Failure to appreciate the chiastic word order may account for Otto Eissfeldt's unsatisfactory translation of UT, 51: VII: 37–39:

wy'yn aliy:n b'il
ib b'il lm thš   a:b
lm thš n̄̄q dmnrn   b:a'

Und es hob an Aliyan Baal:
Ihr Feinde Hadads, warum meidet(?) ihr,
warum meidet(?) ihr die Waffe Demarus?

In the second and third cola, the position of lm thš suggests a chiastic arrangement; this means that disputed n̄̄q dmnrn should be the close semantic counterpart of ib b'il, "O foes of Baal!" in an a:b:b:a' sequence:

And Puissant Baal replied:
O foes of Baal, why do you flee,
why do you flee, O assailants of Demarous?

Since it is now apparent from UT, 2001: 7–8, that dmnrn is an epithet of b'il—and that is the point Eissfeldt wanted to make—it becomes very probable that the one remaining uncertain word, n̄̄q, is a synonym of ib, "foes." Eissfeldt interprets n̄̄q as the noun Waffe, but the apparent chiastic parallelism of n̄̄q dmnrn and ib b'il suggests that n̄̄q are persons, hence to be parsed as a qal participle of n̄̄q, from which derive Ugar n̄̄q, "weapon," "ballista," "missile," and Heb nēšeq or nēšeq, "weapons," "missiles." When n̄̄q dmnrn is rendered "assailants of Baal," the verb thš can be identified with Heb hōš, "to hasten, make haste, flee."
The hypothesis proposed in this paper may be stated thus: when the poet uses the chiastic word order, the synonymy of the parallel members tends to be stricter than when the order is not chiastic. It bids fair to alleviate the ambiguity in numerous verses of the book of Job; in several verses (e.g., 34: 6) it elicits sense for the first time. To bring out more clearly the chiastic structure of the original, the translations will be very literal, hewing to the Hebrew word order as closely as English idiom will permit.

Job 21: 9 may be chosen as the first example because it focuses the problem sharply:

\[
\text{bottéhem sálom mippáhad} \quad a:b
\]
\[
w*ló' ñebel *i'ithk *aléhem \quad b:a'
\]

In their houses is prosperity without fear, and the rod of God is not upon them.

Uncertainty touches only the first colon; the phrase bottéhem sálom mippáhad may be parsed either in the light of Job 5: 24, w*yáda'tá kí sálom 'ohlékah, “You shall know that your tent is safe” (RSV), or, in view of its immediate counterpart, w*ló' ñebel *i'ithk *aléhem, “and the rod of God is not upon them,” a nominal sentence consisting of a subject and prepositional phrase. If we assume a similar nominal sentence in the first colon and a chiastic arrangement of the entire verse, then ambivalent bottéhem answers to prepositional *aléhem both in function as well as in sound. Hebrew grammars and lexica admit the wide prepositional use of bêt when in the construct state—that is, it need not be preceded by the preposition b'. A close parallel is Prov 15: 6, bêt saddly hósen ráb, “In the house of the just man is much treasure,” where the apparatus of BHK', “c Targ b*bét,” may safely be ignored. Equally to be declined are proposals to emend sálom to sál'má on the authority of LXX, Syr, and Vulg (so Siegfried, Duhm), or to sálw (Houbigant), or to s*leém (Perles).

The assonance of parallel bottéhem, “in their houses,” and *aléhem, “upon them,” suggests that in the preceding verse (Job 21: 8) lipnéhem, “in front of them,” was intended to balance assonant l*énéhem, “before their eyes.” Hence the atnach of MT should be advanced from ‘immam to lipnéhem and Job 21: 8 be read and scanned as follows:

\[
zár’tám nákón lipnéhem \quad a:b:c
\]
\[
‘ammín (MT ‘immám) (w*) s* péd*énéhem \quad b:a:c
\]

Their progeny is settled in front of them, vigorous is their offspring before their eyes.

In MT the line seems overlong, and BHK' suggests either the deletion of lipnéhem or the transfer of ‘immám, repointed ‘ammám, to the second colon. When, however, lipnéhem and l*énéhem are seen to balance each other, the chiastic arrangement of the remaining four words comes into view. Since zar'am, “their progeny,” obviously pairs with s* péd*énéhem, “their offspring,” one may conclude that uncertain ‘mm chiastically answers to participial nákón, “settled.” Accordingly, vocalize as plural adjective ‘ammim from the root *amm, “to be vigorous, sagacious.” Consonantal ‘mm would then be another instance of scriptio defectiva, so characteristic of the text of Job.

Job 6: 15 ‘ahay bág’dá k*ómó náhál \quad a:b:c
ka*šélq n’hállm ya*wírbá \quad c:b'

My brothers have been treacherous as a wadi, like a source of wadis they have vanished.

The ambivalent word here is ya*wírbá. Is its subject ‘ahay, “my brothers,” as understood by KJV, “My brethren have dealt deceitfully as a brook, and as the stream of brooks they pass away,” or is it n’hállm, “wadis,” as construed by RSV, “My brethren are treacherous as a torrent bed, as freshets that pass away,” and by NEB, “But my brothers have been treacherous as a mountain stream, like the channels of streams that pass away.” The latter construction assumes a relative clause with the relative pronoun unexpressed—no problem in the elliptical style of Job—whereas the chiastic position of the synonymous middle members suggests that the verbs are also chiastically arranged, with ‘ahay, “my brothers,” the subject of both verbs. It may be noted in passing that the qal/ijiqel sequence of verbs follows Canaanite practice (here both verbs refer to the same past time), and the k’mój/kú parallelism reflects the balance of kmj/k, witnessed in such texts as UT, 51: IV: 51.

Job 8: 5 ‘im ‘attáh t’sahér el ‘etl \quad a:b:c
w* ‘et l*sadday títánnán \quad c:b'

If you will seek after El, and to Shaddai make supplication.

Since piel šíhér elsewhere always governs the accusative, some scholars have proposed either the emendation of first-colon ‘el to ‘et (cf. BHK') or its deletion. Others who retain ‘et tend to explain it on the analogy of dárāt ‘el, “to seek after,” but a more immediate explanation is prompted
by the chiastic ordering of the verse. To make the chiasmus with 'el šadday perfect, the author chose a construction that would yield 'el 'el. Here then would be an instance where the appreciation of Job’s chiastic style proves text-critically valuable.

Consonantal liskn lends itself to two interpretations. Though MT construed it as hiphil taškēn, the ancient versions read it as qal liskn. The application of the stylistic principle of chiasmus sustains MT hiphil taškēn against qal liskn of the ancient versions. Since the line is apparently patterned in an a:b::c’b’::a’ sequence, hiphil taškēn makes an apter counterpart to hiphil har’tiqēhā, “put it far away,” than does qal liskn, which involves a shift from the second person of the first colon to the third person in the latter half of the verse. This shift partially obscures the chiastic pattern.

Proposed in 1965, and confirmed by a reading from Qumran, the reading is further sustained by the stylistic observation that when the order is chiastic, the synonymy tends to be stricter. In the present instance, this means that consonantal š should semantically balance b’yāḏō, “from his hand,” a balance that is realized when it is vocalized ḏō and derived from wš, “to give, donate,” a well-documented root,13 witnessed in Ugar usn, “gift.” MT š would thus have stemmed from an original defectively written š, which, on the basis of Arab awsu, “gift,” and Ugar usn, “gift,” I would now vocalize as ḏō, to balance yāḏō, and to avoid two accents falling on two successive syllables; see below on Job 41: 7.

Chiasmus in Job

Job 11: 14

'im 'awen b’yāḏō kâ' har’tiqēhā
w'rēḥ kol bâšā ḏō (MT b’sar ḏē)

That from his hand is the soul of every living being, and the spirit in all flesh is his gift.

Job 12: 10

'asēr b’yāḏō nepeš kol bây
w'rēḥ kol bâšā ḏō (MT b’sar ḏē)

e’b’

If iniquity is in your hand, put it far away, and permit no evil to dwell in your tent.14

Job 15: 18

'asēr kēšāmim yaggídā
w’le bəšādām kēšāmim (MT kēšādām mešābētām)

e’b’

What wise men have told, and their fathers did not conceal from them.

The chiastic positioning suggests that second colon kēšāmim should be the subject of the second colon, just as kēšāmim, “wise men,” is the subject of the first colon. This becomes possible when prepositional me of MT mešābētām is attached to the preceding word, as has long been suggested, and parsed as the dative suffix. In the two transitive verbs yaggídā and bəšādām one notices the qatl-qal sequence commented upon in connection with Job 6: 15.

Chiasmus and dative suffix likewise characterize Job 31: 16:

'im 'ennātēm ḏēpes (MT 'enma' ḏēpes) dallām
w’tēn 'almānāh kāleleh

e’b’

If I have withheld the poor's desire from them, or the eyes of the widow caused to fail.

Since 'ten 'almānāh, “the eyes of the widow,” is the direct object, it would seem that its chiastic counterpart ḏēpes dallām, “the poor’s desire,” should also be the direct object. By attaching the preposition me of ḏēpes to the preceding verb and parsing it as the prospective dative suffix, we obtain the desired direct object. Moreover, the verb mānā', “to withhold,” elsewhere governs the accusative of the thing desired, e.g., Job 22: 7, ūmērētēb timna' lākem, “and from the hungry you withheld bread,” or the accusative of the person refused, e.g., Num 24: 11, mtnā=kā yluw mikkābōd, “Yahweh has refused you glory.” The dative suffix of 'ennātēm, “(If) I have withheld from them,” recalls Job 15: 18, kēšādām, “did (not) conceal from them.”

Job 13: 12

zikrōnēkēm mīšē 'eper
l'gabbē hōmer gabbēkēm
b’:

Your maxims are ashen aphorisms, indeed defenses of clay your defenses.

Since the order of the two cola is chiastic, one may infer that the syntactic elements in each colon are similar. The first colon is a nominal sentence consisting of subject and predicate. One thus looks for a predicate followed by a subject in the second colon. These emerge when l’t of l’gabbē is construed as the emphatic lamedh, “indeed,” frequent in nominal sentences, rather than as the preposition.15

Job 17: 7

watēkānah mīkka'ah 'enē
wisāray kassēl bāšā-m (MT kullūm)

e’b’:

Dimmed with sorrow is mine eye, and my limbs like a shadow are wasted.
The evident chiasmus of the line points to the desirability of a verb in consonantal *kám*. This stylistic observation lends support to the suggestion of N.M. Sarna\(^7\) that *kālā* plus enclitic *mem* be read for MT *kullām*. I would vocalize *kālā-māl*, to produce assonance with *šāl* and to even the syllable count at 8: 8.

**Job 19: 14** *minmennti hād*āt q’rōbdāy umt’yuddā‘ay ṣ’hēnānī c’b’ā’a*  
From me have fallen away my close friends,  
and my kinsmen have forgotten me.

With the transposition of *minmennti* from the end of vs 13 to the beginning of vs 14, the syllable count of vs 13 becomes 7: 7 and that of vs 14 events at 9: 9. What is more, in vs 14 an a:b:c::c’:b’:a’ chiastic pattern, so characteristic of Job, comes to light; it consists of prepositional phrase: verb:subject::subject:verb: pronominal suffix.

**Job 20: 6** *’im ya’āleh lašāmayim mšy (MT štō) ṣrō’sō lā’āb yoggāl*  
If his statue should rise to heaven,  
or its head to the clouds reach up.

The unexplained hapax legomenon *štō* presents the chief difficulty in this verse. The chiastic word order bespeaks a close semantic bond between c and c’. The LXX reading, ἀ λί τὸ ἀ βρόδη, indicates that they had ἄγιον, “present,” (Ps 68: 30; 76: 12) in mind. Another possibility assumes an instance of a shared consonant\(^8\) whereby the final mem of *šāmayim* also serves as the initial consonant of *mš*, “statue,” a well-attested noun in the Phoenician inscriptions\(^9\) and probably identifiable in 2 Kings 23: 12. The suffix of *mšy* would parse as the third person singular suffix -y, as in Phoenician, a stylistic variant to the normal suffix of *rō’sō*.\(^{10}\) Of course, the picture that comes to mind is that of Dan 3: 1: “King Nebuchadnezzar made an image of gold, ninety feet high and nine feet wide.”

**Job 26: 5** *hār’pā’ im y’hōlālā-mī lēḥat (MT mittabat) maṣyım w’redek’nēhem b’šā’a*  
The Shades writhe in pain,  
dismayed are the waters and their dwellers.

A. C. M. Blommerde\(^8\) has correctly seen that MT *mittabat* conceals the verb needed chiastically to balance *y’hōlālā*, “writhe in pain.” When *mī* is attached to the first-colon verb as the enclitic, consonantal *lth* can be parsed as the niphal third feminine singular *lēḥat* followed by the plural subjects understood collectively. Compare Ezek 32: 30, which juxtaposes the roots *bh* and *šft* that are juxtaposed here. The emergent chiasmus and the 9: 9 syllable count tend to preclude the various emendations and reconstructions that have been hitherto proposed.\(^{12}\)

**Job 28: 2** *barzel mē’āpār yuqqāh w*ē *e’en y’sūqā (MT yūṣqā) n’t’hāšīh b’šā’a*  
Iron is taken from ore,  
and from smelted rock, bronze.

To elicit a coherent statement from this couplet, the critic must recognize, first, the use of a double-duty preposition, with *e’en, “rock,” sharing the preposition of synonymous *mē’āpār, “from ore.” Second, he must see in consonantal *yuqq* defective spelling for feminine *y’sūqā* that modifies feminine *e’en*. For similar instances, compare Job 20: 26; 28: 14, 21.

**Job 32: 14** *w’rē’rōk (MT lō’ rārak) ḡlēy (MT ḡlēg) millin āb’imrēkem lō’ *ṣibennā* c’b’ā’a*  
I shall not marshal against him your arguments,  
and with your words I shall not rebut him.

From the chiastic position of *millin* and ʿimrēkem, the textual critic may assume that unintelligible MT ʿlōʾ ḡlēg ʿēlēy is the close semantic counterpart to lōʾ *ṣibennā, “I shall not rebut him.” The reading lōʾ ʿērōk ḡlēy, based on no consonantal changes of the text, provides the desired counterpart. To be sure, one may read lōʾ, invoking the practice of shared consonants, but since the negative particle in Ugaritic is simply l, the reading lō may stand. Consonantal ʿrēʾ ḡlēy must then answer to *ṣibennā, “I shall rebut him”; this becomes possible when the suffix of ʿlēy is parsed as the Phoenician third person singular -y. Thus the suffix of ḡlēy balances the accusative suffix -ennā of *ṣibennā*. For other instances of ʿel, “against,” compare Job 9: 4; 15: 13, 25, 26. Suffixless *millin*, “your arguments,” shares the suffix of synonymous ʿimrēkem, “your words.”\(^{23}\)

**Job 34: 6** *ʿal miṣpāl ʿakuzzāb (MT ʿakzzēb) ʿānāh hiṣēl b’līl pāša b’šā’a*  
Despite my honesty I am declared a liar,  
wounded by his arrows though sinless.

*BDB*, p. 754b, recognizes ʿal, “despite, notwithstanding,” here and in Job 10: 7, but GB\(^2\), p. 585b, rightly adds Job 16: 17. Here it may be noted that failure to grasp this nuance may underlie the defective understanding
of Job 23: 2, *gam hayyûm m’rî šhi yâdî kâbr’dâh* ‘al ‘ankâhî, “Especially today my complaint is bitter; his hand [suffix of yâdî is third singular] is heavy despite my groaning.” Compare NEB, “My thoughts today are resentful, for God’s hand is heavy on me in my trouble.”

Since ‘al mîs-pâli, “despite my honesty,” and b’lî pâli, “though sinless,” evidently pair off, *kêb* and *mûâs kây* must be mutually elucidated. MT passive ‘ânlû points to the passive vocalization *kûzzâb,* “I am declared a liar,” namely, by Yahweh. Accordingly the suffix of kây, to be pointed either as singular hîssî, “his arrow,” or plural hîssîy, “his arrows,” should refer to Yahweh. This analysis thus links our verse to Job 6: 4, *hiṣê sâdây* ‘immâdî, “Shaddai’s arrows are toward me,” and Job 16: 14, “His shafts encompass me, he pierces my entrails without pity.”

Job 36: 3 ‘êssî dêl’ l’mûrâbôq  
\[ a:b \]
\[ ål’t’ *âll*  ‘êtêtôn sêdeq \]
\[ b:a’ \]

I bring my knowledge from afar, and from my Maker I present the truth.

The similarity of ‘êssî and ‘êtêtôn, both from *primae nun* verbs, bespeaks the chiastic structure of the verse. And since l’mûrâbôq, as in Job 39: 29, signifies “from afar,” l’ of l’pôåll carries the force of “from,” as so often in Ugaritic. Cf UT, 68: 12-13, where l, “from,” is parallel to l, “from,” as here.\(^{27}\) The precise force of the hapax legomenon phrase ‘êtêtôn sêdeq must be inferred from its chiastic parallelism with ‘êssî dêl’, whose meaning is tolerably clear. In dêl’ and sêdeq we have the breakup of a composite phrase signifying true knowledge.\(^{27}\)

Job 36: 12 wî’tîm 1 *yiṣm*’û  
\[ a:b \]
\[ b’selôh ju’åm b’àEu \]
\[ w’iyiqw’û b’lî dâ’å’t \]
\[ b:a’ \]

But if they do not obey, the Channel\(^{28}\) they cross, and expire in Unknowing.

In his study of this passage, N. J. Tromp\(^{29}\) recognizes the a:b:b’:a’ structure of the verse but hesitates to accept b’lî dâ’å’t as a poetic epithet for Sheol. He renders the final colon, “And they die for lack of knowledge.” But he fails to notice that the translation and exegesis of our verse are bound up with the preceding verse:

\[ ‘im yiṣm’û w’ya’âbôdû \]
\[ y’kalû y’mênêm ba’ll ôb \]
\[ ìmêhêm bann’ìlmîm \]

\[ ‘îpees u’ah*utu b’lî dâ’å’t \]
\[ b:å’m \]

If they obey and serve, they pass their days in happiness, and their years in comfort.

Chiasmus in Job

Here the consequence of obedience is expressed by two terms that are strictly parallel and synonymous: *fôb* and *n’tîlmîm.* In vs 12 the consequence of disobedience is presumably stated in strictly parallel and synonymous terms: *sêlôh* and b’lî dâ’å’t. The basic thesis of this paper, that the chiastic pattern bespeaks an even stricter synonymy, excludes Dhorme’s and Tromp’s explanation of b’lî dâ’å’t as giving the cause of their death. The cause of their death is ‘îm lô’ yiṣm’û, “if they do not obey,” not ignorance. Vs 10 plainly states, “He opened their ear for instruction and warned them to draw back from evildoing”; so it seems improbable that two verses later death would be ascribed to ignorance.

This translation and interpretation are sustained by comparison with Job 14: 20-21, which collocate the two motifs of Channel and Unknowing: “You overwhelm him, he passes away forever; you change his visage and send him across the Channel (*t’sâl’t*bêhû*). His sons are honored, but he never knows (*lô’ yêd’dû*); they are disgraced, but he perceives not.”\(^{30}\)

Job 37: 3 ta’bat kol hašâmâyim yiṣrêhu  
\[ a:b \]
\[ w’ôrô* ‘al kan’pôl hâ’âres \]
\[ b:a’ \]

Beneath the whole heaven it flashes,\(^{31}\) and his-lightning is upon the corners of the earth.

In the dispute over the meaning of the hapax legomenon yiṣrêhu, the stylistic observation regarding the chiastic wording sustains the definition of šrh (Ugar šrh), “to flash,” since its chiastic counterpart is Ôrô, “his lightning.”

Job 39: 6 a’ser kamîl a’râbâh bêlô  
\[ a:b:c \]
\[ ìmêk’nôlôyû m’lêbûh \]
\[ c:b’ \]

I made the wilderness his home, and his dwelling the salt flats.

The chiastic parallelism with singular bêlô, “his home,” shows that mišk’nôlôyû, though plural in form, is to be understood as singular in meaning.\(^{32}\) The apparatus of BHK\(^{33}\) recommends the insertion, *mëri causa,* of ‘ères before m’lêbûh in the second colon, but the strict chiastic balance of three-syllabled a’râbâh, “wilderness,” and three-syllabled m’lêbûh, “salt flats,” dis­countenances such an insertion. What is more, the current 9: 8 syllable count and the fact that mišk’nôlôyû can bear two accents render such an addition unnecessary.
The longstanding practice of reading verbal ḫāṭar for nominal ʿyṯūr of MT is upheld by the resultant chiasmus with verbal ḫāṭar.²⁹

Job 41: 7 ṣāḏār ṣāḏām ṣāḏó ʿrō (MT ʿrō) b‏'‏a

His back²⁸ rows of shields, enclosed by a seal²⁸ his dorsum.

Once the chiasmus is recognized, it becomes probable that consonantal ʿrō should be identified with Ugar ṣāḏ, “back, dorsum.”²⁸ The vocalization ṣāḏō instead of ṣāḏār is adopted to avoid two accents falling on two successive syllables, the same procedure as above at Job 12: 10. The chiasmic parallelism of ṣāḏār and ṣāḏām thus recalls the straight balance between ʿūṣāmuy, “his bones,” and ʿgrāmām, “his gristles,” in Job 40: 18. Scríptio defectiva in the original will account for MT ṣāḏ as against revocelled ṣāḏō; since it is a mediae waw root, it would appear as ṣāḏ in normal Hebrew orthography.

The recognition of chiasmus in Job proves valuable in reducing the number of options in equivocal texts. In some verses, it can even prove decisive. The MT (as well as the ancient versions which, though checked, were rarely cited for lack of space) betrays a limited appreciation of this element of ship between Testaments, 68, 116; H. J. van Dijk, 1-2; H. Bauer and P. Leander, The recognition of chiasmus in Job proves valuable in reducing the number
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25 Whereas, in the words of Elihu, Job considered himself just: Cal ~ciddeqo napso me”IDhlm, “because he considered himself just before God.”
26 For further details, consult Blommerde, Northwest Semitic Grammar and Job, p. 125.
28 For this definition of seidq, see the full discussion, with bibliography, by N. J. Tromp, Primitive Conceptions of Death and the Nether World in the Old Testament (Rome, 1969), pp. 147–51.
29 Ibid. p. 150.
30 Compare Is 5: 13–14, where b’ll dā’al “Unknowing,” occurs in a Warfeld teeming with names for the nether world.
31 The ending of the singular verb giṣḥāhu can be parsed as the archaic indicative ending found in Ugaritic. Blommerde, Northwest Semitic Grammar and Job, p. 15, cites other examples in Job and pertinent bibliography.
32 This poetic usage is discussed above in connection with Job 11: 14.
33 It has long been observed that the proper understanding of this verse sheds light on Prov 12: 26:

$ytr̄m mir’thō (MT yšterr mērtu, hō) saddiq
u̲nder derek rš’dlm t’’lm

The just man roams his pasture,
but the path of the wicked leads them astray.
Contrast NEB: “A righteous man recoils from evil, but the wicked take a path that leads them astray.” That mir’thō, “his pasture,” and derek, “path,” are a congenial parallel pair may be argued from Is 49: 9: ‘al d’ｒ’ktm giṣḥ’qo bēkhol b’pdhlm murtidl, “Near the paths they shall pasture, and upon all the bare heights shall be their pasture.” Thus the parallelism in repointed Prov 12: 26 may in turn be cited against the adoption of Q Discuss, which reads in 49: 9, ‘u kwl hrym, “upon all hills,” for MT ‘al d’ｒ’ktm, “near the paths.”
35 I am indebted to Ms Tiqva Frymer for this translation of sāṣṭr ḫōṭām.
36 Dahood, Psalms II (AB), p. 361, collects the evidence for biblical sār, “back.” To the texts listed there, Job 19: 24 bāṣṣṭr may have to be added. The traditional translation “upon the mountain/rock” introduces a new element that ill accords with the imagery of the preceding three cola. Perhaps we should translate Job 19: 24: “With iron stylus upon lead may they be inscribed upon it (bāṣṣār, literally “upon its back,” as in Job 22: 24) forever.”