phrase within the relative clause which contains a referent to the antecedent.

42 This confusion is a reflection of readings in the LXX and Cp, which cite 'night', the S-H, which agrees but gives a marginal note of 'day', and the MT, Tg, and Pesh which read 'day'.

---
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While little can be made, ultimately, of the variations among the Arabic versions regarding the use of 'Lord' vs. 'God', the curiously archaic spelling of SG should be noted, whereby the initial radical, the hamza or glottal stop, is retained after the definite article, and the vowel in the final syllable is rendered consonantally. While this is not consistent with Arabic usage, it can be construed as correct from a bookish point of view, and is virtually cognate to the Hebrew term used in the MT. Indeed, the Hebrew is careful not to use the standard word for God. SG's version is heedful of this practice here, though not consistently throughout the Book of Job.

Perhaps the most noteworthy difference among the Arabic versions is found in the opening verb: though SG employs a different root from BM and TF, they use synonymous terms to that of the MT; not so FA. His choice, from the Sixth Form of 'hd, 'observe closely / heed', carries a connotation of 'have [anything] to do with'. This is broader and more categorical than anything found in any of the predecessor versions, which all approximate the MT.

Finally, the vantage point from which the Deity carries out His activity is literalistically rendered in FA's 'the sky', whereas the other Arabic versions contain synonymous prepositions derived from 'lw (SG) and /wq (BM and TF), 'overtop'.
The reference in BM and TF to the moon is accounted for by their continued reference to 'night' rather than 'day'. The specific reference in the Tg to 'morning light' is paralleled in FA's choice of verb from the root šrq 'shine [from the east]'. SG's verb has less to do with shining than appearing, while the verb in BM and TF is merely 'come [upon]', as in the Cp.

Verse 5a

The Arabic script versions, here as well as at 28:3b, agree over against Sa'adiah that the final Hebrew term of the stich is a compound word. While the validity of such an analysis has been argued among linguists, in the end it is SG who probably comes closest to what the Hebrew originally implied: an abstract noun, and not a compound, should be understood here. Further adding to the confusion, the Arabic script versions all use the root žlm, 'be dark', to translate the Hebrew's xšk as opposed to the near cognate žlmwt.

With regard to the opening verb, TF's version does not employ the jussive to stand for the optative, as does BM. TF's alternative is to settle for the perfect,

---

43 *BDB*, p. 853, col. 2.
much as FA does, albeit in a somewhat different context, at 3ab.44

But the difficulties with the opening verb are not confined to its aspect: there is also disagreement regarding the gender of its subject. All the Arabic script versions agree on using ظلمة, 'darkness', clearly a grammatical feminine, as the first element in a compound subject. BM's conjugation, however, is masculine, perhaps due to gender of the second element in the compound. Since TF's and FA's second subject in this compounding is grammatically feminine,45 they (correctly) employ a feminine verb.

Finally, as for the verbs themselves, there is no agreement on the root (except between BM and TF), but all the Arabic versions employ relatively close synonyms.

Verse 5b

| MT       | תַּשְׁמַרְתּוֹלָיוֹתּוֹ | ṣḥm'rt'lwly't'w
| SG       | יַעֲלוּ עָלָיוֹתּוֹ | y'lw ly'nhtw
| BM       | יִעְלָוְו עָלָיוֹתּוֹ | y'lw ly'nhtw
| TF       | יִעְלָוְו עָלָיוֹתּוֹ | y'lw ly'nhtw
| FA       | וַיְסֵרוּ הַסְּחָאֵב | * y'sr'h s'habh

This short stich finds the Arabic versions in essentially complete semantic agreement, the main difference lying in the choice of the opening verb. BM and TF are the least poetic while FA goes a bit beyond the original in reading 'hide'. But SG evokes the image of the divine shekinah by selecting the Arabic cognate root skn, 'dwell / rest'. As for the word 'cloud' itself, FA stands over against SG, BM, and TF in choosing the root shb rather than gm. The resulting synonyms are virtually interchangeable, though the latter root is perhaps more appropriate in that its root

44 At this point, FA, along with BM and SG, employs an imperfect optative.
45 Non-human plurals are grammatically feminine in Arabic; the presence of the plural here may be interpreted as an indication that TF and FA ascertained a 'plural of majesty' as well as a compounding in the Hebrew.
meaning covers 'veil / render obscure'.

Verse 5c

MT

SG

BM

TF

FA

מַעֲרֵת יֵעָשֵׂה יְמֵי
רֵעָתֵיהֶם חָלָה סְמועָם אֲלֹהָם
יֵעָלֵן ذָכָר הַיּוֹם.
עִלֵּן ذָכָר הַיּוֹם
וּיֵעָלֵןָיָמְלִים יָוֵם שְׁדִּיק

FA now parallels the other Arabic script versions in employing the root ʼain, 'curse': why neither BM nor TF need worry about the occurrence of such a verb impugning the piety of the protagonist may be found in a similar shift in the LXX.46 But SG continues the image of 'covering over' from the previous stich.

Less interesting from a theological point of view, but nonetheless challenging, are the difficulties deriving from the MT’s enigmatic phrase כַּמָּר יֵעָמְר.

Many modern commentators such as Renan (1882), Dhorme (1967), and Kissane (1939) inter alia sense the root of the head of the construct to be kmr, suggesting a meaning of 'darken'. However, other modern commentators including Pope (1965), Gordis (1978), and Habel (1985) follow the more historically traditional path of reading the Hebrew as the preposition וב followed by the construct ממרא יומ, the head of which is based on the root מַרְר, 'be bitter'.

It is this second reading which SG, following the Tg, and FA, following the Pesh, adopt.47 But their attempts to render their solutions into Arabic do not conform to each other, since SG adheres to the syntactical structure but semantically glosses the head of the construct to read 'hot sandstorm', while FA provides no gloss but transforms the construct into a sentence, the subject of which is modified by a

46 In the Greek the passage is v. 6a rather than 5c.
47 BM and TF ignore the difficulty entirely.
possessive pronoun, thus: 'their day is calamitous'.

This rather independent mode of expression of FA has thus made the subject of the verb, 'curse', plural, and then included the sentence 'their day is calamitous' in a relative clause. The result is that FA's entire stich reads, 'May those whose day is calamitous curse it'. While this is not contrary to the spirit of the original, it does signify a willingness on the part of the translator to paraphrase rather than to treat the text in a painstakingly literal manner.

Verse 6a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>הַיָּלְדִּים יְהוֹם יִקְחוּ הלָּלָה</th>
<th>הלָּלָה יְהוֹם יִקְחוּ הלָּלָה</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>עִמּוֹתָיוֹת יִקְחוּ הלָּלָה</td>
<td>עִמּוֹתָיוֹת יִקְחוּ הלָּלָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM</td>
<td>וְתָלַקְלָה יִקְחוּ֥וּהלָּלָה</td>
<td>וְתָלַקְלָה יִקְחוּ֥וּהלָּלָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>וְתָלַקְלָה יִקְחוּ֥וּהלָּלָה</td>
<td>וְתָלַקְלָה יִקְחוּ֥וּהלָּלָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>וְתָלַקְלָה יִקְחוּ֥וּהלָּלָה</td>
<td>וְתָלַקְלָה יִקְחוּ֥וּהלָּלָה</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ultimately, the differences among the Arabic versions are minor, but a few linguistic phenomena are worthy of note:

SG selects a cognate to the Hebrew's final vocabulary item; although this little used root, 'fl, refers to the setting of stars and not to darkness per se, the semantic connection is clear. He continues to view 'night' as grammatically masculine.

BM and TF are consistent in seeing 'night' as feminine. The stich's final vocabulary item is a much more common word than that of SG; indeed, it has already occurred in their versions of 4a and 5a. The truncation in TF betrays a measure of independence not found in most of the rest of his work; this license persists over the next few stichs, and is important from a stylistic viewpoint only.

FA resorts to the same root as that of his verb in 5a, and to the same subject, 'clouds', as in his version of 5b.

48 As we have already seen, it is also a favorite of FA and SG (4a and 5a).
SG, predictably, is closest to the MT,\(^4^9\) while FA departs from standard sentence structure, increasing the force of Job's curse. BM and TF end their stich identically, but not until TF has used a verb string combining the individual verbs of BM and FA.

SG's verb, from the Eighth Form (medial voice) of *im*, 'gather', retains more of the feel of the Hebrew's 'be united' than do the Arabic script versions, which tend to be more mathematical\(^5^0\) in this stich and the following.

BM simply employs the verb 'be', while TF uses 'be' as an auxiliary to the root 'dd, 'recount'.\(^5^1\) FA happens to employ this same root without the auxiliary, and then reinforces it through use of the cognate verbal noun, 'number', at the head of the construct found in the stich's closing prepositional phrase.

---

\(^4^9\) This assumes that the Hebrew יִהְדָּה is to be derived from *ykh*, 'be united', although the MT vocalization suggests the root *hdh*, 'rejoice'.

\(^5^0\) The Pesh, but not the LXX or S-H, displays this same inclination.

\(^5^1\) BM uses this root in the next stich, where TF has no verb whatsoever.
SG joins the Arabic script versions in the semantic realm of calculation and enumeration, apparently on the MT's cue from the word מָסָר, 'number', while adhering closely to the word order of the Hebrew.

BM, which had avoided 'reckon' in the previous stich, now resorts to it. But TF, having used that verb already, simply has it serve elliptically as the verb of this stich as well. The difference between these two versions is simply one of style.

FA parallels his construction in 6b by using the verb from חָסָר, 'calculate' in parallel to 6b's 'reckon', followed by a preposition which takes as its object the cognate noun from חָסָר, which then in turn serves as the head of a construct. Though slightly more wordy than the other versions, the effect of aligning different parts of speech from the same root is to stress the force of the curse.

Verse 7a

Except for BM and TF, which continue somewhat in tandem, there is no agreement among the Arabic versions on the predicate adjective regarding the character of the accursed night in question. Interestingly, the occurrence of the Hebrew term in the rest of scripture is rather rare: it is used twice elsewhere in Job, and once in Deutero-Isaiah. There is a cognate term in Arabic, but all the versions avoid it, possibly due to a divergence in connotation between Hebrew and Arabic.

SG does not stray far from the MT, selecting the passive participle of יָשָׁמ, 'be

---

*This was also the practice of the LXX and S-H, as noted above.*
hard as stone'. Most unfortunate' might be a suitable if inexact rendering of this term.

BM and TF prefer to derive the predicate adjective from a plural of the root w'j, 'be full of pain'. This follows the LXX quite closely, and provides a good contrast to the 'joy' or 'mirth' appearing in the next stich.

FA selects an adjective from a root with many negative connotations: whṣ conjures up images of desolation, melancholy, and gloom.

Verse 7b

Whereas SG toes the line set by the MT in terms of syntax and vocabulary, even to the extent of resorting to the cognate root rrn, 'sound out', for the subject, the Arabic script versions are more prolix in what proves to be the greatest departure thus far in the poetic section of Job.

BM and TF have a compound subject for their verb, betraying an affinity with the LXX and S–H, while FA is even more expansive here, separating the two subjects into separate stichs each with its own verb.

But there is more to FA's text here than mere structural expansion: invoking the vocabulary of Islam, his 7bα speaks not of the absence of 'joy' as do the other Arabic versions, but of unanswered prayer. In 7bβ his language is more reminiscent

53 He is characteristically careful to use the correct classical ending for the indefinite accusative, a grammatical nicety often missed by TF, and occasionally by BM, both of whom display this particular grammatical negligence in this instance.

54 The semantic range of this root in Arabic is much wider than in Hebrew, though given the present context there is little chance for ambiguity.
of the Pesh, which speaks of 'praise' or quite possibly even a hymn or chant. Yet even here FA's language remains consistent with the Islamic ambience set out in 7bα: his reference here is to unoffered praise rather than the 'mirth' of BM and TF.

Verse 8a

This stich displays the thematic consistencies of the various translators, being reminiscent of how the versions deal with Job's cursing of the 'day', for which cf. stich 5a regarding the approach of the three Arabic script versions. While stich 1b would appear to be the precedent setting passage for SG here both in terms of vocabulary and theology, a strengthening of Job's language is unmistakable in SG's use of the root sbb for the verb, the primary meaning of which is 'rail against', with a secondary meaning of 'curse'.

Verse 8b

55 SG softens the bluntness somewhat by putting the verb in the impersonal third person plural.
SG here and elsewhere\textsuperscript{56} takes pains to avoid not only anthropomorphisms, but also personifications of concepts such as Wisdom and investing metaphysical significance to mythological figures such as Chaos. Here he avoids the MT's reference to Leviathan. While the case for the presence of a mythological figure such as Leviathan may be supported by 9c as rendered by the LXX,\textsuperscript{57} SG is most deft in demythologizing his text, doing so in a manner satisfying to the general context of this stich vis-à-vis the semantics of the surrounding passages.\textsuperscript{58} But none of the Arabic script versions share SG's qualms about the appearance of a mythological creature.

The dependence of BM and TF on the LXX and S–H is apparent once again, since all four versions insert the adjective 'great' or 'large' in characterization of the monster. The term selected in these two Arabic versions refers more properly to a dragon rather than a sea-monster,\textsuperscript{59} but the point is clearly apparent, if somewhat convoluted: Job would have those who are mighty enough to restrain the great dragon curse 'the day': strength in might is by implication correlative to strength in malediction.

While the clue for BM's and TF's characterization of the mythological monster may be found in Deutero–Isaiah, FA looks to the Qur'anic reference regarding the prophet Jonah, whose epithet therein is ذو النون, 'Lord of the Great–Fish'. Here, FA employs the plural for monster, which may be interpreted as a plural of intensity. Thus FA's thrust is not dissimilar to that of BM and TF: Job would have those who are mighty enough to undertake an attack upon the great–fish curse 'the day'.

\textsuperscript{56} See the discussion below concerning Chapter 28, especially vv. 10b (p. 224), 14a (p. 233f.), and 22a (p. 247).
\textsuperscript{57} None of the Arabic versions, however, take up this particular cue at 9c.
\textsuperscript{58} On SG's solution, see Goodman (1988), p. 180 (8) and p. 183f., n. 7.
\textsuperscript{59} It should be noted that Isaiah 27:1 effectually equates the two.
Verse 9a

SG is the only one among the Arabic versions that recognizes a reference to 'dawn'. BM and TF make no mention of it, following the LXX and S-H in continuing to reference 'that night'. As for FA, he does stand closer to SG than the other Arabic script versions; his root, shw, 'be cloudless' with the derived sense, therefore, of 'be bright', draws a starker contrast between the light and dark than SG allows or than originally intended.

Verse 9b

Despite the differences in length among the Arabic versions, the general sense of the MT is largely maintained, though FA feels compelled to elaborate upon two implicit readings of the text. His conclusions, however, represent a departure from the original's understanding, even though he appears to have much in common with SG, at least on the surface.

SG and FA share common roots and grammatical structures. But while SG abandons a word-for-word rendering of the MT to add an extra prepositional phrase, FA not only adds the same prepositional phrasing, but also changes the voice
of the verb from passive to middle to permit the introduction of a subject, and adds a second verb at the stich’s close. While the second addition is not only warranted semantically, but also demonstrates his understanding that 'dawn' and not 'night' are referenced here, FA’s introduction of 'people' as the subject of the main verb shows a lack of discernment concerning the principal unifying theme of the opening verses of this chapter, namely, the day of Job’s birth. While the theological implications are negligible, the poetic ones are not: FA has clearly failed in this instance to understand the grand sweep of Job’s condemnation, the day of Job’s birth having been temporarily subordinated, or at least removed from the limelight, by the desire to remove ambiguity from the text.

TF demonstrates a modest amount of independence from BM at this point, adding a second verb to his stich. The change in meaning is not appreciable, and while the reason behind the addition cannot be ascribed unambiguously to differences between varieties of Arabic, it does refine the general meaning of the original.

Verse 9c

| MT | לא ייראה בتفاصيل שחר | לәә لәә لәә لәә لәә | لәә لәә لәә لәә لәә |
| SG | זרעים | זרעים | זרעים |
| BM | וֹלַ נְתַנְתָּ | וֹלַ נְתַנְתָּ | וֹלַ נְתַנְתָּ |
| TF | וֹלַ נְתַנְתָּ | וֹלַ נְתַנְתָּ | וֹלַ נְתַנְתָּ |
| FA | וֹלַ יְבִישֶׁשׁ שֶׁעָעַשֵׁה | וֹלַ יְבִישֶׁשׁ שֶׁעָעַשֵׁה | וֹלַ יְבִישֶׁשׁ שֶׁעָעַשֵׁה |

While the LXX takes the opportunity to parallel the mythological figure of Leviathan at 8b with a reference to Lucifer here at 9c, the Arabic versions clearly understand the poetry of the Hebrew, though their success at duplicating its beauty

60 This was unclear in the previous stich, q.v.
61 In this FA is following the Pesh.
is uneven.

The poetic construct in question is ‘eyelids of the dawn’. As may be expected, SG avoids the anthropomorphism, but his result is no less poetic. Selecting the root *lwh*, ‘flash, glisten, shine’, SG calls up an array of images, two of which are especially pertinent: (1) the connotation of ‘guiding light’, which is granted to angels in order to fulfill divine commands, and (2) the concept of the ‘tableau’ upon which the dawn is painted or displayed. Either way, SG has not sacrificed poetry and beauty to his program of demythologizing his text.

BM and TF, which are identical to each other, are also keen to retain a poetic sense. Finally comprehending that the dawn is the thematic focus, they employ a root generally used for celestial bodies, *t*l, in the sense of ‘ascend’. Their root for the head of the poetic construct, *zhr*, ‘be radiant’, carries connotations of blossoms and flowers and well as splendors and beauties. Thus their poetic construct may be translated as ‘splendor of dawn’ or even ‘flourish of dawn’. The esthetic sense of the original is thus well satisfied, even if the image of ‘eyelids’ is not reproduced or even approximated.

Verse 10a

This verse, which closes the first section of this chapter, answers the question as to why Job would have the day of his birth cursed. It is therefore not surprising that

---

62 Lane, Book I, Part 7, p. 2680, col. 1.
63 This meaning is derivative from the verb, but is central to the verbal noun, ‘that–upon–which–one–writes’.
such a pivotal passage would be the occasion for essential agreement among the
Arabic versions, and indeed among all their predecessor versions, occasional
variations in vocabulary notwithstanding.

Indeed, the Arabic versions display remarkable unanimity in grammatical
structure,\(^64\) while their variations in style are largely predictable: TF is more
pedestrian than its counterparts,\(^65\) SG is the most poetically refined and nuanced, and
FA strikes out on his own.

Verse 10b

| MT | יִמְנַה הַעֲוָלָה מִצְחָנִין |
| SG | לאֵמִיָּנָא קְרָא אָמֶנָא צְלָא |
| BM | كانت حينئذ قد أراحني من الأجاع |
| TF | كانت حينئذ قد أراحني من الأجاع |
| FA | ولم يرفع عنى القد والعمل |

While the reference to 'my eyes' is missing from both SG and FA, there is little
ultimate divergence in meaning among the Arabic versions in this closure of the first
section of this chapter.

SG ends his optative thus: 'that my tribulation had been hidden from me'. The
presence of 'hide' would appear to call for 'my eyes', but SG avoids a literal
translation of the eponymous reference in favor of a more literal understanding.

TF changes the activity of 'my eyes': instead of 'rest from / desist in' as found
in BM, TF posits 'mourn / lament'. While this has possibly resulted from a failure
to decipher BM correctly, it does represent an effort to deal with his text
imaginatively.

FA's contribution to the understanding on this verse lies in his multiplication of

\(^64\) SG uses an optative where the other versions have a simpler, declaratory negative.
\(^65\) There is also an unwarranted shift to the third person at the end of the stich; this
error also occurs at v. 12.
the reference to adversity thus: 'pain and travail'. His verb, from *rf*, 'lift', can only occur with the prepositional phrase 'from me', thus eliminating any possibility of referencing 'my eyes'.

Verse 11a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>Arabic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>לָעַב לָא פְּרָה אֵמוֹת</td>
<td>لماذا لم اموت في البطن</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לְאוֹתֵיו מַעָּמָה בֵּן אָמִי</td>
<td>لماذا لم اموت في البطن</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כְּבָדָא לָא אֵמוֹת בֵּן</td>
<td>كيف لم امت في الرحم</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כְָּבָדָא לָא אֵמוֹת בֵּן</td>
<td>لماذا لم اموت في البطن</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כְָּבָדָא לָא אֵמוֹת בֵּן</td>
<td>كيف لم امت في الرحم</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While SG persists in the usage of modals, the Arabic script versions apparently resort to simple interrogatives, much as in the MT.

BM's verb displays evidence of what Blau (1966) describes as a morphological shift of Middle Arabic, allowing the jussive to retain a long vowel in a closed syllable. TF does the same, though the negative particle governing the jussive has been erroneously omitted.

Unlike BM, FA is fully classical in his morphology of the jussive mood, and thus spells his verb correctly. And, though at first glance he opens this stich with a simple interrogative, the syntactical context in which it appears yields an approximation of the modal in SG: 'why should it not be...?'

Verse 11b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>Arabic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>מַשְׁמַע לְאֵזוֹאֵת אֵמוֹת</td>
<td>وما كنت أرجوا بالخروج من البطن</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַשְׁמַע לְאֵזוֹאֵת אֵמוֹת</td>
<td>zdjęcia na laptop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַשְׁמַע לְאֵזוֹאֵת אֵמוֹת</td>
<td>gunakanlah laptop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַשְׁמַע לְאֵזוֹאֵת אֵמוֹת</td>
<td>الماضي، إذا لم يأتك من ساعتي</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַשְׁמַע לְאֵזוֹאֵת אֵמוֹת</td>
<td>الماضي، إذا لم يأتك من ساعتي</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

66 18.9.5, p. 77.
Despite the differences in length between the Arabic script versions on the one hand and SG on the other, the treatments of this stich are not indicative of major disagreements in meaning, though FA's version displays the most independence.

For 'die', SG uses the Fifth Form of the common Arabic root wfy in the passive; in the middle voice this root presupposes God as its subject, and using the passive merely precludes mention of the agent. Thus while nominally adhering to the MT, SG's vocabulary choice is indicative of a need to buttress his theology, which has an emphasis on the Sovereignty of God.\(^7\)

The other Arabic versions use a less theologically charged word here, agreeing on the root hlk, 'perish / be annihilated'. BM and TF preface use of this verb by a repeated interrogative; they then follow the LXX and S-H in adding a prepositional phrase, 'from my hour', i.e., 'immediately', at the close of the stich. This is not the case, however, for FA, who ends the stich with a repetition of his opening modal at 11a: 'Why should it not be that I perished?' This stylistic nicety of opening and closing this rhetorical passage with a common construction shows a sense of symmetry and equilibrium.

Of further note is the fact that FA has divided 11b into two stichs, as can be noted from the ms. The first is centered on a verb string, كنت ارجوا, while the second, as has already been noted, shares with the other Arabic script versions a verb from the root hlk, 'perish / be annihilated'. The matter of greatest note in terms of FA's independence in translation thus occurs in his 11bα: not only is كنت ارجوا unprecedented, but FA begins this stich with وما to signal a circumstantial clause adverbially modifying 11a; thus FA's 11bα reads 'without [even] having hoped to emerge from the womb'.

\(^7\)While this penchant in SG will be noted elsewhere in this study, the Sovereignty of God is also very much a concern of FA. This issue is dealt with fully in the Conclusions (pp. 388ff).
Given this verse's anatomical imagery, the opportunity for variations among the Arabic versions with regard to nouns is more limited than usual. However, in the first stich, the activities of the knees are a cause for disagreement.

At first sight, SG's is the only version to understand that the context of the birthing process continues here from v. 11. Seeing the potential difficulty of understanding the tersely-worded Hebrew, he expands on the nature of his question, 'what good was it that...?', before attempting to clarify the meaning of the verb. His choice, from *lqy*, signals two possible meanings: 'receive / encounter' and 'take instruction'. The first fits the birthing image graphically. The second meaning would normally be constructed with a preposition, and no preposition is represented in SG's text.

But can it be entirely coincidental that this derivate connotation is adopted explicitly in FA's verb from *rbw*, 'rear / educate / instruct'? This is the also the understanding of the Pesh, while the S-H has yet another meaning, 'hold in one's lap', related to the LXX's 'support'. From this is apparently derived the meaning in BM and TF, 'grow to strength', which causes BM to place 'knees' in a first person singular construct: they are not the knees of Job's mother, but of Job himself. While a *bona fide* misunderstanding of the original is a real possibility here, the mistranslation may have been deliberate, given the immodesty of the image involved. Thus the attempts to redirect the image in 12a.

The language in TF betrays non-classical influence: while retaining the dual for
'knees' and 'breasts', there is confusion in the attendant verbs, one being in the plural, the other singular. In addition, TF slips into the third person singular where the first person is presumed, thus making Job refer to himself indirectly. This is internally consistent with his wording at 10a. Finally, TF varies the interrogatives; this is to be considered largely a result of stylistic concerns.

Verse 13

MT: כנני צחקת ואשכוקים ישנה. ואינכת לא;

SG: לא אלכש כלרהו. ולא חפורט לאסורה

BM: לי הזה كنت מתי ואстерות ולא מתי كنت قد אسترהל

TF: يا לי זה كنت מתי ואстерות ולא אתי מתי לאכשו ירה

FA: לולי كنت ראפרהה לא סעקטא ואינכת נאום מוסרrix

The grammatical devices may be varied, but all the Arabic versions understand that more than simple declaratives are called for here. SG’s mode of expression is even more concise than that of the MT; the Arabic script versions display similar precision.

Further evidence of TF’s nature vis-à-vis BM is found in this stich: classical Arabic demands that the modal ליה, 'would that', be followed by either a noun in the accusative or a clause consisting of 안 plus a pronominal suffix. This is precisely how BM reads. This rule is widely disregarded in middle and colloquial varieties of Arabic, given their elimination of case endings; this disregard obtains in TF’s word order.

FA employs active participles as predicate adjectives where the other Arabic versions compound their verbs in the perfect. This not only gives FA’s text a sense that the activities thus described still obtain in the present, for which SG achieves the same by inserting the adverbial expression for 'now', necessitated by his use of the conditional, which requires verb forms in the perfect, but focuses attention on Job as a person rather than on the activity undertaken or undergone.
This grammar has important theological implications: One of FA's main concerns throughout his translation is to focus on God and Divine Sovereignty to the detriment of human action and freedom. Thus by having Job augment the focus on himself here, even though the nature of the activity concerned is largely passive, FA will be able to signal through the reactions of Job's friends in later chapters that Job's vision is misdirected, or to use language of a more modern age, that his theological anthropology is misguided.

The objection may be raised that the theology of the other human characters in the Book of Job is discredited as the debate and dialogue in the canonical versions unfold. But this concern is largely immaterial to FA for two reasons. Firstly, given his links to Islamic thought and tradition, FA's view of Job's Comforters is more positive than would otherwise be the case. Indeed, their characterization by TH may be brief, but is clearly affirming of their role and status. Secondly, one cannot pretend that FA has adopted the entire theologies of the Comforters; rather, he selects what is consistent not only with the Voice from the Whirlwind, but also with his own theological bent: Divine Sovereignty is so overwhelming it minimizes the relevance of human effort and power.

Thus does grammatical nuance betray theological preferences and agendas.

Verse 14

Implicitly, verses 14 and 15 confirm the status of Job as an important *shaykh* in that
he would have preferred to be like the [other] 'kings, counsellors, princes'. The Arabic versions preserve mention of individuals of high status, though not always with the same terminology of the MT.

FA elevates the status of the second type of dignitary in 14a, putting it in synonymous parallel with the first, thus: 'kings and sultans'. This reinforces the concept discovered in verse 13, revealed through his use of the active participle, that FA's Job has a theologically exaggerated sense of his own importance. SG, BM, and TF, however, retain the intent of the MT by having the second category subordinate in power to the first, thus: 'kings and ministers' (SG), or 'kings and marshalls' (BM and TF).

Despite their differences on the nature of their authority, however, FA agrees with SG that their activity was one of inhabiting what is now desolate; indeed, their vocabulary on this issue is virtually identical, SG adding the characterization of 'many' to the desolate places.

This is not the understanding of either BM or TF, neither of which make reference to 'desolate places' in 14b. Unexpectedly, these two versions also disagree with each other; the reading of TF is to be preferred.

TF's subsequent reference to 'swords', however, is clearly a misreading of حرام, 'spears', for حرام, 'desolation', which is found in both SG and FA. Ultimately, the difficulty stems from the Hebrew, which does not distinguish either alphabetically or phonetically between the Semitic phonemes x and h, representing both by the letter 𐤉. Arabic script and phonology, however, have two different symbols for two separate sounds, so rather than having semantically ambiguous homophonous roots as does the Hebrew, the MT could be rendered by the root xrb, 'be desolate', or by hrb, 'make war'. TF, following the LXX, S-H, and Cp

---

68 This follows the reading of the MT.
erroneously selects the latter; finally, TF's verb in 14b is the Second Form of zyn: 'extol, ornament', again in agreement with the LXX and S-H.

BM reads 14b quite differently here: '...who look upon their eminence.' Given the general similarities in the ductus of the Arabic script for these two phrases, BM's error is understandable, even carrying a certain semantic consistency, though clearly representing a departure from the intent of the story.

Verse 15a

| MT | אני ישראים והם להם |
| SG | והמזרא באין להם אלאיהם |
| BM | ومع الريس الذين كانوا في العقل الكثير |
| TF | ومع الريس الذي كان ذهبه كثير |
| FA | ومع الولاية الذين كانوا أرباب الذهب |

BM continues its separate path, endowing the third category of high-ranking individuals with 'much intelligence'. The other Arabic versions adhere more closely to the MT in reading 'gold' (SG), 'much gold' (TF), or 'ones possessed of gold' (FA). Yet FA evinces a shade of difference from SG and TF: not having any reference to 'houses', FA's implication is that the gold could be merely monetary in nature, while SG and TF's context raises the image of gold-leaf or other architectural ornamentation. 69

The final category of notables finds FA standing alone over against the other Arabic versions, reading 'governors' rather than 'chieftains'. It is arguable as to whether this is further evidence, first discovered at verse 13 and then again at 14b, of FA's effort to show that Job continues thinking of himself more important than is warranted, since the difference in the status of 'governors' and 'chiefs' is largely subjective.

69 In the case of SG, this is confirmed by his translation of 15b.
Finally, BM and TF show evidence of middle rather than classical Arabic in their spelling of 'chieftains'. This spelling also represents a phonetic transcription of the word as pronounced in Egyptian Arabic.

Verse 15b

The parallel to 'gold' in 15a is 'silver' in 15b. SG, however, provides a refinement with mention of 'leaf' rather than 'silver' per se. The root, wrq, 'put forth leaves', lends itself to various interpretations. Goodman (1988) follows Qapah (1970) in translating '[silver]-plate'; '[silver]-leaf' is another possibility.

All the Arabic versions avail themselves of the Arabic cognate of the Hebrew's ml', 'fill'. FA employs the middle voice, making 'houses' the grammatical subject, while the other versions are in the active voice, understanding that it is the owners of the houses that are meant as the subject. As for the houses themselves, TF stands alone in selecting the root nzl, 'descend, stop', whence the noun of place: 'stopping places', or 'houses'. All the other Arabic versions use بيت, the root meaning of which is 'pass the night'. The variation is largely stylistic, though historically بيت referred to a twin-poled tent large enough to spend a night (as opposed to a single-poled shelter where one rested a few hours in the heat of the day), whereas منزل was considered something of a more permanent structure. For non-Bedouin audiences of Egypt and Mesopotamia, however, the distinction would go largely unnoticed.
SG follows the word order of the MT exactly, whereas the Arabic script versions are more conventionally phrased, with BM and TF closely approximating each other.

The reference to a premature foetus pairs SG and FA together over against BM and TF in terms of vocabulary. The former pair both use the root sqt, 'fall', whence 'miscarried foetus', modifying this with dfn, 'bury', as a passive participle. However, BM and TF employ the root sqt adjectively, while the substantive is derived from xdj, 'give birth prematurely'. Thus any reference to burial is omitted, and the opportunity to complete the parallel to the fate of the notables mentioned in vv. 14-15 is lost.

Ever consistent theologically, FA's Job once again highlights himself, as he does in verse 13 with active participles and at 14b by emending the vocabulary concerning men of rank. Here, FA uses yet a third approach, inserting an independent personal pronoun before his negated verb. This addition reinforces the personal reference, since the conjugated form of the verb already includes what is, in effect, an enclitic pronoun.\(^\text{70}\)

---

\(^\text{70}\)This pronominal compounding for emphasis is a standard literary device in classical Arabic; in other registers and dialects of the language many of the distinctions of person in conjugational forms disappear, and so independent pronouns often do not convey emphasis, but merely clarify ambiguities.
Despite the fact that the Arabic script versions are much more prolix than SG's word-by-word reproduction of the MT, the differences that result are more apparent than real. For example, all versions, even TF, use the jussive, while the appearance of relative pronouns in the Arabic script versions, but not in SG, is due to rules of usage: SG's indefinite antecedent precludes the use of the relative pronoun; yet the relative clause is implicitly present in SG. Finally, while FA is alone in not taking advantage of the Arabic cognate for the Hebrew root \( r'h \), 'see', his selection instead of a less common yet virtually synonymous Third Form verb based on 'yn, 'eye', results in little change of meaning.

**Verse 17a**

| SG | فلما كتبت مثل الأطفال الذين لم يرو ضوء الدنيا. |
| BM | أو مثل الأطفال الذين لم يروا ضوء الدنيا. |
| TF | ومثل الأطفال الذين لم يعابنا النور |

All the Arabic versions diverge to varying degrees in this stich: SG limits his elaborations on the MT to questions of syntax rather than vocabulary; BM and TF, duplicating each other, add an important theological tone to their text not found in any predecessor version; FA exercises the most license in his treatment, adding an extra construct and resorting once again to active participles as predicate adjectives. In so doing FA explicitly mentions 'the Lord'; this also represents a departure from

---

71 See 28:7b, 8a, 8b, (p. 219ff) and 28:13a, 13b (p. 231ff), where such usage lends a certain air of antiquity to an Arabic that is otherwise largely non-classical.
all predecessor versions.

Drawing on the root *kfr*, 'be ungrateful', BM and TF incorporate a word that had gone well beyond its root meaning into the realm of technical Islamic vocabulary: كافر, plural كَافِرَةٌ: 'infidels'. While FA misses this opportunity to make a connection to the thought-patterns of Islam, selecting a more pedestrian term, 'sinners', he still explicitly characterizes, as do BM and TF, the attitude of the dead under consideration as irreligious, if not atheistic.\(^{72}\) This is reinforced by his closing construct, 'resentful of their Lord'.

Verse 17b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>ลงทะเบียะ ยิ่งยี่ ค่ะ:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>หกตาปีติ คุณเอามาตอบ:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM</td>
<td>حيث يستريحون المكدودين بالجسد.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>حيث يستريحون المكدودين بالجسد</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>حيث تستريح الكادون في حياة الدنيا</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the Arabic versions use the same root, *ryh*, 'rest', while all the Arabic script versions agree on the root for the subject of that verb: *kdd*, 'be weary'. All in all, there is little to distinguish these versions from each other semantically or theologically.

Yet, differences remain. While de Baudissin (1870) goes to some length to explain and correct the text of BM, its duplication in the Arabic of TF shows that the translator of BM was not entirely immune to non-classical influences. Be that as it may, BM and TF show their dependence on the LXX and S-H in the addition of a final prepositional phrase, which is also found in Cp. FA contains a similar close to his version, demonstrating that he was not entirely reliant upon the Pesh, though

\(^{72}\) In SG's more ambiguous translation, the offenses appear "merely" to be ones of immorality; any connotations beyond that are implicit at best.
it was clearly his main source-text.

Verse 18a

MT  יוהי אלאמר אשמה

SG  למלע אלאמר אשמה

BM  וجميعسارعوا אליהו כל الاولין

TF  וجميعسارعوا אליהו כל الاولין:

FA  هنا דיקא الاسرار ו纰ريقון *

SG is strict in his adherence to the MT in every possible way, while the Arabic script versions all disagree on the grammatical subject of the stich, which the MT and SG give as 'prisoners'.

BM and TF substitute for 'prisoners' the understanding of the LXX and S–H: 'men–of–old'. But the ultimate fate of such people is unclear in these two versions, even though it is the main theme of this stich. The problem stems from the stylistic violation noticed by de Baudissin (1870) in BM (and TF as well): the pronominal suffix in their prepositional phrase 'to it' does not have an antecedent, though a noun of place is conceptually implied both by the prepositional phrases which open verses 14 and 15 and by the repeated use of the adverb حيث, 'where'. Predecessor versions, as well as the other Arabic versions, do not contain a relevant parallel expression at 18a, and are therefore not helpful. As BM and TF stand unemended, they read: 'All the men–of–old have gone to it'73 together.

FA reads neither 'men–of–old' nor 'prisoners'. Instead, he posits a phonologically similar but semantically unrelated root to the Hebrew 'ש', 'imprison', yielding a parallel to the 'sinners' of his version of 17a, viz., 'culprits / evil–doers',

---

73 Or possibly, 'them': the feminine singular is generally used to express non–human plurals. If the latter case obtains here, one may posist an ellipsis of all the previous adverbial phrases which contain the afore–mentioned حيث, or 'where', i.e., 'the places] where'.

79
from ṣrr, 'be wicked'. Thus once again one finds FA in disagreement with the Pesh, which follows the MT closely on this particular point.\textsuperscript{74} FA, however, is alone among the Arabic versions in following the Pesh by beginning the stich with an adverb: 'there'.

**Verse 18b**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>لا يسمع صوت نداء:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>فلما سمى نداء للا配音</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM</td>
<td>حيث لا يقع صوت لمنادى ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>حيث لا يسمع صوت الداعي ولا مجيب:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>ولا يسمعون صوت المستعبد</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Neither BM nor TF have understood whose voice is being referred to here. Yet even in departing from each other in terms of vocabulary, their selections are synonymous, roughly yielding 'caller' in both instances. In contrast, FA is quite clear here, using the active participle from the Tenth Form of the root 'bd, thus: 'enslaver'. SG, however, has chosen a rare term whose general meaning derives from the sense of 'overseer' or 'guard'. All the Arabic versions agree on vocabulary for 'voice', and all but one use the root sm', 'hear', for the verb. BM differs in selecting wq', 'fall', which can be used of sounds in a manner similar to the English expression 'to fall upon one's ears'.

At this point, BM's manuscript breaks off until 6:24b; thus whether this version originally contained an extra clause in parallel to TF's 'and not [the voice of] a respondent' to balance 'voice of the caller' is an unanswerable question. In any case, this extra phrase found at the end of TF's version of 18b is unattested in any of the predecessor versions, though its insertion is consistent with the balanced pairs of the next two stichs: 'great and small' (19a), and 'servant and master' (19b).

\textsuperscript{74} The understanding of FA is not dissimilar, however, to that of the Cp.
Verse 19a

All the Arabic versions agree on the terminology for 'great and small'; FA's additional vocabulary and grammatical structures serve to make explicit the adverbial expression of the MT, duplicated in the Pesh; yet it should be noted that his inclusion of the verb 'come to', which is unprecedented, goes beyond the stative expression found in SG and TF.

Verse 19b

Again, there is complete agreement among the Arabic versions regarding terminology for the principal nouns of the stich: 'slave' and 'his master', though structurally FA associates the two by means of a relative clause, a grammatical device which he favors elsewhere. As for the verb characterizing the relationship between the two, FA uses specialized vocabulary that is synonymous to SG's, while TF follows the LXX and S-H in using 'fear'.

Verse 20a

75 For example, FA makes extensive use of the relative clause in Chapter 28 to link concepts across stichs and verses; cf. especially 28:4b–7a, pp. 209–217.
TF and FA both depersonalize the matter at hand by shifting from the singular to the plural; the LXX and S–H do the same, though the Tg and Pesh do not. This once again removes FA from full dependence upon the Pesh, and while an obscurity in the ms does not allow for a complete decipherment of his language, it is clear that FA’s opening verb, 'hope / request', unprecedented in any of the other versions under consideration, demonstrates a continued independence of thought and interpretation.

Verse 20b

MT והרות李白 לשון
ואלרתים לבן אלהים

SG וحياة לREFERRED במ

TF והרות李白 לשון
ואלרתים לבן אלהים

FA והרות李白 לשון
ואלרתים לבן אלהים

FA employs yet another relative clause in a passage that is more paraphrase than translation. This is in striking contrast to SG, who follows the MT with painstaking exactitude, and TF, which follows both the word order and the economy of expression of the S–H. Yet here FA has not actually gone beyond the import of the text; rather, perhaps like something of a long-winded preacher, he has erred on the side of prolixity in order to assure that his point is not missed.76

Verse 21a

MT המברשיםليفת ואוננו
アルバムטרם אלהים לי

SG המברשיםليفת ואוננו
アルバムטרם אלהים לי

TF המברשיםليفת ואוננו
アルバムטרם אלהים לי

76 FA comes across most clearly as a homileticist in Chapter 28; cf. the Conclusions (p. 383f).
While all the Arabic versions disagree on the vocabulary of 'longing' and its 'requital', the Arabic script versions are particularly discursive in their treatment of death. Both the Arabic script versions resort to relative clauses, and FA's approach requires a second verb where SG and TF have only one to express 'longing': his first verb approximates SG's relatively passive concept of 'awaiting', while his second, which is more active with its idea of 'yearning', approaches that of TF.

The 'requital' clause agains shows divergences, with SG's language once again being not as proactive, but rather resorting to the specialized classical verb 'not be'. TF's language is more forceful, reading 'procure'; FA may be even a shade stronger, with 'gain power over'.

The reason for this divergence between SG and the Arabic script versions may be found in their conflicting interpretations of the final prepositional phrase at the close of 21b in the MT.

Verse 21b

| MT | נָכַּ֣לִיתָ֖ו מַעֲשִׂיָּֽהּ |
| SG | תָּכַ֣לִיתָ֖ו לָלֶֽהְוָֽאַרְמָֽאַאֲפָֽא |
| TF | וְיַקְּרֵֽבְּךָ֣ךְ בֵּֽן |
| FA | וְיַקְּרֵבְּךָ֣ו כָּֽאֲהַו יַקְּרֵֽבְּךָ֣ו בֵּֽן |

Goodman (1988) notes, as if it were some kind of modern aberration, that since the time of the Authorized Version the closing vocabulary item of the MT in this verse has been rendered as 'treasure'. However, both of the Arabic script versions have
this 'modern' understanding, as do the LXX, Pesh, S–H, and Cp.

SG does not, however. Resorting to the root *dfn*, 'bury', he interprets the MT as 'burial places', parallel to *פָּלַמ* in 22b. Yet it should be noted that the root which SG has selected also admits, in its adjectival form, the meaning of 'treasure trove'.

Verse 22

MT

וְהָשְׁמַחְוּ אַל-יְזִירָה יֵשׁשָׁהֵנִי מִימים-חֲצָר

SG

אֵלֶּהוֹ הַמֶּרֶצָהֲתָה בֶּרֶם אֲלֵמַּה אָלָה נָבַעַה קֶרְבָּה.

TF

וּבְרֶחְנוֹ מַאֲנוֹ וְאִשָּׁא בַּאֲנוֹ וְאִשָּׁא מַעֲרָשָׁה קְרַב.

FA

וּבְרֶחְנוֹ וְיֵטְרָבִּים וְאֵלֶּה נֹאֲשָׁא מֶכֶם הַמֶּרֶצָה קְרַב.

FA persists in expanding upon the meaning of the text, going beyond the understanding of any of the Arabic versions and well as any of the predecessor texts when he speaks of the dead 'gathering' at the place of rest: SG has them 'find' it, and TF has them 'get to' it.

Interestingly, both TF and SG win the award for brevity, an honor usually reserved for SG alone. While it should be noted that the LXX and S–H are similarly terse, the wording of TF is in danger of self-contradiction given its treatment of 21a, where the same verb is used to speak of the unobtainable, which here is used to suggest the opposite. Of course, some of the difficulty lies in the meaning of the MT, but the needless duplication of vocabulary is a source of stylistic concern.

Once again, where TF has one verb in the opening stich, FA insists on two.78

---

77 The differing roots for the word in question in the two versions are largely synonymous, while their differing grammatical structures stem from varying levels of formality.

78 SG falls in between, opening with a verb, followed by a verbal noun from the same root as FA’s second verb, as object of a preposition.
And continuing in his consistent approach, SG clearly follows the model given by the MT.

Verse 23a

SG: לָנֵבָר צְמִירִיתָה נְמָרָה
MT: לְנַבָּר צְמִירִיתָה נְמָרָה

tf: الموت للرجل يبج

SG's departures from the MT's v. 23 are relatively mild. Here in 23a SG replaces the Hebrew 'his path' to 'his matters', and does not seize the opportunity to use a cognate Arabic root to the Hebrew verb, based on str, 'conceal'. Otherwise there is little remarkable in his treatment of the text.

If there is any doubt of at least a partial literary dependence of TF on the S-H, it is dispelled here: TF's text follows the S-H word for word, containing cognates of the Syriac for 'death' as well as 'rest'. While the first is not unexpected, the second cognate, based on the root nwh, makes for a false translation, though the error is understandable: the Arabic root has to do with the mourning of death, not the rest resulting therefrom, which is the case in the Syriac.

FA goes beyond paraphrase here; indeed, it appears that he has lost his way. He seemingly ignores the Pesh, which models its version of v. 23 very closely on v. 20. While FA's text has a few points of contact with the LXX of 23a, it has no sense whatsoever of the tightness of expression and of argument not only of the Pesh, but also of the S-H as well as of the LXX. While FA eventually rejoins the thread of Job's argument in subsequent verses, the current pair of stichs demonstrates (a) a misunderstanding of the Pesh, or (b) poetic license run amok; indeed, there is

---

79 Which is also in agreement with the MT regarding 'his path'.
80 There are also echoes of TF's 23b in the latter part of FA's 23a, most notably in the concept of 'exhaustion'.

85
even the potential of a combination of these elements in FA's version of verse 23.
The results at first sight are disappointing: FA's rendering bears little theological
import, lacks stylistic grace, and clarifies but marginally.

Yet FA is careful to lay groundwork here for the future: his use of the root
\( hnh \), 'enjoy' is echoed in 24a, where the same root is used in the middle voice to
describe the lack of enjoyment Job finds when he eats.

Verse 23b

Noegel (1996) sees in the opening verb of the Hebrew a double entendre reflected in
the translation of the verb to 24b. None of the Arabic versions catch the semantic
play, however; indeed, only SG's version is close enough to the MT to make any
realistic attempt possible, though TF's verb, based on \( glq \), 'lock / bolt', is not far
from the MT's 'fence in'. As for TF's subject, an examination of the ms suggests
\( naf \), 'escape', successfully completing the image; the editor's \( lhlh \) is problematic.

FA continues his wanderings. Instead of making the most of the explicit
mention of God,\(^81\) he closes this verse with a comment regarding which it is difficult
to make a certain attribution: 'On the contrary, I say this' may indeed be spoken by
Job. But it just may also be a parenthetical remark on the part of FA himself, noting
that the foregoing material, which bears only the loosest of relationships to what the
scriptures say, is indeed not to be confused with a canonical reading, but is rather a
product of the translator alone. Such a reading may be reinforced by FA's next

---

\(^81\) FA is not above inserting mention of God even when none exists in any of his
potential source texts, as at 11:12 (p. 115f); this is part of his program of
affirming the presence of a Deity all too often missing from the poetic section.
stich (see below), though the understanding may be that it is Job himself who is still speaking here.

Verse 24a

**MT**

כִּי-לפְּנֵי לָעַם אָנַּחַת הָבָא

SG

אֲנָה עִדֵּ֛ה תַּמְסֵֽׁרָה יִכְּבֶּל תַּגָּה דָּוֵּֽד

TF

הַלַּחֲמָיִּים יָאֵֽגְנֵֽני בַּיּוֹם לָא זָפְרָת מְרֻרָּה עַצָּמִי * ولم يتركني اهتنا بالطعام *

FA

While the broad outlines for the sense of the MT are clear, there is enough ambiguity in the poetry to allow the Arabic versions different interpretations of the interrelationship between 'sighs' and 'my food'. Ultimately the theological differences are inconsequential, though the linguistic variety is engaging in its own right.

SG continues his close adherence to the MT, modifying only its word order at the close of the stich. His translation implies that when it is time for Job to eat, his sighing is already come; therefore, given the continual need for nourishment, Job's groans are constant.

If anything, TF ties Job's sighs with his nourishment even more closely than SG, and presents his translation in the form of a rhetorical question: Shall Job's sighs bring his food to him, even offer him his nourishment? The impression is one of virtually complete identification of 'sighs' with 'nourishment': Job feeds on nothing but his own pain.

FA displays remarkable ingenuity, unafraid of exercising considerable license to positive effect. He plays with his text, making a discrete pun, and repeatedly interrelates his current passage thematically with the rest of the Book of Job.

Firstly, rather than selecting the Fifth Form of the root nhd, 'sigh', as do both SG and TF, FA selects a more emotive root zfr, 'sigh deeply / moan'. Not only is
FA's vocabulary more descriptive and exacting than that of SG and TF, it is also phonologically reminiscent of the name of one of Job's three comforters, Zophar. FA, in the end, does not force the pun to its logical extreme: his name for the third comforter conforms alphabetically to the model provided by the Pesh, not to the root ẓfr. But word play in Arabic, especially based on the interplay of various sibilants, allows for an identification of these two lexical items: Moans / Zophar will embitter Job's very bones.

Secondly, while the use of 'bones' is unprecedented in this particular passage, it is a thematic device which occurs elsewhere in the Book of Job: in Chapter 2, the Satan asks that he be allowed to touch Job's bones and flesh; in Chapter 30, Job himself makes a pair of references to the discomfort felt in his bones; in the rest of the Book, both Job's comforters on the one hand and the Voice from the Whirlwind on the other speak of bones as sources and signs of strength. Yet while it is therefore not inconsistent for FA to put these extra words in Job's mouth concerning the 'sighs which make his bones bitter', the question remains as to why FA chose this point in his text to make such an assertion. One might conjecture that the occurrence of 'my food' later in this passage may have brought to the mind of the translator the scriptorially if not phonologically similar 'my bones': طعامي عظامي.

Thirdly, FA's understanding of the relationship between 'moans' and 'my food' differs from the other Arabic versions. Unafraid to expand on the language of the stich, FA suggests that since Job's moans have embittered his bones, these moans also do not allow him any enjoyment of his food. While this may not be the most brilliant display of subtle thought on the part of the translator, FA is careful to tie in the concept of 'enjoyment', based on the root ḥn', 'take pleasure in / enjoy',

---

82 For a full discussion of the various forms of Zophar's name in the Arabic versions, see the discussion of 11:1 (p. 96f).
through the use of the very same root in his somewhat distended version of 23a,
when he describes the 'joy' at the attainment of one's tomb. Indeed, the
juxtaposition of these two self-contradictory thoughts, namely, the enjoyment of the
tomb but not of nourishment, certainly justifies FA's unparallelled use of the verb
'embitter' in his version of 24α.

Verse 24b

MT
SG
TF
FA

The basic images of the expression of pain, movement, and watery substances, being
found in the MT, are all common to the Arabic versions. But what is done with
those images exhibits differences among those translations.

SA creates a parallel where none exists in the MT: 'my food' of 24a is matched
by 'my drink' in 24b. Otherwise he faithfully follows his source text, using the root
z'r, 'roar like a lion', as the root for his closing possessive, 'my roar', while
preserving the sense of the MT's verb, 'overflow'.

TF, taking a cue from the LXX and S-H, reads quite differently: the watery
substance involved is not drink (SG) or water itself (MT), but tears. Accordingly,
adjustment must be made in the verb of motion, with the obvious choice being the
very common Arabic root bky, 'weep / mourn'. What TF does with the idea of
'pain' is also based on the reading of the LXX and S-H, though TF supplies what is,
in effect, an extra stich to accommodate the concept: thus his 24bα ends the
rhetorical question begun at 24a, with 24bβ supplying the effective justification for a

83 Gordis (1978) offers a typical translation: "My groans are poured out like water".
84 Goodman (1988) suggests "my anguish", but this is not quite forceful enough.
85 Indeed, his Arabic uses the cognate root, dm', to the Syriac for 'tears'.
supposed affirmative reply to his question: 'Anxiety and emaciation beset me'.

While 'anxiety' finds its precedent in the LXX and S-H, 'emaciation' does not. Of course, TF's treatment of 24a, where Job's only nourishment is his angst, invites the mention of emaciation in this parallel passage. Indeed, with 'anxiety' itself mentioned within this same stich, its juxtaposition with 'emaciation' is tantamount to suggesting a cause-and-effect relationship between the two.

FA's text requires editorial emendation. Based on the assumption that 'moans', stands as the parallel expression in the previous stich, and that some points of contact with the Pesh still obtain despite FA's numerous digressions over the past few verses (which temporarily come to an end), 'my groaning', should be read for the manuscript's incomprehensible. The result brings FA very close to the MT, though the addition of a predicate adjective serves to emphasize the repetitiveness of the water flow, or its superabundance: 'And my groaning is copious, like flooding water'.

Verse 25a

| MT              | כָּניִ עֲלֵה ת֣וֹרָה יִרְחָא | | |
| SG              | הַאֲלָלִים עֲלֵהּ | מְלֹאָה יִרְחָא | |
| TF              | והלך כי עזר וַאֲנָני | | |
| FA              | ومن أجل أن الخوف الذي كنت احذر الرأي قد نزل فيّ | | * |

As Job's lament moves to its majestically dramatic conclusion, the Arabic versions unite in their basic understanding of the climax, though their modes of expression continue to exhibit variations in compositional style and vocabulary selection.

SG, along with the other Arabic versions, chooses to avoid using a syntactical device which is common to classical Arabic and which appears in the Hebrew of the

---

86 This does no violence to the ductus of the word in question, merely requiring a change in the placement of a few diacritical marks.
MT: the cognate accusative. Given SG's willingness to follow the MT in matters of vocabulary, style, and structure, it is something of a surprise that he does not avail himself of the opportunity here presented. Be that as it may, SG preserves the relative brevity of the MT, and reflects its basic structure in the use of two verbs, the second of which is a cognate of the Hebrew. His opening relative pronoun, without antecedent, is within the stylistics of classical Arabic, in which under certain circumstances the relative pronoun may serve as its own antecedent.

Besides the fact that TF shows surprisingly little evidence of influence from the LXX or S–H, his language is faultlessly classical, presumably due to the approaching climax of Job's speech. His first verb is in the past imperfect (rather than perfect), thus focusing on Job's current condition, while the final verb, the same cognate as used by SG, carries the full force of the perfect. The result is to cover the widest possible semantic (perfect and imperfect) and temporal (past and present) range by the verbs in question, thus linguistically symbolizing the extent of Job's calamities and downfall.

FA supplies an otherwise unnecessary antecedent to his relative pronoun, thus leaving little room for ambiguities. His antecedent comes from converting the opening verb of the Hebrew to the equivalent verbal noun, 'fear'. His relative clause, which follows, is identical with that of TF except for the closing verb, for which FA supplies the root nzl, 'descend / fall upon'. The resulting image is one of 'terror from on high'.

This, of course, not only calls to mind the graphic images in the Joban prologue of death and destruction coming from fire and winds from the sky, but also raises

---

87 It is a rule of long standing in Arabic rhetoric that opening remarks are normally delivered in a higher register of the language; then the central portions of one's talk move from the intellectual to the emotive, with the process being reversed towards the close of the speech, with a return to classical rhetoric.
the issue of the identity of the author of Job’s predicament. Strictly speaking, it is the coming of dread, and not the calamities themselves, which are said to have ‘descended upon’ Job. Yet, the close identification and subsequent confusion of the effect (fear) with their cause (calamities) is a natural one. Accordingly, FA can be seen to be closing this chapter as he opened it, imputing to Job some intuitive knowledge of the divine factor behind his situation. Even more profoundly, FA simultaneously endorses implicitly the theology, found at II Samuel 24:1 (and subsequently "corrected" at I Chronicles 21:1), that God, being the Creator of all things, is ultimately the source of evil as well as of good.

Verse 25b

| MT          | ואַמְרָה יְהוֹתֵי יַבֵּאת לָיִם |
| SG          | וֹאֵלָלְה תַהָרֶת הַל בָּיִם |
| TF          | והָלָּי תַהָרֶת לַכְּלָיָה |
| FA          | וֹצָרָה לַי הָדְלָה הֶל כְּלָיָא לַכְּלָיָה |

The nuances of the Arabic versions result in significant theological variations.

While Goodman (1988) attempts to rebut the notion that Job’s primary motivation in exercising piety was little more than self-serving, SG’s text is indeed open to such an interpretation, moreso than either the MT or Tg. The Arabic root in question, ḥār, 'be cautious / on one’s guard’, potentially contains enough ambiguity to leave the question open.

But the ambiguity disappears with TF, which continues to demonstrate its independence from the LXX and S-H: its verb, based on the root ḫqw, carries the meaning ‘protect oneself / make sure [against]’; this verb is also used in the sense of ‘fear God’. Clearly TF has Job asking, in effect, ‘What’s the point of fearing God if

---

88 Cf. the discussion at 1b, above, p. 51.
89 P. 185, n. 14.
90 This same root is used by both TF and FA in the previous stich.
I am punished anyway? This, obviously, is entirely consistent with the message of the Book of Job, if not with the understanding of the MT at this point in the drama.\footnote{Somewhat distracting, but with no final ramifications on the foregoing argument, is TF's continuing use of third person pronoun suffixes where the first person is called for; here, the offending suffix occurs on the final verb in the stich.}

FA adds an Islamicism to his translation, and in so doing continues the inference that somehow Job knows more about the causes of his tribulations than in the original story. The Islamicism lies in the use of الحد, which is a technical term from the shari’a for legal punishment. FA inserts this in a passage unattested in any of the other versions of Job under consideration. Indeed, being consistent with his practice in the previous stich of supplying an antecedent to a relative pronoun which, strictly speaking, is unnecessary, FA must make explicit what the other versions can leave implicit. But this, of course, requires a conscious decision as to what the antecedent will convey semantically, and الحد, as FA’s antecedent, is replete with theological, legalistic, and Islamic connotations. Thus, instead of simply reading 'That which I have feared...', FA has Job lament: 'I have come to the [legal] punishment of which I have feared'. The One who punishes, of course, can be none other than God in this instance, and Job appears to assume, at least for the moment, that there is some measure of guilt on his own part.

Interestingly, in TH an extensive passage is given over precisely to God’s forgiveness of Job. The tone is non-judgmental, however, with the passage taking on the air of a general dispensation for sinfulness rather than a rehearsal of specific sins and their pardon.

Verse 26a

MT

שלי הוא, ולא-שקפה.
While all three Arabic versions stay close to the intent of the MT, using different but synonymous roots to cover the semantic area for 'rest', 'quiet', and 'repose', FA adds an extra prepositional phrase at the end of the stich, making explicit what is already known by those following the story: Job has neither rest nor peace due to the acuteness of his physical afflictions. Adding the closing phrase 'because of the intensity of the pain' borders on the excessive.

Verse 26b

SG avails himself of the same vocabulary item he used in 10b, بلاء, 'tribulation', to translate a different Hebrew word. While this is not unusual for a translator, given changes of context and implication, in so doing here SG is able to parallel the stylistic closing to the first section of this chapter, concerning Job's malediction, with that of this second section, Job's lament.

TF comes to the same conclusion as did FA at 25b, viz., that Job seems to sense that God is the author of his punishment. The pivotal word is from the root *רַז, which as a noun refers to a divinely visited plague or pestilence. Thus TF simply states: 'Pestilence has been visited upon me'.

FA's closure is not unlike TF's. Rather than following the Pesh, FA reaches

---

92 The root here is cognate to the Hebrew term which occurs at the very same position at the end of the stich!
back to his own version of 25a for the verb 'descend / fall upon', the subject of which is 'wrath', from the root ġdb, 'be angry'. While this root is prominent in the Qur'an, especially with regard to divine anger, it is a common enough word in Arabic, and it would be too much to conclude that its presence here is necessarily an indication of an Islamicism in FA's translation.

Finally, FA adds an extra prepositional phrase at the close of this stich, parallelling the one gratuitously added at the close of 26a. While the semantic merits of this further addition may be argued, at least FA displays a sensitivity to stylistic concerns by structurally balancing the ending of both 26a and 26b.
SG, alone among the versions and in a departure from the MT, makes reference to Job by means of a third person singular pronoun attached as a direct object suffix to the verb. Otherwise, all the versions are in essential agreement, although FA's manuscript moves the second verb from the end of this verse to the beginning of 2a.

Such near unanimity among the versions, however, is not reflected in their renderings of the identity and proper name for this chapter's speaker. While SG and FA, along with both the Pesh and S–H, agree with the MT in referring to Zophar as 'the Na'amathite', TF supplies a different nisbah: 'the Matûnite'.

While TH identifies Zophar as a man of Job's own country, BM offers no genealogical identifier for Zophar here. The same is true of other, extra-canonical sources, such as the Testament of Job.

Additionally, there is no agreement among the versions regarding a standard transliteration for the name of this chapter's protagonist. Among the Arabic script versions, it is BM which approximates the MT consonantal text most closely: both ignore all vowels, while TF and FA display both vowels.

Yet, even these two latter writers differ on the velarization of the initial sibilant, while BM renders no velarization with the voiced sibilant, and TH voices it.

---

93 The LXX in turn gives yet another nisbah: ὁ Μνακης, which is also the reading of the Cp.

94 SG does the same, replicating the Hebrew in his Judeo–Arabic script.
with velarization. Thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>زفر النعمتة</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>زفر النعمتة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM</td>
<td>زفر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>سوفار المتوني</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>صوفر النعمائي</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>ظافر</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only TH's rendering of the MT's name for this comforter of Job carries an identifiably Arabic meaning: 'the victorious one'. However, de Baudissin (1870) notes some variant readings in the five manuscripts analyzed in the preparation of his edition, including زفیر, or 'zephyr'. In addition, SG's version of the name is identical to two homophonous Arabic roots, though the supposed vowelling pattern, $u-a$, does not produce a recognizable meaning.

Verse 2a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>והברת לא תענה</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>מתכלת לא יဇע</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM</td>
<td><em>from the actions more than the words</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>من يكثر الكلام يكثر له الجواب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>وقال أن الله لا يستجيب بكلثرة الكلام</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The MT and SG are virtually identical here, but the other Arabic versions strike out on their own. BM and TF parallel each other, differing only in a single vocabulary item. While there is a possibility that this is attributable to regional variations in Arabic, or perhaps to differences in linguistic register between Classical and Middle Arabic, a more convincing explanation can be found in the desire of BM to supply synonyms for 2a and 2b, while TF is more interested in preserving the epigrammatical nature of this entire verse by repeating الكلام in both stichs. Indeed,

---

95 Derenbourg (1899) contains the spelling ldap, found in the MT at 2:11.
for both BM and TF, this opening utterance of Zophar is shaped in the form of a proverb, complete with internal parallelism and balance of vocabulary and structure: 'Whosoever multiplies speech, to him will be multiplied the response'. As we shall see, this proverbial form, which is unattested by the Tg, LXX, Pesh, and S–H, is continued in the next stich. As for FA's text here, Zophar reminds Job that God is not impressed with wordiness, and is under no obligation to make a reply.

Verse 2b

MT

אֱמוֹרָיָא שְפִיטָה שָׁפַית

SG

אֱמוֹרָיָא שְפִיטָה שָׁפַית

BM

ואמה קיור הקלב עם לבר סאלב מبارك ولד אmares יחלו חייו

TF

ואמה קיור הקלב עם לבר סאלב מبارك ولד אmares יחלו חייו

FA

ואמה קיור הקלב עם לבר סאלב מبارك ولד אmares יחלו חייו

SG departs from the bodily idiom of the Hebrew. Scholars have generally noted that SG has a propensity for non-anthropomorphic imagery with regard to the Deity; here this inclination is carried over and applied to human beings: thus the MT's 'man of lips' is rendered 'one of articulate speech'. The other Arabic versions also eschew the bodily idiom despite the fact that Arabic often resorts to similar constructions, e.g., خفيف الشفة, 'one who speaks much' from the literal 'agile/light of lip'. Such expressions, including this particular one, in fact, are quite close to the rendering of the Tg.

BM and TF are not as close to each other here as in other places, even though they do employ the same triliteral root šlh in rendering the word 'virtuous' (in place of the MT's 'be justified'). But it is clear that TF is better at continuing the structure

96 The Cp comes close, however, reading "He who speaketh many words should hear the answer".
of 2a's maxim to the extent of repeating 2aα as 2bα verbatim before finishing his thought. BM is more interested in preserving the sense of the MT that a rhetorical question is involved here, introducing an interrogative particle at 2bβ.

Following the LXX, both BM and TF include what is effectively a third stich, which BM translates word-for-word from an addition found in the S-H, but not elsewhere, whereas TF, through his use of the root qlb, betrays a preference for the S-H's marginal reading for this stich.

FA's unique introduction of the negative in 2a is deftly paralleled here by the negation of 2b's verb in his version. The result is a syntactical structure that is far from that of the MT; the resulting meaning in FA, while not contrary to the spirit of the Hebrew and the other Arabic versions, displays a freeness and independence of thought more characteristic of paraphrase than of translation.

### Verse 3a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>אֲנִי מָעֶשֶׂה יְזַדָּמָשׁ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>אֵלֶּךָ תִּקְרָר אָדוֹנָיָם</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM</td>
<td>וְלֹא תִּקְרָר קְרִים הָכֹלָם</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>לֹא יִקְרָר קְרִים הָכֹלָם</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>قد يُصْلِتُ مِن كَلَامِكَا السَّامِعُون كَالْمُوَتِّي *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SG makes two intriguing vocabulary choices in this stich. His use of an augmented plural of a collective noun for 'men' adds extra emphasis to Zophar's characterization of Job as an arresting (and therefore deceptive) speaker, for many there be who are taken in by his rhetoric. In addition, the verb from msk literally means 'grasp / hold fast / adhere', but in certain contexts it carries the idiomatic meaning of 'hold in check', i.e., one's tongue. The Pesh conveys similar meaning, though in the very

---

97 The difficulty encountered by 'Iyyād (1967) is clarified by BM.
98 To be sure, an alternative reading uses the simple plural of the collective noun, which is adopted in a similar passage at 11:11a.
different context of the thought that the dead are the only ones who can hold their tongues in check.  

BM and TF diverge markedly, largely in tandem with the LXX, from both the MT and SG as well as from the Pesh. In so doing, they continue to echo the vocabulary, though not the structure, of the proverbial maxim of 2a.

FA adopts the Pesh's reference to the dead, in itself perhaps a misreading of the MT's הים 'men' as פנים 'dead'. It should be noted, however, that FA's grammatical construction differs considerably from the rest of the Pesh's rendering of the stich: due to Job's speech, those who listen are silenced, as though they were dead.

Verse 3b

MT
SG
BM
TF
FA

SG's version, as well as the Tg, appears to be wordier than the MT, but the addition of extra prepositions and adverbs simply makes this stich more precise in its meaning, if less poetic in form.

BM and TF continue to follow the LXX: there is no mention of mockery or shame, as in the MT, or the other Arabic versions.

The insertion of an extra stich in the Pesh, reflected in FA, is unattested in the MT, LXX, and the other Arabic versions. However, a marginal reading in the S–H may be the precedent for FA's additional thought, which reads, 'You speak, and he

---

99 Cf. FA's treatment of this stich, below.
100 FA employs the active participle as the subject.
As in 2b, SG in 4b replaces the anthropomorphic imagery of the MT, 'in your eyes', with the more neutral 'in your opinion'. The question is, to whose opinion does this refer? The MT, with the Tg, understands God as the One who would be granting justification or vindication. SG can be read similarly; indeed, despite the lack of vowels in the Arabic (which can thus admit to the possibility of self-justification), the shift in person from the conjugation of the verb in the first singular to the direct object pronoun occurring in the second singular in the MT is, no doubt, the model SG had in mind, thus: 'And I was pure\textsuperscript{102} in Your eyes'.

The possible ambiguity occasioned by the lack of short vowels in the consonantalscript is eliminated in BM and TF by changes in wording. Though differing in the prepositional phrase with which they end the verse regarding the Lord, these two versions parallel each other in mentioning the Lord explicitly. This, to be sure, is not the only departure in wording from the MT or from any of the other Arabic versions in this verse. For example, BM and TF, with the LXX, S–H and Cp (though not the Pesh) open with a negative imperative at the outset of

\textsuperscript{101} FA adopts the very same circumlocution in this stich; see below.

\textsuperscript{102} Reading \textit{יוֹלֵךְ} with Derenbourg (1899) here rather than \textit{יוֹלָכָה} with Qapah (1970): 'pure' is to be preferred to 'clever'.

\textsuperscript{103} BM utilizes an idiom which is translated word-for-word from the anthropomorphic Hebrew, while TF uses an equivalent prepositional phrase, anthropomorphically neutral, favored in Egypt. This expression's preposition also shares the same root, \textit{qdm}, as the one found in the S–H.
the verse, 'don't say'. They are also careful to describe innocence by means of a negative circumlocution for 'blameless', thus echoing the LXX's ἁμαρτος, which uses the alpha privative prefix. The only other difference between these two versions is the use of the preposition " ב" in BM following the opening verb. The result is to soften a flat declaration to the making of an allegation or broaching an opinion.

FA's version has Zophar accuse Job of engaging in the impiety of self-justification, as though God were irrelevant. This is achieved by keeping the second stich entirely in the second person singular, the antecedent to which is then the stich's opening verb. Thus 4b can only refer to activities of Job himself: 'You say that you have been pure, in your opinion'. In this, FA appears to be dependent upon the Pesh for meaning, if not for structure. Whatever the textual precedent, however, to translate this stich in such a manner fits in well with FA's theology, found sprinkled throughout the Book of Job, that God is Fully Sovereign; to attribute any role of justification or vindication to a creature of the Creator is simply erroneous theology.

Finally, the only other similarity in FA to other versions can been seen in terms of the occurrence of the root zky, which appears at one point or another in this verse in all the Arabic versions.

Verse 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>נלכזמ לאל נלכזא לאל רתה נלכזאה נלכזאה</th>
<th>ימהז שפתה יעך:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>לאל נלכזא לאל רתה נלכזאה נלכזאה</td>
<td>ימהז שפתה יעך:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM</td>
<td>וكيف لك נتكلم את אם יفتح شفتה הילק</td>
<td>ولكن לייט קאן את תبارك ויימני יتكلم *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>איך לק (ק) יتكلم את אם יفتح שפתה הילק</td>
<td>ויהיב וינאף תקמה שמטר את הילק בשמתיه *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>ולכזא רתה נלכזאה נלכזאה נלכזאה</td>
<td>ימהז שפתה יעך:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

104 This phenomenon also occurs at 22:19 (p. 176, n. 221).
105 For a full discussion, see the Conclusions (p. 389/).
SG's language concerning the Deity is characteristically more figurative here than that of the MT, reading 'began his testimony' rather than 'opened his lips'.

Neither BM nor TF evade the anthropomorphism, and their texts virtually duplicate each another, with TF using the plural where BM employs the singular for 'lip'.

FA plays with his text, explicitly parallelling the Deity's desired utterance with that of humankind: 'as a man speaks with his lips'. Another departure by FA is his insertion after the word 'God' the parenthetical 'may He be blessed and exalted', a characteristically Muslim phrase. His text uses the same optative particle as that employed by SG: لَتَلَكَ، while BM and TF use a less formal turn of phrase, كيف لكَ?, 'How would it be with you?'.

Verse 6a

Unsurprisingly, all the Arabic versions agree on the lexical item for 'wisdom', but do not reach a consensus on the opening verb of the stich. SG chooses the root xbr, 'inform'; BM and TF agree on 'lm, 'teach', while FA selects the root zhr, 'enlighten'. Clearly these are synonymous, ultimately reflecting no major theological variations.

Otherwise, BM and TF provide the only other major occasion for comment in this stich, following the LXX and Cp in translating the first term of the construct as
'power'. While this strays from the MT's 'secrets', which is kept in SG and FA\textsuperscript{106} it helps make sense of the reference to 'doubling' which occurs in a parallel position in 6b. The only difference between BM and TF is found in their choice of opening conjunction, with BM more accurately reflecting the LXX in its choice of the sequential ثم.

Verse 6b

| MT        | כִּיֶּפֶלָהוּ תַּעַדְּשֵׁה | וְזִמְצָמְיָה הַתְּשׁוֹבָה הָלֶכֶת  
SG        |                        | כאשר תصف מהفىقبلק  
BM        |                        | חנה יضعفךقبلק  
TF        |                        | מַעְרֵשֵׁה שֵׁנֵבֵי רֲפֵי  
FA        |                        | * מַעְרֵשֵׁה שֵׁנֵבֵי רֲפֵי

It is generally acknowledged that the major difficulty in the Hebrew of this stich is occasioned by the occurrence of בְּכֵלֵים, the root of which refers to 'doubling', followed by הָרִישָׁה; a literal translation might be 'for double with regard to understanding'. This is obviously awkward, even when understood as a follow-on to 6a's 'And He will declare to you the secrets of wisdom'. The Arabic versions reveal whether sense can be made of this without radical textual emendation.

SG keeps the notion of 'doubling' by his use of the plural of 'manifold' from the root בְּכֵלֵים, which also appears in BM. Likewise, the MT's 'counsel' is rendered 'comprehension / knowledge' from the root פִּקּוֹד. Thus SG keeps close to the Tg, yielding 'for truly the comprehension of it (i.e., wisdom, mentioned in 6a) is many times as much as that (i.e., Job's many words; cf. 2a).

BM ignores the issue of multiplicity, departing not only from the MT, but also

\footnote{106 Albeit with different roots: $ghy$ as opposed to $srr$, respectively.}
the LXX. De Baudissin (1870)\textsuperscript{107} suggests that the appearance of تُسْعَف is simply an error, and proposes an emendation representing the passive imperfect from the same root found in SG, as well as TF, thus: تُسْعَف. But BM is not the only version of this stich that encounters difficulty with the notion of 'doubling'. The Pesh reads 'chambers'; Lamsa's 1985 translation interprets this as an attempt to reference the 'inner chambers' of wisdom, emphasizing not only its plurality, but also its hiddenness. The S–H makes no mention of doubling at all; in fact, its marginal remark speaks of the 'indescribability' of the power of wisdom, which raises the question as to whether de Baudissin's emendation of تُسْعَف, 'describes', to 'doubling' to harmonize BM with SG and the LXX, is entirely warranted.\textsuperscript{108} So while the entire sense of the equivalent stich in the S–H is far from that of BM, the possibility of a point of contact in this confused passage is clear.

TF, like BM, makes reference to the heart, presumably as the seat of understanding. This veiled reference to comprehension thus puts TF and BM in close harmony with the LXX, though they are not entirely estranged at this point from the MT, Tg, and SG.

As is often the case, FA takes a novel approach when faced with a difficult text: he makes no reference at all, with the LXX, to 'doubling'; but FA's translation is distant from that of the Greek: 'on account of the fact that [you say] there is a substitute for wisdom'. The mention of a 'substitute', \textit{i.e.}, an alternative or change, may be a reference to 'doubling'. The root \textit{bdl}, 'replace / exchange', admits to such a possibility.

\textsuperscript{107} P. 47, note 5.

\textsuperscript{108} To be sure, de Baudissin makes reference to the S–H's use of 'bend', which he suggests conveys the idea of 'doubling', as further support for his emendation.
Verse 6c

All versions agree with the MT that 6c speaks of divine judgment, with SG and BM following the sense of the Hebrew fairly closely; it is TF and FA which strike out on their own in making a subtle but significant theological departure from the intentions of the MT.

The question centers on the issue of how the action of God is to be characterized. Habel (1985) notes that the Hebrew verb can be derived from two homophonomous roots: niy. One of these, 'forget', has a direct cognate in Arabic's nsy. None of the Arabic versions, however, employ the cognate. Yet, it is this sense that TF and FA may be suggesting in their final clause that God is less concerned with judgment of sin than with absolution therefrom.

TF and FA use two different but synonymous verbs in their translations: the choice of TF is from the root ḥll, 'absolve'. It should be noted that this verb is favored in Arab Christianity to describe priestly as well as divine activity.

FA seizes this opportunity for further interpretative work. In his version, God is not only grammatically active but as such is the subject of a verb derived from the root ǧfr. In choosing this root, FA passes over typically Christian vocabulary, selecting the standard Qur'anic root for both petitioning and receiving divine absolution.

---

109 All the Arabic versions agree in using the same term for 'God' at this point.
110 To be sure, TF and SG concur, adopting the grammar of the MT as well as the Tg and Pesh; placing God as the object of the preposition in BM reflects usage as found in the LXX.
It is unusual to have TF agree with FA against BM as at 6c. This proves to be temporary. Most obviously, SG and FA, along with the Tg and Pesh, continue to use the generic Arabic term for God; BM and TF, in agreement with the LXX and S–H, change to 'the Lord'. In addition, there are two other points of note:

While both the MT and SG have Zophar ask a direct question, the other three versions employ different linguistic devices. FA is more paraphrastic in his Arabic, using لعلك, 'Perhaps you...', which not only softens the question, but is used in this instance to introduce reflective, indirect speech. BM and TF both employ هل تراك, which translates roughly as 'Does it appear to you...?' or 'Would you say that...?'

The approach to the MT's phrase تلاخ זפוז also betrays differences among the Arabic versions in that BM and TF choose to translate the LXX literally, 'traces of the Lord', while FA prefers a less ambiguous turn of phrase: 'the secrets of God'. As for SG, his use of a construct phrase, 'the limit of the knowledge of God', is a bit more wordy than that which we have come to expect, but parallels his equivalent construct in 7b while heightening the precision of his understanding of the MT.
As noted in 7a, SG expands somewhat on the MT in his use of a compound construct in this stich, thus interpreting the Hebrew’s 'limit of the Almighty’ as 'the reach of the power of the All-Sufficient'. His use of a verb with both literal and figurative meanings from the root \( b\ell\hat{g} \), 'attain / reach’, finds concurrence in a similarly wide-ranging root, \( w\ell \), for FA’s 'arrive / get to the point of'.

BM and TF are relatively terse in this stich, and echo the meaning of the LXX, but with more economy of expression: 'Or [do] you know everything the Almighty created?'.

FA’s wordiness in this stich is due both to his own interpretive efforts, as in his closing phrase 'that which God desires', as well as in his following the semantic lead of the S-H, for example, in positing a verb 'attain / go to / reach', as noted in the discussion of SG’s treatment of this stich. However, alone among the Arabic versions and in contradistinction to the MT, Tg, LXX, Pesh, and S-H, FA continues to prefer to continue using the common word for 'God’, while in possibly coincidental instances he shares with SG the use of two roots, \( \hat{g}\ell y \) and \( q\ell d r \), albeit at different points in the stich. The second of these roots has Islamic echoes, especially in the context of the controversy over human freedom and divine sovereignty; here Zophar can be seen as implicitly endorsing the orthodox Muslim position, since only God, not humans, is endowed with \( q\ell d r \). This is consistent with FA’s own theological bent.

Verse 8

111Cf. the LXX and S-H; the Pesh here does not use a verb of motion, preferring instead 'stand'.

108
While all the Arabic versions concur on the term to translate the MT’s 'heavens', SG is unique in his treatment of 'Sheol', preferring the root θry, which refers more to soil or ground rather than to the Underworld per se. Another area of agreement among the Arabic script versions over against SG is the use of the root rf for expressing 'height' as opposed to śmx; the former root’s connotations are in the semantic range of 'elevate / erect / be prestigious', while the latter is 'loom / be arrogant'.

While SG is careful to retain the structure of each stich as a statement containing an elative adjective followed by a question, both BM and TF, along with FA, make the whole of the second stich interrogative. In this, BM and TF preserve the semantics of the MT, if not its poetic structure. FA, however, treats both interrogative phrases similarly, and therefore succeeds in keeping parallel structures in both stichs. The symmetry thus achieved is somewhat marred, however, by the addition of a prepositional phrase at the end of the first stich, thus making explicit what it is the heavens are far from: the ground.112

Additionally, BM and TF miss the opportunity of keeping the concepts of 'height of the heavens' parallel to 'depth of Hell', preferring to cite 'that which is under Hell'. While the results are faithful to the meaning of the MT, a poetic opportunity has been lost.

Finally, it must be noted that BM and TF are identical to each other except for

112 It is perhaps in this mention of 'ground' that we can find a rationale behind SG’s substitution of 'soil' for 'Sheol' in the second stich, especially if he understands the first element more in terms of theologically neutral 'skies' rather than 'heavens'.
the latter's resort to a non-classical contraction, אני, in place of BM's more properly grammatical interrogative phrase איז.

Verse 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>אררת מאיים מרה ורחבת מנייה:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>נגמודה ממלאים ממאותה ומפיים ממלאה:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM</td>
<td>אם גבעת ידמות ארת אם תתרח חמש י/MIT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| TF            | אם גבעת ידומה ארת: ימיד ארת קמר עט עט המע עט배 *
| FA            |

SG is consistent with the basic structures he employed in the previous verse in that he continues the parallel use of elative adjectives in each stich, though the interrogatives have now been dropped, as they no longer occur in the MT. FA does the same with elative adjectives, though the device is new for his translation of this verse, having followed other grammatical structures previously. Semantically, FA and SG are both close to the Hebrew here.

BM and TF, however, pose questions rather than make statements. And their questions imply a further criticism of Job's apparent arrogance, this time not with regard to Divine knowledge, but concerning his own human experience: 'And have you gone to the ends of the earth, or do you yourself know how broad the sea is?'

Such a challenge, of course, anticipates the Voice from the Whirlwind at 38:5a, 8-11, and 18a.

Verse 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>אמי- pcm לכינר וחקל והשימן:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>אמי וה בצלר רוחה והשלום והם לא יראת:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM</td>
<td>אנ הרב אقلب כל שמי מינימ לאי שמי סממע</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

113 The first emphasis is explicit in BM, but not in TF; the opposite obtains for the second emphatic use of the personal pronoun.
This verse, consisting of a conditional phrase (stich one) followed by its result clause (stich two), has occasioned three differing translations among the Arabic versions:

SG follows the MT virtually word-for-word. In so doing he resists the approach of the Tg, which supplies direct objects to the verbs in question in an attempt to elucidate the effects of divine activity.

BM and TF avoid the ambiguities resulting from the presence of so many verbs without attendant objects, condensing all three divine actions of the MT into one, resulting in this translation of the first stich: "Should the Lord overthrow everything". This differs from the Pesh, but is consistent with the approach of the LXX, S-H, and Cp.

Interestingly, both BM and TF contain non-classical Arabic at the close of this verse. BM's non-standard Arabic is found in just about the only place where one might expect it in a text that toes the line of classical grammar fairly consistently: in a quotation. TF differs structurally from BM in that the verb of the second stich is not 'who shall say', but 'who can be equal', with a following occurrence of the word 'saying' being understood implicitly. The saying itself which follows also contains a non-standard Arabic interrogative, though it differs from that of BM.

FA attempts to elucidate the MT by ignoring the opening verb 'moves on', glossing the second verb so that the MT's 'imprisons / shuts up / delivers up' becomes 'gains mastery', and in doing so deftly parallels the second verb with the third so that MT's 'summons' becomes 'gathers up / gathers together' paralleling 'gains mastery'. In so doing FA eliminates any potential ambiguities from detracting from one of his central theological points, which Zophar makes so explicitly here, i.e., that God in His sovereignty is beyond challenge.

This theological perspective is underlined by FA's use of the root rdd. While
SG employs the very same root at the very same point in his translation, he does so using the Third Form of the verb, which implies some sort of parlay or exchange of words. FA’s use of Form One rejects that possibility: there is no mutuality or give-and-take when it comes to humankind vis-à-vis God.

Verse 11a

MT

SG

BM

TF

FA

SG is consistent in his choice of vocabulary here, once again resorting to the root מחלל for the plural of the collective noun to translate the construct form from מחלל, as at 3a. In so doing, SG’s version remains the only one in Arabic which correctly interprets this lexical item of the Hebrew.¹¹₄

BM and TF replace the MT’s construct ‘men of falsehood’ with ‘works of darkness’; which provides a closer parallel with their translations of 11b. In this they follow the first portion of the LXX’s equivalent phrase, "works of transgressors”. Similarly, the Cp at this point reads "works of the wicked”.

FA’s approach is unique among the Arabic versions. One is led to conjecture whether FA had access to the original in Hebrew script, due to the presence of the Arabic מתי, 'when', which is a consonant–for–consonant rendering of the MT’s למאי, 'men', at the head of the construct phrase at the end of the stich. As previously noted at 3a, this Hebrew item has been the occasion for mistranslations in all the Arabic script versions. But whatever the reason for the presence of מתי, FA renders

---

¹¹₄ The Tg and S–H also approximate the MT, the first reading 'the false man', the second 'the servant of unlawfulness'.
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the entire stich thus: 'For He is the One who knows when the time of passing/succession will be...'. In this, his translation generally reflects the sense of the Pesh,\footnote{"For it is He Who knows the beginning of time".} but not that of the LXX, S-H, or Cp.

Verse 11b

| MT | דִּרְכֵּיָם לָאֵלָא יִנָּבֹלֶנְתָּ | ַלַּאֵלָא יִנָּבֹלֶנְתָּ |
| SG | וָּרַכְיֵיָם לָאֵלָא נָבָהלְנָתָּ | נָבָהלְנָתָּ |
| BM | וָּרַכְיֵיָם לָאֵלָא נָבָהלְנָתָּ | נָבָהלְנָתָּ |
| TF | וָּרַכְיֵיָם לָאֵלָא נָבָהלְנָתָּ | נָבָהלְנָתָּ |
| FA | וָּרַכְיֵיָם לָאֵלָא נָבָהלְנָתָּ | נָבָהלְנָתָּ |

Perhaps the absence of an explicit interrogative in the MT has confused SG here, for he does not have two verbs in this stich, both of which have God as their subject. Instead, SG begins the stich with a verb, but ends it with a participial construct clause which stands in apposition to the object of the first verb. In fact, for SG the direct object of the first verb is no longer the concept of evil, but rather a construct phrase deftly paralleling the direct object of his verb in 11a. Thus he translates 'and He sees people of unsuspected malice', with the negative particle of the MT no longer negating a verb, the subject of which is God, but negating a participle as the first word of a construct phrase modifying 'malice'.

BM, along with the LXX, Pesh, and Cp, also fails to recognize that this stich originally contains a question. In fact, about the only grammatical or lexical feature that BM retains of the MT is the presence of an emphatic negative particle, לָאֵלָא. In fact, for all the liberties BM displays in the language and structure of this stich, the result is conceptually faithful to the general sense of the MT: 'The paths of the hypocrites are not hidden from Him'.

TF alone among the Arabic versions supplies an interrogative and thus, like the MT, poses a question in the second half of the stich. But there is no presence of a
negative. Like BM, the subject of the main verb is a construct phrase, 'paths of the hypocrites', which parallels the construct used in both of these versions in 11a, 'works of darkness' (see above). The presence of this construct at the beginning of the stich does not follow the word order of the Hebrew, nor does it represent the usual word order of Arabic; the result is to draw extra attention, supplying added emphasis, to this subject of the verb.

While FA may miss the presence of a question in this stich, his alone among the Arabic versions supplies two parallel verbal sentences, adding a direct object to the second one: 'He sees the sin, and knows its doer'. That the object of the second verb is in the form of a participle means that all of the Arabic versions contain, at one point or another, a participle in this stich. Since present participles in Arabic generally imply habitual or incomplete action, the focus is thus on serious offenders of divine law, serious in that their transgressions are multiple. FA, like the other Arabic script versions, also abandons standard Arabic word order at the beginning of this stich. In so doing, FA draws attention to his subject. But unlike BM and TF, the subject is not the sinner, but God Himself. In this FA is in agreement with the LXX, Pesh, S-H, and Cp.

### Verse 12

| MT | 오예시 네브하 라바 móc פרג הרא קרל되: |
| SG | ורל' בלאמהו גהלב |
| BM | הרל' פארמכא מש ורש א' קרל: |
| TF | הרגל רוחיל מצלון אין עהל عنه |
| FA | ואמה הרגל ערצקי ויתשח' ויתכוי בין ידיה |

116 It should be noted that the Pesh also fails to include a negative in its treatment of this stich, whereas negatives in one form or another appear in the Tg, LXX, S-H, and Cp.
Just as the Tg, LXX, Pesh, and S-H all deal with this verse differently, all four Arabic versions revise the MT to a greater or lesser extent. Faced with obvious difficulties, SG is not inclined to follow the MT (or the Tg) slavishly, and in the end his results are not all that different, conceptually, from those of BM and TF, which follow each other in tandem, almost word-for-word. As for FA, once again it is he who is the most imaginative in his treatment of the text.

SG's translation argues that despite the appearances of the maturing process, mortals know next to nothing: 'A man appears to be intelligent by wisdom, yet that man is like a wild donkey when it is born'. In doing so, SG has assumed that the Hebrew הַיּוֹם has the same meaning as its Arabic cognate root, which he puts in the dissimulative verbal pattern, Form Five (in Judeo-Arabic, MS5b: 'seem to be intelligent').

BM and TF translate: 'Man in his imagination thinks he gets away from Him, but every person born of a woman is like a wild donkey' (TF: '...like a wild ram'). Like SG, these two versions argue that maturity does not bring wisdom, but imply that the (grown) man only thinks he has increased in maturity, whereas in truth he has not risen above his condition of infantile ignorance.

FA is the farthest removed from the MT, making an interesting double entendre on the Hebrew הַיּוֹם, which he renders into Arabic as 'be encouraged / heartened', while apparently using an opportunity to insert an Islamicism, 'He who is Mighty'. In the process, the subject of FA's second stich is no longer the 'pure man' of the first, but is God Himself instead. Thus: 'As for the pure man, he will

---

117 The Cp follows the LXX closely, however.

118 Strictly speaking, 'the Mighty One', which is one of the ninety-nine names of God in Islam, would require the definite article; FA omits it here.
be encouraged and empowered in His presence, and He Who is Mighty by His power aids humankind.’ Thus once again FA introduces God at a point when his theology of divine sovereignty can be restated, even if the divine presence is missing from the Hebrew or possible predecessor versions in this stich.

Though FA may be far from the MT, his translation is reminiscent of that of the Pesh, which reads 'For a pure man inspires courage, and a mighty man helps others'. Since 'mighty' in the Pesh is virtually cognate to the Arabic, the occasion for linguistic influence and cross-over is clear.

Verse 13

All versions are in essential agreement with the MT in initiating a lengthy conditional clause with an emphatic pronoun at the beginning of this verse. The Arabic versions are also remarkably consistent with each other.

SG does not use the obvious verb for the MT's 'stretch out (your hands)', selecting the root bst, 'unfold, flatten' rather than mdd, 'extend, spread', as in the Arabic script versions. The nuance is that SG's root implies a certain naturalness, as if one's hands are more usually open rather than clenched, while the meaning of the root of the other versions sees the action described as being more self-conscious or deliberate.

BM and TF follow each other word-for-word with the exception of 'hand', which TF, like SG, makes dual, whereas the MT, BM, and FA employ the singular.

---

119 The S-H, as well as the LXX, keeps close to the MT here, referring to a xmrā dbryā, 'wild donkey'.

120 The Pesh reads inbr, which is derived from jbr, the same root as FA's jbār.
Their choice of the past perfect for the verb is not replicated in the other Arabic versions; this assures that any ambiguity occasioned by the use of the conditional particle, which generally is followed by the perfect, is eliminated: setting one's self aright is a prerequisite for divine favor.\textsuperscript{121}

FA introduces a second verb to the first stich, echoing his first. What is interesting in FA's choices for both verbs is that his first one is identical to that of SG, while the second is derived from the same root, \textit{nqy}, 'be pure', as the predicate adjective found at the end of the first stich in both BM and TF.

\textbf{Verse 14}

\begin{verbatim}
MT אָסַּרְתָּ בֵּדְרָךְ הַרְחִיקוֹתָּ וַאֲלָלְתֶּם בַּאֲלָלָיוֹ שִׁלָּחְתָּ:  
SG אַלּ נַעֲמַּת נַעֲמַּת נַעֲמַּת נַעֲמַּת נַעֲמַּת נַעֲמַּת נַעֲמַּת נַעֲmַּת ن
SG: 
BM: 
TF: 
FA: 

The MT's continuation of Zophar's prescription for Job's rehabilitation is shadowed mostly closely by SG, which shares the MT's characteristic, with BM and TF, of shifting from the conditional to the imperative mid-verse. For these three Arabic versions, the recognition of evil, and the rectification to be undertaken in response thereto, are Job's responsibility. These versions employ synonymous verbal expressions regarding 'distancing', SG using the root \textit{b'd}, 'separate', while BM has \textit{df'}, 'repudiate' and TF chooses \textit{rmy}, 'cast (away)'.

TF's is the wordiest of the Arabic language versions, though its affinity with BM is clear, and the departures therefrom appear due, at least in part, to attempts to

\textsuperscript{121}Incidentally, these two versions neglect to decline the predicate adjective in the accusative, as the presence of the auxiliary verb 'be', occasioned by the use of the past perfect, requires in strict, classical usage.
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make sense of a difficult reading. By reversing two consonants, TF reads قلبك, 'your heart', for BM's قبلك, 'before you'.122 In addition to this difference with BM, TF adds an extra prepositional phrase at the close of the first stich, emphasizing the full extent to which one's offenses are to be removed from oneself.

FA is unique among the Arabic versions, employing the indicative exclusively, rather than the conditional followed by the imperative, thus: 'That which was, He will distance123 from you; and that which was sin within you, He will reveal to you.' Clearly, FA is continuing the theme, begun in verse 12 (see above), of divine action and grace towards the individual, verse 14 representing a consequence or outcome of following the advice of Zophar. Once having made this theological point, FA can then return to dealing with the original image, as will be seen in his treatment of the next two verses.

Verses 15 and 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>نيما تأنا تأنا متيمة مدمم فلا تارف: בַּלָּא תִּרְךָוּ מֵאָם.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>פָּאַלֶךָ חֲדַנֶךָ הָרְפֵּדַא וֹוַר מִצְּוֶךָ אַל תִּשְׁמְרֵךְ מֵאָם לָא חֵבֶךָ: לִטְרוֹר אַנְּתָה חָנָם שֵׁקָאְךָ וּתִלְכֶּרֶךָ כָּמָּם בְּכָר.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM</td>
<td>וְכִזִּכְלוֹנִיהָ וַגִּבְהַּ מַלָּא הַמַּכִּפֶּא הַוָּסִף פְּרָּסֹא הָעֵצָה בַּלָּא תָּחְפֵּר: חֵי נָשִּׁי יְבֹזֵּע עַנְּךָ הָעֶמֶּגֶּל בְּלָא תָּחְפֵּר.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>וַכִּיָּכָל בִּיהָ וַגְּבָהָ מַלָּא הַמַּכִּפֶּא הַוָּסִף בֶּלָּא תָּחְפֵּר.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>וְכִזִּכְלוֹנִיהָ וַגִּבְהַּ מַלָּא הַמַּכִּפֶּא בְּלָא תָּחְפֵּר.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

122 TF's result may be seen as corresponding more closely to the MT and LXX, given the use of the verb 'lodge'; BM's 'sleep', however, is not far off the mark, especially if the nuance 'lie (in wait)' is understood.
123 The root here is the same one, b'd, employed by SG in the second stich.
What appears to be a fairly straightforward Hebrew text provides several renderings, with SG alone remaining consistently close to the MT. The other versions (especially BM and TF) confuse, or perhaps conflate, the images in these two verses, which are therefore discussed here in tandem.

Only by comparing the obscured ms of TF to the text of BM can one be assured that the parallelism of these two versions continues in this passage. Both BM and TF early on introduce the image in this passage of pure flowing water (it appears in verse 16 of the MT), elaborating this figure with the idea of washing away iniquity. Thus BM: 'Likewise your face will be as beautiful as pure water; filth will fall away from you; you will not fear. At that time fatigue will pass from you like the wave; you will not fear.'

FA picks up the image of 'sin in your tent', which had been left out of his translation of verse 14, and introduces it at v. 15, which thus reads: 'However, leave behind the sin in your house; thereupon stretch out your hand, and you will not fear evil or distress.' Having, then, treated the image he had not sufficiently dealt with earlier, FA resumes a closer approximation of the MT, introducing the concept of water which flows (away), and is thus forgotten. However, even here FA elaborates upon the image as found in the Hebrew: the water is not only forgotten because it has flowed by, but also because the flow itself has ceased.

Verse 17

| MT | ומשאריס יקומך חלך הטפה בצקר רוחה |
| SG | ז(rr) אַלפָּהוֹת יָבֵא תָּמַר כַּמָּה תָּלְעָה פָּנֶיהָ תָּפַלְאָה |
| BM | ותַּבְּרֵי סָלָק שְׁבֵּה הַצָּהָרָה וְתַנְשֵׁר עלָיוֹ הַחַיָּה נָעַפְּת הַנָּהָר |
| TF | וְתַבָּרֵי סָלָק מַלְחַי הַצָּהָרָה וְתַנְשֵׁר אֵלֶּה הַחַיָּה נָעַפְּת הַנָּהָר |
| FA | וַתַּנְּהֵשׁ מִנְּהַר הַשָּׁרָפֶּה * וְיָשַׁר הַפְּלָא לְפָנָיו * וַיְשַׁר הַפְּלָא בְּלֵיל הַנֶּפֶשׁ |

114 The LXX and Cp contain this image; it is missing, however, from the Tg, Pesh, and S-H.
SG is in close agreement with the MT, as is TF with BM; FA's rendition, however, once again lags (see the discussion of the previous passage), finally coming around to treating the image of soil found earlier in the other versions, though in a rather different context.

BM and TF introduce the idea of one's prayer shining like a ray of light to the first stich, and then agree with SG over against the MT and FA in the second half of the verse. Thus SG: 'Indeed, you will shine and become like morning'; BM and TF: 'Life\textsuperscript{125} will dawn upon you like the noon-day'.\textsuperscript{126}

FA cannot resist his focus on God as the primary actor, even after switching to the second person singular in the first stich as Zophar describes Job's condition were the latter to become the recipient of divine favor. In fact, the first stich makes it clear that Job's regeneration will be permanent; thus God is still the effective agent, if not the grammatical subject. In so doing, FA redirects the image of soil washed away by pure waters to something quite different.\textsuperscript{127} Job will arise from the dust\textsuperscript{128} everlastingingly, and the fog or mist\textsuperscript{129} will become as day. FA may very well be hinting at a bodily resurrection, an idea which is certainly explicit in the Tg.\textsuperscript{130}

Thus FA rejoins the MT in the closing stich, where his imagery bespeaks the transformation of gloom into brightness. He does so in a most adept manner, creating a poetic parallel unknown to the Hebrew text, or indeed any of the other Arabic versions: the pair 'dust / light' is paralleled by 'obscurity / clarity'.

\textsuperscript{125} The implication is 'fullness of life'.
\textsuperscript{126} The editor of TF has misread the ms, making the verb masculine. This error results in a largely meaningless text.
\textsuperscript{127} The imagery employed at this point is also found in the Pesh, which finds its precedent in the Tg.
\textsuperscript{128} The Pesh reads 'pit', a possible reference to either the underworld or, more literally, the grave.
\textsuperscript{129} Pesh: "thick darkness".
\textsuperscript{130} Mangan (1991), p. 41, n. 16.
All of the Arabic versions make good sense of the MT, providing assurance to the repentent. Virtually the only real difference among the Arabic versions in this stich centers upon the verb: SG chooses the Fifth Form of the root  \( w\theta q \), 'proceed with confidence', while BM and TF share the Eighth Form of  \( wkl \), 'rely, trust'.\(^{131}\) FA at first sight seems a bit more forceful here, selecting 'lm, 'know', though it should be pointed out that in the parallel stich, he resorts to SG's root choice from 18a,  \( w\theta q \), for a synonym. Perhaps FA understands the root in question to mean 'perceive / discern', which are  \( bona fide \) alternatives to 'know', and are closer to the other versions' less absolutist vocabulary choices. All four Arabic versions agree on the exact same vocabulary item,  \( رجا \), to render the MT's  \( רָאוֹתָה \), 'hope'.\(^{132}\)

In this stich, SG elucidates by elaboration, adding a third verb at the close of the

---

\(^{131}\) Both BM and TF miss the accusative ending on the participle after the verb 'be', required by classical Arabic. In addition, the occurrence of  \( بار \) in TF in place of BM's  \( بيان \) may be ascribed to a corruption, all the more apparent at 18b.

\(^{132}\) In a parallel development, the Pesh and S–H also agree with each other on the vocabulary item in question.
verse: 'and when you set up a tent, you will repose in it and be secure'.

BM is more figurative in its treatment of the second stich: 'and from worry and sorrow He will see you to safety'. And while TF's ms is somewhat obscured, a comparison with BM reveals that the two versions probably differ only in the prepositional phrase, with TF making plural the pronominal object of the preposition. If so, both TF and BM follow the LXX and S–H in terms of meaning, but do so by adopting the word order of the latter.

FA is even more abstract at the close of this verse, and is uncharacteristically terse: 'and you will rely on that [hope]. For once, paraphrase has led to brevity.

Verse 19

The first stich shows general agreement among the Arabic versions vis-à-vis the MT, though some divergence appears grammatically and semantically in treating the MT's participle at its close. Grammatically, FA changes the part of speech in question to a verb; semantically, the areas range from SG's relatively mild 'disturb' (with the Tg, 'disturb', and not far from the Pesh, 'frighten') to BM's and TF's 'combat' (agreement with the LXX and S–H is obvious in this choice) to FA's 'destroy'. Clearly, the degree of opposition varies, but the basic concept is consistent.

The second stich displays more variety. SG understands the MT's רכיב to refer to 'many'. This is also the understanding of FA. This, however, is minor in

---

133 The Tg and Pesh have somewhat similar readings, though without the addition of an extra verb.
comparison to the two other Arabic versions:

BM and TF depart not only from the MT, but also from the other Arabic versions, as well as the Tg, LXX, and Pesh,\textsuperscript{134} reading 'All who start out on a (God's?)\textsuperscript{135} path stand in need of no one.' Whence this reading comes is open to conjecture. Perhaps this phrase, in effect, introduces or helps explain the image found in the opening of the MT's following verse, which speaks of eyes darkening, for if no one has need of another, perhaps it is because all will be able to see their way. Both BM and TF delay introduction of obscured vision to the second portion of 20, and thus omit the final image of the MT, which speaks of the final demise of the iniquitous.

No matter what final resolution one adopts as explanation of the unprecedented translation provided by BM and TF for 19b, the fact that both of these versions follow each other closely here in defiance of all other known predecessor versions argues for close literary dependence, though TF substitutes for the classical verb ليس the negative particle ما.

FA's flirtation with brevity at 18b is abandoned by 19b, but the end result contains no appreciable change in meaning. Perhaps the intent was emphasis through parallelism: [who] seek your face' is followed by 'and many people look to you'. This approach is also taken by the LXX.

Verse 20a

\begin{tabular}{l|l}
   MT & וְזָנִי רָשֵׁםָּתָם תְּבָלִינוּ  \\
   SG & וְזָנִי אֲלָכָלָם תְּבָלִינוּיָם  \\
   BM & והשעלאה לא تعدמה  \\
   TF & והשעלאה לא تعدמה  \\
\end{tabular}

\textsuperscript{134} The thrust of the S-H is unclear in this stich, but it too appears to have little in common at this point with BM and TF.

\textsuperscript{135} This suggestion is made by de Baudissin (1870), who struggles with other difficulties from this verse to the close of the chapter.
The LXX, followed by the S–H, rearranges the imagery of the various stichs in this tri-partite verse. In this they are closely followed by BM and TF; to a certain extent FA is also free with the text in the matter of rearrangements, as is the S–H.

BM and TF’s departure from all other versions, Arabic and otherwise, continues: rather than referring to the sad end of the wicked, they continue the description of the righteous as found in their treatment of the previous verse. Thus it is not that ‘safety shall fail them’ (i.e., the wicked, as in the LXX), but that ‘safety shall not’\(^{134}\) vanish from him’ (i.e., the righteous). It is only in the final stich of this chapter that these two versions shift their attention to the fate of the wicked.

FA is certainly closer to the MT and SG than are BM and TF here and throughout the rest of this verse,\(^{137}\) for in this first stich FA preserves the basic ideas of the eyes of the wicked failing, which BM and TF finally treat in 20c. However, the grammatical approach of FA differs from that of SG and the MT: instead of a construct, ‘eyes of the wicked’, being followed by the verb, FA employs topic-comment sentence structure, emphasizing thereby the wicked: ‘As for the hypocrites,\(^{138}\) their eyes will go dark.’ To be sure, the MT and SG reverse the typical word order of their respective languages by placing the verb last; though this also draws attention to the subject, their emphasis on the ‘wicked’ is diluted due to the use of the construct phrase, which places ‘eyes’ in the stich’s initial position.

---

\(^{136}\) Emphasis added.

\(^{137}\) The Tg and Pesh also adhere closely to the Hebrew.

\(^{138}\) This vocabulary item is often found in the Qur’an to refer to backsliders of various kinds; whether one may safely conclude that this is hard evidence of Muslim influence, however, is tempered by the fact that BM and TF, which show virtually no sign of Muslim bias in the poetic sections of Job, also use this very same word in their version of 20c.
Verse 20b

MT
SG
BM
TF
FA

SG stays very close to the MT, as does the Tg. Both the Pesh and S–H exhibit some license in their treatment of the text, FA and the LXX moreso, while BM and TF continue to exhibit the greatest variance from the original.

BM and TF only differ from each other throughout this entire verse in their choice of the conjunctive particle at the beginning of this stich: ب for the former, ل for the latter, carrying no appreciable difference in meaning. Together, they continue to stand over against all other versions in this stich, explaining why the righteous is safe: 'for hope is before his eyes'.

FA, with BM and TF, as well as the LXX and S–H, make explicit reference to 'hope' here, which SG, the Tg, and Pesh reserve for the final stich. His reading, 'the hope of their souls perishes', is consistent with the general theme of the fate of the wicked.

Verse 20c

MT
SG
BM
TF
FA

SG, unsurprisingly, is moved to alter the curious expression found in the MT, 'breathing out of the soul' by choosing the active participle of the Fourth Form (causative) of xyb, 'miscarry / be dashed / prohibit from attaining'. Thus his end
result is in the order of 'their hope is disbarred from the soul', or, more simply, 'their hope is dashed'.

Now it is finally time for BM and TF to move, with what may be interpreted as something of a sense of homiletic drama, to the fate of the wicked. Interestingly, in doing so they adopt not only the same grammatical device used by FA in 20a (q.v.), but also use the exact same wording of FA without the (optional) particles اما، 'as for...then', used to introduce, respectively, the topic and comment portions of the sentence.

FA's final stich is very close to 20b as found in the Pesh: 'their strength will be abased.' In this both FA and the Pesh differ semantically from all other versions, Arabic and otherwise, under consideration. However, this departure does not, in the end, violate the general spirit of Zophar's final words regarding the fate of the wicked.

\footnote{Goodman (1988) suggests "their hope, a delusion to the soul".}
The Early Arabic Versions of Job (first millennium C.E.):
Speech Cycle Two: Bildad’s Assertion (Job 18)

Verse 1

MT

SG

BM

TF

FA

Only FA\(^{140}\) among the Arabic script versions gives Bildad a *nisba*, which might be assumed to agree with that of the MT, despite three differences. The first of these can be attributed to scribal error: the incorrect placement of a dot, changing the " to a ג. The second, consisting of an omission of dots on the ש, rendering a ס, may be due either to scribal error, or to dependence upon the LXX, which reads בַּלְדָּדּוֹ בָּשְׁמַיִּים.\(^{141}\) The third difference consists of the infix אֲנָה before the *nisba* ending, which is explainable through conventional Arabic linguistic practice.

The only other factor worth noting is that both SG and FA, along with the Pesh and S-H,\(^{142}\) write out the vowel in the *nisba*, which the MT does not.

Of greater interest are BM and TF, which omit the *nisba* of the MT entirely, but then diverge from each other. BM is content to identify Bildad simply as 'his (i.e., Job's) friend' or (less likely) 'his master', the Arabic term in question permitting either interpretation. This omission of a *nisba* fits in with BM's practice elsewhere in his text; it may be related to Bildad's title in the LXX: 'ruler (of the Sauchites)'.\(^{143}\)

TF picks up on BM's cue of dispensing with the *nisba*, as it were, and then

\(^{140}\) At this point in the text FA's seventh chapter begins.

\(^{141}\) Both the Pesh and S-H keep the voiceless fricative sibilant of the Hebrew. Greek, having no such fricative sibilant, uses in its place Σ.

\(^{142}\) Cf. the LXX.

\(^{143}\) De Baudissin (1870) posits that the Arabic term 'friend / master' used here, *i.e.*, صاحب, might be a corruption for الصاحبي, which would represent an attempt to transliterate the Greek version of the *nisba* Σαυχίτης.
elaborates on the identifier which BM does provide: keeping 'friend / master' as the first term of a construct, TF removes the ambiguity of the term by substituting in place of the pronominal suffix two second terms of the construct, each of which has a double entendre. The result can either be a positive description of Bildad, or something quite pejorative.

The positive reading of the TF's phrase صاحب المدارج والبقاء is 'owner of (multi-level) buildings and fields', while the pejorative meaning reads 'master of slanders and calumny'. These two variants, both of which may have been intended, are differentiated less on the basis of vowelling than on divergent concepts behind the roots of the words in question.

The roots of such characterizations of Bildad are problematic. A review of midrashic literature\textsuperscript{144} and of the pseudepigrapha\textsuperscript{145} yields little on the personage of Bildad himself, at least nothing which throws any light upon the issue. As for Muslim material, TH also yields nothing.

Verse 2

\textbf{MT}  
\textit{כִּי הנִּאמָּתָה גֶּפֶן לֶ֛נֶּפֶם נְבִיָּ֖ה הָאָרֶֽמֶּֽה}  
\textbf{SG}  
\textit{אֶלְּכָּלֵת הַנִּשְׁבַּעֲנָלָ֖ם הַנִּפְרָדָֽם הָאָרֶֽמֶּֽה}  
\textbf{BM}  
\textit{אַלַּא מַתִּים הַנִּסְרָֽעֲנָלָ֖ם הַנִּפְרָֽדָם הָאָרֶֽמֶּֽה}  
\textbf{TF}  
\textit{אַלַּא מַתִּים הַנִּסְרָֽעֲנָלָ֖ם הַנִּפְרָֽדָם הָאָרֶֽמֶּֽה}  
\textbf{FA}  
\textit{אַלַּא מַתִּים הַנִּסְרָֽעֲנָלָ֖ם הַנִּפְרָֽדָם הָאָרֶֽמֶּֽה}  

While there are among the Arabic versions a number of differences, as well as some unexpected convergences, the one feature that stands out most is FA's final verb, which is kept in the second person rather than moving to the first. In this, FA is unsupported by the Tg, LXX, Pesh, S–H, or Cp. While there is a possibility of

\textsuperscript{144} Cf. Freedman and Simon (1983).  
\textsuperscript{145} Spittler (1985).
scribal error here, the error would be a fortuitous one, since the semantic result is not unfelicitous, and is reminiscent of epigrammatic portions of Wisdom literature: 'it behooves you to ponder and reflect, whereupon you may speak'.

The use of the pronoun for added emphasis by BM and TF might be (for those with enough imagination!) considered as a corrective for the type of error of which FA may be guilty. However, its appearance in the S-H is a more plausible reason for its inclusion here.

Verse 3

| MT          | סְפֻרַת נִחְמָלָנוּ נְכָפָרֵת נְפַלֲנָהּ בֵּעָלָם: |
| SG          | סְפֻרַת נִחְמָלָנוּ נְכָפָרֵת נְפַלֲנָהּ בֵּעָלָם: |
| BM          | לָמָּא מִלְּחֶבֶּא שָׁכַּנְוּ בְּיֵדָךְ |
| TF          | לָמָּא מִלְּחֶבֶּא שָׁכַּנְוּ בְּיֵדָךְ |
| FA          | לָמָּא אַנְזָלַתְנָא בְּמַנְזָלֵת הֶבְחָאִיָּא |

The occurrence of the *hapax legomenon* נְפַלֲנָהּ at the beginning of the second stich in the MT gives occasion for interpretive work in the Arabic versions. In addition, the second stich's bodily image is also reinterpreted: SG, with the Tg, follows the MT, while BM and TF change the imagery from one bodily metaphor to another.\(^{16}\)

FA, however, dispenses with the second stich's bodily image altogether\(^{147}\) after having elaborated in the first stich with what might be considered a 9th century C.E. equivalent of a modern English expression, totally removed from the LXX or either of the Syriac versions, as well as any of the Arabic versions or the MT: 'Why have

\(^{146}\) Perhaps it is the LXX here that sanctions the change in imagery, since the metaphor is entirely de-anthropomorphized: ἐκατότος οὐ. However, the language of these two versions contains conventional Arabic anthropomorphic imagery.

\(^{147}\) Unless there is occasion for scribal error, a real possibility between 'your eye' and 'with you': עֶבֶךָ - عنَدك, though it should be noted that this would require further tampering with the rest of the stich, something which was not beyond FA's abilities (or inclinations) when necessary.
you put us in the doghouse?" Depending upon the diacritical marks supplied to the ductus, the second stich is also the occasion for further interpretive effort and departure from other biblical texts, with the possible exception of the Tg, with the phrase: 'you think us trifling/squalid/uncouth/miserable.'

On a more minor note, SG's avoidance of the more common Arabic expression 'for what [purpose]?' can be attributed to the non-occurrence of its cognate Hebrew expression in the MT; the Arabic script versions, however, are less exacting here.

Also of lesser importance is the fact that BM and TF, which are in perfect parallel, alter slightly the sense of the MT and SG in having only one verb, ('we were silent / silenced', depending upon the vowelling) for the entire verse, rather than one verb per stich.

Finally, FA, having had Bildad address Job in the second person plural, now changes over to the singular here. SG keeps the more elevated register, with the MT.

Verse 4aα

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>sg</th>
<th>BM</th>
<th>TF</th>
<th>FA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>מִנֶּשֶׁךָ נָפְשֵׁךָ נִמְשָךְ</td>
<td>אֲנִמִּיתִי נִמְשָךְ נִמְשָךְ</td>
<td>וַאֲדֹרֶכָּ֥וֹ יִפּ֣שָּׁךְ</td>
<td>וַאֲדֹרֶכָּ֥וֹ יִפּ֣שֶׁךְ</td>
<td>אֲיִהְּהַ֣ו יֵעָשֶׂ֣ה יִפּ֣שֶׁךְ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

148 Mangan (1991) reads for this stich "sunk in your eyes".
149 From the transitive verb ِبَخَسَسْ, to lessen/wrong/defraud/diminish.
150 The singular adjective is ِبَخَسَسْ, from the intransitive verb ِبَخَسَسْ, to be unclean.
151 Reading, as allowed by the idiom, a preposition ِبْ, plus the singular adjective ِبَخَسَسْ, from 'be coarse / crude'.
152 From ِبْ plus the plural of the adjective ِخُسَسْ, from 'fall in value / be vile'.
153 In this they betray their affinity with the LXX, which truncates the second stich to a mere prepositional phrase.
Both SG and FA discern a vocative here. However, divergent grammatical structures following the inserted particles (SG employs an active participle to begin a construct while FA chooses a roughly synonymous active participle to precede a prepositional phrase) force the choice of alternative vocatives. The resulting stylistic contrast allows FA a more Qur'anic flavor.

The two other Arabic versions do not understand a direct address by Bildad of Job, the MT lending itself to understanding either option. Instead of a vocative, therefore, BM and TF both begin this verse by employing the same verb-phrase idiom, appending it to the thought of the previous verse: 'And anger has overtaken you'. This more or less conveys the basic meaning of the MT, but does so less imaginatively than either the two other Arabic versions or the Hebrew itself.

*Verse 4ab*

While 4aβ would seemingly be a good example showing the lack of direct dependence of BM and TF in relation to each other despite a few common vocabulary items, 4b is exactly the same in the two versions.

Both BM and TF display less affinity with the MT than do the versions of SG and FA, especially in the phraseology of 4aβ. BM and TF make specific the

---

154 In this BM and TF agree with the Tg, LXX, Pesh, S-H, and Cp. Lamsa (1985) does, however, provide a vocative, which he appends to the end of Verse 3, for his English translation of the Pesh.

155 TF's apparent use of the particle ܐ to negate the imperfect may be influenced by classical usage, adopted in various colloquials, of expressing the absolute negative by means of ܐ plus the perfect aspect.
generalized allusion of the MT, and do so by explicitly drawing an alleged parallel, which is to be rejected *prima facie* as an absurdity, between the Creator and Job. Similarly explicit language is found in the LXX and S-H, but not in the Tg or Pesh.

Where all the Arabic script versions do agree, in opposition to SG, is in rendering the MT's 'rock' as 'mountain'.

All versions, as well as the MT, now have Bildad addressing Job in the second person singular, the transition away from the 'polite' or 'deferential' second person plural thus being complete.

Verse 5

| MT | נָמַא רְשִׁיעָה יִשְׁתַּדַּר לִאֶרֶם צְבָאֹת אֲשֶׁר |
| SG | בַּל נֹר אֶלֶּףֲאֵלֶם יִבָּרְכֶנָּו לָאָס צְבָאֹת נֶאמָּּה |
| BM | או הָרוּ הָנָּה וְלִשָּׁנָה הָנָּה |
| TF | אֶמֹּר הֶלְוֹ הָנָּה: וְלִשָּׁנָה הָנָּה |
| FA | אָעַם אֵלַמ אוֹר הָנָּה נְטִיב |

In 5a, the Arabic script versions agree on the verb for 'be extinguished'. However, these versions subsequently part company at other points in this stich. For example, FA's use of an introductory imperative, in contradistinction to the other Arabic versions' usage of a particle or conjunction, is unprecedented. It does not, however, do violence to the basic meaning. Elsewhere, BM's lack of 'the wicked' is paralleled in many Tg mss, according to Mangan (1991).

The difference between the two final words of BM and TF's versions of 5b is suspicious, given their nearly-identical ductus. Of course, whether it was Fuṣṭāṭī as translator, an Egyptian scribe, or the modern editor who is responsible here is a

---

156 The nearly homophonous root-cognates נָעַם and נָעַם serve as the apparent point of semantic transition, though the use of the plural in the Arabic script versions is found only in the LXX and Cp among the predecessor versions.

157 Along with the MT, Tg, LXX, Pesh, S-H, and Cp.

158 P. 51, n. 3.
matter of conjecture, since the root of TF's word is synonymous in Egyptian Arabic with the more classical root *jm* employed by BM.\(^{159}\)

In any case, the only other difference in these two versions in 5b is TF's penchant for negation of verbal phrases with particles in the place of BM's use of 'not be', which also obtains in 11:19 and 18:4b.

The matter of the final pronominal suffixes in 5b should be noted. Whether one argues on the basis of grammar, semantics, or even simple internal consistency, difficulties are clearly present: the MT, which is followed by SG and FA, uses a singular suffix despite a plural antecedent, while TF and BM feature a plural suffix without having a plural antecedent. Perhaps the Gordian knot can be cut by simply characterizing the various usages of the pronominal suffixes as idiosyncratic.\(^{160}\)

**Verse 6**

| MT | أَوَّلَ قِصَّرَ بَعْدَها، مَرَأَةٌ عَلَى يِدِّهَا: |
| SG | نَمَّى اِلْأَلْوَنِّيْرُ مَيْلًا فِي لَعْظَةِ عَلَى عَشَاهُ عَلَيْهِ: |
| BM | ضَوْهُ ظَلْمَةِ يَطْفَأُ وَسَرَّاهُ يَطْفَأُ عَلَيْهُ: |
| TF | لَانَ ضَوْهُ مَعْنَاهُ ظَلْمَةٌ: وَسَرَّاهُ يَطْفَأُ عَلَيْهُ: |
| FA | وَيَظْلَمُ النُّورُ فِي مَسْكَنِهِ: وَيَنْطَفِعُ ضَوْهُ عَلَيْهِ. |

While Goodman (1988)\(^{161}\) highlights SG's treatment of the MT's 6a metaphorically, all the Arabic versions also have recourse to the triliteral root in question: *zlm*. But only FA follows SG and the MT in citing an actual location as to where the light is

---

\(^{159}\) The similarity in the ductus may be purely coincidental, but see 18:20 (p. 146), where a similar phenomenon occurs.

\(^{160}\) The solution proposed by Habel (1985) p. 281 should be noted here: the juxtaposition of the singular with the plural is meant to lead the reader/listener to identify implicitly a single individual, Job, as being a member of the group under discussion, i.e., the wicked. Such an analysis carries more credibility than, for example, that of Blommerde (1969) p. 84, who attempts to explain away the plural, or those who would simply emend it as an error.

\(^{161}\) P. 284, n. 6.
darkened: FA rendering it as 'his (i.e., the wicked’s) abode' whereas SG, employing a different root, can be read as 'his retreat / refuge'.

BM and TF delete the locative reference inexplicably, since the Tg, LXX, Pesh, S–H, and Cp retain it. Yet even in this short stich BM and TF do not follow each other, TF's version being verbless. The basic meaning, however, is retained: the sense of a light darkening, or going out, is expressed through the verbal noun from τ’m, which in classical Arabic is normally reserved not so much to imply consumption as gustatory delectation.

Verse 6b provides less occasion for comment: all the Arabic script versions rely on the root 4f', and all the Arabic versions with the exception of FA refer to a سراج, 'lamp'.

Verse 7

Despite the severe truncation of BM's text, its similarities to, and differences from, TF are apparent: common roots are in use, but are found in variant syntactical constructions employing different parts of the speech.

FA's rendering of the entire verse approaches paraphrase: his text discerns three stichs where the MT, followed by TF, sees only two. However, what we actually have here is an indication that while FA was certainly familiar with at least one Syriac version of Job, as well as the LXX, he may have also been influenced, at

162 Presumably FA avoids it for stylistic reasons, having employed the very same vocabulary item in 5a.
least in this instance, by the more conservative versions derived directly from the Hebrew: FA has conflated the thoughts from the two stichs of the MT with the independent line of thought of the Pesh, which reads in the second stich "his own counsel shall cast him down". It appears that the other two Arabic script versions follow the LXX, if not the Syriac versions: there is some confusion here, since there is little unanimity among the predecessor versions.163

Verse 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>נִכְשָלוּ בְרֵשָׁת בּוֹרְנִיָּה וּלְתַלְפָּת יָדוֹלָלָה:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>בֵּכֶם דְּלָת הרבָלָת פֵּר שָׁרַר אָז אֶחָלְתָה יָדוֹלָה:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM</td>
<td>וּיְצַּעֲרֵי בִּנְפָךְ וְיֵילֵף בַּמִּסְכָּד:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>וּיְצַּעֲרֵי בִּנְפָךְ וְיֵילֵף בַּמִּסְכָּד:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>וּנְשַׁנְּךָ רוֹגָאֵה בַּמִּסְכָּד: * וּיִמָּשֶׁה עַל הָשֹּׁרֶק: *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The differences in the versions are minor. to be noted are the variety and apparent interchangeability of roots for 'trap / net / snare', as well as the lack of agreement on the use of the dual vs. the singular for 'foot', and even the grammatical case thereof: FA and SG prefer the nominative, while BM has the accusative, and the MT makes it the object of a preposition.

TF apparently has dropped a stich, the scribe being possibly confused by the multifarious references to entrapment.

Verse 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>נָאָה בַמְּקַהְלֵךְ פְּחַּה יַזִּיק צְדֵּֽמָה:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>נָאָה בַמְּקַהְלֵךְ פְּחַּּה יַזִּיק צְדֵּֽמָה:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM</td>
<td>וּתַקְעֵלְךָ עַל-הָפִּקָּח וְיַדְרָךְ הַעַטְשֵּֽׁח:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>וּתַקְעֵלְךָ עַל-הָפִּקָּח וְיַדְרָךְ הַעַטְשֵּֽׁח:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

163 For example, Lamsa (1985) reads "He shall be deserted in his illness" at 7a, where the LXX has "Let the meanest of men spoil his goods". The second stich is similarly afflicted, and the interrelationship of these translations with the Arabic versions is highly problematical.
In the first stich, all the Arabic versions agree to use the cognate Arabic root \textit{fxx} to match the MT's \textit{phh}. However, only SG and FA keep the word in question singular, while the other two Arabic versions employ different forms of the plural.

Yet the Arabic of TF, though less than felicitous at the beginning of this verse, still displays its characteristic affinities with BM. And by the end of the second stich, all the Arabic script versions are unanimous in departing from the MT, picking up a thought found in the LXX, also present in the Pesh and S-H, based on the concept of thirst.

The thought in the LXX is that there are those who thirst after the protagonist's destruction: \textit{καταφαγόμενοι ἐμ' αὐτὸν δρόντιοι}. However, the Syriac versions have understood as literal what the LXX takes as figurative, and thus substitute for it a literal affliction which the protagonist will undergo while ensnared. It is this latter thought that the Arabic script versions adopt, though it should be noted that FA preserves, in his verb by which the second stich is opened, a closer affinity with the vocabulary of the LXX.

All this confusion is due to the final word in the MT of this verse,\textsuperscript{164} where the Hebrew root is the occasion for widely varying interpretations. Thus:

SG apparently sees an Arabic cognate, صام, to the Hebrew root \textit{סח}. The main semantic area represented by the Arabic root has to do with deafness; there also appears to be a secondary semantic area having to do with hardness or solidity.\textsuperscript{165} However, the word صام carries a meaning unrelated to either deafness

\textsuperscript{165}Cf. Lane (1863–93), Book I, part 4, p. 1722\textit{ff}.
or solidity: the covering to a bottle applied over its stopper. Rather than using this obscure vocabulary item, SG finds a much more common synonym from the root *nqāb*, meaning 'veil' or 'covering'. His resultant reading, "its mask holdeth him fast" (p. 283) refers, then, to yet another type of trap into which the unsuspecting may fall.

None of the other Arabic versions understand the Hebrew יְמַלְּכָה לְלֹא כִּי נְתִיה: to be derived from בָּלָה, but interpret the root as בָּלָה: 'be thirsty'. This they all translate with the same vocabulary item, rather than using the cognate Arabic root, ُنَمُّ.

However, these three Arabic-script versions disagree as to the context in which 'thirst' appears: BM and TF agree in reading 'and thirst (unexpectedly) overwhelms him', while FA, using the same verb as SG, reads 'and thirst is unbearable for him.'

Verse 10

MT: ָלָבִּיה וַתֵּלֶבֶּיהָ ְלָבָּלָה וַתֵּלֶבֶּיהָ ְלָבָּלָה וַתֵּלֶבֶּיהָ ְלָבָּלָה וַתֵּלֶבֶּיהָ ְלָבָּלָה וַתֵּלֶבֶּיהָ ְלָבָּלָה וַתֵּלֶבֶּיהָ ְלָבָּלָה וַתֵּלֶבֶּיהָ ְלָבָּלָה וַתֵּלֶבֶּיהָ ְלָבָּלָה וַתֵּלֶבֶּיהָ ְלָבָּלָה וַתֵּלֶבֶּיהָ ְלָבָּלָה וַתֵּלֶבֶּיהָ ְלָבָּלָה וַתֵּלֶבֶּיהָ ְלָבָּלָה וַתֵּלֶבֶּיהָ ְלָבָּלָה וַתֵּלֶבֶּי

SG: ָלָבִּיה וַתֵּלֶבֶּיהָ ְלָבָּלָה וַתֵּלֶבֶּיהָ ְלָבָּלָה וַתֵּלֶבֶּיהָ ְלָבָּלָה וַתֵּלֶבֶּיהָ ְלָבָּלָה וַתֵּלֶבֶּיהָ ְלָבָּلָה וַתֵּלֶבֶּיהָ ְלָבָּלָה וַתֵּלֶבֶּיהָ ְלָבָּלָה וַתֵּלֶבֶּיהָ ְלָבָּלָה וַתֵּלֶבֶּיהָ ְלָבָּלָה וַתֵּלֶבֶּיהָ ְלָבָּלָה וַתֵּלֶבֶּיהָ ְלָבָּלָה וַתֵּלֶבֶּי

BM: ָלָבִּיה וַתֵּלֶבֶּיהָ ְלָבָּלָה וַתֵּלֶבֶּיהָ ְלָבָּלָה וַתֵּלֶבֶּיהָ ְלָבָּלָה וַתֵּלֶבֶּיהָ ְלָבָּלָה וַתֵּלֶבֶּיהָ ְלָבָּלָה וַתֵּלֶבֶּיהָ ְלָבָּלָה וַתֵּלֶבֶּיהָ ְלָבָּלָה וַתֵּלֶבֶּיהָ ְלָבָּلָה וַתֵּלֶבֶּיהָ ְלָבָּלָה וַתֵּלֶבֶּיהָ ְלָבָּלָה וַתֵּלֶבֶּי

TF: ָלָבִּיה וַתֵּלֶבֶּיהָ ְלָבָּלָה וַתֵּלֶבֶּיהָ ְלָבָּלָה וַתֵּלֶבֶּיהָ ְלָבָּלָה וַתֵּלֶבֶּיהָ ְלָבָּלָה וַתֵּלֶבֶּיהָ ְלָבָּלָה וַתֵּלֶבֶּיהָ ְלָבָּלָה וַתֵּלֶבֶּי

FA: ָלָבִּיה וַתֵּלֶבֶּיהָ ְלָבָּלָה וַתֵּלֶבֶּיהָ ְלָבָּלָה וַתֵּלֶבֶּיהָ ְלָבָּלָה וַתֵּלֶבֶּי

For TF's صبّاط is obviously meant ضابط, while a regional/dialectal propensity for dropping an initial glottal stop as a weak consonant accounts for the more properly classical انوشته at the beginning of the verse. Ultimately, the difference is one of style rather than semantics. The corporeal imagery in the first stich, which is also present in BM, has no precedent in the Tg, LXX, Pesh, or S–H.

FA's choice of مصيدة in the second stich displays a closeness to the Pesh,

---

\[166 \text{BDB, 1957, p. 855, cites this cognate Arabic root as also covering the semantic area of 'bandaging a wound'.} \]

\[167 \text{The error appears to be a scribal one.} \]
which uses the Syriac cognate. FA's affinity for the MT (and thus SG) is very clear here, despite his verbosity in the second stich and his employment of an imperfect in place of a passive participle at the outset of the verse. Since participles in both classical and dialectal Arabic imply incomplete or ongoing activity, the resulting difference in meaning is minor, especially since the same root, dfn, is common to both SG's and FA's translations. Clearly, TF and BM are much more independent from the Hebrew.

Verse 11

The English idiom of 'nipping at one's heels', which the MT seems to imply in the final prepositional phrase of the second stich, is not the understanding of any of the Arabic versions, which abound in attempts to interpret the Hebrew.

TF and BM are virtually identical, differing only in the verb to be used in the second stich. TF's choice of verb is less than imaginative: '(they) insert his feet in the trap'; BM employs a verb associated with punishment catching up to the offender: '(they) overtake his feet in the trap'. The problem, of course, is that while the image conjured up by TF may be more picturesque, the grammar used to arrive thereto presents difficulties in that the verb لحق is followed by an incorrect

---

168 The S–H employs the same root, but the derivative noun of instrument is taken from a different form of the verb.

169 Of course, if there is a direct dependence of one of these two versions upon the other, one could advance arguments concerning scribal error in an attempt to reconcile them.
preposition, at least according to classical usage.170 The verb forms themselves
deviate from classical usage in omitting the final mood-marker for the indicative.

FA's notion of one's steps 'failing' perhaps approximates most closely to SG's
idea of 'tottering' feet. But this degree of closeness does not extend to vocabulary,
with the former using the root qdm, the latter employing rjl, when dealing with the
notion of 'feet that step'. SG is closer to the 'feet', FA closer to 'stepping'.

Despite all these variations displayed by the Arabic versions, they do little
violence to the basic thrust of the MT, perhaps due to the imagery of traps and
snares and faltering feet having continued on now over several verses.

Verse 12

| MT | 12הרדעאש ינא ראתת נבך לצלחתא: 12הרדעאש ינא ראתת נבך לצלחתא: |
| SG | רבן הלחה לאשא היום מהתא לצלחתא:  |
| BM | וوقعתי מ Teeth אתו:  |
| TF | וوقعתי מ Teeth אתו:  |
| FA | ויסון קחיפה * ויבור ודרצותיה הזל * |

The concept of thirst appeared in v. 9 (see above); yet the Arabic script versions fail
to balance it with the mention of hunger here in v. 12, despite the opportunity
provided by the MT. SG, however, does pick up the cue out of fidelity to the MT
rather than in an attempt to parallel v. 9. The Tg, LXX, Pesh, S–H, and Cp also
follow the MT here. So the omission, especially by BM and TF, is unexpected.

FA's first stich, though grammatically precise,171 is either irresponsibly vague in

170 Unwittingly, the use of the oblique case ending rather than the nominative
preceding the verbs in question for both BM and TF signal the
non-classical nature of the Arabic we encounter in these versions. And, given
that the prepositions in question, וב, are closely related, the
confusion may not be all that grave.

171 Note the proper use, parallelling that of SG, of the indefinite accusative after the
verb 'be'.
meaning, or can be explained by an error: perhaps جايفا is a misreading of جايفا. as in SG's text. If so, the only difference between FA and SG would be found in the omission of the reference to offspring, which FA makes in the following stich.

In FA's second stich, the unedited text is problematic; the diacritics have been altered to produce the text above, the manuscript appearing to read ويورت دريته الذل. If the emendations proposed are correct, then FA's second stich agrees with SG's first in the reference to offspring, which is also one possible variant reading as identified by Mangan (1991) in the Tg. The Pesh's second stich also speaks of offspring, though the LXX, S-H, and Cp do not.

Despite the brevity of BM and TF, the reference to 'suddenness', as found in most of the major versions, has been kept.

Verse 13

| MT       | يأمل بره توزو، يأمل بره بدير مول: |
| SG       | يأمل فروع لتهده يأمل فروع تفنونه، يأملت: |
| BM       | توكل كعاب رجله وياكل الموت جماله: |
| TF       | عقات رجله توكل: وياك الموت جماله: |
| FA       | تهلك قراه بعد الأعزاء: * وموت بكره فجاه: |

FA's first stich parallels the Pesh and S-H exactly, being based on reading the MT's لراذم. While FA's second stich, in agreement with the MT, SG, and Pesh, returns to the theme of the first-born, BM and TF keep close to the LXX's "death shall consume his beauty", which is also apparently the basis for the reading of the

---

172 The MT does not make explicit mention of offspring until v. 13, though it can be argued with Habel (1985) that there is, in the Hebrew, an anticipation thereof in the first stich.

173 The grammatical mistakes of this stich, from the point of view of Classical Arabic, may possibly be due to fairly common, standard dialectal departures from standard Arabic, though it should be noted that such differences have not been hitherto apparent in FA's text, at least outside the prose sections of the Book of Job.
Verse 14

SG plays with the Hebrew text, avoiding the obvious cognate for 'king'. Goodman (1988) ascribes this translation approach to "poetic personification", while also providing an opportunity for injecting his theology of an after-life. Whatever the reason for avoiding the cognate, the result is the same in terms of adherence to Semitic turns of phrase: the employment of the construct to express the superlative by using a term of authority or primacy at the construct’s head. The Arabic script versions, however, are much more literal in their understanding of 'the king' here (with the exception of BM, which avoids the reference altogether, the text appearing to have been apocopated).

FA’s addition of a second verb at the end of the first stich is without precedent, adding the idea of being betrayed by one’s faith/confidence. Whether this is an attempted elucidation of the circumstances through which hope has been cut off, or explains in some manner the hostility of the king in the second stich, is unclear.

Verse 15

174 P. 285, n. 11.
175 E.g., ‘Mother of Battles’. This type of construction has already been encountered in TF’s epithet describing the speaker himself in v. 1, discussed at pp. 127-28.
A wide variety of commentators, including Habel (1985) and Pope (1965) see a real problem in the MT's 'that which isn't his' at the end of the first stich, suggesting a variety of emendations. To be sure, not all commentators see an insoluble difficulty which can only be dealt with by changing the consonantal text.

The Arabic versions are unanimous in dealing with the Hebrew text as it stands, unemended; they diverge only in their ambiguity, or lack thereof, regarding who (or what) is to inherit the abode of the wicked. Thus:

SG wrestles with the MT in carrying on the previous verse's subject in v. 15a, effectively seeing no need to alter the difficult MT phrase in question. His word הפס, however, can yield two possible meanings: vowelled with an i the result is a partitive genitive 'of that which'; an a results in an indefinite relative pronoun, 'who'. Given the reference to [life-threatening] brimstone in the second stich, the first reading might be preferred merely from a semantic point of view. Such also carries the advantage of having the grammar be less forced.

TF (following closely the LXX), and BM continue the figure from the previous verse of death as the subject. This leads the two versions, which differ greatly in length at this point, to agree that the subject is masculine singular, whereas SG's

---

176 He takes his cue from Dahood (1957); indeed, Pope's commentary makes much use of Ugaritics to explain the MT.

177 Cf. the RSV. Kissane (1939) is also counted among this number, as is Renan (1882), whose translation is most explicit in this regard: "L'étranger habitera dans sa tente" (p. 76). This theme is common enough in Job (15:29; 20:10; 20:18) as well as elsewhere in Wisdom literature: cf. Ecclesiastes 2:18–19.

178 In this he is supported by the LXX, though the MT itself is not explicit on this point.

179 Perhaps BM has simply dropped a stich here. The insertion of an additional stich at the end of BM's version of v. 19 could find its origins in the present omission, though it should be noted that TF includes a similar insertion at that same point without having dropped anything here.
use of the feminine singular presupposes a non-human plural antecedent.\textsuperscript{180} Yet despite this grammatical divergence, these three versions follow the LXX in not finding in the MT a parallel, in the first stich, to the 'brimstone' of the second. Indeed, neither BM nor TF mention brimstone in their second stich at all.

FA is close to the Pesh, making clear that the abode will be inhabited by other humans, rather than being left desolate. Presumably the 'brimstone' of the second stich is merely a figure of speech rather than literal reality.

Verse 16

MT

SG

BM

TF

FA

The figurative rendering of the Tg for this entire verse as cited by Mangan (1991)\textsuperscript{181} is only hinted at in the second stich of TF. Otherwise the MT is taken literally by all the versions.\textsuperscript{182}

Verse 17

MT

SG

BM

TF

FA

The lacuna in TF suggested by 'Iyyād (1967) obscures no text, if BM gives any

\textsuperscript{180} The Tg, which also uses a feminine singular here, interprets it literally, and translates at this point 'His wife'.

\textsuperscript{181} Some mss evince a more literal approach, to be sure: p. 51, n. 15.

\textsuperscript{182} The translations of the LXX, Pesh, S–H, and Cp do likewise.
indication of the possible lexical contents. Both versions are less graphic in the
description of one's reputation than either FA or SG, the latter of which is closest to
the MT in terms of the nature of the figurative language used to convey the
imagery of the second stich. In addition, both versions avoid grammatical
negatives in their characterizations of the wicked man's name/reputation, as does the
LXX. They also avoid a locative prepositional phrase at the end of the verse due
to the presence of such a phrase at the end of the first stich, the meaning of which
can be understood to carry over into the final phrase.

But the grammatical negative in FA applies to a verb, while in the MT and SG
the particle in question negates a noun. Other peculiarities of FA include the
gratuitous addition of a hamza on the final word of this verse, which may indicate
grammatical hyper-correction. In addition, the root ḥkr, which occurs in the first
stich of all the Arabic versions, as does its cognate Hebrew root in the MT, appears
in both stichs of FA's translation.

Verse 18

MT

ירדהו ממאו אל-חישר ומקהל י子ど: 183

183 The ms contains penmarks at the point in question, but as these occur at the end
of the line of text, they may not be indicative of anything more than filler.
184 Whether this may call into question the analysis of Goodman (1988) concerning
SG's choice of language as being related to the Kharijites of Islam, who
rejected both the mainstream Sunnite as well as the Shi'ite understandings of
the nature of the religious community, its leadership, and its theology, is
immaterial: SG's language may have evoked reflections on the religious
controversies of his own day, but did so without compromising his reading of
the MT by the insertion of anachronisms, for example.
185 The grammatical constructions of the Syriac versions differ markedly here, and
thus provide no possible model for these two Arabic versions.
186 Interestingly, the copyist supplies a short vowel to this extra consonant to mark
the genitive. This is curious for two reasons: firstly, the word, without the
extra final consonant, would carry no such vowel; secondly, the vowel-like
markings in the manuscript are generally adornments rather than functional
grammatical additions, as noted in the Conclusions (p. 391f).
All the Arabic script versions, along with the Tg, LXX, and Pesh, adopt the passive singular throughout the verse, while SG keeps the MT's active plural.

The second stich, which is dropped by BM and TF as well as by the LXX, S–H, and Cp, gives FA the opportunity to reflect upon the mind of the sedentary Semite: 'and he is exiled from civilization to the desert': the worst banishment possible!

**Verse 19**

MT

לא נין לְאֶל‏ָא נָבְעַת בְּתוֹם אֶלֶּהֶר בָּמוֹר:  
לא נין לְאֶל‏ָא נָבְעַת בְּתוֹם אֶלֶּהֶר בָּמוֹר:  

SG

 inflatable lamp  
 inflatable lamp

BM

ןַלְא נִין לְאֶלֶּהֶר בָּמוֹר:  
ןַלְא נִין לְאֶלֶּהֶר בָּמוֹר:  

TF

ןַלְא נִין לְאֶלֶּהֶר בָּמוֹר:  
ןַלְא נִין לְאֶלֶּהֶר בָּמוֹר:  

FA

ןַלְא נִין לְאֶלֶּהֶר בָּמוֹר:  
ןַלְא נִין לְאֶלֶּהֶר בָּמוֹר:  

BM and TF are so close, that even their grammatical errors are occasionally in parallel: both neglect to decline the indefinite predicate adjective in the accusative in the first stich; in the final stich, however, only TF incorrectly conjugates the verb. A scribal error in BM is corrected by the editor through the addition of a negative particle where TF contains an adversative conjunction. Either wording is adequate. Both contain, as a third stich, a rather convoluted phrase found also in the S–H though not in the Pesh or any of the other predecessor versions.

However, what is of most interest in the versions of BM and TF is, in effect, an additional stich (found also in the Cp as v. 20a), the meaning of which is
conveyed by the thought pattern found in v. 15a of the MT, at which point neither BM nor TF approximated the Hebrew: BM simply shortened his text, while TF paralleled the LXX (see above).

FA, whose language is more figurative, is not as close to the MT as SG. This does not, however, affect the general sense of what FA makes of the Hebrew version.

Verse 20

The balance between those described as 'after' and 'before' in the MT is basically preserved in both SG and FA, as well as in the Tg, LXX, Pesh, S-H, and Cp. It should be noted, however, that none of the Arabic versions comprehend or convey the underlying, figurative meaning of the Hebrew, where 'after' and 'before' correspond to 'west' and 'east', unless one were to read into the Arabic root 'jb, which occurs in BM and TF, a reference to 'west'. If so, its placement falls in the wrong stich, and it is not balanced by any reference to 'east' elsewhere.

In fact, there is no such balance in both BM and TF, whether one understands the Hebrew prosaically or figuratively. In addition, since their differences in vocabulary may be due to misreadings of the consonantal text this verse could provide one of the stronger indications that 1) these two versions depend upon a common source, or 2) there is a relationship of direct dependence of one upon the

---

187 The difficulty has been a consistent one for SG, who, unlike TF and FA, does not catch the double entendre of the root qdm even at 1:3, noted at pp. 19–20.

188 This results in TF making the grave error of having a singular verb follow its plural subject.
other. If so, this evidence must be reconciled with seemingly contradictory evidence at other points.

FA makes short work of the balance between the 'after' and 'before' of the MT, but then supplies a third stich, the result of which is to add an interesting bit of imagery. The source for this additional material is perhaps the root šr of the second stich's verb, upon which a word game is then played in describing the physical symptom of the fears which are being endured.

Verse 21

For the final summary of the argument, one might expect the versions to approximate the MT closely, especially since up to this point in the chapter there was shown no marked theological differences among the Arabic versions.

These expectations are borne out: BM and TF follow each other word-for-word, with the exception of the latter dropping a negative particle.¹⁸⁹ Both versions, along with the LXX, S-H, and Cp refer to the Deity as 'the Lord' instead of the MT's 'God'.

SG's name for the Deity is an interesting one. The term employed is not a standard name or attribute of God, but then, throughout Job in the MT the names of, and references to, the Deity are not always in complete agreement with standard

---

¹⁸⁹ The meaning is preserved by understanding the conjunction ו as an adversative.
Judaic usage. Yet at this point in the text there is no incentive for choosing what is, in effect, an exotic title for God, to whom the MT merely refers here as הַ人参. SG has chosen the root תֹּ֣וֹנָם, whose basic idea is 'power' or 'capability'. This has led Goodman (1988) to translate SG's term here by "the Allpowerful". While this can be considered a valid translation, it sheds little light as to why SG chose this particular term for this verse. Whatever the reason for this deviation from the MT, SG's final verse for Chapter 18 adds only a few extra lexical items to clarify his understanding of the meaning of the MT. These additions are of relatively minor significance.

FA is more far-ranging than any of the other Arabic versions, or than the Tg, LXX, Pesh, S-H, and Cp. His language is somewhat more figurative, especially in the first stich. Yet in both his name for the Deity, and in the final stich, FA also keeps to the Hebrew.

---

190 Dhorme (1967) has an extensive discussion of this topic (pp. lxv-lxxii).
191 P. 283; Goodman notes that SG generally translates בְּרֵאשִׁים, which modern scholarship understands as 'the Almighty', as בְּרֵאשִׁים, "the Allsufficing" (p. 108).
192 One possibility is that the Karaite controversy, in which SG was deeply embroiled, can account for this choice of vocabulary: Cf. Nemoy (1952), pp. xx–xxi; Harkavy (1901) as reprinted in Katz, ed. (1980).
193 FA's is the only Arabic version to agree with the MT, along with both the Tg and Pesh.
Verse 1

| MT          |  וָעָנָהּ אלֶיפַּז הַתִּימְנִי וַאֶמֶר:  |
| SG          |  אֲנָא עַלֵּפַז הַתִּימְנִי וַאֲמֶר: |
| BM          |  אַבָּא הַיָּפָּז הַתִּימְנִי וַאֲמֶר: |
| TF          |  אַבָּא הַיָּפָּז הַתִּימְנִי וַאֲמֶר |
| FA          |  אַבָּא הַיָּפָּז הַתִּימְנִי וַאֲמֶר |

All the Arabic script versions agree upon the spelling for Eliphaz, while SG's Judeo-Arabic spelling replicates that of the MT. In addition, all the Arabic versions also agree upon this Comforter's *nisba*. Practical unanimity virtually extends even to TH, who shares the same spelling with the Arabic script versions for 'Eliphaz', and differs only in his genealogical derivation, for which he gives 'Yamani'. This has a fairly close ductus to that of the Arabic script versions.

To be sure, TF identifies this chapter's speaker as 'the king of Teman' when he is first introduced in Chapter 4. This fits in with TF's inclination to add extra material concerning the various characters met in the course of the story. However, the supplementary data imparted concerning Eliphaz is less revealing than the information he gives concerning Bildad in Chapter 18 (p. 127f).

The source of TF's characterizations is a matter of conjecture. The midrash are just as silent in the case of Eliphaz as they were for Bildad, or Zophar, for that matter. The pseudepigrapha, however, are more helpful here in providing a possible source: the *Testament of Job* is said to be of Egyptian provenance, as is the author of TF. Surely geography must be considered a factor in accounting for this similarity.

Except for the minor fact that only FA, among the Arabic script versions, uses

a coordinating conjunction at the opening of the verse, there is no need for further comment here: the texts are utterly unremarkable.

Verse 2

MT

SG

BM

TF

FA

The unremarkable nature of the first verse is a deceptive harbinger of what is to come in this chapter. All the Arabic versions realize that the point of this obtusely worded verse of the MT is to challenge the notion that mortals and God are equals who can treat with each other, with imagery borrowed from legal practice. But in getting that point across, they take divergent paths. SG strikes out on his own; BM and TF are characteristically close; FA is closer to SG than the other two Arabic script versions, but not slavishly so.

Difficulties with the MT provide occasion for SG to hold forth. To highlight the theme of the lack of equality between God and mortals, SG translates the MT's simple נק by the grander title of "the Allpowerful". But SG's subsequent introduction of the dual in 2b is unprecedented, being due to the semantics of his interpretive effort, which is well beyond a mere translation of the MT. Obviously, SG has made an attempt to make sense of the introduction of 'the wise [one?], whom he sees as a third personage relating to the two unequals of 2a.

The use of the plural by the Tg at the same point in 2b is also a departure from the Hebrew. But the Tg does not represent the same strained level of

---

195 Cf. Job 18:21, where the reason behind the use of this term, when the MT also calls for the more generic word for God, is less clear.
interpretation as SG, who, it is clear, has taken some independent measures to
further a possible understanding of this text. 196

Therefore, unless SG had access to certain traditions of which we are unaware,
the scope and range of SG's changes here in making sense of the MT borders on
what is uncharacteristically extreme, at least for him. What is most puzzling,
however, is not the lengths to which SG goes to make sense of the MT, but the fact
that he does not follow his normal practice of explaining the reasoning for his
departures in his own commentary on the text, a practice in which he painstakingly
indulges when making even relatively minor adjustments to the traditional
understanding of Hebrew scripture.

The admittedly much more minor difference between BM and TF (the dropping
of the final word in the verse by the latter) may be due to scribal error. The LXX
and S-H agree with the fuller wording of BM. 197

Despite the insertion of a second verb in the first stich, FA's wording is
exceptionally close to that of the Pesh. As usual, FA's agreement with that Syriac
version includes the title for the Deity. FA also inserts the vocative between the
two stichs, the Pesh being unique among the possible source versions in this regard,
and makes explicit, with the Pesh, the theme of inequality between mortals and
God. FA also shows internal consistency in his style, given his predilection for the
phrase لملك, which he also uses in 11:7a on a similar occasion. The other versions
differ internally on their particle of choice in this instance.

---

196 Neither the LXX nor the Syriac versions are helpful here, since they all take a
fairly different interpretive tack than either the MT and Tg on the one hand,
and SG on the other.

197 The closeness of the reading of these two Arabic script versions to the LXX is
exceptional at this point.
The relatively straightforward clarity of the MT has not prevented the Arabic versions from varying interpretations. These departures, it can be seen, have their roots in the LXX and Pesh, if not other predecessor versions.

SG's version is closest to the MT, even if stylistic considerations (note the parallel ḥin phrases in the two stichs) result in failing to replicate the MT's economy of words.

BM and TF are almost word-for-word the same. This in itself is not remarkable, except that they both contain extra phrases added in parallel, such as ... an mət ... There is no apparent source for such additions, this verse being closely based, otherwise, on the LXX, where no reference to death appears. A review of the Pesh, S–H, and Cp on this point is also fruitless. Yet the addition is not infelicitous, and does not damage either the linguistic integrity, nor the theological content, of the verse. Perhaps this verse, then, gives reason to postulate a direct dependence of one of these two 9th century C.E. texts upon the other.

FA's reliance on the Pesh is very clear at this point with regard to word order and semantics. However, FA displays a great, almost extreme, economy of expression here. This condensation, found to a lesser extent in the Pesh, can be surmised to result from a failure to recognize that the two parallel stichs of the MT provided meaningful elaborations upon each other: rather than repeat what appeared to be a tautology in the text, the MT's 3a and 3b were conflated.
There is further difficulty with FA's reading, however, whatever his source material. The verb he employs, based on the root lwy, 'be warped / crooked', is clearly pejorative. In contrast, the other Arabic versions speak positively of mending or improving one's ways. The question is whether FA's use of negative or pejorative language constitutes evidence of any particular doctrinal points of contention.

Salient to FA's place and time is fatalism, clearly pronounced in FA's Islamic environment, but no stranger to Christianity as well. Perhaps the use of a pejorative shocks the reader into a rejection of fatalistic doctrine, urging them on to positive deeds. Anti-nomianism also comes to mind here, being something which Job's Comforters accuse him of repeatedly. Following a 'twisted' way is definitely in constrast to the 'right' way of Job's forebears, a theme which Eliphaz will argue explicitly in succeeding verses.

Finally, Islamicists might wish to read into FA's use of the lexical item منفعة evidence of influence from Islamic law, where the word in question can refer to interest on an investment, as well as to a more generalized concept of 'yield' or 'produce'.

Verse 4

| MT | נָרַעְתָּא יִצְוָה יִכְוֶא טָמֵר בֶּמֶשֶׁפֶךְ |
| SG | והָיֶלֶקֶךָ פָּנָה קֹתֶךָ אֶל בֵּמֶשֶׁפֶךְ |
| BM | هل תַּעַיִי יֶבֶּֽלֶךָ אֲמֵהַ יֶֽבֶּֽלֶֽךָ קֵֽא הָעֹֽמֶלָּא |
| TF | هل קַדָּר לַהֵנִּי יֶבֶּֽלֶּךָ אֲמֵהַ יְגַנָּאָּא קֵֽא הָעֹֽמֶלָּא |
| FA | יֶבֶּֽלֶּךָ וְיָחָאָּסֶק |

SG and FA come down on opposite sides of how to understand the dichotomy presented by the Hebrew root yr$: 'awed reverence' (SG) or 'fear' (FA). But that is a minor difference between these two versions, and in the second stich, they agree
on the point, in opposition to the MT, concerning the issue of the Deity and the mortal coming together into a court of judgment: SG and FA de-emphasize any inference of equivalency between the two parties by removing the prepositional phrase 'with you', though the notion of the presence of two unequal parties in judgment together is preserved by their use of Form III of the final verb in the verse.

BM and TF are more problematic, with the latter proving to contain the more obtuse reading: kneeling in a court of judgment may be a reference to some ancient practice, for example, but such a reading, though culturally interesting, is not sanctioned by any of the predecessor versions. Should Form III of the verb here imply both parties kneeling in judgment together, then we have indication of Eliphaz' hyperbole rendering the idea all the more absurd for Job to contemplate. Such a reading, while not out of the question, would be an unusual one.

However, the close coincidence in ductus between the two texts raises the issue that TF may have been copied from BM without a full understanding of the source. The result was to mis-divide the words in question and supply incorrect diacritics, (first stich), or to simply misunderstand the words, and then supply the wrong diacritical markings (as in the second stich, thus giving a form of the verb 'kneel').

Verse 5

| MT | נַחֲלָה רַעְמָּה רַבָּה אַ֣יָּרֵךְ לֹ֖כְנָה | אַ֣לָּא אֵ֖לֶּה שָׁאַרְרֹתֵ֑י הַלֵּֽכְנָה לְדֵֽנָהֽוּ | אַ֣לָּא אֵ֖לֶּה שָׁאַרְרֹתֵ֑י הַלֵּֽכְנָה לְדֵֽנָהֽוּ |
| SG | אַלָּא אֵ֖לֶּה שָׁאַרְרֹתֵ֑י הַלֵּֽכְנָה לְדֵֽנָהֽוּ | אַ֣לָּא אֵ֖לֶּה שָׁאַרְרֹתֵ֑י הַלֵּֽכְנָה לְדֵֽנָהֽוּ | אַ֣לָּא אֵ֖לֶּה שָׁאַרְרֹתֵ֑י הַלֵּֽכְנָה לְדֵֽנָהֽוּ |
| BM | אַ֣לָּא אֵ֖לֶּה שָׁאַרְרֹתֵ֑י הַלֵּֽכְנָה לְדֵֽנָהֽוּ | אַ֣לָּא אֵ֖לֶּה שָׁאַרְרֹתֵ֑י הַלֵּֽכְנָה לְדֵֽנָהֽוּ | אַ֣לָּא אֵ֖לֶּה שָׁאַרְרֹתֵ֑י הַלֵּֽכְנָה לְדֵֽנָהֽוּ |
| TF | אַ֣לָּא אֵ֖לֶּה שָׁאַרְרֹתֵ֑י הַלֵּֽכְנָה לְדֵֽנָהֽוּ | אַ֣לָּא אֵ֖לֶּה שָׁאַרְרֹתֵ֑י הַלֵּֽכְנָה לְדֵֽנָהֽוּ | אַ֣לָּא אֵ֖לֶּה שָׁאַרְרֹתֵ֑י הַלֵּֽכְנָה לְדֵֽנָהֽוּ |
| FA | אַ֣לָּא אֵ֖לֶּה שָׁאַרְרֹתֵ֑י הַלֵּֽכְנָה לְדֵֽנָהֽוּ | אַ֣לָּא אֵ֖לֶּה שָׁאַרְרֹתֵ֑י הַלֵּֽכְנָה לְדֵֽנָהֽוּ | אַ֣לָּא אֵ֖לֶּה שָׁאַרְרֹתֵ֑י הַלֵּֽכְנָה לְדֵֽנָהֽוּ |

The Arabic script versions have Eliphaz make adept use of transitional conjunctions to move from the theoretical realm to what the speaker claims is Job's actual
The agreement between BM and TF on the conjunction in question is certainly further possible evidence for mutual dependence. The conjunction used by the Pesh, which has a cognate in Arabic, is not used in either of these Arabic versions; the conjunction employed by the S-H, kema, does share a common morphological element with أما, but the similarity is incomplete at best. Thus, given the highly idiomatic usage of the Arabic in both these versions, the agreement is all the more striking. The only major difference between these two Arabic versions, found at the close of the first stich, can be attributed to confusion regarding the ductus of the text, further evidence of possible direct dependence.

SG stays exceptionally close to the MT; FA’s version does likewise.

Verse 6

MT: כיריחהל אחתה הנה בענרת תורמה המש ל.: 'The Lord turned again and said,'

SG: דקר nýp sKn ý5oný rcarc n ýK rc ýýnor irc Kean

BM: וشهدת עליך אחוטיך בبطل ולبوسه איתצע ותרקם עראה

TF: ושדחתعلم אחוטיך בبطل: ولبوسه איתצע ועריהם

FA: לאך אחודה될חוכיך בبطل: ונזעת לפש המסיקין

Though the extreme closeness in the last few verses of BM and TF finishes with the first stich (note the possible scriptorial confusion between עליך and علم: BM makes more sense here), the similarity between the two versions is not to be denied simply due to the omission of a second verb in TF.

FA has points of contact with all the other Arabic versions, though not in the same regard. With SG, FA shares a common root, rhn, to express the idea of the MT’s 'take pledges', an idea that is, at best, only implied in the other two Arabic versions.

Indeed, BM and TF understand the MT’s verb from hbl, a homophonous root
meaning 'act ruinously / corruptly', and thus masterfully employ the root ṣdd, which can mean not only 'act violently / with intensity', but also has a secondary meaning of 'tie, bind, fasten', harkening to the meaning of both SG and FA.¹⁹⁸

FA also shares some common roots with the two other Arabic versions, including btl, 'be futile', as well as nz', 'dispossess', the latter root describing the action of stripping the naked of their clothing. Elsewhere in FA, the introduction of the concept of 'the poor' at the close of the verse is not only a question of making explicit what may be read into the text concerning 'the naked', but is probably also due to a mistaken double entendre of the Syriac versions' use of the word mashkāna in the first stich.

Verse 7

MT: Ṽm-ma ṼK ṼK 3u-3u 3u-tůl u-3l-3n qv 3o-n 3n-
SG: Ṽm-ma ṼK ṼK 3u-3u 3u-tůl t-r2t-ril rm KsaS m-pon t45
BM: Ṽm-ma ṼK ṼK 3u-3u 3u-tůl t-r2t-ril rm KsaS m-pon t45
TF: Ṽm-ma ṼK ṼK 3u-3u 3u-tůl t-r2t-ril rm KsaS m-pon t45
FA: Ṽm-ma ṼK ṼK 3u-3u 3u-tůl t-r2t-ril rm KsaS m-pon t45

The first stich shows remarkable agreement of all the Arabic versions with the MT, especially with regard to the use of cognate roots, for example, sqy and mwh. All the Arabic script versions also agree on the root for 'the thirsty': ʿtš.

The second stich, though not exhibiting the same heightened degree of closeness, displays nevertheless unusual convergences. Worthy of note is the common root mn in the MT and SG, as well as the common root jw in the three Arabic script versions.

Interestingly, it is FA alone that agrees with the MT at the close of the verse in making a specific reference to 'bread' rather than taking the more generalized

¹⁹⁸ The double entendre found here is highlighted in Noegel (1996), p. 79ff.
concept of the other Arabic versions, which use the root \( \text{m} \), with the broader meanings of 'food' or 'nourishment'.

Verse 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>ואלַש רוחַת לְךָּת יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲלֵהֶם וְתֹאֶם וְיֶבֶל בָּהּ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>וְיִתְגָּרֶא אֵלֶּהְךָּת אֲלֵהֶם וְיֶבֶל בָּהּ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM</td>
<td>וַמְּלֹאֵה יִתְגָּרֶא אָסְכָּנֵת עַל הָאָרֶץ מַסֵּאִין</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>וַמְּלֹאֵה יִתְגָּרֶא אָסְכָּנֵת עַל הָאָרֶץ מַסֵּאִין</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>וַכֹּלְכָּל בַּמַּעְלֶה אְסְכָּנֶה עַל הָאָרֶץ מַסֵּאִין *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This verse has received much attention over the centuries. Some commentators have thought it to be misplaced, presumably due to the interruption of the second masculine singular litanies of accusation directed against Job. Kissane (1939), for example, suggests moving v. 8 to a position following v. 14, despite the link occasioned by the presence of the Hebrew root \( zr' \) in both 8a and 9b. A cursory review of the literature shows that Kissane is not alone in proposing such solutions.

Even those not resorting to such extreme repositioning\(^{199}\) still have difficulty with the semantics, thus:

The MT may be giving a further indictment by Eliphaz of what Job has allowed to take place through ignorance or neglect. This view sees Job as sinning by omission, without attempting to reverse or ameliorate the problems described. However, Job's role may be seen as being more active, sinning by commission through the use of his own power.

SG, with the Tg, S-H, Cp, and to a lesser extent LXX, explicitly goes with the latter interpretation, while FA, with the Pesh, is more ambiguous, leaning by

\(^{199}\) The LXX merely reverses the two stichs within the verse itself.
implication to the former idea. In so doing, however, they both depart substantially from the reading of the MT, introducing the concept of the landowner being deprived of the fruits of his labor, a fairly common theme in Wisdom literature.\textsuperscript{200}

But these differences pale in comparison with what BM and TF make of this verse. The wordiness of these two Arabic versions, especially in dealing with the first stich, is symptomatic of their difficulties with the text, and their solutions are clearly innovative from a semantic point of view. And, it should be noted, their interpretations place 22:8 clearly in the context of what precedes and follows it, thus obviating any need to relocate it.

Both BM and TF are clear, at least in the second stich, in blaming Job for actively promoting injustice, as can be seen in their use of the causative verb \(\text{اسكن} \) which carries as its primary meaning 'cause to dwell'.\textsuperscript{201} But they differ from the MT, LXX, SG, Tg, S–H, and Cp in their understanding of what, exactly, is the injustice which Job is accused of fostering.

In the first stich, BM begins with an unconventional spelling (the semi-weak consonant \(\text{ن} \) being omitted)\textsuperscript{202} of an otherwise standard classical word: \(\text{الباهي} \) 'pride'. Given that TF in this same place has a word, \(\text{الناس} \), with a fairly similar ductus to the colloquial spelling \(\text{البای} \), the question arises regarding a possible misreading should BM be dependent upon TF, or vice versa. As we shall see, the sense of BM is clearly superior, if somewhat novel vis–à–vis all other versions.

After this point these two Arabic versions proceed largely in tandem, with both at pains to stay close to the LXX. They both resort to the root \(\text{wih} \), which as a

\textsuperscript{200} E.g., Ecclesiastes 2:21; similarly, there is a complementary parallel theme cited in the discussion of Job 18:15 (p. 142f).

\textsuperscript{201} Though see the discussion in the two final paragraphs of this section for their skillful use of a double entendre with regard to this verb.

\textsuperscript{202} The omission of this consonant in medial position, especially in the active participle of the Basic Form, is well attested in pronunciation, even in classical words, e.g. \(\text{شيد} \) for \(\text{شاهد} \).
verb means 'be a person of distinction, be a notable' in making sense of the contexts for the LXX's πρώοωνος and the MT's דָּלָּא. Yet, these two Arabic versions do not agree on the syntax, thus arriving at dissimilar results: TF uses a noun based on w/h as the first term of a construct, thus keeping כּוּרֵין in the first stich, while BM effectively ends the thought by prefixing a definite article to wוֹכֶה, appending the following word, כּוּרֵין, to the second stich.

Thus BM at 22:8a reads, 'Out of pride hast thou been moved to recompense him (i.e., the unfortunate), and (thus) thou hast gained respect / prestige', while TF's reading is slightly more garbled, and is less condemnatory without mention of the concept of pride and haughtiness: 'A number of people hast thou paid, and thou hast gained the respect of many'. Part of the awkwardness of TF is due to the fact that the antecedent for 'people' is ambiguous: it could refer to the 'unfortunate ones' of the previous verse; alternatively, maybe Job is being accused of unconcern with the unfortunate ones, only having a regard for his socio-economic equals.

This forces a reconsideration of the question at the opening of the discussion for 22:8, viz., whether Job's offense is one of commission or omission. If one sees the antecedent in question as being persons of Job's ilk, then his sin is of the latter type. In such a reading, which has affinities with the thought expressed in the MT, one would render the verb in question as 'trafficked with' as opposed to 'paid', both being acceptable.

Except for their treatment and thus placement of the word כּוּרֵין, these two versions have virtually identical second stichs. The main verb employed by both versions contains a double entendre: the basic meaning, 'cause to dwell', which follows the LXX, has a secondary meaning, 'impoverish, render destitute'. It is this semantically secondary sense that is carried by the cognate verbal noun, מָסָּאָכְיִין, as the stich's final word. Thus, in the end, the results are at variance not only from
the other Arabic versions, but also from the LXX.

BM has the better sense, not only internally, but also as a follow-on to the first stich: 'Many hast thou rendered impoverished upon the earth'. TF finally ends some of the awkwardness carrying over from his first stich, reading: 'Thou hast rendered destitute upon the earth unfortunate ones'. Either way, the difference with the MT in an attempt to remain in agreement with the LXX is clear.

Verse 9

All the Arabic versions are eager to accentuate the crimes referred to in this verse, perhaps because they resonate so clearly with the classical sins cited in scripture, viz., the oppression of widows and orphans. Each version, however, does so differently.

SG augments the gravity of the crime by injecting an introductory adverb, making clear the continuing nature of Job's supposed offenses against those that have no protector.203

While BM and TF preserve the economy of expression of the MT, they differ on the central verbs of the two stichs. TF has what may be considered the more forceful terminology of the two, reading 'Widows you have plundered; and orphans you have put down', while BM keeps closer to the MT. Its complete reading is

---

203 It is the conjecture of Goodman (1988) that SG's use of the term 'widows' is done in a manner which broadens the reference to those who are destitute in general rather than to a particular class (n. 2, pp. 308-09) by the choice of a secondary plural; it appears that Lane (1867) p. 1160, cols 2&3, can be interpreted to support such a reading. If so, this would also be an indication of a heightened sense of the offense.
'Widows you have heard emptily, and orphans you have expelled/evicted/ousted'.

The extra stich in FA's translation has no parallel in the predecessor versions of Job under examination. The S-H's marginal option sheds no light here, and all the other versions considered keep strictly to the schema of two parallel stichs. Thus here we have an example of FA striking out on his own, adding the middle stich to gloss the verse's opening one. While the wordiness that results may be seen as diluting the sheer starkness of the offense in question, the opposite may be argued as well: the greater the injustice, the more attention in the text does it deserve. In either case, the extra stich does not serve to alter the understanding of the text, but rather makes explicit what the MT hints at.

Verse 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>עלךון מכרחות פחדה נבחלך פחד פחדת</td>
<td>Widow's you have heard emptily, and orphans you have expelled/evicted/ousted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SG</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>לַלֵּךְ מִכְרָחֵךְ פַּחַד נְבָּחֵלְךָ פַּחַד פַּחַד</td>
<td>Widow's you have heard emptily, and orphans you have expelled/evicted/ousted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BM</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ولذلك احاطت بك الأوجاع وأسرع عليك القتال بحجة</td>
<td>And as a result of the offense, darted to your enemy with a justification.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TF</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ولذلك احاطت بك الأوجاع: وأسرع عليك القتال بحجة</td>
<td>And as a result of the offense: darted to your enemy with a justification.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FA</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>لذلك احاطت بك الفخاخ: وأفرعك الخوف بحجة *</td>
<td>And as a result of the offense: darted to your enemy with a justification.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two unique readings in BM and TF, one per stich, account for the main features here. That of the second stich is easily explained: the reference to strife in these two Arabic versions can be traced to the LXX, S-H, and Cp, which have translated the MT's 'dread' a bit more precisely. SG and FA, however, have preserved the broader, more wide-ranging sense of the Hebrew.

It is the reference in the first stich to 'ailments' or 'pains' in the BM and TF that is more problematic. Such an understanding is unprecedented, which makes the presence of such a reference in both of these versions further indication of textual

204 A variant reading reported in de Baudissin (1870) in the first stich results in 'Widows you have neglected', which appears to be more in harmony with the LXX and S-H.
dependence. Of course, the translator may be referring to the boils that afflict the protagonist. Thus the poetic licence displayed is not without literary sensitivity.

Verse 11

The reference to 'light' found in the first stich of both BM and TF can be traced to the LXX, but BM's reference to 'shame' in the second stich is puzzling, as is TF's reference to 'anger'. In a departure from the MT, the Pesh reveals a different understanding of this verse, which may have a clue for BM's reading.

The Pesh sees a transition at this point to the thought of the following verse, rather than a continuing recitation from the previous verse of the consequences of contemptible behavior. The tone moves to one of taunting the protagonist: could he have really thought he could have evaded the repercussions of his sinfulness? BM, though continuing a recitation of the consequences that have overcome the protagonist, may contain in its reference to 'shame' or 'contempt', as well as in its omission of any reference to 'water', an anticipation of what the Almighty discerns, as stated in v. 12. Another possible source for the understanding of 'shame' here may be the S–H, which closes the stich with the word 'thy lying down'. The emendation of the final radical from א to ר would yield 'your shame'.

TF's reference to 'anger' does not supplant that of 'water', but is rather inserted immediately previous to it. The S–H's reference to 'lying down', in harmony with the LXX and Cp, has already been noted, and this Arabic version's reference to

---

205 A similar phrase is found in the Cp.
'anger' may come from yet another misreading or a misunderstanding of a source text as made in BM. Indeed, 'lying down' may have made no sense to TF, and thus [divine] anger might have been arbitrarily inserted as a cause for being overwhelmed by water.

Verse 12

MT

SG

BM

TF

FA

Once again, the Arabic versions do not agree regarding terminology to refer to the Deity. The MT uses what is the standard Joban term, and SG, for once, agrees to use the standard Arabic term equivalent, along with FA.206 BM and TF, however, use a more specialized name, 'The Most High'. This might be due to the circumlocution found in the LXX, 'He that dwells in the high places', which is echoed in the S-H and Cp. But the terminology in BM and TF suggests independent development from those versions, as well as possible dependence between themselves or on some other unknown source.

BM and TF also agree with FA in placing together within their first stich both the MT's negative of its first stich with the active verb of its second. This allows for the introduction of a new thought in their second stichs while dropping the explicit reference of the MT to the 'stars'. Thus is only a faint echo of the created cosmos found in BM and TF ('that which is beneath Him') and even less so in FA ('and created it by His command'). In fact, FA removes all reference to God's

206 The Tg and Pesh also stand with the MT here.
survey of His creation, which BM and TF preserve. But where these three Arabic
script versions subsequently head differs even more widely.

In the second stich, BM and TF create a poetic balance, contrasting the loftiness
of God with the low estate into which He brings mere 'mortals', reference to whom
is made from the root qlb, the Fifth Form as used here being an allusion to the
beatings of the heart. Here an affinity with the LXX is preserved, though all
contact with the MT seems lost, at least temporarily.

FA's second stich, 'and created it by His command', fails to create a poetic
balance, as do the other Arabic script versions. Additionally, it is not in harmony
with the MT or SG in their reference to God's cosmic surveillance. To achieve this
latter end, FA adds a third stich, which has the Deity overlooking not just the
created order in general, but Satan in particular, whose pride has cast him down.
Thus this third stich betrays possible influences from the LXX,207 but it shows
independence of theological reflection by FA in his re-introduction of Satan.

This appearance is most probably due to theological reflection connecting to the
brief and ambiguous allusion in Isaiah 14:12, elaborated upon in the Christian
scriptures,208 of Satan being cast out of heaven. In the Job of the LXX, this idea is
hardly even implicit, even though the second stich speaks of abasement: "and has
He not brought down the proud?". But the two other Arabic script versions
inadvertently reinforce the possibility of the Isaianic reading, given their introduction
of the root qlb, the Fifth Form of which can refer not only the beating of one's
heart, but also to being overthrown.209 Thus FA can interpret the reading as
referring not just to mere mortals, but to the fallen, 'turned upside down' Lucifer.

207 The reference to a self-aggrandizing Satan clearly fits with the LXX's 'the proud'.
209 The semantic range included within the root in its basic Form is 'turn upside
down / reverse', and in its Fifth Form, as used here, 'fluctuate / palpitate'.
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In this FA is not being original, but follows the lead of earlier Christian theologians and commentators, such as Tertullian and Gregory the Great, who saw such a connection between Job 22:12 and Isaiah 14:12.

FA's explicit introduction of Satan at this point in the story of Job not only allows him, as a Christian biblical interpreter, to highlight points of contact between the two testaments, but also gives an opportunity to provide an explicit connection between the prose and poetic sections of the story of Job itself. Satan has been absent throughout the poetic section, but now in FA's translation, he reappears.

In the MT, the heavenly and earthly stages of the story of Job are well separated, and once Satan has played his part in the drama, he unceremoniously disappears from view. Unquestionably, the Book of Job in its Hebrew version is not primarily a story about Satan and his works. But we have seen that in TF's version, the satanic carries a greater accent, though the underlying fidelity to scripture keeps a check on overly developing such a theme.

TH's Islamic tale, however, is unencumbered by the perception of the need to adhere to a canonical text; indeed, TH's Job largely ignores the book's poetic sections, leaving a story in which the struggle between God and Satan for a mortal's soul is much more central. Thus the roles of Satan and his minions are magnified, casting the protagonist of Hebrew scripture into a relatively passive role.

Now, while a Christian interpreter such as FA would keep, by-and-large, to the canonical tale, it would not be out of character for such an interpreter, working and living in an Islamicized environment, to remind his readers of such a major character as Satan if the opportunity occurred, even if this were not his primary aim. Thus is the seizing of the theological opportunity complemented.

210 BM and TF accomplish much the same at v. 30b.
211 Cf. 1:14a (p. 36), 17a (p. 42), and 18a (p. 43).
The shift in the MT's title for the Deity to the basic Semitic הַלּוֹךְ results in terminological shifts in all the Arabic versions with the exception of FA, who still employs the equivalent generic Arabic word for 'God'. BM and TF, however, translate הַלּוֹךְ as 'The Mighty One', while SG reverts to one of his favorite names for the Deity, אלָמַנְיָא, "the Almighty".²¹²

FA's fidelity to the MT is recaptured in the first stich after his theological and stylistic foray of the previous verse. In fact, all the Arabic versions approximate the MT fairly closely here, in contrast to the lapses in agreement that have characterized many of the previous verses in this chapter. This is all the more significant, since this verse is theologically pivotal to the argument that Eliphaz puts forth, with all the Arabic versions making the same point as the MT: someone who offends against God cannot hope to remain unknown to Him, and therefore can expect punishment from Him.

FA, however, uses imagery in the second stich that is at variance with all the Arabic versions, which adhere more closely to the MT's notion of God in His judgment seeing through clouds that otherwise obscure human vision. In FA, there is no reference to any clouds whatsoever. Instead, he speaks of God's light. Thereby FA is able to introduce the theological concept of divine transcendence in an entirely different manner from the other Arabic versions, or even from the MT:

---
²¹² E.g., at 18:21 (p. 147), where SG uses this term to translate the very same title for God when He is characterized by His might.
God is judge of what happens in the mundane realm despite, not because of, His other-worldly, radiant glory. The other versions view the difficulty of bridging the gap from humanity’s point of view; FA focuses on the divine instead. In the end, however, the theological argument is the same: no matter what the obstacle, whether viewed from 'below' or 'above', God's power is overwhelming.

All this assumes, of course, that FA's text has been correctly transcribed. It would be a very simple matter, however, to remove two dots, changing from ضیاءه (His light) to ضیاءه (His clouds), thus bringing FA's vocabulary precisely into line with that of BM; the new reading of FA for the end of v. 13b would then be 'while He is in His clouds'. This is a tempting proposition.

If there is no emendation, however, then we have evidence of FA's grammatical acumen, the second ي in question being required as the seat for the genitive ending preceding the pronominal suffix. Otherwise, this second ي would not appear at all, the modern orthographical equivalent requiring only an unseated glottal stop.

Verse 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>عبر Signing</th>
<th>בזונה ב airl</th>
<th>$</th>
<th>אִלְּאָלָּזִים</th>
<th>נִשָּׁמָא</th>
<th>יְוהֵי שֵׂם יִשְׁתָּל</th>
<th>מֵאְלָלוֹת</th>
<th>מֵרָתָה</th>
<th>מֵעָלָם</th>
<th>יְי</th>
<th>יי</th>
<th>יי</th>
<th>יי</th>
<th>יי</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>לְהַרְגִּלָּלָה לַאֲרָמָא</td>
<td>יְרָמ</td>
<td>יי</td>
<td>אָלָלָזִים</td>
<td>נִשָּׁמָא</td>
<td>יְוהֵי שֵׂם יִשְׁתָּל</td>
<td>מֵאְלָלוֹת</td>
<td>מֵרָתָה</td>
<td>מֵעָלָם</td>
<td>יְי</td>
<td>יי</td>
<td>יי</td>
<td>יי</td>
<td>יי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM</td>
<td>וַאֲנֵמְבָּא בַּשְּׁבָּא</td>
<td>מַלְּתָא</td>
<td>מַלְּתָא</td>
<td>אָלָלָזִים</td>
<td>נִשָּׁמָא</td>
<td>יְוהֵי שֵׂם יִשְׁתָּל</td>
<td>מֵאְלָלוֹת</td>
<td>מֵרָתָה</td>
<td>מֵעָלָם</td>
<td>יְי</td>
<td>יי</td>
<td>יי</td>
<td>יי</td>
<td>יי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>וַאֲנֵמְבָּא בַּשְּׁבָּא</td>
<td>מַלְּתָא</td>
<td>מַלְּתָא</td>
<td>אָלָלָזִים</td>
<td>נִשָּׁמָא</td>
<td>יְוהֵי שֵׂם יִשְׁתָּל</td>
<td>מֵאְלָלוֹת</td>
<td>מֵרָתָה</td>
<td>מֵעָלָם</td>
<td>יְי</td>
<td>יי</td>
<td>יי</td>
<td>יי</td>
<td>יי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>וַאֲנֵמְבָּא בַּשְּׁבָּא</td>
<td>מַלְּתָא</td>
<td>מַלְּתָא</td>
<td>אָלָלָזִים</td>
<td>נִשָּׁמָא</td>
<td>יְוהֵי שֵׂם יִשְׁתָּל</td>
<td>מֵאְלָלוֹת</td>
<td>מֵרָתָה</td>
<td>מֵעָלָם</td>
<td>יְי</td>
<td>יי</td>
<td>יי</td>
<td>יי</td>
<td>יי</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the Arabic script versions all seem to struggle with the Hebrew in its entirety, the second stich is the more difficult. Only SG stays with the MT through both. The question, then, regards why the other Arabic versions stray from the meaning of the MT. With the Tg, LXX, Pesh, and S-H giving no clue, the difficulties are inexplicable in terms of literary dependence. The leaves the question of whether theological reflection may be the determining factor.
Not having divine transcendence negate God's ability to enforce justice and moral law in the immanent world, even on a personal level, has been the main thrust of Eliphaz' theological argument. It is in dealing with transcendence and immanence that the Arabic versions find room for variation.

In BM and TF we find, through words that Eliphaz puts in the mouth of Job, God's sight not reaching 'the ends of the earth'. Of course, Eliphaz would argue the contrary of what he accuses Job of believing: that despite God's seeming distance and invisibility, He sees everything that happens, and thus is in a position to know what injustices have been committed and which moral laws require divine enforcement. This is a recurring theme in Wisdom literature, and is perhaps most pronounced in Ps. 139. Though the phrase 'the ends of the earth', is not found in that psalm, it is often encountered in scripture in connection with God's omniscience or sovereignty. Thus, this scriptural echo serves to underline the folly imputed to Job, or at least to those who are said to think as Job is accused of thinking.

This, of course, considers God's transcendence from the human viewpoint, that is, from an earthly one. FA, however, continues to reflect upon transcendence from a heavenly point of view, and in his second stich refers to God's works as being visible, even if God is not. Indeed, while 'works' appear in the other Arabic script versions, they do so as the evil works of mortals, not the results of divine activity. Thus does FA, in contradistinction to the other Arabic versions, continue to consider transcendence as something that is bridged from 'on high' rather than as a problem to be solved or a riddle to be considered from those of us 'below'. Or, to view the situation less charitably, FA is obliged by his theology to forcibly rework the sense of the text if he is to preserve its lexical integrity. Thus, there is no escape from the omnipotence or omnicompetence of God, even if God Himself is not readily

\[213 \text{ Cf. Ps. 22:27, 65:5, and Is. 52:10, inter alia.}\]
apparent to human view.

Only at this point, having dealt with the theology of transcendence, does FA feel free to return to the theme of the MT, which happily fits in with considering transcendence from the divine viewpoint. He thus adds a third stich, equivalent to the second stich of the Hebrew, picturing God striding upon the circuits of heaven.

Verse 15

| MT          | יָשָׁרַד לעֵלָה וְתַפְּסֶר אֵשֶׁר וְרֹבְּדֵיהֶם | בַּאֲלֹהָיו אֲלֵודֵיהֶם וְתַפְּסֶרּוֹ אֵשֶׁר וְרֹבְּדֵיהֶם |
| SG          | וָאֵלְכָה הַמִּשְׁפָּרָה מִיָּשֶׂרֶת בְּהַשָּׁמְיָה | וָאֵלְכָה הַמִּשְׁפָּרָה מִיָּשֶׂרֶת בְּהַשָּׁמְיָה |
| BM          | וָסָָּלֵכִי הַמַּעֹנֶה מִיָּשֶׂרֶת בְּהַשָּׁמְיָה | וָסָָּלֵכִי הַמַּעֹנֶה מִיָּשֶׂרֶת בְּהַשָּׁמְיָה |
| TF          | לְמַלְּכֵי הַמִּשְׁפָּרָה מֵיָּשֶׂרֶת נָשְׁפִּית | לְמַלְּכֵי הַמִּשְׁפָּרָה מֵיָּשֶׂרֶת נָשְׁפִּית |
| FA          | מֵלְכֵי הַמִּשְׁפָּרָה מֵיָּשֶׂרֶת נָשְׁפִּית | מֵלְכֵי הַמִּשְׁפָּרָה מֵיָּשֶׂרֶת נָשְׁפִּית |

One major division among the versions here concerns the nature of the men who have followed the path of which Eliphaz speaks. The difference is occasioned by the disagreement between the MT, Tg, Pesh, and S-H on the one hand, which speak of evil men, and the LXX and Cp, which speak of the righteous. In the end, SG and FA follow the former grouping, while BM and TF follow the latter.

Another major issue in this verse concerns what the versions make of the MT's curious phrase מַלְּכֵי הַמִּשְׁפָּרָה, the path over which these personages are said to have walked. Instead of one major divide here, there are four, there being no agreement whatsoever among the Arabic versions as to what is meant.

SG uses a term which had taken on a technical meaning in Arabic, which might be loosely translated as 'atheist' or 'freethinker'. The question is over whether SG may have had the technical meaning in mind. Whatever SG did intend, however, it is apparent that his thinking is idiosyncratic here, since the other Arabic versions did not read into the verse the same idea. Perhaps the closest to SG is the reading of BM, if a technical, or rather, a philosophical or theological position, is accepted as
standing behind SG's thought. In any case, SG's lexical choice for the term 'paths' permits a technical reading.214

BM translates the troublesome phrase in question as 'travellers of the deep', which at first sight is unclear semantically. However, if the imagery of metaphysical speculation as 'deep' is posited, such might provide a clue as to the meaning which BM intended. In addition, his choice of roots for the first term of this construct, *slk*, can be understood as supporting an interpretation of metaphysical speculation for 'deep'; therefore the phrase could be understood as reading 'those who follow the philosophical path'.

TF displays more fidelity to the text semantically, seeing some reference to length of time, which he renders into Arabic as 'antiquity'. His reading, therefore, is 'those who tread (the paths of) antiquity'. This is reminiscent of "the eternal way" as found in the Cp.

FA works into his reading the consonant-by-consonant Arabic cognate for the Hebrew word in question: זֵדֶלַם becomes, quite simply, عَالِمَ, which can have two different meanings. The direct cognate to the Hebrew, عَالِمَ, 'world', yields a meaning approaching that of SG: 'way of the world'. An alternative vocalization, عَالِمُ, 'knowledgeable one', is reminiscent of BM's philosophical path.

Verse 16

| MT | אֲשֶׁר-כָּפַתִּים וַאֲמַהֲתָהּ נָורָּה זֵדֶלַם יָמֵם: | SG | אֲלָלִים מָאָלַתִּים בְּעִנָּרָם כַּהֲלִקָהּ כָּלַעֲמָהּ: | BM | ولم تدرى بايک توحد بلا وقت | TF | ولم يدرى بايک توحد في غير وقت | FA | ولم تدرى بايک توحد في غير وقت |

214 Goodman (1988), explores the issue fully at n. 6, pp. 309-10.
All the Arabic script versions are seized, as it were, with a desire to expostulate at great length on the tersely worded Hebrew text. Interestingly, the same phenomenon occurs in some, but not all, mss of the Tg, as well as in the Pesh, but not the LXX, S-H, or Cp, which remain close to the MT.

SG's variation on the MT, characteristically, is relatively minor: perhaps in an attempt to render the metaphorical image more consistent, he uses in his first stich the verb 'overwhelm', rather than the MT's 'seize', in order to parallel his image in the second stich of being beset by a flood.

BM and TF remain fairly close to each other by sharing lexical items for the most part. When they do not do so, the semantic differences between the two are still not great. One difference to be noted is that BM shifts the conjugation to the second person singular, thus directly accusing Job rather than continuing, as does TF initially, the thinly-veiled accusations derived from a characterization of 'the wicked', which continues from previous verses. TF does soon fall into line with BM, however, before the end of the first stich.

Neither of these versions, unlike SG, alter the MT's 'seize' in the first stich, taking their cue from the LXX, which similarly follows the Hebrew very closely at this point.

After the first stich, however, both BM and TF become rather verbose, adding, in effect, a third stich (as does FA) after exhibiting difficulties in their understanding of the second stich itself. For example, both make reference to 'the mountains', creating an image of being thrown against rocks by the floods. Such a reference is simply unattested elsewhere, unless it is found in FA's final word to his first stich, العقاب, which can have a variety of meanings, ranging from 'heels' (of the foot) to 'eagle' to 'upshot / outcome' to 'black she-camel'.

However, taking our cue from the mountain motif in BM and TF, the meaning
for the plural of عقبة, 'mountain road', or even more likely، which in itself has three areas of meaning that might apply here: 'mass of stone', 'hill', or most intriguingly, given the water image in this verse, 'a channel by which water flows to a trough'.

In adding a third stich, BM and TF are joined by FA and the Pesh, though there is some disagreement as to the reason for the insertion of this extra thought. FA's final vocabulary item in this third stich, 'their foundation', is identical to SG's close of his second stich. Thus do these two versions eventually converge, though FA gives ear, in effect, to the thought of the Pesh: 'and then did not remember who had laid down their pattern of living'. Here, FA reads 'and they did not remember He who created their foundation.'

Verse 17

Remarkably, all the Arabic versions follow the MT, but their respective variations, found in the verb and its subject of the second stich, are worth noting.

SG adds an auxiliary verb at the beginning of the second stich, 'make light of', thus clarifying a potential ambiguity of the Hebrew.

FA also adds a second verb, but the meaning is quite different from that of SG's translation: 'be capable of'. Due to varying grammatical structures, however, the semantics of the SG's and FA's two stichs are brought into virtual harmony.

BM and TF are interesting in that the subject of the verb is الضابط, one

---

215 Cf. Lane (1874), Book I, Part V, p. 2102, column 3.
rendering of which might be 'the Omnipotent'. While these two Arabic versions are not consistent in all other places of using this term to translate "الضابط"، based on the root "dbt 'control / manage', is used occasionally, as in Job 22:25a, in construct with "كل" in BM, or without the definite article in TF, thus: 'Maintainer of All'.

Additionally, while BM and TF do not add auxiliary verbs, unlike SG and FA, one nuance of the second stich's only verb, from the root "jlb", is 'bring harm upon'. Thus BM and TF are more explicit than the LXX's "or what will the Almighty bring upon us?" Clearly, what they have in mind is the sense, often found in the Authorized Version, of 'divine visitation'.

Finally, the presence of the Middle Arabic lexical item "الش" in TF is consistent with similar usage previously encountered. Given the virtually complete agreement between TF and BM here, the presence of the word "الش" in the latter can be taken as a corruption, given the ductus.

Verse 18a

| MT | وملا غيتهد موب |
| SG | وملا جيتهد فروم |
| BM | كل الذين ملوا بيوتهم من الخير |
| TF | كل الذين ملوا بيوتهم من الخير |
| FA | وهو ملا بيوتهم الخصب والخير |

The closeness of SG to the MT continues through the first stich of verse 18; FA is similar, though he elaborates on that which is 'good' with an extra noun based on "هش", 'abundance'.

---

216 This is not one of Islam's 99 names of God.
217 The occurrence of the word "كل" immediately following this definite noun is cause for some confusion as to where this verse ends; the presence of a definite article on "ضابط" is clear indication that the word "كل" belongs in the next stich as the antecedent to the relative pronoun.
But BM and TF see the first stich as being a further relative clause, based on that which began the previous verse. In so reading, they delete any adversative particle, and thus misunderstand who is the provider of all the 'good': it is not God, but the wicked themselves. This, of course, makes perfect sense when considered in conjunction with their version of the first stich of verse 17, 'what can the Lord do to us?', the implication being that the wicked feel themselves to be well nigh untouchable, God being able to do little to them.\textsuperscript{218} It is thus unsurprising that the wicked see themselves, rather than Providence, as the source of their plenty. Indeed, the wicked in these two Arabic versions see God as being virtually irrelevant, a source of neither good nor evil in the lives of mortals.

Verse 18b

\begin{tabular}{ll}
MT & אעש את רשלים רחכה פַּלֵיה \tiny{מַה קַצְנֵיה} תל אֲלַפָּלוֹתָם \tiny{אָלַפָּלוֹתָם}\\
SG & יבָחֹר מַלָאך שֵׁם קַצְנֵיה תֵל אֲלַפָּלוֹתָם \tiny{אָלַפָּלוֹתָם}\\
BM & וمواد רעבם \tiny{רֹאשׁ רָאִיתם} \tiny{שָׁמִיר אֶל} חָסִיד כָּל אֶלֶף אָלֶף בֵּית אֲדֹנֵיָם\\
TF & וمواد רעבם \tiny{רֹאשׁ רָאִיתם} \tiny{שָׁמִיר אֶל} חָסִיד כָּל אֶלֶף אָלֶף בֵּית אֲדֹנֵיָם\\
FA & \end{tabular}

The common semantic element to all the Arabic versions is 'distance', with complete unanimity on the use of the root \textit{b`d}. That which is being distanced, however, is a matter of disagreement.

SG's reading makes the wicked believe not so much in the entire irrelevancy of God, as do BM and TF in the previous stich. However, he notes that God has chosen not to act with immediacy to punish the wicked, but grants them a respite; this the wicked do not realize. SG's wording is less than poetic, and fails to recognize that with the end of 18a, the quotation by the wicked is closed, and Eliphaz is inserting his own pious editorial comment.

\textsuperscript{218} Cf. SG's use of the verb 'make light of' as the parallel in the second stich here.
BM and TF also see the thought of 18b as following directly on from 18a rather than a completion of a quotation from the wicked followed by a comment from Eliphaz. Both BM and TF refer bluntly to the 'plots' or 'conspiracies' of the 'hypocrites', saying that such activities are far from 'the Lord'. They are thus the only versions to identify the Deity directly, as implied in the LXX and Cp but not in the MT, unless one were to understand the first person singular pronominal suffix, with which the MT closes this stich, as part of a quotation by God, referring to Himself.

FA's version of 18b is an explanation following on from the adversative with which the verse opened. What is characterized as being distant is the thought of the wicked, who simply cannot fathom that God would have filled their places with 'good and fruitful things', as is stated in 18a. That FA has missed an opportunity, seized by BM and TF, to exploit a Qur'anic parallel, is well worth noting.

Verse 19

With the exception of the initial verb in FA at 19a, describing that which ultimately befalls those who are wicked, viz., 'and they fall / go for a tumble', there are no major disagreements among any of the Arabic versions, and only the following linguistic points need be highlighted:

BM mixes classical and colloquial verb forms within the first stich; additionally,

---

219 As does the LXX.
220 This is a favorite Qur'anic word for the enemies of God and His prophets and apostles.
there is a gratuitous dot over the middle radical in the second verb, where clearly
dhk, 'laugh', as opposed to the non-sensical dxk, is meant.

Along with TF, BM follows the perfect of 'be' with a construct to negate the
adjective,\(^{221}\) thus reading 'whoever was without blame'. SG, however, with the MT,
gives the positive, reading 'pure / innocent', while FA independently supplies a
felicitous circumlocution, 'the one who lives by the good'.

Verse 20a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>InputStream</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>InputStream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM</td>
<td>InputStream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>InputStream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>InputStream</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

That the last word in the MT's first stich makes for difficulty has long been attested.

Gordis (1978)\(^{222}\) eliminates, among others, one possible reading which SG's version
appears to adopt, reading the troublesome word in question as 'their creatures'.\(^{223}\)

The objections raised by Gordis (1978) to such a reading apply to SG as well. To
have such a word as the subject of the passive form of the verb derived from ktm,
which in itself is not attested to by lexicographers, but whose meaning can be
inferred, makes for a linguistically awkward passage. This is not one of SG's finer
moments.

If BM and TF would have been puzzled over the MT, the LXX served them as
a clear model. Their lexical choice, \(\text{قوابم} \), for 'sustenance', is based on the Arabic
root cognate to that of the Hebrew in the MT. This also works well in that

\(^{221}\) Cf. the LXX, which employs a similar construction in using the alpha privative in
\(\Delta\mu\iota\mu\iota\pi\iota\sigma\). 

\(^{222}\) P. 248f.

\(^{223}\) This is at variance with the suggestion by Goodman (1988) to translate 'their
souls', which is possible, but stretches the point.
appropriately parallels 'abundance / plenty', found in the second stich. In a departure from classical Arabic, both BM and TF place an adjective, سريع, after the particle إن, which requires either a noun or a pronoun in the accusative. Either they misunderstood the meaning of the adjective, 'quick / rapid', thinking it to be the subject of the stich, or, more likely, were unconstrained by classical word order, and understood سريعا, an adverb normally derived from the adjective by the addition of an accusative ending.

FA's reading of the first stich is the freest, turning it into the opening clause of a conditional statement, clearly giving a moralizing warning to the wicked. Thus:

'If they do not repent from the evil of their doings...'

Verse 20b

MT
SG
BM
TF
FA

For BM and TF, the lexical items in the second stich are identical, though their word order varies: TF's reading is more pedestrian, while BM is more emphatic, the choice being stylistic. In this, BM is in agreement with the word order of SG, while TF is parallel to FA. All the Arabic versions, with the exception of FA, use 'kl, 'consume' as the root of their verb; FA employs a more literal hraq, 'burn up / destroy by fire'.

By contrast, when it comes to the direct object of the verb, FA is in agreement with SG on the root bqy, 'be left over', though they differ on which part of speech to use, FA adopting a verbal noun, SG the active participle; BM and TF employ the same lexical item, from brk, 'give in blessing', usually said of God.
Both SG and FA read nuances into the MT's first verb, and the results are appropriate in each case. SG's imperative from the root \( rkn \) gives the idea of 'listing towards', while FA's verb, 'come to an agreement' is no less accurate, though he may be accused here of lacking a poetic sense. Both of these Arabic versions take advantage of a cognate root, \( s\ell m \), for the second verb of the MT's first stich. FA is more literal in his approach to the relationship of the first verb to the second by the insertion of the transitional conjunction \( \text{ف} \) between them, whereas SG simply follows the syntax of the MT: imperative verb, prepositional phrase, imperfect verb. Either is acceptably classical Arabic, though the insertion of a pronoun after the imperative by FA is unnecessary unless it has been added for rhetorical emphasis.

In contrast to the ease with which SG and FA deal with the MT's first stich, TF can be seen as struggling with the original. The lack of a parallel passage in BM, which simply omits the entire verse, does not aid in interpreting the ambiguity found in TF's use of the Arabic root \( jn\nu \), which can mean either 'be fruitful' or 'be criminal'. The former definition can be seen as following the LXX if word order is ignored. In addition, the LXX's 'I pray thee' can be seen as the source for TF's 'your prayer', though the meaning throughout TF's verse is garbled and truncated.

The former definition can be seen as following the LXX if word order is ignored. In addition, the LXX's 'I pray thee' can be seen as the source for TF's 'your prayer', though the meaning throughout TF's verse is garbled and truncated.

---

24 The S–H also includes the second masculine singular pronoun at this point, but in a different grammatical context.

25 Indeed, the MT's הָלַבּוּ is the source for the LXX's \( \kappa\alpha\rho\pi\omicron\omicron \), though this is not its only possible interpretation. Additionally, the S–H also makes reference to 'crops' or 'fruit'.
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This leads to the consideration of the second possible semantic area represented by the Arabic root /ny, 'be criminal', which gives the following reading: 'You will / would not be delinquent / criminal while you incline your prayer towards goodness.'

While such a reading is unprecedented, the semantics follow on well from those of verse 20 in this Arabic version, which already displays differences with the thrust of the MT. In following such a reading, Eliphaz is thus not opening his final section of admonition at this point, but rather continues his preceding argument, which is only completed in 22a.

Finally, FA’s lengthy treatment of the MT’s second stich must be addressed here. Already, the addition of the prepositional phrase 'in His praise' after the second verb in the first stich226 is an unprecedented gloss, but not an inapt one. While the resulting juxtaposition of the roots slm and hmd lends an Islamic flavor, it does not do so exclusively.

FA’s use of this prepositional phrase helps make more explicit the notion that God, who is never mentioned in this verse, is the One who brings 'the good'. FA expands this final concept, not only by the use of the plural, but by preceding this plural with the gloss 'crops', thus bringing his reading into harmony with that of the LXX, Pesh, and S–H, if not TF.

Verse 22

| MT | קֶרֶנֶא מְפִּיּ הָרְוָה וֹשִׁמְא אָמְרֵי בָלָבְּרָא |
| SG | אֲנָכַּבְּלָא מְלָא מַמְרָה אַלְשְׁמָה גֶּזֶר אָסְכַּמָּלָה פּ מְלָבְּרָא |
| BM | פַּנָּהְרִי מִנְּךָ מָא לָא בֵּיְנֵי וַאֲנַחְצֵ נָאָב עלָא קָלְּבּ ק |
| TF | פַּנָּהְרִי מִנְּךָ מָא לָא בֵּיְנֵי וַאֲנַחְצֵ נָאָב עלָא קָלְּבּ |
| FA | פַּנָּהְרִי מִנְּךָ מָא לָא בֵּיְנֵי וַאֲנַחְצֵ נָאָב עלָא קָלְּבּ |

226 FA’s division of this verse into its constituent stichs is inaccurate from the MT’s point of view, though the result reflects the natural grammatical division of the Arabic itself.
By the second stich, all the Arabic versions converge; but TF’s first stich, as well as that of BM, reads quite differently. In doing so, the stich in question remains faithful to the thought of these versions’ two preceding verses, which, as it has been noted, have been at variance with the MT, if not with all the predecessor versions under consideration.

SG’s choice of the root šś‘ for ‘law’ is virtually inevitable, as is his attempt to render the anthropomorphic image less so. At first sight, therefore, FA’s choice of a different root is surprising, especially in light of the obvious Islamic overtones available in SG’s vocabulary item.

But FA is not oblivious to the opportunity presented by the MT’s use of הָרָה. Seizing upon the root snn, which is used in Islam to describe not only the practices and sayings of the Prophet himself, but also the resultant normative code of behavior for the entire Islamic community, FA is faithful to his text while displaying sensitivity to his religious environment.

FA is not as squeamish in the anthropomorphic imagery of the MT’s first stich; neither are TF and BM. But the latter two texts treat the mouth as terminus a quo, not the terminus ad quem. The difference is reflected in BM’s choice of the imperative from the root trh, ‘spew out’, synonymous to TF’s root lqy, ‘hurl’.

These verbs are in contrast to the one shared by both SG and FA from the root qbl, ‘receive’. In fact, the closeness of these two versions continues through the second stich, where the variations are due to close synonyms, e.g., קلامה for קָפְלָה, or differing moods based on the identical root syr.

Verse 23a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>BM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>אַמִּיתָשׁוֹת וּדִרְשָׁר הַהַבָּנָה</td>
<td>אַמִּיתָשׁוֹת אִלָּהּ אֵלָהְמֵאתָהּ בֶּנֶיהָ</td>
<td>לאֶלֶקָן אוֹרֵמָתָּ וּגְמַעַת בֵּין יְדֵי הַרְבּ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The verb with which the MT's first stich closes, נָחַת, has been the occasion for widely varying interpretations, both ancient and modern. Some, including Pope (1965) and Habel (1985), cite possible Ugaritic linguistic influence for their elucidations: 'you will be healed' and 'you will be rehabilitated', respectively. Such readings necessitate minimal textual emendations, as does the Tg's "you will be restored", which is apparently behind Kissane's understanding (1939); perhaps Renan's 1882 reading, "tu te relèveras" is to be included in those interpretations requiring minor variations on the MT, though the exact reasoning of Renan is not provided (p. 97).

Others are content to let the MT stand: the Pesh is the most important here. And, predictably, among the Arabic versions, SG is counted as the most conservative, simply accepting the MT and translating 'you are built up', with the cognate Arabic root bny.

But many have simply found the MT unsatisfactory, including the LXX and S–H, which understand 'you shall humble yourself', adding the extra phrase 'before the Lord'. In this they are followed by TF, who provides hd' [if] you bow / obey / humble yourself between His hands', i.e., 'in His presence'.

The text of BM has been seen as presenting a difficulty in itself; de Baudissin (1870) assumes the LXX and S–H for his reading, though this is based on his understanding of the LXX as the source text for his ms. However, the root appearing in BM, jm', which de Baudissin finds unacceptable, can be considered simply an alternative Arabic expression for 'be built up'. True, as a root it is broader than that used by SG, for it includes in its semantic area 'combine / amass / comprise'. But despite this, BM can be seen as not following the LXX (and thus the
S–H) in parallel with TF, but rather as adhering to the Pesh.

FA’s approach is the most radical in that he adds a medial stich to this verse. In his first stich, he employs a verb based on the root *twb*, which is cognate to the MT’s *swb*. This choice betrays a Qur’anic echo. In so choosing, he avoids the more obvious root selected not only by BM and TF, but also by SG as well: *rḥ*.

It is this Qur’anic vocabulary which provides the point of departure for FA’s new stich. The Arabic root *twb* carries two meanings which can be seen as two sides of the same linguistic coin, as it were: if applied to mortals, the meaning is ‘repent’; but when applied to God, the meaning is ‘pardon’, *i.e.*, in response to repentence. There is, in effect, a semantic symmetry behind the two meanings.

This symmetry gives FA the license for the extra stich, in which God, as opposed to a repentent mortal, is now the subject of the verb based on *twb*. Thus this medial stich provides the result clause to the first stich’s opening conditional.

**Verse 23b**

| MT | Hebrew: Torahm Uhrul Matalal:  
| SG | Hebrew: Al b’osor M’m Matalal:  
| BM | Ybbad min Te’amak al og’ah  
| TF | Fybbad min Te’amak al og’ah  
| FA | Wann Ant A’budt al’am ‘un Mas’kak  *

Now BM and TF approximate each other, and in doing so differ from the MT, Tg, LXX, Pesh, S–H, Cp, and all the Arabic versions. Together they read ‘and (thus) He will distance ailments from your nourishment’, a curious phrase, to be sure. While the reasoning behind such phrasing is speculative at best, it should be noted that the change of a single dot in the S–H would change the word ‘habitation’, which is found in all the predecessor versions as well as the other Arabic ones, to the word ‘date’, *i.e.*, a type of fruit, which is one of the acceptable meanings of the Arabic
(otherwise 'nourishment') according to Lane (1874).\textsuperscript{227} The further alterations in the stich to produce the unique reading of BM and TF are within the realm of the grammatically possible.

Both SG and FA keep the hypothetically repentant Job as the subject of the verb 'distance', making this final stich to verse 23 the opening of yet another conditional clause. There is little to note otherwise in either of these versions except for FA's use of the emphatic pronoun, which is without parallel in any of the other Arabic versions at this point.

\textbf{Verse 24a}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>BM</th>
<th>TF</th>
<th>FA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'1Yz</td>
<td>אלולו מת אלהים אלהים</td>
<td>ויהלך על סכרה חזקה</td>
<td>ויהלך על סכרה חזקה</td>
<td>וجمعت הפגש مثل החרב</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final word of the MT's first stich is a cause of confusion in the successor versions, both Arabic and otherwise. \textit{BDB}\textsuperscript{228} suggest two homophonic roots here, the first related to 'precious ore', the second to 'fortified enclosure'.\textsuperscript{229} Even if these were the only alternatives entertained by the Arabic versions, there would be no consensus. As it turns out, there are even more variations, partially due to an ingenious attempt by the LXX to preserve the ambiguity of the MT, but which is misunderstood by two of the Arabic versions.

SG, in harmony with the Tg, unambiguously chooses the meaning of

\textsuperscript{227} Book I, Part 5, p. 1854, column 3.

\textsuperscript{228} P. 131, column I.

\textsuperscript{229} One can easily imagine several possible underlying connections between these two supposedly separate roots: \textit{e.g.}, 'casket', \textit{i.e.}, a locked place were precious stones may be kept, as well as 'rock', in which precious ores may be found and out of which fortifications may be built.
'stronghold'. As such it is the only Arabic version to adopt this reading. The stich's opening verb is in the imperative, though Goodman (1988) sees this phrase as part of a larger conditional construction stretching over several verses.

Both BM and TF agree with the S-H in reading 'upon solid rock', based on the LXX's phrase "on a heap in rock". The LXX's opening verb can imply 'treasure', which approximates one of the MT's possible readings. But this nuance is ignored in favor of a verb based on the root jls, whose basic meaning includes not only the notion of being seated, with the usage being understood as transitive, 'He shall seat you / set you up', but also the idea of doing so on a heap of rock or rugged ground,\(^\text{230}\) which is the apparent inspiration for this choice of vocabulary. Indeed, the Hebrew root sfr can suggest 'place upon' when constructed with the preposition על; indeed, both of these Arabic versions, along with the S-H, use its respective cognates.

FA opts for an unambiguous rendering, choosing 'silver' for the noun in question. In so doing he is in complete agreement with the Pesh. His stich completes a conditional statement, citing the reward for the repentence urged upon Job by Eliphaz. In so doing, FA chooses to treat the MT's 'lay up / set' as 'accumulate', based on the root jmr, thus: 'thou shalt gather silver like dust'.

Verse 24b

| MT                  | הָעַבֵּדֶרְעָלִים אָלֹא יִפְרָרָה
|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| SG                  | כָּלַאֲאֶנַּם אֶלָֹא אֲרוּדִית דָּבָּה אָלָֹא יִפְרָרָה
| BM                  | וְיִהוָּוְּהֹ בֶּלַק אָוֹדִיהַ הַכְּלַיָּהַ כְּלַיָּהַ הַכְּלַיָּה
| TF                  | וְיִהוָּוְּהֹ בֶּלַק אָוֹדִיהַ הַכְּלַיָּה
| FA                  | וְמִן הַזִּבָּהַ מַלַּק תַּרְאָבָּ הַכְּלִיָּה * |

Though the MT does not explicitly mention gold, its suggestion in the previous

\(^{230}\) Cf. Lane (1865), Book I, Part 2, p. 443, col. 2.
stich, coupled with the reference to Ophir, is enough to prompt SG and FA to make matters explicit; BM and TF, however, having set down a different path in their understanding for several verses now, do not even mention Ophir, much less gold at all. The only common element to all four Arabic versions, in the end, is their common lexical item, for the MT’s D’ým.

BM and TF are identical in both this stich and the previous one. The fact that their understanding of this passage differs from all other versions’, Arabic and otherwise, has implications for literary dependence. For instance, the S–H does not make mention of gold, but does cite the place name Ophir. The Pesh mentions both, while these two Arabic versions mention neither. Both BM and TF contain the phrase ‘rivers of goodness’, which is unattested elsewhere. In addition, both of these Arabic versions begin this stich with the verb ‘encircle / enclose’, which is also unattested elsewhere, unless the MT’s opening prepositional phrase, בֵּין, is mistakenly read as a reduplication of the final lexical item of the first stich. As noted at 24a, one possible meaning for this root is ‘fortified enclosure’, which could be the source of the Arabic verb here derived from the sense of ‘enclosure’. The resulting image is poetic, even if it is of unclear provenance.

This possibly confusing sequence of Hebrew consonants, בֵּין, which ends the first stich and begins the second, is not the only instance of consonantal parallelism between this and the preceding stich. The close assonance of the MT’s and has been noted by several commentators. While Dhorme (1967) sees this assonance as a fine poetic touch, the second of these pairs has caused confusion for FA, who reads ‘dust’ in both stichs, thus opting for the first instance from this

231 This geographical entity is related to gold in Genesis 2:11–12, I Kings 9:26ff., I Kings 10:11, and even Job 28:16.
232 The occurrence of ‘silver’ in the previous stich in FA’s translation also supplies a clear, poetic parallel.
233 Neither does FA, incidentally.
pair as his basis for translating both words. 'Orphir' does not occur in the LXX, giving further reason for FA's own omission.

Verse 25a

The same ambiguities that obtained concerning the Hebrew root bsr, which resulted in divisions among the Arabic versions in 24a, now serve to split the MT on the one hand from all the Arabic versions on the other.

SG is consistent, between 24a and 25a, in his interpretation of the meaning of this root. The same is true of the Tg.

BM and TF both add an extra phrase, prompted by the LXX, concerning 'deliverence from enemies'. For this they have both supplied identical verbs. Their opening verbs differ, however; neither selection keeps BM and TF in the same semantic area as any other versions under consideration. For example, while neither the Pesh nor S-H supply a verb here, the former preferring (with SG) a noun, the latter choosing a participle, they select an identical root centering on the concept of 'assistance'; BM, however, translates 'endorse', whereas TF inexplicably reads 'fear'.

FA does select a verb, but stays in the semantic area of 'assistance', supplementing this verb with an auxiliary from 'be', giving a present/future imperfect. He omits any mention of 'enemies'.

Verse 25b
The second word of the stich in the MT is rare, occurring in only two other places in the OT. *BDB* posits a cognate Arabic root, *yaf*, 'ascend [a mountain].' While this meaning is not attested in Lane (1893), whose lexicon’s completeness is problematical at the end of the alphabet, Wehr (1961) partially corroborates *BDB*. Still, the meaning of *והיו התומים* in Job is less than clear.

According to Goodman (1988), SG has wrestled with the difficulty by positing a transposition of the Hebrew consonants *י* and *ד*, scribal confusion between *י* and *י*, and the elimination of an extraneous *י*. The resultant root means ‘shine out’, which SG has chosen to translate by an active participle from the root *thr* 'be pure'; 234 SG’s translation thus yields for this stich 'and (the Allsufficing will be) your pure wealth / fortune'. While this reading is semantically possible, it is rather strained. Unfortunately, the Tg is of little help, settling as it does for making some sense from the MT without any emendations. The same is true of the Pesh. Whatever the reasons for SG having resorted to the root *thr*, his understanding of the sense of the passage is corroborated, and elaborated upon, by that of the LXX and S-H, which are followed in turn by BM and TF.

The imagery in BM and TF of 'refinement / purification by fire' is one that is not only well-attested in scripture, but which fits the root *thr*, given that ritual purification is implied thereby. It also harkens to the MT in that *BDB* suggest 'ingot' as a possible rendering for the troublesome vocabulary item in question, though in so concluding they come from a very different semantic route, viz., 'ascend [a mountain]' which yields 'eminence' which in turn suggests 'towering' and

---

234 The semantics of this root has a strong element of ritual purity to it.
therefore 'heaps / bars / ingots [of silver].

FA sees nothing of the refining process here, but suggests instead that God will be liberal in His rewards to whosoever takes Eliphaz' suggestion.

Verse 26

MT

SG

BM

TF

FA

SG is not hesitant here to exhibit linguistic, and therefore theological, acumen in his understanding of the two verbs in this verse as Eliphaz' speech nears its conclusion. The first verb is derived from the root *dll*, whose basic meaning is 'direct' but which has a derivative semantic area: 'be bold [and therefore?] / behave in a jesting manner'. The suggestion, then, is that Job will be able 'to be at ease' from the implication that one can only act boldly before God if one has His confidence or favor, based on close familiarity with Him. The second verb, from *ra*, 'raise', is less worthy of comment than its accompanying participial adverb, from *šf*, 'be a double', yielding 'as a double', *i.e.*, 'as an intercessor'. This reinforces the suggestion of intimacy and its accompanying behavior as reflected in the first stich. Finally, that God is not mentioned here by SG at all is perhaps due to stylistics; there is certainly no resulting ambiguity, especially considering the use of the anthropomorphic imagery in the phrase 'between His hands' in stich one.

BM and TF agree as to how to handle the verbs at issue: the first stich is

---

235 Mangan (1991) notes that some mss of the Tg make the same omission (p. 58).
treated by supplementing the verb 'stand' with a participial accusative236 'firmly planted', inexact but estimably dealing with the LXX's understanding of 'boldness'. Indeed, the resulting phrase in BM and TF has the double entendre of 'stand firmly planted / stand in serenity', somewhat reminiscent of SG's 'be at ease' as discussed above. In their second stich, both BM and TF once again follow the LXX's wording closely. They also keep parallel phraseology between their two stichs by opening the second stich with a verb and closing it with a participial accusative. However, they both employ what appears to be the feminine form of the participle, faithfully reproducing the sound of the Arabic237 rather than fully adhering to classical grammar.

While BM and TF are thus close at important points, the latter reveals his inclination for less formalized Arabic in a number of instances, most clearly in his use of the phrase علوك فوقد in place of the more classicalكل. Both versions, unlike SG, refer explicitly to the Deity, doing so by following the LXX and S–H in using the term الرب, 'the Lord', where the MT reads 'Almighty'. Yet these two Arabic versions soon diverge in that BM, with SG, uses the common anthropomorphic image of 'hands', whereas TF simply translates 'before the Lord' without recourse to poetic or anthropomorphic images. In one final area of disagreement, TF inexplicably opens with the verb in the third person rather than second person masculine.

FA begins a stretch of several verses at this point exhibiting an uncharacteristic economy of expression: that the ms understands only one stich for this entire verse is symptomatic of this, even though FA does use two verbs which are meant to correspond, one per stich, to those of the Hebrew. (To be sure, FA will end the

236 Neither version carries the requisite classical case ending.
237 This is due to complicated rules of phonology which come into play when the final radical of the root is weak.
chapter\textsuperscript{238} with a return to the paraphrase which is more characteristic of his work). This mildly surprising linguistic phenomenon can be traced to the Pesh, which also is tersely worded.

Verse 27

SG takes advantage on virtually every occasion to use Arabic cognates of the Hebrew vocabulary. The result is a solid, if unimaginative, translation.

BM and TF's use of the cognate accusative verbal noun in the second stich in order to emphasize the force of the verb 'vow' is a thoughtful touch, consistent with fine, though not florid, Arabic. Less laudable from a linguistic point of view is the fact that both versions add an extra verb to the first stich,\textsuperscript{239} in an attempt to translate both verbs of the LXX, 'hear' and 'grant', the second of which belongs more properly in the second stich.

If BM and TF unnecessarily add extra verbs, FA does quite the opposite: the first verb of his first stich here has been absorbed into the end of verse 26, resulting in only two verbs for the entirety of verse 27. For FA, who is not at all averse to paraphrase, the result would be an uncharacteristically close translation if it were not for the choice of his final verb, from the root Əmr, 'be fruitful'. Thus 'your vows' become, for FA, the subject of the verb, rather than the direct object, so that his second stich reads, 'and your vows will bear fruit'.

\textsuperscript{238} His own division of the text into fifteen parts has the close of Job 22 correspond to the close of his eighth section.

\textsuperscript{239} This results in three verbs for the first stich alone; this borders on the excessive.
Verse 28

Here again, SG, his translation being in complete agreement with the Tg, gives little cause for comment, though his use of cognates is less prolific than in the preceding verse.

BM and TF, consistent with their treatment of verse 23b, have misunderstood the reference in the first stich to 'abode' and have instead chosen 'food', thus yielding 'a meal / repast of integrity / righteousness'. Again, though the same vocabulary item as found in 23b of the S-H could be at the root of this confusion, it should be noted that the LXX's term δικαιοσύνη does potentially include a dietary nuance, which none of its successor versions under consideration has incorporated.

In the second stich of BM and TF, there is an allusion to the moon. The source for this curiosity can be found in the S–H, the consonantal text of which reads נור נור, which in itself is problematic. If mistaken consonantal reduplication is posited, the reading נויר can be inferred, i.e., 'light / radiance / brightness'. This would bring the meaning of the S–H closer to the LXX, Pesh, and Cp.

However, if one accepts the occurrence of two nouns in a construct relationship as found in Ceriani (1874), then the addition of the weak consonant י� after the second radical of the second noun yields נויר, which Oraham (1943) defines as 'a

---

body that gives light, especially one of the heavenly bodies'. Though this leaves a difficulty with the first term of the construct as found in the S-H, it helps clarify the source of the reference to the moon common to BM and TF. Finally, differences between BM and TF in the use of verb mood and singular vs. plural nouns in the second stich have no overtly major theological or semantic import.

FA does not follow SG in the use of a cognate root ‘mr in the first stich with the result that his translation lacks a certain precision: 'And whenever you speak a speaking...' rather than 'And you will decide a matter...'.

More important, however, than the lack of semantic exactitude is the syntax: FA introduces a conditional here, rather than the simple declarative of all the other Arabic and predecessor versions. FA’s grammar also makes God the actor regarding the completion of the conditional clause within the first stich.

FA thus clearly makes a theological observation: repentance results in God’s acting positively in the life of those reconciled to Him. While this is not, in itself, a particularly startling observation, FA’s is the only Arabic version to make it, doing so in a manner that fits in with the theology of Eliphaz seamlessly: humans, in the end, are totally dependent upon God and, of themselves, can avail nothing. This is consistent with FA’s emphasis on God’s sovereignty. As if to underline his theological point, FA gratuitously adds the word ‘جمس, 'the entirety of / all of', which is not found in any of the other Arabic versions: in other words, God’s control is total. FA also employs the causative form of the verb, thus emphasizing that God, mentioned explicitly in the first stich, is still the actor in the second one.

In this understanding of the verb, FA once again stands alone among the Arabic versions, reading 'And He shall illumine you in all your ways'.

---

241 P. 330, col. 2.
242 As does the LXX, though what God is actually doing is not agreed upon here by these two versions.
The difficulty in the MT's יִדְיוֹ is universally acknowledged from the time of the Tg\textsuperscript{243} to the present day. The varying attempts of the Arabic versions also bear testimony to this fact. In addition, the occurrence here of a plural verb in the MT without an antecedent, explicit or otherwise, has also occasioned much comment.

In an attempt to deal with such issues, SG’s characteristic terseness is temporarily abandoned. Additionally, in his commentary\textsuperscript{244} SG expends major efforts in an attempt to elucidate the text from a linguistic as well as theological point of view. Yet in the end the results seem to do little more than reflect the problematical nature of the MT. One problem, viz., the appearance of a verb in the plural with no clear antecedent, is effectively ignored by SG, who supplies an Arabic verb in the plural as well. The other problem, stemming from the MT’s use of the term יִדְיוֹ, is answered by an equally problematic Arabic vocabulary item from SG:

אפעידאר, from the root qdr, which refers to ‘power’ or ‘potentiality’. The Form VIII verbal noun used by SG is unattested in Lane (1885), though possible meanings, more or less suited to the context of this stich, might be inferred from Lane’s treatment of the corresponding verb and participles, thus: ‘one who applies himself,

\textsuperscript{243} Mangan (1991) cites three separate understandings of this verse, and refers to "many discrepancies" in the mss (p. 58f).

\textsuperscript{244} As edited by Qapah (1970), p. 131.
as to a task, to acquire power or ability' or simply 'possessing power, ability'. If the MT's 
\( \text{ פָּרָה } \) is understood as 'pride', then the connection between this and SG's term is clear, especially if SG is understood as providing not an exact translation, but rather an attempt to clarify a difficult text. Yet the resultant reading is still awkward: 'And you will know that they were humbled to you, and you said 'This is אֵּכְנָדָא.' Goodman (1988) suggests a translation of "insolence" for the term in question.

But there is yet another area of meaning, according to Lane (1885), that can be inferred from this Arabic term: 'moderation'. This seems opposed to the MT's intent. However, the reading which would result is less problematic from the point of view of context: 'And you will know that they were humbled to you, and you said 'This is appropriate'.

BM and TF predictably go their own way in their versions of the expression 'in His presence', with TF choosing a classicism favored in Egypt, قَدَامَهُ, 'in front of Him', while BM picks an equally classical بَيْنَ يَدِهِ, 'between His hands'. Both versions follow the LXX (departing from the MT and Tg) in solving the problem of having a third person masculine plural verb without an antecedent by simply changing the verb to second person masculine singular, thus attributing self-abasement to a repentent Job, not to nameless others. In this their theological theme is consistent with those of the previous verses. But when it comes to the second problem occasioned by the MT's 
\( \text{ פָּרָה } \), they part company. BM adheres to the MT's and LXX's understanding of 'pridefulness', but unlike either of these versions, BM keeps Job as the subject of the verb: '...for you humbled yourself before Him and [thus] banish from yourself pridefulness'. Exhibiting an even more

245 Book 1, part 7, p. 2496, col. 2.
246 Though Habel (1985) understands 'take] courage" here, which the Hebrew root, if not SG's Arabic, would potentially allow.
pointed difference from the understanding of the MT, TF posits not a second person singular imperfect here, whose subject is Job; instead, he supplies a third person singular imperfect, thus implicitly reintroducing God as the subject of the second verb of this stich: '...and [thus] He banishes away from you...'. This is reminiscent of FA's treatment of the previous verse in that it is God who is in control.

In yet another departure from both BM and the other Arabic versions, TF substitutes as the object of his verb the concept of 'worry / grief', as found in a marginal gloss of the S–H. While this is in substantial variance with the many other understandings of this difficult verse, it is not inconsistent with general theological themes in the Book of Job as a whole. Thus TF reads in the second part of the first stich: 'and He banishes away from you sorrow', giving evidence that there is some relationship of direct dependence of TF on the S–H.

FA is clearly influenced by, but not slavishly imitative of, the S–H and Pesh. In so doing, he cuts the Gordian knot as it were and supplies a pithy stich of four words reminiscent of a proverb in both structure and content: 'For He who humbled you shall raise you up'. Thus FA continues to be consistent in his theological stance made explicit in the last few stichs that it is God, not a repentent Job, who is the main actor in this theological drama and is thus the primary focus of attention. Indeed, the expression of such an understanding persists in FA's translation through the end of the chapter.

Verse 29b

MT

לא cuanto דבש: 29b

247 Cf. Lamsa (1985), who is quite clear on the aphoristic nature of the saying as supplied by the Pesh here: "For it is said, He who humbles himself shall be exalted". While the wording of the S–H is less terse, and a marginal gloss is added to deal with this passage, it is clear that the two Syriac versions come to similar conclusions.
The MT is much clearer here. As a result, all the Arabic versions are able to provide reasonably succinct translations. However, their results are fairly divergent based on the differing paths each of these versions took in their treatments of the previous stich.

Having tried to keep close to the spirit, if not the brevity, of the MT's first stich, SG is able to benefit from his earlier fidelity to the text by now simply translating the MT's second stich virtually word for word: 'And [as for] the lowerer of eyes, He will succor him'.

Despite departing company in 29a, BM and TF are completely identical in 29b. As such neither agrees with the LXX, which is faithful to the MT at this point, and the theological viewpoint of TF prevails over against that of the opportunity presented by the Pesh: it is God who actively saves the repentant.

FA expresses this same theological truth as BM and TF, being completely consistent with his own previous theologizing. Unsurprisingly, however, in so doing FA uses vocabulary and grammatical structures not common to BM and TF. For

---

248 Reading with Derenbourg (1899), whose edition supplies an active participle here, rather than Qapah (1970), who supplies a verbal noun. Though Derenbourg's edition is said to have many errors subsequently corrected by Qapah, in this instance the former is to be preferred if one considers that an active participle as the first term of a construct is more likely to allow the definite article.

249 The occurrence of the phrase 'between His hands' rather than 'in front of Him' in TF can be seen as a stylistic variation necessitated by the use of the alternative expression in the previous stich.

250 Lamsa (1985) reads, "and he who is meek shall be saved."

251 His use of the indefinite accusative to mark the adjectival predicate following the occurrence of 'be' once again shows FA's clear grasp of classical Arabic grammar and usage.
instance, FA resorts to the perfect aspect of the verbs 'deliver / rescue' and 'preserve / save', thus turning this portion of the stich into a blessing: both blessings and curses in Arabic are commonly expressed through the perfect aspect of the verb, since the very utterance of such a statement is considered tantamount to its fulfillment. A reinforcement of the flavor imparted by this specialized use of the perfect aspect is found in the addition of the phrase 'from evil' at the end of the stich: clearly, the notion of Divine blessing is being evoked.²⁵²

Verse 30

The MT's reading אִזְמָה אִזְמֶה has caused a division among commentators, both ancient and modern, as to whether theology requires the emendation of the text. The Arabic versions, however, speak unanimously on this issue, preferring the emendation. However, when it comes to the second stich of this closing verse to Eliphaz' speech, they part company.

SG assumes the emendation, thus changing 'unrighteous' to 'righteous man' by resort to the root br', which carries a legal nuance of 'exoneration'. SG does not use the second stich to explain how the righteous would be saved, something that the Tg, inter alia, is forced to address. Accordingly, SG can draw a parallel between a repentant Job of the second stich and the generic 'righteous man' of the first.

²⁵² Given the paucity of Arabic versions of the New Testament dating from the time of FA, it is unclear whether this particular phrasing of 'deliver ... from evil' is explicitly meant to echo the close of the Lord's Prayer as found at Matthew 6:13.
BM and TF differ from each other only in the addition of an emphatic pronoun in the former with God understood as the antecedent. It is interesting to note, additionally, that both of these versions draw a parallel between a repentant Job and the generic 'righteous man', but with two differences from the manner of SG. First, there is a change of vocabulary, with 'righteous man' in BM and TF translated by the Arabic الزكي. The root zky does not carry a legal sense as does the one used by SG at this point; rather, the nuance is one of 'growing to perfection'.\(^2\) The second difference is structural: BM and TF do not use the two stichs of v. 30 to draw the parallel found in SG; rather, 29b refers to a repentent Job for these two versions. Thus, 30b can be used for another purpose unattested in the Tg, LXX, Pesh, S–H, and Cp: if Job repents, God will return to him his fortune.

This fits in well with the story of Job as a whole, and its inclusion here provides an extra link between the prose and poetic sections of the tale. The agreement between BM and TF on what may be an independent insertion into the text itself unattested in all the predecessor version adds evidence for the theory that there must be some measure of direct dependence between BM and TF, even if this theory is not sufficient to explain all the similarities between them, much less their points of departure from one another.

FA's paraphrase, for once, does not range as far afield as that of the other Arabic versions. The second stich, which has provided occasion for theological comment and poetic license, finds FA at variance in the use of the third person (rather than the second person) singular possessive pronoun suffix. In so doing, FA once again puts God at center stage as the main actor in the drama of salvation, emphasizing that it is not human repentence which delivers, but rather divine grace.

\(^2\) In the end, this difference could be reduced to stylistics as much as anything else, since the root zky can also refer to one who is forgiven rather than inherently pure, thus coming close to the more legalistic 'exoneration'.
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Commentators both ancient and modern have cited the pivotal importance of this chapter in the Book of Job, and it is not necessary to review their extensive observations here. Suffice it to say in general that the Hymn to Wisdom presents a number of difficulties to any of its would-be interpreters. For the Arabic versions, confusion as to where poetic stitches begin and end, ordering and transposition of materials, and disagreement as to transitions between basic themes, abound.

One particular feature of the Hymn to Wisdom that should be mentioned for purposes of this study is its thematic and therefore linguistic points of contact with previous and subsequent chapters. Of especial significance is the relationship of the Hymn to Wisdom with chapter 11, where Zophar at vv. 7-12 holds forth on the futility of humankind’s quest for 'the things of God', and with the Voice from the Whirlwind, which contains extensive vocabulary related to the created order and its creatures. Both topics are gathered together in the Hymn to Wisdom; indeed, their interrelationship is one of its major foci.

Verse 1a

SG struggles here with the relatively easy opening of what will prove to be a challenging chapter. His is the wordiest amongst the Arabic versions, and in the final analysis it is difficult to conclude whether the excess vocabulary actually

\[254\text{In addition, 11:14a prefigures 28:28b thematically, though not linguistically.}\]
clarifies matters. There is no precedent in the Tg for SG's approach, and while the treatment of this stich by the S–H is lengthy, semantically its language diverges not just from that of SG, but from all the Arabic versions.

Of the two differences between BM and TF, the former displays greater fidelity to the LXX in its understanding of the Greek δρομ as an adverb of motion; accordingly, it uses not simply the Arabic adverb حيث, but prefixes it with the preposition من. This approach is repeated in the next stich. However, BM omits the introductory particle at the beginning of v. 1a; it is the only Arabic version to do so. TF's retention of the introductory particle sets a grammatical trap: the particle in question, لأن، requires the accusative in classical Arabic, and TF omits it. TF's other omission, that of the preposition من, can perhaps be attributed to an attempt to translate word for word if the LXX is the source, where the single word δρομ is best expressed by a prepositional phrase in Arabic, as supplied by BM.255

Uncharacteristically, FA displays the greatest economy of expression among all the Arabic versions, parallelling the Pesh very closely. More typical of his Arabic is his attention to classical grammatical detail, a trait which he shares with SG.

Verse 1b

| MT | ὡς ἀρχή Ἰσραήλ: |
| SG | οὕτω εἰσῆλθεν Ἰσραήλ: |
| BM | وموضع للذهب معلوم من حيث يبت |
| TF | وموضع للذهب معلوم حيث يبت |
| FA | وفي مواضع يغسلون تراب الذهب |

SG's difficulties continue in this stich: he violates the integrity of the MT's poetry by failing to give a translation for מַעֲלָה. SG's word order serves as a partial

255 The S–H contains the same preposition-plus-adverb sequence of BM, while the Pesh differs sufficiently here, thus appearing to eliminate either of them from consideration as the primary source for this stich as treated by TF.
explanation, since his previous stich ends with a noun of place. To avoid repetitiveness, another noun of place, which would immediately follow, is omitted. The result is a rather unbalanced translation of six words for the first stich, and only two for the second. Furthermore, SG’s choice of تصفة to translate 'purify / refine' is puzzling. While the root $fy$ is on target, the suggestion in Qapah\textsuperscript{256} that SG meant to use the more standard مصفاة here is to be followed.

While SG deals with the concept of 'purify / refine', BM and TF are unprecedented in their omission of it altogether.\textsuperscript{257} This is due to a misreading of the final Hebrew word in the stich, since the MT’s $qq$ carries the meaning 'refine', but a biconsonantal root, $qq$, carries the implication of 'leaping, springing forth'.\textsuperscript{258} In addition, both of these Arabic versions add the word معلوم, 'given, fixed, determined', in this stich. While this fits in well with one of the motifs of this chapter, viz., what-is-knowable as opposed to what-is-hidden, there is no linguistic precedent for this insertion here. The result reads, 'And a place for gold, determined whence / where\textsuperscript{259} it springs.'

FA correctly understands that the purification of gold is at the root of the Hebrew verb in this stich. However, given that the verb is plural, FA posits that there must be more than one location where this process occurs. Additionally, he realizes that, strictly speaking, gold is the outcome of the refining process, and, before it is purified, it is ore or dust. Thus he translates, 'And there are places (they) purify gold dust'. Of course, with such a reading FA may be anticipating the occurrence of דבש, 'dust', in the next stich of the MT.

\textsuperscript{256} P. 142.
\textsuperscript{257} The Tg, LXX, Pesh, S-H, and to a lesser extent Cp, more or less follow the MT in this particular regard.
\textsuperscript{258} So BDB, p. 278, col. 1.
\textsuperscript{259} As noted in the discussion of 1a, BM is on firmer ground in translating من حيث rather than TF’s حيث, given the occurrence of ḫαν in the LXX and a cognate Syriac expression in the S-H.
Verse 2a

SG finds his bearings, as it were, at this point. His translation is almost word for word exact, except for his addition of a possessive pronoun suffix to 'dust'.

BM and TF are identical to each other here; their use of the verb 'be created / fashioned' instead of the MT's\(^\text{260}\) 'be taken', is in itself creative: 'Iron from the earth is fashioned'.

FA is needlessly wordy. After referring to 'dust' pronominally, he further ties this stich to the previous one by repeating the reference to 'gold' before moving on to 'iron' as found in the MT. He then unnecessarily adds an extra stich, repeating the verb 'extract' and then explicitly repeats the reference to 'dust'. Indeed, these two stichs, plus the previous one, should be redivided into two, with the reference to 'iron' beginning the second one, thus:

\[
\text{وفي مواضيع يغسلون تراب الذهب ويستخرجون منه الذهب} \\
\text{والحديد انا يستخرج من التراب}
\]

Such stichs are not balanced, and the word order of the second is not overly classical, but this division would more closely reflect the poetry of the MT, if not the grammar of Arabic \textit{per se}.  

Verse 2b

\(^{260}\) SG's use of the passive of 'take' is exact.
The unanimity of the Arabic versions on the use of the cognate to the Hebrew’s נחס is contrasted by their differing approaches to the verb in this stich.

Ultimately, how the verb is interpreted may have implications for what the Arabic versions mean by the word نحاس.

SG translates 'Copper is poured out from its rocks'; in his choice of the root $bb for the verb, SG has made an interesting selection: rather than adopt a more conventional root for the smelting process, such as $hr or $bk, he has selected a root whose meaning is primarily 'pour out'. While his resulting verb can be used for 'smelt', this derivative meaning is rather rare; indeed, Lane (1872) does not even list it as a possibility, concluding that while $bb suggests figurative meanings ranging from 'pour out punishment' and 'pour oneself out', yielding 'descend', the smelting process is not among them. SG has thus chosen to be literal in his treatment of the Hebrew, even if that course results in some vagueness in his Arabic.

BM and TF adhere to the LXX, S-H and Cp in that they do not see any reference to smelting per se; rather, they read 'Copper is hewn out like stone'. This raises the question as to the true meaning of the Hebrew נחס and its Arabic cognate. If one accepts that this term refers to an alloy of copper, such as bronze or brass, then the use of 'smelt' or some similar verb referring to the melting and pouring of metallic elements becomes requisite. However, 'copper' can admit not only to the verb 'smelt', but also to the use of 'cut / hew', especially in parallel

\[\text{Notes:}\]

\[\text{261} Wehr (1961) admits to the possibility of the Arabic noun carrying the meaning 'the casting [of metal]', but is silent on the verb having such a connotation. Spiro (1895), however, lists the verb in colloquial Egyptian Arabic as meaning 'pour out / cast / mould'. \]

\[\text{262 It should be noted that the Tg and Pesh are in agreement with the MT's 'pour out / melt' at this point.}\]
to the previous stich’s "Iron comes out of the earth" (LXX). Thus BM and TF, by implication, can only mean ‘copper’ when it comes to the Arabic 

On a grammatical note, it should be mentioned that in this stich TF uses a third person plural verb here for the impersonal; by contrast, BM uses the passive to convey a similar meaning.

FA’s treatment of this stich, in the end, is the clearest of all the Arabic versions by far. Obviously looking to the Pesh as his model, FA’s Arabic is concise, yet not terse: ‘And copper is extracted from amongst the rocks’. In so writing, FA has finessed the ‘smelted’ vs. ‘hewn’ issue, realizing that what is important here is that it is ‘rock’ which yields copper, or bronze, or brass. While the physical process may be of interest to some, it is the source of the metal that interests FA, for one of the main issues of this chapter is the question of the source of Wisdom: Whence does it come? What is it that will yield it to mortals?263

Verse 3ab

MT කුම් මේ පහේ සෘශ්ෂු වක්ෂයම් වූ පෙන් වේ
SG මේ පහේ සෘශ්ෂු වක්ෂයම් වූ පෙන් වේ
BM මේ පහේ සෘශ්ෂු වක්ෂයම් වූ පෙන් වේ
TF මේ පහේ සෘශ්ෂු වක්ෂයම් වූ පෙන් වේ
FA මේ පහේ සෘශ්ෂු වක්ෂයම් වූ පෙන් වේ

The first issue to confront us is the identity of the unstated subject of the opening verb: is it God, or mortals, who undertake the activity of 'setting the bounds of darkness'? In terms of the subject matter, as well as the vocabulary (especially the use of the rather rare הָלָלְתָו in the MT), the case can be made that it is divine

263 Habel (1985), pp. 391–95, has an interesting treatment of the tripartite motif of this chapter. If one were to accept Habel’s thought, which is laid out schematically at pp. 394–95, one would conclude on the basis of this stich that FA has a full grasp of the ’A’ motif, which Habel labels "Place/Source" (emphasis added).
activity which is being described. For example, at 11:7, Zophar uses הַבּוֹלֵי when speaking of God’s cosmic dimensions, as it were. Its reoccurrence here suggests that divinity is once again the subject matter at hand. Yet none of the Arabic versions treat הַבּוֹלֵי in 28:3 as they do at 11:7.

On this issue of divine as opposed to mortal activity, SG retains something of the ambiguity of the MT at least in terms of the grammar, whereas BM and TF’s rewording of the passage avoids the issue entirely, making ‘darkness’ the topic of the verse’s opening. However, these two versions diverge in the matter of the opening vocabulary item. The reading of TF, ‘provenance’, is more felicitous than that of BM’s ‘order’.

Only FA explicitly states that it is ‘its Creator’, خالقه, who ‘sets for it (i.e., darkness) a limit’. FA then underlines the issue by completing the MT’s first stich with poetic license, reading, ‘For He is knowledgeable of all limitations’. Clearly, only God Himself can be the subject of such a phrase, given the context.

BM and TF rejoin each other after 28:3α, and are in complete agreement with each other in their treatment of the close of the MT’s lengthy first stich. Their understanding of 28:3αβ, however, is in contrast to that of FA on the one hand, and SG on the other. All the Arabic versions, to be sure, include the cognate to the MT’s אֹלַל, and but only BM and TF understand this cognate as being in synonymous

---

264 Given the context, however, SG does see God as the actor here; cf. Goodman (1988), p. 330.

265 Neither do so using any verb whatsoever.

266 The modern commentators understand that it is mortals who ‘set the bounds of darkness’, seeing in this a continuation of the mining motif of the previous verses. In such a reading, humans push back the limits of the darkness by their mining, presumably either by exposing elements to the open air, as in strip mining, or by bringing lights below ground.

267 While it may be argued that FA’s poetic license still results in the closest rendering of the MT, there is significant divergence from the Hebrew among all the Arabic versions.
parallel with the 'darkness' mentioned in 28:3α. BM and TF do so by using this
cognate to introduce a construct phrase reading 'all manner of terrors'. FA's focus,
however, remains on the Divine, Who is knowledgeable of 'all limitations'. As for
the grammar of SG's text, there is no construct phrase whatsoever; his cognate,
reading 'just as for all', introduces a closing comment: 'for verily h/He is a seeker',
which thought concludes in the following stich.

Verse 3c

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>BM</th>
<th>TF</th>
<th>FA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>יז התוים ת&quot;לא יומת עָלֶם</td>
<td>יז מתוים ת&quot;לא יומת עָלֶם</td>
<td>יז מתוים ת&quot;לא יומת עָלֶם</td>
<td>וּמִלְכָּה</td>
<td>הָלַיֵּנָה</td>
<td>וּמִלְכָּה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>גַּלְגַל</td>
<td>גַּלְגַל</td>
<td>גַּלְגַל</td>
<td>גַּלְגַל</td>
<td>גַּלְגַל</td>
<td>גַּלְגַל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יז התוים ת&quot;לא יומת עָלֶם</td>
<td>יז מתוים ת&quot;לא יומת עָלֶם</td>
<td>יז מתוים ת&quot;לא יומת עָלֶם</td>
<td>וּמִלְכָּה</td>
<td>הָלַיֵּנָה</td>
<td>וּמִלְכָּה</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SG's understanding of this stich is largely metaphorical. There is no reference to
any 'stone' as in the MT; rather that which is sought after is 'darkness' and gloom
in and of itself. Clearly, for SG 'stone' stands for the inner core, or essence, of
whatever is under consideration.

BM also drops any reference to 'stone', but the question seems to be more an
issue of scribal error rather than metaphorical intent. The resulting construct,
'shadow of death' is therefore understood to be in apposition with the closing
construct of the previous stich.

Only TF and FA make explicit mention of 'stone', using the same root, but not
the same word. The preservation by TF of 'stone' requires a change in grammar;
unlike BM, which sees this stich as a construct in apposition to 28:3α, TF

---

268 The central member of the construct, אֵзоֹרֶפֶד הָלָיֵנָה, is a good attempt to deal with the
appearance in the Hebrew of מַלְכָּה in 28:3α, as discussed above.
270 SG employs a little used, direct cognate of the Hebrew here.
coincidentally approximates the MT, which understands 'stone' as the direct object of a verb in 28:3a. Given the rules of Arabic grammar, TF's verb is implicit, and 'stone' is thus the predicate noun of his unstated verb 'be'. Likewise, the following construct phrase serves as a second complement.

FA, due to his paraphrastic approach, feels free enough to use two stichs to comprehend the thought of the MT. The shift from the limitations made by the Creator is signaled by the particle اما, 'as for', which then allows a consideration of 'the stone which is in the deep'. FA may be trying to account for the rendering of the Pesh, which reads 'the deep and dark mine', for none of the other Arabic versions elaborate on 'stone', if it is indeed mentioned at all. Be that as it may, FA's second stich here refers to the 'shadow of death' common to BM and TF; he does so by using a phrase which is not cognate to the Hebrew, however, but by employing a relatively rarely used root for 'shadow', fy', which is also present in Qur'anic vocabulary.

Verse 4a

Confusion obtains among the Arabic versions in their attempts to deal with various perceived difficulties in the MT. The Tg, LXX, Pesh, S-H, and Cp also reflect a lack of unanimity, prefiguring the variations which are found in the Arabic. In addition to basic semantics, issues for this verse include its length, the number of component stichs, thematics, and grammar, all of which contribute to the dissimilarities of approach and result. Indeed, if Noegel (1996) is correct in his
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analysis of a key Hebrew word in this stich, then a failure by the Arabic versions to
discern the intentional ambiguity of the MT would account for much of their
difficulty.\footnote{Pp. 89–92.}

SG, along with BM and TF, understands the MT's יָרָד as referring to a wady. This, after all, is the standard meaning for vocabulary derived from this root, and the Tg and LXX also read the MT in this manner. Given this understanding of the topic of discussion (which is actually the direct object of the opening verb), SG then is compelled to supply an appropriate verb at the beginning of the stich. His choice is masterful, for in one root, גור, he covers two disparate semantic areas: he can agree with the Tg, which opens the stich with 'He forces open', while not being out of the step with the LXX, which reads 'He cuts off / blocks up'. Either meaning is semantically possible for a wady, and SG's root in Arabic can mean 'obstruct' as well as 'make a gap'.\footnote{Cf. Lane (1863), Book I, Part I, p. 338. Clearly, this root proves the apocryphal adage of frustrated orientalists that among the four primary denotations of any Arabic root, one is its basic meaning, and another is its opposite.} SG is then left to make sense of the close of the stich. He does so by positing that the Hebrew root גור,\footnote{The potential ambiguities of this word is the pivotal point in Noegel's (1996) linguistic analysis of 28:3–4 (see above). However, SG's choice of meaning is not among those that Noegel lists as options.} 'sojourn', is cognate to the Arabic יר, 'flow'. This is clearly not the case, but his resulting translation, which is completed by supplying a prepositional phrase to match that of the MT, is grammatically and semantically clear, even if it is not an accurate reflection of the MT itself. In so doing, SG closely matches the wording of the Tg.

BM and TF are simpler in their approach than SG, though they follow the same path. Their verbs, based on the common root סקק, 'demolish', are apparently closer to the understanding of the MT's 'open [a gap]' rather than the LXX's 'cut off / block up', though it can clearly stand on its own, with the resulting translation 'He
does violence to / destroys the valleys'. Any reference to SG's 'flowing waters' ("]אלוים, 'wadi') or the MT's 'neighbor' is simply omitted.274

FA's apparent independence of thought vis-à-vis the other Arabic versions is not what it seems here; on the contrary, his translation is not so much the product of paraphrase or unique insight, but rather is very clearly dependent in this stich and throughout this entire verse upon the Pesh, which reads at 28:4a "They have inherited a ruined mine from an alien people". While FA is not slavish in reproducing this understanding, he is obviously much closer to the world of thought found in the Pesh, which is in essential agreement with the S-H. These appear to be, collectively, much closer to the intent of the MT rather than that of any of the other Arabic versions, the Tg, or LXX. As for any mention of 'valleys' as found in these other Arabic versions, FA delays working them into his text until the next stich, which provides them with an entirely different context.

Verse 4b

In this stich the various Arabic versions begin the process of coming together again by sharing an underlying concept: SG's use of 'footstep', BM and TF's 'paths', and FA's 'which wandered' are indicative of this vague semantic rapprochement. Even if this move to convergence seems fairly tenuous, it is indeed unmistakable.

SG continues his misapprehension of the theme of the MT, persisting in his implicit identification of God as the subject of the activity described. He also fails

274 The metathesis of the two consonants in the word for 'river valleys' in TF is the result of scribal error rather than evidence for a divergence in meaning between his text and BM.
to recognize that the MT carries on the mining imagery introduced at the beginning of this chapter. In this SG is joined by the Tg\textsuperscript{275} and LXX.

BM and TF also translate without regard to mining. A scribal difficulty is the probable cause of the difference in vocabulary in the second term of the construct phrase: BM's root, \textit{rjm}, has the base meaning 'throw stones'. The derived sense of the active participle used here becomes 'revilers'. The text of TF, on the other hand, is corrupt, and carries no discernable meaning as it stands.

For FA, this entire stich stands in apposition to the 'alien people' of the immediately preceding one, explaining their departure from the current scene. It is at this point that FA works in the 'valleys' of the other Arabic versions, citing them as the reason why the original miners are no more: they have gotten lost, 'having wandered among the valleys'. Once again FA betrays an affinity for the Pesh, which reads "they are gone astray from the right path".\textsuperscript{276} His choice of the root \textit{dll} for the equivalent verb is not only exact, but also Qur'anic. However, it should be noted that a number of prominent Muslim commentaries on this final word to the opening sûra of the Qur'an allege that its root, used in its active participial form, refers to Christians as those who have gone 'astray'. If FA has deliberately employed a Qur'anic root here, he certainly has done so to the detriment of his co-religionists, unless his intent is to be ironic.

\textbf{Verse 4c}

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|l|}
\hline
MT & הלו קאמאש לולא: \textit{דול קאמאש מַלַאכָּם וָאַלְמַרְבִּדָּה}.
\hline
SG & קֵפַר לָעָפוּ מְלָאכָּם וָאַלְמַרְבִּדָּה: \textit{יתضعف משין الناس}.
\hline
BM & \textit{יתضعف משין الناس}.
\hline
TF & \textit{יתضعف משין الناس}.
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

\textsuperscript{275}It is apparent that the Tg has not only failed to identify the true meaning of the MT, but has also failed to make any real alternative sense of this verse altogether.

\textsuperscript{276}There is no mention in the Pesh, however, of 'valleys'.
The convergence noted for the previous stich continues somewhat for SG, BM, and TF in that they all employ the same root, \( d^f \), 'wane', in their treatment of the main verb to this final section of 28:4. This verb obviously has points of semantic contact with the Hebrew root \( dll \); however, given that none of these three Arabic versions continues the mining imagery of the MT, the resulting meaning in context does not, unfortunately, come near to approximating that of the Hebrew.

In addition, SG ends the stich with a second verb, as does FA (see below) in an attempt to approximate the MT structurally. The choice of verb by SG, 'sway', from the Eighth Form of the root \( drb \), comes close to the Hebrew verb 'swing back and forth', derived from the root \( nw' \). Yet once again, SG's failure to understand the mining imagery gives a finished translation that despite some good word-for-word treatments of the MT fails, in the end, to understand it properly. For in SG's context, the verb in question takes the derivative meaning 'fall into disorder', i.e., having become disturbed or mixed up through agitation.

BM and TF, unlike SG, do not add a second verb at the end of the stich. In this, they follow the LXX's wording rather closely, duplicating each other in the process.

FA in 4c completes his thought about the alien people of 28:4a who have gone astray in 28:4b: the Tenth Form of the stem 'sl as employed here means 'uproot'. As a result, despite a lack of convergence on vocabulary with the other Arabic versions, FA joins with them in general agreement, over against the MT itself. The addition of a second verb by FA, while perhaps intended merely as a gloss upon his first, coincidentally follows not only the MT, but also Tg (which stands semantically with the MT against all the other versions in question) and SG, at least in point of view of structure. The root, \( sby \), has a variety of meanings, but it is clear that FA
intends 'be carried away as captive'. Then, in anticipation of subsequent language, which furthers the convergence of all the Arabic versions, FA adds the prepositional phrase 'from the earth'. His rendering of 28:5b, then, is a relative clause using 'earth' as its antecedent (see below). Given that these stichs are thus expertly connected in a relatively seamless manner, the resulting translation gives the effect of flowing prosody rather than being a collection of discrete poetic units.

The convergence of the Arabic versions, not only with each other but with the MT, is now virtually complete. This may be attributed to the simplicity and clarity of the Hebrew, which now temporarily abandons the world of mining, ores, and gems.

Variations which remain among the Arabic versions are relatively incidental. For example, SG's verb is past imperfect; BM and TF disagree with SG, employing the present imperfect. These latter two also disagree with each other in terms of the verb's subject. But in the end none of these linguistic fine points results in any appreciable differences in meaning.

As for FA, his stich ends with a gloss on the grammatical subject by adding a second noun in apposition thereto. In doing so he takes the opportunity to employ a typically Qur'anic vocabulary item, الرزق, which carries connotations of God-given plenty as opposed to mere abundance. But just as in the other Arabic versions, FA's

---

277 Interweaving his text even more intricately, FA also begins 5a with a relative pronoun, whose antecedent is the 'alien people' of 28:4a.
nuance is just that: a nuance that does no damage to the basic concepts and theme of the stich. He accomplishes this in a single stroke, as it were, while remaining consistent with two of his penchants: favoring a theological focus on Divine sovereignty and activity, and displaying a linguistic preference for Islamic usage.

Verse 5b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>ויתהת התרפה במרלאה</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>אנקלפת של א_predictות זאראת כשנראה:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM</td>
<td>והנהה תרבע כמילת النار תנقلب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>ולידהו ירבע כמילת النار תנقلب.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| FA   | *

All the Arabic versions agree on the root qlb to render the Hebrew niphal of hfk, differing only as to whether it is the middle voice that should be employed (FA) or the passive (SG, BM, TF). Otherwise, their approaches take separate grammatical paths, with the exception of BM and TF, which parallel each other closely.

SG is less precise than has been his custom, perhaps out of a perceived need to bring emphasis to the notion that the current situation bears absolutely no resemblance to previous conditions. He does so by the addition of words based on roots such as bdl, 'make a substitution', and jm', 'be all-encompassing'.

BM and TF's only appreciable difference lies in the choice of preposition to open the stich. This difference is not due to the register of Arabic employed, but rather reflects a division between the two in their understanding of the verse. BM chooses the cognate of the Hebrew preposition 'under' as found in the MT, as well as in Tg, LXX, Pesh, S–H, and Cp, while TF selects its opposite, 'upon'. This editorial revision can be seen as having been made to harmonize the physical purview of 28:5b with the scene of the previous stich, which describes vegetation coming out of the earth. All the other versions in 28:5b change focus to what has
happened 'under' the earth, but TF continues to survey the situation above ground.

FA, continuing his narrative approach, making prosody of poetry, links this stich to previous ones by once again employing a relative pronoun, whose antecedent in this instance is 'the earth' of 28:4c. He also plays with the sonority of his language, much as does Hebrew in such expressions as תוהו וווהו (tohu va-vohu: 'chaos'), and as found in such Arabic maxims such as فتتش الجار قبل الدار (fattish al-jaar qabl al-daar: 'seek out the neighbor before the house'). In order to so, FA supplies a noun, البار, where the MT and Pesh only read 'that which is under'. Unfortunately, this noun is of uncertain root and meaning.

According to Lane (1863), the root brr in the form بار yields several possibilities: 'a pious man', 'an oath', 'land', and 'desert', all derived from the root بَر, which is the preferred spelling. While the first two possibilities are awkward, the final two make for comprehensible readings: '...which [i.e., the earth] upturns within it the (waste)land, like fire'. Such a reading would be confirmed by the root bwr, 'lie uncultivated', which has an exact cognate root in Syriac: 'be waste, void'. It is also in semantic parallel to the previous stich.

Another root is possible: بَر, 'dig a hole' or 'conceal in a hole', whence بَار, 'well-digging', and بَار, 'wells'. According to Blau (1966-67), the medial glottal stop is often elidable in Christian Arabic.278 And certainly 'wells' qualify for 'that which is under'. Thus the intended reading might be: '...which upturns within it wells like fire' or even '...which turns wells into something like fire'.279 Whether this is a reference to volcanic activity or to something more prosaic, the image of desolation, as with the previously discussed roots, brr and bwr, is clearly set.

279 I am indebted to Dr. M. Fishbein of UCLA for pointing this out as a possibility.
Verse 6a

| MT | פַּקְדַנְתָּם אֱלֹהִים |
| SG | אָבָלוֹתָם הַמִּלְתָּה אֲלֹהִים |
| BM | 'אֶלְמַהְתָּ תַּנְתֵּךְ הַחַיָּה |
| TF | 'אֶלְמַהְתָּ תַּנְתֵּךְ הַחַיָּה |
| FA | 'וְחַיָּהָ חוֹדֶרְתָּ הַשְּׁפֵי |

Just as SG, BM, and TF converge in terms of the verbal root qlb in the previous stich, they now concur on a rather obscure vocabulary item, לִמְּהָ, 'lustrously white', i.e., 'crystal', to translate the MT's יַלְלִים. And as for the MT's 'stone', all four Arabic versions resort to חָזָעָה.

SG's choices for vocabulary items in this stich, by and large, come from the opening of this chapter, where the mining imagery is unmistakable. This is also the case for BM and TF, which curiously repeat a prepositional phrase they employ in stich 2b: 'like stone'. In the earlier instance, they follow the lead of the LXX. But at 6a, they have no apparent precedent. Most likely, the occurrence of לִמְּהָ, employed at the beginning of the stich, is thought to be an appropriate occasion for a gloss, since it is not an exclusively mineralogical term. Thus the closing phrase, 'like stone'.

FA's translation is much less complicated than that of the other Arabic versions for this stich. Indeed, his terseness is less reminiscent of Arabic prosody than of Hebrew poetry. His vocabulary is influenced by the Hebrew as well, rather than by his earlier choices at the opening of the chapter, making use of what he apparently understands to be the Arabic cognate, סְפִיַר, for the MT's יַלְלִים, whence the English 'sapphire'. The more usual Arabic term is סְפִיַר, or even סְפִי. The first of these, incidentally, harks back to the choice which SG, BM, and TF make in this stich (see

---

280 This, according to Lane (1893), is generally said of teeth.
(see above), since سفیر, according to Lane,\textsuperscript{281} carries connotations of a faint, lustrous whiteness, as it relates to the color of the sky in a false dawn or immediately after sunset.

Verse 6b

\begin{verbatim}
MT
SG
BM
TF
FA
\end{verbatim}

SG, BM, and TF are virtually synonymous, differing only in the gender of the possessive pronominal suffix. This represents, for all of them, a slight clarification of the wording in the MT.

FA departs further than the other Arabic versions from the MT, adhering closely to the Pesh, which mentions 'paths'; in fact, FA uses the Arabic cognate for the Syriac here.\textsuperscript{282} Though it may be argued that the Arabic term employed has Qur'anic overtones, its usage in Qur'anic and non-Qur'anic material is so widespread that any move towards possible conclusions regarding Islamic influence requires caution.

Despite FA's wanderings, however, it is clear that he, unlike the other Arabic translators, has understood that the first half-dozen verses of this chapter have a common, underlying image of mining. In this stich FA explicitly mentions 'extraction', whereas the other Arabic versions only imply it at best. Indeed, their separation of the term 'dust' from 'gold' weakens any reference to mining activity whatsoever, while FA's language is unmistakable in its evocation of the world of

\textsuperscript{281} Book I, Part 4, p. 1371, column 2.

\textsuperscript{282} The S–H does not use the term 'paths'; in fact, it is even closer to the MT than SG.
mineralogy.

Verse 7a

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>נתייב לא-ידע לא עליה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>הם שלם ולא שונים אלמאיר מחלא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM</td>
<td>وفي طريقها الطيور</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>وفي طريق ما عرفتها الطيور</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>هذه التي يعرفها الزياء من الطير</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SG stands alone on several minor points regarding this stich. Firstly, he follows the Hebrew in selecting a nuanced word for 'path'. Secondly, he alone refers to 'bird' in the singular, though it must be admitted that the Hebrew allows this interpretation. Finally, he adds 'for instance' to the end of the stich. Goodman (1988) suggests this softens the starkness which the MT attempts to convey, noting that in parallel at 7b, SG employs a similar device.

The difference between BM's positive verb and TF's negation is resolved in favor of the latter by de Baudissin (1870), who supplies the standard Arabic ليس, 'not be', at the point where TF gives a typically colloquial construction of the negative particle لا, plus the perfect. But de Baudissin does not deal with BM's omission of the verb 'know', which is found not only in TF but also in the MT, SG, and FA. The other difference is the preference of TF for the singular of 'path' over against BM's plural. This preference, while not consistent, has also been encountered at 11:19 (p. 122).

FA continues his use of the relative clause as his construction of preference. In addition, his is the only Arabic version to identify precisely the type of bird(s) that appear in this stich: falcons. Of course, this is even more precise than the Hebrew, which simply reads 'birds-of-prey' from the root 'יָי, 'scream, shriek'. It also represents a departure from the Tg, LXX, Pesh, S–H, and Cp, which are as inexact
as the majority of the Arabic versions. However, it does provide a closer parallel for FA's translation 'kite' or 'hawk' in the next stich. And in a final peculiarity, FA's version alone (accepting de Baudissin's emendation, see above) puts the verb in the affirmative rather than negative. Given that the next stich in parallel does contain a negative (employing the same device as SG of لام plus the jussive, an exclusively classical construction), it can be deduced that an error of omission has been made at this point.

Verse 7b

MT

SG

BM

TF

FA

Looking backward, the softening of the harshness of the imagery begun in 7a by the addition of an adverbial qualifier as noted by Goodman (1988) in SG, continues here. Looking forward to the bestiary in future chapters of Job, we find a variation in the race of birds depicted: SG and FA agree on hawks, while BM (in the singular) and TF (in the plural) read 'eagle'.

Internal to this stich, all versions, even TF, negate the verb using the same classical, literary device. Given the general lack of classicisms encountered in TF, the occurrence of this classical negative must be accounted for, both here and elsewhere in Chapter 28.

The distinctive individuality of this chapter has been perceived by the majority of commentators, ancient and modern. While a full review of their arguments is beyond the purview of this study, some view this chapter as a separate 'ode' or

SG's verb, from لز, is the more exacting in its interpretation of the MT.
'hymn' inserted into the poetic portion of the book (which, in turn, was inserted into the prose story). Of course, by the end of the first millennium C.E., a translator would approach the Book of Job not as several separate prosodic, poetic, and hymnal works, but as a totality. Yet if the 'ode' was perceived as a composition of a somewhat different literary quality than the surrounding chapters, with its own linguistic tone and register, then the translator could reflect such difference by elevating, *i.e.*, classicizing, or lowering, *i.e.*, colloquializing, the register of Arabic employed. This, of course, has been common to speakers and writers of Arabic, even down to the present day.\(^{284}\)

Perhaps the presence of the classical grammatical device in TF represents either a conscious or unconscious move on the part of the translator to elevate the tone of the chapter, thus singling out its peculiar nature, since the usage of ظلم imparts something of an archaic quality to the text.

**Verse 8a**

| MT     | لا آبادكبح بني راحمأا |
| SG     | هل يطوها بنين المنجبين |
| BM     | ولم يطوها بنين المنجبين |
| TF     | ولم تسلكها |
| FA     | ولم يطوها بنين المنجبين |

FA treats this entire verse as though it were one stich only, using as the common subject for the two verbs 'lion' from 8b. In doing so, he misses the opportunity, taken by SG, BM, and TF, to employ a cognate Arabic construction to the Hebrew's typically Semitic turn of phrase, 'son(s) of ...'. However, the three Arabic versions which employ this device do not agree as to what is being referred to by 'sons of...', the MT being metaphorical in its approach.

---

\(^{284}\)This phenomenon has already been noted at 3:16b (p. 77).
SG selects, unambiguously, a noun meaning 'beasts-of-prey'. This would have conceptually paralleled to 'bird-of-prey' at 7a if SG had seized this opportunity as presented by the MT. But BM, preferring a more literal rendering of the MT, translates 'sons of pride' with the LXX, S–H, and Cp. This presents TF with a difficulty, however: while the root from which BM derived his translation, *n*b, exists in his native Egyptian Arabic, its meaning is related to 'intelligence' rather than to 'pride'. Instead of this false cognate, TF selects the root *n*j, 'be fertile'. While the result here too is less than elegant ('sons of the fruitful'), such would tie in with the imagery in verse 5a, where a once productive earth is no longer so. Of course, how the verb from the root *w*y, 'cross, traverse' relates to such beings is a matter of open conjecture.285

Verse 8b

| MT       | لم يجوز عليها اسد |
| SG       | ولم يجوز عليها اسد |
| BM       | ولم يجوز فيها الاسد |
| TF       | ولم يجوز فيها الاسد |
| FA       | ولم يجوز فيها الاسد |

SG's vocabulary choices for both the subject and verb of this stich differ from those of the Arabic script versions, which are in essential agreement with each other.

Keeping the parallel to the previous stich's 'sons of beasts-of-prey', SG selects as his subject 'lion-cub', while the Arabic script versions, in agreement with the MT, certain mss of Tg, as well as the LXX, Pesh, S–H, and Cp, simply translate 'lion'.

SG's choice of verb, from the root *m*y*l, 'bend' and thus 'be favorably disposed

---

285 The difference in the verb 'traverse' as written by SG and BM on the one hand, and TF on the other, can be attributed to the difficulties inherent to roots containing two weak radicals, in this case و and ي. From the point of the view of standard Arabic, the spelling of SG and BM is correct.
to', seems to go beyond the original intent of the MT. Indeed, the Arabic script versions agree on the more prosaic root *jwz*, 'travel through'. However, if the suggestion of Goodman (1988) that SG is deliberately softening the categorical negatives in this swath of verses is followed, then the use of "frequent" shows some consistency of thought: the Arabic script versions, with the MT, LXX, Pesh, S-H, and Cp, imply that the lion has not passed that way at all, while SG, in agreement with the Tg, which reads 'deviate', another possible reading from SG's Arabic root, suggests that while the lion (cub) has *habitually* stayed away, its absence is not absolute.

Verse 9a

| MT     | כַּהֲלַמְּשָׁה שָֽלאָה יְזָה |
| SG     | מְלַמְּשָׁה אֱלָה יְזולאמר |
| BM     | וָגִּבְלָל הַשָּׁלָֽאָה אֵלָֽא יָדְיוֹ |
| TF     | וֹגְבָּלָל הַשָּׁלָֽאָה אֵלָֽא יָדְיוֹ |
| FA     | וָאָזָד מַדּ הָאָלָֽאָה יֵדָֽו לַיְּהָרָֽא הָנָרָֽן *

The brief excursion in verses 7–8 to the realm of wild animals now ends, although the MT does not explicitly signal the transition: the occurrence of 'his hand' as the direct object of the verb was apparently considered a sufficient semantic device to move the reader from the fowls of the air and beasts of the land on the one hand to humankind on the other. BM and TF concur; SG retains some ambiguity as to the subject of the verb; however, FA clearly does not take the hint, and pursues his own agenda once again: God\(^{284}\) is explicitly cited as the actor in this stich, stretching forth His hand. This unprecedented reading, unattested in the Tg, LXX, Pesh, S–H, and Cp, prepares the stage for a somewhat apocalyptic understanding of the next stich.

\(^{284}\) Here, 'their Creator'; cf. 'its Creator' at 3a.
In terms of specialized vocabulary, 'flint' in the MT is responded to in different manners by the Arabic versions: according to Lane (1872) SG's root, sld, 'be hard (and smooth)', carries the implication that the stone thus named gives off sparks and fire only with great difficulty, if at all.\footnote{287 BM and TF both resort to the root swn, "black stones which are not hard, giving off sparks" (Lane 1872; emphasis added), employing the plural, as does FA. But FA resorts to a third root, trr, 'slaughter with a sharp-edged stone'. Clearly, the practical unanimity of the Arabic versions' treatment of mineralogical terminology as found in the opening verses to this chapter has broken down, and the variation which obtains in dealing with vocabulary relating to the fauna in earlier verses of the Hymn to Wisdom is now the rule here for 'flint'.}

Verse 9b

| MT | סַלְמּוּ הָרִים | סְלַמְמָיו הָרִים |
| SG | וַאֱכַלְלֵי הַמֶּרֶסֶת הַבֵּית | וַאֱכַלְלֵי הַמֶּרֶסֶת הַבֵּית |
| BM | וַאֱכַלְלֵי הָבָיִט | וַאֱכַלְלֵי הָבָיִט |
| TF | וַאֱכַלְלֵי הָבָיִט | וַאֱכַלְלֵי הָבָיִט |
| FA | וַאֱכַלְלֵי הָבָיִט | וַאֱכַלְלֵי הָבָיִט |

The clarity of the Hebrew is reflected in the closeness of the meaning of the Arabic versions, and even in some of their common vocabulary. The root qlb, 'overturn', is common to SG, BM, and TF, and is actually repeated by the latter two versions in their stichs 9a and 9b. The only major difference among the Arabic versions, with FA in opposition to the others, hinges on the previous stich. There, FA interpreted God as being the actor, not humanity (see above). Thus the metallurgical imagery of mining for 'flint' and 'razing / uprooting / overturning mountains', so clear in SG,

\footnote{Unfortunately, this deviation on the part of SG from the other Arabic versions does not yield a clue as to whether the identity of the verb's subject is divine or mortal.}
BM, and TF, is transformed into a display of divine power for FA.

Verse 10a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>בָּשָׁרְתָא יִאֶרֶזְ בְּקֹךְ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>אֶשְׁקֵקָל לֶחֶטֶןָא מֵךְ זַאצָּרְנָא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM</td>
<td>וַאֲהוֹלָא הָוֹדִיָּה שִׁנְקַע</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>וַאֲהוֹלָא הָוֹדִיָּה שִׁנְקַע</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>וְאֵלָהּ זֶדַכֶּל יְהֹודַא הַבּוֹשְׁתָא בּעֶזְהָה</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SG resorts to the root *swn*, employed by BM and TF in 9a, using the plural of a plural\(^{288}\) to emphasize the multiplicity of "boulders" of the mountains which were overturned in 9b: indeed, the addition of a possessive pronominal suffix to "boulders" provides a thematic tie-in not found in the MT to the previous two stichs.

BM and TF return to their translation of 4a to provide most of their vocabulary here; such repetitiveness is not found in the Tg, LXX, Pesh, or S-H. These two Arabic versions' reference to 'powers' at the close of the stich is found in the Pesh, as well as in a marginal gloss of the S-H; it is also reflected in FA. But in BM and TF, the powers described are clearly natural; for FA the 'might' is supernatural.

FA finally turns to the root *qlb*, employed in the previous verse by the other Arabic versions, which all agree at this point on *ṣqq*, 'demolish'.\(^ {289}\) But he stays his course in seeing God ('His might') as the perpetrator of the activities described, though he agrees with SG, BM, and TF in what those activities actually are, i.e., the diversion of river courses.

Verse 10b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>אַלְיַמְכַּר רַאָהָה צֵּּנָא</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{288}\) Some mss cited in Qapah (1970) do not cite this augmented plural, preferring a simple one.

\(^{289}\) Goodman (1988) renders this as "cleave".
The occurrence of בַּל in the MT leads to a broadening amongst all the Arabic versions on the intent of the Hebrew, which is still focussed on the world of minerals and gems. The existence of a cognate Arabic root, wqr, 'be heavy / be settled (fact)', holds a key to the possible meanings of the Arabic versions, especially FA’s; but the cognate root itself does not appear in any of those versions.

SG’s intent to avoid anthropomorphisms is said* to lie behind his turn of phrase 'had been anticipated by His knowledge', which substitutes for the MT’s 'His eye has seen it'. This is the clearest indication thus far that despite the initial grammatical ambiguities cited above, SG, like FA, does not understand the immediately preceding verses as referencing human activity.

As for the question of what it is that God's (fore)-knowledge had anticipated, SG reads 'every mighty deed'. But 'mighty deed' finds no precedent in the Tg; nor does it occur in the LXX, Pesh, S-H, or Cp.

BM and TF’s understanding of the Hebrew’s בַּל parallels that of SG: 'mighty / significant / splendid (thing)'. In this they approximate what BDB cite* as the late Hebrew connotation: "weighty, influential", which also approximates the cognate Arabic root as noted above.

But also worthy of mention in BM and TF is their disagreement as to whose eye, 'his' or 'my', is doing what. BM follows the reading of the LXX, S-H, and Cp,

---

* If there is any question of human activity in these verses, it lies in this particular phrase for SG.
* The two Syriac versions use their language’s cognate root to the Hebrew.
* P. 430, column 1.
'my eye', while TF agrees with the Tg and Pesh, 'his eye'. A first person singular pronoun reading can be seen as carrying the implication that divine activity is being referred to, and that God is doing the speaking; a third person singular pronoun does not rule out God as the actor, but it is more ambiguous, if only from a grammatical point of view.

As for the faculty of sight itself, BM selects the root nzr, which carries a broad range of meanings, e.g., 'view / contemplate / try a court case / be loyal', while TF prefers bsr, whose semantic range is more limited: 'see / comprehend'.

FA's verb, from the root zhr, 'appear', is in the Fourth Form, yielding 'show, demonstrate'. Thus God makes manifest, according to FA, while the other Arabic versions, and the MT, picture a more passive or reflective activity. When this revised understanding in FA's version is added to the grammatical direct object, 'personal nobility' or 'every noble trait', certain theological implications come to light, depending upon who is seen as the speaker in this passage.

Traditionally, Job has been seen as the reciter of the Hymn to Wisdom, since it appears within his final speech cycle, chapters 26-31. If this is FA's understanding, then what we have here is a Joban assertion, consistent with his thought throughout the Book, that in the end God will vindicate him, making clear to all that Job has been a character of 'personal nobility', a person of 'every noble trait'.

But, if FA discerns the Hymn to Wisdom as being something of an interlude in the poetic drama, then the same stich could be seen either as a comment by an unknown or unseen narrator or chorus that 'all will be revealed', or, as yet another in a series of tauntingly accusatory passages found up to this point on the lips of Job's Comforters: in the end, it is God Who will have to 'show / reveal every noble trait', since none of the other characters in the drama can believe that Job can be relied upon to tell the truth of his own sinfulness, let alone his 'personal nobility'.
Attempts have been made to clarify the difficulty in the Hebrew’s opening vocabulary item by resort to Ugaritic, resulting in various proposals for emendation. The Arabic versions, despite the cognate bky for the MT’s bkh, ‘weep’, respond with a variety of roots; the semantic results do not diverge markedly from each other, however. In fact, they suggest that BHS’ reading is not off target.

SG resorts to the root ġws, ‘immerse’, yielding ‘sunken’. While such an approach has affinities with the LXX and S–H, the Tg’s understanding, which is followed by the Pesh, does not concur with that of SG.

As for the close of the stich, SG resorts to the Arabic cognate of the MT’s verb, from the root hbs ‘block / bar / hold back’. Coincidentally, this verb in Arabic can be used of tears, harking back to a literal, unemended reading of מבלת as found in the Hebrew.

BM and TF, which agree entirely with each other, adopt the root ‘mq, ‘be deep’ to deal with the opening of the stich. In so doing they are cognate to the reading of the S–H; their difference with SG, therefore, is largely one of nuance. However, at the close of the stich, BM and TF contradict the MT and SG. In so doing, they are more in tune with the Tg, Pesh, and S–H, which speak, more or less, of overflowing waters, not of hidden or sunken or dammed up ones. More importantly, BM and

---

294 BHS and Habel (1985), p. 390, whose translation is “deep springs”, both make suggestions in this regard.
295 Derenbourg’s edition (1899) of SG’s translation posits a phonologically related root here, ġyd, ‘become scanty, sink into the earth [water].
TF thus provide a semantic parallel to their verb from the following stich: in 11a, *kṣf* 'lay bare', agrees with 11b's causative form of *zhr*, 'appear', yielding 'make manifest'. In this, too, they are in general agreement with the Tg, Pesh, and S-H.

FA is more in tune with SG here than the other Arabic script versions. Indeed, as far as the verb is concerned, FA employs the same root as SG, differing only in its aspect: SG uses the pluperfect, FA the imperfect. But as far as the troublesome opening of the stich is concerned, FA posits that what the text requires is the 'course' of the rivers, to which he adds the adjective 'strong', the latter of which has precedent from the Tg.

Verse 11b

*BHS* suggests that the MT is incorrect here. SG, along with BM and TF, add an extra pronominal suffix, which clearly ties the imagery of this stich to that of the previous one. Without such connection, the vocabulary alone, speaking of 'light' and 'darkness', is in danger of lending itself to figurative understandings, as will be seen immediately below.

This stich provides one of the few occasions where the divergence between BM and TF is substantial, though the error involved stems initially from a mere reversal of consonants. Yet these two versions concur on an important divergence from the

---

296 

297 Goodman (1988) suggests (p. 333, n. 6) that this addition is due to a misreading of the feminine gender marker in the Hebrew as a possessive pronominal suffix.

298 SG and FA both choose terms for darkness that carry implications of murkiness and density.
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MT, doing so with the LXX, S-H, and Cp, by their introduction of the concept of 'power'. Thus BM reads 'And He makes visible their strength [i.e., that of the rivers] on the low-lying [ground]', while the latter reads 'And He exposes their power to the light', or, in more idiomatic English, 'He brings their power to light'. In both of the these readings, the power is clearly that of the rivers in the previous stich, whereas the LXX and S-H characterize the power in question as being of divine origin. As for lapsing into figurative language, clearly TF is the more metaphorical, while BM clings more closely to physical images and material realities.

FA continues his use of the imperfect aspect for his verb in 11b in consistent contrast to SG, whose own employment of the pluperfect here parallels that of 11a. But more importantly, FA's language is the most grandiose of all the Arabic versions, speaking in terms reminiscent of the creation, when 'light is brought forth from darkness'. Without making use of any synonym for the word 'power', as do BM and TF, FA unmistakably invokes the concept in a manner that breaks with the earthly language of 11a in favor of the language of divine sovereignty.

Verse 12a

All the Arabic versions except for FA begin, like the Hebrew, with the noun 'wisdom', even though questions in classical Arabic generally begin with the interrogative. This word order is an accepted device used to underscore the importance of the noun, but FA's treatment of this stich is exceptional for more reasons than this, as will be noted below.
SG agrees with FA on the root of the verb, *wjd*, 'find'. SG's verb, like that of the MT, is passive, while FA's is not, for reasons which will be apparent in the discussion of the latter's translation. Additionally, SG goes out of his way to use a prepositional phrase cognate to that of the Hebrew. This close fidelity to the MT is countered somewhat by the addition of a single word, יָשָׁב, 'likewise', which helps SG connect this transitional verse with the preceding discussion, toning down the thematic shift in the text.

BM and TF are succinct, duplicating each other exactly. They employ a less pedestrian verbal root, *swb*, in the transitive, i.e., Form IV: 'attain [an end] / win [a fortune] / acquire [a certain amount of knowledge]'. While this verb is a bit more precise than the more generalized MT and SG, it is an apposite choice. Indeed, in their brevity and structure, they represent perhaps the closest Arabic version to the MT.

FA indulges himself as a practical theologian here. Alone among the Arabic versions as well as the Tg, LXX, Pesh, S–H, and Cp, FA supplies a new subject in the first person plural without a grammatical antecedent, making 'wisdom' the direct object, not the subject, of the question at hand. Having a pronoun without a proper antecedent raises stylistic issues for the classical Arab grammarian, though even the Qur'an contains at least one instance of such a construction, at 112:1.

FA's use of 'we' as a rhetorical device also draws the audience into the drama: the story and dilemma of Job become our own, not merely something that happened long ago and far away. There are few occasions where this translational device can

---

299 Goodman (1988) suggests that the verb is in the second person active rather than the third person passive; if Goodman is correct, this would have Job answering Bildad (if the order of speakers as found in the MT is not emended) directly through the use of the Hymn.

300 To be sure, the occurrence of a pronoun without a proper referent has occasioned much spilled ink in Qur'anic commentary.
be used without unnecessarily violating the text. As an interlude in the drama, this is one of those occasions, and thus FA the translator shows that he is also Fatyūn the homileticist.

As if to underscore his point, FA inserts another stich, with a second verb, also in the first person plural: 'take possession / attain'. In this manner FA remains faithful to the MT's verb, 'find', and then adds a second, more precise verb as a gloss. While BM's and TF's use of a single verb to cover both semantic occasions is more elegant, the use of two verbs gives FA a chance to reaffirm the shift to first person plural, as does his prepositional phrase following the opening interrogative of the stich.

Verse 12b

| MT | וַיְהִי תָּפֵר הָלָא אֲלָפָה |
| SG | וַיְהִי תָּפֵר הָלָא אֲלָפָה | וָאֵּי מְמוּשׁ הַפִּֽטַּנָּה | * וָאֵּי מְמוּשׁ הַפִּֽטַּנָּה |
| BM | | וָאֵּי מְמוּשׁ הַפִּֽטַּנָּה |
| TF | | |
| FA | | |

All the Arabic versions translate the MT's מַפָּר with the same word: موضع. But a more central vocabulary item, הֵῦָֽנָּה, is the cause for the separation between SG and FA on the one hand and BM and TF on the other.

SG's softening of the thematic break at 12a calls for parallel language in his version of 12b, which he readily supplies. And again, almost as if to counterbalance this linguistic excursion, SG is careful to use in 12b, as in 12a, yet another cognate term, this time to the MT's interrogative. As for his understanding of הֵעיָֽנָּה, SG selects the relatively neutral term הָֽנָּה, 'perceptiveness / insight'.

301 The root in question, הָֽנָּה, is reminiscent of the name of one of Job's comforters, Zophar. As noted earlier in the discussion of Chapter 11 on p. 97, TH employs this very root to transliterate this name.
BM and TF do not duplicate each other exactly, foreshadowing greater variance further into this chapter before a final linguistic reconciliation at its climax. TF's interrogative is a prepositional phrase, whose language coincidentally brings to mind SG's through the common use of the preposition في, albeit at different points in the text. But BM and TF do stand together on translating the MT's فنطقة as فنحة, or 'acumen, sagacity'. While less neutral or pedestrian a choice than SG's and FA's term, the semantic nuance is not of any effective significance.

FA's brief stich is an adequate treatment of the MT, but even in such a brief passage FA apparently cannot resist the urge to tinker with the text: instead of inquiring as to 'the place of understanding', FA reads 'the place of its understanding', thus tying this stich to the previous one, since the antecedent for 'its' is 'wisdom'. However, to his credit, FA has ignored the fact that the Hebrew root for 'understanding', byn, has a cognate in Arabic, where it serves as a key concept in Qur'anic theology. Rather than incorporating another linguistic link to Islamic thought, FA remains faithful to the basic meaning of his scripture, given that the resulting translation would be imprecise at best, inaccurate at worst.

Verse 13a

| MT                                    | لهارئ مما أورش أزه      |
| SG                                    | لأخليك أتأسقنا كومهنا |
| BM                                    | لعلم الإنسان مسلكتها   |
| TF                                    | لعلم الإنسان موضعها مسلكه |
| FA                                    | لعلم أحد اين موضع كنزها  |

All the Arabic versions use the same classical construction to open this verse. All but FA agree on the same vocabulary item to translate the subject of the stich. But it is an age-old disagreement concerning possible readings of the MT which causes a divide in the Arabic versions, between SG and FA on the one hand, which, with the
Pesh, deal with the MT, and BM and TF on the other, which follow the LXX, S–H, and Cp. 302

SG translates the MT's דֵּרֶךְ with "דרֶךְ מָצָא", both of which mean 'its value / worth'. Interestingly, the basic semantic area of both the Hebrew and Arabic roots involved has little to do with value, but both words are unambiguous in their respective contexts.

The translations of BM and TF are based on reading the MT's דֵּרֶךְ as דֵּרֶךְ מָצָא, i.e., from 'its value' to 'its way'. Those who argue in favor of such an emendation, such as Habel (1985), note that "the question of locating [emphasis added] wisdom (vs. 12–14) precedes the consideration of its value (vs. 15ff.)." 303 And, as if in anticipation of this observation, TF adds to his interpretation of the stich מְמוּשָׁה, 'its place / location'. The only other difference between BM and TF concerns the gender of the Arabic translation of the Hebrew: BM chooses the feminine; the reading of TF is to be preferred.

FA deals with the Hebrew text in a manner which provides a thematic link to the previous imagery of precious metals and gems: the 'place' is delimited in construct with 'its treasure', which Lane (1885) then goes on to define as a treasure that is "properly buried in the earth". However, קנץ can also be not only a literal treasure, but, more figuratively, a treasure of knowledge or science and the like. In an attempt to unite various themes, FA has certainly found a mot juste here, even if the translation itself of the Hebrew is not exact.

Verse 13b

| MT | לעַל תָּמְצָא בָּאָרֶמְתּ הָרַיִם | \(לְאֶלֶם \) חַתֹּךְ רֵיֵהּ אֲלַמְּהָא.
| SG | לעַל חַתֹּךְ פִּי דָּרֶךְ אֵלַמְּהָא |

302 The Tg copes with the MT in a rather idiosyncratic manner.
303 P. 390.
Relatively simple Hebrew is the occasion for elegance by SG, a prosaic approach in BM, grammatical error in TF, and a contradiction of original intent by FA.

BM and TF are close, though the latter shows his lack of a complete grasp of the classical verb mood system he seeks to employ. The difference in gender between the two versions' verbs is due to the lack of agreement, noted in the discussion of the previous stich, regarding the gender of the verb's subject. Both versions seem to limit the sense of the MT by their prepositional phrase 'among men' in place of the MT's 'land of the living'. Their precedent for this is the LXX, which is followed by S–H and Cp.

FA asserts, in an unprecedented manner, that the thus-far elusive place of Wisdom is, indeed, found in the 'place of life'. In fact, FA contends that it is only found there, as opposed to the world of gems, minerals, and natural phenomena. Given FA's fixation on the Sovereign and Almighty God, this bold departure from the MT makes little sense apart from an attempt to harmonize this passage with the scriptural assertion304 that God is the God of the living (and not of the dead).

Verse 14a

SG's tendency to avoid anthropomorphisms extends to the figure of הוהי, the

304 Matthew 22:32.
primordial chaos of the deep, from Hebrew mythological thought. While mention of this personification cannot be avoided without too extreme a departure from the text, SG literally denies the figure its voice: "If The Deep were able, it would say...", using the particle generally reserved for introducing an unrealizable condition. This, of course, robs The Deep of its quasi-metaphysical status. In avoiding such anthropomorphisms, SG shows himself to be concerned with protecting Divine Sovereignty, though his strategies differ from those of FA.

Neither BM nor TF have a difficulty with personifications from mythology. Perhaps reinforced by the archaic ambience which would accompany such a figure, TF yet again uses a classicism, this time in the use of the verb 'not be'. Given a lacuna in BM's text, it is impossible to determine whether BM is the source of that usage, however.

Equally worthy of note is the use of the word ח_budget, 'terror', by both BM and TF to translate the MT's מ_ח. Neither the Tg nor LXX, remaining close as they do to the MT, give a clue as to this choice on the part of these two Arabic versions; the Pesh and S-H are even less helpful, resorting to the Syriac cognate thwm' at that point in their text. What we have, then, is an example of apt translation of a concept rather than merely a vocabulary item: מ_ח was a source of dread and dismay throughout much of the cosmogenies of the ancient Near East. Merely to translate 'the deep' would lose much of the semantic shading of the Hebrew text.

FA's translation treats the figure of מ_ח in yet a third manner; resorting to a construct phrase, the result is to rob the figure of its almost supernatural status, though in a manner less theological than SG. And, FA does so without augmenting

According to Qapah (1970), some mss add "if asked"; such indeed is the reading of Derenbourg (1899).

One of SG's main concerns, of course, was combatting the Kara'ites, whose literalistic approach to scripture, including its anthropomorphisms, endangered the metaphysical nature of God, in SG's view.
the mental image involved as do BM and TF. In fact, given his choice of vocabulary, FA is forced to repeat himself in 14b. Thus is FA's translation surpassed in quality by all the other Arabic versions in this verse.

Verse 14b

None of the Arabic versions departs from the model found in the previous stich:

SG persists in reminding his readers of unrealizable conditions; BM continues its silence, while its companion document, TF, continues in the same style and approach as found in the previous stich; FA is trapped by his vocabulary blunder of the previous stich, as noted above. Otherwise, the only other point worth noting is the Arabic versions' unanimity in selecting the nearly-homophonous, but false cognate for the Hebrew preposition عند.

Verse 15a

SG is alone among the Arabic versions in shunning the generic term for gold in favor of, 'pure gold'. Lane (1863) suggests this word, which is obviously of non-Semitic origin, is derived from ἀργυρός. However, since this vocabulary item is not used anywhere in the LXX, that avenue for venturing a rationale for the occurrence of أَبْرِيز at any particular point in any of the Arabic versions, based
on usage by antecedent translations, is moot. Given the propensity of the various Arabic versions to supply synonyms for 'gold' seemingly at random, little linguistic or theological significance should be read into the difference here between SG on the one hand and his fellow translators on the other.

BM's translation is unprecedented among the Arabic versions in that this stich is prefaced by the phrase 'Nothing can be obtained surpassing it'. The Tg, LXX, Pesh, and Cp do not provide an obvious source for this addition. However, the presence of marginal comments in the S–H, mentioned below, may have inspired this supplementary phrasing.

TF misreads this extra introductory phrase in BM, but makes the best of it. Confusing the root 'ty, 'give', with gty, 'cover', gives TF a reading of 'something covers it over', a far cry from BM's 'nothing can be obtained surpassing it'. Obviously, TF takes this phrase as a summation of the thought of the previous three verses, which have as their theme the concealment of Wisdom. In fact, TF's ms inserts end–of–verse punctuation after this phrase, demonstrating that this thought pattern relates to the previous material regarding the location of Wisdom, not to the subsequent material regarding its value. Thus TF's passage takes on a clearly valid logic of its own.

In the second portion of the stich, TF shows more independence than usual from BM. While all the other Arabic versions contain some version of the root bdl, 'exchange / substitute', TF supplants this option for the somewhat more forceful fdy, 'ransom / redeem'. The extensive marginal notations of the S–H for vv. 14–19, pertaining to the impossibility of setting an equivalency to the worth of Wisdom, may have prompted this line of thought, just as it may have been the source of BM's introductory material to this stich.

---

307 The difference consists of a single diacritical mark.
FA, making sure that his audience has not lost the train of thought, explicitly mentions Wisdom once again, whereas in all the other Arabic versions, it is simply referred to by pronominal suffixes.

**Verse 15b**

| MT | لا يشترى بضعة مهرة |
| SG | ولا يعدل ذهب ولا إبريز |
| BM | ولا يعدلها الإبريز |
| TF | ولا تشتري بالفضة |

The mention of silver in the MT causes unexpected variation in the Arabic versions: SG makes an understandable, if not entirely warranted, leap to 'wealth' or even 'money'; BM and TF repeat various synonyms for 'gold'; only FA catches the reference to silver itself. Given that the Tg, LXX, Pesh, and S-H all follow the MT correctly at this point,\(^{308}\) the divergences are curious, if ultimately unimportant.

The variation in the Arabic versions concerning this stich's verb is largely a question of nuance, though SG's 'be weighed [in the balance]', and the semantically equivalent 'counterbalance' found in BM and TF, are certainly more poetic than FA's 'purchase'. In fact, FA's choice here heightens the absurdity of the contention that anything as sublime as Wisdom can be obtained by anything as prosaic as a mere commercial transaction.

**Verse 16a**

| MT | لا تكون ثمنها الزمرد |
| SG | لا تكون ثمنها الزمرد |
| BM | لا يكون ثمنها الزمرد |
| TF | لا يكون ثمنها الزمرد |

\(^{308}\) The Cp conflates this stich with the previous one, and in so doing deletes any second reference to a precious metal.
The various versions simply range among a variety of synonyms for the verb (concerning which even BM and TF do not agree) and the precious objects mentioned: gemstones, emeralds, pure gold. Only SG makes explicit mention of the place-name 'Ophir'; in standing thus over against all the other Arabic versions, SG is supported not only by the MT, but also by the Tg, LXX, Pesh, and S-H; the placename in the Cp, "Sophir", is obviously related to that of the MT.

Verse 16b

Inexplicably, BM and TF truncate the stich by failing to mention a second precious stone. TF further shortens matters by failing to supply a verb for this stich, having the verb in the previous stich serve both. FA's verb here, from qys, 'measure', is the same as that used by SG in the previous stich.

Verse 17a

The various Arabic versions continue to trade roots for synonyms. For example, FA's verb employs the root found in BM's and TF's treatment of 15b, while here these latter two resort to SG's choice from that very same stich. Strangely enough,
only SG and FA employ the near-cognate Arabic زجاج for the MT's 
v1.39 glass', while BM and TF prefer 'emeralds'. Given the blue and green shadings of some varieties of glass, perhaps their choice is understandable. But finally, of greater import is SG's structural emendation, and FA's addition of an extra stich to 17a.

The reason behind SG's elaboration on what is not complex Hebrew may be found in the disagreement among various versions of the Tg. Faced with a wealth of options, some of which are extensive in nature, SG's changes are relatively conservative. The results, however, go beyond the MT's reading: "Gold and glass cannot match her in value". SG is clearly more forceful, reading 'It is not to be valued in gold — how then in glass?"

FA's extra stich is used to accommodate not only the second precious commodity being compared to Wisdom, but also a third: 'jewels'. This variety stands in contrast to FA's failure to find a parallel verb for his extra stich. He simply repeats his opening verbal phrase, 'And gold cannot be enumerated for it', simply substituting 'glass' and 'jewels' for 'gold' in the additional stich. As noted in the treatment of 15a, the tendency to extensive cataloguing of incomparables may find its roots in the marginal notations of the S-H for vv. 14–19.

Verse 17b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>BM</th>
<th>TF</th>
<th>FA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>וַאֲנַחֲנוּ בְּרַחֲמָתָּךְ</td>
<td>וַאֲנַחֲנוּ בְּרַחֲמָתָּךְ</td>
<td>וַאֲנַחֲנוּ בְּרַחֲמָתָּךְ</td>
<td>וַאֲנַחֲנוּ בְּרַחֲמָתָּךְ</td>
<td>וַאֲנַחֲנוּ בְּרַחֲמָתָּךְ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וָאֲנַחֲנוּ בְּרַחֲמָתָּךְ</td>
<td>וָאֲנַחֲנוּ בְּרַחֲמָתָּךְ</td>
<td>וָאֲנַחֲנוּ בְּרַחֲמָתָּךְ</td>
<td>וָאֲנַחֲנוּ בְּרַחֲמָתָּךְ</td>
<td>וָאֲנַחֲנוּ בְּרַחֲמָתָּךְ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וָאֲנַחֲנוּ בְּרַחֲמָתָּךְ</td>
<td>וָאֲנַחֲנוּ בְּרַחֲמָתָּךְ</td>
<td>וָאֲנַחֲנוּ בְּרַחֲמָתָּךְ</td>
<td>וָאֲנַחֲנוּ בְּרַחֲמָתָּךְ</td>
<td>וָאֲנַחֲנוּ בְּרַחֲמָתָּךְ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

309 The Pesh and S-H use the equivalent Syriac cognate to the Arabic.
310 Its treatment by the LXX, Pesh, S-H, and Cp is straightforward here.
While BM and TF persist in the gold motif,³¹² SG and FA prefer the cognate route, though with differing results: SG's choice for an equivalent root to the MT's *fzz*, 'be refined [gold]' is *fwz*, 'attain good fortune' (whence the noun 'treasure'), while FA opts for *f$z*$, the Second Form of which is 'set a ring' (whence the noun 'ringstone'). The difference in results is not dramatic. FA alone, however, in following the Pesh, makes no mention of the MT's 'vessels'. Like the Pesh, he simply cites more precious substances, ringstones and pearls, rather than valuable utensils that have been crafted by humankind.

Verse 18a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>BM</th>
<th>TF</th>
<th>FA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| रामण नियम ने जिवर | नलरान्ता ने नलरा रहाम ने नवरान मुहाम | न तली नास | न तली नास  | न तली नास | नालन हार्क मे अर्थर कायम *

SG follows the verb, 'be mentioned'³¹³ with the prepositional phrase, 'with it',³¹⁴ the antecedent for the pronoun being Wisdom. Given that this stich is part of the ongoing discussion of all the valuables which are not comparable to Wisdom, the addition of this phrase simply helps clarify Wisdom's incomparability to yet another pair of prized entities.

The abbreviation which occurs in the text of BM and TF results from having dropped stich 18a$x$. The omission is easily understood: 18a$x$ continues to enumerate precious substances, and is therefore thematically and conceptually aligned with the previous verses, whereas with 18a$β$ the catalogue of valuables has come to an end, albeit a temporary one. Thus the omission of another pair of prized objects

---

³¹² TF omits his verb here, relying on the continued force of the verb in his 17a.

³¹³ The conjugation in the dual is a clear mark of SG's mastery of classical Arabic.

³¹⁴ Derenbourg (1899) reads ננלי, 'with the likes of it'.
prized objects in the long listing that has run for more than a few verses may be
unfortunate, but does little violence to the sense of the text.

BM and TF rejoin the translation effort at 18aβ, which contains a verb, on
which the MT, Tg, LXX, S-H, Cp, and SG all agree: "shall not be mentioned".315
The subject of this verb, of course, was originally contained in the material which
BM and TF have omitted. The question then becomes one of determining the new
subject for these two Arabic versions. There are a number of possibilities.

The Arabic verb as found in BM and TF, from the root lḥy, 'turn one's
attention',316 can be a third person masculine middle voice perfect (Form Five), in
which case 'people' is the subject. If this were the understanding of BM, then the
omission of 18aα is even more understandable, with 18aβ representing a shift in
thought away from the preceding catalogue of precious objects. This translation
would then read: 'People are not distracted / give no consideration'. At this point
one would further understand the reasoning behind SG's addition of an extra phrase
on the order of 'by the likes of it' (see above).

The verb in TF can be understood in a different way: a third person feminine
active imperfect. In this case the grammatical subject is either (i) the golden utensils
of 17b, or (ii) Wisdom itself. Given TF's lack of a verb for the 'golden utensils' of
17b, (i) seems a reasonable choice, since the previous negative verbs from 15b to
this point all have as their subjects the precious objects which cannot be compared to
Wisdom itself. Thus option (i) would read: 'Golden vessels do not distract men'. If
(ii) is adopted, however, the reading would be 'Wisdom does not distract men'.

The theological implications of (ii) would be profound, since it condemns

315 As translated by Brenton (1870).
316 The relation of this semantic area to that of 'be mentioned', as found in the MT,
Tg, LXX, S-H, Cp, and SG, is easily traced: 'mention' can lead to the sense of 'give consideration' which in turn can lead to the sense of 'be distracted'.
These latter two are both bona fide options for the Arabic root in question.
humankind as unconcerned with Wisdom. Yet this understanding of the text would contradict the sense of the rest of the chapter: Wisdom is indeed the object of great attention and search, whereas golden vessels are not, or at least should not be. Therefore the understanding of option (i) for TF is to be preferred.

At first appearance, FA’s attention to stich-by-stich translation becomes less focused over vv. 18–19a, so much so that by 19b he condenses his material in order to rejoin the other versions before the refrain of v. 20. FA assembles affirmation upon affirmation concerning the value of Wisdom, occasionally shortchanging individual elements of the original text. As such, FA’s version displays similarities with the Pesh, which, though less diffuse, still compares Wisdom with a larger number of precious substances than either the Tg or LXX.317

Upon closer examination, FA’s version betrays a number of characteristics of conflation in vv. 18–19, doing so by combining the expansive language of the S–H with the comprehensive cataloguing found in the Pesh. In this, FA bears the marks of a homileticist: he stresses his point by marshalling and amassing whatever support seems warranted by the task at hand, since he is more interested here in the broad meaning of the text in its fullest sense, rather than in its constituent elements.

Verse 18b

| MT | ימשר חכמה מפוריים |
| SG | תמאו את黑客הת יתא ומ אלבערא: |
| BM | تستحب الحكمה אפלה מנה קהל: |
| TF | בשלום הحكמה אפלה מנה קהל: |
| FA | ולא יشبهו הזקן הפקק * ולא תبدل באלזרד ולアルバム * |

Whereas SG and FA make declarative statements, BM is exhortatory, and TF is confused. In addition, FA and SG continue the discussion of various valuables,

317 In fact, at 18a FA follows the Pesh quite closely.
while the other two Arabic versions resort to more universalistic statements concerning the value of Wisdom, following the lead of the LXX.

The potential ambiguities in SG are arresting: his opening noun, 'substance', has a curious derivative meaning 'rising [floodwaters]'. Though 'rising [flood]' would make no sense in SG's own text, the ambiguous consonantal text of the S-H could yield 'the flood', among other readings (see below), at precisely this point; such potential ambiguities in the S-H are dealt with in a marginal gloss.

The difference between BM and TF's opening verbs is more than either a matter of poor copywork or regional/stylistic variation. Rather, the divergence lies in a misconception of the meaning of the Syriac of the S-H. Ceriani (1874) contains the marginal clarificatory gloss, noted in the preceding paragraph, dealing with this problematic reading; apparently TF did not have access to such an apparatus, or ignored it. Taking the meaning of the Syriac to be derived from 'be armed / have a weapon', TF translates 'In the bearing of Wisdom is [something] better than all this', whereas BM's meaning, 'prefer', is based correctly on the antecedent versions in question, yielding 'You are to prefer Wisdom more than all this'.

FA supplies two stichs where only one is necessary, strictly speaking. Like the Pesh, FA lists three valuables whose worth is not comparable to that of Wisdom.

Verse 19a

The MT opens this verse with the same wording used at 17a, but only SG seems

---

318 The Pesh is also fairly prolix at this point.
constrained by this example to do likewise, unless one reads FA’s first portion of
19b as his equivalent to 17a. As for the placename at the close of the verse, only
BM and TF agree with each other on its translation. Finally, the semi-precious
stone of the MT leads to the adoption, by TF, of a near-cognate Arabic term for a
precious metal. This offers some support for the contention that TF was not
working solely from BM.

Strictly speaking, SG gives the most accurate geographical term for the MT’s
‘Kush’, though the reading of BM and TF, ‘Nubia’, really cannot be argued with.

The relative inexactitude and lack of agreement concerning the names of the
prized substances has been noted earlier in this chapter; here, except for the
additional item found in TF, ‘vessels of zmrd’, which partially duplicates the
’zmrd of Nubia’ as found in BM, the lack of convergence continues. What is
most interesting, however, is the closing construct in TF: ‘the silver of Nubia’.
Clearly, the appearance of ‘silver’ is an attempt to deal directly with the first term
of the equivalent construct phrase as found in the MT by means of assuming an
Arabic cognate: the Hebrew’s ftd, with a feminine termination, is rendered ffd, also
with feminine termination. The translation of this specialized vocabulary item may
not be fully accurate, but the linguistic approach is time-honored.

Verse 19b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>כנרת חותר לא חולה</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>נמלגאודא אלנוקה לא חכמה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM</td>
<td>ולא יזון مقابلלה ذهب האבריר</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

319 As has been already noted in the discussion of 18a, FA crowds an inordinate
amount of material into 19b after a lag that begins with v. 18.
320 FA’s text will address this geographical issue at a later point.
321 This is also the reading of the Tg.
322 The zbrjd in SG represents the same linguistic phenomenon, the only difference
   being found in the lack of nasalization in SG’s voiced bi-labial.
Similar to the approach in the previous stich, the MT virtually duplicates in 19b the wording of 16a, though a reversal of the verb with the prepositional phrase takes place. However, only SG models his version of this stich on the Hebrew.

TF's addition of an extra prized possession at 19a is balanced by deleting the mention of one in 19b. Unfortunately, this does not represent a simple removal of a vocabulary item from one stich only to have it inserted elsewhere, since the extra item in TF is not the same as the one paralleled in BM.

FA, along with the Pesh, finally catches up to the rest of the versions here. While his inventory of costly items is rather idiosyncratic, the end result is consistent with the sense of the various predecessor and Arabic versions.

Verse 20

While the wording of this refrain in the MT is not exactly the same in vv. 12 and 20, the similarities as so close that at this point BM and TF simply reproduce their previous wording; in so doing their texts remain identical to each other. FA, on the other hand, shows the greatest divergence from his previous rendition of this refrain, deleting here an entire stich from his previous version of the "a" portion of the text. However, FA does parallel SG in catching the nuance that in v. 12, humankind is

323 There is a possible alchemical reference in FA's second stich, where he speaks of the 'stone of divination'. On the relationship of the Book of Job to the Jewish alchemical tradition, see Patai (1994), pp. 24, 42-3.
the active agent, but in v. 20 is implicitly passive.

Verse 21a

| MT | ונהלמה霦ון כל־יה | עכוֹלָמִים מִשְׁעָרָם כָּל־יה |
| SG | יַזְּרֵל | יַזְּרֵל |
| BM | גִּבּוֹת הַדַּרְשֵׁים | גִּבְיוֹת הַדַּרְשֵׁים |
| TF | הַדַּרְשֵׁים | הַדַּרְשֵׁים |
| FA | خفية عن كل عين حي | خفية عن كل عين حي |

BM, following the LXX and S-H, narrows the breadth of the MT's understanding that Wisdom is hidden from all living things, reading instead 'every man'; TF's equivalent phrase, 'every one', meant to be fully synonymous, coincidentally provides a reading that is somewhat less narrow. SG and FA, on the other hand, select the Arabic cognate to the Hebrew for the beings in question, FA employing the substantive in a manner that can be interpreted as adjectival, while SG clearly treats the word as a noun. SG's version is closer to the meaning of the MT.

The other notable difference between SG and FA, indeed between FA on the one hand and all the Arabic versions on the other, is FA's failure to include a verb, not only in this stich, but for the entire verse. Such practice is not an unusual rhetorical device if employed in answers to questions. In place of a verb, then, FA opens each stich with an adjective. Here in 21a, FA selects the same root, šfy, 'be hidden', as that of SG's verb in the same place, while BM resorts to the fully synonymous ǧby. TF at this point disagrees, employing the same ductus as BM, but pointing it to read ǧny, 'be in no need of', which would yield 'this [i.e., the hidden place] has no need of anyone / anything'. The reading of BM is to be preferred.

---

324 There is a certain amount of ambiguity here.
325 More exactly, 21b opens with a passive participle, but in Arabic grammar both active and passive participles are known as 'verbal adjectives'.
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Verse 21b

It is at this point that BM breaks off, just as SS begins. Here, SS and TF continue in virtual parallel, agreeing with each other against SG and FA even in such ultimately unimportant areas as the usage of plurals as opposed to singulars, and the employment of synonymous roots.

Verse 22a

As at v. 14, the Ode enters the realm of anthropomorphisms. SG's strategy for dealing with this linguistic phenomenon, however, differs markedly in v. 22 from that of his previous effort. Instead of inserting verbal particles with resulting readings such as 'would say', SG alters the subject of his verb. Such qualification is possible given theological beliefs concerning the survival of the soul after death. Thus the speaker is not Death itself or Destruction\textsuperscript{326} \textit{per se}, but the residents thereof.\textsuperscript{327}

Such qualms are not the concern of the other Arabic versions: SS and TF, using the very same words as SG for 'Hell' and 'Destruction', are in complete

---

\textsuperscript{326} The translation of Wehr (1961) is 'Eternal Damnation'.

\textsuperscript{327} 'Residents', which SG uses, has its precedent in the Tg's 'house'.
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agreement with each other, even to the point of missing the dual ending on the verb in the perfect. FA does not make this error, and adds another classical fine point in his use of topic-comment phrasing, introducing the subject with the particle اما, 'as for', which precedes the predicate, in turn introduced by the conjunction ف. Finally, FA agrees with the other versions on the appearance of 'Death', الموت; but his other speaker here is 'The Abyss', الهاوية. This represents a good attempt to deal with the MT's somewhat enigmatic character.

Verse 22b

| MT   | סמענו שמטענו שמטענה: סמענו בהגדה: |
| SG   | סמענו שמטענה לברירה: |
| SS   | סמענו בהגדה: |
| TF   |انا סמענוخبرהבהאנה |
| FA   | *

SG and FA, once again, are virtually synonymous, differing only in word order resulting from FA's inclusion of an introductory emphatic particle. Both are quite close to the MT, LXX and Pesh, if not the Cp. SS and TF continue their parallel track, and stand over against the other Arabic versions, along with the S–H, in their emendation of 'report / rumor' to 'praise'. Such a change is not due to any misreading of the text, but rather has resulted from an attempt to give Wisdom and Understanding a more positive characterization.

Verse 23a

| MT   | אלוהים זהב ורביה |
| SG   | כלם אלוהים אלהים במרכה |
| SS   | וואנ אללה אحسن תقويיר שלה |
| TF   | וואנ אללה אحسن תقويיר שלה |

238 Technically, this is not an 'error' in Middle or Christian Arabic, neither of which generally employ the dual.
This verse begins to give answer to the dilemma posed from the outset of this chapter. As such, this and the following verses serve as something of an introduction to the Divine Speech which occurs at the close of the poetic section of the Book of Job.

SG, SS, and TF have a clear grasp of the concepts at hand, with the latter two showing clear reliance on the LXX and S–H. FA, however, characteristically introduces a relative clause once again. The result is somewhat awkward, although all the elements necessary for dealing adequately with the theme of the stich are present in his translation.

All the Arabic versions agree on translating without a verb, though SG does use an active participle. They also agree on the translation of the MT's קָלָדֹם as الله.

Verse 23b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>BM</th>
<th>TF</th>
<th>FA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>הלָחָם יַעַר אַרְמַכֹּהָ:</td>
<td>יַעַר אַרְמַכֹּה בִּמְצוֹלָה:</td>
<td>יִוָּה מִמְצוֹלָה</td>
<td>יִוָּה מִמְצועָה</td>
<td>יִוָּה מִמְצועָה</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is little remarkable in this stich: SG continues his preference for the active participle, whereas the Arabic script versions resort to an imperfect indicative active verb. Given that participles are imperfect from a semantic point of view, all the Arabic versions are indeed quite close to each other, with SS and TF being entirely

---

329 FA's preference for the relative clause as already been noted throughout this chapter, where he uses it as a transitional device to unify thematically what are often autonomously disparate poetic stichs.

330 The 1967 edition of TF, where the word occurs without the definite article, is incorrect according to the ms.
identical. As for FA, the awkwardness which characterized his previous stich disappears.

Verse 24a

| MT | 너דוהך האראה יבש להנה אלMiami אלאים יתמה |
| SG |ипן ינאקשת אלאים יתמה |
| SS | وكلما تحت السما هو ينظر |
| TF | وكلما تحت السما هو ينظر |
| FA | לא ירי כלמה كان مستورا أقصى الأرض *

Though no appreciable difference in meaning results amongst the Arabic versions, once again SS and TF, sharing an identical text, betray their dependence on the LXX. For example, they reverse the stichs of the MT, and speak here of 'that which is under the heavens' rather than 'the ends of the earth'.

FA, despite his adherence to the Pesh and his addition of a gratuitous phrase, 'all that was hidden', approximates SG and the MT somewhat more closely than the other Arabic script versions. Yet FA does display his characteristically independent streak: where SG faithfully replicates the MT's 'ends' of the earth, FA keeps the notion singular. Additionally, FA adds a gratuitous phrase, 'all which was hidden', to this stich, just in case his audience missed the point.

Finally, none of the Arabic versions agree on the verb for this stich, with the resulting nuances being real, though ultimately of secondary importance.

Verse 24b

| MT |HHת ثلاثה תרשימהים יראתו: אמה תחת לصوم אל(Paintא יראתו: הערק כל שفى الأرض |
| SG | וใคร כל שفى الأرض |
| SS |וזה יערק כל שفى الأرض |
| TF |oiry כלמה تحت السماء *
| FA |
With SS and TF surveying the earth, SG and FA follow the heavenly perspective of the MT. Their approach to universality, however, differs: SG, with the Pesh, speaks of the entirety of the heavens, while FA, with the Tg, emphasizes the entirety of that which is under the heavens. While this difference is ultimately of little consequence, it demonstrates a reversal of the usual textual dependencies of these two Arabic versions: SG generally follows the Tg, and FA the Pesh, not vice versa as is apparently the case here.

Verse 25

SS and TF continue to tamper with the word order, departing here even from the LXX. Thus this verse will be considered in its entirety.

All the versions, with the exception of TF, catch the arresting reference to the weight of the wind, where the etymologically related roots kll 'be burdensome' (for SS and TF) and kyl 'weigh' (SG and FA) appear.

As for the measuring of the waters, which is a common theme throughout scripture as an indication of divine power, FA provides the exception, conflating it with the following reference to rain, with his second stich at 25b glossing on the matter of the wind's weight. This is the practice of the Pesh, upon which FA clearly demonstrates his dependence here.

Scribal error is the most obvious reason for this glaring omission, which results in semantic confusion. Another occurrence of error can be found in SG, where the preposition in the first stich should not be followed by the definite article in its entirety; the second stich provides the correct spelling in a similar occurrence.
The phrase in SS and TF, 'from that which He created', inexplicably appears at the close of this verse. Clearly, its presence originally represented an effort to deal with the MT's root 'š, 'do, make', which appears at the beginning of the verse. The LXX, which misunderstands the phrase as an explanation of the previous verse's reference to everything on the earth and under the heavens (thus: 'that which He created'), keeps the phrase in its initial position. SG, sensing that something less than 'creation' is called for, translates with ǧn', 'craft', and FA concurs, opting for the root ǧsr, 'make'. SS and TF, however, employ the standard root dealing with creation, xlq, with the result that the creative effort is focussed upon the attributes of two elements of the creation, rather than upon the entirety of what God wrought. Whether the theological shortcoming accounts for the linguistic confusion, or the reverse, is subject to speculation.

Verse 26a

MT
SG
SS
TF
FA

This stich provides yet another occasion when a reference to divine power is not adequately dealt with in one or another of the Arabic versions: with the LXX, neither SS nor TF accounts for divine control over the rain. Of course, conflation with the waters of the previous stich may be the culprit here, just as it was for FA, albeit in reverse. However, SS and TF will compound the error by failing to allude to thunder per se (see 26b below).

SG and FA are both remarkably close to the structure of the MT. Their semantic interpretation shows some variation, however: they both adopt the Arabic
cognate, from the root \textit{mtr}, for 'rain', and although they are consistent with their practice in the previous verse in that they avoid any reference to creative power, in their direct objects they find an occasion for variation. FA avoids the apparent legal allusion of the MT,\footnote{Some versions of the Tg make it explicit; \textit{cf.} Mangan (1991), p. 66.} while SG opts for the Arabic root \textit{rsm}, 'trace', as the equivalent for a more basic meaning of the Hebrew root in question, \textit{hqq}, which can mean 'inscribe' as well as 'decree'.

SS and TF are even more verbose than the LXX, which exhibits a major structural variance of its own with the MT here.\footnote{Dhorme (1967), p. 412f, is especially helpful at sorting out the difficulties.} Both of these Arabic versions take a more universalistic view of divine power now: rather than continuing to foreshadow the Voice out of the Whirlwind through a recitation of individual instances where God exercises control over certain elements of creation, SS and TF sweepingly ascribe to God general superintendence of all things.\footnote{SS' use of the passive, 'be measured out', does not make sense; TF has emended it correctly.}

Yet from time to time both of these versions betray isolated points of linguistic contact with the MT. For example, in citing 'His voice' at the close of their version of this stich, there is perhaps an allusion to the thunder of 26b (see below).

**Verse 26b**

| MT | נורְרֵךְ לָהֶזֶכְכָלָה | *norêrêk lahezkêlêh* |
| SG | הָאָמַּר הֲלָבֵיתֶךָ נֶאָמְרָה | *hâmar labîtêkha neamërâh* |
| SS | وهو يعرف طرقة وتفسيرها عندله | *huw irarê troquê wa'tfisêrêha an-delâ* |
| TF | وهو يعرف عرقة وتفسيرها عندله | *huw irarê urquê wa'tfisêrêha an-delâ* |
| FA | وطريق للرد * ولبع للبرق | *wórêqî la-rêd * wólûlê la-brêq* |

SG displays the height of brilliance as both a translator and a poet of elegance in this stich. He begins by expertly supplying a verb where one is missing from the
MT, using the root \( trq \) which more usually occurs in the noun طریق, 'path'.\(^{333}\) As a verb, it can thus mean 'forge a path', but carries several secondary meanings, including 'hammer' and 'bring calamity'. All three meanings are poetically appropriate if a verb is to be supplied for the 'voice of intense brilliance', itself a poetic image of lightning and its thunder.

SS and TF continue their relative independence, even from the LXX.\(^{336}\) Yet as noted in the discussion of 26a, evidence of linguistic points of contact with the Hebrew continues, here in the occurrence of the root \( trq \) (see above). The presence of تفسیر, 'elucidation', can be accounted for in two alternative manners: it could be an attempt to deal with the LXX's ἔριδοις, in which case it would provide further indication that these two Arabic versions have reversed the order of the stichs in this verse, if not in their entirety, then at least in having some of their images and concepts transposed.\(^{337}\) Otherwise, the 'elucidation' may properly belong to the following stich, where SS and TF supply only a single concept, rather than a pair as in all the versions under consideration.\(^{338}\)

FA's grammar is less than classical. Without a verb to parallel that of 26a, there is a loss of the accusative ending on the two direct objects that appear in 26b.\(^{339}\) Another possible reason for this loss is due to the appearance, immediately following, of two instances of the letter ظ; Arabic sanctions the deletion of an

\(^{333}\) Note that this word is used by FA in his version of this stich, with SS and TF using its plural.

\(^{336}\) Though more succinct, the S-H also exhibits some freedom, resorting to a pair of marginal glosses to furnish varying readings.

\(^{337}\) Cf. the discussion of thunder in SS and TF under 26a, above.

\(^{338}\) In neither instance can any point of contact with Islamic usage be discerned, where the word in question has become the technical term for Qur'anic commentary.

\(^{339}\) The disappearance of case endings in Christian Arabic is well documented; cf. Blau (1966), p. 371ff. Of course, FA has tried to maintain classical case endings, even supplying them occasionally when they are not consonantal.
under very specific circumstances when it falls between two ل's, presumably due to esthetic considerations which are served in the avoidance of an excess of vertical strokes. This is not such an occasion, but may also account for the error.

In terms of content, FA separates out the allusion to lightning in the catalogue of divinely ordered elements in a manner reminiscent of the Pesh, whereas SG and the MT closely associate lightning and 'its voices', combining them in a construct phrase.

Verse 27a

MT  
SG  
SS  
TF  
FA  

The Arabic versions cannot agree on the opening for this stich, nor on its first verb, with SS and TF omitting the second verb entirely (see above). Yet the resulting difference are relatively minor.

SG is the only one of the Arabic versions to open his stich with an adverb, as does the MT, Tg, LXX, Pesh, S-H, and Cp. He employs the cognate root r'y, 'see', to the MT's, and while for his second verb there is no Arabic cognate, his translation is exact: 'recount / relate'.

In SS and TF, which appear heavily truncated after having inflated the immediately preceding stichs, the opening adverb is replaced with a conjunction, 'for / because', and the second verb is omitted, as noted in the discussion of the previous stich. Their remaining verb is based on the root bṣr, which in the augmented form

340 Strictly speaking, the LXX uses a conjunctive adverb here; SS and TF will opt for a conjunction as a result (see below).
employed can carry the meaning 'ponder / reflect / consider'. This approximates FA's verb, going beyond the more prosaic readings of the MT, Tg, LXX, Pesh, S-H, and SG.

FA replaces the introductory adverb, preferring to use the occasion to reiterate, if only pronominally, the Actor in this drama of divine activity. In so doing, he once again uses a relative clause: 'He Who...'. But if FA is content to refer to God with a pronoun, he makes explicit the topic of this entire chapter, citing Wisdom by name as the direct object of his first verb. With SS and TF, FA is not content to suggest that Wisdom is worthy of anything less than divine scrutiny. His verb, from the root 'yn, in its Third Form here, means 'examine / inspect / survey'. FA's second verb, however, stays closer to the Hebrew: the Fourth Form of the root xbr signifies 'communicate / report / relate'.

Verse 27b

| MT  | תְּחַנְלָה הַמֶּרֶץְהֶרֶנְהָה |
| SG  | חַנְלַה אַמְרַשְׁרָה |
| SS  | וְעַנְדָּהָה אַסְכַּסְוָה אַתֶּרְהָה |
| TF  | וְעַנְדָּהָה אַסְכַּסְוָה אַתֶּרְהָה |
| FA  | וְעַנְדָּהָה אַסְכַּסְוָה אַתֶּרְהָה |

While SG and FA are even more concise than the MT, limiting themselves to two verbs and their direct object suffixes, SS and TF introduce the adverbial expression they ignored at the beginning of the verse in what appears to be yet another instance of transposing elements from "a" to "b" stichs, and vice versa. They also supply a possessive phrase as the direct object to their second verb, thus bringing further expansion to the structure of the stich.

In terms of common roots in the Arabic versions, FA stands alone in his reiteration of wzn, 'weigh', used by all the versions with the exception of TF at 25a.
In this FA stands with the Pesh, whereas SG, SS, and TF all select the Second Form of the root \(hy\)', 'give shape to', which proves to be an exact translation of the Hebrew.

The second verb of the stich provides the most variation of all, with none of the Arabic versions, even SS and TF, in agreement on the vocabulary in question.\(^{341}\) SG, FA, and TF make generally synonymous choices on the order of 'search repeatedly / painstakingly', while SS' verb carries a sense of motion: 'pursue / follow up', conjuring up the image of God tracking\(^{342}\) Wisdom wherever it may wander. While this is not painstakingly faithful to the MT, it does approximate somewhat the LXX's \(\varepsilon\xi\chi\nu\nu\alpha\sigma\sigma\nu\), from the verb 'trace out', and fits with images of a personified Wisdom as found in Proverbs 8 and elsewhere in Wisdom Literature.

Unsurprisingly, the climax to the Hymn to Wisdom is not characterized by radical differences among the Arabic versions. Yet the following areas of agreement and contrast are worthy of note.

All the Arabic versions, in contradistinction to the MT and Tg but with the Pesh and S-H,\(^{343}\) refer to 'God' rather than 'the Lord'.

SG, looking to the Tg, discerns in its term 'sons of man' the semantic nuance

---

\(^{341}\) Whether the variance between these latter two versions is due to scribal error or the rarity of the vocabulary item is subject to conjecture; perhaps both factors came into play at the time of TF's composition.

\(^{342}\) Both SS and TF make explicit reference to 'its traces'.

\(^{343}\) The LXX finesses the issue by using the verb 'be godly'.

---
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and accordingly translates 'Adamites' rather than the more general 'people' of the
Arabic script versions. In addition, SG's is the only Arabic version to follow the
MT's word order of what is clearly a fixed scriptural phrase, given its occurrence
elsewhere in the canon.

SS and TF cannot agree on word order, with TF moving Wisdom to the head
of the proverb, as does FA. This accents Wisdom, rather than 'the fear of God', as
the focus of attention. Both SS and TF use the same vocabulary as SG concerning
'fear', which has taken on in Arabic the technical meaning of 'piety', whereas FA
uses a more generic term derived from ḥay, 'dread'.

Verse 28b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>TF</th>
<th>FA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IVQ<code>1V</code>7K</td>
<td>KrK 01m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, no startling variations in meaning among the Arabic versions occurs, but SG
and FA lack some of the MT’s poetic elegance and proverbial conciseness. And
while all the Arabic versions agree on the word for 'evil', there is no unanimity on
the terms for 'avoidance' and 'understanding'. Thus for two of the three central
concepts of the stich, the Arabic versions diverge.

SG adds a closing adverb, 'too', as if to contrast the contents of 28b with those
of 28a, thus damaging the poetic symmetry of the two stichs. Otherwise, SG follows
the word order of the MT, and agrees with FA on fhm for 'understanding', while
standing alone in the selection of the root zwl to express 'avoidance'.

While SS and TF select the root b'd, 'keep distance', to convey the idea of

---

344 FA's term differs from that of SS and TF, though it is etymologically related to it.
avoiding evil, the former employs the the active voice, the latter the middle; the difference between the two is unimportant semantically in this context. Both versions are consistent in that their parallel here to Wisdom is derived from the root ḥtn, 'be sagacious', as was their practice at 12b. Clearly this is a well-chosen equivalent to the MT's ידבר, or 'discernment', and is more precise than SG and FA's root. Thus, both of these versions finish their treatment of this chapter on a strong note.

FA parallels the word order he adopted in the previous stich, thus highlighting 'understanding' rather than 'the avoidance of evil'; this allows his version of the verse to display a certain internal structural consistency. Inexplicably, this care is not carried through grammatically, when FA fails to supply a pronoun of separation required by the appearance of a definite predicate nominative immediately following a definite subject.345 While these two points do little structural damage to the stich as poetry, FA resorts to two roots to express avoidance: myl, 'depart from', is supplemented at the end of the verse by trk, 'leave'. While adding little to the meaning of the verse beyond providing the emphasis which comes from adding a second verbal noun and a pronominal possessive suffix to the stich, FA once again shows that the structure of the MT is secondary for him, and is readily sacrificed to other concerns he has as a translator with theological and homiletical aims.

---

345 This grammatical omission cannot be accounted for by differences in dialect or linguistic register; indeed, FA does not make this same omission at the same point in 28a.
In the canonical versions, the poetic cycles of chapters 3 through 31 are now interrupted by half a dozen verses of prose which serve to introduce another character in the Joban drama. While Eliphaz, Bildad, and Zophar theoretically remain on stage, as it were, as part of the dramatic tableau, their active roles are now ended, if not by an exhaustion of their observations or by Job's rebuttals, then by the appearance of a new interlocutor.

By contrast, TH largely ignores the poetic section of chapters 3 through 31, his opening prose prologue having been much longer than that of the MT. Indeed, the observations of Eliphaz, Bildad, and Zophar are pithily summarized thus: "Repent from the sin for which thou art punished" (p. 150). Of Job's overt reaction to this advice there is no record whatsoever.

But this is not to say that TH treats only the prose portions of the tale. On the contrary, a substantial section is given over to an otherwise nameless "youth, recent of years" (p. 150), followed by an even lengthier passage reporting Job's repentance, which appears prior to the theophany: theological sensitivities have dictated that God's appearance not be the catalyst for repentance; rather, repentance is pre-requisite to divine self-disclosure.

Before TH's account of the tale closes, there is a dialogue between God and Job, during which God forgives Job of his sin, promising the restoration of Job's fortune. There is no equivalent, however, of the closing prose section of the MT containing an actual description of the restoration of the status quo ante. Instead, TH's account concludes with a short passage demonstrating the personal physical change that resulted from Job's healing: his wife, who has remained devoted to her husband, not counselling Job to "curse God and die", does not recognize her spouse
now that God has healed him. Then, TH goes on to report a series of short
traditions concerning a number of other episodes from the life of the Prophet Job.

While TH's account of his nameless speaker does not closely follow the MT's
six chapters of Elihu, there are sufficient points of contact between this Muslim
version and the canonical versions of the Elihu material to warrant its occasional
consideration as part of this study alongside those Arabic versions which have
emerged from the Jewish and Christian communities of the first millennium C.E.

Verse 1a

In this first stich of the chapter, the characterization of 'the three' varies among the
Arabic versions: SG and FA are as non-committal as the MT, simply referring to
Eliphaz, Bildad, and Zophar as 'these three persons' or 'the three men', while SS
and TF follow the LXX in taking a more positive view, calling them 'his three
friends', using (perhaps not entirely unintentionally) the root $dq, 'speak truthfully',
as the basis for the substantive.

Also of note is the difference in the activity described here: SG and FA, using
different verbs, state that the three men made a conscious decision, and 'desisted' or
'ceased' their speech, whereas SS and TF simply say they 'fell silent'.

36 Other non-canonical versions of Job vary in their view of the role and
importance of Elihu; some, such as the Testament of Job, make Elihu the
main human villain, for example, whereas TH makes Elihu the spokesman for
theological rectitude, defending and vindicating Job in the face of the Three
Comforters.

37 FA adds, unsurprisingly, an extra relative clause: 'who wanted to answer Job',
parallelling the Pesh's "who wanted to condemn Job".
This stich explains why 'the three' are no longer part of the Joban drama, with a fine but significant split among FA on the one hand and all the other Arabic versions on the other.

SG, SS, and TF employ the root *ṣlh* as descriptive of Job's self-characterization, the implication being that given Job's intransigence to listen to and accept advice, the three abandon their efforts.

FA, however, builds upon the suggestion of the Pesh in positing that the three comforters were not just defeated by Job's arguments, but were actually won over by him: they recognize in Job someone more pious and more truthful in speech (אבר מנהם) and more youthful.

It is as though FA cannot conceive of anyone abandoning the field of theological dispute out of simple frustration or lack of a decisive outcome. Of course, this conversion of 'the three friends' implicitly allows a rejection of Elihu's assertion that old age and wisdom do not necessarily go hand in hand: with the submission of the old, only brash youthfulness is left in theological error at the close of the story, and the tradition of respect for one's elders (and therefore betters) is left intact as a basis on which to organize both church and society.

This reading of the Book of Job puts FA at odds with the Muslim tradition as reported by TH wherein Elihu and Job are allied over against Eliphaz, Bildad, and

---

348 The presence of the comparative foreshadows its appearance in other versions, albeit in a rather different context.
Zophar. Instead of taking advantage of yet another opportunity to exploit a point of contact with Islam, FA sets himself unequivocally against it.

That he does not do this out of a Christian sense of fidelity to scripture is clear, since his perspective on the role of Elihu in the Joban drama is unique, if not uncanonical. But it can be argued that even though FA's idiosyncratic reading of the Elihu-Job relationship is faithful neither to Christianity nor to Islam, it is faithful precisely to the cultural norm against which Elihu seems so anxious about transgressing: the superiority of the wisdom of the mature over the foolishness of the young.

This cultural stance is common to a wide variety of societies over different epochs, including the culture of the Arabs in particular and the ancient (and modern) Near East in general. To a certain extent all the versions of the Book of Job, Arabic and otherwise, set up the youthful brashness of Elihu for failure; but this feature is more prominent in FA's version than any other under investigation, given FA's peculiar interpretation of the role of our new character and his twist on the story itself as it unfolds. Thus FA exploits a point of contact not with a particular religious tradition per se, but with a cultural one with which he would have been very much at home, and to which he evidently subscribed.

Verse 2aα

MT  ירה את אליהם בכרכאלא הנה מספהנה טמ
SG  פמאחר עלה ועוד אליהם בן ברכאל אלאודין פט משרה טמ
SS  פغضב היעסבן בראשיל התvrirתיי מני נסיה אדאמ ... הביתיה
TF  פغضב היעסבן בראשיל البرוטיי הני מני נסיה אדאמ מני ארפש הביתיה
FA  פאשדغضב היעה ابن ברקייל * הדנוראו מני קבלת רמון *

349 Not to speak of Judaism.
350 Whether FA could even define a difference between 'religion' and 'culture' is beyond our abilities to determine.
The introduction of a new character in the poetic drama elicits a variety of genealogical records. The MT recognizes in Elihu the only Jewish persona of the Book of Job, to which SG adds his assent. But the Arabic script versions reflect other traditions concerning the youngest of the book's protagonists. And while these versions do not agree on the spelling of the new speaker, there are enough similarities to the names النوريّي / البروطيّي / النوراطي to posit a common, underlying tradition concerning Elihu's immediate family background. Indeed, while they may all be connected phonologically to elements of the MT's ٥٥٥٥٥٥٥٥٥ باعا,31 with FA's version being the most distant therefrom, the other genealogical information supplied makes clear the non-Jewish background of the new character.

TF, which states at 1:1 that Job is from 'al-Bataniyyah', appears to cite the same region32 as the home of 'Elius', the Hellenized version of the name adopted from the LXX. This addition is consistent with the LXX's insertion της Αὐόητους χώρας, "of the country of Ausis", which is the same country named at 1:1 in the LXX as Job's homeland, viz., 'Uṣ. Therefore, for TF, Elihu is a fellow countryman of Job's, who has already been identified at the outset of the Book as someone whose background is non-Israelite.

The argument is sealed by TF's insertion, confirmed by SS, that Elihu is 'of the kinship of Edom': من نسبة إدم. The spelling of 'Edom' in neither TF nor SS conforms to the phonology of the Hebrew, which would suggest إدم; indeed, such a spelling is found in the London Polyglot (1657), where a poetic colophon to the Book of Job states that 'Uṣ is located في ائتمام إدم وعربيا. However, the equivalence of the Hebrew ܦ with the Arabic ا is well-attested, the 'textbook case'

31 This would make Elihu a kinsman of King David.
32 The Encyclopedia of Islam (Vol. II, p. 1093) maintains that أرض البشنة, which is the phrase as found at this point in TF, should be translated 'the March of Bathaniyyah', and as such represents a different region of Syria from the one cited in TF's version of 1:1.
of سلام DRAW vs.adam DRAW being one of countless examples, which would predict the spelling found in SS: DRAW. Of course, the traditional locations of Edom and al-Bathaniyya are at opposite ends of the east bank of the River Jordan; yet which ever way this difference is resolved, TF is clear: Elihu was not one of the Children of Israel.

FA agrees that Elihu was not Jewish, giving the fourth comforter's tribal affiliation as Rimmûn. Obviously chosen at least in part due to its phonological similarity with the Hebrew text's DRAW, or 'Ram', Rimmûn is mentioned at various points in the OT,333 and is thought to have been ultimately derived from the name of a pagan Syrian deity. This Syrian connection,334 of course, is consistent with TF's mention of al-Bathaniyyah, a region near Damascus. Thus FA stands in agreement with the other Arabic script versions in keeping the entire set of dramatis personae of the Book of Job outside traditional Jewish settings and identifications.335

Having now identified our new character, the question of his role can be brought forward. Here, only SG states that Elihu became angry at Eliphaz, Bildad, and Zophar, with which the account of TH concurs; the Arabic script versions, however, simply state that Elihu became angry. This in turn is precisely the understanding of the LXX, S–H, Pesh, and Cp, where no anger is explicitly directed against the Comforters at this point.

Verse 2aβ

| MT | בלאב חרה אפי |
| SS | על רם, חורא השדים זבים |
| SG | וغضب על אירוב جدا |
| TF | וغضب על אירוב جدا |

333 Cf. Numbers 33:19f.; Judges 20:45f.; II Sam 4:2ff., II Kings 5:18, etc.
334 The placename continues in Palestine to the present day, under the vocalization of 'Rammûn'. The site is near Ramullah.
335 Whether there is any connection between the name DRAW and the 'Light-bearer' (Lucifer), would be speculative.
All the canonical Arabic versions can agree that Elihu was angry at Job. All use the root *gdb*, with the exception of FA, who selects *wjd*, which adds a heightened sense of fervor and passion to its animosity. The emotional element is accentuated by using the cognate accusative, a device often found in classical Arabic. By contrast, SS and TF use the adverb 'very' to stress their point, while SG gives no indication that Elihu's anger with Job was any stronger than against his Comforters.

Verse 2b

| MT | פא -זך עפ נָעַם מַלְאַלְוֹן | פא -זך עפ נָעַם מַלְאַלְוֹן |
| SG | לאֶה קוּל עַל נַפְסָהּ הָאַלִילֵהוּ | לאֶה קוּל עַל נַפְסָהּ הָאַלִילֵהוּ |
| SS | לאֶה קוּל עַל נַפְסָהּּ אַלִילָהוּ | לאֶה קוּל עַל נַפְסָהּּ אַלִילָהוּ |
| TF | לאֶה コウֺל עַל נַפְסָהּּ אַלִילָהוּ | לאֶה コウֺל עַל נַפְסָהּּ אַלִילָהוּ |
| FA | לאֶה צוּק עַל נַפְסָהּּ אַלִילָהוּ | לאֶה צוּק עַל נַפְסָהּּ אַלִילָהוּ |

SG's interpretation of this stich departs from that of the MT, as well as the Arabic script versions, which follow the intent, if not the wording, of the MT. Goodman (1988) sees the primary motivation here as being anti-Islamic, but this ignores the precedent set by the Tg, upon which SG's translation is clearly based.

The Tg reads, "his considering himself more righteous than God" (emphasis added). Even though his wording differs in detail from the Tg, SG pointedly retains the elative: "holding himself more blameless than his Lord" (emphasis added). The grammatical inspiration for such a construction is found in the MT's use of the

---

356 For FA, this would imply anger at the Three Comforters, since they have, for intents and purposes, assented to Job's theological position; this will become explicit at v. 3a.

357 For example, all four Arabic versions contain a reflexive, but SS and TF associate the reflexive with the verb 'say', while SG and FA agree that verb in question is the Estimative (Form II) of *zkw*, 'be blameless / pure'.

358 P. 349, n. 1.
proclitic preposition ﲩ, whose cognate in Arabic, من, is combined with the elative form of the adjective to produce the comparative degree. The result is much more offensive theologically than even the readings given by the Arabic script versions, where Job is accused of declaring his righteousness 'before the Lord'.

Verse 3αα

| MT | וַיִּשָּׁלָם יֵצֶר חָרָה אַפּוֹ |
| SG | אֲבֹאָ אֵלֶּה תַּלְאַזְתָה אֶתָּגָאוֹת פָּאֵסְתָה נַצְבָּה |
| SS | וַגוֹצֵּב גַּדִּי עַל תִּלְאַזְתָּה אֶסְדָּכָה |
| TF | וַגוֹצֵּב גַּדִּי עַל תִּלְאַזְתָּה אֶסְדָּכָה |
| FA | וַאֲשֶׁר זַגוֹצֵּב עַל אֶסְדָּכָה הָאֵשָּׁנָה * |

There is little new that is worthy of remark in the wording of this stich. All the Arabic versions stay close to the intent of the MT, and FA shows remarkable convergence to the wording of SG. As for TH, the contents of this passage are merely implied therein, where subsequent discourse amounts to nothing more than an attack upon Job's detractors coupled with a defense of Job himself.

Verse 3αβ

| MT | תֵלָא אֲשֶׁר לֹא הָפַלְסָא מַעֲשָּׁה |
| SG | לֹא מִאֵלֶּה לֹא הָפַלְסָא לָוֶּא |
| SS | בַּנְּהָם לֹא יִסְטַעֲבוּ אָנָה יִגָּמָו אֵיְבָּה מַכָּלָה |
| TF | עַנְּדָה לֹא יִכְדַּרְוּ עַל גְּעוֹבָא אֵיְבָּה |
| FA | לֹאָם לֹא יִכְדַּרְוּ אָנָה יִשְּגַּבְוַ אֵיְבָּה בַּעַנְּבָא מַכָּוְּלָם * |

The first reason given for Elihu's anger is interpreted differently by each of the four Arabic versions, of which SG's approach is the simplest, following the MT and Tg: the three did not 'find' an answer.

---

359 The prose prologue to Elihu's speech is highly repetitive in character.
SS reads that the three were not able to 'silence'\textsuperscript{360} Job, which fits the LXX reading a bit more closely than the S-H, which speaks of the the Comforters' inability to 'refute'\textsuperscript{361} the objection' of Job. Either way, SS represents a fuller explanation than TF, which approaches that of SG: 'they were not able to answer'.

FA conflates the end of the first stich with the entirety of the second.

Following the understanding of the Pesh, FA's language is even stronger than that of the S-H: they were 'unable to condemn', the root $\mathcal{j}b$ meaning in its Second Form not only 'condemn', but also 'curse'. Its basic root meaning is 'afflict / grieve'.

Verse 3b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>\textit{ואמר: הנה אֲנִי הָאֱלֹהִים}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>\textit{וא喙ק עליה בַּעֲלָל}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>\textit{ונב לפך עליה כֶּנִּים}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>\textit{ונב לפך עליה כֶּנִּים}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second reason for Elihu's anger is theologically linked with the first. If we adopt the \textit{Tiqqun\text{"e} Sopherim} that in place of אָדָם was originally אָדָם, then Elihu's motive is to save right religion: with friends such as the Three Comforters, God does not need enemies. But while SG simply adopts the MT as it stands, reading אָדָם, the Arabic script versions are grammatically ambiguous, supplying a pronominal suffix which could apply to either Job or God.

For SG, the issue is one of simple logic: how can the Three Comforters not find an answer to Job, yet still hold him in the wrong?\textsuperscript{362} SG's translation is thus faithful to the MT.

\textsuperscript{360}This reading of a difficult point in the ms posits the root \textit{wjm}, which should be in the subjunctive, but which has been put into the declarative.

\textsuperscript{361}The Syriac root here is \textit{pny}: 'turn around / be converted'.

\textsuperscript{362}This is not quite the understanding of the Tg, which appears to have Elihu give the Three Comforters partial credit for their condemnation of Job, even if they could not provide support for their position.
The wording of SS and TF are identical in this stich, and follow closely the reading of the S–H’s marginal gloss emphasizing the inability of the three to make Job realize unambiguously his error. This perhaps suggests a slight softening of Elihu’s rebuke.

Verse 4a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>אֲלִילֵיהּ תַּחְתָּם אֲחֵרֵיָתוֹ בְּדַבֵּרָם</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>אֲלִילֵיהּ מַגְתָּם אָמוֹן מִכְּלָלָם</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>צוֹעִיף יִבְּשָׁה שָׁמָּן גָּדוֹל לָיֹב</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>צוֹעִיף יִבְּשָׁה שָׁמָּן הַרְבִּים לָיֹב</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>צוֹעִיף יִבְּשָׁה שָׁמָּן הַרְבִּים לָיֹב</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While SG and SS resort to differing vocabulary, their understanding of this stich is similar, reflecting the basic agreement among the MT, Tg, LXX, S–H, and Cp. This is not the case with the two other Arabic versions, however.

TF and FA do not explicitly state that Elius/Elihu waited for his elders to finish their words in order to take his turn to speak. Culturally this would be the natural supposition, however, so its explicit omission does not subtract much from the assumption that Elihu has been, thus far, respectful despite his exasperation. The alternative readings which TF and FA supply go beyond the cultural notion of deference; however, they are not in agreement with each other.

TF has simply misunderstood SS’ opening verb from the root wqf, which admits a wide semantic range. Chosen because of its basic denotation of ‘be at a standstill’, there is a variety of derivative meanings, including ‘get to one’s feet’. This latter meaning is selected by TF, who employs another root, qwm, ‘stand up’, since in some registers of Arabic wqf is associated with ‘come to a stop’ as well as other unrelated concepts. Thus TF sees Elihu as rising to begin his poetic address.

FA’s view of Elihu allows the depiction of the new speaker as setting out to
attack Job without a hint of any deferral or delay on Elihu’s part: the onslaught against that which Elihu perceives to be theological error begins without tarrying to challenge those who were unable to refute Job’s impieties.

Verse 4b

There is no agreement, except between SS and TF, on the root for the comparative adjective relating to age. Even though all the expressions are roughly synonymous, SS and TF have a more scriptural feel, keeping closest to the Hebrew turn of phrase ‘ancient of days’ (Daniel 7) by selecting the cognate Arabic roots. 

FA, not having to supply a reason for Elihu’s standoffishness, transforms the rationale of 4b into a circumstantial clause with an opening adversative: ‘though the group were older in age than he’. His use of the noun القوم, ‘the group / band’, rather than a pronoun to refer to the Three, is also unique at this point, though SG will have recourse to it at 15a, where FA will use it once again.

Verse 5a

SG and FA, with the Syriac versions, both interpret the opening of this verse adverbia1ly, whereas SS and TF, the latter of which presents this stich in
considerably truncated form, adhere to the structure of the MT and LXX.

TF's differences with SS are not limited simply to the truncation of the reference, found in the MT, LXX, and S-H, regarding the 'mouths' of the three men in 5aß. Also altered is the opening verb, and the substitution of a noun, incorrectly declined in the accusative, describing the inability of the three to answer: the root א'ל signifies 'impotence'. Its appearance in this context deftly allows the elimination of 5aß without doing violence to the grammar of the rest of 5a.

FA's use of the both the jussive and subjunctive are flawless, as is his care to give the full spelling of the irregular verb 'see', which TF, by contrast, has shortened to reflect popular pronunciation.

Verse 5b

| MT | וּרְוָה ָאָבְּךָ | אֵשְּחָר ָנְכָּלָה | פָּגְשֶׁבָּ גָּפְשָׁבׁ שְׂדֵדְקָ | פָּגְשֶׁבָּ גָּפְשָׁבׁ שְׂדֵדְקָ | אֵשְּחָדְךָ שְׂדֵדְקָ עָלֵיָם |
| SG | אִשֶּׁהָר ָנְכָּלָה | פָּגְשָׁבָּ גָּפְשָׁבׁ שְׂדֵדְקָ | פָּגְשֶׁבָּ גָּפְשָׁבׁ שְׂדֵדְקָ | אֵשְּחָדְךָ שְׂדֵדְקָ עָלֵיָם |
| BM | | | | |
| TF | | | | |
| FA | | | | |

The brevity and force of the Hebrew is found in all the Arabic versions, which all carry in common roots for 'anger', גֶּדֶב, and 'intensity', סְדֵד. However, SG and FA use the latter root for the stich's verb, SS and TF using the latter root adjectivally. In so doing both these latter texts fail to supply the accusative indefinite markers on the noun-adjective phrase serving as the direct object of their verb.

Verse 6a

| MT | יַעֲנוּ אֲלֵיהָ רֶכֶבֶרַבְּקֶל הָוָּדֶד רַחֲאֵר | מָאֲבַהֲרָמְא אֲלֵיהָ בֵּן בֶּבֶלֶבֶרַבְּקֶל בְּאָבָדֶד מְבָלֶד |
| SG | | | |
| SS | | | |
| TF | | | |
| FA | | | |
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With the exception of TF, which continues abridging the text, the Arabic versions follow the lead of the MT in giving two verbs in 6a. The formula 'answered and said' is common in the MT; the Arabic versions, however, are not content to give literal translations in this instance.

SG ignores the precedents set by both the MT and Tg, translating the opening verb as 'begin', from bd', this being, of course, more logical than 'answer', given the context. SS' verb is similar, though more nuanced: the Fourth Form of qbl yields 'turn towards / embark', giving the implication of 'commence an address'. FA's solution is the least imaginative in that he merely provides a synonym to the formula's second verb, 'said', his choice being influenced by the perception that a parallel was required.

Verse 6bc

MT

SS

TF

FA

SG carefully follows the grammatical structure of the MT, as does SS; but the other versions employ differing approaches. TF uses a construct, while FA not only has a circumstantial accusative, but reverses the two stichs. And while there is some convergence among the Arabic versions in terms of roots, with snn as one of the expressions regarding age common to all except SS, TF's expression of age, حديث السن, is virtually the same as TH's حديث السن.

Verse 6de

MT

SG
Here SG and FA share much of the same vocabulary, especially if one posits an emendation for the last word in FA's version, requiring only a reversal of two consonants, yielding 'knowledge' in place of 'activity'. If that is accepted, then the only real difference with SG lies in FA's omission of the first verb in 6d; indeed, his second verb is identical to that of SG.

SS and TF, in basic agreement with the LXX, S-H, and Cp, are virtually identical to each other, while their differences with the other Arabic versions here are relatively minor linguistically, and non-existent theologically.

Verse 7a

None of the Arabic versions display the economy of expression found in the MT. Yet in the end SG and FA are basically faithful to its intent, while SS and TF, which are identical in 7a, adhere closely to the LXX, S-H, and Cp.

SG rarely indulges in complex constructs during the poetic sections of the Book of Job, if only because of the relative brevity of the Hebrew. At this point, however, SG renders the second subject of the Hebrew stich, 'years', by a tripartite construct phrase, 'possessors of an abundance of lifetimes'. He thus avoids any

---

363 For example, both make explicit the nuance that the opening verb of the stich refers to reflection rather than to overt speech; this is not the case for SS and TF.
implication that the span of time is personified, a possibility left open by the readings of both the MT and Tg.

The LXX’s phrase ὁ χρόνος ἔστην ὁ λαόν gives rise to a relative clause in Arabic, which, as has been seen repeatedly in Chapters 3 and 28, is a favorite device of FA. Here, however, it is adopted by SS and TF, not out of a desire to link stichs that would otherwise be grammatically and semantically independent, as would FA, but to remain faithful to the linguistic model provided; this highlights once again the different approaches of FA on the one hand, whose translation is often paraphrastic, and BM/SS, which is intent on providing a classical translation per se, while TF also intends to stay as close to source documents as possible.

FA is content to parallel his previous stich’s felicitous if somewhat recherché construction, which consists of a circumstantial accusative following an elative adjective. As a whole, this lengthy stich allows FA to give Elihu an air of deference and humility, though this stance will, of course, soon be abandoned.

Verse 7b

| MT | וְרָבָה שָׁנִים יִרְחֶה חָכמה |
| SG | וְלָא חָכְמָה לְכָלְתֶּרֶן יִסְקָם אֶלְמָה |
| SS | וָלָא הַחֲכָמָה לְכָלְתֶּרֶן יִסְקָם |
| TF | וָלָא הַחֲכָמָה לְכָלְתֶּרֶן יִסְקָם |
| FA | וָלָא בְּלַחֲכָמָה יִסְקָם |

SG and FA display a preference towards continued use of grammatical features employed in 7a: SG once again uses a tripartite construct to replace a single Hebrew term, while FA continues to play with the accusative, although in different grammatical contexts: attributive complement of 'be' in 7βα, followed by its use as an adverb in 7ββ.

---

36 This follows the lead of the S-H.
The relative clause of 7a is not repeated in 7b for either SS or TF, however; additionally, TF reverts to his usual practice of avoiding the classicism of 'not be'. This, along with a difference in prepositions, breaks the uniformity of his translation with that of the SS text.

Verse 8a

MT

SG

SS

TF

FA

The ambiguity and therefore the question regarding the identity and the derivation of the spirit mentioned in the MT leads to a split among the Arabic versions, with SG and FA favoring a humanist solution, while SS and TF identify the spirit as divine in origin.

Unexpectedly, this split cannot be traced to differing approaches between the MT and Tg on the one hand and the LXX and S-H on the other, for none of these predecessor versions, with the addition of the Pesh, makes explicit any supernatural reference at this point. Thus the unique reading of SS and TF carries theological as well as linguistic implications.

SG is quite clear that Elihu refers to human nature, not divine inspiration, literally speaking. This allows Elihu to condemn the Three Comforters: the source of their arguments are potentially defective because their human faculties are just that: human. FA will parallel that very line of thought. And, happily for Elihu, he can put forward this argument in such a way that does not jeopardize his own claim

One must note, however, a variant ms reading reported in Qapah (1970) where the change of a preposition from 'from', to 'in / within', strengthens a sense of ambiguity here.
for making a contribution to the discussion at hand.

SS and TF both mention God as the source of the spirit, but the former gives an expected twist by putting 'spirit' in the plural. This grammatically parallels the collective term 'people' at the end of the stich, thus identifying the spirit involved as much with humankind as with its Source: God provides separate instances of inspiration to His creatures. But TF uses the singular, thus not only more closely identifying the spirit as God's, but also approximating Islamic usage, where روح الله, or more simply الروح, is common Qur'anic terminology. Although there is, accordingly, something of a difference between SS and TF in their theological understanding, both stand together over against SG and FA, which perceive that there is a spirit within humanity that provides a natural point of contact with the divine. This latter understanding becomes clear in the next stich, which is not a poetic restatement of 8a (as it is, largely, for SS and TF). Rather, SG and FA use 8a as a point of departure in a developing argument.

Grammatically, FA finds yet another opportunity for the indefinite accusative: the subject of a clause following a particle, loosely translatable as 'verily', requiring the accusative. The repeated use of such a classicism at this point not only begins to take on the characteristic of a linguistic tour de force, but is also reminiscent of Qur'anic practice, in which quasi-poetic use of repeated sound patterns helps both the flow of the narrative as well as memorization of the material.

Verse 8b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>TF</th>
<th>FA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>גנשתה של 팔</td>
<td>הלאל</td>
<td>אללה ואלה</td>
<td>אללה</td>
<td>יזיהו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ורוחו ה랩ב קלח היי תלומ התנאס</td>
<td>ורוחו ה랩ב קלח היי תלומ התנאס</td>
<td>וואנמא ישיב אלנみました אלל</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SG has Elihu state that it is the human spirit which perceives that God's speech can enlighten mortals. Thus he completes the thought in 8a that what is under discussion is a human faculty.

In SS' and TF's phrase روح الضعيب, 'Spirit of the Almighty', the final term is their standard translation for the MT's "לְוָדָה.366 Here, the phrase stands in direct, positive parallel to TF's روح الله. Thus 8b is largely a restatement of 8a, especially for TF.

FA uses 8b for a bit of theologizing, producing a unique reading. Given his high theology, and therefore perhaps somewhat uncomfortable with the implication found in 8a that humanity has any independence apart from God, FA hastens to add that it is by God's breath alone that humankind exists. Thus, FA's version of 8b opens with an adversative, not found in any other Arabic version, since SG's 8b is a development of the thought in 8a rather than a contradiction, while SS and TF's 8b is a reaffirmation of 8a.

Verse 9a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>לאירברוכם חכמים</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>פליאז הכוזר אלטרר חכמה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>وليس كبرى الزمان هم الحكما</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>وليس العنت هم الحكما</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>وليس طوال العمر وكبره الذيعلم ويحكم</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The agreement of all the Arabic versions in opening with the classical negation of 'be' as well as the closing root hkm, 'judge' and therefore 'be wise', reflects semantic agreement in this stich, even if the grammatical structures used differ in manners which we have come to expect. Such agreement should not be surprising, since it

366 Cf. 11:7b (p. 107), 22:23a (p. 180), and 22:25a (p. 186); however, the MT's term is translated differently at 22:17b (p. 172).
contains the crux of Elihu’s argument as to why he feels compelled to speak. FA is more verbose than the other versions, SG elaborates the MT sparingly (though another triple construct finds its way into his translation), and TF largely, though not slavishly, follows the lead of SS.

Verse 9b

| MT | הֶבֵּן בֵּין מַשְׁפֹּתֵן | ולָא כָּלָא אִלְּאָשָׁא נְפֶשֶׁת אֲלָהָבָה | ולָא הַשֵּׁהֲוִּים יִעַרְפְּנוּ הַפְּדָע | ולָא הַשֵּׁהֲוִּים נַעֲרוּבֵּם בָּאֲלָעֲנָה | وليس الحكم والقضاء للكبر والشيخوخة *
| SG | | | | |
| SS | | | | |
| TF | | | | |
| FA | | | | |

Once again, the basic semantics of the stich are not a matter of argument, with vocabulary providing points of contact. The root syx, 'be elderly', is common to all the Arabic versions; additionally, the Arabic script versions share the root qdy, 'pass judgment'. Yet once again a commonality of vocabulary is not a guarantee of similar grammatical sequences, with FA providing a gloss for kbr, 'be senior' and SG including a simple construct. For once, SS represents the most concise translation.

TF departs from the model provided by SS in order to preserve grammatical parallellism to the previous stich. He does so inserting a personal pronoun followed by an active participle and its attendant preposition before rejoining SS’ wording.

Thus TF gives evidence of not being merely an unimaginative rendering of its counterpart.

Verse 10a

| MT | לְכַז אַמָּרֵי שְׁמָעוֹלָה | לְכַז לְכַז אַמָּרֵי שְׁמָעוֹלָה | فَالآن أَسْمَعُوا لِي | الآن أسمعوا لي |
| SG | | | | |
| SS | | | | |
| TF | | | | |
| FA | | | | * | لذلك أقول فاسمعوا قولي |
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SG once again stays close to the MT, with FA poetically providing a cognate accusative to the root *qwl*, 'say', between the opening verb and the direct object of the imperative.

Perhaps confused by the seeming disagreement between the LXX and S–H, where the latter's initial verb is semantically (if not grammatically) reflexive, both SS and TF simply drop the opening verb of this stich. This is not grave, since it is unnecessary to the development of Elihu’s argument.

**Verse 10b**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>Hebrew text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>Arabic text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Arabic text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>Arabic text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>Arabic text</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At first glance, SG’s is the only Arabic version which provides the added personal emphasis found in the MT’s poetic formula הֶעְבִּיאָהוּ. Indeed, SS foregoes two opportunities to add personal pronouns to either of the stich’s verbs; TF’s translation, which changes the second verb to a verbal noun, to which is added a possessive suffix, also misses two such opportunities.

FA, however, achieves the intent of the MT in another manner. Rather than using a relatively neutral opening verb for the stich, such as SG’s 'inform' or SS' and TF's 'tell', it is a root with heightened pedantic connotations, *tlw*, that is selected: 'read out loud / recite'. The image is a pedagogical one, adding to the image of Elihu's impudence.

**Verse 11a**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>Hebrew text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>Arabic text</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Habel (1985) cites this verse as beginning a new section of Elihu's argument wherein he gives his justification for ending his reticence. Poetically, there is a transition here, with verses 11 and 12 both containing three stichs instead of two. It is as if the Arabic versions sense a shift as well, taking the occasion to revert to their regular linguistic patterns: SG resumes his high degree of closeness to the MT; SS and TF are virtually identical once again, albeit temporarily, both using the LXX and S–H as their model; FA resumes his reliance upon the Pesh.

In this stich, the brevity of the LXX is reflected in SS and TF, whereas both SG and FA are more verbose. These latter two versions are in essential agreement, although SG's fairly serene verb from sbr, 'be patient', finds its counterpart in FA's more deliberate kff, 'hold (oneself) in check'.

Verse 11b

The Arabic versions continue the pattern established in the previous stich, with SG and FA adhering to the MT and Pesh, respectively, with SS and TF following the LXX. Since the predecessor versions have inverse understandings of the topic, their corresponding Arabic versions follow accordingly.

FA's dependence upon the Pesh is clear from his addition of an extra verb in

367 Coincidentally, both SG and FA will resort in the next stich to the root of SS' and TF's main verb, nst, 'hearken', but in a different context.
this stich referring to the *terminus ad quem* of Elihu's silence: he has attempted to remain respectful of his elders until they have had their full say. The occurrence of such an additional verb is not attested in any of the other Arabic versions, or in their predecessors.

Once again, the relationship between SS and TF is clearly not one of merely copying out a classical text with an occasional simplification: the root employed by TF, *ntq*, 'enunciate', is more refined and nuanced than the pedestrian, though perfectly classical offering, of SS' *qwl*, 'say'.

Verse 11c

| MT                                      |_targets| تحج نأهذالا ملواي* |
| SG                                      | targets| حتا نفتحون كلامي |
| SS                                      |        | لتفحصوا كلامي |
| TF                                      |        | وجريكم الكلام* |

All the Arabic versions converge lexically at the end of the stich, but only the Arabic script versions agree with the Hebrew that the verb in this stich focuses on the semantic area of 'testing' or 'examining'. Curiously, only SG differs, and in so doing departs not only from the MT, but also from Tg. His result, 'until words have run out', makes sense both in itself and also in the context of Elihu's remarks. However, the reason for this choice on SG's part is ultimately unclear. TF's verb, from the root *fhz*, 'examine', is common in classical Arabic. Scribal difficulties may not account for the difference between TF's choice and that of SS.

Verse 12a

| MT                                      |_targets| מִכְלָסֵת אֲתַהַבוֹנוּ |
| SG                                      | targets| וצְרָךְנוּ אֲתַמְפָּה |
| SS                                      |        | והייכמ בֶּלֶגְ נֶפֶנֶטִי |
The confusion as to the roles of Elihu on the one hand and the Three Comforters on the other continues, with the MT, and thus SG and FA, seeing Elihu as the passive party in a completed disputation, and the LXX (and thus SS and TF), seeing Elihu in his role as an active participant in the attempt to deal with Job.

SS and TF are very close in wording, with the former resorting to a rare diminutive: فمُئِمي, 'my little mouth'. Of course, the reference is not only to physical size, which is metaphorically related to Elihu’s young age, but also to the lesser importance of what Elihu, as a younger man, may have to say.

FA’s use of the root šhd, '(bear) witness', is more likely to be an attempt, by means of a cognate, to deal with the Pesh’s shdwt, 'testimony', by means of a cognate, rather than a betrayal of Islamic influence.

Verse 12b

Here the Arabic versions are in essential agreement, though the Arabic script versions are more strongly worded: while SG has Elihu complain that there is none to 'face up to' Job,368 SS and TF select a root, wbx with a fairly wide semantic area, covering the concept 'rebuke', while FA has the fairly synonymous 'censure', albeit from a narrower root, bkt.

---

368 Even should the root in question, qbl, be conceivably stretched to include the concept of 'confrontation', such an irregular reading would still fall short of the Arabic script versions' linguistic understanding.
SG and FA regard the participle מַלִיתו as the grammatical subject of this stich; however, the other two Arabic versions prefer an indefinite relative pronoun serving as the subject of a verb in the imperfect. SS and TF will parallel their construction in the next stich, and FA will join them, with SG continuing in his use of active participles.

The variation between SS and TF can be attributed to the latter's avoidance of the classical jussive mood in favor of a negative construction found in both colloquial and classical varieties of Arabic, albeit with slightly different meanings: the classical construction of לְמָא followed by the perfect makes for an unusually strong negation, while the same construction is understood in colloquial Arabic as the standard method for negating the past. Given the strength of the stich's main verb, the former, classical reading fits in well, though a colloquial reading is more consistent with the general tone of TF's text.

Verse 12c

MT:

SG:

SS:

TF:

FA:

קואות אפרים חכמה.
לאו מלייבת עליך נקוחלא חכמה.
ולא מנייאוב قوله מניק.
ולא מנייגיבע قوله:
ולא פיוקמ מנייגיבע באגواب.

Adhering to a preference found earlier at various points in this chapter, FA makes use of the same root for both his verb and its (indirect) object, such practice being a common rhetorical device in Arabic, often used to add emphasis or force to the activity under discussion. This practice puts FA at odds with the other Arabic versions, which agree that the (indirect) object of the verb should be derived from

---

369 The active participle and the imperfect in Arabic are semantically very close, since the participle usually cannot connote completed activity, but rather reflects a current state or situation.
the root *qwl*, not *jwb*. The difference, in the end, is more a question of style than
substance, with FA displaying greater rhetorical flourish.

As noted in 12b, it is the Arabic script versions which stand together over
against SG in resorting to an indefinite relative pronoun to stand as subject to the
stich’s verb, while SG uses an active participle. Again, rhetorical style more than
substance is at issue here, with SG and FA faithful to their source material while
SS and TF maintain consistency between 12b and 12c.

Verse 13a

| MT | lipstick matana haba
cala betakw ol lo kdr aloha haba
| SG | ولا تقولوا أنا وجدنا فيه حكمة
| SS | ولم تقولوا بانا وجدنا فيه حكمة الرب
| TF | ونقولون أن لنا حكمة *
| FA | |

With the minor exception of FA, who drops the stich’s second verb ‘we have found’
in favor of the prepositional phrase ‘to us’, the Arabic versions are, to a great extent,
lexically in concert. Even the variations in the verbal moods, with SG in the
subjunctive, SS in the declarative (Middle Arabic form), TF in the jussive (negative
imperative), and FA in the declarative (classical form), have as much to do with
grammatical formalism as with semantic nuances, which are relatively minor.

It should be noted, however, that TF ends the stich with ‘the Lord’, given his
addition of the conjunction ‘and’ before the following verb. This changes the direct
object, حكمة, from being an indefinite noun to being the head term in a construct.

370 The MT’s two stichs have two participles, whereas the Pesh switches from a
participle in 12b to a relative clause in 12c.
371 The equivalent grammatical structures in the LXX do not display such stylistic
consistency; the S-H uses relative clauses in both stichs; indeed, the relative is
a favorite device of S-H in the Book of Job.
Verse 13b

It is clear that the ancient versions had some difficulty with the sense of the MT: the Tg, as well as Pesh, strengthens the verb while staying in the same semantic area, whilst the LXX, followed by S-H, changes the meaning of the verse substantially.

As if to confirm such difficulties, both SS and TF reject the model afforded them by the LXX and S-H, resolving their differences by abbreviating the passage in question with an optative which further emends the passage: 'May the Lord [TF: 'He'] provide / endow you', i.e., with Wisdom, presumably. This avoids the accusation made by Elihu, according to the LXX and S-H, that the Three Comforters see themselves as wiser than their Lord. While this would not be out of character for the brash young man, it may have been seen as theologically offensive.

While SG leaves the sense of the MT largely untouched, FA preserves the stronger language of the Tg and Pesh. Coincidentally, the resulting indictment by Elihu of the Three Comforters inadvertently confirms FA's high theological sense that it is God, not humankind, who is the only real actor in any given human drama.

At this point mention needs to be made of the approach of TH to Elihu's speech. While there have been isolated linguistic tangents between one or another of the Arabic versions to that of his Muslim tale of Job, it is at 13b where TH echoes the forceful text of the Tg, Pesh, and FA. He does so using the same verb
as FA, from the root *b*lw, "afflict".372

TH's argument that God afflicts his favorites, however, sets the meaning of the canonical Arabic versions on their head: divine affliction in TH is viewed positively, just as Elihu's view of Job in TH is similarly positive. Thus we find that convergence in vocabulary between FA and TH cannot be taken to posit either semantic or theological convergence.

Yet despite these divergences, the personality of Elihu is unmistakably the same in TH as it is in the canonical versions: a young man impudently dares to educate those who are his elders, if not his betters, in matters of theological import.

Verse 14a

| MT       | الوَلَّا تَفَهْمُ أَلِّمَ مَثَلَّهُ       |
| SG       | هذه فلما تَفَهَّمْ أَلِّمَ مَثَلَّهُ    |
| SS       | إن تَتَكَلَّمُونَ بِكَلَامِ الْحَقَّ لَرَجِلٍ مَثَلَّهُ    |
| TF       | إن تَتَكَلَّمُوا بِكَلَامِ الْحَقَّ لَرَجِلٍ مَثَلَّهُ    *
| FA       | ليست أقول فولا بنقض الكلام *

There is some ambiguity concerning the subject of the verb in this stich, an ambiguity which is not resolved by any of the Arabic versions. SG preserves the ambiguity; indeed, he even emphasizes it with the addition of an independent pronoun.373 The texts of the Arabic script versions, on the other hand, vary markedly from the intent of the MT, so that due to a change in the conjugation the issue never arises.

SS and TF, which are identical except for an error due to a hyper-classicism in

372 While the root, and the particular form employed here, are quite common to the Qur'an, its range of use far outstrips the religious sense; thus any argument on the basis of this text for Islamic influence on FA should be cautiously entertained at best.

373 Grammatically, the result may be construed as a subordinate circumstantial clause, the *hāl* construction.
the former, make the Three Comforters the grammatical subject of this stich, in which Elihu sarcastically dismisses the validity of what they have had to say. This is not the reading of the LXX, but these two Arabic versions appear to be based upon the more direct reading of the S-H.

Diverging from the Pesh and indeed from all other versions under consideration, FA has Elihu effectively repeating himself in this and the subsequent verse, if not verbatim, then at least thematically. This particular stich, however, has semantic points of contact with the MT’s 14b.

Verse 14b

MT  דַּעְתְּךָ אֲנֵה אַשְׁרֵנָה
SG  אַפְּרֵרַלְךָ אֲנֵה יִנֹּה אֵלֶּה
SS  וַאֲנֻעַיְתֵךְ...
TF  ולא נעייתך...
FA  ואל אנお互い את קلامכם

SG makes some interesting choices: the augmented plural for 'speech' allows an added emphasis without violating the structural model of the MT. This form, from the root qwl, 'say', also carries a technical meaning: 'proverbs / maxims'. Thus does Elihu allude to the Wisdom cited earlier as a supposed trait of the Three Comforters. There is, no doubt, at least a hint of sarcasm here, not dissimilar to that noted in the previous stich’s characterization of Elihu by SS and TF.

SG’s care to follow the grammatical construction of the MT in 14bα is abandoned, temporarily, by the end of the stich. By inserting 'be possible', from jwz, he has Elihu declare that he has something to say that is not merely different from that of the Three Comforters, but that a different approach from that of the Three Comforters is necessary: what they have had to say cannot possibly be effective in refuting Job’s arguments.
SS completes the sarcasm of 14a with a short irony: 'you have condemned (him)'.

TF is not entirely clear due to the physical condition of the text, though an examination of the ms suggests that his reading may have been the same as that of SS with the addition of a verb in the second person plural. For this, 'Iyyād (1967) suggests 'you have been pious'. The implication would be, therefore, that the Three Comforters have been more interested in preserving their own self-perceptions of theological rectitude than in dealing meaningfully with Job's predicament. This interpretation of Elihu's misgivings concerning the Three Comforters is profound; it has a modern echo in Tsevat (1976), whose trenchant analysis of the Book of Job, while ignoring for the most part Elihu himself, graphically affirms that the fault lies in the basic, underlying theology of the Three Comforters, and not just in their verbal arguments.

If this verse is taken in isolation, the manner of Elihu's condemnation of the Three Comforters implies that Job himself might not be entirely in the wrong. Perhaps it is from such nuanced readings or, at worst, misperceptions, that an extra-canonical view, such as that of TH, arose wherein Elihu is portrayed as the defender and champion of Job.

FA's text seemingly contradicts itself here. Whereas Elihu arrogantly stood in judgment at 11c concerning the words of the Three Comforters, here he claims to give their words no heed. This, of course, puts FA's understanding of this stich at odds with SG's, though it agrees with the argument of SS and TF at 11c. This could be regarded as evidence that FA was confused, but there are two other possible explanations.

The first explanation has similarities to SS and TF: having declared himself competent to sit in judgment at 11c, Elihu now feels himself competent to condemn
the Comforters' arguments as unworthy of his further consideration. The second explanation, consistent with FA's description of Elihu earlier in the chapter at 1b, portrays a self-contradictory Elihu so carried away by rhetoric that his credibility is thereby undermined.

Verse 15a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>TF</th>
<th>FA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>חיות לא ראו עזר</td>
<td>חיות ואנשים לא ראו עזר</td>
<td>ולא תראו</td>
<td>ולא תראו</td>
<td>* כנסת القوم ولم יגיבורו</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The literary form of poetic drama is interrupted in the Arabic script versions, while SG continues to expand upon the MT.

In 15aא, SG's use of לגחלות, "folk", is not used in reference to the Three Comforters as in FA. Thus any vocabulary convergence appears to be coincidental. But it is SG's usage here, and not his vocabulary choice, which is critical in understanding his interpretation of 15אב. Employing לגחלות as the subject of the following verb, SG is careful not to cut off Elihu's speech, which would occur had the antecedent to לגחלות been the Three Comforters. Not only is the literary form of the MT thus preserved, but in SG's version, as in the MT and Tg, Elihu makes clear that the effect of poor argumentation, if not poor theology, goes well beyond hurting Job himself.

Stich 15א in SS and TF consists of narration wherein the Three Comforters are reported as having nothing to say in the face of the accusations hurled against them by Elihu. While this is further confirmation of their dependence upon the LXX and S–H, the brevity of which they surpass by omitting the opening verb ἐπτομήσαν, "they were afraid", it should be noted that whereas LXX continues narration in 15ב,
SS and TF will both return to reporting Elihu's speaking at that point.

FA's version, like that of the other Arabic script versions, also turns to narrative for what will prove to be a more extensive period (through 17α), similarly shifting the focus from Elihu to the Three Comforters themselves, who remain silent in the face of Elihu's accusatory impudence. Basically, this is also the practice of the Pesh, though FA adds, at 17α, a single verb to signal the return from narration to direct speech.

Verse 15b

| MT       | תַּחְתַּיָּכֵּםּ מִּלָּהּ  |
| SG       | לאַעִנָּאִלְכֵּם נַעַמְּהָ |  |
| SS       | וִבְּדָא עֵנֵנָאִלְכֵּם  |
| TF       | ולאַיִּנְהֵרְכֵּם נַעַמְּהָ |  |
| FA       | וּכְוַּמְּוָאִלְכֵּם  |

It is in the verb of 15b that the Arabic versions once again show their lack of agreement in their translations, with FA not even agreeing with the other versions as to its grammatical subject.

SG is careful to employ a medio-reflexive (Form Eight) of *nql, 'move away', thus avoiding any implication of personification. This represents a departure from the MT, which employs the causative and therefore both active and transitive *hiph'il* form of the verb root.

SS once again represents Elihu as the speaker, who in 15b reacts to the silence of the Comforters reported in 15a. In so doing, he resorts to an intransitive verb from the root *byd, 'pass away', thus achieving the same tone as that of SG: there is no question of endowing 'speech' or 'argument' with any vital qualities of its own. But rather than this being a strategy to avoid personification, it is a device that points up the impotence of the Comforters as effective participants in the dialogue.
The author of TF avoids the verb byd as found in SS, but does not merely replace one lexical item with another. Rather, he resorts to a classicism, the jussive mood, negating the verb from the root hdr, 'be present / attend'. So while 15b is used in TF to report the reaction of Elihu to the silence reported in 15a, TF's translation gives 'words' an almost independent existence from that of the Comforters: 'Words were not in your presence...'.

As noted earlier, FA's version of 15b is the only one that neither makes 'words' the grammatical subject of the stich nor uses it for quotation rather than narration. During the stich he will use the root kff on the third of what will prove to be four occasions in this chapter. Such lexical reduplication is unsupported by the Pesh, upon which FA has displayed a certain measure of dependence. But given the unmechanical nature of FA's translation, this should come as no surprise.

Having already seen how FA's style is largely homiletic, the answer to this repetitiveness may lie there. Indeed, on two occasions, at 1a and here, the root kff refers to the Three Comforters, while at 11a and 19b it refers to Elihu. Therefore we find FA juxtaposing the main antagonists of this chapter, showing that what was once appropriate for one party to the discussion, Elihu, is now incumbent upon the other: the application of the same quality or activity to opposing elements serves to heighten the argument of the speaker: 'I was quiet, now you be quiet.'

374 The addition of the prepositional phrase at the end of the stich further reinforces this intent.
375 Verses 1a, 11a, 15b, 19b.
376 By this point in the story, Job is not so much a target as an occasion for argument; in any case he is certainly not a participant in this chapter.
377 It should be noted that for reasons of style, FA cannot carry this lexical repetition to its logical extreme; indeed, there are other vocabulary items descriptive of verbal restraint in his translation.
Once again, the root 'speak' is common to all the Arabic versions, but the verb for 'restraint' from speech differs, with the only agreement being found between SS and TF. In addition, FA persists in defining the text as narration rather than speech.

SG once again\textsuperscript{378} resorts to the root \textit{sbr} by which Elihu approvingly notes his own patience during the previous discourse. Elihu in both SS and TF is similarly an image of politeness, standing in the presence of his elders whilst keeping silence.

FA's verb, Form Two (intensive) of \textit{mkn}, yields a meaning close to that of the other Arabic script versions: 'stand fast'. Here, however, it is the Comforters who do so, remaining silent (perhaps out of shock, shame, or confusion) in the face of Elihu's onslaught, which will resume at 17b.

The lengthiness of SS and TF is not reflective of the LXX, S-H, or Cp, and their conjugation of all verbs in the second person masculine plural is unique, amongst not only the Arabic versions, but also all the predecessor versions. By contrast, FA's stich reads more like the Greek and Syriac versions than the two other Arabic script

\textsuperscript{378} Cf. 11a (p. 279).
translations do. With SG displaying continued fidelity to the MT and Tg, the question then becomes one regarding the source of the read of SS and TF.379

The use of the second person masculine plural is easily justifiable given the nature of the Elihu's accusatory form of address. To have him directly confront the Three Comforters rather than referring to them in the third person, as do the MT, Tg, LXX, S–H, Pesh, Cp, and SG, 380 makes semantic sense even if it represents a departure from the traditional readings.

As for the additional elements in SS and TF, which consist of a second verb in 16bβ as well as a direct object, these two factors clarify the text rather than provide a qualitatively different understanding of the stich. Thus: 'You arose, unable to pass judgment'.

Verse 17a

MT

SS

TF

FA

Commentators have noted381 that there is something of a transition here as Elihu builds his argument to excuse his uninvited participation in the discussion. This perceptible shift may have been the occasion for the more abrupt move to narration in SS and TF.

For SG, however, in agreement with the MT, Tg, and Pesh, 17a is a

379 These two Arabic versions differ only in that TF's orthography, which though not without error in terms of the classical language, is the more conventional of the two.

380 FA may be added to this list, but it should be remembered that his literary form here is one of narration, not reported speech.

381 Cf., e.g., Habel (1985), p. 17.
continuation of Elihu’s speech. With the exception of his opening verb, he is careful to follow the MT closely. Given that the MT’s opening verb, which was adopted by the Tg, is from ‘nh, ‘answer’, SG is consistent with his translation of 6a in replacing it with the less formulaic but more semantically precise ‘I shall begin’, from the Eighth Form of bd’, ‘commence’.

The Arabic script versions all consist of narrative, representing a relapse for SS and TF but a continuation for FA. All serve to re-introduce Elihu, but differ in both length and lexical content, with the exception of the appearance of the verb قال, ‘say’, in all three. Yet, all these versions betray points of contact with those versions of Job in which Elihu’s speech continues uninterrupted.

Both SS and SG share أيضا, ‘also’, which does not appear in TF, for which it would be superfluous, given its appearance in 17b as well; however, SS does share with TF the verb زاد, ‘add’, which reflects the occurrence of ὑπολογίζων in the LXX and اهپك, ‘add’, in the S–H.

FA gives one more word of narration as a transition to reported speech, at which point he rejoins his occasional model, the Pesh. Given the Pesh’s relative closeness to the MT at this point, the resulting variation is not of signal importance. What is of stylistic note, however, is the recurrence of the root qwl, ‘say’, three times within this stich: once as narration, once as Elihu’s opening utterance, and once as the direct object. The last two instances represent the use of the cognate accusative.

Verse 17b

MT

382 To be more precise, FA begins the stich with narration, but quickly moves to reported speech; this is not standard practice, where divisions between stichs in both Hebrew and Arabic usually occur in moving from narration to quotation.
While the content of SS and TF thematically duplicates the material which is found in the other Arabic versions' treatments of 17a, SG and FA move on, consistent with the MT and Pesh, respectively. Given the continued closeness of these earlier versions, SG and FA resemble each other semantically, though not lexically: both use the causative (Form Four) of their respective roots for the opening verb, which are fairly synonymous, and both place the direct object of that verb in the possessive first person singular.

Verse 18a

After a long period of relative disharmony, a high degree of convergence now characterizes all the Arabic versions. While there are differences between the use of participles in SS and TF, on the one hand, and the use of the perfect in SG and FA, all four versions share a basic structure, a common vocabulary, and a consistency of thought.

Verse 18b

383 The potential for a divergence in meaning is great in such instances, since participles are effectively equivalent to the imperfect.
The brief harmony of the Arabic versions is broken, despite the MT's use of roots which have cognate counterparts in the Arabic versions for every one of the Hebrew words in this stich. SG takes advantage of one cognate root of the MT to open his stich, but then avoids use of rwḥ, 'be endowed with spirit', a root charged with theological meaning. Its occurrence in a non-divine context would also open the door to possibilities of personification or anthropomorphism. Finally, SG changes the reference to 'my belly', substituting 'my heart'. This makes sense in view of his avoidance of וְנַפֶּשׁ, which is replaced with מִנָּה, 'my notion / advice': the seat of the intellect was traditionally seen in Jewish thought as being found in the heart.

SS abandons the reference to 'heart' or 'belly' or any other anatomical concept, presumably due to the retention of רוּחַ: what 'wind' or 'spirit' should have to do with either of these portions of the body, in this context, would be problematical. But given the similar ductus of נָפֶשׁ, 'my utterance', to בּטֶנִי, 'my belly', the retention of רוּחַ as a reference to 'breathe' becomes comprehensible. Finally, SS' verb, 'consume', reflects the strong language of the LXX.

TF either has made a linguistically understandable if mistaken consonantal substitution in dealing with SS' verb, 'consume', or has come up with an entirely new, but plausible, understanding of the import of the text. To change TF's ול to a ק' would yield 'burn', arguably synonymous with SS' 'consume' in the given context. But leaving TF's text unemended would give the felicitous result, 'My heart is inciting me', i.e., to speak.

FA takes advantage of cognates on two occasions in 18b: he retains mention of

---

384 Both are unvoiced palatal stops.
'my belly', but is careful not select the direct cognate of מָר, opting instead for הריע, 'the wind'. Given his view of Elihu, FA is careful not to associate him with much that is spiritual! As for his opening verb, from נָז, 'brag', an emendation to נָצ, 'inflate', would require only the placement of the diacritic above, rather than below, the final consonant. This would represent a departure from the Pesh in favor of inner consistency, which path FA has taken on innumerable occasions.

Verse 19a

SG finally introduces the image of the belly, which serves as the repository for the as yet unspoken words of Elihu; additionally, SG presents an image of wine that has not been opened to let it breathe. His wordiness serves to tie his illusions in 19aα with those of the previous verse, and to clarify in 19aβ the MT; he has thus remained faithful to its intent.

With the exception of the omission in TF of SS' opening adverb, these two versions are identical, adhering closely to the LXX. The Greek contains an extra verb in its stich, represented in these two Arabic versions by a relative clause which contains the verb in question. While they thus appear even more verbose than SG, their lengthiness is an indication of fidelity to their model rather than an example of any textual disagreement with it.

FA abandons the order of the stichs as found in the Pesh, yet still displays his ultimate dependence upon it by his omission of the imagery of both unvented wine

385 The S-H at this point is fraught with marginal glosses and variant readings.
and new wineskins as found in the MT on the one hand, and that of the bellows as cited in the LXX version of 19b on the other. Instead, Elihu reveals that he has so much to say, that he is in pain, the urgency of his mission being so real to him.

Verse 19b

MT

SG

SS

TF

FA

FA shows some evidence of going beyond the Pesh in the phrase 'my belly has burst', the verb of which is built on the root šqq, 'split', in the passive voice (Form Seven). While the Pesh has nothing anatomical being riven asunder, SG does include a reference to splitting, also based on the root šqq, though in the reflexive (Form Five); the subject of SG's verb, following the MT, is 'wineskins'.

SS and TF are completely identical, and both display independence from the LXX. Yet, they are closer to the Greek's 'brazier's bellows', which the S-H duplicates, than to the Hebrew's 'wineskins'. In the place of 'brazier's bellows', however, they both substitute 'a molten cup of a smith'. How they struck upon this particular image is open to conjecture.

Verse 20

MT

SG

SS

TF

FA

^Thus FA deals with the Pesh, which in 19aβ states that Elihu cannot find relief.
The Arabic versions partially converge after the disagreement over imagery in the previous stich. Yet FA adds an extraneous stich that adds little to the development of Elihu's argument. With SS and TF, FA shares the concept of 'rest' or 'relief' not found in the MT or SG, but which does appear in the LXX and Pesh. Cognates abound amongst the Arabic versions, some of which are shared with the Hebrew of the MT as well: 'fth śfty, 'I shall open my lips', is found in all five.

FA's extra stich, unattested elsewhere, simply reads 'And I shall state the declaration which has come to me'. The choice of the verb, however, is curious: xrrj, 'exit', is here in the causative; as such it can be used in a vulgar fashion if its direct object is רוח, 'wind'. Though that vocabulary item is not found here, FA did make use of it in 18b. This verb is also used in the expression 'stick one's tongue out'. Given that the direct object here is 'speech', which proceeds from the mouth, FA is putting in the mouth of Elihu language that is less than elegant, at best.

Verse 21a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>TF</th>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>FA</th>
<th>Arabic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>אלוהים אשק פירותי</td>
<td>לא יאבקי אדם</td>
<td>לא יאבקי אדם</td>
<td>לא יאבקי אדם</td>
<td>ولا أجابني أحد</td>
<td>ولا أجابني أحد</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the MT Elihu now turns some of his focus more directly on Job; the question is one of how he proposes to deal effectively with someone who has stymied the Three Comforters. This in turns depends upon the nature of the defeat, as Elihu sees it, which Job has inflicted upon those Three.

Except for the fact that SG avoids figurative language using anatomical imagery, his reading is semantically faithful to the MT. In this version, Elihu
declares that the contest of words to be waged will be 'no holds barred'.

The difference between SS and TF can be accounted for by alternative understandings of the ductus. For SS, the model is provided by the LXX, wherein Elihu says he will not be 'awed' by Job. The reading of TF speaks of 'embarrassment' rather than 'awe', with the implication that the Three Comforters were confounded or confused by Job, but that Elihu will not be.

The issue here hinges on the interpretation of the S–H, where the root khd, 'fear', appears. It can, in derivative forms, refer to 'veneration' or to 'shamefulness'. The reading of SS picks the former, TF the latter.

FA has Elihu speaking to a different topic. In 21ac Elihu notes, or rather complains, that his listeners have nothing to say. Is this because, he asks in 21aβ, he is unworthy of notice? The verb which FA uses is from jzy, 'be content'. Clearly, if the reading is accepted without emendation, Elihu is unhappy with the silence he is encountering.

However, moving the diacritical marking of the first consonant from beneath to above yields the root xjy, 'be embarrassed'. This would bring FA's text more into line with TF and, more significantly, with the Pesh.

Verse 21b

| MT |aleza ADM  הַיְמֹרְנָה: |
| SG | הַלַּא אֲבָנָי אָבְרַהֲם אַלַּא אָבְרַהֲם הַל.a |
| SS |ولا أخذ بوجه أنسان |
| TF |ولا أخذ بوجه. الرجال: |
| FA |ولا استحي من وجه أحد * |

All the Arabic versions converge semantically, with the exception of FA, who uses this stich to gloss the second half of his 21a. It should be noted that in the MT as well, 21b can be viewed as something of a restatement of 21a.
SG's verb, from kny, 'allude', is historically cognate to the Hebrew, which means 'show deference'. The common idea between the two is 'indirectness'. However, kny has taken on a new meaning in Arabic: to honor someone by addressing them as a parent, using the kunya formula, e.g., 'X father of Y' / 'A mother of B'. This represents not so much a shift in, as a coloring of, meaning through additional cultural content. Finally, SG ends with a circumstantial accusative clause, reinforcing the basic idea of deference unshown.

SS and TF differ in one minor regard: the use of the plural in the idiomatic expression 'take someone's face', i.e., to take sides. The suggestion of Iyyād (1967), that the final member of the construct should be moved into the next verse, is unnecessary and even deleterious. Both versions are faithful to the meaning of their predecessor versions.

As we have seen in 21a, FA here is simply glossing a previous verb. Thus while his meaning in 21b differs from the other Arabic versions, it is in basic harmony with the overall drift of Elihu's arguments as expressed earlier.

Verse 22a

MT
SG
SS
TF
FA

While SG continues his discussion of deference, following the MT closely, SS and TF depart from the LXX: they omit the images of 22a and 22b in favor of using their closing stich to restate the meaning of 21b. FA, for his part, has Elihu ridicule the Three Comforters: the reason he will not be embarrassed is because he already knows what embarrassment is, i.e., their repeated imploring: thus his use of القيح,
from qyh, which in the Fourth Form means 'ooze constantly / fester'.

Verse 22b

SG, like the MT, invokes the name of the Creator. FA, however, misses this opportunity to make an explicit reference to God. This is due to his long departure from his model of the Pesh, and by being bound to the context which he has independently created over a number of verses.

At least FA is consistent, however, when it comes to the character of Elihu. Shifting to the first person plural, Elihu completes the insult broached at 22a by suggesting that the Three Comforters did not have enough patience, عزي, to complete the task of refuting Job. Indeed, Elihu declares that he himself is ready to endure in order that theological correctness might triumph. FA's caricature of Elihu as pridefully arrogant has now been clearly established.
The Early Arabic Versions of Job (first millennium C.E.):
Opening the First Divine Discourse (Job 38)

Verse 1

SG, SS, TF, and FA, obviously conscious of the pivotal nature of this narrative introduction, have taken pains, as have their predecessor versions, to stay extremely close to the intent of the MT. Yet in terms of wording, they continue in many of their typical idiosyncrasies. For example, SS and TF are identical except for disagreement regarding the title for the Deity. As for the whirlwind, for which the MT uses a single noun, only FA stands in agreement regarding usage: SG suggests a construct from 'wind' and 'great violence', while SS and TF, following the LXX, S–H, and Cp, posit two independent elements, 'cloud and whirlwind', the spelling of the second element of which betrays Middle Arabic pronunciation.

Even the main verb of the clause differs among the canonicals: in SG, God 'answered Job'; in SS and TF, God/The Lord 'said to Job'; in FA, The Lord 'addressed Job'.

While these differences carry no theological implications, it will be noted that when the Deity actually speaks in subsequent verses, in many instances there will be fewer divergences among the canonical versions, especially when the series of accusatory questions begins at v. 4. This suggests that among these Arabic
translators there is even less license when dealing with the actual, quoted words of God than in the words of other speakers or in the narrative itself. They all realized that the point of the tale was to be found in God's questions.

Just as in the opening prose section, TH adds parenthetical interpretation, which in this instance is consistent with the thought, if not the specific intent, of the MT. However, while explaining that 'clouds' from the root  qedem, 'veil', were thought to herald divine punishment, TH keeps the "Companions" of Job as continuing participants in the drama. This is contrary to the canonical versions, which center on Job and God to the exclusion of all of the other dramatis personae; TH's text must still deal with the Comforters, who are to be divinely judged.

The choice of the word for 'cloud' as 'a veil which conceals' is an apt one, given TH's grammar. The Speaker that calls out is not identified; in fact, the passive voice is used, which precludes the explicit mention of any grammatical subject. Thus the thought of 'veiling', which lies at the base of the root  qedem, is reiterated: God, hidden from the mortal world, is only identified through self-revelation; no 'narrative' can do that, theologically speaking.

Verse 2a

| MT | כִּי זָרַעְתִּי עַצָּה | כִּי זָרַעְתִּי עַצָּה |
| SG | קָמָה מִשְׁלָלָה כְּלָלָה בַּכָּלָה | קָמָה מִשְׁלָלָה כְּלָלָה בַּכָּלָה |
| SS | מִנִּיהָ הַכְּלָלָה | מִנִּיהָ הַכְּלָלָה |
| TF | מִנִּיהָ הַכְּלָלָה | מִנִּיהָ הַכְּלָלָה |
| FA | מִנִּיהָ הַכְּלָלָה | מִנִּיהָ הַכְּלָלָה |
| TH | יָא אִבָּעַר. אִמָּלֵךְ אֶלָּא. בְּלָא עָלָּם | יָא אִבָּעַר. אִמָּלֵךְ אֶלָּא. בְּלָא עָלָּם |

While the canonical versions rely upon the narrator rather than an explicit reference by God as to who is being addressed, TH has God mention Job by name. This puts

387 As usual, FA provides more exceptions here than the others.
the mortal and his Lord in something of a more intimate relationship than is the case in the canonical versions. This closeness will be confirmed by the following stich in TH, where Job is clearly favored.

Among the canonical versions, the translation of the MT's מַעַשְׂרָא provides the most interest, with SG's being the only version to duplicate the MT's use of a participle, though, through the use of the imperfect, SS and TF, which are identical, approximate the participle well. FA, however, prefers a prepositional phrase in the negative. He also conflates the two negatives in this verse, telescoping 'obscuring counsel' and 'lack of knowledge', thus once again demonstrating a linguistic, and therefore a theological, independence.

Verse 2b

MT

SG

SS

TF

FA

TH

While the canonical versions persist in their accusatory tone, TH continues in a friendlier voice regarding the relationship between the Creator and His creature. Yet TH makes it clear that there is no possibility of a level playing field, which the Job of the canonical versions has been seeking, between Creator and creature. This is demonstrated by the use of the root \( dn\)w, 'con)descend', which tempers the adverbially expressed proximity of God to one of His prophets, which has remained uninterrupted throughout the drama. Indeed, the root \( zyl\) expresses discontinuity, but this verb is generally negated in Arabic, as it is here, in which instance the negation is achieved using a classicism.

SG is as brief as the MT; FA is also brief, though for a different reason,
completing the thought of 2a rather than adding anything new. SS and TF, however, follow the lead of the LXX and S-H, providing extra material while displaying a small degree of independence from each other at the close of the verse.

SS uses a bodily metaphor, 'his mouth', where none exists in the MT. The LXX does, however, contain a reference to 'his heart', which is reflected in the S-H. This is reproduced in SS and in TF; perhaps the former felt the need for another bodily image to be used in parallel. Since both the heart and the mouth can be seen as the source and/or repository of 'words', then SS' imagery is understandable.

TF does not follow SS' lead, but stays closer to the LXX, and thus to the MT, in speaking of 'gathering up words ... to hide from Me'.

Verse 3a

| MT | אֲרוֹרִיָּהּ הַנֵּבֶר הַלַּיְלָה | ילָּאָנוּ הַנֵּבֶר הַלַּיְלָה |
|---|---|
| SG | יֶלְקָנַר הַנֵּבֶר הַלַּיְלָה |
| SS | שֵׂדֶחֹוּק מַיָּל הָרָגֶל | שֵׁדֶחֹוּק מַיָּל הָרָגֶל |
| TF | שֵׂדֶחֹוּק מַיָּל הָרָגֶל |
| FA | |
| TH | * |

The thought patterns of all the versions, both canonical and non-canonical, are clearly in agreement, but this stich clearly shows the structural and linguistic affinity of the Jewish and Christian accounts over against TH. For example, only FA and TH use the Arabic cognate to the MT לָכֵר. And, while all the versions rely on the root שָׁדַד, 'gird', only the canonical versions agree that it is a portion of the body, rather than a garment, that is the object of that verb. The Christian versions agree with TH on the use of the preposition مثل, and all the canonicals save FA employ the root ḫqw for the portion of the body that is to be fortified.
TH's version is much wordier, making explicit in some instances matters which the canonical versions assume: Job is commanded to stand, show courage, to speak and defend himself, all this before doing any 'girding' or being 'mighty' and 'like unto' God.

This verbosity and repetitiveness are put to good use, given the friendlier tone noted earlier in God's address to Job in TH. Whereas the canonical versions have short, stinging commands and sharp rebukes, TH pictures God as being supportive and encouraging to one of His prophets. To be sure, a theophany in all three religious traditions is an occasion for fear, but it is TH which at this point says, in effect, 'Be not afraid'.

Verse 3b

At this point TH digresses. His additions, however, are very much in the spirit and the vocabulary of the rest of the theophany as found in the canonical versions (chapters 38–41). Indeed, there are references to subduing beasts both natural (the lion) and mythological (the griffin) with nose-rings and bridles, reminiscent of Chapter 40 in the MT. Obviously there has been something of a conflation in the Muslim version of the story, the consistency of which with the canonical version is...
surpassed, perhaps, only by the opening prose section of the Book of Job.\(^{388}\)

At the digression one still finds very much the same spirit of encouragement and friendly supportiveness described hitherto. With the use of the root \(xs\), 'contend, litigate' for the third time since the theophany began in place of the canonic's less legalistic terminology, TH shows an understanding of the Job of the canonic as one who repeatedly called for legal action against his Creator. This somewhat surprising affinity is displayed despite such words not being found in the mouth of the Job of TH's account. Clearly there is implicit knowledge of the canonical tradition of Job which comes to the surface from time to time in TH.

Among the canonical versions, structural and lexical convergences are all the more apparent when viewed over against TH: the Jewish and Christian texts all consist of three words or less, with FA, uncharacteristically, being the most reticent. These versions also are unanimous in the use of the Arabic cognate to the MT's \(s'l\), 'ask', which has no parallel whatsoever in TH.

Verse 4a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>אֲֽלֵֽפָ֑הּ חַ֨רְצַ֣מ הָֽאָֽמִ֑רֲתָ֤</th>
<th>אֲֽלֵֽפָ֑הּ חַ֨רְצַ֣מ הָֽאָֽמִ֑רֲתָ֤</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td></td>
<td>אֲֽלֵֽפָ֑הּ חַ֨רְצַ֣מ הָֽאָֽמִ֑רֲתָ֤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>אֲֽלֵֽפָ֑הּ חַ֨רְצַ֣מ הָֽאָֽמִ֑רֲתָ֤</td>
<td>אֲֽלֵֽפָ֑הּ חַ֨רְצַ֣מ הָֽאָֽמִ֑רֲתָ֤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>אֲֽלֵֽפָ֑הּ חַ֨רְצַ֣מ הָֽאָֽמִ֑רֲתָ֤</td>
<td>אֲֽלֵֽפָ֑הּ חַ֨רְצַ֣מ הָֽאָֽמִ֑רֲתָ֤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>אֲֽלֵֽפָ֑הּ חַ֨רְצַ֣מ הָֽאָֽמִ֑רֲתָ֤</td>
<td>אֲֽלֵֽפָ֑הּ חַ֨רְצַ֣מ הָֽאָֽמִ֑רֲתָ֤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>אֲֽלֵֽפָ֑הּ חַ֨רְצַ֣מ הָֽאָֽמִ֑רֲתָ֤</td>
<td>אֲֽלֵֽפָ֑הּ חַ֨רְצַ֣מ הָֽאָֽמִ֑רֲתָ֤</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With his digression complete, TH rejoins, to a remarkable degree, the canonical

\(^{388}\) While this study focuses only on Chapter 1 of the MT's opening prose section, a reading of Chapter 2 reveals continued points of the contact between the MT and TH, most especially in terms of the nature of the second agreement between God and Satan, Job's physical afflictions, and the arrival of the Three Comforters. Only in the role of Job's wife is there an important divergence: TH describes her as consistently supportive of her husband, an implicit role model for Muslim women.
versions in the series of relentless divine questions and commands issued to Job. Similarities of structure and lexical choice are striking now, if only in contrast to their strong divergences hitherto.

FA, arguably the most independent of the canonicals in this stich, has a number of points of linguistic contact with TH: the use of 'ss, 'establish', in the form of a noun rather than a verb, and the inclusion of the root *xlq, 'create'. TH displays complete independence, however, in his use of an extra verb, from *wֹד, 'place', and his introduction of the prepositional phrase, 'in relation to me', as part of the opening interrogatives. This usage will be repeated extensively as the theophany continues.

**Verse 4b**

| MT | נָאָדֵד בְּרָאָמְתָּה בְּנֵיהֶם: |
| SG | אֲמַרְרֵךְ בְּרָאָמְתָּה וְהָפָךְ נָאָדֵד |
| SS | אֲמַרְרֵךְ אַנָּא עָנַּד מַעְרָכִּת הָפָךְ |
| TF | אֲמַרְרֵךְ אַנָּא עָנַּד מַעְרָכִּת הָפָךְ |
| FA | אֲמַרְרֵךְ בֶּלֹכְכָּא אַנָּא עָנַּד עָנָּד |

*While TH is temporarily silent here and in 5a, the canonicals continue their close relationship. Only FA conflates two lexical items related to 'knowledge' and 'understanding' with a root not found in the other Christian and Jewish versions at this point: 'lm, 'discern'.

**Verse 5a**

| MT | מְרַפְּשָׁתֵן מְפַרְּשָׁתֵן כִּי חֶרֶץ |
| SG | מַלְאָא צִירֵךְ מְפַרְּשָׁתֵן מְפַרְּשָׁתֵן |
| SS | מַלְאָא צִירֵךְ מְפַרְּשָׁתֵן מְפַרְּשָׁתֵן |
| TF | מַלְאָא צִירֵךְ מְפַרְּשָׁתֵן מְפַרְּשָׁתֵן |
| FA | מַלְאָא צִירֵךְ מְפַרְּשָׁתֵן מְפַרְּשָׁתֵן |

*From which you have not been numbered, *|

**309**
The classic characteristics of the canonical versions remain apparent: although SG is a bit wordier than the MT, he is still concerned to follow the structure of the Hebrew. FA, following the Pesh, gives a version close in meaning to that of SG, although his vocabulary does not always conform in terms of roots and parts of speech. Indeed, FA's syntax here is also typical in that he uses a relative clause, thereby lessening the structural independence of 5a from 4b. SS and TF are identical, following the lead of the LXX and S–H: their use of pronouns helps tie this question to the previous verse, and gives the impression of relative brevity. No theological divergences resulting from language and usage are apparent.

Verse 5b

| MT | אֵין מֵרֶם הַלִּיָּה בּוֹ | אֵין מֵרֶם הַלִּיָּה בּוֹ |
| SG | או מִן וְעָלִיָּהּ הַלִּיָּה בּוֹ | או מִן וְעָלִיָּהּ הַלִּיָּה בּוֹ |
| SS | או מִן וְעָלִיָּהּ הַלִּיָּה בּוֹ | או מִן וְעָלִיָּהּ הַלִּיָּה בּוֹ |
| TF | * | * |
| FA | וַמִּתְגַּלְגְּלָהּ הַטַּרְיָא וַאַסְלָּהָ | והֵלְעָמְתָּ בַּגִּיוֹן מְכֹדָּרָּהָ |
| TH | כִּפְנֵיהֶּם | כִּפְנֵיהֶּם |

SG adds an extra prepositional phrase, 'like unto Me', thus answering the stich's basic question. This occurs after correctly discerning the intent of the MT's קַח, 'measuring line'.

The difference between SS (who has correctly understood the intent of the MT) and TF stems from a single alif tawila if one accepts an emendation of TF's الحيط. Yet an unemended root hwf 'set boundaries', rather than xyt 'measure', may actually have been intended, because the root hwf is used for 'the ocean', which is seen as surrounding, and thus setting the boundaries to, the land.

FA's Arabic is problematic, given his apparent attempt to find a cognate to SG's التري (ʽamputated limbʼ), which obviously does not fit the
context. However, two emendations are possible. First, one could simply remove the final consonant, bringing FA into complete agreement with SG. Otherwise, an emendation of ýt: Jl to L;., 41, '(moist / tillable) soil' would be consistent not only with rules of pronunciation and orthography, but also with the meaning of the following verb, 'till', which carries a pronoun suffix whose antecedent must be feminine. While theرى is grammatically masculine, the pronunciation of the ending's alif maqsura can be easily confused with the conventional marker of the feminine.

If these changes are accepted, then FA's stich reads: 'And Who threw upon it (i.e., the land or terrain) the moist soil and cultivated it?' While such a reading is unprecedented, it is certainly consistent with the role of God on the third day of creation as found in the Book of Genesis.

The interrogative structure in TH, where God asks 'Do you know that I...', differs from that of the canonical versions, where the question posed is 'Who...'. In effect, God's question in TH contains the answer to the equivalent question posed in the Christian translations (with SG's version providing the answer separately, as noted above). While there is little difference in general meaning or in theology among any of these approaches, the shift in perspective as found in TH is arresting, especially since it is repeated in the ensuing stichs.

The addition of an extra question by TH here, "Or wast thou passing by its borders with Me" (p. 153), though probably due to conflation, transposition, or a similar phenomenon, is not inconsistent with the tenor of the series of questions as a whole.

Verse 6a

| MT |accumulated from the earth |
| SG |accumulated from the earth |
| SS |وَبَعْدَ ذَلِكُمْ خَلِيْقَتُهَا |
SG adds a subordinate clause in which God almost mockingly goads Job: "if perchance thou dost know" (p. 384). There is no obvious origin for this phrase, but it is certainly consistent with the timbre of the theophany here.

SS and TF, once again identical, ignore the LXX as well as S–H, inserting a grammatical passive where none is found in the other canonicals, although TH hints at such (see 6b).

Now it is FA’s turn to have his reading of a divine question contain the answer for that of the other Arabic versions, his extraneous prepositional phrase, ***على الماء***, anticipating a theme of v. 8.

TH reverses the two halves of the questions of v. 6. This is readily apparent in that he shares, with the canonical versions, a root of broad semantic range: **zwy**, 'contract / remove / hide' at the end of the second half of this divine query. The noun is often found as the second term of constructs, including 'cornerstone' as found SG, SS, and TF. Like FA, however, TH employs the plural, to which a possessive suffix is added, yielding 'its corners', a reference to the (four) corners of the earth.

---

**Verse 6b**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>SPATHA 2AKIM PUNA</th>
<th>SPATHA 2AKIM PUNA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>2AKIM NAL INN 2AKIM 2AKIM</td>
<td>2AKIM NAL INN 2AKIM 2AKIM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>2AKIM NAL INN 2AKIM 2AKIM</td>
<td>2AKIM NAL INN 2AKIM 2AKIM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>2AKIM NAL INN 2AKIM 2AKIM</td>
<td>2AKIM NAL INN 2AKIM 2AKIM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>2AKIM NAL INN 2AKIM 2AKIM</td>
<td>2AKIM NAL INN 2AKIM 2AKIM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>2AKIM NAL INN 2AKIM 2AKIM</td>
<td>2AKIM NAL INN 2AKIM 2AKIM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

389 These two predecessor versions do not agree between themselves, either.
SG’s verb, from the Fourth Form of lqy, ‘cast (down)’, has already been encountered in FA’s version of 5b. Given FA’s difficulties in that stich, the question arises as to whether FA’s use of lqy there was the result of transposition or other confusion with 6b.

However, the root used by FA to express the verb in question is one that is shared with all the other Arabic script versions, canonical and non-canonical, at this point: w dq, ‘put down, place’.

SS and TF continue as exact matches. In a departure from the LXX and S-H, they make explicit what has been implied in TH’s version of 6a and FA’s 6b: that there is a ‘four-fold’ quality accompanying the root zwy, whether that is understood as ‘cornerstone’ as in SG, SS, and TF, or as the ‘corners of the earth’ as in FA and TH.

FA’s usage regarding zwy has been noted under 6b’s discussion of TH, which it matches over against the other canonical versions. Yet FA’s affinity with TH is not complete, since his reference to ‘mountains’ obviously has points of contact with the ‘cornerstone’ of the other canonical versions. Indeed, FA’s version stands roughly equidistant from the other canonical versions on the one hand and TH on the other, reading ‘Who placed the mountains in its (four) corners’.

**Verse 7a**

| MT |  
|---|---|
| br¬‘ira hakki bi-hakki |  
| SG |  
|  lam tusqra kawn bannak lam manukhu bennak al-‘asam |  
| SS |  
|  
| TF |  
|  
| FA |  
|  
| TH |  
|  

The common reference to ‘stars’ or ‘planets’ keeps the Arabic versions from diverging entirely. But before TH addresses this issue, his text contains three extra
questions (the third of which is compounded) concerning the placement of the earth upon the waters and the suspension of the heavens.

SG must resort to circumlocution in order to avoid any implication of semi–divine beings or the personification of inanimates. The result is to do violence to the imagery of the MT, even if its theology is protected.\textsuperscript{390}

The relative brevity of SS and TF is due to the paraphrastic work of the LXX, S–H, and Cp. There is, therefore, no reference to the type of stars, whether 'of the morning' (MT), or 'of time' (SG), nor do they 'cry / clamor'. Thus, for different reasons from those of SG, SS and TF are devoid of the imagery found in the MT.

FA connects the subject of this stich by means of yet another relative clause in a chain linking back to 5a. For all of this structural tightness, however, FA does have a problem following the intent of the MT: the adverb 'together' or 'all at once' is in reference to the creation of the stars, whereas in the MT and SG this applies to their clamoring.

This is perhaps not an accident, however, especially since FA's erstwhile model, the Pesh; contains no adverb here whatsoever. The reference to having created the 'stars of clamor' all at once, is consistent with a theology, enunciated by SG,\textsuperscript{391} which posits a 'big bang' creation rather than one that took place gradually over time, as depicted by a literal interpretation of Genesis. It is unclear whether FA subscribed to such a theological stance, but his language would suggest at least an affinity for such a train of thought.

If the canonicals display a pronounced measure of divergence, TH clearly has another perspective on the stars, not entirely inconsistent with that of SS and TF: TH's stars do not shout, nor are they personified. They simply provide another example through which God demonstrates His wisdom, which is so overwhelming

\textsuperscript{390} For a full discussion, see Goodman (1988), p. 387, n. 11.
\textsuperscript{391} Ibid.
that it is different qualitatively, not just quantitatively, from that of Job.

This theme follows on from two questions appearing in the text of TH which are not matched in the canonicals: "In obedience to thee does the water bear up the earth or in thy wisdom is the water upon the earth as a covering?" (p. 153). A shift from God's 'power' to His 'wisdom' occurs, while sustaining the theme of the 'waters' found at 6a in FA and possibly in TF at 5b, depending whether or not an emendation is posited. This theme will shortly follow in the other canonicals.

Verse 7b

MT

SG

SS

TF

FA

Among the canonicals, the Arabic script versions are intent to discuss why, or rather 'for whom', the angels were shouting their praise. Whereas FA uses a third person pronoun to agree with his previous string of relative pronouns, SS and TF have God make personal reference to Himself as the recipient of this glorification. This pronominal emphasis is further underlined by the reference to 'My angels'. Thus God in SS and TF identifies Himself as the answer to the rhetorical questions of SG and FA, the texts of which do not provide much occasion for remark here.

TH continues to insert extra lines, this time concerning the raising of the firmament. It is apparent that, even if TH is not following the canonicals stich-by-stich, he is concerned to use the Genesis creation theme as the model for

---

SS and TF, following the LXX and S–H, also add an extra prepositional phrase to underscore the noisiness of the praise.
his divine questions. The question is whether this suggests a knowledge of Genesis itself, or whether there is a more Islamic source for TH.

While this is not the place to discuss Islamic origins and their roots in, and reliance upon, predecessor faiths, it will simply be noted that the Qurʾān, for example, contains little about the Creation that resembles the Genesis story except to mention that it happened in six days. Yet the Qurʾān assumes in its readers or listeners a knowledge of matters religious, including cosmogenesis, that goes beyond what is in its own pages. So, it would not be unreasonable to believe that TH knew well the scriptures of the Jews. Indeed, the author of TH himself mentions that the (supposed) source for his version of Job is a certain Wahb, whom Macdonald (1898) describes, along with his co-religionist Kaʾb, as "Jews of al-Yaman, who embraced Islam, and through whom seems to have passed most of the Jewish material that has been taken up in the Muslim tradition." Macdonald, however, goes on to say that Wahb and Kaʾb, "so far as we can judge ... were liars of quite astonishing capabilities."

Yet perhaps is it not surprising that at the point now identified as 7b in the canonicals, where TH is given the opportunity to discuss the angels, a signal focus of belief in Islam, the author of TH fails to mention them at all. This is further evidence for the use of the Genesis 1 theme as a possible guide in TH: the angels are not mentioned there, and so the author does not mention them here.

Verse 8a

MT

316

393 Cf. 7:54, 32:4, etc.
394 Of course, in Islam the Qurʾān is comparatively dwarfed in volume by the hadith and other sources, many of which make extensive reference to the Creation. Cf., inter alia, Saḥīh al-Bukhārī.
395 P. 145, n. 6.
Among the canonicals, the Arabic script versions are virtually identical. SG stands out, however, partly due to a lengthiness occasioned by his inclination for expressing certain poetic images in language that avoids any possible literal reading. Thus he speaks of the sea 'as though' it had gates or doors. In ANE thought the Sea was often personified as the (semi-)divine figure of Chaos, and while it is clear that 'persons' do not have 'doors', SG is very cautious in his wording when it comes to such mythic figures. This caution is well taken, given the imagery of the next stich.

Once again, TH betrays possible influence from Genesis by inserting a question concerning differentiating night from day before proceeding on to discuss the sea in concert with the canonicals.

Verse 8b

The MT refers to the 'womb' of the sea, from which the waters are prevented from gushing forth. The imagery is not only of natural forces, but of the birthing process. It is the latter that SG is most keen to avoid, and he does so by resorting to a fuller

396 Though in light of 8b, the image is open to sexual interpretation.
emphasis on the former, describing the sea as 'leaving its depths'. The power of
God is thus well illustrated, and all anthropomorphism neatly avoided in a manner
that is faithful to scripture, at least in part.

If SG is intent to limit the birth imagery, SS and TF reinforce it. The root
mxd refers to the labor of childbirth, thus complementing the stich's reference to 'its
mother's womb'. The addition of an adverb, 'gushingly', ties in with imagery of
natural forces; its equivalent is found not only in the LXX, but also in S-H.

FA, like SG, avoids any bodily imagery: however, FA refers to the power of
God not only in the creation of the sea's boundaries, but also as the agent Who
brought the waters forth from their sources. Thus both of these translators speak of
the depths of the sea, but to different ends.

TH is careful to treat both images, from the world of the physical sciences as
well as that of biology. Finding these two virtually exclusive, he treats them in two
separate questions. For the first, he shares a root, hdd, 'bound', with FA, while for
the second he uses the cognate root for the MT's rhm, 'womb'. There is obviously a
strong intent to keep to the canonical understanding of the tale at this point.

After this point, however, TH's text pays decreasing attention to the canonical
versions. This is not to say that it abandons the structure of rhetorical questions
levelled at Job by God. But the themes raised by TH no longer noticeably track
those of the MT, though on occasion the two converge for a stich or two. Even so,
the order of TH's topics shows increasing confusion with respect to the canonical
versions. Roughly, his topics now include the waters of the heavens, thunder and
lightning, and then unnamed phenomena 'beyond' the air. Returning to earth, there
is then a consideration of living elements of the created order, including flora,
fauna, humankind, and angelic beings.
Verse 9a

Once again the canonical versions converge, while TH makes no use of the MT’s imagery here at all; if the theory concerning Genesis as a possible source model for the questions is correct, then the silence of TH here would be explained, since ‘clouds’ are not part of that tradition.

The canonical versions are all fairly terse, and the Arabic script versions among them are especially close to each other, if one accepts that TF’s divergences are due to scribal error.

Over against the Arabic script versions, SG has chosen the root ǧmm, ‘veil’, for clouds. This root, already found at verse 1 in TH, is poetically more adept than the other canonicals’ use of the more generic word from shb,\(^{397}\) since the clouds serve as clothing which veils the earth.

As it stands, TF reads: ‘I made for us from it [i.e., the sea water] clouds’. While this has a certain logic of its own, an emendation to read identically to SS would not be difficult to defend from scriptorial and semantic points of view.

Verse 9b

\(^{397}\)The relationship between the root and ‘clouds’ is rather complicated.
The compactness of v. 9 continues in this stich. All the Arabic canonicals share the word 'fog' from the root *dbb*, 'keep close to the ground', which in the Fourth Form yields 'be foggy'. Agreement on the subject, however, does not carry over to the verb: SG contains no verb whatsoever, depending upon the previous stich in this regard. He reads, then 'the fog is its [i.e., the sea's] covering'. SS and TF have the root *lff*, 'envelop', while FA, like SG, uses a root *str*, 'veil', as the basis for a noun, thus: 'the fog is its veiling'.

Verse 10a

Divine utterances continue in rapid-fire terseness in the canonical versions; even FA, which is the longest, divides this passage into two stichs to preserve structural brevity.

The MT is problematic, reading something on the order of 'and I broke upon it [i.e., the sea] my boundary'. The major difficulty lies with the root *hqq*, 'decree', of which the noun *ḥqr* has a wide semantic range.

The Tg, sensing the verbal meaning 'decree', translates the noun as "my ordinance". This reading may help explain SG's choice of *ṣrt*, which not only means 'make a condition, stipulate', but also which carries the meaning of 'make an incision', matching another portion of the semantic range of the Hebrew.

(Masterfully, SG resists the urge to use the Arabic root cognate with the Hebrew, since the difference in meaning is not insignificant). Thus SG reads 'And I broke upon it my stipulation'. This, however, does not make for clarity, even when it is realized that 'break' can often mean 'subdue', *i.e.*, as in the sense of 'breaking a
horse', and 'conditions' or 'ordinances' refer to limits, as the context suggests.

The reading of the Arabic script versions, however, especially the virtually identical texts of SS and TF, is unequivocal. SS ignores the concept of 'break' as found in the MT, following the LXX's 'establish' and the S-H's 'place'. The direct object, from hdd, 'restrict, confine, impede', renders a clear translation: 'I placed boundaries upon it'. While the difference between SS and TF is confined to a single letter, that of the pronominal suffix to the preposition 'upon', the theological difference is great. SS understands God to be talking about the sea and its limits. TF, however, has God addressing Job directly, speaking of Job's limitations. While context shows that SS is correct, the theology of TF at this point is not inconsistent with that of the theophany in general.

FA adds an extra prefatory phrase here, reading 'I adopted a covenant'. While this preserves the mildly legalistic imagery found in the MT and thus SG, from the root meaning 'decree', this phrase is more important in that it represents an attempt to harmonize, or rather to interrelate, the words of God in Job with the actions and promises of God in Genesis.

It has already been noted, especially in connection with the discussion of TH, that the Genesis theme cannot be far from the mind of the writer of this section of Job. Here, we have a reference to the Noah story, the end of which may be seen as an occasion of a second creation. Then, in dénouement, God covenants never again to destroy the creation by flood; this fits in remarkably well with the present idea of making for the waters a boundary.

Verse 10b

| MT | אַשֵּׁם בֶּרֶךְ וּרְחֵם | ואַשֵּׁם בְּרִי וְרַחֵם |
| SG | וַיָּקָחָה חֵרֹת לְתַנֵּא וּמְצָאִים | וַיֶּלֶדֶת עַל אֶבוֹבֵי אֶגוֹל |
| SS | וַיִּשְׂרֲאֵל חֵרֹת לְתַנֵּא וּמְצָאִים | וַגִּלְגֹּל עַל אֶבוֹבֵי אֶגוֹלִים |
If there is any lack of clarity in the meaning of 10a as found in the MT or SG, the contextualization provided by 10b clarifies matters somewhat: while the root *nfr* generally refers to carpentry, SG has in mind a meaning related to the bolts and locks with which any cabinet maker must concern himself. Then, using the same vocabulary item as at 8a, he faithfully completes the image of the MT, while being careful to make explicit the poetic nature of the image by adding the prepositional phrase, 'As though' at the beginning of the stich.

SS and TF are not concerned with poetic hypotheticals. God simply states that He made for it (the sea) doors and locks. The reason for reversing the order of these latter two items vis-à-vis the MT is presumably due to the order in which a woodworker would accomplish his task. In any case, this order is also found in the LXX, whereas the S-H preserves the order of the MT.

FA represents, in effect, a blending of the two approaches of SG on the one hand and SS and TF on the other: with SG, FA adds an extra preposition, 'as though', at the beginning of the stich; with the other Arabic script versions, he shares roots and vocabulary, with the exception of the verb, which he omits altogether.

**Verse 11a**

| MT | ואמר תרצהה תהא ולא תעברה |
| SG | acab kalot laה אלא התנה תאית ולא חוד |
| SS | وقالت اليها هنا اسمع ولا تتعداه إلا محك |
| TF | وقالت اليها هنا انتهى ولا تتعداه إلا عليك |
| FA | وقالت له ان ينتهي الى حدوده ولا يجوزها *

The versions only disagree on the verbs for 'go' and 'trespass / exceed', with SG using *zyd*, 'expand', SS and TF *'dw*, 'extend beyond / cross / overstep', and FA *jwz*,
'pass'. None of these differences has overt theological implications.

Verse 11b

The mention of 'waves' in this stich provides the various translators with a poetic occasion to go beyond the MT, and the other predecessor versions.

SG sees the bounds set by God as weakening the power of the waves. While the difference from the MT's idea of the waves breaking against the bounds may seem trifling, the poetry of SG has clearly been influenced by the Tg, which speaks of the waves "drying up". On a more personal note, SG ignores the occurrence of מַצְבָּה in the MT, which not only means 'pride / majesty', but which was SG's formal title as Chief of the Babylonian academy at Sura. One cannot be sure that FA would have missed such an opportunity!

SS and TF introduce a new image, entirely consistent with the picture of the waves of the sea: using the root drb, 'beat', the picture becomes one of the constant rolling of the waves against the bounds set by God.

FA, after an insertion of a restatement of 11a, also shares with SS and TF the idea of the rolling waves, doing so through the use of the root dwr, 'rotate, circle' combined with a repetition of his verb, found at the close of 11a, from jwz, 'pass'.

Verse 12a

398 The English term 'breakers' comes to mind.
None of the versions deals with the MT with anything approaching its brevity, combining its three basic elements, time, command, morning, in different ways.

SG provides the most idiosyncratic reading. Ignoring the alternative model of the Tg, he strikes out on his own, intent to make it plain that the idea of there being a creator other than God could never be entertained, not even hypothetically. Therefore, instead of the bald question of the MT, asking whether Job himself issued the command 'Let there be light', God asks whether Job was present to witness that cosmic event.

None of the Arabic script versions has the theological problem which SG's text implies, and so Job is indeed asked whether or not he was, in effect, the Creator. SS and TF, which are relatively brief, track each other except for the stich's closing adjective. They imply in their verb from rtb, 'arrange', that what is being discussed is the ordering of creation rather than the issuance of commands to create ex nihilo. Since both concepts of creation can be found in scripture, sometimes within the same passage, it is unclear whether the theological departure in evidence here is deliberate or not.

Despite displaying a marked difference in vocabulary and word order from the other Arabic script versions, FA, in the end, finds himself in the same semantic neighborhood as they are.

Verse 12b

MT

399 Cf. Genesis 1:2-3; where v. 2 implies that an ordering of elements is necessary, while v. 3 contains a command to create light ex nihilo.
As in the previous stich, SG departs boldly from the MT, resulting in a theological shift. The term in question is the MT's שָׁרַד, which in and of itself is not problematic. However, as will be seen in the discussion of SS and TF, the tradition of the LXX was to associate that term in similar contexts with the figure of Lucifer. To avoid the slightest hint of this, SG substitutes for רָאָב an ironic term, אָרוּם, 'blackness', unattested in the Tg or any other predecessor version. 'Blackness' not only serves as an antithetical poetic parallel to 12a's אלנום, 'the light', but in so doing SG removes a semi-mythological figure from his translation.

SS and TF are clearly dependent upon the LXX here with the reference to 'brilliance' from zhr, 'be radiant', which stands for ἀσωφόρος, 'morning star', or 'Lucifer'. These two Arabic versions, however, ignore that derivative implication. Additionally, both also part company with the LXX on another question regarding the morning star: the LXX speaks of the placement of the morning star, whereas SS and TF focus on the timing of its appearance. In this, they are unique among all the versions under consideration, and thus demonstrate their close relationship. Yet despite their similarities, SS and TF differ regarding the participles with which they close the verse. SS' reading is evidence not only of hyper-classicism, but also of a scribal error regarding the pronominal suffix; thus TF's reading is correct in both instances.

FA's translation is virtually synonymous with the intent of the MT except that he does not understand the opening verb to be causative. This follows the reading of the Pesh.
Once again, SG departs from the brevity of the MT, since theological misunderstandings might otherwise result. The picture is one of ultimate divine control over 'the end of the earth' as well as its inhabitants. According to SG, it is inconceivable that God would ask whether or not Job himself has such power. Thus, SG's text has God ask whether Job can comprehend such power.

What SG's Voice from the whirlwind cannot ask, SS not only asks, but augments the nature of the powers in question: it is not only a matter of seizing the earth, but also its winds. This added element is missing from TF, as well as from the LXX, S-H, and Cp; yet, it is not inconsistent with the image of omnipotence being fashioned.

FA's Voice from the whirlwind raises the issue of Job's powers explicitly, adding the italicized portion of: 'Are you capable of grasping the ends of the earth?'

Linguistically, the Arabic versions all use constructs for 'ends of the earth', but with the exception of SS and TF they fail to use common vocabulary for the constructs' first element. In SG, the root knf, 'fence in', serves as the head of the construct; his phrase can thus be read as 'wings of the earth'.⁴⁰⁰ What is being grasped in SS and TF are also the 'wings' of the earth, though the root involved is a different one: jnh, 'list to one side'. FA, however, uses the root trf, 'be newly acquired', presumably as in 'an offshoot'. The noun serving as the first element in

---

⁴⁰⁰ Goodman (1988) has "corners of the earth"; however, it should be noted that the root for 'corner' here is not the same as that of 6b's נָתָן קָנָה.
the construct phrase, then, is 'border / outermost point / extremity'.

Verse 13b

| MT | הַגְּדוֹלָהּ הַרְשִׁידָהּ מָצְרָה: |
| SG | הָרֹאֵשׁ הַרְשִׁידָהּ אֲלַפָּאֲלָם: |
| SS | וְתַגְּדוֹלָהּ הַרְשִׁידָהּ |
| TF | וְתַגְּדוֹלָהּ הַרְשִׁידָהּ |
| FA | *تقدَرَ أَنْ تَنْحَبَ عَنْهَا المَنَاِفِقِينَ |

The verbs in SG, SS, and TF are the same, and FA's difference from them is minimal. Of more interest is the characterization of 'the wicked', where all the Arabic versions adopt words common to the vocabulary of Islam.

SG chooses to call the wicked 'oppressors', while SS and TF prefer 'infidels', and FA adopts 'hypocrites'. Perhaps not too much should be made of an Islamic aspect of the translations, since such a basic category as 'the wicked' can easily be found in various religious traditions.

Verse 14a

| MT | כָּלְּחֹלָהּ חַסֶּרָהּ חָהָה |
| SG | כָּלְּחֹלָהּ חַסֶּרָהּ אֲלַפָּאֲלָם |
| SS | אוּ אָמַר אֵלֶּה טֵינִים מִן אֶרֶץ וּגְלָבָתָם מִן חֲיָוָן |
| TF | אוּ אָמַר אֵלֶּה טֵינִים מִן אֶרֶץ וּגְלָבָתָם מִן חֲיָוָן |
| FA | *وتְסַלֶּב אֶֽגְּלֹ֑ם אֱלֹֽמִּים אֱלֹֽמִּים |

Commentators have spent much time and energy on this stich, with Dhorme (1967) expressing the modern consensual view thus: "the awakening of nature in the first rays of dawn, the objects then assuming their distinct contours, like clay under a seal". None of the Arabic versions come close to such an understanding. Indeed, they diverge so much one from another that virtually the only common element

---

401 P. 581.
among them is the reference to clay, which all the Arabic versions derive from ṭyn, 'plaster with mud'.

Goodman (1988)⁴⁰² notes that SG argues elsewhere against theories of the transmigration of the soul, which the MT may be misconstrued as supporting here. Thus SG’s translation is careful to note that this stich does not refer to the ‘turning’ of the soul, but to the ‘overthrow’ of ‘clay / earth’.

SS and TF, dependent upon the LXX and S–H, inaugurate a new question for Job, this one regarding the creation of animal forms from the clay of the earth.

FA uses the same verbal root as SG, qlb, ‘turn / overthrow’, but uses it to describe the punishment of the wicked ones of 13b, whose bodies are rendered into clay once they have been expelled from, or ‘shaken out’ of, the earth.

Verse 14b

While SS and TF continue to diverge markedly from the other Arabic versions due to influence from the LXX and S–H, they find an echo in TH, who poses a vaguely equivalent question immediately after that of v. 19, just before that of v. 22. As for SG and FA, their only real point of contact is found in the vocabulary item for ‘clothing’.

SG, having altered the previous stich to make a theological point, tries to realign his version with the MT, his problem lying in the interrelationship between

⁴⁰² P. 388, n. 13.
'clothing' on the one hand and 'clay' and 'the wicked' on the other. He does so by simply dressing the wicked ignominiously, thus making the best of a difficult linguistic situation.

SS and TF, having asked Job whether he created animals from clay, drive their point home by asking whether it was he who gave the beasts their gift of speech, for which SS reads 'talk', from klm, 'utter words', while TF is even more generous in his description of God's gift to the animals, using the root ntq, 'articulate'.

FA has trouble here, his translating reading thus: 'they stand like clothes'. This is far from the Pesh, which speaks of the wicked, now turned to clay, being discarded into heaps. It also bears little resemblance to the Cp, which reads: 'and placed him (a living creature) speaking upon the earth'. Neither is the intent of FA, whose wording and sense are puzzling. The presence of the root qwm, however, provides a possible point of contact with the theology discussed at 14a which SG was trying to combat: that of transmigration of souls. While there is no hint of that in FA, qwm has as one of its many meanings 'be resurrected'. As a Christian who may have been intent on demonstrating that doctrines such as the resurrection of the dead are found in the Old Testament, FA may be reading such evidence into his text.

Verse 15a

MT דַּעְסָן מֵרֵמָה אָוָה
SG לִכְךָ מֵרֵמָה מִן אָלֶּפָּלים נְרוֹתָה
SS או אַנְתָּ נָזָעְתָּ הַנּוֹר מֵנִּקְפָּר
TF או אַנְתָּ נָזָעְתָּ הַנּוֹר מֵנִּקְפָּר
FA תַּמִּרְנָה הָאָבָתָה נְורָהֶם *

For the verb of this stich, SG and FA select 'deprive' from the cognate to the MT's root mn', whereas SS and TF choose the virtually synonymous nz', 'remove / strip
away / divest'. The subject of the verb shows other variations among the Arabic versions: SG, SS and TF are consistent in using 13b's vocabulary item for 'the wicked', but FA employs a synonym in poetic parallel, 'sinners'. Structurally, FA's stich is in the form of a statement, rather than the question of SS and TF and the indirect question posed in SG.

Verse 15b

MT
SG
SS
TF
FA

While there is complete agreement among the Arabic versions regarding the use of the cognate ar`, 'measure', as the root for 'arm', SG and FA continue the pattern set in 15a of agreeing, over against SS and TF, on a root for the stich's verb. In addition, SG and FA also put this verb, from ksr, 'break', in the passive (Form Seven), while in SS and TF employ the active of htm, 'crush'. This latter pair see 15b as another rhetorical question which God mockingly directs at Job.

In the vocabulary and syntactic relationship of the MT's דָּלָה there is greater variety. SG forms a noun-adjective phrase between 'arm' and 'upraised', from rf`, 'elevate'. SS and TF, however, form a construct between 'arm', (TF: 'arms'), and 'the proud (ones)', from kbr, 'magnify'. In this they follow both the LXX and S–H. FA, for his part, is closer to SG, though he is less poetic, simply reading 'mighty' as the adjective for '(their) arm'.

Verse 16a

MT
SG

330
While all the versions, canonical and otherwise, speak of the depths of the sea, TH varies from the others in his verb.

Repeating the pattern of v. 15, SG and FA use an identical verb, 'enter', from *dxl*, while SS and TF agree on 'cross to / swim' from 'br'. TH, however, reads 'see', from *r'y*. This may be either due to a divergence in the tradition, or may be an attempt on the part of TH to highlight Job's impotence, given that seeing the bottom of the sea is less of a feat than travelling there.

Interestingly, SS and TF have the closest translation to the MT's נחלים, 'springs of the sea'. While Goodman (1988) suggests a similar translation for SG's construct, the root in question, *gws*, 'dive / plunge / immerse', does not fit the semantic range of the MT as precisely as does SS and TF's nb, 'well up'. FA’s root, *ljj*, has to do with tremendous depths rather than sources or springs. Then, despite the opportunity afforded through the addition of a gloss, unprecedented in both the Pesh and Cp, FA fails either to provide an alternative to 'tremendous depths', or to expand its semantic range to fit the MT more precisely. Instead, FA uses the gloss 'its bottom' to heighten the sense of the impossibility of Job's task.

Verse 16b
FA shares common elements with both SG on the one hand and SS and TF on the other. With SG, FA agrees that 'the deep' is the proper parallel to the previous stich's 'the sea', where SS and TF read 'the flood'. However, FA employs the same verb as SS and TF from msy, 'walk', instead of SG's 'journey / follow along', from syr.

At first sight, the connection between TH and the canonical versions appears minimal. Up to this point, TH's Voice from the Whirlwind has been asking about waters in general, both of the sea and above the firmament. His next question, "What is beyond the air" (p. 153) points to TH's next thematic direction, which will be taken up by the canonical versions at v. 31. But by 19a, all the Arabic versions will share yet another common theme regarding a different topic altogether.

Verse 17a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>TF</th>
<th>FA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>הָגַּדְתָּ לְךָ שֵׁרֵיָּמָה</td>
<td>אַהֲנִֵבָּךְ לְךָ אֶבָּלַם אֶלְמָהְתָּ</td>
<td>הָלַּיְּפִּּתְּךָ לְאֶבָּלוֹבֶּכְּלַעַת</td>
<td>הָלַּיְּפִּּתְּךָ לְאֶבָּלוֹבֶּכְּלַעַת</td>
<td>ظָהַרְתָּ לְאֶבָּלוֹבֶּכְּלַעַת</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While differences in verbs appear in all the Arabic versions, with even TF and SS diverging in voice (passive vs. active) from a common root, fth, 'open', perhaps the most salient difference is the appearance of an extra adverb in SS and TF at the close of the stich, with SS reading 'in terror' and TF having 'out of fear'. The source for this is the LXX; the S-H at this point also adds an adverbial expression, 'from weakness', which inexacty duplicates the Greek.

Verse 17b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>SG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>שָׁנְתָּ בָּלַעַת תַּרְאָהָּ</td>
<td>אַאֲרִּּתָּ אֶבָּלָאֵלַעַמָּא</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

332
The Hebrew לֶשֶׁם הַבֵּית has already been encountered at 3:5a and 28:3b, where the Arabic script versions read this as a compound word, 'shadow of death'. However, only FA conforms to previous practice in his treatment of this word as a phrase rather than a single lexical item. SG also displays consistency in the simplicity of his translation: 'darkness', from gbs, 'be gloomy'.

SS and TF entirely ignore לֶשֶׁם. This is not surprising, since the LXX, S-H, and Cp do the same. Despite their agreement on this omission, TF disagrees from SS in that he adds extra information, reminiscent of the marginal gloss of the S-H, truncating the passage shared with SS, and inserting a delayed reference to the adverb 'in terror' found in the previous stich of SS. Thus in TF there is no mention of the 'doorkeepers', and the reference to 'falling in fear' is possibly due to scribal error.

Thus FA alone makes mention of the shadow of death, duplicating his references at 3:5a and 28:3b. In all of these instances his construction is a curious one: where one would expect a construct, which is found in the Syriac as well as Arabic, FA presents a noun, 'shadows', followed by a prepositional phrase, 'in death'.

Verse 18

MT הָעֲבוֹנָה עַדְּרֶהֶצֶּּרֶדֶּר בְּרֵי נַעֵרְשֵׁהְוֹת בְּלָהֶ:  
SG הָעֲבוֹנָה עַדְּרֶהֶצֶּרֶדֶּר בְּרֵי נַעֵרְשֵׁהְוֹת בְּלָהֶ:  
SS حلّ فَهَمَت عَرْضٍ مَا تَحَت السَّمَّا عَلَيْهِ كُمْ هُوَ وَمَا هُوَ  
TF حلّ فَهَمَت عَرْضٍ مَا تَحَت السَّمَّا عَلَيْهِ كُمْ هُوَ وَمَا هُوَ  
FA رَأى عَرْض الأَرْض كَلَّهَا  

403 This corruption, via the Greek, of the Hebrew 'gates', is also found in the Cp.
The Arabic versions all employ the root *fhm*, 'understand', to translate the MT's *bvn*, for which there is a cognate root in Arabic of somewhat similar meaning. They also agree on *xbr*, 'inform', for the MT's *ngd* in the Hithpa'el, for which the Arabic cognate is semantically quite far afield.

As for areas of disagreement, only FA employs a cognate to the MT's *kll*. By avoiding the same, SG changes the nature of the question, heightening the focus on Job's impotence: whereas the MT asks whether Job knows the entirety of the earth's expanse, SG asks whether Job knows anything whatsoever about it; since the answer to this rhetorical question is presumably 'No', Job's lack of knowledge is shown to be complete. On the other hand, SS and TF, agreeing semantically with FA and the MT, crushingly pose the question to Job; by asking for a full explanation or accounting, Job is beaten into impotence and despair.

FA has dropped 18b, possibly because this stich begins with the same word as 19a. This is unfortunate if only from an aesthetic point of view.

**Verse 19a**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>STTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>בְּאֵתָן הַחַרְבָּן יָשַׁבָּמָךְ</td>
<td>וַיֹּאָמַר מִרְכָּבַי יַסְכִּינְךָ אֵלָהָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>תִּפְּלֹא בָּאֵי אָרְזוֹן יְסַכְּנֵנְךָ</td>
<td>וַיִּשְׁרֵף יָנָלָה שַׁמְשָׁו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>TF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וְאֶחָֽזֶרְךָ אֵין יָנָלָה שַׁמְשָׁו</td>
<td>אַף אֲשֶׁר יָנָלָה שַׁמְשָׁו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>TH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>∗</td>
<td>∗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TH temporarily rejoins the canonical versions thematically, although the order of his questions is now far removed from theirs: immediately following this query is a question similar to that of 14b, while preceding it is a parallel to 16a supplemented by a non-canonical interrogatory. TH's form of 19a reveals an affinity with the LXX's approach.

SG's addition of the adverb 'permanently' at the close of the stich is
unprecedented. Given that his verb *šn*, 'dwell / be at rest' stands in contradiction to the noun *ṭḥ*, 'pathway / course', SG’s intent is to emphasize not the activity of light, but its source or its cause. SG’s contradiction between action and state-of-being is not a problem for SS and TF, given that the LXX and S–H omit any reference to 'path' whatsoever.

FA’s treatment of this verse is interesting in that he expands upon the Pesh, which has no mention of 'path', so doing by effectively adding an extra stich to accommodate and approximate the MT’s *דַּרוּת*. Clearly the Pesh is not the only source of FA’s translation, and no other predecessor version provides a clue as to the cause of FA’s expansion.

**Verse 19b**

| MT | חַשְׁרֵךְ אָמֹרֵה מָכָה | אָלָּלֶםָא אֱלָלְתְּהַ אָרָּאָה |
| SG | וּאֵי מָעַשׂ הַצּוּלָּה | וּאֵי מָעַשׂ הַצּוּלָּה |
| SS | | *
| TF | | |
| FA | | *

With the mention in 19a of 'the light', the next question from the Voice in the Whirlwind is, unsurprisingly, about 'darkness'. SG, having added an extra adverb at the close of 19a, aesthetically adds a parallel one at the end of 19b. He also is careful to follow the exact wording of the MT, while the Arabic script versions display a more conventional Arabic word order. Otherwise all the Arabic versions are remarkably similar one to another.

**Verse 20a**

| MT | כִּי יָכֹ֣ה אָלִיםְכָּוֵל | אָלָלֶםָא אֱלָלְתְּהַ אָלִי הָךְ |
| SG | | הַל תֶּוֶּזֶנְיָא אָלִי הָךְ |
| SS | | |
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While all the Arabic versions match the brevity of the MT in terms of structure, there are some differences in vocabulary among them, even between SS and TF.

SG's understanding tracks that of the Tg in preference to that of the MT in that SG picks an unambiguous term from *txm*, 'delimit', to translate the MT's broader term ָל, which can include not only 'limit' but 'territory'. That the latter meaning was the intent of the MT can be argued on the basis of the reference in 19b to 'its place'. Still, the difference between SG and the MT here pales in comparison to the treatment that the Arabic script versions will afford this stich.

SS uses the same verb as SG, but supplies a different direct object: rather than conducting darkness to its limits, Job is asked whether he is able to lead God Himself to the limits of light and darkness. Clearly, in following the LXX and S–H, SS is continuing the practice of rhetorically crushing Job underneath the weight of such fantastic challenges.

TF follows SS in this, but changes the verb slightly to describe a more complete course of action: Job must not only lead God to the borders of light and darkness, but is also to deposit Him there as well. This difference is not due to variant readings of the LXX and S–H, but may be ascribed to the tendency of augmenting the nature of the challenges being hurled at Job.

FA, on the other hand, diminishes the weight of God's question by simply asking 'Did you know its place?', a daunting query nevertheless. The Pesh and Cp are similar in this regard, though they contain references to 'its borders' (Pesh) and 'their boundaries' (Cp). Thus FA is more closely aligned to the MT than to his occasional source document.
Verse 20b

The first portion of FA's version of 20b repeats the root nzl, 'descend / dwell' found at 19a, thus lexically tying together the theme of the entire passage. This root, incidentally, is also found in SG's version of this stich. But FA's treatment has connections to that of SG, who is interested in the place of darkness, as well as to that of SS and TF, who write of its path. FA does so economically and masterfully through the use of a construct: 'the path to its abode'.

Verse 21a

While the Arabic versions make a question of this stich, most modern commentators such as Renan (1882), Kissane (1939), Pope (1965), Dhorme (1967), Gordis (1978), and Habel (1985), inter alia, see a statement here, agreeing with the Tg, LXX, and S–H, though not the Pesh or Cp.

SG's version of the question is: "Didst thou know thou wouldst be born?" Of course, such a question raises the issue of pre-existence, or perhaps even the mistaken doctrine, encountered at 14a, of the transmigration of the soul, which SG is so keen to combat. Thus the patent absurdity of the question. As most commentators note, this stich is weighted in sarcasm.
SS and TF pose essentially the same question as SG. The problematic appearance of حينيذك in TF should be read as حينذالك, which is synonymous to SS' حينيذ, 'at that time / then'.

FA's question is syntactically tied to that of 20a, from which it borrows its verb. Like SG, FA understands a passive verb here, though instead of 'born', from ولد, he selects the root خلق, 'create', thereby highlighting the role of the divine. Thus: 'Or [did you know] when you were created?'

Verse 21b

MT
SG
SS
TF
FA

Only SG discerns the grammatical subject as falling within the first term of the construct, 'number of your days', whereas the Arabic script versions see the second term as the logical subject of the stich. Otherwise, only FA’s translation is marked by a lack of brevity found in the MT. In addition, just to make certain that his version is understood as a question, FA includes two interrogatives, one at the outset, with the other introducing an alternative question at the end of the stich.

The other Arabic versions assume a follow–on interrogatory from the question posed in 21a.

Verse 22a

MT
SG
SS
TF
FA

*
SG, who has added extra adverbs elsewhere in this chapter, does so again here: 'at one time [or another?]. This portrays God as giving Job the widest possible latitude for providing an affirmative answer, which, of course, Job cannot do, thus further underscoring his impotence.

While all the Arabic canonical versions agree on the word تَلْجَر, cognate to the Hebrew's שלג, 'snow', their verbs are varied, though semantically close: SG's w3l yields 'come to', SS' and TF's 'y, followed by the preposition على, is 'reach [the end]', and FA's d3l gives 'enter'.

In TH there is one semantic point of contact with 22a: his root xzn, 'storehouse', is found in both FA and SG, and is roughly synonymous with knz, 'treasury', in SS and TF. Immediately following in TH is a parallel to 22b (see below). Otherwise, the ordering of TH continues to differ markedly from that of the canonical versions: his two questions here immediately follow the one equivalent to 14b.

Verse 22b

The closeness of all the Arabic versions is striking. Even the use of 'mountains' in TH can be viewed as a metaphorical equivalent to the 'storehouses' of SG and FA as well as the 'treasures' of SS and TF.

SG and FA also agree with the MT on the use of the root r'y, 'see', whereas SS
and TF employ 'yn, 'examine'. Only TH omits any verb whatsoever.

Verse 23a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>אַשְׁרֶה חֲשַׁבְתֶּם לַעֲשֹׁתָם</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>אלֶהָחֲשַׁבְתֶּם לֶאְכָּחָה שִׁלֹה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>موضوع هو عندك الساعات العدوان</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>عند أخصاء ساعات العدوان</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>المخفوطة لزمان الضيق</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Arabic versions continue being remarkably faithful to the intent of the MT. Yet there is unmistakable linguistic divergence among them: FA is not as close to SG as has been the case over the last few verses, and even SS and TF show some independence from each other.

SG follows the structure of the MT with exacting precision, undaunted by the lack of appropriate cognates. SS displays very much the same relationship to the S-H. SS' relationship to TF, however, partially depends upon whether their different endings⁴⁰⁴ are bona fide contrasting readings, or merely due to scribal error.

The words in question are based on 'dw, 'engage in hostile action'. Assuming correct usage on the part of SS, the stich ends with an an elative adjective, عدوى, 'worst', whereas TF ends with a noun, عدوان, 'hostile action', in construct with 'hour / time'. Both readings work well, although this happy result may be coincidental. Less than felicitous are other aspects of TF's grammar, e.g., following the preposition عند, 'at the time of', with a verb. The correct reading should be عندما.

FA's stich is the briefest of all. Despite a complete lack of conjunction in roots or structures vis-à-vis the other Arabic versions, however, FA's translation is in essential agreement with them, the MT, and (of course) Pesh; his agreement with the

---

⁴⁰⁴ The other difference is found at the beginning of their stichs, where TF deletes the opening as an unnecessary restatement of a noun of place in parallel to 'treasures' in 22b.
Cp is less exact, however.

Verse 23b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>לֵיָהּ כְּרֶם וְמִלְחָמָה:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>לֵיָהּ כְּרֶם וְמִלְחָמָה:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>או ליומם ה.removeChild והדבר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>או ליומם ה.removeChild והדבר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>וָלֵיָהּ עלום הجهاد והדבר</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The convergence of the Arabic versions is clear. The only lexical item worthy of remark is the appearance in FA of שעֵד, which can be variously translated. The root, *jhd*, simply means 'strive'. The noun has a generic meaning, 'battle', but there is the well-known variant from Islamic theology, 'holy war'.

What FA may have being trying to express here is problematic, and involves a study of the various meanings of the versions regarding what the 'time of difficulty', to use SG's phrase, really concerned. Goodman (1988) assumes that SG has an apocalyptic image in mind. Habel (1985; p. 542) sees a reference here to holy war in ancient Israel, where the appearance of hail (22b) figures greatly. If FA's understanding was the same as the one reached in the modern period by Habel, then that Arabic version need not be seen as deliberately carrying another element of Islamic thought.

Verse 24a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>אֲרֵיחָה הַרְרֶךְ יִהלֵךְ אֶלֹהָ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>וְהִיא אַלְמָרָב יַחֲסָם אַלְמוּם</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>ومن ابن ينطلق الجليد</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>ومن ابن ينطلق الجليد</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>או תعلم في أي طريق يقتسم النور</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Cf. Josh. 10:11; Isa. 30:30. Dhorme (1967) adds to this list Ps. 18:13–14, and Pope suggests Ecclus. 39:29 as well.*
While the LXX-based versions continue the theme of the cold, the MT, Tg, SG, Pesh, and FA revert to a discussion of 'light' (cf. vv. 12, 19) and its path. Except for FA's opening interrogative, 'Or do you know', the only difference between SG and FA here is due to former's choice of one variety (Form Five) of the middle voice for the verb, based on qsm, 'divide', while the latter uses another (Form Eight).

SS and TF follow the S–H and use the Arabic cognate to the Syriac's glyd', 'ice', in parallel to 22a's 'snow' and 22b's 'hail'. Otherwise, an underlying congruence with the MT and the other Arabic versions is highlighted in the use of the passive (Form Seven) of tlq: 'be emitted / proceed on one's way' as the verb for this stich.

TH contains two possible parallel passages. In one, which appears just before the question cited at v. 34, his verb root, qsm, is the same as that of SG and FA here at 24a. Yet, the subject of that verb, 'showers', is more reminiscent of a suggestion by Dhorme (1965) than the 'lightning' of the MT. The other passage in TH, which occurs just before the passage cited in parallel to v. 16 of the MT, mentions 'flash of lightning'. Though TH's text does not mention the lightning's 'path', as do SG and FA, TH does have an affinity with the MT in that it asks 'Whence...?' Yet, while TH's word for 'lightning' is unambiguous, that of SG and FA is not. Indeed, FA will not treat the subject of 'lightning' until v. 25, in contradistinction to all the other canonical versions.

Verse 24b

| MT | اسم كثير علیاً: |
| SG | نَا تَبْدِِئَ َء أَلاَّ تَسْرَبُمُ عَلیاً أَلاَّ تَسْرَبُمِ |
| SS | أو من ابن يتحرك التيميم فتماماً تحت السما برياحه |

SG follows the MT very closely, preserving word order and structure except for opening with the adversative interrogative 'Or?'. His verb, from bdd, 'disperse', is entirely synonymous with the one in his previous stich. Indeed, they both appear in the same middle voice (Form Five).

The only difference between SS and TF in this lengthy version of the stich is due to scribal error: on the basis of grammar, the reading of TF is to be preferred. Both versions begin with the same double interrogative, the second member of which, 'whence', is in direct parallel to their version of 24a. Finally, the circumlocution 'that which is under the heaven' is followed by 'with its winds'. This is gratuitous, given that the antecedent for the pronoun is 'the south wind'. There is no equivalent phrasing in either the LXX or S-H. Thus there is limited evidence that these two versions are not entirely dependent upon either the LXX or S-H; however, their dependence upon each other is clear.

FA is relatively brief compared to SS and TF, but his version does include two verbs. The first, 'emanate', from the Fifth Form of xrj, is appropriate not only to its subject but also to its parallel in 24a. However, the second verb, from wkhb, 'give / grant / present / endow', does not fit the subject, 'the winds', very well, raising the question as to whether a second subject has been omitted. While neither the Pesh nor Cp provide any indication of such, TH may do just that.

To be sure, the connection between the stich of TH cited here and those of the canonical versions is not exact, since the placement of TH's questions occurs in a differing order from that of the canonical versions. Still, the second of TH's queries here shows affinities with those versions, reading "Or does thy power ... scatter the
water?" (p. 153). The verb here, from nōr, is synonymous with that of SG and the
MT, while the subject is appropriate to the verb in FA, cited above.

Verse 25a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>מִשְׁפַּל לָשׁוֹת הַתַּעֲלוֹת</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>וְמִמּוֹ נֶאָר קַפֵּם לָלַמְרָק קָנְוָהָ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>מִנֶּה מִסְיָל הָמָּר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>מִנֶּה מִסְיָל הָמָּר הָעֵזִי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>מִנֶּה אֵין יִקְוָנָה נוֹר הָמָּר *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>אֱמִמֶּה אֵי שֵׁי לֵהַב הָמָּר</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SG has God answer His own question, adding 'but I' to the interrogative 'Who
[could] it [have been] but I?" And, in a linguistic tour de force, SG once again
resorts, as at 24a, to the root qsm, 'divide', this time in the causative (Form Two),
yielding 'divide [a portion] / 'allot'.

SS inexplicably drops the final adjective, 'forceful', in describing 'the rain'; this
adjective appears in TF, being found also in the LXX and S–H. Thematically, both
SS and TF also reflect basic agreement with SG and the MT.

FA, following the Pesh, departs from the other canonical versions, but finds in
TH a close parallel. Given the clear and unambiguous mention of 'lightning' in FA
here, it is all the more apparent that he did not see the reference to 'light' in 24a as
being indicative of 'lightning'.

If the original intent of v. 24 has nothing to do with lightning as such, then of
the two passages from TH cited there (p. 342) as possible parallels to the canonical
versions, the former is to be chosen, with the latter placed here in agreement with
FA. Furthermore, the question as cited by TH is linked with another, which is
equivalent to that of 25b in the canonical versions, though it should be noted that
the order of the two questions in TH is reversed. Thus we have another instance of
a closeness between TH and FA over against the other versions.
The affinity of TH to FA over against SS and TF is once again demonstrated in this stich, while SG contains two elements found individually in the other Arabic canonical versions.

The two elements in question refer to thunder's path and sound. For the former, SG uses a verb in the causative (Form Two) from the root \textit{trq}, yielding 'forge a path'. For the concept of the sound of the thunderclap, 'voices' is used as the direct object of the verb, and a specialized term for 'thunder', from \textit{fq'}, 'explode', is invoked. In both instances, SG displays a grasp of grammatical nuance rarely found elsewhere, even in other portions of his own translation of Job, resulting in a masterful syntactic economy of expression.

A corruption in SS, first noted at the end of 25a, continues with a misplaced appearance of 28b at the beginning of the stich. Then, SS rejoins TF, which in turns follows the LXX and S-H closely. These versions all make explicit the 'path' of thunder, but do not include any explicit reference to its sound or 'voice', perhaps due to a desire to avoid semantic redundancy. The term used for the thunder itself, from \textit{r'd}, 'tremble', speaks as much of the physical shaking felt as it does of the rumbling sounds heard when a thunderclap follows the flash of lightning.

FA senses no tautology between thunder and its voice; indeed, his stich simply reads 'and the voice of thunder', clearly neglecting any mention of its path.

However, in the previous stich, the interrogative 'whence?' can be seen as applying
here; thus the notion of path is implicit in FA’s version.

In TH, God asks "Do you comprehend what the voices of thunder are?" \(^{407}\)

wherein there is no mention of thunder’s path, as in FA’s translation. In fact, the
last two words of TH are virtually identical in form and structure to those of FA,
 differing only in the appearance of a plural, ‘voices’, in the former.

Verse 26a

| MT     | יָבָא אֶל-אַרְמָן לֹא לָא-אַרְמָן |
| SG     | אֵין יָבָא אֶל-אַרְמָן לֹא אַרְמָן פִּידָה |
| SS     | יָבָא אֵל-אַרְמָן לֹא אַרְמָן פִּידָה |
| TF     | יָבָא אֵל-אַרְמָן לֹא אַרְמָן פִּידָה |
| FA     | יָבָא אֵל-אַרְמָן לֹא אַרְמָן פִּידָה |
| TH     | יָבָא אֵל-אַרְמָן לֹא אַרְמָן פִּידָה |

SG follows the MT, even to the extend of employing a cognate root, mtr, ‘rain’.

However, he does add an extra prepositional phrase, ‘in it’, at the stich’s close to
clarify the relationship between the land itself and its lack of inhabitants.

SS also employs the root mtr. However, TF displays an independent streak at
this point, anticipating a theme from 28b: his root, qtr, ‘drop [dew]’, has a similar
ductus to mtr; this may help explain TF’s departure from SS.

It has already been noted in the discussion at 38:18 that SS and TF employ a
circumlocution for ‘upon the earth’, namely, ‘that which is under the heavens’.
However, they do not follow that here,\(^{408}\) due to the semantics involved: since rain
falls ‘upon the earth’ rather than indiscriminately elsewhere, the phrase used in this
instance provides an appropriately narrower focus.

FA also shares with SG the root mtr, but derives from it a noun rather than a

---

\(^{407}\) p. 153; the sentence structure and vocabulary is reminiscent of Qur’an 97:2, viz.,
“What will make you understand what the Night of Power is?”

\(^{408}\) This is also true of the LXX and S–H at this particular juncture.
verb. Since rain ‘falls’, he unsurprisingly calls upon nzl, ‘descend’. This root FA shares with TH, though the later uses it in the causative (Form Four), however, only TH refers to ‘water’ generically rather than to ‘rain’ specifically; this is internally consistent given the context in which his passage appears, wherein ‘water’ as a natural phenomenon in its various forms is the thematic focus.

Verse 26b

This stich in the MT is a restatement of 28aß; SG would be hard pressed to follow the MT more closely. However, in the LXX and S–H, 28aß has been dropped, and so 26b stich represents a conflation of 28aß and 28b for SS and TF. As for FA, he alone among the canonical versions uses a transitive verb, ‘dwell’: *skn. SG has no verb whatsoever, while SS and TF use ‘not be’.

The question posed in TH is, at best, only vaguely equivalent to that of the canonical versions. The tenuous link is the phrase ‘lands which I have consumed’, which can been seen as an equivalent of the ‘wasteland / wilderness’ of the other Arabic versions. Given that TH’s question falls between two others regarding the rain, the thematic link is somewhat strengthened.

Verse 27a
Only SG avoids the subjunctive: God's actions are fact, especially in view of the One Who is reporting on those activities. The indicative verb SG uses, from Form Four of the root ןב, 'saturate', is cognate to that of the MT.

Also worthy of note is SG's use of cognates from the root עב, 'be empty', for both the verb's subject and its participial modifier. Such use of cognates in Arabic is indicative of good form and style, though the practice is usually found in the verb and its direct object, or cognate accusative.

SS and TF use the same root as SG for the stich's verb. They both close with a relative clause which may be a misplaced version of 28aא. SS' omission of the negative within the relative clause can only be due to scribal error; the meaning of his phrase as written is contrary to the entire thrust of v. 26.

FA stands alone in the use of the root עב, 'irrigate', and provides for it a direct object that anticipates the following stich.

Verse 27b

The Arabic versions continue using their respective verbal moods from the previous stich. Otherwise there is a high degree of synonymity among the versions, symbolized by the occurrence of the root עב, 'bring forth vegetation', in all four.

Verse 28a

MT
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While SG (whose text once again follows the MT extremely closely), TF, and even FA are all in agreement, SS' text is corrupt.

An alternative reading for SS can be posited: 'Who is father to the rain?', requiring only a deletion of one diacritical mark and shifting another from above to below the consonant, thus bringing SS fairly close to TF. However, if the placement of the diacritics is not emended, then two other readings may be proposed: 'Who is father to the rain?', as well as 'Who is father to the rain?'. Making exact sense of either of these is problematic, but the use of the root '60, 'grow profusely [plants]', would provide an apt poetic parallel to the previous stich. This may be what SS had in mind, although such a perspective is not supported by either the LXX or S–H. Thus the first of the three alternative readings proposed is the likeliest.

FA's wordiness does not alter his basic agreement at 28a with both predecessor and other Arabic versions: a verb is inserted after the interrogative, thus: 'do you know...?' in addition, his question closes with an alternative question 'or not?'.

Neither of these additions conform to the texts of the Pesh or Cp.

Verse 28b

Strangely enough, the only common element among the Arabic versions is found in the verb, from wld, 'give birth', which is cognate to the verb in the MT.
Thematically, however, all the versions match each other closely, with three of the four versions sharing, in varying combinations, the roots qtr, 'fall as droplets', and ndw, 'be moist / dewy'.

SG continues to follow the MT virtually word-for-word, resorting to the Arabic cognate, from tll, for the MT's 'dew', while SS and TF both use a construct for that same concept. If FA's division of this stich from the subsequent one is accepted, following the Cp, then his is the briefest of all the Arabic versions, avoiding the Pesh's use of a construct, 'drops of dew'. However, the first word of his next stich is thematically part of 28b; dropping the definite article from the القطر and moving the الطل to the present stich would result in a reading much closer to the Pesh. It would also bring FA's version closer to the other Arabic script versions structurally, continuing this chapter's pattern of the affinity, in terms of vocabulary, with SG.

Verse 29a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>ما من ظهر مع حِكْرَة</th>
<th>כְּבָשָׁם מִצְאָה הַכּוֹרָה</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>هِزْمٍ فِي مَة فَرَزْ أُلْؤْلُؤُ</td>
<td>או من بطن من أم يخرج منها الجليد</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>او من بطن من أم يخرج منها الجليد</td>
<td>أو من يدري منين تخرج مهما الجليد</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td></td>
<td>الطر والجليد من أي يخرج *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SG continues his close relationship with the MT, while the differences between SS and TF can be accounted for by scribal error: the reading of TF is to be preferred, with the exception of منها, found at the close of the stich. FA, for his part, differs from SG in terms of word order, though he agrees with the other Arabic script versions on the omission of any mention of 'womb'. Finally, all four Arabic versions share the root jld for 'ice'.

350
Verse 29b

While SG continues following the MT as closely as possible, and SS differs only from TF in the omission of this stich's opening word, FA goes off on one of his tangents in a manner that suggests textual corruption: he retains the word "heaven", with all the other Arabic versions, but includes it in an unprecedented construct, 'face of heaven'. Given that this would be in parallel to the MT's and Pesh's 'face of the deep', as well as the Cp's 'face of the ungodly', all found at 30b, and given that FA's text does not include any such phrasing there, the evidence of a misplacement of vocabulary is strong. FA's text as it now stands says: 'Who has put in order the face of the heavens, and made manifest its existence?'. Such a reading has no strong parallel in any of the versions, canonical or otherwise. However, it may represent an anticipation of the theme in vv. 31a-33a.

Verse 30a

Whereas the MT treats v. 30 as a clause subordinate to v. 29, SG and FA both begin a new question here, while SS and TF see 30a as a relative clause.

409 This is due to scribal error, since the first word of 29b is the same as the final word of 29a; thus TF's reading is to be preferred.
SG is constrained, as are most mss of the Tg, to add a prepositional phrase, 'like stone', to the close of the stich. This is due to his choice of verb, Form Six of kțf, 'be united in solidarity', which has a much broader range than the Hebrew. This is narrowed by the inclusion of the prepositional phrase, with the meaning, as a result, remaining close to that of the MT at the expense of structural similarity.

The only difference between SS and TF is in the closing word of the stich, where SS has an active participle, 'flowing', and TF an adjective, 'calamitous'. SS text is to be preferred, since TF’s reading represents a mistaken reading of the LXX, S–H, and Cp. Given that both the LXX and S–H are in basic disagreement with the MT, the thematic image in SS and TF is not one of solidified or frozen water, but flowing, even torrential water, descending from heaven.

Now FA rejoins the canonical versions, adding a second verb, from $1b, 'solidify', to gloss his opening verb, from jmd, 'freeze'. Like SG, he closes with an extra prepositional phrase, 'like stone', thus paralleling the Pesh.

Verse 30b

| MT | וַגְלִית תֹּהַם יִתְלוּלָה: |
| SG | והנה álbum התלוויל: |
| SS | מִזְאַזִּל וַחֲוזֵה הַקָּמָר: |
| TF | מִזְאַזִּל (א) וַחֲזֵה הַקָּמָר: |
| FA | מִזְאַזִּל עַד אִם הַמַּעֲמָא רַבָּה בְּחֶדוֹם |

In the previous stich, SG’s verb has a wider semantic range than that of the Hebrew, thus calling for an extra closing prepositional phrase for purposes of clarification. This, in its turn, raises a new problem for SG in 30b: if his parallel verb here stays close to his previous Arabic one, then yet another prepositional phrase to render its meaning more precise may be called for. But if SG approximates the Hebrew more closely, then the structural parallelism of his Arabic will be jeopardized. In the end,
SG splits the difference: his Arabic verb, Form Five of 'lq, 'be attached', parallels his choice of the Arabic in the previous stich; however, no extra clarification is added, given the context supplied by 30a.

While the text of TF is corrupt, the reading of SS provides a clue as to what TF may have had in mind. The verb, Form Four of äbl, 'wither', is close to the reading of the LXX, 'wasting away'. Therefore the image is one of judgment: God sends the ice of heaven in punishment upon the ungodly. The root as presently found in TF, kbr, can carry the idea of 'contradict', although the text as it now stands is nonsensical. Thus we have another instance of TF trying to approximate the model afforded by SS, though the attempt here fails.

FA is somewhat confused here, as noted in the discussion of his version of 29b. The present stich is thematically reminiscent of v. 8, which, as we have already seen, has a vague parallel in TH, with whom FA shares a number of common traits. But the idea of 'frozen water' is missing here, replaced by the idea of 'the water's abyss'. Thus God asks, 'Who fixed / determined the water's abyss in its bounds?'

Verse 31a

MT

SG

SS

TF

FA

While still in the realm of the created order, the scene changes to a consideration of

410 Thematically there is thus a link to the holy war motif found at vv. 22–23.

411 The motifs are 'gates', 'the sea', 'borders'. In point of fact, 'borders' recurs at 10a and 11a, while 'the sea / the deep' is found also at 16ba.

412 In the mind of FA the concepts of 'frozen' and 'fixed' are perhaps related.
heavenly bodies, or as TH would have it, "what is beyond the air" (p. 153).\footnote{TH's version of this stich was discussed at 16b.}

Identifying the various astronomical names presented in the Arabic versions, while having little theological import, holds clues regarding issues of textual dependence, provenance, and possible corruptions.

In this stich, all the Arabic versions agree on the name "النورا," 'the Chandelier'. This is generally identified with the Pleiades, or the Seven Sisters of the constellation Taurus.

SG's text, however, complicates the issue. In so doing, SG may shed light on a controversy regarding the text of the MT itself. 'The Chandelier' is in construct with the name of another group of stars usually associated with Sagittarius rather than Taurus. While this may either be an indication of a shift in meaning over the centuries or an improper identification of the astronomical phenomenon, it should be noted that the word in question, "نورا," has a meaning unrelated to astronomy: 'amenities / delicacies'. This has obvious points of contact with the unemended text of the MT, where "יָנֶּהוֹת", according to the AV, means 'sweet influences'. While Habel (1985) suggests emending the MT to read "יָנֶּהוֹת", or 'chains', caution should be urged, given the confluence of meanings in the Arabic as found in SG's translation: the MT as it stands may indeed be consonantally correct.

The witness of SS and TF, however, suggests that Habel's emendation does have linguistic support in scripture. They make explicit the concept of 'chaining' in their noun "יָבֵּד", 'shackles'; the LXX reads similarly.

FA also appears supportive of this view, though his understanding, mediated through the Pesh, is not quite the same as that of the LXX. The point of contact is FA's verb from "משק", 'grasp (hold of)'. The difficulty here is the context: God asks, 'Are you able to grasp (hold of) the Pleiades that they move not?', with 'able to
grasp' standing in parallel not only to 'shackles' in SS and TF, but also potentially to their verb 'Do you understand...?'

Any rush to judgment on emending the MT, therefore, must be resisted in view of the conflicting witnesses of the Arabic language versions.

Verse 31b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>או יהלן ב^nש-מתת:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>אני נאלץ סהיל תחתל:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>או סִיָּאָג הַגָּבָה פַּתֵּחַ וַאֲנֵת אֲלֵי יַפְתָּח לְהַגָּבָה בֹּקְעָתָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>או סִיָּאָג הַגָּבָה פַּתֵּחַ וַאֲנֵת בַּפּוֹקֵת.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>או רַאיָיט טִרְקֵי הָדְבַרָן</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In an attempt to deal with the MT's בְּסֵילָה, generally thought to be Orion, 'the Fool', a confusion of constellations is accompanied by the appearance of an extraneous stich in SS, inspired by a variant reading found in the S–H. The end of the phrase, 'in its time', represents a misplacement of the prepositional phrase found at the close of the next stich in the MT.

SG identifies בְּסֵילָה not as a constellation, but as בֵּית הַלַּחֳּמֶל, the star Canopus of the constellation Carina. This heavenly body is found in the southern sky, as is the MT's Orion. SG's verb, from הַלָּל, 'resolve / untie', is in antithetical parallel his verb in 31a.

SS and TF both refer to the constellation in question as 'the Giant', another name for Orion. If 31b is assumed to be in parallel to 31a, as is the case with SG, then there is support for understanding the verb in the previous stich as 'grasp' (as made explicit in FA): the verb here, from כָּחֹל, not only means 'open' but also 'conquer / control'. Thus the gist of the question becomes one of whether Job has

---

This star, the second brightest of the sky (after Sirius), is also known as Alpha Carinae.
the power to release 'the Giant' Orion so that it might make its cycle through the skies. This is in agreement with the rhetorical question found in FA's version at the end of the previous stich.

FA provides a third alternative for الدبران: has been identified both with the Hyades of the constellation Taurus, and with a single star\(^{413}\) known in Arabic as التتابع, 'the Follower', so named since it is said to pursue the Pleiades across the skies. So FA agrees with the other Arabic versions in placing this heavenly body in the southern skies, associated with Orion.

Ultimately, the various celestial identifications supplied carry no overt theological ramifications. Instead, it is the verb, in this case FA's, which has linguistic significance and therefore possibly theological importance as well: following the Pesh, FA reads 'see', which is a bit weaker than 'control' or 'untie' as found in the other Arabic versions and the Cp: Job is asked whether he has (merely) seen the path of the Hyades. This lowering of expectations only serves, as has been seen repeatedly elsewhere during the divine discourse, to heighten Job's impotence.

Verse 32a

| MT | התבלה מורה בファー | החל פטר אַלנוזוּ פִי אַקָּהָה | ותגר הדברן בנאציוּה | או מזרחו |
| SG | ¢ | ¢ | ¢ |
| SS | ¢ | ¢ |
| TF | ¢ | ¢ |
| FA | * |

While SG simply speaks of 'stars', SS and TF now make specific reference to the celestial phenomenon cited by FA in the previous stich, الدبران. Thus the confusion concerning heavenly bodies continues.

\(^{413}\) Alpha Tauri, also known as Aldebaran.
In making a positive identification of al-dabran, the verb in SS and TF may be of help. From the root *jrr* is formed the verb 'tug / drag / pull'; this is complemented by the prepositional phrase 'by its forelock'. While al-dabran is usually identified with five stars in Taurus representing the animal's back, there may be a confusion with the constellation mentioned in 32b of the MT: the Bear. In Arabic the generic term for 'bear' is *dab*, which is identical with al-dabran in terms of the beginning of its ductus. However, the proper name for the constellation (either Ursa Major or Minor) is *bnat Na'sh*, 'daughters of Na'sh', cited in the MT and SG at 32b. Any definite identification of al-dabran remains elusive, therefore.

All this is separate from the issue as to where this reading comes from: it is far from that of the LXX, though SS and TF are quick to rejoin the Greek in the next stich. The S-H provides an alternative reading, but in the end SS and TF must be seen as mutually interdependent over against any predecessor versions.

FA betrays an independent streak in terms of the content of this stich and its length. However, his point of contact here with SG is clear in that they both share the root *xrj*, 'exit', which FA puts into the form of a noun of time, yielding 'the time of its going out'; this same meaning is achieved by SG by his closing prepositional phrase.

Verse 32b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>ولیش علی‌بن‌ال‌نهحه:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>بنات نعش تفریز آلمه</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>وتقوده</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>وتقوده</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>تعلم وقت بنات نعش وطلوعها *و تقوم بوجه العيون</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SG returns to a consideration of specific star systems. Goodman (1988), in a
discussion of Job 9:9 suggests that SG's 'daughters of Na'sh' is yet another reference to the Pleiades. Yet the evidence is inconclusive, given the citation in Wehr (1994) to 'the Bear'.

Unfortunately, SS and TF, following the LXX, do not provide a passage parallel to that of SG; indeed, their stich is the essence of brevity, with the verb, from \textit{qwd}, 'lead', in close parallel to their \textit{jrr}, 'tug / drag / pull' in 32a.

FA is anything but brief. Duplicating SG's expression 'daughters of Na'sh', which he places in an extended construct to speak of its time and rising, FA then adds an extra stich regarding 'water springs'. While this suggests a misplacement of a stich from elsewhere in Job, its source is unclear, though thematically 'water springs' may have a point of the contact in 8b. At this point, the Pesh is very different from FA, given its discussion of the \textit{dibran}. The Cp also provides little indication as to what may have been on the mind of the FA at this point.

Similarly, TH, which shares many points of contact with FA to the exclusion of the other canonical versions, provides no clue as to the provenance of this extra stich.

**Verse 33a**

\begin{tabular}{l|l}
MT & \textit{hrutq haqta shem} \\
SG & וּמָא עֵמֶל לְנָתִים הַמֵּרֵם לֹאֵמֶל \textit{hal ́talum tarbir ́sama} \\
SS & הִלּ תּלֵעְמֲ טַבְּרֵי ́סָמה \textit{hal ́talum tarbir ́sama} \\
TF & \textit{mah ́talum tarbir ́sama} \\
FA & \textit{mah ́talum tarbir ́sama} \\
\end{tabular}

This stich is characterized by exacting brevity in the Arabic script versions, although complete convergence is lacking except with regard to the word for 'heaven'.

SG follows the Tg in adding an extra introductory 'And is it possible that you...'

---

\footnote{416 P. 226, n. 8).} \footnote{417 \textit{Cf}. the discussion of the previous stich.}
His translation for the first member of the construct corresponding to the MT's 

אֲלוֹתַיָּם, 'laws of heaven', is from the root ṛṣm, 'set rules / ordain / outline / sketch', yielding "ordinances of heaven" (p. 385).

The text of SS and TF reflects a more dynamic concept of how the heavens are ordered. Indeed, the LXX's τροπῆς οὐρανοῦ as well as the S-H's ˀswerf' ḏšmy' both make witness to the idea that the heavens are in a state of flux. This is apparently behind the use by both SS and TF of the root 'brtc, 'pass [over]'. However, in the Form Two verbal noun, as it appears in these two Arabic versions, there is an approximation of the more static concept found in both SG and the MT: 'expression / utterance of heaven' is the masterful result.

FA introduces yet another perspective on the MT's phrase 'the laws of heaven'. Using the root snn, 'be traditional / time honored', FA's 'the norm of heaven' carries with it a highly Islamic flavor, given that the term in question, سنة, had become by FA's time a technical term in Islamic society and law concerning the behavior of the faithful based on the model of the Prophet Muḥammad. Thus FA's interest in matters Islamic is reflected in his vocabulary, a practice that he has shied away from for the most part during the divine discourse.

Verse 33b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>אֲלוֹתַיָּם מֵאָשָׁר בְּאָרֶץ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>בְּאָרֶץ מַעְטָרָתָהּ כָּלָּאָרֶץ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>וּמַאֲרִים תֵּבְּרַּע עַל־הַשָּׁמַע</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>וּמַאֲרִים תֵּבְּרַּע עַל־הַשָּׁמַע</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>או תִּנָּהּ בֶּאֱרֶץ הַשָּׁנִים</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The MT, having posed a question concerning 'the laws of heaven' in 33a, now asks whether Job himself can establish these laws upon the earth. The understandings of the Arabic script versions, however, diverge from that of the MT in that they do
not speak of the imposition of heavenly 'law' upon the earth.

SG, as expected, stays close to the MT. His use of the root hkm, 'pass judgment', in parallel to 33a's rsm, confirms his legalistic bent in this passage.

SS and TF, however, continue with the theme of change and flux. Through the use of the root kwn, which not only means 'exist' but also 'occur', it is the actions taking place in 'what is under heaven' that are in focus. To heighten the sense of Job's insignificance, an extra adverb is added at the close of the stich. As a result, the reading in its entirety is, [And do you know] all of what happens under heaven?

FA twice repeats his use of the root snn as found in his previous stich, once for his verb, 'enact [a law]' and then for its direct object, 'habit / rule'. While this use of the cognate accusative is indicative of good style, its placement so soon after the use of the same root in the previous stich borders on the excessive.

Verse 34a

MT  hehres tole ketole
SG  ‘a tole herpes tolle odor
SS  heleh danadi b’reiq b’sotuk
TF  heleh danadi b’reiq b’sotuk
FA  teruq sosotok oni sasab  *
TH  AMDFDRHI TSHIR SBSAB

Except for the addition of yet another version of the adverb 'perhaps' at the beginning of the stich, SG’s reading is characteristically close to that of the MT despite the lack of opportunity for using any roots cognate to the Hebrew.

SS and TF would have Job call out not to 'clouds', but to 'the lightning'. While this technically represents a departure from the LXX, S-H, and Cp in addition to the other Arabic versions, it is not ultimately inconsistent with the image in its entirety as contained in vv. 34-35.

FA’s reading is very close to that of SG; they share not only two roots, rfi,
'raise', and $\text{swt}$, 'give voice', but from these roots derive the very same vocabulary items placed in the same grammatical constructions.

A possible parallel in TH is found here. It has already been cited as a possible equivalent to FA's version of 24b. While the only shared vocabulary item between them is 'cloud', the verb from the root $\theta yr$, 'arouse / stir up', fits the imagery of all the canonical versions.

Verse 34b

There is a lessening of the demand upon Job's powers in SG's version of 34b. Whereas the MT and Tg refer to voluminous amounts of water, in SG God is content to challenge Job to produce mere raindrops.

The addition of what is effectively another stich in SS and TF reflects the LXX's understanding. Paralleling the citation of 'lightning' in 34a, now there is mention of 'thunder' before any 'torrential rain' is 'poured out'. The only difference between the two versions, consisting of a disagreement concerning verbal aspect, is due to scribal error; the reading of SS is to be preferred.

The activity to which Job is challenged in FA is slightly different from that of the other canonical versions; indeed, FA departs from the Pesh and Cp as well. Instead of causing rain to fall upon his head, Job is asked whether he can fill, from the root $ml'$, the clouds with 'abundant water'.

This departure for FA puts TH in greater agreement with the other canonicals at this point. In fact, TH's verb, from $nOr$, 'sprinkle', is semantically consistent with
SG over against the MT, SS, and TF.

Verse 35a

| MT | והמשלח בpués והלו | هل תرسل הסauważ תטלק |
| SG | והמשלח באפרות פרסחב | هل תرسل הס aşağı תטלק |
| SS | | * תסרה הברק ליפסי |
| TF | | |

All the Arabic canonical versions, like the MT, place two verbs in this stich; FA’s second verb, however, exhibits a different semantic range from that of the other Arabic versions. FA also differs from all those versions in seeing a singular here for 'lightning' rather than its plural.

SG disagree with the Tg, refusing to place an introductory adverb here, as he had done most recently at 33a and 34a; his results place him very close to the MT.

SS and TF, rejoining the imagery of the other canonical versions, are forced to find a parallel to the root brq, 'flash', whence 'lightning', which they used in the previous verse.418 The parallel root, s'q, 'strike down with lightning / stun', is phonologically altered to s'q, a shift common in Middle or Christian Arabic.419

The activity of the 'lightning' in FA reflects a quality inherently different from natural phenomenon. Rather than 'going forth', as in the other canonical versions, FA reads 'illuminate', from Form Four of the root dw’. This innovation is FA’s alone, since there is no parallel in the Pesh, Cp, or even TH. In addition, reflecting a theological nuance, FA puts this verb in the subjunctive to show the inherent impossibility of Job’s carrying out this challenge.

---

418 Indeed, this root is now found in this stich for both SG and FA.
419 Indeed, this very example at Job 38:35 is cited in Blau (1966), p. 110, as indicative of Christian Arabic orthography.
There is little to note in this stich beyond the formulas with which the Arabic versions close the verse. There is a direct Arabic cognate to the Hebrew's הָנְנֵּנָה, roughly 'We’re here!', but none of the Arabic versions resort to it.

SG's is perhaps the most idiomatic, deriving his expression from lby, 'obey / carry out [an order]'. Either SG has ignored the implication of personifying lightning as a speaker, or was not able to find any way in which to avoid the issue. In any case, the idiom may be translated 'Here I am!' or 'At your service!'

SS and TF contain the expression מַאֲזָא הָו, roughly 'What is it?'. The difference between the two versions preceding this phrase may reflect a divergence regarding the issue of personification. If lightning is understood to be anthropomorphic, then the plural verb of SS is in order; if viewed as inherently inanimate despite the imagery, then TF's singular verb is correct.

FA's closing quotation, from the root 'ty, 'come', is equivalent to 'I'm coming!'

The use of the imperfect aspect is somewhat startling, given the predilection of Arabic to use the perfect to refer to past events whose results still are in effect, thus: 'I have arrived!'. Be that as it may, the basic meaning of FA's phrase is clear.
The difference between the LXX and MT is reflected in the Arabic versions; however, each of those versions exhibit unique subtleties in their understandings of their respective predecessor texts, all the while keeping to the general theme of Wisdom.

The question as posed in SG contains two peculiarities worth noting. First, God answers His own question by the insertion of the construct 'other than I'. Perhaps the rhetorical weight is now so crushing upon Job that there is little danger in giving him the correct theological response. Secondly, the MT's מִתְמַלֵּךְ has long been recognized as problematic. SG has chosen to translate this lexical rarity as 'that which is certain' from וְ砼, 'have confidence in'. His reasoning is unclear, since the Hebrew root in question, וְ砼, is related to 'being covered over', and the Tg approximates the MT. Instead, SG's text speaks of the certitudes of Wisdom. This is an apt theme, considering the type of literature which the Book of Job represents, but it may not be appropriate to the current context.

If SG's text is puzzling, SS, despite dropping virtually an entire stich, shows its affinities with TF and the LXX, S–H, and Cp. All these versions speak of the wisdom granted to women. Why such a discussion should arise during a passage dealing with natural phenomena indicates that the basis for such a reading is probably due to textual corruption. However, it should be noted that SG and FA, at 36b, conceptually support the understanding of the LXX here by positing a parallel passage concerning the intelligence of craftsmen. Be that as it may, TF describes the type of wisdom involved, i.e., working with cloth; SS' text here drops the stitch, as it were.

The canonical version that comes closest to the MT, then, is that of FA, due to
his close adherence to the Pesh. However, FA still displays a streak of independence, adding to the beginning of the stich an extra verb, 'Have you seen...?' This is perhaps offered in contrast to the concept of 'concealment' found at the close of the verse. It should also be noted that there is no reference in FA's text as to where Wisdom is placed, unlike SS and TF on the one hand, and TH on the other.

Yet TH obviously tracks FA here and in the next stich. Rather than speaking of 'wisdom', as do the canonical versions, TH says that God provides 'intelligence'. And rather than granting this quality to women, as in SS and TF, God places it in the 'innards of men'.

Verse 36b

MT אָמַרְתָּ לְאָשֶׁר בָּרוּךְ: 
SG אָמַרְתָּ לְאָשֶׁר אֲלָמוֹרָה אֲלַפֵּהֶם: 
SS בָּרוּךְ אִשְׁתֶּם אֱלָמוֹרָה אֲלַפֵּהֶם: 
TF אוּכְלָךְ אִשְׁתֶּם אֱלָמוֹרָה אֲלַפֵּהֶם: 
FA אוּכְלָךְ אִשְׁתֶּם אֱלָמוֹרָה אֲלַפֵּהֶם: 
TH אוּכְלָךְ אִשְׁתֶּם אֱלָמוֹרָה אֲלַפֵּהֶם: 

Unfortunately, the parallel term in the MT for 36a's בָּרוּךְ is even more obscure. While Goodman (1988) suggests that SG does understand בָּרוּךְ to be parallel to מַשְׁחָה, a more likely interpretation of SG's vocabulary item shows an affinity with the LXX. The Arabic script versions, both canonical and non-canonical, are of little further help in deciphering the MT.

In SG the parallel term for בָּרוּךְ is from the quadriliteral root zxrf, 'embellish / ornament'. Goodman (1988) links this concept to the intelligence needed in the craft or artisanry of interior decoration, citing SG's translation of Isa. 2:16. But given the witness of the LXX and the interpretation thereof by SS and TF, a more literal understanding of SG's text is warranted. Therefore the meaning runs: 'And
who gave the artisan acumen?"

This interpretation of SG is in basic agreement with that of SS and TF, despite a difference in vocabulary. Of course, given the imagery in 36a of women working in cloth, the context for the vocabulary here suggests that embroidery is the craft described. This is also, incidentally, the understanding of the Cp.

FA is careful to parallel his own version of 36a, and this task is simplified by the model of the Pesh: rather than speaking of artisanry or craftwork, FA is still very much in the world of the abstract, citing human faculties rather than applied knowledge.

This is precisely the tack that TH takes at this point. While the faculties of hearing and vision only inexactly match FA’s vision and acumen, the similarities between these two texts are clear, especially when considered in contrast to the other versions.

Verse 37a

| MT | פִּירַס וְשָׁחֵקָה בְּעַבָּדָה |
| SG | לֹא יַצְרֶנֶם פִּי אֲלִישָׁאֵרָה בְּעַבָּדָה |
| SS | ومن يحصي السحابة بحكمه |
| TF | أو من أحصى السحاب بحكمته |
| FA | من أحصى السحاب بحكمته |
| TH | ونصبت شواويخ الجبال |

SG may have been led astray by a near, but false, cognate to the Hebrew root $\text{םסח}$, 'pulverize', yielding 'clouds / dust'. The Arabic root SG employs, $\text{شح}$, however, carries the meaning of loftiness (which can indeed be said of clouds) in terms of mountain peaks. Interestingly, this meaning contains links to a passage from TH, wherein God asks, "Where wast thou ... when I ... set up the peaks of the mountains?" (p. 153). The root in TH, not being the same as that of SG, cannot indicate conclusively any direct connection to a canonical version, but the similarity
in theme is worthy of note nevertheless.

The canonical Arabic script versions are virtually identical. The word for 'cloud' is unambiguous, and they all share the verb from the root ḥṣy, 'enumerate'.

Verse 37b

| MT |  וֹבִֽלְּתַת שֶׁמֶשׁ מִלְּשָׁלֶֽבֶּה | אַמּוּת הַשָּׁמַּאֲם לָלֹאָמָא בְּלוּלֶֽאָמ | אַמּוּת מִאמְרַי הַשָּׁמַּאֲם עַל הָאָרֶץ | אוּ מִמַּאמְרַי הַשָּׁמַּאֲם עַל הָאָרֶץ | וַמִּמַּאמְרַי אַמּוּת הַשָּׁמַּאֲם | אֵין קָנַת מִנָּאָה יָוָם רְמַעְת הַשָּׁמַּאֲם סְפְּרָאָהּ | לָא מְעָאִילִין נְסָקָהָּו לָא תָּחֹלָה דָּעָאָמ |
| SG |  ṣ`m7` `n 0"nm ``7»1 | | | | | | | | |
| SS |  | | | | | | | | |
| TF |  | | | | | | | | |
| FA |  | | | | | | | | |
| TH |  | | | | | | | | |

SG avoids the imagery of the MT's 'bottles of heaven', yet is clearly keen to adhere to what he takes to be the meaning of the Hebrew text rather than that of the Tg, which bears affinities with the LXX. SG uses the Arabic cognate root skb, 'pour out', corresponding lexically, but not semantically, to the Hebrew skb, 'lie down'. This explains the divergence between the Tg, LXX, and Cp on the one hand and SG on the other, which can be explained thus: the 'bottles of heaven' in the MT are 'poured out' (SG) by their being 'made low' (MT), i.e., tipped over.

Both SS and TF have difficulty in rendering the LXX's phrase ἐκλαυε, 'make bend / bow', based on a literal reading of the Hebrew. Yet they have avoided the error of the S–H, which is similar to that of the Pesh and therefore FA. This error, then, is further compounded in TH, who appears to model his understanding on that of FA.

SS renders the Greek by the quadriliteral root ṭmʿn, 'soothe / put to rest'. While the match is inexact, the semantic areas of the Greek and Arabic do overlap. TF, however, either confuses the theme of this stich with that of v. 38, or interprets the

\footnote{FA's interpretation varies greatly, bearing similarities to the S–H and Pesh.}
Greek sense of 'lowness' incorrectly. Either reason explains his use of tnr, 'cover with dirt'. Unfortunately, the resulting translation is a poor one.

The S–H and Pesh both speak of distance, rather than contact, between heaven and earth; there is no 'bending down' of one to the other. Rather, the Pesh's 'pillars of heaven' distance the heavenly realm from the earthly one. Thus FA's text reads: 'And Who established the pillars of heaven?'

Despite a verbosity unmatched in any of the canonical versions regarding the present theme, it is obvious that TH thematically matches FA in this stich, rendering explicit much that FA leaves unsaid: "Where wast thou with Me on the day when I raised the heaven as a roof in the air without cords holding it and pillars carrying it not underneath?" (p. 153.) This is a far cry from the other canonicals; thus once again FA and TH stand together over against the other Arabic versions.

Verse 38a

| MT | בְּצֵקָהּ עַפּר לְמָצַקְךָ |
| SG |اءَمْ كَنِّكَ لَنَظَرَوا لَ هُمْ عَلِيَّاَ |
| SS |المنشورة عليها مثل الرماد الملتزمة |
| TF | ونشرها عليها مثل الرواق |
| FA | ومن خلق للراب على الأرض *

What happens when the 'bottles of heaven' are poured out over the earth is the subject of v. 38 in the MT; the LXX, however, does not contain this image of the rains pouring down on very dry land.

After adding an extra interrogative phrase 'And where were you when...?' at the outset, SG leans towards the understanding of the Tg at the close of 38a without leaving the MT behind entirely. All three speak of solidification, but in the MT the term is associated with the casting of metals, whereas SG's root, rkz, from which he derives a noun of place, yields the meaning 'a firm piece of ground'. SG's verb,
However, from *sbb*, 'pour out', keeps close touch with the imagery of the MT.

SS adheres to the LXX, S-H, and Cp. The stich ends with reference to 'ashes', thus ignoring the MT's concept of solidification; at the outset of the stich the root *nšr*, from the world of agriculture referring to the broadcasting or scattering of seeds, is employed. Thus SS' text surveys a land akin to a dust bowl.

TF also makes mention of solidification in this stich. But his course is independent of SS, as shown by choice of the root *zwq* at the close of the verse, thus demonstrating that TF was something of a poet in his own right: the root has the basic meaning of 'pulverize', whence the idea of dust or ashes as found in SS and even SG. But the actual noun used by TF refers to powders, especially cosmetics. Thus the theme of this stich is conceptually linked with the women, craftwork, and multi-coloured artisanry of v. 36.

FA goes a bit farther afield than the Pesh, which in its turn is not far removed from either the Tg or SG. FA brings the activity of this stich directly into the realm of the divine: while the verb *x/lq*, 'create', is not exclusively limited to divine work, the context here does not permit any other suggestion. Of course, this oblique reference to Genesis 1:9–10 implicitly brings with it the idea of solidification found in the Hebrew: dry land upon the earth was formed by gathering it together, away from the waters under the firmament.

**Verse 38b**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>הָבוֹן הַדְּבָקָה</th>
<th>אַלַּ֣בָאֹתָ֣שׁ הָלָ֖הוֹת</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>המנָצֶרֶת עַלְיהָ</td>
<td>תְפִלָּתָה מִלָּלָ֖ו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>המנָצֶרֶת עַלְיהָ</td>
<td>תְפִלָּתָה מִלָּלָ֖ו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>והמטָר עַלְיהָ</td>
<td>וּתָפֵלְתָהּ מִלָּלָ֖ו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>וּמְאַלֵּכָה הָקֶשֶׁף</td>
<td>וּמְאַלֵּכָה הָקֶשֶׁף</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>וּנָסְבָה שֵׁיֹּמֵּ֣עַוּךְ</td>
<td>גָּבְעָל</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The LXX and S–H now invoke the thought of dry earth becoming solid, not
through the waters as suggested by the MT in 38a, but implicitly due to the dryness of scorched land which cakes. But the Arabic script versions are genuinely confused as to how to deal with this verse, despite a common theme of 'rockiness' which not only pervades all the Arabic script versions, but is also reflected in TH.

SG's choice of ṣbā, 'dug up', is a curious one etymologically; yet it fits the intent of both the MT and Tg, which use this stich as a poetic parallel to 38a. For SG, then, the 'clods', i.e., those things which have been 'dug up', stick one to another.

SS understands that 38a and 38b are in parallel; thus the grammatical structures of the two stichs match each other in his translation. But given the condition of the ms itself, it is difficult to ascertain the exact reading intended. Still, it is apparent that the basic idea runs along the lines of 'the outcropping above it resembles rock like ???'. While this is fairly distant from the LXX, S-H, and Cp, it does bear a certain resemblance to the Pesh, which reads 'And Who has made the steep rocks?'

TF's final word for this stich, while not absolutely clear in the ms, has a logic of its own. What appears to be the الصواع may be a reference to 'pile of rocks', i.e., الصوئي. If so, the problem in the ms at the close of SS' version of the stich is solved, and TF's opening verb of the stich, from ḥq, 'throw / toss', fits in well with the rest of the imagery.

FA does not mention rocks in particular, but his reference to 'caves' provides something of an adequate, if inexact, parallel. His verb, from ṭqān, 'bring to perfection', is in obvious semantic agreement with his choice of verb in the previous stich.

At first sight, any connection between TH's text, which reads "And I set up the peaks of the mountains" (p. 153), and any of the canonical versions in Arabic, is tenuous at best. But there is a point of contact with the Pesh, which, we have seen, is generally the model for FA, which in turn has proved to be the closest canonical
version to TH. Whether this single isolated incident of agreement with the Pesh over against FA is cause to find in the Syriac itself the basic model for TH, however, remains problematic.

Verse 39a

| MT | הָלְלִי תַּלְבֶּשֶׁ בְּרָחָ | هلَّلَلِةِ تُلَبُّشُ بِرَحَائِخُ |
| SG | הָלְלִי תַּלְבֶּשֶׁ בְּרָחָ | هلَّلَلِةِ بِرَحَائِخُ تُلَبُّشُ |
| SS | وهل انت تتصطيد الطعام للأسد | هلِّ انتِ تَصْتَيْدُ الطَّعْمَ للَّأسدِ |
| TF | هل انت تصيبد الطعام للأسدان | وَهِلَّ انتِ تَصْتَيْدُ الطَّعْمَ للَّأسدَانِ |
| FA | ومن يعطي الأسودة عداها | ومن يَعْطِي الأسودة عداها *
| TH | ومن قسم للأسد زاقها | ومن قسم للأسد زاقها |

With the exception of FA, all the Arabic versions, both canonical and non-canonical, are in basic agreement. Similarities in vocabulary range from verbs\textsuperscript{421} to nouns\textsuperscript{422}.

FA's divergence concerns one of the inherent God-given qualities of the lion, while the other versions speak of God's gracious provision for its survival. His root, 'dw, 'commit aggression', yields the abstract noun 'aggressiveness'. Thus it is God's role to provide the lion the wherewithal to live, rather than to sustain it directly.

While the theological implications are obvious,\textsuperscript{423} FA's text is perhaps most important in that it anticipates a similar divine role in TH's version of v. 41.

Verse 39b

| MT | מִזְרָחָתָ הַמַּפְרֶשׁ בְּרָחָ | מִזְרָחָתָ הַמַּפְרֶשׁ בְּרָחָ |
| SG | נְבֵומָ הַמַּפְרֶשׁ בְּרָחָ | נְבֵומָ הַמַּפְרֶשׁ בְּרָחָ |
| SS | אוِ انتِ الذي تشبع نفس التنين | أوِ انتِ الذي تشبع نفس التنين |

\textsuperscript{421} SS and TF share, with the S–H, the root $y$$d$, 'hunt'.

\textsuperscript{422} All the Arabic script versions, canonical and otherwise, share the root 'sd for 'lion'.

\textsuperscript{423} Indeed, given FA's inclination for emphasizing God's grace as opposed to the abilities of the creation to fend for itself, the theological shift is somewhat puzzling at first sight.
While the MT, Tg, SG, and Pesh continue in parallel imagery concerning God's provision for the welfare of lions, the Arabic script versions, along with the LXX, S–H, and Cp, change from a consideration of lions to serpents / dragons / Leviathan.

SG agrees with the Tg over against the MT and Pesh in simply giving a synonym for 'lion' in this stich rather than shading the meaning to 'lion cub'. In addition, SG is more concrete than either the MT or Pesh in that he makes reference to 'filling the bellies' of the lions rather than the MT's 'appeasing the appetite', which is essentially the reading of the Pesh, or the Tg's 'supply provisions'.

SS and TF are in complete parallel with the exception of the inclusion in the former of 'appetites', from the root ṭā'ās, 'be precious'. The word used by both SS and TF for 'dragon', التنين, is cognate to the term used at this point by the S–H. For these two Arabic versions, this word also appears in their respective translations of Job 3:8b (p. 62), where the reference to Leviathan is unmistakable.

FA does not repeat his vocabulary of 3:8b, النبيان, in the present context. Instead, he picks a near-cognate to the Hebrew term for Leviathan, which, as has been noted, is not present in the MT here. FA’s term is also a near-cognate to that of TH: اللوتياء. Since TH's text, however, does not speak of the satisfaction of Leviathan's appetites, the provision of its sustenance, or the filling of its belly, there is no parallel to any of the Arabic canonical versions beyond the use of the name.

Verse 40a

MT

424 The Cp also speaks of 'dragon' at this point.
425 Macdonald (1898) is careful to demonstrate that the Arabic and Hebrew words are effectively equivalent (p. 154, n. 19).
While SG, SS, and TF attempt to deal with the MT's concept of 'lying low', FA and TH, taking their cue from the Pesh, pursue an entirely different course.

The verb in the MT, from יְחוֹשְׁבָא, 'lie low / crouch', inspires in the Tg a subtle but important shift in meaning, yielding 'cower'. That this is indeed a valid way of understanding the MT is reflected in the LXX, S–H, and Cp, all of which translate the verb in question as 'fear / be frightened'.

While SG resists the linguistic drift of the Tg, using the Seventh Form of the root צָהֵד, 'lie low', both SS and TF incorporate explicitly the meaning of fear in the use of the synonymous roots צָה ה / צָה ו, 'fear'. In so doing these latter two versions avoid any mention of 'crouching' or 'lying low', thus completing the transformation of the MT's thought pattern.

A further difference in vocabulary, though ultimately not in real meaning, between SG on the one hand and SS and TF on the other, is carried through the closing prepositional phrase of the stich, with the former reading 'their lairs' while the latter two read 'their sleeping places'. This is also the understanding of the Cp.

FA seemingly shifts away from the lions of 39a and Leviathan of 39b to הסנֵג הקשתה, which has two possible interpretations. The first simply is 'many wild-animals-of-prey', which adds further variety to the bestiary which will close this chapter with the mention of ravens. However, a secondary meaning of הַסְגָּע is 'lions'. If this second reading is accepted, then the reference to Leviathan can be seen as the result of textual confusion or misplacement, with the lion image continuing through vv. 39–40 as it does in the MT.
TH's question shows agreement with the former of FA's possible meanings. Indeed, that is the only real semantic point of contact between TH's question and the query posed by any of the canonical versions; however, given this question's placement between the considerations of lions and ravens, it is clear that this particular phrase, in tandem with the one which immediately follows, is equivalent to FA and/or the Pesh.

Verse 40b

Once again there is a tri-partite division among the versions, with the MT, Tg, and SG making explicit mention of ambush from dens or hiding places; the LXX, S–H, SS and TF place the beasts in the woods; the Pesh, FA, and TH cite the fields or wilderness as the animals' habitat.

The portion of SG referencing 'the shadows', from 𐤉𐤂𐤊, 'be shady', may be indicative that the LXX's ἐν "οὐκος, 'in the woods', is not as far-fetched as may first appear. However, that would leave the Pesh's 'in the field' unexplained. This is the reading of both FA and TH, the only difference being the use of the singular in the latter as opposed to the plural in the former.

TH, however, does have a point in contact with the other canonical versions, especially the MT and Tg: he cites 'their dwellings', from ska, 'be tranquil / dwell'. Though this is not the root used in either of these versions, the MT and Tg are the

---

426 In an interesting departure, the Cp bears more resemblance here to the MT, Tg, and SG.
only versions which contain explicitly specific mention of the animals' place of habitation. The Cp's "in the gates" may also be a reference to habitat.

Verse 41a

MT  מַרְאֵיָּה לְעֹרֶב יְזֹרָה
SG  מַלָּעָה לֹא רָאָה
SS  מַלָּעָה מִן הָיוֹת לְעֹרֶב טַעַמָּה
TF  מַלָּעָה מִן הָיוֹת לְעֹרֶב טַעַמָּה
FA  מַלָּעָה מִן הָיוֹת לְעֹרֶב טַעַמָּה
TH  מַלָּעָה מִן הָיוֹת לְעֹרֶב טַעַמָּה

This stich provides one instance when all the canonicals, and their predecessor versions, stand together over against TH. The issue is the role of God vis-à-vis the raven, or, as TH would have it, fowl in general.

Despite variations among the canonical versions in terms of vocabulary, and, to a lesser extent, syntactical structures, it is clear that God directly provides food for the raven. For the canonical Arabic script versions, which are Christian in origin, the Joban attitude is reinforced by that of Matthew 6:28, where it is stated that God feeds the birds of the air, and the parallel passage at Luke 12:24, where ravens are explicitly mentioned as the objects of divine attention.

But in TH, God’s role is not as immediate as implied in the canonical versions: God does not grant to the birds their food per se, but rather grants them the ability to recognize it, making them aware of it. Implicitly, TH’s version speaks of God-given instincts rather than the direct provision of sustenance. As seen already, this removal of God by one step, as it were, from direct care for the animal kingdom, is displayed by FA in his version of 39a. Thus it may be seen that despite the real divergence at this particular point between TH on the one hand and

---

427 FA uses a root with heavily Muslim overtones: *rzq*, 'provide with the means of subsistence'.
all the canonical versions on the other, some consistency in general perspective
between TH and FA is not altogether lacking.

Verse 41b

| MT | כהיותו אלה יشهر
    | אל יאדו אלה יسأل אלהי יחוון
    | או מפועונ פואס ידועני
    | או מפועונ פואס ידועני
    | الذي צוות פואס אלוה
    | ועطفו על אפר大きה

SG

SS

TF

FA

TH

While there is general agreement among all in the Arabic script versions in the use
of Form Two of the root *frx*, 'have fledglings', when speaking of the young waiting
to be fed, the differences in references to God among the canonical versions
continues as it has throughout the Book of Job. In addition, the verbs of these
versions differ in root, with SG using ǧwθ, 'ask for succor', which is very prominent
in the Qur'ān.

As in the previous stich, the canonical versions, FA included, share a common
perspective over against that of TH. There is no explicit mention of God in TH,
though it is God, not the raven’s fledglings, Who is the main actor. Thus TH
displays an inner consistency and coherence in focusing upon animal instincts
through the use of Form Two of the root *'tf*, 'make favorably disposed / awaken
affection or sympathy or interest', for the verb describing how God moves the
parent fowl in its behavior towards its fledglings.

Verse 41c

| MT | תשמ ולמיilet
    | זjęל בפיו אלהים

SG

SS

TF

FA

TH

428 SG's term is more general, from *wld*, 'give birth', yielding 'offspring'.
The chapter closes with a partial, though ultimately incomplete, return to the textual alignments displayed occasionally before the current verse: the MT, Tg, and SG vs. the LXX, S-H, SS, TF, and Cp vs. the Pesh and FA; there is no parallel equivalent in TH’s text, however.

All the versions agree that the activity described in this stich concerns food, but the MT speaks of a 'want' of food and the LXX of a 'search' for food, while the Pesh adds the extra element of 'fainting' for lack of food. Obviously, the first two sets of texts are closer to each other than the third is to either; indeed, the Arabic verb in SS and TF, from Form Eight of ıms, carries meanings that effectively bridge the two groups: 'beg (for) / search (for)'. Interestingly, the Cp carries two verbs of similar import: "wandering and seeking after their food".

The additional component in the Pesh, and therefore FA, underlines the sense of urgency, heightening the importance of the task at hand, making it even more apparent that Job cannot begin to dream of filling the divine role: his impotence is complete; thus FA takes yet another opportunity to reinforce his theological perspective on the sovereignty of God and the dependency of His creatures.
The Early Arabic Versions of Job (first millennium C.E.):
Conclusions

The Arabic versions may be viewed firstly as documents in their own right: their individual characteristics may be considered from the point of view of grammar, theological perspectives and approaches, Islamic influences, differences between the prose and poetic sections of the tale, and so on. But as a collection of Arabic language documents from the first millennium C.E., the versions may also be considered in relation one to another, compared in terms of similarities in morphology and syntax, stylistics, and registers of Arabic employed, as well as in terms of their interrelationships to the wider scriptural tradition, by which the versions can be grouped according to the languages of their source documents: (1) Hebrew and Aramaic, (2) Greek and Syriac (S–H), and (3) Syriac (Pesh).429

The Versions Individually Considered
Language: Classical, Christian, and Colloquial Arabic

The Version of SG

The only consistently Classical Arabic text among the canonical versions of Job is that of SG. Indeed, SG proves to be a master linguist and poet in his own right. For example, while adhering strictly to the structure and word order of the MT at 38:25b, SG demonstrates his mastery of the semantics and morphology necessary to create nuanced poetry of the highest order.

A greater degree of independence is displayed in the prose section at 1:13 and in the poetry at 3:24b, where SG proves not to be beyond correcting the MT’s style in order to introduce literary balance. But even with such additions of parallel expressions, SG is often careful to use similar parts of speech to the MT (in the case of 1:13, active participles), and frequently resorts to cognate Arabic roots when appropriate opportunities arise.

429 The Cp does not prove to figure, by and large, as a possible predecessor version.
A different kind of independence is shown at 3:9c, where SG's theological program requires even greater departures from his source documents, the MT and Tg. Yet in the end, style is not sacrificed at all, and the result is a fine piece of linguistic and theological work.

The Version of BM/SS

BM/SS provides a clear example of Christian Arabic.\textsuperscript{430} As a variety of Middle Arabic, Christian Arabic evinces a breakdown of the more formal and arcane Classical rules while preserving many of its basic lexical and stylistic qualities. For example, at 1:18b BM uses the oblique case where the nominative is clearly called for according to rules of Classical Arabic. The occurrence of the verb 'be' may account for this confusion, since its complement in Classical requires the accusative. But a more likely reason for the use of the oblique case is the shift in Middle Arabic away from discrete case endings represented consonantally, as in the regular masculine plural found at 1:18b. Indeed, the oblique ending in such instances came to supersede a separate nominative spelling, so that all three cases share a common spelling.

Another characteristic of Christian Arabic, related to the elimination of separate case endings as occurred at 1:18b, is the gradual disappearance of the accusative indefinite case ending from the masculine singular. This occurs in BM at 11:18a, and may account for the grammatical peculiarity found at 22:20a. Similar avoidance of the Classical accusative indefinite occurs at 22:26a.

The Version of TF

TF's language has clearly been influenced by a regional variety of Arabic, viz., Egyptian. Indeed, the overwhelming majority of the differences between TF and

\textsuperscript{430} Indeed, Blau (1966–67) repeatedly cites illustrative passages from BM and SS in his Christian Arabic grammar.
BM/SS can be explained by this phenomenon, there being some five dozen examples thereof. This heavy coloring of TF's language leads to the conclusion that despite many occurrences where TF actually improves on the Arabic of BM/SS (e.g., 32:9b), and despite instances where TF does not appear to have been influenced directly by BM/SS (22:20b), by and large TF can be seen as an Egyptian Arabic version or translation of BM/SS, both in its prose and poetic sections.

For example, TF's Arabic makes sparing use of the jussive (eliminated at 28:13b), the subjunctive (dropped from 3:5a), and the optative (removed from 28:5a), while shunning other classicisms such as the verb 'not be' (11:19). When a classical term has taken on a different meaning in Egyptian Arabic, TF will sometimes opt for an entirely different Egyptian vocabulary item in order to avoid confusion (28:7b). TF also has a tendency to change vocabulary items from Classical to their non-Classical equivalent in order to avoid case endings required by Arabic morphology (3:1a), and when case endings are unavoidable according to rules of syntax, TF very often simply drops such endings (32:5b). Spellings are also occasionally changed to reflect regional Egyptian pronunciation (32:5a).

But this is not to say that TF's language is necessarily pedestrian or prosaic. At 32:9b, 32:11b, and 32:11c, his style is of the highest caliber, demonstrating a nuanced linguistic grasp of his text. At 38:38a, TF provides clear indication of his strengths as a poet in his own right. And when his text requires a classicist turn of phrase, as is the case throughout much of Chapter 28, TF demonstrates that he can understand, and use, the basics of Classical grammar. One clear example occurs at 28:7b, where the particle ي is used; the same practice is found at 32:15b.

*The Version of FA*

FA is not only a master of Classical Arabic, at least as far as the treatment of the poetic passages of Job are concerned, but he also proves to be something of a
grammatical humorist, playing with his text at various turns. For example, at 3:24b FA inserts a pun on the name of Zophar into his translation, while in the following verse he is careful to select language that harmonizes with imagery from the prose section of the book. In 18:2 and 22:29a, FA’s concern is not so much internal harmony to the rest of Job, but to the larger Wisdom tradition.

In something of a grammatical tour de force, at 32:7a, 7bα, 7bβ, and 8a, FA ends each of his stichs with an indefinite accusative, each instance of which occurs for differing grammatical reasons: a لحم construction, an adverb, a direct object, and a noun governed by the particle ان. There is no apparent reason for this practice on FA’s part beyond a sheer love of language. Thus does his personality show through his handiwork.

Language: Prose vs. Poetry

Just as virtually all commentators have noted the differences between the prose and the poetic passages of the MT of Job, so too will differences be found in the Arabic versions, especially those transmitted in Arabic script. The reasons for such, however, are at variance with those well-rehearsed suggestions for the MT, which are said to be based in the very nature of prose vs. poetry, as well as in provenance, dates of composition, and theological raisons d’être. For the Arabic script versions, however, the issue is due to varieties of authorship/translators, with possible evidence of translation-by-committee, such methods being well-known in the Islamic world of the era under consideration.

The Version of FA

In Chapter 1, FA shows a basic lack of familiarity with simple grammatical rules of classical Arabic. Yet in subsequent poetic sections, FA’s style becomes

431 The literature here is too large to cite, being for all practical purposes co-extensive with the modern critical literature on Job.
becomes exacting, even showing some improvement on the poetics of the MT, and grammatical errors virtually disappear. The idea that differences within FA's translation would be due entirely to the relatively primitive nature of the style and vocabulary of the prose section of Job, as opposed to the more polished and erudite poetry, is untenable.

As if to confirm that FA's linguistic shift from the prose to the poetry of Job is not merely incidental, there is also a perceptible shift in theology as well. In 1:11b, FA implies that God cannot be the author of evil. However, at 3:25a, his translation presupposes the exact opposite: that God, as the Sovereign Ruler of All, is ultimately responsible for everything that occurs in His creation, evil as well as good. That his conflict is not resolved in FA is hardly surprising, given the treatment that this theological issue has received through the centuries. Indeed, it is a major problem of the Book of Job itself, and FA clearly places himself, as it were, on both sides of the controversy.

Finally, there is an occasional tendency in FA to make certain poetic passages read more flowingly, despite his care to observe, by and large, the poetic structure as found in the MT. His major syntactical tool here is the relative clause, by which he links stichs thematically and semantically. While FA does not employ such clauses indiscriminately,\textsuperscript{432} the result is to provide the reader/listener with easier transitions from one thought to the next, clarifying interrelationships within the text. This, of course, fits in well with his homiletic tendencies, which are discussed below.

\textit{The Versions of BM/SS and TF}

The changes within BM/SS and TF in the transition from prose to poetry are of a different nature, and while these changes are less dramatic than those evinced in

\footnotesize\textsuperscript{432}FA resorts to this device at 3:19b–21a, 28:4–7, and 38:5a–7a, with more isolated instances occurring at 28:23a and 32:1a.
FA, they are nonetheless easily visible. It is clear that BM and TF share a basic affinity, paralleling each other throughout most of Chapter 1 of the prose section. But the relationship between these two versions becomes even closer in the poetic chapters of Job. In addition, as will be discussed more fully concerning the relationship of BM/SS and TF to the wider scriptural tradition, it is clear that while the S–H is the source document for these two Arabic versions in the poetry of Job, the Pesh exerts some influence over the prose sections of BM and TF.  

Language and Theology: Homiletics

The Version of FA

Whether it is his inclination towards paraphrase that allows him to preach, or his need to preach that forces him to intersperse sermonic observations throughout his text, this characteristic of FA is unmistakable.

That the Ode to Wisdom provides the greatest number of instances should not be surprisingly, given that the Ode serves as a hiatus in the poetic disputations, providing an occasion for theological reflection. For example, at 28:12a FA draws the reader/listener into the story itself. Up to this point, the characters of the Job story have been on a dramatic stage, removed, as it were, from their audience. But by taking the opportunity of the break in the dramatic speeches to shift the focus from the characters to the listeners, FA becomes a preacher, inviting his congregation to apply to themselves the lessons of the story.

At 28:13b, FA’s concern is harmonization of scriptures. Here, his Christian congregation is given a thematic echo of the Gospel according to Matthew. At 28:18a and 28:28b, homiletic stylistics come to the fore, when FA sacrificing structural niceties in favor of emphasizing a broad textual meaning in order to stress

433 Surprisingly, the reverse occurs in FA, whose prose sections are dependent upon the S–H, but whose poetry is closer to that of Pesh.
a homiletical point.

But this does not mean that the rest of FA's text is untouched by his homiletical skills. For example, at 22:20a, FA turns a declarative statement into a conditional, thus allowing a transformation of 20b into a moralizing warning concerning repentence. Indeed, Eliphaz' Indictment is a favorite chapter for FA to read theological statements into his text. At 22:3 FA preaches against anti-nomianism while struggling with the implications of the pervasive fatalism of his culture and age. Only half a dozen verses later, FA gratuitously adds an extra stich in order to accentuate the supposed sinfulness of Job, using the extra wording to dwell upon the full implications of some of the most heinous sins in scripture. And then, in a major departure from the structure of the Book of Job, FA reintroduces the figure of Satan at 22:12 in a passage which underscores the theme of evil and sin.

But Eliphaz is not the only figure into whose mouth FA puts adds theological reflection. Zophar, who in FA makes a number of statements concerning Divine Sovereignty (p. 388f), makes at 11:6c a carefully worded observation, shared with TF, concerning divine absolution. In this, Zophar accentuates the role of grace rather than judgment, thus coaxing a seemingly reluctant Job to confession with honey rather than vinegar: FA's marks as a preacher are clear.

The other major occasion for theological reflection by FA occurs in Chapter 38, when at 10a his concern is to harmonize divine activity in Genesis with those of the Book of Job, harmonization with Genesis also occurring at 38:38a (as discussed under the theme of Divine Sovereignty (p. 388f)). At 14b, FA makes a veiled reference to resurrection, serving as a harmonization of Job with Christian thought.

Finally, FA sometimes gets carried away by his own verbosity, as at 3:20b.

Language and Theology: Names for God

The names and titles for God in the Hebrew text have been the occasion for much
comment. The Arabic versions further complicate the issues involved.

Recognizing that there are two basic names for the Deity in Hebrew, i.e. 
الرب and אלהים, there are then two equivalent Arabic terms: الله and والد. But what occurs in Job is considerably more complex, both in terms of the Hebrew and the Arabic.

The Version of TH

Simplest of all is the approach of TH, who refers to God as الله no matter what the context or occasion. In light of the Muslim tradition that God has ninety-nine names, the lack of variety in TH may been seen as surprising.

The Version of FA

FA shows almost as little variation as TH: of the thirty-three instances where God is explicitly mentioned in the portions of the MT analyzed, FA refers to God as الرب only seven times, six of which occur in the opening prose section. But the reason for such variation is theologically based, with الله being used when the transcendence of God is emphasized, and الرب occurring when His immanence is highlighted.

At 1:6a, 7a, 7b, and 8a, the scene is the heavenly court, where الرب is in close proximity to those with whom He is speaking or interacting. An apparent exception here at 8b, where الله is used, is not the exception it seems, given that the context of the use of الله is with reference not to a nearby member of the heavenly court, but to a distant mortal, viz., Job himself. This is also the case at 9b; the instance at 9a, where الرب is used in violation of the pattern regarding transcendence and immanence, can be attributed to scribal error, given the use of الله immediately preceding and following. At 1:21a, Job refers to God as الرب in the celebrated poetic passage towards the end of the first chapter. The theme, of course, is God's intimate

---

43 Dhorme (1967) contains a useful summary and analysis (pp. lxxv-lxxii).
interaction with His creatures. The only other instance where FA refers to the Deity as 
الرب is at 38:1, where He is about to address Job directly. Thus it is clear that
for FA the issue regarding which name or title to use for God relates to His
c nearness, or distance.

The Version of SG

For SG (as well as BM/SS and TF), the issue of divine names is complicated by
the need to translate 'יִהְיָה, שֵׁם, and אלהים into Arabic. The greatest consistency is
found in his rendering of the MT's 'יִהְיָה as 'אֲלֵפָמָן, "Allpowerful", as found in six
instances at 18:21, 22:2, 22:13, 22:17a, 32:13b, and 38:41b. 'אֲלֵפָן is not normally found
in the Hebrew scriptures, being a mere transliteration of the general Semitic term
for 'God'. Then the issue becomes why SG should have chosen for such a relatively
non-descript term a highly specific Arabic word such as 'אֲלֵפָמָן.

Another term SG uses as a divine name is 'אֲלַכְנַפִי, "the Allsufficing", which is
his favorite rendering for 'יִהְיָה. However, at 32:8b, the MT's 'יִהְיָה is translated as
אֱלָהוֹ.

SG further shows his independence as a translator, and therefore as a theologian,
by his treatment of such titles and names for the Deity as 'אֱלָהוֹ, 'אָלָהָד, 'אָלָהָד, and
אָלָהוֹ. The greatest consistency here is the treatment of 'אָלָהוֹ, which is always
translated by 'אָלָהוֹ (11:5a, 11:6c, 11:7a, 22:12), or 'אָלָהוֹ (3:4b), which represents
no more than a variant spelling of the conventional Arabic word for God; at 22:26b,
'אָלָהוֹ is translated by a pronoun suffix. However, 'אָלָהוֹ has been used to translate
'יִהְיָה at 32:8b. It is also used variously for 'אָלָהוֹ (28:23a), for 'אָלָהוֹ (1:7a, 12a,
12c, 21a, 38:1), and for 'אָלָהוֹ (28:28a).

But 'אָלָהוֹ of the MT is also occasionally translated in SG as 'אָלָהוֹ (1:9,
1:22b, 32:2b), or simply omitted altogether (1:16b). Thus there is no sense that God's
transcendence or immanence plays a role in determining which name to use for
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Him, at least not as it does in FA. Indeed, the use of 'the Lord' in SG is limited to only these three passages of the chapters under analysis. Variations in the Tg alone cannot account for SG's practice. Indeed, the Tg mss do not even agree among themselves on these issues.

The Versions of BM/SS and TF

While it has already been noted in the discussion 'Language: Prose vs. Poetry' that BM/SS and TF bear a close relationship to each other, especially in the poetic sections of Job, this closeness is absolute regarding the usage of terms to translate titles other than 'God' or 'the Lord': in such instances, BM/SS and TF are completely in lockstep with each other.

The four titles in question are العظيم, used at 11:7b for כָּל הָעָלָם כְּבוֹד; العالي, used at 22:12 for כָּל הָעָלָם כְּבוֹד; القوي, used at 22:13 for כָּל הָעָלָם כְּבוֹד; والأقوى, used at 22:17b, 22:25a, and 32:8b for כָּל הָעָלָם כְּבוֹד.

As for the contrasting usage between BM/SS and TF for 'God' and 'the Lord', the differences which obtain are not systematic. TF uses אל for BM/SS' אל at 1:12a, 22a, and 38:1, while the reverse occurs at 1:22b. Both agree to use אל at 1:8b and 9, 11:5a and 6c, and 28:23a and 28a, while the two translate אל at 1:12c and 21a, 3:4b, 11:7a, 18:21, 22:2, 17a and 26b, 32:2b, and 38:1b. Thus in fully half the passages under consideration, there is a common preference for אל: the close relationship, if not complete interdependence, of the two versions is thus attested by the strong parallel usages exhibited in the various names and titles for the Deity.

Theology: Anthropomorphisms

The Version of SG

While students of SG have long noted his penchant for eliminating language that...
ascribes to God human characteristics,\textsuperscript{435} this is only part of a broader theological program: for SG, the protection of God as the only Divine Being leads to the redefinition of Satan as a mere mortal accuser of Job (1:6b, 1:7b), the elimination of Leviathan (3:8b) and Lucifer (38:12b) altogether, and the depersonification of such 'figures' as Sheol (11:8), the Sea and Chaos (28:14a, 38:8a, 38:8b), Abaddon (28:22a), Time (32:7a), Speech (32:15b), and the heavenly bodies (38:7a); even Spirit receives the same treatment at 32:18b. In terms of natural phenomena, the dawn is no longer endowed with eyelids (3:9c), but inexplicably lightning speaks at 38:35b.

\textbf{Theology: The Sovereignty of God}

\textit{The Version of SG}

SG is so intent to protect the Sovereignty of God that he does not limit his program either to the elimination of anthropomorphisms or to downplaying any other forces that might be seen as challenging God. Indeed, in his translations of 22:4, 28:4bc, and 28:10b, SG comes down on the side of Divine activity taking precedence over human actions, with the result that the value of mortals is de-emphasized in the face of Divine reality, doing so in a manner that demonstrates independence from the theology of any possible predecessor versions.

\textit{The Version of TF}

TF also pushes his text in the same direction on occasion. In 22:29a, a change in the conjugation of the verb implicitly makes God, not Job, the subject of the stich. Thus God effects Job's deliverance, rather than Job working out his own salvation. This shift is confirmed in the following stich. Finally, at 28:26a, TF and SS both augment divine powers from a mere governance of limited meteorological

\textsuperscript{435} Cf. 1:11b, 1:12a, 11:2b, 11:4, 11:5, 22:22, 28:10b; however, at 1:6a SG uses an anthropomorphism in order to avoid use of the Tetragrammaton, while at 22:26a he provides the only other exception to the effort to expunge any anthropomorphic language whatsoever concerning God.
phenomena to a grandiose oversight of universal proportions.

*The Version of FA*

Such theologizing proves to be yet another *tour de force* for FA. In over twenty passages which occur in the poetic chapters, his text goes beyond the predecessor versions in explicitly citing God as an active, albeit hidden, player in the drama. FA thus reminds his listeners that God is the most important reality, while humans are comparatively incidental: the form of the Joban drama may be a human debate among mortals, but God is the most important Interlocutor of all in this matter. Over half of such passages occur in Zophar’s Argument and the Ode to Wisdom, though FA takes advantage of the closing of Eliphaz’ Indictment to turn the summation of the chapter into an affirmation of the primacy of divine grace in the drama of salvation.

FA has Job mischaracterize himself at 3:13 in order to prove later that humans are not as important as they think themselves to be.436 This tack is also taken by FA at 32:13b, where Elihu denigrates the Three Comforters in the face of Divine activity; at 38:41c, God Himself belittles Job’s potential; at 11:4, Zophar asserts that there is no self-justification or self-vindication possible when it comes to human action in the face of the Divine. Indeed, human free will is discounted (11:7b), and any challenge to God is illusory (11:10, 22:4).

This proves to be part of a larger theme of the primacy of Divine grace, which thematically closes Chapter 22, but which is also found at 11:14, 11:17, and 28:5a. FA appears to seize virtually any opportunity to augment God’s role, introducing Him where no predecessor version cites Him (3:17a, 11:12, 28:3a), or highlighting His power (28:9–10), transcendence (22:13), and activity (28:27a). God is cited, in

---

436 Mistaken self-portraiture is also a habit of FA’s Elihu, albeit for different reasons, ultimately; *cf.* 32:1b.
effect, as the 'Ground of All Being' at 32:8b, which is further underlined by His
creative role at 38:38a, where parallels to the first chapter of Genesis are discernable.
Indeed, FA even tackles the thorny theological problem regarding the existence of
evil in light of an all-powerful Deity: at 3:25a, God Himself is seen as the source
of the evil that has befallen Job. God's sovereignty is thus given the ultimate
protection, at least in the poetic portion of the text.  

Theology: Islamicisms

The indigenization of Judeo-Christian scripture to that of the dominant Islamic
community and culture is present in varying degrees in the first millennium versions
of the Arabic Job, ranging from doubtful existence in SG, relative rarity in TF, to
a more extensive catalog in FA.

The Version of SG

Only two possible Islamicisms in SG are found: at 1:8a, the term لَهْبُ، 'beloved of God', has echoes in both Shiite and Sufi thought; at 38:41b, a
root found extensively in the Qur'an is employed. Neither of these examples
provide more than the lightest suggestion of any Islamic influence on SG, however.

The Version of TF

Here, indigenization occurs on three levels. The first consists of textually
specific connections to Islamic thought. In the poetic passages, the occurrence of the
phrase روح الله, 'spirit of God', found at 32:8a, may be construed as echoing Islamic
usage, where the title refers to the Archangel Gabriel. This same kind of echo can
be found at 22:18b, where the occurrence of المنافقين, 'hypocrites', has many
Qur'anic precedents, similar to the use of الكفرة, 'infidels', at 3:17a; in both of these
instances, the usage is shared with BM. In the prose sections, TF shows evidence of

436 As noted in the section on 'Language: Prose vs. Poetry', FA's position in Chapter
1 differs from that of Chapter 3.
437 This is paralleled even more rarely in BM/SS.
even more points of contact with the world of Islamic thought. At 1:1, TF is clearly within the Islamic tradition in locating Job’s homeland, while at 1:14a and 1:17a, his description of the role of the satanic is close to that of TH. Finally, at 1:21aßb, TF and BM both share a common vocabulary item with TH.438

This connection to TH, however, is more important in terms of general outlook than any specific instance of lexical similarities or sharing: both versions grant Satan a greater role than do any of the predecessor versions, or any of the other Arabic versions of the first millennium C.E. Indeed, SG deliberately downplays Satan’s status, while FA’s reintroduction of Satan into the poetry of 22:12 is more of a rhetorical or homiletical device than anything else.

Added to the foregoing is the question of the physical appearance of TF’s ms. Occasional decorative florets, which are found both in the Qur’an and in non-sacred poetic texts of Arabic literature, are inserted.

The Version of FA

The appearance of FA’s ms goes beyond that of TF in that FA not only uses florets much more extensively, marking the end of each and every stich, but also supplies markings which are meant to be vowel diacritics, but which on closer examination prove to be largely ornamental.439 As far as the content of FA’s translation is concerned, Islamicisms are entirely absent from the prose section, but not from the poetry, where over two dozen identifiably Islamic traces can be found, such as the parenthetical pious remark, ‘May He be praised and exalted’, at 11:5.

Such widespread indications of indigenization raises the question as to whether

---

438 Given the later dating of TH, it may be argued that similarities in vocabulary do not show dependence of TF upon Islamic thought patterns. However, the fact that TF would employ vocabulary that a Muslim used in the same context argues that TF’s translation, though Christian, was congenial to the Islamic mind.

439 To be sure, at critical points in his translation, FA supplies proper vowel markings to indicate the use of a passive, or to indicate a declensional ending.
FA deliberately intended to provide connections to the Islamic tradition. If this were to prove to be the case, what FA's motivations may have been would still be difficult to ascertain. A near-contemporary of FA provides a possible model: John, Bishop of Damascus, was a regular guest at the caliphal court as a theological disputant and apologist. While the discussions were often heated, they were generally conducted in an atmosphere of mutual respect. FA may have seen himself as an apologist for Christianity to the Islamic community.

In any case, FA's poetic text is replete with Islamic references. Indeed, the only single possible trace of Islamic influence in the prose section proves to be tenuous at best, occurring at 1:13 (p. 34), from which the reference to the drinking of wine is deleted. As noted in the ensuing discussion at page 35, this omission need not be interpreted necessarily as indicative of Islamic influence.

References to Islamic Law can be found at 22:3, and even more clearly at 3:25b. Interestingly, the judgmental flavor which results in the latter of these instances is not in tune with the words of Zophar at 11:6c; this difference in outlook may be attributable to the fact that the utterances are not made by the same person. Other instances in Islamicisms in Zophar's speech can be found at 11:6c, where Islamic notions of forgiveness are invoked in the use of the Tenth Form of the root ǧfr, 'ask forgiveness'; at 11:7b, where the question of the freedom of the human will is implicitly addressed when it is states that God (alone) is endowed with qadar; and at 11:12, where one of the ninety-nine names of God is inserted.

The two other Comforters also contain Islamicisms in their respective passages as rendered by FA, though in the case of Bildad's Assertion, the connection to the

440 A study of the career of John of Damascus is found in Sahas (1969).
441 Other instances of Islamic influence in Job's Soliloquy can be discerned at 3:7b and 8b, where Qur'anic terminology is used.
442 Despite this apparent contradiction, 11:6c carries other Islamic overtones, as will be discussed below.
world of Islamic imagery is relatively weak, consisting of a classical vocative particle at 18:4aa which occurs not only in the Qur'an, but extensively in non-religious literature. Its appearance, then, may be attributable not as much to Islamic influence as to FA's fine sense of correct classical usage.

In Eliphaz' Indictment, the use of three roots with heavily Islamic connotations, viz., s1m, hmd, and snn, all within a relatively brief passage (22:21b-22a), reveals a reliance upon Islamic imagery as a conduit of expression. Indeed, snn recurs at 38:33a and 38:33b. The other instance in Chapter 22 is FA's employment at stich 23a of the root twb, which carries two highly religious meanings, 'pardon' and 'forgive', depending upon the context.

FA's version of the Hymn to Wisdom contains two unmistakable Qur'anic roots, and while a third instance is clearly less evocative of Muslim thought, the occurrence of all three in close proximity to each other lends an Islamic cast to 28:3c-5a. At 28:3c, 3y', 'shadow', a relatively rare root in Arabic, occurs repeatedly in the Qur'an. More self-evidently Muslim are the adoption of المضالين at 28:4b and الرزق at 28:5a: both are clearly Qur'anic, where they refer, respectively, to 'the wayward' and to 'divine beneficence'.

In the Opening to the First Divine Discourse, the use of snn at 38:33a and 33b has already been noted; the other Islamicism in Chapter 38 occurs at 38:23b, where FA's introduction of الجهاد, 'struggle, Holy War', reinforces the apocalyptic imagery which obtains in portions of the theophany.

Despite this extensive evidence of indigenization, it should be noted that FA misses, or avoids, several clear opportunities to Islamicize his translation. Of all the canonical Arabic versions, FA uses the least Qur'anic vocabulary to describe 'the wicked' at 3:17a; the very same situation proves to be the case at 22:18b, again with reference to 'the wicked'. And while the appearance of a Qur'anic term at 32:12a at
first glance seems to fit with the general tenor of FA’s translation, final analysis demonstrates that, at best, FA happened upon a felicitous coincidence in dealing with a cognate term from the Syriac.

At 28:12b, FA ignores the opportunity to use an Arabic cognate in treating the Hebrew, which would have resulted in the usage of a root with Qur'anic overtones. However, given FA’s reliance on the Pesh rather than the MT itself, this instance may not be indicative of a deliberate attempt to shield his version from Islamic influence. Similarly, FA’s unique treatment of Elihu’s character, discussed at 32:1b, shows independence from both Judeo-Christian precedent on the one hand and Islamic tradition on the other. This can be ascribed to the priority of FA vis-à-vis the Muslim TH: it is the latter who fails to adhere to FA’s precedent, not the former who fails to set the tone for a characteristically Muslim view of Elihu.

On balance, it can be concluded that though there is widespread evidence of indigenization in FA’s translation, such should be regarded as unintentional in nature.

The Versions Considered in Relation to Each Other and to the Wider Scriptural Tradition

SG as related to the MT and Tg

Ecker (1962) contends that SG is highly dependent upon the Tg. The present analysis concludes, however, that although SG occasionally prefers readings of the Aramaic, there are significant occasions when he shuns it, either to agree more closely with the Hebrew, or to strike out entirely on his own.

Significant examples of SG’s avoidance of the Tg in favor of the MT include 11:10, in which instance the Tg adds direct objects to the verse’s verbs, thus elucidating the effects of divine activity. But SG prefers to follow the MT virtually word-for-word here, despite the opportunity for clarification. At 38:12a, SG avoids the alternative reading of the Tg, but similarly rejects the model provided by the MT as well. The result is due to the perceived need to protect the notion of the
uniqueness and incomparability of God. SG continues this independent tack in 38:12b, where the inclination to protect God's otherness is combined with his program of demythologizing in order to produce a reading unattested in any of the predecessor versions.

Yet SG does prefer the readings of the Tg on occasion. For example, at 38:20a, he agrees with the Tg in selecting a term with a narrower semantic range than that of the MT. With the Tg at 38:39b, SG provides a duplicate rather than a synonym for the parallel to stich 39a's 'lion', while at difficult points in the text (e.g., 11:6b and 28:4a) he adopts Tg's attempts at clarification.

Of course, many times agreement with the MT means agreement with the Tg as well, as at 11:20b, 28:16a, and 32:3aβ. In addition, there are the relatively isolated instances where SG agrees with other versions, such as the Pesh (28:24b, over against FA, which agrees with the Tg here).

In sum, in translating Job SG used the MT as his basic source, resorting to the Tg on occasion. Indeed, more often than not, SG clarifies the MT not by resort to the Tg, but through his own acumen.

BM/SS as related to TF

This relationship has been partially treated in the linguistic discussions 'Classical, Christian, and Colloquial Arabic' and 'Prose vs. Poetry', above. In the former of these two, it was concluded that TF's translation can be viewed as an Egyptian Arabic version of BM/SS' Christian Arabic text. This is reinforced by parallels between the two documents, which often display close similarities where they betray no common precedent or source. Eliphaz' Indictment, inter alia, is replete with such examples as found at 22:3, 22:10, 22:24b, and 22:30.

While this conclusion regarding TF as a derivative of BM/SS is generally tenable, there are a number of characteristics peculiar to TF which merit attention.
With regard to the personal particulars of the human cast in the Joban drama, TF had access to extra-canonical sources that were either unavailable or not used by BM/SS. TF supplies Zophar with a nisba, 'al-Matûnî', which is not only unparallelled in BM/SS, but which disagrees all other versions supplying such information. The description supplied regarding Bildad is even more extensive, and contains a double entendre unprecedented in the text. There is some convergence with regard to Elihu, who is described in both documents as being from 'al-Bathaniyya', but regarding whose nisba there is some confusion. Only regarding Eliphaz do BM/SS and TF agree entirely.

Occasionally, the language of TF represents an improvement upon that of BM/SS: both 11:2b and 32:9b are indicative of a degree of attention to poetic and stylistic concerns by the monk of Fuṣṭât not found in SS, while 38:24b is evidence of his greater attention to grammatical detail. Other passages simply reveal that TF has chosen superior vocabulary items to those of BM/SS, as at 28:3a.

Differences in language at 28:11b result in a metaphorical reading by TF where BM is more prosaic; other linguistic disagreement may be reflective of, or may result in, divergent theological viewpoints, as at 11:6c, 22:29a, and 32:8a.

TF does not always understand, however, what BM/SS is saying. At times the result is not infelicitous, as at 28:15a, where the difference of a single diacritical mark causes TF to stretch for meaning which, in the end, is unrelated to that of any other version of Job, but which clearly fits the general themes of the story. A substitution of consonants at 32:18b leads to similar results, while 38:5b and 38:9a appear to be indicative of good sense being made of further scribal difficulties.

Less positive are the instances of 22:4, 22:8, 22:11, 28:4c, and 28:8a, where TF

43 Since TF identifies Job himself as being from al-Bathaniyya, it may be conjectured that BM/SS may have done the same; unfortunately, the opening pages of the Book of Job are missing from the latter version.
has not fully understood the import of the passages, and fails to make good sense of them on his own.

Finally, there are isolated instances where TF appears to have greater affinities with Arabic versions other than BM/SS. At 22:2b, TF conforms to the thought patterns of FA, incidentally leaving BM in greater agreement with SG than with its non-classical 'counterpart', while at 22:15 TF is closer to the MT than are SG or BM.

**BM/SS and TF as related to the LXX and S–H**

Despite the occasional differences between BM/SS and TF as outlined above, it is clear that they are closely related versions of Job. This is due not only to the dependence of TF on BM/SS, but also results from their reliance upon a common tradition, *i.e.*, that of the LXX as occasionally mediated through S–H. While evidence for this relationship to the wider scriptural tradition is less than clear-cut in the prose section, the poetic passages confirm this pattern.

Chapter 1 shows that TF bears affinities at v. 2 not only with the S–H, but also with Pesh. In the next verse, TF (with FA) parallels the Tg while clearly departing from both Syriac versions. At 1:5a TF rejoins the S–H, but by 1:6a shows a closer relationship to the MT. By 1:7b TF settles into the familiar pattern of closeness not only to the S–H, but to BM as well. This agreement is kept, by and large, until the close of the chapter, but not without exception: at 1:13a TF strikes out on his own, while at 1:20a it is BM that displays an independent streak.

The evidence from the poetic passages is overwhelming. There are instances wherein BM/SS and/or TF agree with the LXX as opposed to S–H or *vice versa*: at 22:15 and 38:10b, BM/SS and TF stand with the LXX over against S–H, but do the opposite at 32:14a; at 22:29a and 32:21a, BM/SS parallels the LXX, while TF bears

---

*In fact, TF is closer to MT here than is SG, which has notable similarities to FA at that point.*
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some similarities to S-H; at 28:15a, 32:3aß, and 38:23a BM betrays varying degrees of dependence on the S-H, while TF is clearly self-reliant in his rendition of these stichs; at 38:13b TF parallels both LXX and S-H, but SS does not. But affinities with other predecessor versions are scant, with BM/SS occasionally agreeing with TF on paralleling a single predecessor version. For example, at 3:4c, both follow the Cp closely, while at 28:12a and 28:27b both bear a striking resemblance (with SG) to the MT; at 28:19a both are close to Tg. Occasionally the two Arabic versions part company: at 22:23a BM is close to the Pesh while TF follows both the LXX and S-H; at 28:10b this pattern is reversed.

Therefore, with the exception of those instances, cited above, where BM/SS and TF are mutually interdependent to the exclusion of all predecessor versions, they are directly dependent on the LXX and S-H well over half the time in the prose section, and in excess of three-quarters of the time in the poetic passages.

**FA as related to the Wider Scriptural Tradition**

The present study bears out Graf (1944), who states that FA can be viewed as more a scriptural paraphrase than a translation; however, despite this attribute, there are clear lines of literary dependence for the work of this "interpreter" of scripture.445

In the prose section, where FA displays the least amount of independence,446 there is clear literary dependence on the S-H: in eight instances where FA shows explicit parallels with predecessor versions, over half of those instances are indications of agreement with S-H, with only a quarter showing affinities with the Pesh. There is only instance where a close relationship to the Tg is discernible.

In the poetic passages, however, FA displays a marked degree of literary independence. On those occasions where a relationship with a predecessor version

---

446 Only at 1:15a does FA clearly strike out on its own.
can be detected, the Pesh is clearly the favored model: indeed, virtually four-fifths of those passages where a pattern of dependence occurs are based on that Syriac version.447

Yet it must be noted that FA is not averse to ignoring even his favored source text: in Chapter 3 instances of literary independence outnumber those of reliance on the Pesh. Other chapters show a greater inclination to depend upon that Syriac version, but there are still remarkable instances of departure from it, especially in the Ode to Wisdom and the Opening of the First Divine Discourse.

TH as related to the Wider Scriptural Tradition: Linguistics

In the prose section, there is clear evidence of similarities between TH on the one hand and SG, TF, and FA on the other; these three appear to be equally influential upon TH. But this equality disappears with the move to the poetic sections, more exactly, to the Elihu material and the Divine Discourse, where the major affinities between TH and the canonical versions can be found.448

In Chapter 38 there are well over a dozen examples of close similarities between TH and FA. Given the relationship of FA to the Pesh, as noted above, it is not surprising, then, that half a dozen instances of direct literary agreement with FA occur in passages where FA is directly dependent upon the Pesh, viz., 32:13b, 38:25a, 38:36b, 38:40a,b, and c.

But TH is also in contact with the wider scriptural tradition as represented by the Genesis story: there are at least three references449 to the opening book of the Hebrew canon in TH's version of Chapter 38; this is unparalleled in either the predecessor or Arabic versions.

447 The exceptions do not significantly favor one predecessor version over another.
448 In point of fact, the overwhelming number of points of contact occur within the Divine Discourse.
449 38:7b, 8a, and 9a.
TH as related to the Wider Scriptural Tradition: Theology

If FA represents a paraphrase of Job, then TH might be considered an imaginative composition on Joban themes. Yet despite this relative looseness in the relationship between TH on the one hand and the canonical versions on the other, thematic and linguistic points of contact with both Arabic and predecessor versions are clearly perceptible. This should not detract, however, from the very real contrasts which obtain between TH and the wider scriptural tradition.

Theologically, a major concern of TH is the question of how God relates to His creation, in this case specifically, to Job himself. While the resolution of this issue has implications for the question of Divine Sovereignty, TH handles this subject in a manner distinct from both Jewish and Christian versions of the story as represented by SG and FA.

In contrast to SG, TH clearly sees a partnership between God on the one hand and His Prophet on the other. This is not to say that there is a measure of equality between the two, but for TH Job is not to be terrified by God, nor is he to be chastised by Him. It is as though TH saw Job as a 'beloved son, in whom God is well pleased' rather than as a 'mere mortal' who "obscureth wisdom with words devoid of knowledge" (SG). God in TH is a kinder, gentler God than the One Who speaks from the whirlwind in SG, or in of any of the other canonical versions, for that matter: indeed, only in TH does God call His Prophet by name (38:2a).

While the contrast, then, between TH and SG is clear, it is only marginally less so with regard to FA, who deals imaginatively with the problem of how God relates to Job. Bound by a sense of fidelity to the OT on the one hand and his Christian adherence to the revelation of the NT on the other, FA does not wish to present a picture of a God Who is uncompromisingly remote from His creation. This is

450 Cf. p. 388ff, where this theme is discussed in relation to SG, TF, and FA.
accomplished through occasional harmonizations with the NT at strategic points in
his OT paraphrase.\textsuperscript{451} This does not mean, however, that FA's version is a deliberate
teological bridge between the Jewish and Muslim traditions here. Rather, the
approaches of SG, FA, and TH must be considered in view of the broader picture of
theological developments from Judaism through Christianity and into Islam.

Despite this interest on the part of TH in portraying God as a benevolent Deity
Who is sympathetic to the circumstances and concerns of His people, His
sovereignty is never called into question. There is a clear relationship of
dependence of Job upon his Creator (38:2b), and it is still God Who issues
commands for Job to obey (38:3a).

Another theological concern of TH is the question of evil. While FA takes one
approach in the prose passages and a contrasting one in the poetic material\textsuperscript{452} with
regard to the metaphysics of evil, TH takes a mythic fascination with the satanic in
the prose passages. In this TH shares an affinity with TF, although the development
of this theme is more temperate in the Christian version than it is in that of his
Muslim counterpart. For TH, evil comes from a veritable host of demons, jinn,
fiends, and devils, all under the command of Iblis, who himself delights in the
torture he inflicts upon an unwitting Job. The resulting portrayals are luridly graphic.

The final theological issue is that of atonement. In the canonical versions, much
effort is expended in attempts to persuade Job to repent. But when the moment of
penitence finally comes, Job is quite brief, leaving some question as to whether his
utterances really qualify, or were intended, as repentence. With TH, there is also
some doubt, though it be different from the canonical versions' approach: Job
begins his prayer in self-abasement, but quickly moves on to a plea for help, given
his afflictions and torments. It is that plea which leads to the theophany.

\textsuperscript{451} Cf. p. 383f.
\textsuperscript{452} This is discussed in 'Language: Prose vs. Poetry', p. 382.