

THE "ENEMY" IN ISRAELITE WISDOM LITERATURE

A Dissertation
Presented to
the Faculty of the
Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy
by
John Keating Wiles
June 1982

Digitized by Ted Hildebrandt, Gordon College, 2006
Displayed with permission from Dr. John Keating Wiles

APPROVAL SHEET

THE "ENEMY" IN ISRAELITE WISDOM LITERATURE

John Keating Wiles

Read and Approved by:

Marvin E. Tate (Chairman)

John Joseph Owens

John D. Watts

Date: August 10, 1982

CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
1. Introduction	1
Personal Enemies in the Psalms	3
A Methodology for Investigating	
"Enemies" in the Wisdom Literature	18
Methodological Caveats	22
Contemporary Value of this Study	28
2. Enemy Designations Within the	
Wisdom Literature	30
Proverbs	32
The אֱוִיב-Group	33
The רָשָׁע-Group	35
The religion of the wicked	36
The demeanor of the wicked	37
The speech of the wicked	39
The allies of the wicked	41
The Neutral Group	45
The Friends and Kinfolk Group	56
The Animals Group	59
Job	61
The אֱוִיב-Group	61
The רָשָׁע-Group	66
The Neutral Group	72

The Friends and Kinfolk Group	74
The Animals Group	76
Qoheleth	77
The רשע-Group	78
The Neutral Group	79
The Animals Group	80
Sirach	80
The רשע-Group	82
The רשע-Group	87
The wicked in the cult	91
The wicked and the economy	92
The wicked at court	93
The wicked and their speech	94
Wicked friends	94
The wicked and the family	96
The wicked and duplicity	99
The wicked and the fool	100
The Neutral Group	101
The Friends and Kinfolk Group	105
The Animals Group	109
Wisdom of Solomon	110
The רשע-Group	112
The רשע-Group	114
The Neutral Group	118

The Friends and Kinfolk Group	119
The Animals Group	120
Summary	121
3. Derivative Enemies in Wisdom Literature	127
Proverbs	129
Foolish Characters as Enemies	130
Righteous Characters as Enemies	138
Wisdom and Yahweh as Enemies	141
Job	146
Righteous Characters as Enemies	150
Satan as an Enemy	156
Yahweh as an Enemy	157
"The Enemy behind the Enemy"	163
Qoheleth	166
Sirach	169
Historical Characters as Enemies	171
Dispositions, Actions and Things	
as Enemies	172
Fools and Sages as Enemies	176
Wisdom and the Lord as Enemies	179
Wisdom of Solomon	184
Righteous Characters as Enemies	185
Idolatry as an Enemy	186
Creation as an Enemy	188
Summary	190

4. Wise Responses to the Enemy	194
Proverbs	194
Rejection of Enemy Behavior	195
No Anxiety over Enemies	199
Avoidance of the Enemy	201
Securing Actions in the Face of Enemies	206
Gifts work wonders	207
Heed wisdom	208
Fear Yahweh	209
Love for the Enemy	210
Motives for Wise Responses to the Enemy	218
Self-destruction	218
Fate-fixing actor	219
Yahweh as "midwife"	222
Job	227
The Friends	228
Elihu	232
Yahweh	234
Job	235
Response to Satan?	239
Qoheleth	239
"Quietism"	240
Hatred	242
Enjoyment	245
Fear	253

Sirach	258
Hostility	259
Caution	262
Reconciliation	266
Piety	275
Motives behind Sirach's Counsel	278
Death	280
Shame	281
Response to Wisdom	284
Wisdom of Solomon	285
Welcome to Strangers	285
Responses to Idols and Their Worshipers	287
Gentleness	290
Motives behind Responses to the Enemy	293
Summary	296
5. Conclusion	299
Bibliography	307
Appendices	
I. Enemy Designations within the Wisdom Literature	321
II. Enemy Behavior within the Wisdom Literature	329
III. Derivative Enemy Designations	350
Abstract	361
Biographical Data	363

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

The wisdom tradition of Israel departs in a remarkable way from the dominant Old Testament attitude toward personal enemies.

If your enemy is hungry, give him bread to eat;
and if he is thirsty, give him water to drink;
for you will heap coals of fire on his head,
and Yahweh will reward you.

Proverbs 25:21-22

This instruction, cited by Paul in Romans 12:20, articulates an ethic of treating enemies in a beneficent manner. It is perhaps the closest the Old Testament comes to Jesus' command to love the enemy (Matt. 5:44). A few other passages in the wisdom literature speak of treating enemies in a non-aggressive way.¹

Examples of beneficent responses to enemies may be adduced in other complexes of Israelite tradition. Exodus 23:4-5 commands one to return the enemy's stray ox or ass and to help him lift up his overburdened beast.² Narratives tell of Joseph aiding his brothers who had conspired to kill him, to cast him into a pit and to sell him to the

¹ Prov. 16:7; 24:17-18; Job 31:29-30.

² S. Driver, *A Critical and Exegetical Commenter on Deuteronomy* (3rd ed., Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1901), p. 250, commenting on Deut. 22:1, the deuteronomic reformulation, calls the Exodus form of the law "an old-world anticipation of the spirit of Mt. 5:44."

Ishmaelites.³ David spared Saul's life when he was most vulnerable.⁴ In the latter case, Saul was evidently surprised by David's behavior for he asked, "If a man finds his enemy will he let him go away safe?" (I Sam. 24:19). Each of these examples may be viewed as beneficent responses to a personal enemy.

The wisdom tradition, however, sounds this note most clearly. The narrative examples of this ethic may perhaps be gainsaid since David was not dealing with a common enemy but with Yahweh's anointed,⁵ and Joseph was acting under the watchful and subtle guidance of God's providence.⁶ The beneficent behavior mandated by Exodus 23:4-5 is somewhat oblique for the object of neighborly consideration is the enemy's livestock, not the enemy himself. Why should

³ Gen. 37:18, 24, 28; the whole story comprises chapters 37, 39-50.

⁴ I Sam. 24:1-22; 26:1-25. The two stories are doublets of the same tradition; see K. Koch, *Was Ist Formgeschichte? Methoden der Biblexegese* (3 Aufl., Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1974), pp. 163-181.

⁵ I Sam. 24:6; 26:9; in both versions of this saga the fact that Saul is Yahweh's anointed is the reason given for David's restraint.

⁶ Gen. 45:4-8; 50:20; G. von Rod argued that the Joseph story is a wisdom tale in "The Joseph Narrative and. Ancient Wisdom," in *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays*, trans. by E. Dickens (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966), pp. 292-300; and in *Genesis: A Commentary*, trans. by J. Marks (rev. ed., Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1972), p. 435; but see also G. Coats, "The Joseph Story and Ancient Wisdom: A Reappraisal," CBQ 35 (1973), 285-297.

innocent animals suffer merely because neighbors had become involved in some dispute?

Personal Enemies in the Psalms

Although personal enemies do appear in narrative materials, law and wisdom literature, they seem to play a relatively minor role. With the individual laments and thanksgiving songs the enemies play a major role. They form one of the three fundamental components of the lament.⁷ Furthermore, although the Hebrew title of the Psalter (תהלים) is more properly translated "Praises" there is a large amount of prayer or petition (תפלות); approximately one third of the Psalms are not in fact praises but laments.⁸ It is scarcely surprising, therefore, that enemies appear so frequently in the Psalter.

Because of the major role which enemies play in so many psalms, impressions of Old Testament attitude toward personal enemies are most easily formed on the basis of the Psalter. When it is examined with a view toward discerning how to treat one's enemies, the results are radically different from the beneficent, or at least non-aggressive,

⁷ C. Westermann, "The Structure and History of the Lament in the Old Testament," in *Praise and Lament in the Psalms*, trans. by K. Crim and R. Soulen (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1981), p. 169 (= "Struktur und Geschichte der Klage im Alten Testament," ZAW 66 [1954], 44-80).

⁸ A. Anderson, *The Book of Psalms*, Vol. I (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981), 36.

responses noted in the passages above. For example:

Break thou the arm of the wicked and
 evildoer;
 seek out his wickedness till thou
 find none.

Psalm 10:15

O that thou wouldst slay the wicked, O God,
 and that men of blood would depart from
 me,
 men who maliciously defy thee,
 who lift themselves up against thee for
 evil!

Do I not hate them that hate thee, O LORD?
 And do I not loathe them that rise up
 against thee?

I hate them with perfect hatred;
 I count them my enemies.

Psalm 139:19-22⁹

Little wonder then that many may assume that Jesus' remark that it was said of old, "You shall love your neighbor and hate your enemy" (Matt. 5:43), is an accurate quotation of some Old Testament passage or, at least of some contemporary Jewish teaching. Such an instruction is not to be found in Jewish scriptures, however, and nothing like it has been discovered in rabbinic materials.¹⁰ Nevertheless, it is very easy to understand how readers, critical or otherwise, could conclude that such hostility toward enemies was precisely the teaching of the Old Testament, and

⁹ Cf. Psalms 5:11; 7:7, 10; 10:2; 12:4-5; 17:13-14; 25:3; 28:4-5; 31:18-19; 35:1-8, 26; 55:10; 58:7-12; 59:6, 12-14; 69:23-29; 70:3-4; 71:13; 79:6, 12; 83:10-19; 94:2; 109:7-20, 29-30; 129:5-7; 137:7-9; 140:10-12; 143:12.

¹⁰ T. Manson, *The Sayings of Jesus as Recorded in the Gospels according to St. Matthew and St. Luke Arranged with Introduction and Commentary* (London: SCM Press, 1949), p. 161.

(depending on one's understanding of biblical authority) rightly or wrongly so taught.¹¹

Frequency of references to enemies is one factor which has created a situation in which studies of enemies in the Old Testament are focused almost exclusively on the Psalms. The second factor in this focus is the problem that the enemies are very difficult to identify. Since the psalmists most often speak simply of various enemies and evildoers, but almost never identify them explicitly,¹² commentators traditionally suggest various identities.

Many suggestions have been advanced in efforts to identify the personal enemies in the individual laments. The earliest suggestions are witnessed in the scattered historical notes of some of the psalm titles.¹³ Of course,

¹¹ Cf. J. Laney, "A Fresh Look at the Imprecatory Psalms," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 138 (1981), 35-45; F. Hesse, "The Evaluation and Authority of Old Testament Texts," trans. by J. Wharton in *Essays on Old Testament Hermeneutics*, ed. by C. Westermann, English trans. ed. by J. Maya (2nd ed., Richmond: John Knox Press, 1964), pp. 285-313; J. Bright, *The Authority of the Old Testament* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1967), pp. 234-241.

¹² Although this is especially true with regard to the individual laments, it is also true in national laments as in Psalm 124. In the royal psalms it is equally difficult to decide. Who are the enemies in Psalms 18:38-46 and 89:43? Granted that they are national geopolitical enemies, but given the history of the Israelite state, that could be almost anybody from Egypt to Mesopotamia.

¹³ Suggested enemies are Absalom in Psalm 3; Cush a Benjaminite in Psalm 7; all (David's) enemies and Saul in Psalm 18; Abimelech in Psalm 34; Doeg the Edomite in

most modern scholars reject these titles as far as any historical value is concerned, but the settings in various situations of David's life played a major role in attempts to identify the enemies for most of the church's history.¹⁴ Even after the rise of critical studies of the Old Testament and its wholesale rejection of Davidic authorship in favor of late dating of the psalms, historical questions remained decisive for the identity of the enemies. The goal was to reconstruct the historical occasion in the life of a psalmist which evoked each psalm. One component of this effort were attempts to identify the enemies. They were commonly identified as impious Jews who harassed their pious neighbors, the psalmists, frequently in the Maccabean era.¹⁵

Psalms 52; the Ziphites in Psalm 54; the Philistines in Psalm 56; Saul in Psalm 57; and Saul and the men he sent to watch David's house in Psalm 59.

¹⁴ Cf. *St. Augustine on the Psalms*, Vol. I-II, trans. and annotated by Heuglin and Corrigan Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1960, 1961); St. Basil, "Homily on Psalm 7," in *St. Basil: Exegetic Homilies*, trans. by A. Way (Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1963), pp. 175-180; *The Commentary of Rabbi David Kimhi on Psalms CXX-CL*, ed. and trans. by J. Baker and E. Nicholson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973); J. Calvin, *Commentary on the Book of Psalms*, 5 vols., trans. by J. Anderson (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1949); M. Luther, "Psalm 101," trans. by A. von Rohr Sauer in *Luther's Works* Vol. 13, ed. by J. Pelikan (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1956), 143-224.

¹⁵ Cf. J. Olshausen, *Die Psalmen* (Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1853); C. Toy, "On Maccabean Psalms," *Unitarian Review and Religious Magazine* XXVI, No. 1 (July, 1886), 1-21; B. Duhm,

The work of Hermann Gunkel¹⁶ was (and remains) of pivotal significance for Psalm study. With his thesis that psalm poetry was originally cultic, sociological-institutional concerns were destined to be raised. These new questions were finally to undermine all attempts to reconstruct some historical occasion in the life of a psalmist which evoked a psalm. The task became the attempt to discern the cultic occasion for which a psalm was composed and, more importantly, performed.

This attempt led to the recognition (so obvious today) that compositions were socially customary and appropriate to certain situations in life and out of place in others. If the various kinds ("forms" or "Gattungen") of psalms were recognized, then their social settings could be determined. The dominant questions concerned what was typical of various situations and their correlative literature rather than what unique, irrepeatable situation must be presupposed in order

Die Psalmen (Leipzig und Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1899); but S. Driver, *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* (New York: Meridian Books, (1957), pp. 387-389; and A. Kirkpatrick, *The Psalms* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1902) took a more moderate view, even allowing for some psalms of Davidic authorship.

¹⁶ H. Gunkel, *Die Psalmen Übersetzt und Erklärt* (5 Aufl., Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1968, 1 Aufl., 1926); H. Gunkel und J. Begrich, *Einleitung in die Psalmen: Die Gattungen der religiösen Lyrik Israels* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1933); henceforth, *Die Psalmen* and *Einleitung* respectively.

to understand a psalm. The psalms, it was seen, make sense and "work" for many people and groups in many historical settings because they bring to expression what is typical rather than unique.

In spite of Gunkel's recognition that psalm poetry emerged from and belonged to the cult, however, he remained a man of his age. He believed that the psalms present in the Psalter were in fact private compositions by and for (post-exilic) pious groups of laity and had no living connection with the temple itself. They were modeled after psalms which were used in the (Solomonic) temple, but were not themselves written for temple worship. Because of this belief, Gunkel's handling of the enemy problem did not represent any significant departure from pre-form-critical solutions.¹⁷

Sigmund Mowinckel,¹⁸ a pupil of Gunkel, followed his teacher in seeing psalms as cultic compositions, but he moved one important step. He maintained that the psalms actually found in the Psalter were not free and private compositions modeled after earlier cultic compositions, but were in fact written for and used in the pre-exilic temple services. It was not necessary to reconstruct hypothetical

¹⁷ Gunkel, *Einleitung*, pp. 209-211.

¹⁸ S. Mowinckel, *Psalmestudier*, 6 Vols. (Kristiania: In kommission bei Jacob Dybwad, 1911); and *The Psalms in Israel's Worship*, 2 Vols., trans. by D. Ap-Thomas (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962).

models based on post-exilic imitations. The poems of the canonical Psalter were overwhelmingly the actual *Psalms in Israel's Worship*, not the psalms in the worship of "'conventicles' of pious laymen."¹⁹

If the vast majority of the Psalms were in fact pre-exilic and not (late) post-exilic compositions, then solutions of the enemy problem along the lines of sectarian controversies in post-exilic Judaism were out of the question. Clearly, Mowinckel had to explain the enemies differently than had his predecessors. Early on in his career he offered the thesis that the "workers of iniquity" (פועלי־און) encountered in the individual laments, which he understood primarily as psalms requesting healing from sickness (*Krankheitspsalmen*),²⁰ were sorcerers (and allied demons) whose curses had caused the illnesses of the psalmists.²¹

¹⁹ *The Psalms in Israel's Worship* is the English title of Mowinckel's originally Norwegian work titled *Offersang og Sangoffer* which is literally translated "Song of sacrifice and Sacrifice of song" or "Offering song and Song offering"; see "Author's Preface to the English Edition" of the work, p. xxiii. The phrase "'conventicles' of pious laymen" above is drawn from the same work, p. 29.

²⁰ Mowinckel, *Psalmestudien*, Vol. I, 9-12, 98-103; see especially p. 101 where he states, "in Wirklichkeit durften die allermeisten individuellen Klagepsalmen Krankheitspsalmen sein.—Wenigstensiersich lassen sie sichalle von dieser Annahme heraus erklären.

²¹ Mowinckel, *Psalmestudien*, Vol. I, 33-58, 76-133; see especially pp. 76-77 where he states, "Bedeutet awan Zaubere, so sind die po'ale awan die Zauberer, und diese Auntater sind in den betreffenden Psalmen nur eine andere Bezeichnung der Feinde, über die der Beter klagt." Cf. also idem.,

Some scholars rejected Mowinckel's identification of the personal enemies with sorcerers,²² but the perspectives from which a solution might be sought (for any problem in the Psalms) had shifted decisively. Although he might be disputed on such points of detail the disputes were determined by a new agenda.²³ The most important of the suggestions concerning the identifications of the enemies have remained firmly anchored to institutional and temple activities.

Hans Schmidt²⁴ proposed an alternative to Mowinckel's identification of the enemies. While Mowinckel dealt with

"Zwei Beobachtung zum Deutung der פְּעֻלַּי יְיָ אֱלֹהֵי," ZAW 43 (1925), 260-262.

²² Cf. L. Aubert, "Les psaumes dans le culte d'Israel," *Revue de Theologie et de Philosophie* NS 15 (1927), 224-230; Gunkel, *Einleitung*, pp. 196-211; Birkeland, *The Evildoers in the Book of Psalms* (Oslo: I Kommissjon Hos Jacob Dybwad, 1955), pp. 40-46, henceforth, *Evildoers*.

²³ For example, Mowinckel's hypothetical New Year Festival may be rejected only to be replaced by an equally comprehensive Covenant Festival (A. Weiser, *The Psalms: A Commentary*, trans. by H. Hartwell [London: SCM Press, 1962].) or a Royal Zion Festival (H. J. Kraus, *Worship in Israel: A Cultic History of the Old Testament*, trans. by G. Buswell [Richmond: John Knox Press, 1966]; and *Psalmen* [5 Aufl., Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag des Erziehungsvereins, 1978]). Scholars seem exceptionally ready to name festivals which the Old Testament never mentions and to disregard those that it does, at least for the purposes of nomenclature. Are the modern names better than those given by the Israelites themselves?

²⁴ H. Schmidt, *Das Gebet der Angeklagten im Alten Testament* (Giessen: Alfred Topelmann, 1928); and *Die Psalmen* (J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 754).

most individual laments from a "medical" perspective, Schmidt dealt with them from a judicial one. They were uttered by people accused of a crime and were connected with some sort of cultic ordeal; hence the frequent assertions of innocence found in the laments.²⁵ On this view the one who laments would be a defendant while the enemies would be plaintiffs or false witnesses. Although their emphases are different from Schmidt the judicial perspective has also been pursued by Delekat²⁶ and Beyerlin.²⁷

Harris Birkeland²⁸ brought forth a serious objection to all attempts to identify the personal enemies in the Psalter. He argued that "the enemies of the individual were in principle identical with those of the nation, viz. the *gentiles*."²⁹ Beginning with five individual psalms which explicitly identified the enemies as gentiles (גוֹיִם),

²⁵ For example, Psalms 7:4-5; 17:1-5; 26:1, 4-7, 11.

²⁶ L. Delekat, *Asylie und Schutzorakel an Zionheiligtum* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1962).

²⁷ W. Beyerlin, *Die Rettung der Bedrangten in den Feindpsalmen der Einzelnen auf institutionelle Zusammenhänge untersucht* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1970).

²⁸ H. Birkeland, *Die Feinde des Individuums in der israelitischen Psalmearteateratur* (Oslo: Grondahl and sons, 1933); and *Evildoers*.

²⁹ Birkeland, *Evildoers*, p. 9.

strangers (זרים) and peoples (עמים),³⁰ he maintained that the enemies in these five individual psalms were no different than those in others of the individual psalms.³¹ Therefore, the enemies in other individual psalms must be foreign foes of the nation of Israel, not fellow Israelites who opposed the psalmists.

A second factor in Birkeland's argument was that all royal psalms which mention enemies³² refer to national enemies, as well as a number of psalms in which "I" appears as a subject but a collective interpretation is more likely.³³ Corollary to this is the fact that "I" sometimes appears in psalms which are national psalms.³⁴ Birkeland reached the conclusion that

in more than half of all I[ndividual] P(salms) containing enemies, these enemies must necessarily be gentiles because it is expressly stated in almost all of them, and even in the rest of them

³⁰ Psalms 9:6, 16, 18, 20, 21; 10:16; 43:1 speak of גוי (ם); 54:5 speaks of זרים although there is a variant reading זדים (see BHS), and the same line appears in Psalm 86:14 reading זדים; and 56:8 speaks of עמים; cf. Kraus, *Psalmen*; Gunkel, *Die Psalmen*; Weiser, and Anderson at the passages cited.

³¹ Birkeland, *Evildoers*, p. 14.

³² Psalms 18; 20; 21; 28; 61; 63; 89; 144; I Sam. 2:1-10.

³³ Psalms 36; 66; 75; 77; 94; 118; 123; 130; 131.

³⁴ Psalms 44:7, 16; 74:12; 60:11; 83:14.

the enemies are fairly generally recognized as national enemies.

. . . The situation, then, is that we *know* who are the enemies in more than 20 psalms. In the other half of all I[ndividual] P[salms] they are *described* in the same way. From this fact only one method of research can be deduced: we have to suppose, at least as a working hypothesis, that the enemies are of the same kind in those psalms in which their identity is not expressly stated, as in those psalms in which it is expressly stated.³⁵

Birkeland's point that the enemies in five individual psalms are gentiles must be granted. The texts are quite clear. With the royal psalms likewise the enemies are most reasonably taken to be national (although the Israelite kings did have some problems with "internal security"). The conclusion that all other enemies must be identical because they are described the same way is, however, not warranted. The fact that the psalms were composed and used in the cult means that the enemies must have been, capable of more than one meaning. The reason that descriptions of enemies are the same in all the psalms which mention them is not because the enemies are everywhere identical, but in order that the psalms might not be restricted to a single kind of enemy. If the psalms were to be used in the cult then they had to be capable of referring to more than one kind of enemy.

³⁵ Birkeland, *Evildoers*, p. 15.

A second, consideration which speaks against Birkeland's conclusion is the fact that Israelites lamented and gave thanks for personal events and circumstances as well as national. The Old Testament is perfectly clear at this point. Jeremiah's laments³⁶ contain descriptions of his enemies which could appear just as easily in the Psalter, yet they are demonstrably not gentiles; they are the "men of Anathoth."³⁷ Job's descriptions of his personal enemies do not refer to foreigners but to people within his own community who are his enemies.³⁸ Surely Jeremiah and Job were not the only ones to describe their personal home-grown enemies like kings described their national gentile enemies.

Finally, the observation should be made that Israelites were not as doctrinaire in their use of the different forms of psalms as modern scholars have been. The anachronism of Hannah uttering a royal song of thanksgiving (I Sam. 2:1-10) did not create any apparent problems of verisimilitude for the writer(s) of I Samuel. Evidently Israelites (even

³⁶ Jer. 11:18-12:6; 15:10-21; 17:14-18; 18:18-23; 20:7-13; 20:14-18. Cf. S. Balentine, "Jeremiah, Prophet of Prayer," *Review and Expositor* 78 (1981), 331-344; W. Baumgartner, *Die Klagegedichte des Jeremias* (Giessen: Alfred Topelmann, 1917); P. Bonnard, *Le Psautier selon Jeremie* (Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1960); J. Berridge, *Prophet, People and the Word of God* (Zurich: EVZ-Verlag, 1970).

³⁷ Jer. 11:21, 23.

³⁸ Cf. Job 6:15-27; 16:10, 20; 19:14-19; 30:1-15.

women) were able to use psalms which were form-critically inappropriate.³⁹ If the different forms were mutually exclusive, then Hezekiah should have used a psalm which was more clearly royal in its orientation (Is. 38:10-20).

Birkeland's identification of all enemies is reductionistic.

They were (and are) open to more than a single referent.

The "Myth and Ritual School"⁴⁰ also offers an interpretation which denies the possibility of reference to personal enemies in the individual psalms. On this view, the "I" is the king who suffers and is resurrected in the

³⁹ Some use of royal psalms by commoners in post-exilic Judah is a necessary assumption; otherwise they could not have been used and would not have been preserved. Although it is historically unlikely that Hannah could have used a royal psalm (before there was any royalty in Israel), the fact that she could be portrayed doing so in a pre-exilic text means that such use of royal psalms by non-royal figures was certainly conceivable during the monarchical period. It should also be remembered that, in principle at least, the royal psalmists could have reworked pre-monarchic individual psalms in order to make them royal. There was, after all, a temple in Israel before there was a king, and a temple without psalms would be an interesting phenomenon. In the case of Hannah's song only the conclusion ("he will give strength to his king, and exalt the power of his anointed.") requires a royal understanding. All the rest of the psalm is perfectly intelligible as an individual song of thanksgiving.

⁴⁰ I. Engnell, *Studies in Divine Kingship in the Ancient Near East* (Uppsala:—Almqvist and Wiksells Bbltr., 1943), p. 170; A. Johnson, "The Role of the King in the Jerusalem Cultus," in *The Labyrinth: Further Studies in the Relation between Myth and Ritual in the Ancient World*, ed. by S. Hooke (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1935), pp. 71-111. Cf. J. Eaton, *Kingship and the Psalms* (Naperville, Ill.: Alec R. Allenson, 1970). His extensive royal interpretation, though not the same as the "Myth and Ritual School," would essentially rule out personal enemies in the Psalms; they would rather be enemies of the king.

cultic drama. The enemies, therefore, cannot be real human beings, but are rather mythic powers who attack the god-king. This position may have some merit when explicit mention is made of Sheol as an active and potent reality,⁴¹ but the Old Testament nowhere speaks of the king playing the role of any god (certainly not Yahweh) in a cultic drama.⁴²

One other option which would seem to deny the possibility of reference to personal enemies is that of Othmar Keel.⁴³ He interprets the enemies psychoanalytically as physical personifications of the distress of the psalmist. While their ancient near eastern neighbors could objectify their anxieties (*Angste*) and apprehensions (*Sorgen*) by speaking of various gods and demons, Israel's theological space for such projections was limited by Yahweh's intolerance; it was restricted to Yahweh and the human (and animal) world. Therefore, the enemies must be seen much more as

representatives of a sinister world of evil than as individuals in our sense. In order to be able to describe the evil and hostility with which the

⁴¹ Cf. Psalms 18:6; 89:49.

⁴² Cf. M. Noth, "God, King, and Nation in the Old Testament," in *The Laws in the Pentateuch and Other Essays*, trans. by D. Ap-Thomas (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967), P. 175.

⁴³ O. Keel, *Feinde and Gottesleugner: Studien zum Image der Widersacher in den Individualpsalmen* (Stuttgart Verlag katholisches Bibelwerk, 1969).

suppliant found himself confronted these supply an abundance of comparisons and metaphors.⁴⁴

Undoubtedly the enemies in the individual psalms can function this way⁴⁵ and, presumably, they could have in Israel. Yet, the "comparisons and metaphors" would most likely be effective if there were known examples of such people and actions in the external world. By way of illustration, the descriptions of enemies who "dig a pit"⁴⁶ is probably to be taken metaphorically, but it could be used only because this spoke of a real danger which even the legal tradition recognized.⁴⁷ Laws are not formulated to regulate metaphorical digging of pits, but real pits.

This brief survey⁴⁸ of suggested identities of the enemies in the individual psalms may be summarized in three

⁴⁴ " . . . Repräsentanten einer unheimlicher Welt des Bösen als Individuen im unserm Sinne. Um die Bosheit and Feindseligkeit, denen sich der Beter gegenüber sieht schildern zu können, bedarf dieser einer Menge von Vergleichen und Metaphern." Keel, p. 91.

⁴⁵ S. Meyer, "The Psalms and Personal Counseling," *Journal of Psychology and Theology* 2 (Winter 1974), 26-30.

⁴⁶ Psalms 7:16; 9:16; 35:7.

⁴⁷ Exod. 21:33-34.

⁴⁸ Helpful summaries of research on the Psalms may found in E. Gerstenberger, "Psalms," in *Old Testament Form Criticism*, ed. by J. Hayes (San Antonio:—Trinity University press, 1974), pp. 179-223; R. Clements, *A Century of Old Testament Study* (London: Lutterworth Press, 1976), pp. 76-P; Keel, pp. 11-35; and B. Feininger, "A Decade of German Psalm-Criticism," *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 20 (1981), 91-103.

brief statements. (1) The enemies are not unique historical figures or groups, but are stereotypical and multivalent.

(2) They are sometimes, but by no means always, gentiles.

(3) Israelites evidently did have personal enemies whom they described as the individual psalms describe the enemies.

A Methodology for Investigating

"Enemies" in Wisdom Literature

Note has already been taken above of the fact that personal enemies seem to play a relatively minor role in wisdom literature, as well as other complexes of Israelite tradition. Yet, they are prolific in the Psalms; indeed, at times the impression may emerge that the psalmists suffered from paranoia. Were the sages oblivious to such folk as the enemies and their attacks? How could they notice such varied phenomena as trade,⁴⁹ sexual promiscuity,⁵⁰ etiquette,⁵¹ legal procedure,⁵² wealth and poverty,⁵³

⁴⁹ Prov. 20:10; 14, 23; Sir. 26:29-27:3.

⁵⁰ Prov. 7:1-27; 23:26-28; 30:20.

⁵¹ Prov. 25:6-7; Sir. 30; 31-32:13.

⁵² Prov. 18:17; 25:7c-10.

⁵³ Prov. 10:15; 11:4, 24, 28; 13:7, 8; 14:21; 16:19; 18:11; 19:4, 17; 22:1, 9; 23:4; 28:6; 30:7-9; Qoh. 5:9-10; Sir. 4:8-10; 13:24; 14:3-10; 30:16.

animal husbandry,⁵⁴ alcohol abuse,⁵⁵ and even friendship⁵⁶ and scarcely mention the problem of enemies? Was their social world so different from the psalmists', or did they perceive it differently?

This investigation intends to demonstrate that the sages were in fact aware of the folk designated and described as enemies in the Psalms. The method to be used begins by noting all the designations of enemies within the individual laments, thanksgiving songs and songs of confidence in the Psalter.⁵⁷ The enemy designations thus determined are then sought within the wisdom literature,⁵⁸ and they form the

⁵⁴ Prov. 27:23-27.

⁵⁵ Prov. 23:19-21, 29-35,

⁵⁶ Prov. 3:28-29; 6:1-5, 29; 11:9, 12; 13:20; 14:20, 21; 16:29; 17:17, 18; 18:19, 24; 19:4, 6, 7; 21:10; 22:11, 24-25; 24:28-29; 25:7c-10, 17, 18, 20; 26:18-19; 27:6, 10, 14, 17; 28:7; 29:3, 5; Job 2-11; 6:14, 15, 27; 12:4; 16:20, 21; 17:5; 19:13, 14, 21; 22:6; 31:9; 42:10; Qoh. 4:4, 9-12; Sir. 5:12; 6:17; 7:12; 9:14; 10:6; 12:9; 13:21; 15:5; 20:23; 25:18; 37:1-6; 41:18, 21.

⁵⁷ Of course, individual judgments may differ on a given psalm, but the selections listed below represent a reasonable consensus; they form the basis of the enemy designations and behaviors gleaned in preparing this study. Psalms 3; 4; 5; 6; 7; 9-10; 11; 12; 13; 14; 17; 18; 22; 23; 26; 27; 28; 30; 31; 32; 34; 35; 36; 7, 61; 39; 40; 41; 42-43; 52; 53; 54; 55; 56; 57; 58; 59; 61; E2; 63; 64; 69; 70; 71; 73; 86; 88; 102; 109; 119; 138; 139; 140; 141; 142; 143; cf. Kraus, *Psalmen*; Gunkel, *Die Psalmen*; Weiser, and Anderson at the passages listed.

⁵⁸ See "Appendix I: Enemy Designations within the Wisdom Literature." Lists of enemy designations in the Psalms may be found in Keel, pp. 94-98; and L. Ruppert,

basis of the discussion in Chapter 2, "Enemy Designations in the Wisdom Literature."

A second avenue to the location of enemies in wisdom literature is to note which figures are described as enemies are described in the Psalter. This involves, of course, determining how enemies' actions and dispositions are presented in the Psalms⁵⁹ and then locating any of these actions and dispositions which appear in the wisdom literature.⁶⁰ As will be seen, some figures (such as the "lord of anger" in Prov. 22:24) appear as subjects of these actions or dispositions who did not appear in the discussion of enemy designations. These new enemies have been called "derivative enemies,"⁶¹ and they form the basis for the discussion in Chapter 3, "Derivative Enemies in the Wisdom Literature."

Following the groundwork laid by locating enemy designations and folk who act like enemies within the wisdom literature, the possibility of asking after wise responses to the enemy will emerge. Are beneficent (Prov. 25:21-22)

Der leidende Gerechte und seine Feinde: Eine Wortfelduntersuchung (Wurzburg: Echter Verlag, 1973), pp. 7-97.

⁵⁹ Ruppert, pp. 111-168.

⁶⁰ See "Appendix II: Enemy Behaviors within the Wisdom Literature."

⁶¹ See "Appendix III: Derivative Enemies Designations."

and non-aggressive⁶² responses to one's enemy characteristic in wisdom literature? Or, are they rather isolated "old-world anticipation[s] of the spirit of Matthew 5:44"?⁶³ Are they "unique" within the wisdom literature as in the Old Testament in general?⁶⁴ What presuppositions allow or demand these, or other, responses to the enemy on the part of the wise? Chapter 4, "Wise Responses to the Enemy," will address these issues.

James Crenshaw has asked, "How can one determine what is distinctive of Israelite sages in the area of ethics?"⁶⁵ His question is particularly significant for this investigation because it is placed in the midst of a discussion of the declaration of innocence in Job 31 where he observes, "Nothing in the catalog of vices falls into the category of distinctive wisdom behavior,"⁶⁶ and these vices certainly include rejoicing over an enemy's calamity. Such a statement requires that the final chapter attempt to assess the

⁶² Prov. 16:7; 24:17-18; Job 31:29-30.

⁶³ See n. 2 above.

⁶⁴ H. Ringgren, "אָיָב; 'ayabh; אֵיִיב 'oyehb; אֵיִיבָה 'ebhah," *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, tool. I, ed. by G. Botterweck and H. Ringgren, trans. by Willis (rev. ed., Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974), 215.

⁶⁵ J. Crenshaw, *Old Testament Wisdom: An Introduction* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1981), p. 15.

⁶⁶ Crenshaw, p. 15.

validity of the opening thesis of this investigation (on page 1 above) that "the wisdom tradition of Israel departs in a remarkable way from the dominant Old Testament attitude toward personal enemies." In light of that evaluation it will be possible to confirm, modify or reject the initial thesis.

Methodological Caveats

The methodology outlined above makes a very important assumption; namely, that the sages who were responsible for the wisdom literature of the Old Testament were Israelites. They were just as Israelite as prophets, priests, psalmists, kings and others in ancient Israel. This may seem obvious, but it has been disputed.⁶⁷ As Israelites, they used the same language as other Israelites. Undoubtedly, each sphere of Israelite society used some technical terms,⁶⁸ but the lexical stock used to designate and describe enemies in the Psalter is hardly technical. They are simply Hebrew words which any Israelite might be expected to know and use;

⁶⁷ See G. Wright, *The Biblical Doctrine of Man* (London: SCM Press, 1954), p. 154, who evaluates wisdom as "lacking almost completely in the typically Israelite conception of society."

⁶⁸ For example, **סלה** and **למנצח** for the psalmists, **נאם־יהוה** for prophets, **מוֹת יוֹמֶת** for judges or lawgivers, **טמא** for priests. Interestingly, attempts to determine a technical vocabulary for sages have not met with a great deal of success; cf. R. Whybray, *The Intellectual Tradition in the Old Testament* (Berlin: DeGruyter, 1974).

hence, the rationale for the proposed methodology. The enemies are not particularly noticeable in wisdom literature because they do not tend to cluster as they do in the Psalms where they constitute one of "the three determinant elements"⁶⁹ in the Psalter's most abundantly witnessed forms. Because the psalmists used conventional Hebrew to designate and describe their enemies, however, the assumption is reasonable that sages would draw from much the same lexical stock when they spoke about the same or similar folk.

In the cases of the wisdom books of Sirach and the Wisdom of Solomon, the linguistic situation is complicated by the fact that these documents are known primarily in Greek. As confessed by Sirach's grandson, and translator, his book was originally written in Hebrew, but the Greek text is found in the larger canon of the Old Testament. Hebrew textual witnesses (none complete) have been discovered in the modern period.⁷⁰ Because of this peculiar situation in Sirach's textual transmission the Greek text is used as primary in this study with Hebrew fragments used for

⁶⁹ See n. 7 above.

⁷⁰ I. Levi, *The Hebrew Text of the Book of Ecclesiasticus* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1904); Y. Yadin, *The Ben Sirs Scroll from Masada with Introduction, Emendations and Commentary* (Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society and the Shrine of the Book, 1965).

illumination where appropriate. The Wisdom of Solomon was originally written in Greek and has been preserved in that language.⁷¹

This linguistic situation requires another step in locating enemy designations and behaviors. They will be determined by sifting through all the possible translations of the enemy vocabulary as witnessed by Hatch-Redpath.⁷² Because of the vagaries of the Septuagint's translation techniques,⁷³ this procedure does widen the field considerably, but the alternative of moving from vocabulary found in the Greek Psalter directly to Sirach and the Wisdom

⁷¹ D. Winston, *The Wisdom of Solomon: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, 1979), pp. 14-18. Some have argued for an original Hebrew (or Aramaic), but their arguments have not won much agreement. See E. Speiser, "The Hebrew Origin of the First Part of the Book of Wisdom," *Jewish Quarterly Review* 14 (1923-24), 455-437; and F. Zimmermann, "The Book Wisdom: Its Language and Character," *Jewish Quarterly Review* 57 (1966), 1-27, 101-135,

⁷² E. Hatch and H. Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament including the Apocryphal Books*, with Supplement by Redpath (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1897, 1906) and E. Camilo dos Santos, *An Expanded Hebrew Index for the Hatch-Redpath Concordance to the Septuagint* (Jerusalem: Dugith Publishers, Baptist House, n. d.).

⁷³ J. Barr, "Vocalization and the Analysis of Hebrew among Ancient Translators," *VTS* 16 (1967), 1-11; J. Blau, "Zum Hebraisch der Übersetzer des Altes Testaments," *VT* 6 (1956), 98-100; P. Katz, "Zur Übersetzungstechnik der LXX," *Die Welt des Orients* 2 (1956), 267-273; D. Riddle, "The Logic of the Theory of Translation Greek," *JBL* 51 (1932), 13-30; J. Rife, "The Mechanics of Translation Greek," *JBL* 52 (1933), 244-252.

of Solomon runs a greater risk of missing some expressions which could be important. Hence, caution must be exercised in discussing the Greek enemy designations and descriptions of behavior.

Related to the linguistic caveat just noted is the fact that this methodology neither assumes nor argues for influence from wisdom on other spheres of Israelite life nor vice versa. Common language, geography and history between various groups means that they are related somehow and that these relations will exert some kinds of influence, usually mutual. Claims of influence from one realm of society on another realm of the same society are notoriously difficult to demonstrate⁷⁴ because commonalities may be due to the simple fact that different groups in the same social system are in fact part of one single system. Israelite prophets (or other groups) may sound like Israelite sages simply

⁷⁴ Cf. J. Crenshaw, "Method in Determining Wisdom Influence on 'Historical Literature'," JBL 88 (1969), 129-142, for the difficulties in tracing influence from wisdom to other kinds of literature; W. McKane, *Prophets and Wise Men* (Naperville, Ill.: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1965), for an attempt to trace influence from another sphere upon wisdom; for statements on the commonalities between wisdom and other complexes of Israelite tradition see M. Tate, Jr., *A Study of the Wise Men of Israel in Relation to the Prophets* (Th.D. Dissertation, The Southern-Baptist Theological Seminary, 1958), passim, but especially pp. 395-408; R. Murphy, "Wisdom--Theses and Hypotheses," in *Israelite Wisdom: Theological and Literary Essays in Honor of Samuel Terrien*, ed. by J. Gammie, W. Brueggemann, W. Humphreys, and J. Ward (Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1978), pp. 39-40; D. Morgan, *Wisdom in the Old Testament Traditions* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1981), is a very good study of this problem of the relations between wisdom and other complexes of Old Testament traditions.

because they are Israelite. The reverse is, of course, equally true.

Thus far no attempt has been made to define wisdom. Terms such as "wisdom literature," "wisdom tradition," "wisdom," "wise" and "sages" have been used without explicit definition. This same phenomenon is often encountered in studies of wisdom for the problem of definition is still awaiting a satisfactory solution.⁷⁵ Proposed definitions range anywhere from the convention which simply means to designate the five wisdom books of Proverbs, Job, Qoheleth, Sirach and the Wisdom of Solomon which are bound together by a "mysterious ingredient"⁷⁶ to definitions in terms of a system of thought (either "secular," "religious" or both),⁷⁷

⁷⁵ J. Crenshaw, *Old Testament Wisdom: An Introduction*, pp. 16-19; cf. idem., "Method in Determining Wisdom Influence on 'Historical Literature'"; and "Prolegomena," in *Studies in Ancient Israelite Wisdom*, ed. by J. Crenshaw (New York: KTAV, 1976), pp. 3-5; and B. Kovacs, *Sociological-Structural Constraints upon Wisdom: The Spatial and Temporal Matrix of Proverbs 15:26-22:16*, Vol. I (Ph. D. Dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1978), 31-104.

⁷⁶ Crenshaw, *Old Testament Wisdom: An Introduction*, p. 17.

⁷⁷ Cf., for example, W. Zimmerli, "Zur Struktur der alttestamentlichen Weisheit," *ZAW NS* 10 (1933), 177-204; H. Schmid, *Wesen und Geschichte der Weisheit: eine Untersuchung zur Altorientalischen und Israelitischen Weisheitsliteratur* (Berlin: Verlag Alfred Topelmann, 1966); G. von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, Vol. I, trans. by D. Stalker (New-York: Harper and Row, 1962), pp. 418-459; idem., *Wisdom in Israel* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1972); 1117—Gese, *Lehre und Wirklichkeit in der Alten Weisheit: Studien zu den Sprüchen Salomos und zu dem Buche Hiob*

a pattern of life⁷⁸ or a sociological phenomenon,⁷⁹ among others.⁸⁰

Most definitions of wisdom, of course, are not one-dimensional but are varying combinations of several factors noted above. This study does not seek to solve this troublesome problem. Instead, a consensus view has been followed that whatever wisdom may be, it is certainly to be found in the books of Proverbs, Job, Qoheleth, Sirach and the Wisdom of Solomon.⁸¹

One final caveat is in order. That Israelite wisdom has much in common with similar phenomena in ancient Egypt and Mesopotamia is now a certainty. This is more

(Tubingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1958); and Crenshaw, "Method in Determining Wisdom Influence on 'Historical Literature',"

⁷⁸ Cf., for example, MaKane, *Prophets and Wise Men*.

⁷⁹ Cf., for example, R. Gordis, "The Social Background of Wisdom Literature," in *Poets Prophets and Sages: Essays in Biblical Interpretation* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1971), pp. 160-197; and H. Hermisson, *Studien zur Israelitischen Spruchweisheit* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchzner Verlag, 1968).

⁸⁰ See Kovacs, Vol. I, 31-104, for a discussion of the various ways in which definitions of wisdom have been formulated; he discusses thirteen different perspectives from which attempts have been suggested.

⁸¹ Crenshaw, *Old Testament Wisdom: An Introduction*, p. 17; R. Murphy, *Wisdom Literature: Job, Proverbs, Ruth, Canticles, Ecclesiastes, Esther* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981), pp. 3-4.

immediately self-evident with wisdom literature than any other in the Old Testament. Because of this state of affairs, it is quite frequent to find discussions of "Wisdom in Israel and the Ancient Near East."⁸² This study does not pursue the problem of enemies in the ancient near eastern texts for three reasons. First, this investigator lacks the linguistic competence to carry out the task properly. Second, methodologically this restriction forces the investigation to deal with Israel as Israel and not simply as one more instance of what is commonly true in the ancient near east. Third, considerations of space would prohibit more than a cursory treatment of the extensive ancient near eastern literature.

Contemporary Value of This Study

To say that the contemporary world is pluralistic has become a commonplace. The indications seem to be that while the globe will grow increasingly smaller due to communications, travel, interdependence of economies and many other developments, its peoples will become increasingly pluralistic. The "global village" will scarcely be a village in terms of shared values, patterns of living, political persuasions or religions.

⁸² The title of *Supplements to Vetus Testamentum*, Vol. III, ed. by M. Noth and Thomas Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1955).

This increasing pluralism, of course, brings with it certain advantages--so the conventional wisdom goes--advantages including opportunities of openness, new perceptions of old problems, breakdown of triumphalisms, to name a few. The dark side of this growing situation is that opportunities for tension, hostility and enmity also will rise. One person's now freedom in a pluralistic world is another's way of life threatened. More people are more likely to have more opportunities to perceive enemies than previously.

This study may allow for some reflection on how to deal with enemies. Perhaps the historical and cultural distance of the modern student from the Israelite sages will offer a certain amount of "safe" space in which to experiment imaginatively with various stances within the context of enemies, their attacks and wisdom. If such proves true in even a limited way, then the investigation will have been personally rewarding. Only the reader can make that judgment.

Chapter 2

ENEMY DESIGNATIONS WITHIN WISDOM LITERATURE

The task of this chapter is to analyse the data compiled in Appendix I, "Enemy Designations within Wisdom Literature." All occurrences of enemy designations in the wisdom writings of Proverbs, Job, Qoheleth, Sirach and Wisdom of Solomon are listed there. The following analysis intends to delineate as many of the social locations of the folk branded with enemy designations as possible. In addition to social locations, attention will be directed to the literary contexts of these designations for the several writers-compilers reveal various perceptions of these folk through their formal placement of enemy designations.

One obvious task of analysis is organization. This discussion will follow the categories developed by Othmar Keel and Lothar Ruppert in their studies of enemies in the Psalms.¹ Both scholars see two fundamental groups which they designate as the "אֹיֵב" and "רָשָׁע-groups." The first is comprised of virtual synonyms of אֹיֵב ("enemy") or terms which, although not synonymous, bespeak simple

¹ O. Keel, *Feinde und Gottesleugner: Studien zum Image der Widersacher in den Individualpsalmen* (Stuttgart: Ieriag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1965); L. Tuppert, *Der leidende Gerechte und seine Feinde: Eine Wortfelduntersuchung* (Wurzburg: Echter Verlag, 1973).

hostility irrespective of moral or religious stance. The "רשע-group" is made up of synonyms of רשע ("wicked") or terms focusing attention on some moral or religious stance which issues in enmity. Two other groups used by both these scholars are the "family and friendship group" whereby enemies are explicitly designated as either family or friends and the "animals group" which speaks of enemies with the metaphors or similes of animal figures. Ruppert adds a fifth category which he calls the "neutral group." This includes several words which are recognizable as enemy designations only by their appearance in contexts clearly treating of hostile figures. Otherwise, the members of this group may have nothing to do with enmity.² Although these categories of enemy designations were developed in studies of the Psalms, they provide a relatively coherent structure for this examination of wisdom literature as well.

² The problem of the enemies in the Psalter has a long history of study; it is now recognized that the enemies form an integral topic in certain forms of psalmody (cf. C. Westermann, "Struktur und Geschichte der Klage im Alten Testament," ZAW 66 [1954], 44-80). Hence, it is reasonable to include such terms as אדם, איש and בני־אדם in a study such as Ruppert's. In wisdom literature, however, there is no such recognition. Therefore, only such "neutral" terms as, for example, זר and שר which may be more clearly related to enmity and which provide more precision than would terms such as איש have been included.

Proverbs

The book of Proverbs contains two basic kinds of material: longer didactic compositions (primarily in ch. 1-9) and shorter *m^eshalim* (primarily in ch. 10-31). The many *m^eshalim* stand quite independently of one another as so many "pearls on a string." With this material, footholds for analysis are limited to considerations such as parallelism and syntax within each individual *mashal*.³ The longer didactic compositions, on the other hand, provide somewhat greater breadth for analysis insofar as their very

³ The various superscriptions (1:1; 10:1; 24:23; 25:1; 30:1; 31:1) as well as certain other phenomena such as the independent acrostic of 31:10-31, the dependence of 22:17-24:22 upon the Egyptian "Instruction of Amenemope" (cf. O. Eissfeldt, *The Old Testament: An Introduction*, trans. by P. Ackroyd [New York: Harper and Row, 1965], pp. 474-475), the predominance of antithetic parallelism in ch. 10-15 and synonymous or synthetic parallelism in 16:1-22:16, and numerous examples of catch-word arrangement and other paronomastic devices, point to the conclusion that the book is in fact an anthology of several collections (cf. U. Skladny, *Die ältesten Spruchsammlungen in Israel* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck Ruprecht, 1962]). As "collections" however, the contents show no unmistakable signs of intentional development beyond that offered by their individual members. There seems to be no sure reason why one *mashal* should have led to the next, except in rare occasions (e.g., 26:4-5).

That there is, or was, some kind of architectonic structure to the book does seem probable (cf. P. Skehan, "A Single Editor for the Whole Book of Proverbs," *Studies in Israelite Poetry and Wisdom* [Washington: Catholic Biblical Association, 1971]), but it is equally probable that such a structure is recognizable and exegetically significant only in its broadest outlines. Thus, the "Hymn to the Good Wife" (31:10-31) forms the conclusion to the book in both MT and the Greek text, while 30:1-14 and 30:15-31:9 may occupy different places in the book's arrangement.

length allows for more development of thought and expression. They allow for more connections between various terms to be drawn or for greater description of individual terms to be developed.⁴ With these fundamental distinctions in mind, attention may be directed to the enemy designations within the book of Proverbs.

The **אֹיֵב**-Group

Of the five references to personal enemies (**אֹיֵב**, **שׁוֹנֵא**) in the book of Proverbs, one is a simple saying,⁵ two are admonitions with motive clauses,⁶ and two are observations.⁷ The saying and admonitions are interesting insofar as they provide an insight into the sages'

⁴ Of course, a longer composition may have developed by expanding a simple *mashal*, but McKane's analysis of the instruction genre seems more likely (cf. W. McKane, *Proverbs: A New Approach* [Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1970] pp.51-182, 262-412). Even if the older form critical explanation is followed, however, the fact remains that they cannot be broken up into so many independent sayings as can the collections in 10:1-22:16 and 24:23-31:9.

⁵ 16:7.

⁶ 24:17-18; 25:21-22. Of course, 24:17-18 might be designated as part of the larger instruction comprising 22:17-24:22; cf. McKane, pp. 369-406. Interest is here focused on the immediate passage rather than the whole instruction so it is more appropriate to consider it an admonition.

⁷ 26:24-26; 27:6. In view of the negative jussive construction of 26:25 (**אַל־תֵּאֲמַן**), 26:24-26 is arguably an admonition rather than an observation. The jussive is subordinated to the thrust of the observation so it is best taken as observation with an admonitory motif.

ethic *vis-a-vis* enemies, but the present discussion is concerned with the identity of the enemy. In this regard, they offer no guidance; presumably, the enemy in question is self-evident. With the observations, however, descriptions of the enemy are provided. Hence, these must be examined more closely.

A hater makes himself unknown with his lips,
and sets deceit in his innards;
When he makes his voice gracious, do not rely
on him,
for seven abominations are in his heart.
Hatred is concealed with guile,
his evil is uncovered in assembly.

Proverbs 26:24-26

Reliable are the wounds of a friend,
while plentiful are the kisses of a hater.

Proverbs 27:6

The אִשָּׁה of these two observations is a classic example of duplicity. The descriptions are not identical, but they are coherent. Fundamentally, this figure is deceptive. The deception turns on an interior-exterior axis. Externally all is pleasant and gracious, even affectionate, while internally the hater is full of deceit, abominations, guile and evil. The אִשָּׁה disguises interior reality with speech and kisses; the means of falsification in both observations involve the organs of speech. A further complication in recognizing the אִשָּׁה is that his true disposition is revealed not in the daily course of events but "in assembly"; that is, in view of

the use of "abominations" in verse 25, probably a cultic event.⁸

The רשע-Group

The "wicked" (רשע) are the most prominent foes in the book of Proverbs; the designation occurs seventy-six times in the book. Such a large number of appearances makes it very difficult to identify the figure with any precision. One step in the direction of clarifying this term is provided by the poetic form of the material with its ever-present parallelism. By means of parallelism seven expressions may be identified as synonyms for the wicked: the "treacherous" (בוגדים),⁹ "evil ones" (רעים),¹⁰ "scoffer" (לץ),¹¹ "godless" (אובתן),¹² "worthless witness" (עד-בל יעל),¹³ "evildoers" (מרעים),¹⁴ and "unjust man" (איש-עול).¹⁵ As antonyms, six

⁸ L. Perdue, *Wisdom and Cult: A Critical Analysis of the Views of Cult in the Wisdom Literatures Israel and the Ancient Near East* (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977), p. 161.

⁹ 2:22; 21:18.

¹⁰ 4:14, 14:19; 24:20.

¹¹ 9:7.

¹² 11:7.

¹³ 19:28.

¹⁴ 24:19.

¹⁵ 29:27.

expressions appear: "good men" (טובים),¹⁶ "faithful" (אמונים),¹⁷ "those who keep instruction" (שומרי־תורה),¹⁸ the "blameless" (תמים),¹⁹ the "upright" (ישרים),²⁰ and, most often, the "righteous" (צדיקים).²¹ It is interesting that the wise do not appear as antonyms of the wicked, nor do any fools appear as synonyms.

The religion of the wicked. Insofar as the righteous are those who stand in a sound, healthy, proper relationship to Yahweh,²² the wicked are those who stand outside a viable relationship to Yahweh. The righteous are those who are declared righteous, while the wicked are those declared

¹⁶ 2:20; 14:19.

¹⁷ 13:17.

¹⁸ 28:4.

¹⁹ 2:21; 11:5.

²⁰ 2:21; 11:11; 12:6; 14:11; 15:8; 21:18,29; 29:27

(ישר־דרך).

²¹ 2:20; 3:33; 10:3, 6, 7, 11, 16, 20, 24, 25, 28, 30, 32; 11:8, 10, 23, 31; 12:5, 7, 10, 12, 21, 26; 13:5, 9, 25; 14:19, 32; 15:6, 28, 29; 17:15; 18:5; 21:12, 18; 24:15, 16; 25:26; 28:1, 12, 28; 29:2, 7, 16, 27.

²² B. Kovacs, *Sociological-Structural Constraints upon Wisdom: The Spatial and Temporal Matrix of Proverbs 15:28-22:16* (Ph.d. Dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1978), pp. 383, 399, 402.

wicked.²³ These observations, however, are hardly any aid in an attempt to delineate the wicked further. The next step must be to see how the wicked reveal themselves.

The wicked have access to the cult, but their participation is abominable for they sacrifice with ulterior motives.²⁴ For them the cult is a means to some other end rather than an authentic expression of non-instrumental worship. Unfortunately, it is almost impossible to recognize the wicked by cultic behavior since the evaluation of "abomination" is Yahweh's prerogative.²⁵

The demeanor of the wicked. In terms of their demeanor the wicked have haughty eyes, a proud heart, and their face makes a bold, or perhaps harsh, appearance.²⁶ In spite of such bravado, however, the *mashal* tradition humorously observes that the wicked flee when no one pursues; the righteous under such circumstances feel confident as a lion.²⁷

²³ H. Schmid, *Wesen und Geschichte der Weisheit: Eine Untersuchung zur Altorientalischen und Israelitischen Weisheitsliteratur* (Berlin: Verlag Alfred Topelmann, 1966), p. 160.

²⁴ 21:27; cf. 15:8.

²⁵ 15:8; 21:27 MT reads simply תועבה, but the Greek reads βδελυγμα κυριω.

²⁶ 21:4, 29.

²⁷ 28:1.

The wicked are also recognizable in their behavior toward others. They overturn common virtues. A neighbor of the wicked finds no help from them for their appetite craves harm.²⁸ As the admonition of Proverbs 24:15-16 shows, they characteristically lie in wait against the righteous and their belongings.

Lie not in wait as a wicked man against the
dwelling of the righteous;
do not violence to his home;
for a righteous man falls seven times, and
rises again;
but the wicked are overthrown by
calamity. Proverbs 24:15-16

Of course, these signs are often hard to detect until it is too late to avoid disaster. Nevertheless, there is a hint of the wicked person's distortion; they give themselves away by mistreating their animals.

A righteous man has regard for the life of
his beast,
but the mercy of the wicked is cruel.
Proverbs 12:10

Their "mercy" then reveals itself for the cruelty it really is. Presumably they think they can get by with such behavior toward animals since "dumb beasts" are seldom ever known to talk back to their master.²⁹

²⁸ 21:10.

²⁹ The wicked are clearly not students of the Torah, else they would know of Balaam's ass, Num. 22:28.

The speech of the wicked. The appearances in the *mashal* literature indicate that the greatest danger posed by the wicked is their speech. Their mouth conceals violence and is perverted;³⁰ they are like springs bubbling forth harm and injury.³¹ If wisdom is the "art of steering,"³² then the "steering" of the wicked is deceitful.³³ No wonder towns can be overthrown by their mouth.³⁴

The words of the wicked lie in wait for blood,
but the mouth of the upright delivers men.
Proverbs 12:6

Their very words are bloody ambushes!

Most likely, the danger posed by the speech of the wicked is related not to common gossip but to the legal setting where false or distorted speech and counsel can quite literally destroy others. At least three sayings clearly presuppose the judicial life of a community.

A wicked man accepts a bribe from the bosom
to pervert the ways of justice.
Proverbs 17:23

A worthless witness mocks at justice,
and the mouth of the wicked devours
iniquity. Proverbs 19:28

³⁰ Prov. 10:6, 11, 32.

³¹ 15:28.

³² W. Zimmerli, "The place and Limit of Wisdom in the Framework of the Old Testament Theology," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 17 (1964), 149.

³³ 12:5.

³⁴ 11:11.

The violence of the wicked will sweep them
away,
because they refuse to do what is just.

Proverbs 21:7

A fourth saying also probably reflects a legal setting when it observes that the wicked "brings shame and reproach."³⁵

The most dangerous social position for the wicked is clearly in the circles of high authority. Such wicked authorities are named as "ruler" (**מושל**)³⁶ and "ministers"

(**משרתים**).³⁷ Again, it is interesting that expressions

such as "counselor" (**יועץ**) and "wise men" (**חכמים**) do

not appear. The danger posed by wicked rulers and ministers is that they are responsible for the administration of justice,³⁸ and it is noted that

A righteous man knows the rights, of the poor;
a wicked man does not understand such
knowledge.

Proverbs 29:7

Thus the wicked may be characterized generally as those who stand outside a valid relationship to Yahweh. Their

³⁵ 13:5; on **יבא יש** as "to bring shame" see P. Ackroyd, "A Note on the Hebrew Roots **באש** and **בוש**," JTS 43 (1942), 160; cf. 27:11 where **חרף** reflects a legal setting.

³⁶ 28:15; 29:12; cf. 29:2, 16.

³⁷ 29:12.

³⁸ H. Boecker, *Law and the Administration of Justice in the Old Testament and Ancient East*, trans. by J. Moiser (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1980), pp. 40-49.

worship is inauthentic and their bravado false. They overturn normal values of neighborliness and common decency, and they wreak havoc in the judicial life of the community by their malevolent speech and outright distortion of the legal system. They are able to do such things because they function at the highest levels of government and society.

The allies of the wicked. Of course, the wicked have much in common with others who stand as obstacles to the system of justice. The *mashal* literature mentions several kinds of undesirable witnesses: "lying" (כזבים),³⁹

"worthless" (בל יעל) "gratuitous" (חנם),⁴¹ and

"false witnesses" (עד-שקרִים).⁴² Such witnesses are deceptive,⁴³ they breathe out lies,⁴⁴ and others are often enticed by their lips.⁴⁵

Some "violent folk" (אִישׁ חֲמָס) appear who seek to "entice" (יִפְתֶּה) their friends into "a way that is not good."⁴⁶ Another passage speaks expansively of sinners

³⁹ 21:28.

⁴⁰ 19:28.

⁴¹ 24:28.

⁴² 6:19; 12:17; 14:5; 19:5, 9; 25:19.

⁴³ 12:17.

⁴⁴ 6:19; 14:5; 19:5, 9.

⁴⁵ 24:28.

⁴⁶ 16:29.

(חטאים) who seduce (פתה) simple youth to join them
in a life of banditry.

My son, if sinners entice you,
do not consent.
If they say, "Come with us, let us lie in
wait for blood,
let us wantonly ambush the innocent;
like Sheol let us swallow them alive
and whole, like those who go down to
the Pit;
we shall find all precious goods,
we shall fill our houses with spoil;
throw in your lot among us,
we will all have one purse"--
my son, do not walk in the way with them
hold back your foot from their paths;
for their feet run to evil,
and they make haste to shed blood.
For in vain is a net spread
in the sight of any bird;
but these men lie in wait for their own blood,
they set an ambush for their own lives.
Such are the ways of all who get gain by
violence;
it takes away the life of its possessors.

Proverbs 1:10-19

The final verse reveals that these sinners are all
those who make inordinate and expedient profit (בוצע
בצע).⁴⁷ Related characters are those who rob their own
parents (גזול אביו ואמו)⁴⁸ and the "workers of
iniquity" (פועל־יֵאֵן) who are dismayed when justice
is done.

⁴⁷ 1:19; cf. 15:27. These characters may also stand
behind the false weights and measures (20:10, 23) which
create profits so quickly and unfairly. At any rate,
someone very much like them is responsible.

⁴⁸ 28:24.

⁴⁹ 21:15.

Likewise dangerous to the legal system are the "lying tongue" (לִשׁוֹן שָׁקֶר)⁵⁰ and the "treacherous"

(בוגדים)⁵¹ who are unreliable and untrustworthy.⁵²

Yahweh will ruin their words.⁵³ Of course, such false words and speakers would present little problem in the long run were it not for the fact that

An evildoer listens to wicked lips;
and a liar gives heed to a mischievous
tongues

Proverbs 17:4

Eager hearing of false reports is ultimately just as damaging to the judicial system and community health as the false reports themselves.

In the less specific and more common realm of daily life such false speech is also encountered and abhorred.

"Lying lips" (שפת־יֶשָׁקֶר) are an abomination to Yahweh and are used to conceal hatred.⁵⁴ The lying tongue can be used to gain wealth, fleeting though it may be,⁵⁵ or it can

⁵⁰ 6:17; 12:19.

⁵¹ 2:22; 11:3, 6; 13:2, 15; 21:18; 22:12; 23:28; 25:19.

⁵² 25:19.

⁵³ 22:12.

⁵⁴ 10:18; 12:22; cf. 26:24.

⁵⁵ 21:6.

work in conjunction with the "flattering mouth"

(פה־חלק) for the ruin of its hated victims.⁵⁶

A few other designations which belong most appropriately in the רשע-group seem to have little, if anything, to do with worship, speech or the judicial setting. Two sayings are interesting in that they are naming formulae:

The haughty, arrogant man--"scoffer" is
his name--
who acts with overreaching pride.
Proverbs 21:24

Whoever plans to do evil,
to him they shall call, "Lord of devices!"
Proverbs 24:8

The proud and overbearing (גאים) also belong to the רשע-group. Proverbs 15:25 gives little indication as to their identity apart from the contrast with the widow whose boundaries Yahweh protects. The term seems to be used with somewhat greater clarity in Proverbs 16:19 where it may refer to victorious warriors who "divide spoil."⁵⁷

The final member of this group of enemies is one who oppresses (עושק) the poor.⁵⁸ Of course, there always exists the danger that members of the social strata above the poor will take advantage of them in innumerable ways

⁵⁶ 26:28.

⁵⁷ On חלק שלל cf. Gen. 49:27; Exod. 15:9; Judg. 5:30; Isa. 9:2; 53:12; Psalm 68:13; BDB, p. 323; KBL, p. 305f.

⁵⁸ Prov. 14:31; 22:16; 28:3.

(a situation no less true in Israel than elsewhere).⁵⁹ The *mashal*-users, however, were not so enamored by a romantic view of the proletariat that they neglected to note that the poor sometimes oppressed one another.⁶⁰

The Neutral Group

The concept of the "stranger" (זר) is particularly interesting because of its ambiguity. This figure is not always a negative one; at times it is precisely the stranger who praises the wise.

Let a stranger praise you, but not your mouth,
a foreigner, but not your lips.

Proverbs 27:2

The difficulty with strangers is that they are an unknown quantity. One can never know for how long they might be in the community. Most likely their customs are unusual and unconventional. Perhaps their values, always much more difficult to detect, are likewise unconventional. Hence, financial transactions with them ought to be avoided completely.⁶¹

The word זר, however, may not always carry an ethnic sense. It may refer to one who is an "outsider" from the

⁵⁹ 14:31; 22:16.

⁶⁰ 28:3.

⁶¹ 11:15; 20:16; 27:13.

perspective of the mores of the community.⁶² This may be the case with the "stranger" mentioned in Proverbs 6:1 where it is paralleled by "neighbor" (רֵעַ). Here again, though, the point at issue is still financial dealings with such persons.

The "strange woman" (אִשָּׁה זָרָה) is a problem peculiar to Proverbs. She was clearly a troublesome figure for the circle(s) responsible for Proverbs 1-9, not to mention latter day commentators. At least four interpretations have been proposed: a common prostitute, a cult prostitute, the unfaithful (foreign) wife of a Hebrew, and Astarte or some other fertility goddess.⁶³

The first appearance of this figure is in Proverbs 2:16-19 which is part of an instruction comprising the whole

⁶² L. Snijders, "The Meaning of זָרָה in the Old Testament," OTS 10 (1954), 63f., 78, 79.

⁶³ Kovacs, p. 252; cf. G. Bostrom, *Proverbastudien die Weisheit and das Fremde Weib in Spr. 1-9* (Lund: C. Gleerup, 1934); McKane, pp. 264-288, 314-320, 326-331, 334-341, 365-368; B. Lang, *Die weisheit Lehrrede: Eine Untersuchung von Sprüche 1-7* (Stuttgart: Katholische Bibelwerk Verlag, 1972), pp. 87-99; Perdue, pp. 146-155; J. Burnham, *Women in the Book of Proverbs* (Th. M. Thesis, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1956), pp. 56-81; M. Tate, Jr., *A Study of the Wise Men of Israel in Relation to the Prophets* (Th.D. Dissertation, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1958), pp. 355-360; N. Habel, "The Symbolism of Wisdom in Proverbs 1-9," *Interpretation* 26 (1972), 131-157; H. Ringgren, *Word and Wisdom: Studies in the Hypostatization of Divine Qualities and Functions in the Ancient Near East* (Lund: Hakan Ohlssons Boktryckeri, 1947).

chapter.⁶⁴ Verse 16 introduces the "strange woman" from whom the pupil will be delivered if he heeds the words of the teacher.⁶⁵ Verses 17-19 describe this woman as one

who forsakes the companion of her youth
and forgets the covenant of her God;
for her house sinks down to death,
and her paths to the shades;
none who go to her come back
nor do they regain the paths of life.

Proverbs 2:17-19

This woman is evidently unfaithful to her marriage. The use of אלהיה (her God) rather than יהוה (Yahweh) is striking since the latter is characteristic of Proverbs 1-9. Yet, the God in question must be Yahweh who was a witness to the covenant between a man and the wife of his youth.⁶⁶ Whoever falls prey to this woman is led inevitably to involvement "with her in her estrangement from society. . . . They take a journey to the land of no return."⁶⁷

⁶⁴ As McKane, pp. 278-279, notes the adherence of this chapter to the instruction genre is rather loose; there are no imperatives, and it lacks "concrete, authoritative instruction on specific matters." Nevertheless, "the formal structure of the Instruction is the key to the analysis of this chapter."

⁶⁵ Note the אם (if) clauses of vv. 1, 3 and 4 on which the ואז (then) clauses of vv. 5 and 9 are conditioned.

⁶⁶ Mal. 2:14; otherwise, the "covenant" may refer to the commandment against adultery (Exod. 20:14; Deut. 5:18) which belonged to Yahweh's covenant with Israel.

⁶⁷ McKane, p. 288.

The instruction of Proverbs 5 is wholly devoted to the issue of adultery. The masculines of verses 9, 10 and 17 (נכרי, זרים, אכזרי, אחרים) are troublesome.

Are these associates of the "strange woman"? Or, do liaisons with her lead to ruin at the hands of these foreigners? The difficulty stems in part from the fact that the aim of the instruction is to warn against promiscuous behavior. What "descriptions" there are occur in the motivations (vv. 3-6, 9-14) and the rhetorical question of verse 20 which, from a formal standpoint, are subordinate parts of the chapter. More important are the descriptions of the joys of the young man's wife which are integrally related to the imperatives and jussives (vv. 15, 17-19) essential to the instruction genre.⁶⁸ Most likely the chapter has in view adulteresses in general who are typified by the "strange woman."

Although the "strange woman" (אשה זרה) does not appear in the instruction of Proverbs 6:20-35, the passage is often interpreted in association with her, primarily on the basis of the appearance of the "foreign woman" (נכריה) who is parallel to the "strange woman"

⁶⁸ McKane, pp. 1-10.

elsewhere.⁶⁹ In Proverbs 6:24 the parallel designation is "evil woman" (אֵשֶׁת רָעָה).⁷⁰

The issue may, of course, be complicated if verses 20-35 are not unitary but composite.⁷¹ On literary grounds, however, few good reasons can be produced for excluding any verse from the passage. The instruction genre is characterized by imperatives and jussives as in verses 20, 21 and 25, and reasons why such advice should be followed as in verses 22-24 and 26-35.⁷² It seems much more likely,

⁶⁹ Prov. 2:16; 5:20; 7:5.

⁷⁰ BHS proposes to emend רָעָה ("evil") to רֵעָה ("neighbor") on the basis of the Greek reading of *στανδρου* (cf. also v. 29, MT reading אֵשֶׁת רֵעָהּ and Greek reading *γυναικα στανδρου*); another suggestion by BHS is to emend אֵשֶׁת רָעָה to אֵשֶׁת זָרָה, on the basis of Prov. 7:5. The latter suggestion has no textual support while the former represents only a different vocalization of the same consonantal text. MT should probably be read since, as McKane, p. 328, notes, "the expression would have to be 'eset re'aka."

⁷¹ R. Whybray, *Wisdom in Proverbs: The Concept of Wisdom in Proverbs 1-9* (Naperville, Ill.: Alec. R. Allenson, 1965), pp. 48-49, excludes vv. 23, 26-31 and 33-35 on (unconvincing) literary critical grounds. Bostrom, pp. 143f., cited by McKane, p. 328, argues that vv. 20-26 should be dealt with separately from vv. 27-35. His reasons are evidently ideological, at least to Judge from McKane's observation on p. 329: "Bostrom would perhaps not have argued the lack of unity in vv. 20-35 so rigidly if he had not had the special concern of advancing his theory of the 'issa zara. She is promiscuous in a context of cultic devotion (this is his theory), but the description of adultery in vv. 27-35 cannot be fitted into such a framework, and so it must be separated cleanly from the 'issa zara passages."

⁷² See McKane, p. 3; cf. J. Crenshaw, *Old Testament Wisdom: An Introduction* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1978), p. 21, who argues concerning this passage, "when he wants

therefore, that verses 20-35 are in fact a unity warning against the foreign (v. 24) wife of a neighbor (v. 29) who commits adultery.

In the three passages relating to the "strange woman" which have been examined, the interpretation which has seemed most cogent is that she is an unfaithful foreigner married to an Israelite. Proverbs 6:26 excludes the interpretation of her as a common prostitute (זונה) for her price is a man's life rather than a mere loaf of bread. The references to her in Proverbs 2:16-19; 5:1-22 and 6:20-35 contain nothing which demands any cultic perspective.⁷³ An unfaithful foreigner married to an Israelite would fit each of the passages.

The instruction of Proverbs 7:1-27 contains the last explicit reference to the "strange woman." The didactic narrative of verses 6-23 describes her making a pitch to an

to make his point decisively this sage quotes a proverb." Whybray's rigid use of grammatical person as a literary critical criterion leads him astray. The questions of vv. 27-28 and 30 are certainly not addressed to some third party but to the "my son" of v. 20.

⁷³ So also Perdue who remarks concerning 2:16-19 that "the identity of the 'Strange Woman' in this context as a prostitute or temple harlot (is) only a suggestive possibility" (p. 147); concerning 5:1-22 that "the text contains nothing that would allow us to decide whether she is to be regarded as a prostitute for hire or a temple priestess" (p. 148); and concerning 6:20-35, "she is easily identified as an Israelite adulteress" (p. 149).

unsuspecting youth.⁷⁴ The reference to sacrifices (זבחי־שלמים) and vows (נדרי) in verse 14 is, of course, cultic and may indicate that her invitation to sexual intercourse is a cultic invitation. Such an interpretation is dependent upon translating verse 14b in a future perfect tense: "Today I shall have fulfilled my vows."⁷⁵ Yet, the Hebrew probably translates more naturally, "Today I have fulfilled my vows."⁷⁶ If this translation be correct then she is claiming that she has performed her cultic duties and now seeks the young man (ostensibly) to share her peace offerings. The communion meal is then a pretext.

Verses 6-7 of this didactic narrative pose another possible cultic reference. The Hebrew text presents the wisdom teacher⁷⁷ looking out the window of his house

⁷⁴ On פתִי see Chapter 3 below.

⁷⁵ So Perdue, p. 149; cf. McKane, pp. 221, 339; R. Scott, *Proverbs, Ecclesiastes: Introduction, Translation, and Notes* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, 1965), p. 64.

⁷⁶ Taking the perfect verb שלמתי "to represent actions, events, or states, which although completed in the past, nevertheless extend their influence into the present" (G-K 106g). Cf. RSV, KJV, NEB, JB, TEV, NASB and NIV.

⁷⁷ Perdue, p. 149, states that "these verses describe either 'Mistress Wisdom' or the 'Strange Woman'." In fact, they describe either the "strange woman" (so LXX) or the wisdom teacher who is the antecedent of the first common singular forms in vv. 1-2 and 24 while "Mistress Wisdom" speaks she refers to herself in first person, not third; is referred to as a third person in v. 4. When Wisdom

observing (נִשְׁקָפְתִּי) the disastrous encounter between the young man and the "strange woman." The Greek text, however, reads third person (παρακυπτουσα), and thereby presents the "strange woman" looking out the window.⁷⁸ This woman who "looks out the window" has been connected with the fertility goddess Aphrodite παρακυπτουσα of Cyprus.⁷⁹ If the Greek text is followed then the "strange woman" must be identified as

a sacral priestess or a devotee of a fertility goddess who dresses in her sacral garb and takes to the streets in order to induce young man to join her in fertility rites.⁸⁰

Following the Greek text does make a cultic interpretation quite likely, but should the Greek text be preferred

cf. 1:22-33; 8:1-36; 9:5, 11. If this were each of "Mistress Wisdom" 7:4 would read, "Say to me, 'you are my sister,' and call insight your intimate friend."

⁷⁸ The full Hebrew text of vv. 6-7 translates,
For in the window of my house,
through my window-lattice I have looked
down,
and I saw among the simple;
I perceived among the youthful sons one
without sense.

The Greek text, on the other hand, translates,
For out of the window of her house
into the streets she peeped out,
she would see him among the simple youth,
a young man lacking sense.

⁷⁹ So Perdue, p. 149, following Bostrom and W. Albright, "Some Canaanite-Phoenician Sources of Hebrew Wisdom," VTS 3 (1955), 10.

⁸⁰ Perdue, p. 149.

to MT? In light of two factors, preference of the Greek seems doubtful. First, the character of the Septuagint Proverbs is such that

the greatest caution should be exercised in employing LXX to elucidate or emend difficult portions of MT. To use LXX in these circumstances in order to recover an "original" Hebrew text is in fact to invent a Hebrew text which never at any time existed. . . "For the explanation of minor deviations in the LXX Proverbs from MT textual criticism has, indeed, very little help to afford, and any arguing which neglects the translator as a creative factor is very likely to lead astray."⁸¹

In this case the Hebrew is not difficult to read or understand at all. The best reason to follow the Greek text may well be the desire to find cultic dimensions in the picture of the "strange woman."⁸²

The second factor which argues against reading with the Greek text against the Hebrew follows from this character of the Greek text. Its translator(s) may have been following an exegetical tradition which allegorically

⁸¹ McKane, pp. 34-35; in the last sentence of the above citation McKane is quoting G. Gerleman (cf. G. Gerleman, "The Septuagint Proverbs as a Hellenistic Document," OTS 8 [1950], 15-27; and *Studies in the LXX, III: Proverbs* (Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1956). On p. 43 McKane lists Prov. 7:6 under his category, "Where the deviation of LXX from MT derives from exegetical presuppositions or from a striving after what are thought to be more fitting sentiments than those expressed by MT."

⁸² The Syriac evidently agrees with the Greek (see BHS), but it may have been influenced by the LXX; cf. Eissfeldt, pp. 699-700.

actualized the warnings about the "strange woman."⁸³ This exegetical move may be seen at Qumran where the figure really refers to "all powers which could estrange the member of this brotherhood."⁸⁴ Not only at Qumran was this tradition current but in Greek speaking Judaism as well. The Greek text of Proverbs 2:17-19 evidences this when it translates the Hebrew אִשָּׁה זָרָה ("strange woman") by κακή βουλή ("bad counsel"), and "the 'Madam Folly' in Proverbs 9 LXX receives features of the strange woman . . . which she did not possess in the Hebrew version."⁸⁵

The objection might well be raised here that these examples of allegorical actualization of the "strange woman" are simply updating what was already very much like

⁸³ Lang, p. 89, "*erst vom zweiten vorchristlichen Jahrhundert an haben wir Belege für eine allegorische Aktualisierung der Warnungen vor dem fremden Frau.*"

⁸⁴ Lang, p. 90, ". . . alle Kräfte, die das Mitglied der Bruderschaft dieser entfremden konnten."--Lang is referring to 4 Q 184 in J. Allegro, ed., *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of the Jordan V* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968). 82-85; see Lang, p. 89, n. 7 for further bibliography.

⁸⁵ Lang, p. 90, ". . . erhält die 'Frau Torheit' in Spr 9 LXX Züge der fremden Frau . . . die sie in der hebraischen Version nicht besass." These new features that Lang mentions are the additions to Prov. 9:18 which derive from 5:15-18. The additions translate,

but turn away, do not delay in the place,
lest you set your name upon her;
for this would pass over a strange water
and overflow a strange river.
But keep away from a strange water,
and do not drink from a strange spring,
so that you may live a long time,
and life might still be bestowed upon you.

allegory. The objection loses force, however, when it is noted that another writer who lived in the same milieu and stood squarely in the mainstream of the wisdom tradition did not follow this exegetical procedure. Sirach's translator rendered his grandfather's Hebrew **אִשָּׁה זָרָה** ("strange woman") as **γυναικι εταιριζομενον** ("loose woman," Sir. 9:3) and as **γυναικος εταιρος** ("a woman who is a harlot, " Sir. 41:22).

This should not be surprising for Sirach's grandson was simply following the ancient wisdom tradition's warnings against promiscuous sexual behavior. Such warnings are common in ancient near eastern wisdom literature, especially in the instruction genre, as far back as Ptah-Hotep.⁸⁶ The "strange woman" in Proverbs 1-9, even chapter 7, is best taken as a heightened presentation of a woman who presents a particularly alluring appeal for the folly of illicit sexual relations. The warning is against adultery with her, not her foreign status nor her cultic affiliation.

Only one *mashal* seems to refer to the "strange woman."

A deep pit is the mouth of strange
women (**זָרוֹת**)
with whomever Yahweh is angry, he will
fall there.

Proverbs 22:14

⁸⁶ See J. Wilson, "The Instruction of the Vizier Ptah-Hotep," *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, by J. Pritchard (2nd ed., Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1955), p. 413.

The difference, of course, is that only here does the figure appear in the plural. It is possible that this saying is older than the development of the stock figure of the "strange women" found in Proverbs 1-9. The warning is against foreign women in general.⁸⁷ The limitations of the simple two line *mashal* exclude any extended description.

The Friends and Kinfolk Group

Although the *mashal* literature generally shows a great sensitivity to the positive value of friends and kinfolk and offers guidelines for maintaining and enhancing such relationships,⁸⁸ it also notes the fact that there are times when friends and relatives may become enemies.

This is often the case with the poor.

All the brothers of a poor man hate him;
how much more are his friends distant
from him.

Proverbs 19:7⁸⁹

⁸⁷ So also McKane, p. 571.

⁸⁸ R. Cook, *The Neighbor Concept in the Old Testament* (Ph.D. Dissertation The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1980), pp. 143-147; cf. H. Wolff, *Anthropology of the Old Testament*, trans. by M. Kohl (rev. ed., Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974), pp. 185-191.

⁸⁹ The last line of this verse does not seem to make sense as it is in MT: מִרְדֵּף אֲמָרִים לֹא־הֵמָּה. Literally translated, "Pursuing words not they" or reading the Qere, "Pursuing words to him they." Scott, p. 115, reads "*hu' meraddep, 'omrethem lo hemah*,"="When he follows them they speak angrily to him." B. Gemser, *Sprüche Salomos* (Tubingen: Mohr, 1937), pp. 58, 59, reconstructs a Hebrew text of 4 lines based on the LXX; hardly a plausible

Evidently, there are those friends who avoid such entanglements with the poor, because they are likely to get too involved and lose their cherished autonomy.⁹⁰ Of course, it is more difficult for blood relatives to desert their poor kin, but hate is still an option. As noted earlier, the essence of hating is an interior-exterior disparity.⁹¹

Another economic context where friends may become enemies devoid is in connection with suretyship. Only a person wholly devoid of sense would continue in a relationship of surety, especially in the presence of a neighbor who could later act as witness to the proceedings.⁹² At such times the neighbor might as well be a "stranger," one who stood beyond the bounds of the community standards.⁹³

The judicial setting is another area where friends become enemies. After all, the judicial arena is in reality

endeavor. H. Ringgren, *Sprüche Übersetzt und Erklärt* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1962), p. 77, indicates the omission of this line with an ellipsis and a note commenting, "MT: '*wer Worten nachjagt, nicht sie, 'ist unverstandlich*.'" Likewise, Mckane, pp. 240, 52., omits the line.

⁹⁰ Cf. also 14:20; 19:4.

⁹¹ Such self-centered behaviors are not always practiced by friends, nor are brothers always of more help than a friend: "There are friends who make themselves out to be friends, but there is a lover who cleaves beyond a brother" (18:24).

⁹² 17:18.

⁹³ 6:1; cf. Snijders, p. 84.

simply an institutionalized form of controversy. Its goal is to remove the adversary proceedings from the common daily life of the community so that they can be dealt with in a relatively safe environment and the participants reintegrated into the life of the community.⁹⁴ To avoid legal proceedings, therefore, is to avoid the unpleasant reality of friends acting as adversaries.

What your eyes have seen
do not hastily bring into court;
for what will you do in the end,
when your neighbor puts you to shame?
Argue your case with your neighbor himself,
and do not disclose another's secret;
lest he who hears you bring shame upon you,
and your ill repute have no end.

Proverbs 25:7c-10

Another observation notes that one's case always looks good at first, but the cross-examination of a friend poses a nameless hazard.

He who states his case first seems right,
until the other comes and examines him.

Proverbs 18:17

A final opportunity for a shift from friendship to enmity should be mentioned. One admonition warns against too much "neighborliness," lest one's welcome be exhausted.

Let your foot be seldom in your neighbor's
house,
lest he become weary with you and hate you.

Proverbs 25:17

⁹⁴ W. Clark, "Law," in *Old Testament Form Criticism*, ed. by J. Hayes (San Antonio: Trinity University Press, 1974), p. 103.

The Animals Group

Animals used as metaphors for hostile figures appear in Proverbs. Whenever these metaphors are used to point up the threatening or dangerous characteristics of the referent, they occur in connection with some royal personage.⁹⁵ Another enemy metaphor concentrates attention on the disgusting behavior of a fool who is like a "dog returning to his vomit,"⁹⁶ while on yet another occasion the reference is quite simply to a dog as a dog.⁹⁷

Job

The book of Job opens with a story about a righteous man whose piety was tested by God at the prodding of one of the "sons of God," the Adversary. Job's piety is vindicated,⁹⁸ but his suffering continues. In the midst of this suffering Job's three friends, Eliphaz, Bildad and Zophar, come to console him. The encounter between these four is contentious as Job complains that his suffering does not correspond with his piety, and the friends urge him to repent. When the three friends fail to bring about Job's

⁹⁵ 19:12; 20:2; 28:15; in a non-threatening use, emphasizing courage, the righteous are compared to a lion (28:1).

⁹⁶ 26:11.

⁹⁷ 26:17.

⁹⁸ Job 1:22; 2:10.

repentance a young man, Elihu, appears who argues against Job. The last figure to appear in this discussion is Yahweh who asks Job a series of overwhelming questions to which Job can only respond in humble submission to the divine majesty. The book closes with Yahweh's affirmation of Job, condemnation of the three friends and restoration of Job's family, friends and property, even "more than his beginning" (42:12).

The narrative setting of the book of Job which is provided by the prologue (ch. 1-2) and the epilogue (42:7-17) occasionally allows an identification of the enemies as characters in the "dramatized lament."⁹⁹ The speeches of the poetic dialogue (3:1-42:6) which form the bulk of the book allow greater opportunity for description of the enemies than any of the forms in Proverbs. This formal distinction, however, must not be pressed overly much for Job's friends, as well as Job himself, are often simply repeating what has become orthodox doctrine. A more important formal consideration is the fact that Job's speeches are modeled after the traditional laments while those of his friends are disputations and indictments.¹⁰⁰ These

⁹⁹ C. Westermann, *The Structure of the Book of Job: A Form-Critical Analysis*, trans. by C. Muenchow: (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981), pp. 8ff.

¹⁰⁰ Westermann, *The Structure of the Book of Job*, pp. 10, 17-25.

forms, especially the lament, typically include mention of enemies. More frequent appearance of the enemies may, therefore, be expected.

The **אויב**

The book of Job utilizes a fuller complement of words belonging to the **אויב**-group. Whereas Proverbs used only

אויב, **שונא** and **משנא**, this poet uses these three

words¹⁰¹ as well as **מתקומם**,¹⁰² **צר**¹⁰³ and

השטן.¹⁰⁴ The most frequently used of these is **השטן**,

but it appears only in the prologue and always refers to the heavenly adversary who indicts Job's piety. Otherwise, these words are most often found in Job's speeches.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰¹ **אויב** in Job 13:24; 27:7; 33:10; **שונא** in 8:22; 34:17; **משנא** in 31:29.

¹⁰² 20:27; 27:7.

¹⁰³ 6:23; 16:9; 19:11.

¹⁰⁴ 1:6, 7 (2x), 8, 9, 12 (2x); 2:1, 2 (2x), 3, 4, 6, 7.

¹⁰⁵ **אויב** in 13:24 and 27:7, if the latter belongs to Job; the transmission of the "third cycle" of speeches is consistently judged to be corrupt with no agreement as to its reconstruction; cf. Westermann, *The Structure of the Book of Job*; R. Gordis, *The Book of Job: Commentary, New Translation and Special Studies* (New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1978); M. Pope, *Job: Introduction, Translation, and Notes* (3rd ed., Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, 1973). Job 33:10, although found in an Elihu speech, should really be attributed to Job as it is an allusion to 13:24. **מתקומם** in 27:7; **צר** in 6:23; 16:9; 19:11; **משנא** in 31:29.

Three times Job is simply referring quite stereotypically to his human enemies.¹⁰⁶ In all of these places the hostile figure is nondescript, but it appears that the adversary of Job 6:23 could refer to a legal adversary; this possibility is raised by the references to offering a bribe (v. 22) and to ransoming Job (v. 23). The hostile figures of Job 27:7 and 31:29, on the other hand, are more probably not legal adversaries. In the case of the former this is so because the content of Job's wish is that the enemy-opponent come to be *as* the wicked-unrighteous (כרשע // כעול) not that they *become* the wicked-unrighteous which would be the case in a legal setting. With the latter there is simply not enough material to warrant a judgment.

Although it is commonly said that God is Job's enemy,¹⁰⁷ the evidence is somewhat more subtle. In actual fact, if the enemy designations found in the Psalms are taken as the best witness to enemy vocabulary, it is only at Job 16:9 that Job explicitly refers to God as his

¹⁰⁶ 6:23; 27:7; 31:29.

¹⁰⁷ G. von Rad, *Wisdom in Israel* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1972), p. 217, which Crenshaw, p. 109, cites in agreement. Cf. Westermann, *The Structure of the Book of Job*, p. 45.

adversary (צַר).¹⁰⁸ Thus, only a single time in the entire book is God named as the enemy.

In two passages Job radically re-orientes the enemy vocabulary. He claims that God has made him, Job, an enemy.

Why do you hide your face
and count me for your enemy?
Job 13:24¹⁰⁹

He has kindled his wrath against me
and counted me as his adversary.
Job 19:11

It is, of course, not surprising at all to find reference to enemies in the lament form which is the predominant genre of all Job's speeches.¹¹⁰ Ordinarily a lament will contain questions about "why" or "how long" God intends to neglect, or cause, the suppliant's distress. Furthermore, a significant theme in the situation of distress is often the enemies' attacks. In Job's laments, however, the attacks of the enemy¹¹¹ are separated from the one who is made to be the enemy, the lamenter. This semantic contradiction between the perpetrator of the attacks

¹⁰⁸ Even here, some would take this to refer to the human enemies who are the subject of vv. 10f.; Pope, p. 123; but cf. Gordis, pp. 176f.

¹⁰⁹ Cf. 33:10.

¹¹⁰ Westermann, *The Structure of the Book of Job*, p. 31.

¹¹¹ Cf. 13:25, 27; 19:6, 8, 10, 12, 13, 22.

(God) and the putative enemy (Job) is at the heart of Job's suffering.¹¹²

The significance of this semantic contradiction is pointed up by the fact that enemy (**אויב**) is a unilateral designation. However intense the hostility may be, the other is always the enemy while the protagonist is never designated as such. Of course, it is logical to assume that most often enmity is a bilateral affair (i.e., he is my enemy, and I am his enemy), but the linguistic usage does not conform to such an assumption.

Psalm 139:21-22 is the clearest example of this. It is clear that the psalmist is at enmity with Yahweh's enemies from the verbs of verses 21-22a which are first person singular.

¹¹² This contradiction in Job's situation was also noted by the rabbinic interpreters: "He (i.e., Job) blasphemed with a tempest, as it is written, 'For he breaketh me as with a tempest' (Job 9:17). Job said to God, 'Perhaps a tempest passed before you and caused you to confuse Job ('Iyyob) and enemy ('oyeb),." **בסערה חרף דכתיב אשר בשערה ישו פני אמר לפניו רבוני של ועלם שמא רוח סעהר עברה לפניך ונתחלף לך בן איוב לאויב:** Baba bathra I, 16a. The passage goes on to record three rejoinders by God to the effect that he made no such error at all. The rabbis were simply using the age-old device of puns in their discussion of Job. It may be that the Joban poet as well was trying to pun upon the name with 13:24 and later 33:10; 19:11 would then be based upon the pun of 13:24 by simply substituting **צר** for **אויב** (i.e., **איוב**). The name **איוב** could be formed from the root **איב** in which case it would be construed in a passive sense on the analogy of **יילוד**; cf. Gordis, pp. 10-11; M. Noth, *Die Israelitischen Personennamen im Rahmen der Gemeinsemitischen Namengebung* (Stuttgart: Verlag von W. Kohlhammer, 1928), p. 11.

Do I not hate them that hate thee, O Yahweh?
 And do I not loathe them that rise up
 against thee?
 I hate them with perfect hatred.

Psalm 139:21-22a

Verse 22b, however, shifts to third person (although RSV retains the first person) and reads, "They have become enemies to me" (לֹאֹיְבִים הָיוּ לִי). The only exception to this linguistic usage is found in Exodus 23:22 where Yahweh promises, "I will be an enemy to your enemies" (אֵיבֹתַי אֶת־אֹיְבֶיךָ).¹¹³

Thus, the unique character of Job's situation with Yahweh is pointed up by his peculiar linguistic usage. He sees himself as a "reckoned" (חָשַׁב) enemy of God, reckoned by God and thereby factually an enemy. Yet, he is not the one who is behaving as an enemy; God behaves as an enemy. Job's situation is that of (innocent) victim while God's behavior toward Job is that of an enemy. Linguistically, Job cannot bring himself to say, "I am an enemy of God."¹¹⁴ He can only ask, "Will you reckon me for your enemy?" (13:24), or make the outrageous claim, "He has reckoned me for himself as his enemies" (19:11).

¹¹³ The exceptional character of this usage is further pointed up by the fact that this is the only appearance of the root אֵיב as a finite verb.

¹¹⁴ הֵייתִי אוֹיֵב לְאֵל or אֲנִי אוֹיֵב לְאֵל
 or אֵיבֹתַי אֶת־אֵל.

Outside Job's speeches the designations of the enemies from the **אויב**-group appear only in a speech of Bildad (8:22)¹¹⁵ and in one by Elihu (34:17).¹¹⁶ Elihu adds a new dimension to this vocabulary. In a rhetorical question he speaks of one who hates not someone but rather something (**משפט**). Enmity has been depersonalized by being construed as a relationship between a person and a principle. Elihu is now giving a lecture.¹¹⁷

The **רשע**-Group

The wicked (**רשע**) appear twenty-five times in the book of Job. They are mentioned by each of the major figures in the book.¹¹⁸ That the wicked are those who stand outside a sound, healthy relationship to God in Job as in Proverbs is indicated by the prominent relationship to the "profane" or "godless" (**חנף**),¹¹⁹ the "unjust" (**עויל**),

¹¹⁵ Otherwise, Bildad mentions in 8:20 "evildoers" (**מרעים**) and, antithetically, the "blameless" (**תם**).

¹¹⁶ **מתקוממה** in 20:27 (Zophar) is used verbally rather than substantively; its subject is **ארץ**.

¹¹⁷ Westermann, *The Structure of the Book of Job*, p. 140.

¹¹⁸ Job in 3:17; 9:22, 24; 10:3; 16:11; 21:7, 16, 17, 28; 24:6; 27:7, 13; Eliphaz in 15:20; 22:18; Bildad in 8:22; 18:5; Zophar in 11:20; 20:5, 29; Elihu in 34:18; 36:6, 17; and Yahweh in 38:13, 15; 40:12.

¹¹⁹ 20:5; cf. 8:13; 15:34; 27:8; 34:30; 36:13.

¹²⁰ the "ruthless" (עריץ), ¹²¹ the "workers of iniquity" (פועל־יֵאֵן), ¹²² and the "evildoers" (מרעים). ¹²³ Standing in opposition to the wicked are the "blameless" (תם). ¹²⁴

The nature of the forms in Job allows further observations which confirm the religious content of this designation. Whereas in Proverbs (at least in 10:1-22:16 where the רשעים are most prominent) the context is limited to short sayings, in Job there are speeches. Thus, it often occurs that a major portion of a speech begins by mentioning a group under one designation and concludes by referring to the same group under another, but essentially synonymous, designation. ¹²⁵ Such formal considerations require

¹²⁰ 16:11; 27:7; cf. 18:21; 31:3.

¹²¹ 15:20; 27:13; cf. 6:23 where עריץ is parallel to צר.

¹²² 34:8; cf. 31:3; 34:22.

¹²³ 8:20.

¹²⁴ 8:20; 9:22.

¹²⁵ For example, 8:11-22, which begins with rhetorical questions concerning a well-known plant image (cf. Psalm 1; Jer. 17:5-8) and concludes with an assurance to the blameless and promise of destruction to the wicked; 15:(17-19) 20-35 which begins with the designations "wicked" and "ruthless" (רשע // עריץ) and concludes with "company of the godless," and "tents of bribery" (עדת חנף // אהל־יֵשׁוּחַד); 18:5-21 beginning with the wicked and ending with the "unjust" and "he who does not know God" (לא־יֵדַע־אל // עול).

broadening the range of synonyms which may be ascertained by strict parallelism to include other significant designations such as the "evil man" (רע),¹²⁶ "those who forget God" (שוכח־אל),¹²⁷ the one who is "not innocent" (אי־נקי),¹²⁸ and the "one who does not know God" (לא־ידע־אל).¹²⁹ A similar broadening of the range of antonyms on the basis of these formal considerations requires the inclusion of the "righteous" (צדיק),¹³⁰ the "innocent" (נקי),¹³¹ the "afflicted" (עני),¹³² "poor" (דל),¹³³ "needy" (אביון),¹³⁴ "lowly" (שח־עניים),¹³⁵ "widow" (אלמנה),¹³⁶ "orphan"

¹²⁶ 21:30.

¹²⁷ 8:13.

¹²⁸ 22:30; on the particle see Gordis, p. 252, and Pope, p. 169, who take it as the negative particle known in Ethiopic, Phoenician, rabbinic and modern Hebrew and perhaps even biblical Hebrew at Sam. 4:21 (7):23

¹²⁹ 18:21.

¹³⁰ 22:19; 27:17; 36:7.

¹³¹ 9:23; 22:19; 27:17.

¹³² 24:4, 14; 34:28; 36:6, 15.

¹³³ 34:19, 28.

¹³⁴ 24:4, 14.

¹³⁵ 22:29.

¹³⁶ 24:3.

(יתום),¹³⁷ "dying" (מתים),¹³⁸ and "wounded" (חלל).¹³⁹

For the most part, the various synonyms for the wicked present the same picture noted in Proverbs. There are, however, new developments. Bildad offers Job the assurance that "the tent of the wicked will be no more" (8:22b) which is a quite traditional affirmation. Atypical of this kind of affirmation is the use of שונא (hater) in the parallel stich (8:22a).

Those who hate you will be clothed with shame,
and the tent of the wicked will be no more.
Job 8:22

This is the first example in wisdom literature of an apparent identification between the hater (שונא) of the אֵוִיב-group and the wicked.

A second synonym which represents something hitherto unspoken in the wisdom literature is the socioeconomic identification of the wicked as "nobility" (נדיב).¹⁴⁰

Related to this is the antinomy between the wicked and the

¹³⁷ 24:3.

¹³⁸ 24:12, revocalizing with BHS to מְתִים

¹³⁹ 24:12.

¹⁴⁰ 21:28; 34:18; cf. also שוע, שר, מלך and

אביר in 34:18, 19, 20.

underprivileged.¹⁴¹ The examples of antithetic parallelism between the wicked (rich) and the poor (righteous) occur primarily in two places: Job's speech in chapter 24 and Elihu's speeches in chapters 34 and 36.¹⁴²

In each of these cases the opposition of the wicked and the afflicted is the result of the forms which make up the speeches. The Elihu speeches all make use of the humiliation-exaltation hymnic motif which is familiar from the psalm tradition of Israel.

He pours contempt upon princes
and makes them walk in trackless wastes;
but he raises up the needy out of affliction,
and makes their families like flocks.¹⁴³
Psalm 107:40-41

Job's speech in chapter 24 consists of quite a long description of the distress of humanity following his

¹⁴¹ Cf. the antonyms עֲנִי in 24:4, 14; 34:28; 36:6, 15; אֲבִיּוֹן in 24:4, 14; דָּל in 34:19, 28; יְתוֹם, in 24:3; אֶלְמָנָה in 24:3; מָתִים in 24:12; חֲלָלִים in 24:12; שַׁחֲעִינִים in 22:29; אֲסִירִים in 3:18; יְגִיעֵי־כּוֹחַ in 3:17 ("victims," Gordis, pp. 28, 38).

¹⁴² Eliphaz's speech in 22:29 appears to have a note similar to Elihu's remarks if the RSV is followed, but it seems better to follow Gordis, pp. 242, 252, and translate MT as it stands: "When men are brought low you will say, 'Rise up,' and he who has been humbled will be saved." Cf. Pope, p. 164, who translates, "When they abase, you (i.e., Job) may order exaltation; and the lowly of man he will save." The verse belongs in the context of Eliphaz's promise that if Job would repent (שׁוּב, v. 23) then he would be one of those righteous folk upon whose merit others could receive favor; Gordis, pp. 251f.; Pope, 168.

¹⁴³ Cf. Psalms 33:10-17; 76:5, 9, 12; 113:5-9; 145:14, 19-20; 146:7-9; 147:6; and I Sam. 2:4-8.

lamenting "why" of verse 1. Such a description of distress is integral to the laments of the Psalms.¹⁴⁴ Thus, this new identification of the wicked in opposition to the lower classes of the socio-economic scale is due to the use of traditional forms, not to any new thoughts on the nature of the wicked.

In fact, this claim for the social location of the wicked is a quite logical outcome of their religious stance, their lack of a proper relationship to God. Elihu recognizes that God strikes these mighty folk because they turned aside from behind him and did not comprehend his ways so that they made the cry of the poor to come to him.¹⁴⁵ The socially oppressive nature of the wicked is hardly a genuinely new development in wisdom material. Rather, it is a simple outcome of the fundamental defect of the wicked: they stand without a proper relationship to God.

A third factor is introduced by Elihu which is really a new dimension in designations of the wicked. Elihu predicts that "men of understanding" (אֲנֹשֵׁי לֵב) and the "wise man" (גִּבּוֹר חָכָם) will say:

Job speaks without knowledge;
his words are without insight.

¹⁴⁴ For example, Psalms 5:9-10; 6:6-7; 10:1-11; 12:1-4.

¹⁴⁵ Job 34:24, 26-28.

Would that Job were tried to the end,
 because of answers like¹⁴⁶ wicked men.
 For he adds rebellion upon his sin,
 among us he claps (his hands),
 and multiplies his words to God.

Job 34:35-37

Job is accused by Elihu of being a wicked man because of his foolish speaking. Unlike the material in Proverbs, Elihu here hints at an identification of the wicked with characteristics which normally apply to the "fool."

Thus the book of Job presents substantially the same picture of the wicked as is found in Proverbs. The identification of the wicked as those who oppress the lower classes in society seems to be a change. This alteration, however, is due entirely to the traditional forms used in the composition of the speeches; it is not a specifically wisdom theme but a theme of psalmody used by a wisdom writer. The parallelism between a term of the **בִּינָא**-group and the wicked is a new note in the wisdom tradition, but it occurs only once in an assurance which could be quite at home in the Psalter. The most significant new dimension is the implicit identification of the wicked with the fool which Elihu introduced.

The Neutral Group

Only two times does the term **זָר** ("stranger") appear in the book of Job. The first appearance (19:15) refers to

¹⁴⁶ Reading **כִּאֲנֹשִׁי** instead of **בִּאֲנֹשִׁי**; see BHS.

the "outsider" who is unknown in the community; it is parallel to the "alien" (נכר). It is as such an outsider that Job's maidservants reckon him. Once again, Job's complaint is phrased in such a way that he himself is designated by a frequent enemy designation. Job finds himself in the situation of an enemy.¹⁴⁷

The other appearance of the stranger is at Job 19:27.

Whom I shall see for myself
and my eyes shall see¹⁴⁸ and not a stranger.
My kidneys are spent within me.

There is some question as to whether the "stranger" should be taken to refer to God¹⁴⁹ or to some other person instead of Job.¹⁵⁰ If the first option be accepted, then Job is wishing for the day when he will behold God as his Redeemer (v. 25) and not as the divine stranger who presently confronts him. More probably, however, זר, should be taken

¹⁴⁷ Cf. 13:24; 19:11; 33:10 and the discussion above on the אֵיב in Job.

¹⁴⁸ Emend ירא to ירא; *yod* has been lost through haplography; cf. G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob* (Gutersloh: Gutersloh Verlagshaus G. Mohn 1963), p. 309; G. Holscher, *Das Buch Hiob* (Tubingen: Mohr, 1937), p. 46.

¹⁴⁹ So apparently Pope, p. 139.

¹⁵⁰ So Gordis, pp. 198, 207; cf. also Holscher, p. 46; Fohrer, p. 322; and E. Dhorme, *A Commentary on the Book of Job*, trans. by H. Knight (London: Nelson, 1967), p. 286, who leave their comments almost as ambivalent as MT on the identity of the זר, but on careful reading seem to favor this interpretation.

merely at another ("*mit dem er nichts meter zu tun hat*"¹⁵¹) who might see God although Job himself would be unable to do so. In this case, the "stranger" is no enemy but simply some anonymous third party.¹⁵² The sense is then. "my eyes shall see, and not someone else's."

The Friends and Kinfolk Group

Only in Job's speeches are terms for friends and kinfolk used to designate enemies. Job claims that his "brothers" (אחים) have become treacherous,¹⁵³ his "friends" (רעים) scorn him,¹⁵⁴ and his "kinfolk" and "close friends" (קרובים ומידעים) have failed him.¹⁵⁵ Indeed, Job 19:13-19 is a veritable lexicon of friendship and household designations.

He has put my brethren (אחים) far from me,
and my acquaintances (וידעים) are wholly
estranged from me.
My kinsfolk (קרובים) and my close friends
(ומידעים) have failed me;
the guests (גרים) in my house have for-
gotten me;
my maidservants (ואמהות) count me as a
stranger;

¹⁵¹ Fohrer, , p. 322.

¹⁵² Cf. the similar use of זר in Prov. 27:2;

יהללך זר ולא-פריך. The LXX clearly take the passage in this sense: α ο σφθαλμος μου εορακεν και ουκ αλλος.

¹⁵³ Job 6:15; cf. 19:13.

¹⁵⁴ 16:20; cf. 12:4.

¹⁵⁵ 19:14.

I have become an alien in their eyes.
 I call to my servant (לַעֲבָדִי), but he gives
 me no answer;
 I must beseech him with my mouth.
 I am repulsive to my wife (לְאִשְׁתִּי),
 loathsome to the sons of my own mother
 (לְבָנֵי בִטְנִי)
 Even young children (עוֹלָלִים) despise me;
 when I rise they talk against me.
 All my intimate friends (מֵתֵי סוּדִי) abhor me,
 and those whom I loved (זֶה־אֶהְבֵּתִי)
 have turned against me.

Job 19:13-19

It is quite significant that designations from this particular group appear to refer to enemies only on the lips of Job. This motif is well-known from the laments of the Psalter.

It is not an enemy who taunts me--
 then I could bear it;
 it is not an adversary who deals insolently
 with me--
 then I could hide from him.
 But it is you, my equal,
 my companion, my familiar friend.
 We used to hold sweet converse together;
 within God's house we walked in fellowship,
 Psalm 55:13-15¹⁵⁶

This motif is one of the most fitting which the writer uses.

Job 19:13-19 expansively describes the alienation from his social milieu which Job experiences as a result of God's hostile actions toward him (19:6-12). Otherwise, these designations drawn from the friends and kinfolk group point to the three friends of the dialogue.¹⁵⁷ These three

¹⁵⁶ Cf. also vv. 21-22 and Psalms 31:11; 41:9.

¹⁵⁷ Job 6:14f. (cf. the explicit identification in v. 21); 12:4 (Gordis, p. 136); 16:20; 19:21.

friends had come to comfort Job (2:11), but their words of consolation misfired. They could only offer disputation which finally leads to outright indictment (Job 22).¹⁵⁸

This is why Job is so confounded that he cries out to his friends to have pity on him (19:21) and asks how they would comfort him with nothings (21:31). Rather than playing the proper role of comforters, Job's three friends have moved toward a legal role. They have become Job's accusers.¹⁵⁹

The Animals Group

Eliphaz uses the "lion" (אַרְיֵה), the "fierce lion" (שָׁחַל), the "young lions" (לְבִיאים), the "strong lion" (לְיֵשׁ) and the "whelps of the lioness" (בְּנֵי-לְבִיָּא)¹⁶⁰ as metaphors for those who "plow iniquity" and "sow trouble."¹⁶¹ Otherwise in Job the animals mentioned refer to real animals with no metaphorical significance intended.¹⁶²

¹⁵⁸ Westermann, *The Structure of the Book of Job*, pp. 9ff.

¹⁵⁹ On the legal forms in the book of Job see L. Kohler, "Justice in the Gate," postscript to *Hebrew Man*, trans. by P. Ackroyd (London: SCM Press, 1956), pp. 158-163.

¹⁶⁰ 4:10-11,

¹⁶¹ 4:8.

¹⁶² 30:1; 38:39.

Qoheleth

The "riddle"¹⁶³ of Qoheleth appears to go back at least to Jamnia¹⁶⁴ if not to the apologetic epilogist of Qoheleth 12:9-13. Although he claims to have set for himself the task of investigating everything that happens "under the heavens" (1:13), he never mentions any of the enemies from the זִי־גֵוֹן-group. Nor does he ever present friends or family members as enemy figures.

Even when Qoheleth mentions enemies from other categories the nature of his style seems to trivialize them. His style, largely prose, consists of "essays" which fly in the face of hitherto accepted conclusions. Where Qoheleth uses sayings which sound as if they might well stem from an ongoing tradition,¹⁶⁵ he nevertheless uses them in such a way as to neutralize their heuristic function. "Even though a wise man claims to know, he cannot find it out" (8:17). Qoheleth would probably pass the same judgment on all his interpreters. At any rate, at least a minimal illumination of his occasional remarks on those who may be enemies must now be sought.

¹⁶³ A. Wright, "The Riddle of the Sphinx: The Structure of the Book of Qohelet," CBQ 30 (1968), 313-334.

¹⁶⁴ Eissfeldt, p. 568.

¹⁶⁵ J. Loader, *Polar Structures in the Book of Qoheleth* (Berlin: Walter deGruyter, 1979), pp. 132f. Cf., for example, Qoh. 4:5, 13; 7:5; 9:16a, 17, 18a; 10:2, 3.

The רשע-Group

The wicked are most often found in antithesis to the "righteous" (צדיק).¹⁶⁶ They are also found in antithesis to those who "fear before God" (ירא מלפני־אלהים).¹⁶⁷ Quite simply, Qoheleth is denoting by these terms the same religious and ethical types already noted in Proverbs.¹⁶⁸

In one example the righteous and the wicked stand at the head of a series of antithesis.

. . . one fate comes to all, to the righteous (צדיק) and the wicked (רשע), to the good (טוב) and the evil (רע),¹⁶⁹ to the clean (טוהר) and the unclean (טמא), to him who sacrifices (זובח) and him who does not sacrifice (אינו־זובח). As is the good man (טוב) so is the sinner (חוטא); and he who swears (נשבע) is as he who shuns an oath (שבועה־ירא).

Qoheleth 9:2

These persons are not synonymous, of course, but they do form two coherent groupings for Qoheleth. His point in this series of antitheses is simply to drive home the contention

¹⁶⁶ 3:17; 7:15; 8:14; 9:2.

¹⁶⁷ 8:12, 13.

¹⁶⁸ R. Whybray, "Qoheleth the Immoralist," in *Israelite Wisdom: Theological and Literary Essays in Honor of Samuel Terrien*, ed. by John G. Gammde, Walter A. Brueggemann, Humphries and James M. Ward (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1978), p. 195.

¹⁶⁹ ולרע has fallen out of MT, but the LXX read και τω ακαθαρτω.

that one fate comes to all.¹⁷⁰ Hence, these pairings are simply conventional, a concession to his audience. Had Qoheleth been seriously concerned with delimiting the meanings of the wicked and the righteous, he might well have chosen less traditional pairings.

The only other word from the **עשׂר**-group which Qoheleth uses is "oppressor" (**עוֹשֵׁק**). The observation is made that these oppressors had power on their side while their victims had only tears.

Again I saw all the oppressions that are practiced under the sun. And, behold, the tears of the oppressed, and they had no one to comfort them! On the side of their oppressors there was power, and there was no one to comfort them.

Qoheleth 4:1

The Neutral Group

Among the neutral terms used to designate enemies, only **שׂר** ("prince") is used by Qoheleth.¹⁷¹ The ambiguity of the designation is demonstrated particularly well by its appearance in Qoheleth. He pronounces a woe to the land because her king is a boy and her princes feast in the morning. In the very next breath, however, he pronounces a blessing upon the land whose king is the son of freedmen

¹⁷⁰ The point is made again in 9:3a, "This is an evil in all that is done under the sun, that one fate comes to all."

¹⁷¹ 10:16, 17.

and whose princes feast in the time,¹⁷² for strength and not for revelry.

Woe to you, O land, when your king is a child,
and your princes feast in the morning!
Happy are you, O land, when your king is the
son of free men,
and your princes feast at the proper time,
for strength, and not for drunkenness.

Qoheleth 10:16-17

These aristocrats, king and prince, could be friend or foe.

The Animals Group

Only once does Qoheleth refer to animals which are used as metaphors for hostile figures. Qoheleth 9:4 mentions the living dog and dead lion as literal animals in a "better than" saying which may intend to undergird his preference of life over death, even a life of vanity. After all, he argues, "a living dog is better than a dead lion."

Sirach

A kindred spirit to those whose legacy is found in Proverbs is encountered in Sirach. The formal considerations noticed in Proverbs are more appropriate here than anywhere else in the wisdom literature. In fact, the same two distinctions, short independent sayings and longer didactic compositions, which are found in Proverbs are also

¹⁷² Cf. 3:1-9.

present in Sirach.¹⁷³ He is a self-conscious heir to the sages who stand behind Proverbs.

All this does not mean that Sirach is simply redundant compared with Proverbs. There are clear signs that he stands at a later, more sophisticated place in the wisdom tradition's history. Not the least of these signs is the self-identification and attribution of the book.

Instruction in understanding and knowledge
I have written in this book,
Jesus the son of Sirach, son of Eleazar,
of Jerusalem,
who out of his heart poured forth wisdom.
Sirach 50:27

Sirach's more abundant use of the longer didactic poems (which appear to be his favorite medium) also indicate a development beyond earlier sages. Even when he uses independent sayings, they are much more likely to be arranged topically rather than being scattered throughout the book as in Proverbs.¹⁷⁴ In comparison with Proverbs, Sirach shows a development toward schematization and a desire to cover all the bases on a certain topic. Other signs of Sirach's development include his survey of Israel's history

¹⁷³ Cf. Sir. 24:30-34; 51:13-30.

¹⁷⁴ For example, 14:3-10 is a series of seven sayings (vv. 3, 4, 5, 6-7, 8, 9, 10) each one of which could stand independently with complete clarity. They are found together because they all deal with the topic of the miser. In Proverbs seven sayings dealing with miserliness would more likely be found in seven different places.

in the "Hymn to the Fathers" (44:1-50:24), the recognition that wisdom is revealed in the Torah (24:23-27: 39:1-5) and the more frequent appearance of prayer forms, learned no doubt from the Psalms.

The **בִּי אֵל**-Group

The primary Greek word which translates **בִּי אֵל** is **εχθρος**.¹⁷⁵ As the major Greek word it will be the starting point of this discussion. The Greek text of Sirach uses **εχθρος** thirty-four times.¹⁷⁶ Clustering around this word are most of the other designations belonging to the **בִּי אֵל**-group.¹⁷⁷ Only the designations "hateful man" (**μισητος ανθρωπος**),¹⁷⁸ "the one who reviles a friend" (**ο ονειδιζων φιλον**),¹⁷⁹ and the "adversary"

¹⁷⁵ **Εχθρος** is used to translate **בִּי אֵל** 246 times; otherwise, **εχθρος** translates **צַר** (34x), **צָרָר** (9x), **שׁוֹנֵא** (7x) **שׁוֹר** (6x), **רַגִּי**, **אֶרֶב**, **עַר**, and **מִשְׁבָּא** (2x each), and **אִיבָה**, **אָכַל**, **זָר**, **מַת**, **צַמַּת** (hi.) **קוֹם** (hith.) and **רָע** (once each). The Hebrew **בִּי אֵל** is also translated by **υπεναντιος** (11x), **εχθρα** and **εχθραινων** (2x each), and **διωκοντες**, **εκθλιβων**, **εχθρευων**, **θλιβοντων** and **πολεμιος** (once each).

¹⁷⁶ 5:15; 6:1, 4, 9, 13; 12:8, 9, 10, 16(2x); 18:31; 19:8; 20:23; 23:3; 25:7, 14, 15; 27:18; 29:6, 13; 30:3, 6; 33(36):7, 10; 37:2; 42:11; 45:2; 46:1, 5, 7, 16; 47:7; 49:9; 51:8.

¹⁷⁷ **Ανθεστηκοτας** (46:6); **αντιδικον** (33 [36]: 6[7]); **εχθραν** (6:9; 37:2); **παρεστηκοτων** (51:2); **υπεναντιων-ους** (23:3; 47:7).

¹⁷⁸ 20:15.

¹⁷⁹ 22:20.

(σαταναν)¹⁸⁰ are not found in contexts which also mention the εχθρος ("enemy").

Several times the enemies are simply mentioned incidentally, but little information may be gleaned concerning the identity of the enemy. For example,

He who teaches his son will make his enemies
envious,
and will glory in him in the presence of
friends.

Sirach 30:3¹⁸¹

In cases like these the wholly expected antithesis between "friend" (φιλος) and enemy is present,¹⁸² but little else is forthcoming. The same problem obtains even in the cases that mention a person's becoming the "laughinstock of his enemies,"¹⁸³ for it is difficult to decide how that could narrow the range of the enemy's identity. It is also true of the "adversary" (21:27) whom the "godless man" (ασεβης) curses; in what manner or place is this one an adversary?¹⁸⁴

¹⁸⁰ 21:27.

¹⁸¹ Cf. 6:4; 18:31; 19:7; 25:7; 30:6; 42:11.

¹⁸² 19:8; 30:3, 6.

¹⁸³ 6:4; 18:31; 42:11.

¹⁸⁴ Σαταν (=Ἰὼν) may, of course, be the personal name of the devil (cf. I Chr. 21:1), but here it seems more natural to translate simply "adversary" meaning someone's human opponent. Cf. J. Snaith, *Ecclesiasticus* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974), pp. 109f., "It is unlikely that Ben Sira uses 'Satan' as a personal name in the sense of the head of cosmic evil powers. . . . Ben Sira, . . . shows no knowledge of any independent evil power

Another group of passages which provide little help in clarifying the enemy are the prayers which Sirach composed. The lament of Sirach 22:27-23:6 refers to "adversaries" (υπειναντων), "enemy" (εχθρος), "haughty eyes" (μετερισμον οφθαλμων), and the "shameless soul" (ψυχη ανειδει) while that of Sirach 33(36):1-17 prays for Israel's deliverance from "foreign nations" (εθνη αλλοτρια), the "adversary" (αντιδικον), the "enemy" (εχθρος) the "survivor" (σωζομενος), "those-who harm your (i.e., God's) people" (οι κακουντες του λαου σου), and the "rulers of the enemy" (αρχοντων εχθρων). The thanksgiving song of Sirach 51:1-12 similarly refers to deliverance from the "slandorous tongue" (διαβολης γλωσσης), "lying lips" (χειλων εργαζομενων ψευδος), "bystanders" (παρεστηκοτων), "gnashings of teeth" (βρυγμων εταιμον), "hand of those seeking my life" (χειρος ζητουντων την ψυχην μου), "fire" (πυρος), "belly of Hades" (κοιλιας αδου), "unclean tongue and lying word" (γλωσσης ακαθαρτου και λογου ψευδος), "enemies" (εχθρων) and "proud" (υπερηφανιων). In each of these three passages there is

in the universe." N. Peters, *Das Buch Jesus Sirach oder Ecclesiasticus* (Munster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1915), pp. 176f., "*Der Satan ist genannt als eigene schwache and verderbte Wale des-Minschen (vgl. Jak., 1, 14f.) Damit ist naturlich die teuflische Versuchung nicht absolut-ausgeschlossen.*"

a wealth of enemy designations, but they are just as stereotypical and imprecise as those encountered in the Psalms.¹⁸⁵

The identification of the enemies, however, is quite clear in at least one section of Sirach: the "Hymn to the Fathers" (44:1-50:24). In every case a particular historical enemy of Israel (or the hero being praised) is intended. The historical figures named are Moses' enemies (45:2), Joshua's enemies (46:1-6), the congregation who opposed Caleb and Joshua (46:7), Samuel's enemies (46:16), David's enemies and the Philistines (47:7) and God's enemies in the days of Ezekiel (49:9). Their enmity consisted solely in hostility to Israel, Israel's leader of the day and Israel's God.

Otherwise, "friends" appear who are, or soon will be enemies.¹⁸⁶ Occasion to discuss these "friends" will arise somewhat later within the context of further remarks from Sirach on the topic of friendship. For now, however, it is sufficient to note that these passages make explicit the identification between friends and enemies. Proverbs

¹⁸⁵ For example, "my foes" (צָרִי) in Psalm 3:2; "those who speak a lie" (דּוֹבְרֵי כָזָב) in Psalm 5:7; "lying lips" (שִׁפְתֵי שָׁקֶר) in Psalm 31:19; and "those who seek my life" (מִבְקְשֵׁי חַיִּי) in Psalm 35:4.

¹⁸⁶ 5:15; 6:9; 12:8, 9, 10, 16; 20:23; 22:20; 27:18; 37:2.

indicates such an identification by construing "friends" as the subjects of verbs which characterize enemy behavior. Sirach identifies "friend" with "enemy."

One final note on the identity of the enemies of the **בְּיָדָא**-group is sounded in regard to loans, surety and alms.¹⁸⁷ Cases of credit extended often lead to credit abused which, in turn, makes an enemy. Sirach advises entering such arrangements with the utmost caution because of their great risk; indeed, interpersonal risk appears to be more threatening to Sirach than financial risk. On the other hand, almsgiving is a life-securing action; it could act as one's champion with the enemy.

Store up almsgiving in your treasury,
and it will rescue you from all affliction;
more than a mighty shield and more than a
heavy spear,
it will fight on your behalf against your
enemy.

Sirach 29:12-13

Thus, the economic arena provides the possibility of gratuitous enmity and security.

Sirach 20:15 is also set in the economic sphere when it speaks of one who "lends today and asks it back tomorrow; such a one is a hateful man." In itself this presents nothing new or unusual, but the identity of the one who so behaves is important. He is a hateful man, but he is also

¹⁸⁷ 29:6, 13.

a "fool" (αφρων, v. 14). This correlation between enemy and fool is the most explicit encountered in any of the wisdom literature thus far. Job was accused by Elihu of being a wicked man because of his speaking without knowledge or insight. Sirach tightens the identification by describing a fool (vv. 14-15c) and clinching his saying with "such a one is a hateful man" (v. 15d).

The רשע-Group

The designation רשע, from which this category of enemies takes its heading, is complicated in Sirach by the fact that three words rather than one are commonly used by the LXX to translate it. Most often, רשע is rendered by ασεβης ("ungodly, profane").¹⁸⁸ The other two words which frequently translate רשע are αμαρτωλος ("sinner")¹⁸⁹ and ανομος ("lawless").¹⁹⁰ it is, therefore, not

¹⁸⁸ Ασεβης translates רשע; otherwise, it is used to render חנף (6x); כסיל and חטא (5x each); חמס, בן-בל יעל, און, אויל, זור (3x) and שחת, רעה, רעע, פשע, על יז, מרד (hi.) once each.

¹⁸⁹ Αμαρτωλος translates רשע; otherwise, it renders רשע (ה) (14x); רשע (twice)) and חנף, חרש and רע (once each).

¹⁹⁰ Ανομος translates רשע 31x. otherwise, it translates רשע and און (5x each); פשע (4x); רשעה and ענן, עול, סרה, לצון, חטא, זד, הלל, בדיל (po.), זמה, שחת, שוא, רמיה, עריץ, (hi.), מרשעת and תועבה (once each). רשע is also translated by αδικος 3x; αμαρτανειν and πονηρος 2x

surprising to find the Greek text of Sirach using these words interchangeably, in synonymous parallelism or designating the same or related characters within the same context.¹⁹¹

These three major designations from the **נפג**-group appear sixty-three times within the book of Sirach.¹⁹² The field of words in this category is enlarged further by several expressions which appear in synonymous parallelism or the near context. Related on contextual grounds are the **αδικος** ("unjust," 40:13),¹⁹³ **αλλοτριος** ("other," 11:34),¹⁹⁴ **διγλωσσος** ("two-tongued," 5:9),¹⁹⁵ **κακουργος**

each and once each by **αδικειν**, **αδικια**, **αδικως**, **ανηρ**, **ασεβεια**, **ασεβειν**, **δυναστης**, **θρασυς**, **καταοικαζειν**, **παρανομος** and **σκληρος**.

¹⁹¹ Thus, **ασεβης** is related to **αμαρτωλος** at 7:16, 17; 9:11, 12; 12:4, 5, 6, 7; 19:11; 39:25, 27; 41:5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11 and to **ανομος** at 16:1, 3, 4; 31(34):18, 19; 39:24. **Αμαρτωλος** is related to **ανομος** at 21:9, 10; 39:24, 25, 27; 40:10.

¹⁹² **Ασεβης** at 7:17; 9:12; 12:5, 6; 13:24; 16:1, 3; 21:27; 22:12; 31(34):19; 39:30; 40:15; 41:5, 7, 8, 10; 42:2; **αμαρτωλος** at 1:25; 2:12; 3:27; 5:6, 9; 6:1; 7:16; 8:10; 9:11; 10:23; 11:9, 21, 32; 12:4, 6, 7, 14; 13:17; 15:7, 9, 12; 16:6, 13; 19:22; 21:6, 10; 23:8; 25:19; 27:30; 28:9; 29:16, 19; 35(32):17; 36(33):14; 39:25, 27; 40:8; 41:5, 6, 11; **ανομος** at 16:4; 21:9; 31(34):18; 39:24; 40:10; 49:3. Also entering the picture at this point is the verb **αμαρτανειν** used substantively at 10:29; 19:4; 38:15.

¹⁹³ Cf. 17:14; 27:10; 32(35):18 and the verb **αδικειν** used substantively at 4:9.

¹⁹⁴ Otherwise appearing at 8:18; 9:8; 21:25; 21:8, 25; 23:22, 23; 29:18, 22; 33(36):3; 35(32):18; 39:4; 40:29(2x); 45:18; 49:5.

¹⁹⁵ Also 5:14, 15.

("scoundrel," 11:33),¹⁹⁶ λαιδορος ("railing," 22:8), παρα-
βαινοντες ("transgressors," 40:14),¹⁹⁷ υβριστης
("insolent," 8:11)¹⁹⁸ and υπερηφανος ("arrogant"
11:30).¹⁹⁹

Although designations belonging to this category appear
in abundance the sheer number of their usage is not neces-
sarily helpful. It is true, of course, that

Good is the opposite of evil,
and life the opposite of death;
So the sinner is the opposite of the godly.
Look upon all the works of the Most High;
they are likewise in pairs, one the
opposite of the other.

Sirach 36(33):14-15

Such statements, however, are of little value in determining
who the "sinner" may be,²⁰⁰ though they are expected to be
the opposite of the "godly."

At one point the "days of lawless men" is dated to the
reign of Josiah (49:13). It was in their time that he

¹⁹⁶ Cf. 30:35(33:27) and the related words κακος at
20:18 and κακου at 33(36):8 where they are used sub-
stantively.

¹⁹⁷ Cf. 10:19; 19:24; 23:18 and παρανομος at 16:3.

¹⁹⁸ Cf. 32(35):18 and υβρις at 10:6, 8; 21:4.

¹⁹⁹ Cf. 3:28; 13:1,20; 15:8; 21:4; 23:8; 27:15, 28;
34(31):26; 35:32)08; 51:10 and the feminine υπερηφανια
at 10:7; 15:8; 51:10.

²⁰⁰ Cf. 1:25; 3:27, 28; 5:6; 7:1, 16, 17; 8:10; 9:11,
12; 10:6, 7, 8, 23, 29; 11:21; 15:7, 12; 16:6, 13; 17:14;
19:22; 21:6, 9, 10, 27; 22:12; 25:19; 27:10, 27, 30;
34(31):26; 38:15; 39:24, 25, 27, 30; 40:8, 10; 41:11; 42:2.

"strengthened godliness." In this case the lawless ones are probably to be identified with any or all of the idolatrous priests who ministered to other gods in Jerusalem, the male cult prostitutes, the priests in Bethel and Samaria and the other cultic functionaries whom Josiah purged.²⁰¹ Such an historical identification is limited to this single notice.

Designations from the **רשע**-group appear three times in prayers which are modeled after forms found in the Psalter: an individual lament (22:27-23:6), a community lament (33[36]:1-17) and an individual song of thanksgiving (51:1-12). In each of these, as in the Psalms, enemies are designated by terms drawn from the **אויב**- and **רשע**-groups as well as the more neutral group. The most striking difference from the Psalms is found in the individual lament where the burden of the plea is for deliverance from one's own shortcomings which provide the occasion for the triumph of external enemies. The more dangerous enemies in this prayer are one's own mouth, lips and tongue (22:7), thoughts and mind (23:2), eyes (23:4), evil desire (23:5), and gluttony, lust and shameless soul (23:6). The other two passages present no different picture of enemies than would be expected in similar contexts in the Psalter.

²⁰¹ II Kgs. 23:5, 7, 20; 11 Chr. 34:3-7.

The wicked in the cult. Enemies belonging to the **עש**-group do, however, appear in contexts which provide more help in identifying their social locations. As in the earlier *mashal* literature of Proverbs, so also in Sirach the wicked are occasionally found within the cult.

If one sacrifices from what has been
wrongfully obtained,
the offering is blemished;
the gifts of the lawless are not acceptable.
The Most High is not pleased with the offerings
of the ungodly,
and he is not propitiated for sins by a
multitude of sacrifices.

Sirach 31(34):18-19

These are the wicked who obtain their sacrifices from the property of the poor or by shorting an employees wages.

The passage goes on to accuse them of murder.²⁰²

As with sacrifice, so also with praise:
A hymn of praise is not fitting on the lips
of a sinner,
for it has not been sent from the Lord
For a hymn of praise should be uttered
in wisdom,
and the Lord will prosper it.

Sirach 15:9-10

Conversely, the Lord will accept favorably a prayer of the humble; he will deliver him and execute judgment on the unmerciful, the nations, the insolent and the unrighteous.²⁰³

Related to these enemies within the cult are those who violate the accepted norms of the wise. These are the

²⁰² Sir. 31(34):20-22.

²⁰³ 32(35):17-21.

"transgressors" (παράβαινοντες). Specifically these are people who transgress the law or the commandments.²⁰⁴ Once a specific commandment, "Thou shalt not commit adultery" (Ex. 20:14), is in view. There is mention of a man who "transgresses from his bed" (Sir. 23:18). That adultery should be singled out is not at all surprising for this had long been a concern of the sages.

The wicked and the economy. Another sphere of life which is fertile ground for the growth of these enemies from the עשׂר-group is that of the community's economy. Sirach advises discretion in the matter of almsgiving.

If you do a kindness, know to whom you do it,
and you will be thanked for your good deeds.
Sirach 12:1

The point in such discretion is that one might give alms to the good but not help the sinner. Helping sinners is borrowing trouble for one's return. is double in evil for all the good.²⁰⁵ A similar discretion is advised in cases of surety. One should help a neighbor, but the watchword is, "Beware!" Caution must be practiced since a "sinner will overthrow the prosperity of his surety."²⁰⁶ From the side

²⁰⁴10:19; 19:24.

²⁰⁵12:1-7.

²⁰⁶29:14-20; in Proverbs, of course, all surety was to be avoided like the plague; cf. Prov, 6:1-5; 17:18.

of the one in need, however, the life of a beggar is to be avoided. Begging may be sweet in the mouth of the shameless, but by the time it reaches his stomach it causes indigestion (40:28-30).

More dangerous than the wicked needy who often become enemies are the proud rich. The rich would exploit others as long as they could, only to deride and forsake them in the end.²⁰⁷ Humility is disgusting to a proud man just as a poor man is to a rich man.²⁰⁸ Of course, such wicked rich folk are ultimately doomed,²⁰⁹ but in the meantime they may be quite dangerous.

The wicked at court. Sirach also notes the wicked in the legal realm of the community. Sometimes sinners judge a case, and the counsel of Sirach is against sitting with such a body (11:9). The role advised is that one should deliver the injured party from the power of the wrongdoer and not be timid in judgment (4:9). As a defendant the sinner would shun reproof, while as a plaintiff he would simply shop around for a decision "to his liking" (35[32]:17).

²⁰⁷ Sir. 13:1-7.

²⁰⁸ 13:20; cf. v. 24.

²⁰⁹ 21:4; 40:12-15; cf. 14:3-10.

The wicked and their speech. A crucial component of the legal system is people's talk, and Sirach has quite a lot to say on the subject. Most of his remarks, however, appear to refer more generally to common conversation rather than the more limited judicial setting. A "babbler" (γλωσσωδης) is feared by a whole city.²¹⁰ Sinners often meet their nemesis in their own speech which comes back to them with a vengeance.²¹¹ The talk of "proud men" (υπερηφανων) could even lead to bloodshed; their swearing could "make one's hair stand on end" (27:14-15). "Slander" (διαβολην) and "false accusation" (καταψευσμον) are among phenomena worse than death (26:5).²¹² False and malicious speech is so dangerous that Sirach urges his audience to curse the "whisperer" (ψιθυρον) and the "deceiver" (διγλωσσον). "Slander" (γλωσση τριτη) has been the cause of many a downfall, and the tongue can be more dangerous than a sword.²¹³

Wicked friends. Friendship is likewise a sphere where one might encounter the wicked. Sirach 12:8-18 shows this

²¹⁰ 9:18; cf. 8:3.

²¹¹ 23:7-15; cf. 20:18-20; 27:28.

²¹² This numerical saying is 3+1; the first three items are slander, a mob and false accusation. All three are worse than death. The fourth item is apparently a wife "envious of a rival" (v. 6).

²¹³ 28:13-26.

reality admirably by its structure. Verses 8-12 and 16-18 refer quite naturally to the "enemy" (vv. 8, 9, 10, 16) whose "wickedness" (πονηρια, v. 10) tarnishes all who touch it like rusting copper. All this could have been said quite as easily in Proverbs. There is an interesting step in Sirach in the central section of verses 13-15.

Who will pity a snake charmer bitten by
a serpent,
or any who go near wild beasts?
So no one will pity a man who associates
with a sinner
and becomes involved in his sins.
He will stay with you for a time,
but if you falter, he will not stand
by you.

Sirach 12:13-15

By placing the remarks about associations with snakes, wild beasts and the sinner in the center of this passage there is an implicit identification of the "enemy" (εχθρος) with the "sinner" (αμαρτωλος). This is the first occasion where a wisdom writer using a wisdom form has come so close to equating the enemy with the wicked.

Such dangers in friendship make it incumbent upon Sirach to urge caution in choosing one's companions. A sinner would disturb friends and inject enmity among folk who were at peace.²¹⁴ "Rascals" (πονηρευμενοι) are about who are full of deceit (19:26). Hence, one simply could not bring just anybody home for dinner. The "crafty"

²¹⁴ 28:8-12,

(δολιος) and "proud" (υπερηφανος) are like spies or decoys in a cage. They are not trustworthy. Such a "scoundrel" (κακουργος) is always devising harm.²¹⁵ Unfortunately, neither can one simply get up and leave an "insolent fellow" (υβριστης) "lest he lie in ambush against your words" (8:11). It is the task of the wise never to fall in with such characters in the first place.

The wicked and the family. Friends and neighbors certainly present dangerous incarnations of the wicked, but more dangerous still are those encountered in one's own household. Apart from the wickedness within a person's own self,²¹⁶ the greatest vulnerability is known at home. The "household slave" (οικετης) may be a scoundrel, but there is always recourse to the "racks and tortures" to deal with that contingency (30:35[33:27]). The closer relationships, however, are more troublesome. Childlessness is preferred to ungodly children; a tribe of lawless men could devastate an entire city (16:1-5). Forsaking and angering one's parents make one equivalent to a "blasphemer" (βλαφημος) and cursed by the Lord (3:16).

Sirach reserves special ire for the "impudent daughter" (θρασεια) who disgraces her father and husband (22:5).

²¹⁵ 11:29-34.

²¹⁶ See the lament in 22:27-23:6 and the discussion above.

Indeed, special instruction is given to

Keep strict watch over a headstrong daughter,
 lest, when she finds liberty, she use it
 to her hurt;
 Be on guard against her shameless eye,
 and do not wonder if she sins against you.
 As a thirsty wayfarer opens his mouth
 and drinks from any water near him,
 so she will sit in front of every post
 and open her quiver to the arrow.

Sirach 26:10-12

The danger does not always arise from the children for offspring are also vulnerable to their parents. The children of sinners start life with at least two strikes against them. They grow up around the haunts of the ungodly, and their inheritance is already doomed. Hence, they blame an ungodly father since they suffer reproach because of him (41:5-7).²¹⁷

A man's most intimate relationship, marriage, occasions both his highest blessing and security (26:1-4)²¹⁸ and his most devastating enemy.

Any wound, but not a wound of the heart!
 Any wickedness, but not the wickedness
 of a wife!
 Any attack, but not an attack from those who
 hate!

²¹⁷ 41:5-13 deals with the legacy of the good and the ungodly. Part of the ungodly's legacy is the destruction of their offspring as indicated above. There is nothing explicitly advised for the children who might wish to mitigate such an inherited vulnerability, but it is best to assume that Sirach would have included such unfortunate youth in his invitation to instruction (51:23-30).

²¹⁸ Cf. 26:13-18.

That Sirach was a misogynist can scarcely be doubted, but that ought not prevent observation of the times he shows animosity toward the shortcomings of men. The adulterer who "transgresses from his bed" (23:18) has already been noted. It should now be added that this transgressor is mentioned as the third (and climactic) character in a two-three numerical saying (23:16-21). Indeed, for all Sirach's bluster against women, he still likens the unmarried man to a "robber" (ληστυη) whom no one will trust (36:26-27).

The wicked and duplicity. Sirach's most perceptive designation of the enemies belonging to the **עשׂר**-group is that they are "double-tongued" (διγλωσσος).²²² Such a characterization of enmity was already seen in Proverbs 26:24-26 although there it was used of an enemy belonging to the **בני אדם**-group. Sirach is speaking of the **αματωλος** who clearly belongs to the **עשׂר**-group. The double nature of the sinner is not limited to the tongue. His whole conduct is divided; he "walks upon two ways."²²³ Such duality is the very essence of enmity whether it is evaluated as simple hostility or as moral opposition.

Sirach's presentation of enemies belonging to the **עשׂר**-group then makes some advances, or at least

²²² Ο αματωλος ο διγλωσσος in 5:9, 15; simply διγλωσσου in 5:14; cf. 28:13.

²²³ Επιβαινοντι επι δυο τριβους, 2:12b .

differences, from earlier wisdom literature. He still sees these folk in the cult, the economy, the courtroom, among friends and in the family as his predecessors did. He does, however, clarify and sharpen some of the perceptions by drawing words from the family-friendship group, the **רשע**-group and the **בן־אדם**-group into closer proximity to one another. Thus, without ever saying that a wife is an enemy he nevertheless orients the discourse on the evil wife (25:13-26) toward that perception. Similarly, his composition technique in chapter 12:8-18 centers his reflections on the enemy-friend around a brief remark about the sinner. These shifts, however, are not completely surprising because they simply pursue notions which were already present in earlier wisdom materials.

The wicked and the fool. The genuinely new notes in Sirach's presentation of the enemies of the **רשע**-group are the few times when he pairs such designations with words commonly used to signify another negative figure in the wisdom tradition: the fool. Sirach quite easily parallels "foolish men" (**ἀνθρώποι ἀσυνετοί**) with "sinful men" (**ἄνδρες ἁμαρτωλοί**, 15:7) or he places a "moron" (**μωροῦ**) in the same league with an "ungodly" man (**ἀσεβούς**, 22:12);²²⁴ both are mourned a lifetime rather than the

²²⁴ Cf. also 22:11.

customary seven days. He can likewise compare the "sinner" (αμαρτωλος) with the "stubborn minded" (καρδια σκληρα, 3:27).²²⁵ In earlier wisdom literature the enemies from any group were not paralleled with fools.

Conversely, where one would expect to find antonyms to αμαρτωλος, ασεβης, or ανομος to be something like δικαιος or δικαιοσυνη Sirach uses ευσεβης ("godly, pious").²²⁶ Another significant antonym of the עֲשֵׂר-words is "those who fear the Lord" (οι φοβουμενοι κυριον)²²⁷ which is an age-old wisdom ethic. Twice the "intelligent" (συνετος) is used as an antonym, once to the αμαρτωλος (10:23) and once to the φυλα ανομος (16:4). As with synonyms so with antonyms, earlier wisdom literature did not parallel the wicked antithetically with the wise.

The Neutral Group

Although the "stranger" (αλλοτριος) may be mentioned quite innocuously by Sirach (21:8), he is primarily a

²²⁵ Cf. also 3:26.

²²⁶ The most frequent antonym of עֲשֵׂר is, of course, קִיָּץ which in turn is most often translated by the LXX with δικαιος (192x). Ευσεβης is used only 4x by the LXX to translate קִיָּץ; within Sirach, however, it appears at 11:17, 22; 12:2, 4; 13:17, 24; 16:13; 23:12; 27:11, 29; 28:22; 36(33):14; 37:12; 29:27; 43:33. 227Cf. 2:15, 16, 17; 15:1, 19; 21:6; 35(32):14, 16.

negative figure.²²⁸ Several times the stranger is obviously a foreign nation (εθνη αλλοτρια).²²⁹ Other times the stranger is simply someone who is unknown and therefore ambiguous; one could not trust such unknown quantities.²³⁰ The stranger might also be the man by whom one was cuckolded (23:22-23) or the person to whom one was beholden for the necessities of life.²³¹

The ambiguities of the strangers are due to the fact that they stand outside the peer group of the protagonist. They are not properly qualified and duly certified members of the social group in question. This is clearest when "Dathan and Abiram and their men and the company of Korah"

²²⁸ As in 8:18, 9:8, 11:34; 21:25; 23:22, 23; 19:18, 22; 33(36):2; 39:4; 40:29(2x); 45:18; 49:5. αλλοτριος at 35(32):18 stems from the confusion of ג and ט; the Hebrew text (cf. Levi) reads טי but the translator read גי.

Whereas αλλοτριος is primarily negative (ετερος is primarily innocent; cf. 11:19, 31; 14:4, 15, 18; 30:28 (33:19); 35(32):9; 41:20; 42:3; 49:5. Its only negative usage occurs at 11:6 where it is noted that "illustrious men have been handed over to the hands of ετερων." B* S 157 545*, however, read εταιρων; similar confusion appears at 14:4; 42:3; and Wisd. 14:24. L-248 provides corroboration that these "others, companions" are in reality enemies by its reading of εχθρων. See J. Ziegler, ed., *Sapientia Iesu Filii Sirach* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1965),

²²⁹ Sir, 29:18; 33(36):2; 39:4; 49:

²³⁰ 8:18; 11:34.

²³¹ 29:22; 40:29. The "dependent one" on 29:21-28 is designated a παροικε (vv. 26, 27; cf. v. 24) which probably translates גר or תושב. There are, unfortunately, lacunae in the Hebrew texts.

are designated as ἀλλοτριοι (45:18). In relation to the wise, the ἀλλοτριοι are likewise those who do not share the discretionary, prudential ethic which is so characteristic of wisdom. These "strangers-outsiders" are tantamount to fools (21:22-25).

The "powers that be" are also ambiguous figures to Sirach. They may be either dangerous or beneficent.

An undisciplined king will ruin his people,
but a city will grow through the under-
standing of rulers.

Sirach 10:3

Any arrogant ruler is hated by both God and humanity, and it is for their very injustice, insolence and wealth that "sovereignty passes from nation to nation." Indeed, "The Lord has cast down the thrones of rulers and has seated the lowly in their place."²³² It hardly need be said, of course, that the rulers of any people who are anti-Israel are to be deemed enemies.²³³

Because such ambiguous people are in fact powerful, Sirach advises against becoming involved in controversy with them; one might fall into their power (8:1). The "rich" (πλουσιος) are to be avoided for similar reasons; their

²³² 10:7, 8, 14.

²³³ 33(36):10; 46:18,

resources could be overwhelming (8:2).

A rich man does wrong, and he even adds
reproaches;
a poor man suffers wrong, and he must
add apologies.

Sirach 13:3

A rich man who is a liar is, of course, hated (25:2). It is conceivable (barely) that a rich man might be blameless, but who is he? (31:8-9). In the idealized past of Israel's sacred history there were "rich men furnished with resources, living peaceably in their habitations" (44:6), but in the empirical present peace between rich and poor is unnatural (13:18)²³⁴—unless they share a common glory in the fear of the Lord (10:22).

Groups of people are occasionally threatening in Sirach, but when they are, they are usually characterized more precisely as groups of traditionally negative types.²³⁵ Of course, groups may also be mentioned in ways which have little or no bearing on the problem of enmity.²³⁶ In Sirach 26:5, however, a group, or a formation of a group (*ἐκκλησιαν οἴλου*), is ranked along with the slander of the city and

²³⁴ Cf. 13:19-23.

²³⁵ *Πληθει αμαρτωλων* in 7:16; *τεκνων συναγωγη αχρηστων*, in 16:1 (cf. v. 3); *συναγωγη αμαρτωλων* in 32(35):21; and *συναγωγη κορε* in 45:18.

²³⁶ *Οχλος* at 7:7; *πληθος* at 5:6; 6:34; 7:7, 9, 14; 31(34):19; 36(33):11; 42:11; 44:19; 51:3; *συναγωγη* at 1:30; 4:7; 24:23; 34(31):3; 41:18; 43:20; 46:14; and *ἐκκλησια* at 15:5; 21:17; 23:24; 24:2; 30:27(33:18); 34(31):11; 38:33; 39:10; 44:15; 50:13, 20.

false accusation. Such are worse than death, only to be surpassed by a wife "envious of a rival" (26:6).

Two other ambiguous characters could be revealed as enemies: the "helper" (βοηθων) and the "counselor" (συμβουλος). The helper might be one who loaned to another in need (29:4) or one to whom a petitioner looked to no avail in a time of distress (51:7). They could, however, as easily be one's enemy who was merely feigning the helping role (ως βοηθων, 12:17). Some counselors give counsel "in their own interest" only to cast a lot against another. Therefore, one has to be cautious in choosing such a person (37:7-9). A counselor should be "one in a thousand" (6:6). The danger of counselors cannot be completely avoided for it is only God who has no need of one at all (42:21). Humans are always vulnerable to this necessity.

The Friends and Kinfolk Group

Every friend will say, "I too am a friend";
but some friends are friends only in name.
Is it not a grief to the death
when a companion and friend turns to enmity?
Sirach 37:1-2

The phenomenon of enemy-friends is oft noted in Sirach.²³⁷ Fair weather friends are quite dangerous because

²³⁷ The designations of these characters are **φιλος** at 5:15; 6:6, 9, 10, 13; 12:9; 13:21; 19:13, 14, 15; 20:23; 22:20, 21, 22(2x); 36(33):6; 37:1, 2, 4, 5, 6; **πλησιον** at

they are seldom recognized until one is in some kind of distress and a true friend is needed. These "friends" would not "stand by [one] in the day of trouble" (6:8).²³⁸ They may be compared to a stallion which "neighs under everyone who sits on him" (36[33]:6). Therefore, friends must be acquired through testing. Once acquired, a person has to be on guard toward them (6:7, 13).

The blame for the shift from friendship to enmity might rest on either party or on social circumstances, for friendship is a reciprocal relationship within a concrete social setting. If a friend, becomes an enemy it could be one's own fault.

A man may for shame make promises to a friend,
and needlessly make him an enemy.

Sirach 20:23

A person might simply act ignorantly and thereby become an enemy (5:15), or a friendship might be destroyed (just as an enemy destroyed people) by acts of duplicity such as reviling, arrogance, revealing confidences and a treacherous blow.²³⁹ Of course, a "fool" (μωρος) has only himself to blame when "those who eat his bread" (οι εσθοντες τον αρτον αυτου) speak unkindly of him (20:17).

10:6; 19:14, 17; 27:18, 19; 28:2; 31(34):22; εταiros at 37:2, 4, 5; and οι εσθοντες τον αρτον αυτου at 20:17.

²³⁸ Cf. vv. 9-12,

²³⁹ 22:19-22; 27:16-21.

In spite of one's own best intentions and personal integrity, however, there still remains the possibility that a friend might become an enemy.

There is a friend who changes into an enemy,
and will reveal a quarrel to your disgrace.
Sirach 6:9

A neighbor might, by an unintentional slip of the tongue, bring forth the possibility of enmity (19:16). More malicious neighbors and friends might cause injury,²⁴⁰ feign friendship only for their own selfish advantage,²⁴¹ or they may have been an enemy all the time and only appeared to be friends.²⁴²

Sirach also reveals that the shift from friendship to enmity might be due to the social context.²⁴³ The rich have friends who steady them through the minor mishaps of life. The humble, on the other hand, are roughly treated even when they fall and deserve genuine sympathy and aid (13:21-23). Related to the wealthy are the observations that friends

²⁴⁰ 10:6; 28:2.

²⁴¹ 6:7; 37:5.

²⁴² 12:8-18.

²⁴³ Certainly Sirach does not intend that the social environment necessarily overwhelms people; he is perceptive enough to observe, however, that some social settings might well predispose people to behave a certain way, but this observation does not constitute a kind of social determinism.

become enemies in times of adversity.²⁴⁴ The friendship might also turn to enmity because some third party in the social equation is guilty of slander (19:13-15). In that case the turn of affairs, which might have been avoided, is tragic indeed.

Enemies within the family have already been encountered among the folk belonging to the **עשׂר**-group. They are ungodly sons (16:1-5), the ungodly father who brings reproach upon his children (41:7) and the evil wife (25:13-26). Of these three it is the evil wife who exercises Sirach the most.

Unfortunately, Sirach does not provide much information which would clarify what constitutes an evil wife. Most often he simply mentions her or warns against her.²⁴⁵ Occasionally, however, glimpses of one who is a "chatterbox" (**γλωσσωδης**) may be seen. She may be beautiful and wealthy and support her husband, or she may not please him or follow his direction. Other possible characteristics of the evil wife include envy of a rival, drunkenness or harlotry.²⁴⁶

The evil wife receives so much opprobrium for Sirach because of his misogynistic bias. Woman is the origin, or

²⁴⁴ 6:7, 9-12; 12:8-9; 37:4-5.

²⁴⁵ 24:13, 16, 23, 25; 42:6; cf. 7:26; 9:1; 25:17, 19; 42:12-14; 47:19.

²⁴⁶ 25:20-22, 23, 26; 26:6, 8, 9; cf. 23:22ff.; 9:9.

at least the occasion, of sin and death (25:24). Her goodness is worse than a man's wickedness (42:14). Nevertheless, he makes some quite positive observations about women; at times, it might be enough to "turn a girl's head."²⁴⁷ Most likely, for Sirach, it is not a matter of a program of either misogyny or feminism, but rather of recording those potential threats which the wise would certainly try to avoid or, at least, mitigate.

The Animals Group

The "lion" (λεων) is mentioned several times by Sirach. Three times it simply intends the animal itself. In the "Hymn to the Fathers" the lion is named as one of David's playmates (47:3). Twice it is used literally, but proverbially, to make some point about how the rich treat the poor²⁴⁸ or the horrors of living with an evil wife.²⁴⁹

As a simile or metaphor the lion is sin which lies in wait for the workers of iniquity (27:10). "Its teeth are lion's teeth, and destroy the souls of men" (21:2). Like: wise, vengeance lies in wait as a lion for the proud man from

²⁴⁷ 7:19; 25:1, 8; 26:1-4, 13-18; 26:26-30(22-26); 40:19, 23.

²⁴⁸ They are treated "just as" (οὕτως) lions prey on wild asses; 13:19.

²⁴⁹ Sirach prefers cohabitation "with a lion and a dragon" to living with an evil wife; 25:16.

whom mockery and abuse issue (27:28). The tongue is a danger greater than the sword, and whoever is enslaved by it will find it "sent out against them like a lion" (28:18-23). Finally, one who is a "faultfinder" (φαντασιοκοτων) with his household is as dangerous as a lion in his home (4:30).²⁵⁰

Wisdom of Solomon

Wisdom of Solomon is the only example of wisdom literature which had its origin in the diaspora. Most likely it is of Egyptian provenance, probably Alexandria, from the late pre-Christian era.²⁵¹ The Hellenistic influences on the writer are palpable, yet he is just as clearly Jewish.²⁵²

²⁵⁰ 4:29 speaks of one who is "reckless in speech" (θρασυς εν γλωσση) and may, therefore, orient the lion-faultfinder of v. 30 toward the dangers of speech. It seems, however, that 4:20-5:3 is a series of independent admonitions, each dealing with various ways of avoiding evil and shame (4:20). If this analysis be correct then the lion-faultfinder of 4:30 ought to be perceived apart from the reckless speaking of 4:29; both are simply shameful evils against which Sirach warns.

²⁵¹ W. Deane, *The Book of Wisdom* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1881), pp. 7:35; P. Heinisch, *Das Buch der Weisheit* (Munster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1912), pp. XIX-XXIII; E. Clarke, *The Wisdom of Solomon* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973), pp. 1-3; D. Winston, *The Wisdom of Solomon: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, 1979), pp. 12-14, 20-15; Eissfeldt, p. 602.

²⁵² J. Reese, *Hellenistic Influence on the Book of Wisdom and Its Consequences* (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1971), p. 154.

The whole work was originally written in Greek and used many Hellenistic rhetorical devices;²⁵³ so many, in fact, that Jerome commented that its style was "redolent of Greek eloquence."²⁵⁴

Where the simplest unit in previous wisdom writings was the two line sentence, the author of the Wisdom of Solomon uses "the classical Greek period, which he ordinarily rounds off with an inclusion."²⁵⁵ These are the building blocks of the composition which has been formed into a unity by the author.²⁵⁶ This unity has been accomplished by two primary devices: "flashback" and thematic coherence.²⁵⁷ Therefore, characters mentioned explicitly in one passage may well be implicit in others.

²⁵³ Winston, pp. 14-18; see Chapter 1, n. 71.

²⁵⁴ Winston, pc 15.

²⁵⁵ Reese, p. 123.

²⁵⁶ The unity of the book has been questioned by some commentators; cf. F. Feldmann, "Zur Einheit des Buches der Weisheit," *Biblische Zeitschrift* 7 (1909), 140-150; P. Beauchamp, "Le salut corporal des justes et la conclusion du livre de la Sagesse," *Biblica* 45 (1964), 491-526, especially p. 500. The arguments of Reese, pp. 122-145, and Winston, pp. 12-14, however, that the book was written by a single person albeit over a long period of time (cf. P. Skehan, "The Text and Structure of the Book of Wisdom," *Traditio* 3 [1945], 1-12) seem convincing.

²⁵⁷ Reese, p. 123; by "flashback" Reese means "the frequent repetition of significant ideas in similar phrasing" (e.g., Wisd. 10:6-7 and 4:4-6). He compiles 45 examples of the device in pp. 125-140.

The 218-Group

Once again the predominant Greek word from this category is *εχθρος* ("enemy").²⁵⁸ Associated with this, designation is found the "oppressor" (*θλιβων*),²⁵⁹ "overpowering ones" (*κατισχυοντων*),²⁶⁰ the "foe" (*πολεμιος*),²⁶¹ the "rage" (*θυμος*)²⁶² and the "opponent" (*υπεναντιος*).²⁶³ Most often these designations refer to Israel's historical enemies, known from scripture, who were "most foolish, and more miserable than an infant" (15:14). For Wisdom the cardinal enemy in Israel's history is certainly Egypt.²⁶⁴ Other historical enemies mentioned are the enemies of Jacob,²⁶⁵ the Canaanites²⁶⁶ and perhaps Amalek.²⁶⁷ Once, referring to the fiery serpents in the wilderness, the rage

²⁵⁸ 5:17; 10:12, 19; 11:3, 5; 12:20, 22; 15:14; 16:4, 8, 22; 18:5, 7, 10.

²⁵⁹ 5:1; 10:15.

²⁶⁰ 10:11.

²⁶¹ 11:3.

²⁶² 16:5; 18:21; 19:1.

²⁶³ 11:8; 18:8.

²⁶⁴ 10:15-21; 11:5-14; 15:18-16:22; 18:5-19; undoubtedly, this preoccupation with the Egyptians is due to the author's Alexandrian setting.

²⁶⁵ 10:9-12.

²⁶⁶ 12:3-22.

²⁶⁷ 11:5.

of wild beasts which God sent against Israel is mentioned (16:5).

Wisdom 5:17, part of a passage dealing with the contrasting fates of the righteous and the ungodly, mentions God's enemies, who are also called the "madmen" (παράφρονες). Occasionally, an agent of God appears who is designated by enemy vocabulary. Thus, God's anger is once directed against Israel (18:21)²⁶⁹ and, once against Egypt (19:1), and God's "all-powerful word" which accomplished the death of Egypt's firstborn is designated as a "warrior" (πολεμιστής, 18:15).²⁷⁰

The conventional usage of **אֱוִי** (=εχθρος²⁷¹) within the Psalms and especially the historical literature of the Old Testament is in reference to Israel's political

²⁶⁸ 5:20; the "ungodly" which properly belongs to the **אֲשֵׁר**-group will be discussed in connection with that category below; it may be noted now, however, that these are also identified with Israel's historical enemies at 10:20; 11:9; 16:16, 18.

²⁶⁹ Cf. Num. 17:6-15.

²⁷⁰ Two further terms, the "adversaries" (ανθεστηκοτων, Wisd. 2:18) and the "one who despises wisdom and instruction" (σοφίαν . . . και παιδεία ο εξουθενων, 3:11), which properly belong to this category will be dealt with in the discussion of the group below since they are here used only with reference to the "ungodly" (ασεβεις).

²⁷¹ Cf. the statistics on **אֱוִי**-εχθρος in n. 175 above.

enemies,²⁷² so that the writer of the Wisdom of Solomon simply followed the lead of scriptural sources. This usage is likely the earliest in the **אֵיבָה**-group.²⁷³ What is interesting about these designations in Wisdom is their antithetic relation to a few designations which indicate a positive religious stance. In Wisdom the enemies oppose Israel, who is designated as a "holy people and blameless race,"²⁷⁴ "holy men"²⁷⁵ and the "righteous."²⁷⁶ At this point, the writer has exhibited a shift from Sirach where the designation "righteous" does not occur in enemy contexts.

The **אֵיבָה**-Group

Wisdom uses **ασεβης** ("ungodly") more often than any other designation belonging to this category.²⁷⁷ Occasionally **αμαρτωλος** ("sinner")²⁷⁸ appears and **ανομος**

²⁷² Cf. H. Ringgren, "**אֵיבָה** 'ayabh; **אֵיבָה** 'oyebh; **אֵיבָה**," 'ebhah," *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, ed. by G. Botterweck and H. Ringgren, trans. by J. Willis, Vol. I (rev. ed., Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977), 214-215.

²⁷³ Ruppert, pp. 8-13, 104-105.

²⁷⁴ 10:15.

²⁷⁵ 10:17.

²⁷⁶ 10:20; 16:7, 23; 18:7; cf. 5:15.

²⁷⁷ 1:9, 16; 3:10; 4:3, 16; 5:14; 10:6, 20; 11:9; 12:9; 16:16, 18; 19:1; cf. also **ασεβεια** and **ο ασεβων** in 14:9.

²⁷⁸ 4:10; 19:13; cf. also **αμαρτανων** in 14:31 and **αμαρτια** in 1:4; 10:13.

("lawless")²⁷⁹ as well, but these two do not appear with nearly the frequency found in Sirach. A check of possible Greek translations of enemy designations belonging to the **עֲשָׂרִי**-group yields several other terms which most naturally occur in the same contexts. These include the "unrighteous" (**αδικος**)²⁸⁰ those who "trivialize another's labors" (**αθετουντων τους πο νους αυτου**),²⁸¹ badness" (**κακια**),²⁸² "accursed race" (**σπερμα . . . κατηραμενον**)²⁸³ "evil" (**πονηρια**)²⁸⁴ and "lying mouth" (**στομα . . . καταψευδομενος**).²⁸⁵ These members of the **עֲשָׂרִי**-group issue in three categories or understandings of the "wicked."

The most obvious understanding of these folk is that their wickedness, is a moral and religious stance. They are

²⁷⁹ 17:2; cf. also **εκ . . . ανομων . . . τεκνων** in 4:6; **ανομηματων**, in 1:9; **ανομια** in 5:23 and **παρανομος** in 3:16.

²⁸⁰ 3:19; 4:16; 10:3; 12:12; 14:31; 16:24; cf., also **αδικια** in 1:5; **φθεγγεμενος αδικια** in 1:8 and **αδικου γης** in 16:19.

²⁸¹ 5:1.

²⁸² 2:21; 4:11; 5:13; 7:30; 12:2; 16:14; cf. also **kak'o5-** in 15:6; 16:8; **κακοπραγια** in 5:23 and **κακοτεχνον ψυχην** in 1:4.

²⁸³ 12:11.

²⁸⁴ 4:6, 14; 10:7; 17:11.

²⁸⁵ 1:11.

adulterers (3:16) and blasphemers (1:6). They refuse to know God in spite of historical and natural phenomena which clearly reveal God's identity and intention (16:16). Such people, when parents, are capable of murdering their own children even while practicing their perverse religion which, of course, sponsors the atrocities (12:5-6). Immoral people like these are ungrateful to the God whose very word preserves those who believe (16:26-29). In comparison with these morally and religiously bankrupt people a barren, yet undefiled, woman or a eunuch are blessed (3:13-14). The destiny of childlessness with virtue is preferred to that of an unrighteous generation (3:19-4:1).

The second understanding of the ungodly is closely related to their moral and religious outrage. They are in active opposition to the righteous.²⁸⁶ Indeed, they oppress them (5:1). These righteous are none other than God's "elect" (εκλεκτοι),²⁸⁷ the Jews, a "hallowed people and blameless seed."²⁸⁸ In view of this, the ungodly are quite

²⁸⁶ 3:1, 10; 4:16; 5:1, 15; 10:6, 20; 11:14; 12:9; 16:17, 23; cf. 2:10-20.

²⁸⁷ 3:9; 4:15; cf. also the πεποιθετες in 3:9; 16:24; πιστοι in 3:9; 16:26; οσιοι in 3:9; 4:15; 10:17; 18:1 and αγιοι in 1:5; 5:5.

²⁸⁸ 10:5; also ευαρεστος θεω γενομενος ηγαπηθη in 4:10; υιοι θεου in 5:5; 16:26; 18:4; λαον σου (i.e., θεου) in 16:20; 19:5; ταις σαις (i.e., θεω) in 19:6 and οι τη ση (i.e., θεω) σκεπαζομενοι χειρι in 19:18.

reasonably identified with Israel's and God's historical enemies, the Egyptians, Canaanites and others.²⁸⁹ These past enemies of Israel are paradigmatic for the Jews' contemporary enemies in the (Egyptian) diaspora.

The preceding understandings of wicked enmity as moral, religious and ethnic hostility are quite expected in Israelite literature. More significant is the final perception in Wisdom: the ungodly are various kinds of fools;²⁹⁰ because "wisdom will not enter a deceitful soul nor dwell in a body enslaved to sin" (1:4). The identity between the righteous and the wise, however, is only once confirmed by explicit coordination of the righteous, the target of the ungodly, with the wise man.

The righteous man (δικαιος) who has died will
condemn the ungodly who are living,
and youth that is quickly perfected will condemn
the prolonged old age of the unrighteous man.
For they will see the end of the wise man (σοφου),
and will not understand what the Lord
purposed for him,
and for what he kept him safe.

Wisdom of Solomon 4:16-17

Evidently, the identification of foolish with ungodly was much clearer than that between the righteous and the wise.

²⁸⁹ Cf. *εχθρου* in 5:17; 10:19; 11:5; 16:22; *εθνους θλιβοντων* in 10:15; *βασιλευσιν φοβεροι* in 10:16 and *υπεναντιους* in 11:8.

²⁹⁰ *Αφρονας* in 1:3; 3:2; 5:4; *ασυνετον* in 1:5; *παραφρονας* in 5:20; *σοφιαν . . . και παιδειαν ο εξουθενων* in 3:11; *σοφιαν . . . παραδουσιν* in 10:7 and *απαιδευτοι ψυχαι* in 17:1; cf. also *αφρονσυνης* in 10:8.

The Neutral Group

In previous wisdom literature the "stranger" or "other" (αλλοτριος) has often, though not always, been portrayed as an enemy figure. The αλλοτριος is differently regarded in the Wisdom of Solomon, however, for he is presented as the victim of enemy actions.

The punishments did not come upon the sinners
without prior signs in the violence of thunder,
for they justly suffered because of their
wicked acts;
for they practiced a more bitter hatred of
strangers.

Others had refused to receive strangers when
they came to them,
but these made slaves of guests who were their
benefactors.

And not only so, but punishment of some sort
will come upon the former
for their hostile reception of the aliens;
but the latter, after receiving them with
festal celebrations,
afflicted with terrible sufferings
those who had already shared the same rights.
They were stricken also with loss of sight--
just as were those at the door of the righteous
man--

when, surrounded by yawning darkness,
each tried to find the way through his own door.

Wisdom of Solomon 19:13-17²⁹¹

The "multitude" (πληθος) functions as an enemy designation only when it is further qualified by some less ambiguous or non-ambiguous term. Once, the "prolific brood of the ungodly," who are ephemeral and useless appears

²⁹¹ Αλλοτριος is used only one other time in the Wisdom of Solomon where it is maintained that it would be alien (αλλοτριον) to God's power "to condemn him who does not deserve to be punished" (12:15).

(4:3). At another point, the writer of Wisdom demonstrates the exceptional propriety of God's acts of judgment by pointing out that God could have sent upon the Egyptians a "multitude of bears" instead of the "multitude of irrational creatures" so akin to the irrational serpents and other worthless animals which they worshiped (11:15-17).

The "powers that be," "king" (βασιλεὺς), "mighty" (κραταιός) and "those who exercise power" (καταδυναστεύσαντες), are generally portrayed as beneficent or, at least, not harmful.²⁹² This is, of course, entirely in keeping with the book's "wise king"-ideal adapted from the Hellenistic milieu with its many tracts "On Kingship" which customarily treated universal ethical ideals.²⁹³ Twice, however, the king is an enemy whom Moses confronted (10:16) or the one whom God punished just as he did all Egyptians (18:11). Similarly, those who exercise power are once the enemies of God's people (15:14), and the mighty are liable to greater responsibilities than their subjects. There is a strict inquiry in store for them (6:8).

The Friends and Kinfolk Group

Only once does the "friend" (φίλος) characterize an enemy in the Wisdom of Solomon. Mentioned is the one whom

²⁹² Cf. βασιλεὺς in 6:1, 24; 7:5; 9:7; 11:10; 12:14; 14:17.

²⁹³ Reese, pp. 71-37.

the ungodly consider a friend (1:16). The one in question is death (v. 12). The ungodly consider death their friend because the brevity of life seems to recommend sensual pleasure as life's goal (2:6-9). Otherwise, only the friends of God appear; these are created when Wisdom "passes into holy souls" (7:27).

Family members as enemies are named a few times in Wisdom. Once a righteous man fled from a brother's wrath which is an allusion to Jacob's flight from Esau (10:10). The Canaanites are characterized as "parents who murder helpless souls" (12:6) which refers to their practice of child sacrifice and is only one of their hateful practices (12:4).²⁹⁴ Finally, the bereaved father is said to have begun the practice of making and honoring images (14:15). Thus idolatry issued in all of the many evils present in the world (14:21-29).

The Animals Group

The only animal enemy known from the Psalms which is also mentioned in Wisdom is the *λεων* (lion, 11:17). Bold lions could have been sent against the Egyptians, together with a multitude of bears. Indeed, God could have sent even

²⁹⁴ 4:6 also mentions parents, but they are victims of their children who are evil witnesses against them in their examination. These children, however, are of an unlawful sleep. The generations are thus bound up in a reciprocal enmity.

newly created, unknown beasts full of rage,
 or such as breathe out fiery breath,
 or belch, forth a thick pall of smoke,
 or flash, terrible sparks from their eyes;
 not only could their damage exterminate men,
 but the mere sight of them could kill by fright.

Wisdom of Solomon 11:18-19

Instead God used a "multitude of irrational creatures," who were sent in order that the Egyptians might learn that "one is punished by the very things by which he sins" (11:15-16).

Summary

In the preceding survey of enemy designations within the wisdom literature enemies have appeared with varying frequency in the sages' reflections. Enemies from the **נִינְא**-group have a very low frequency in Proverbs moving to a high frequency in Sirach and the Wisdom of Solomon. This movement from lower to higher frequency of the **נִינְא**-group is contradicted only by Qoheleth.

Various factors are certainly responsible for this situation. Within Proverbs the low frequency of the enemies probably reflects the relative stability of the sages' social status. Their social world was, of course, not immune to distortions and upheavals, especially where a particular individual was concerned, but the circles of the wise apparently lived in the confidence that their social group had been and would continue to be enduring in spite of the vagaries of social change. Threats to their well-being were not posed primarily by enemies. Even if enemies

were to get the upper hand, they would then need the kinds of discreet, dependable and perceptive folk which wisdom produced.

In Job the enemies have a higher frequency because of the lament form which the writer used so extensively. Complaint about enemies was a well-known motif in Israel's laments, and Job is portrayed as a lamenting but innocent sufferer. When the lament is used as extensively as in Job, mention of enemies can scarcely be avoided. The striking thing about the enemies in this book is the peculiar semantic contradiction which emerges. Only once is God named as the enemy. Job, however, is throughout presented as the lamenting victim *and* the reckoned enemy.

The high frequency of the enemies in Sirach and the Wisdom of Solomon is to be attributed to their respective social settings. Sirach lived and wrote in Jerusalem during the Hellenistic period. He observed the shifting political domination of first Ptolemaic Egypt and later Seleucid Syria over Palestine. With these external political changes local Jews were constantly fragmented into various groups. The range of factions was capable of seemingly infinite variety. Sirach is pre-Maccabaeon and reflects the situation prior to the acute social upheaval which characterized the Maccabean revolt. His setting was much more complex than Jew against Gentile for it was Jew against Jew as many tried to

adjust and cope with the ambiguities of the day. The primary threat to Sirach was neither Egypt nor Syria but "nominal" (or apostate) Jews, who Sirach thought would bring about the demise of Judaism and Jewishness through thoroughgoing Hellenization. He found himself in the uncomfortable position of having to view some among his own people as enemies.

Living much later in Alexandria the writer of the Wisdom of Solomon consistently identifies his enemies as the Egyptians. No doubt there were divisions within the Jewish community itself, but the far more obvious cleavage was between Jew and (idol-worshipping) Gentiles. This is why the single appearance of *αλλοτριος* within a hostile context in Wisdom portrays him as the victim of enmity rather than its perpetrator. The writer was himself one of the *αλλοτριαι* in Alexandria. In all previous wisdom literature the sage was the native and the "stranger" might be the enemy. Only in Wisdom does the opposite perspective appear in which the sage is the intruder and the enemy is the native.

The almost complete silence concerning enemies on Qoheleth's part is much more difficult to explain. His occasional notices of enemy figures (*עוֹשֶׁק* and *רָשָׁע*) are precisely that: notices. Such figures pose no particular threat to Qoheleth's own life. All other wisdom

writers reveal more or less anxiety over the danger posed by traditional enemy figures. Indeed, one concern of the *mashal* tradition was to limit one's vulnerability to such people.²⁹⁵

It appears that Qoheleth has completely succeeded in limiting his vulnerability to such people where others had achieved only a modicum of success. For all his observations of the distortions of human beings Qoheleth remains strangely dispassionate. He was finally invulnerable to anything or anyone human. "Enemies" simply were not "under the heavens" of his world. This social invulnerability on Qoheleth's part, however, laid him open to vulnerability from other factors: time, toil, vanity and the structure of life itself. It seems doubtful that any particular social setting, stable or otherwise, is the necessary or even probable context of such a vulnerability.

In addition to the growing frequency of enemies from Proverbs through the Wisdom of Solomon, with the exception of Qoheleth, another shift may be noticed. There is an increasing blurring of the distinctions between the various categories of enemy figures. Within Proverbs the five groups of enemy designations were quite distinct. By the time Sirach and the Wisdom of Solomon appeared, however, the designations from the various groups appear side by

²⁹⁵ Prov. 16:7; 25:7c-10; 26:24-26.

side and may be virtually equated with one another. A friend or family member may be an enemy (עֹיֵב = ἐχθρος) and wicked (רָע = ασεβης). The lines between simple hostility and religio-moral opposition are hazy or irrelevant.

Along with the blurring of enemy categories an emerging equivalence between the wicked and the fool was observed. In Proverbs the wicked are not identified with any sort of fool. Elihu hints at their equivalence by wishing that Job be indicted "like wicked men" because he spoke "without understanding." With Sirach and Wisdom the identity between wicked and fool is completed in explicit statements and by parallelism of wicked and fool.

This identity of wicked and fool in Sirach is a consequence of the view that wisdom is to be found pre-eminently in Torah. Whoever disobeyed Torah had long been wicked. The fool was one who spurned (the sages') instruction. With the doctrine that wisdom, counsel and instruction was in Torah it became self-evident that the fool was wicked and the wicked was a fool.

In Wisdom of Solomon the identity of wicked and fool hinges upon the old, but now greatly expanded, conviction that creation itself provides (divine) instruction in wisdom and righteousness. Hence, the fool was one who ignored the lessons of the world and its history and, therefore, one who

also ignored the Creator of the instructive cosmos.

Idolatry was the height of folly for it signified a confusion between creation and Creator. Whoever was an idolater was easily identified as a fool.

Perhaps the most surprising factor in this connection is the non-identity between the opponents of the wicked, the righteous, and the wise. It would seem an easy step to equate the wise with the righteous once the equivalence of wicked and fool had been established. There are, however, only a handful of occasions where a move toward such an equivalence may be observed. While the correspondence between wicked and fool grew quite strong, a correspondence between righteous and wise was only occasional and tenuous.

Chapter 3

DERIVATIVE ENEMIES IN WISDOM LITERATURE

The previous chapter focused attention on enemy designations encountered within wisdom literature. These were gleaned by sifting through the various designations of enemies found in the individual laments and thanksgiving songs of the Psalter. This chapter turns its attention to a discussion of folk in wisdom literature who are described as acting as enemies act in the Psalms. In this study, people so described, who do not appear as enemies in the Psalter, have been called "derivative enemies."

These are located by examining the many activities alleged against enemies which, in turn, provides a catalog of enemy behavior. The next step in the investigation is to note any of these activities which also appear in wisdom literature¹ and the characters who are alleged to behave in such a way. Certainly this procedure would be tautological if carried out within the Psalms, but within wisdom literature it is productive in two ways.

First of all, it yields enemy designations which do not appear in any of the individual laments or thanksgiving songs, but which nevertheless fit quite intelligibly within

¹ See "Appendix II: Enemy Behavior within the Wisdom Literature."

one of the five categories of enemy designations suggested and developed by Ruppert² and used previously in this investigation.³ These designations have about them the ring of something quite traditional.⁴ In principle, they could be equally at home in the Psalter. Their absence is more likely due to the exigencies of historical preservation and transmission than to their lack of propriety as enemy vocabulary. The appearance of these derivative, but traditional, enemy designations within wisdom literature is a confirmation of the categories previously used.

Secondly, the procedure of using enemy behavior as an indicator of the possible mention of enemies yields designations which do not fall comfortably into any of the categories of traditional enemies. It is among these genuinely new enemies, which would sound out of place in the Psalter, that the wisdom tradition's own peculiar perception of enemies and enmity is most likely to be found.

² L. Ruppert, *Der leidende Gerechte and seine Feinde: Eine Wortfelduntersuchung* (Wurzburg: Echter Verlag, 1973), pp. 7-109.

³ It goes without saying, of course, that often the folk who are presented acting like enemies are traditional figures already discussed in Chapter 2. They need no further discussion here.

⁴ Such terms, for example, as מֵרֶדֶף in Prov. 11:19; בֶּלִיעַל אִדָּם in 6:12 and 16:27; זֹרֵעַ עוֹלָה in 22:8; בֵּן in 10:5; 17:2; 19:26 and נִגִּיד in 28:16.

These designations which will not fit in any of the traditional categories are best described as derivative and non-traditional.⁵

The following discussion of derivative enemies in wisdom literature focuses primarily on derivative and non-traditional enemies. Occasionally, some of the derivative, but traditional, enemies will be discussed, but most of these do not require discussion since they present no features which have not already appeared in the preceding chapter.

Proverbs

Among the five categories of traditional enemies the **עושה**-group is presented in Proverbs as acting across the whole spectrum of enemy behavior.⁶ This broad distribution

⁵ A complete listing of the "Derivative, but Traditional" and "Derivative and Non-Traditional Enemy Designations" may be found in "Appendix III: Derivative Enemy Designations."

⁶ Ruppert, pp. 110-179, categorizes enemy behavior within the Psalms in two major categories ("More or Less Concrete Terms" and "More or Less Picturesque Terms"), the first of which falls into seven subgroups which he designates "Utterances of Malicious Pleasure, Scorn, Abuse and Hate"; "Terms for Being Overwhelming, Domineering and Striving to Destroy"; "Terms for Perversion of Law and Oppression"; "Terms for Scheming, Intrigues, Slandering and False Accusation"; "Terms for Inquisitorial Behavior"; "Presumption, Arrogance, Temporary or only Feared Triumph"; and "Defection from Friends and Kinfolk"; and the second which falls into three subgroups which he designates "Picturesque Words from Hunting Terminology"; "Terminology Drawn Mainly from War"; and "From the Sphere of Descriptions of Wild Beasts." The present

of members of the רשע-group as actors in so many kinds of enemy behavior is not surprising since they are also the most prominent enemy figures in the book of Proverbs. The other groups of traditional enemies, including derivative, are quite unremarkable in Proverbs since they do not depart from previous lines.

Among the non-traditional enemies found in Proverbs are three distinct groups. Some of the foolish characters of Proverbs pose some of the same dangers that traditional enemies pose. A second group who may share some dispositions with the traditional enemies are the righteous. The third group of characters who may assume an enemy stance is comprised of the non-human realities Wisdom and Yahweh.

Foolish Characters as Enemies

The author expected the portrayal of various foolish characters portrayed as enemies within the book of Proverbs at the outset of this investigation. The previous chapter revealed, however, that these do not appear together with the traditional designations found in the Psalms. Only when enemy behaviors are examined does it appear that such.

investigation is focused on the enemies themselves and uses enemy behaviors only as indicators of the possible presence of enemies so it has not seemed necessary to treat these subdivisions; they are helpful in some cases, however, to get a feel for how widely (or narrowly) distributed certain enemies are.

characters as the simple (פתי),⁷ the scoffer (לץ),⁸ the stupid fellow (כסיל),⁹ the fool (איל),¹⁰ the sluggard (עצל)¹¹ and the madman (מתלהל)¹² may pose the hazard of enmity.

Wisdom cries aloud in the street;
in the markets she raises her voice;
on the top of the walls she cries out;
at the entrance of the city gates she
speaks:
"How long, O simple ones (פתיים), will you
love being simple?
How long will scoffers (לצים) delight in
their scoff ()
and fools (כסילים) hate knowledge?
Give heed to my reproof;
behold, I will pour out my thoughts to you;
I will make my words known to you.
Because I have called and you refused to
listen,
have stretched out my hand and no one
has heeded,
and you have ignored all my counsel
and would have none of my reproof,
I also will laugh (אשחק) at your calamity;
I will mock (אלעג) when panic strikes you,
when panic strikes you like a storm,
and your calamity comes like a whirlwind,
when distress and anguish come upon you.

⁷ Prov. 1:29-31 (cf. v. 22).

⁸ 1:29-31 (cf. v. 22).

⁹ 1:22, 29-31; 10:18, 23; 15:2, 2,0; 18:2, 7; 26:5;

cf. אולת כסילים in 1:32; שלות כסילים in

14:8; אשת כסיל in 9:13.

¹⁰ 12:15; 14:9; 15:5; cf. זמה אולת in 24:9.

¹¹ 26:16.

¹² 26:18-19.

Then they will call upon me, but I will not
 answer;
 they will seek me diligently but will
 not find, me.
 Because they hated knowledge
 and did not choose the fear of Yahweh,
 would have none of my counsel,
 and despised all my reproof,
 therefore they shall eat the fruit of their way
 and be sated with their own devices.
 For the simple (פְּתִימִים) are killed by their
 turning away,
 and the complacency of fools (כְּסִילִים)
 destroys them;
 but he who listens to me will dwell secure
 and will be at ease, without dread of evil."
 Proverbs 1:20-33

This speech of personified Wisdom falls quite easily into two parts (vv. 22-27 and 28-33) with an introduction (vv. 20-21). Part I, construed in second person plural, is direct address by Wisdom to the "simple" (פְּתִימִים).¹³ The address to the simple consists of an admonition with a promise (v. 23),¹⁴ a reproach (vv. 24-25) and a threat (vv. 26-27). The only characters who may be portrayed in enemy terms are the "stupid fellows" (כְּסִילִים) who are said to hate (שָׂנֵא) knowledge (v. 22c).

¹³ The כְּסִילִים and the לְצִיִּים are construed with third person plural verbs in v. 22bc. The אֵין־מִקְשִׁיב of v. 24b is participial and therefore non-finite.

¹⁴ R. Murphy, *Wisdom Literature: Job Proverbs Ruth Canticles, Ecclesiastes, Esther*, The Forms of Old Testament Literature, Vol. XII (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981), 55, takes this as a command although no imperative is used; C. Kayatz, *Studien zu Proverbien 1-9: Eine Form- und Motivgeschichtliche unter Einbeziehung Ägyptischen Vergleichsmater* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1966), p. 120, identifies it correctly as a *Mahnung*.

Part II is introduced by the transitional particle **וְ**

("then") and is construed throughout in the third person.¹⁵

¹⁵ Vv. 28-32 are third person plural constructions while the concluding promise of v. 33 is singular. Of the commentators who provide an outline of the speech itself, W. Oesterley, *The Book of Proverbs with Introduction and Notes* (London: Methuen and Co., Ltd., 1929), p. 10, outlines in three parts: vv. 22-23, 24-32, 33; C. Toy, *Proverbs* (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1899], pp. 20-29, outlines in two parts: vv. 22, 23, and 24-33 (further subdivided into 24-27, 28-31, 32, 33); W. McKane, *Proverbs: A New Approach* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1970), pp. 273-76, does not outline the passage explicitly, but his *de facto* outline evidenced by his discussion and bold type face vv. 22, 23, 24f., 26f., 28-30, 31f., 33; likewise, H. Ringgren, *Sprüche* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1962), pp. 15-16, does not outline explicitly, but the discussion and bold type face indicate an outline: vv. 22, 23, 24-25, 26-32, 33; Murphy, p. 55, and Kayatz, p. 10, outline alike as vv. 22, 23, 24-25, 26-28, 29-30, 31-32, 33. Only Toy (perhaps McKane) shows any recognition, much less its significance, of the shift from second to third person between vv. 22-27 and 28-33; his outline is, however, not form critical, but is based on content as is Oesterley's and Ringgren's. McKane apparently notices the shift since he begins a new paragraph with vv. 28-30, but he is primarily concerned to note the introduction of the "fear of Yahweh" in v. 29, thus bolstering his thesis of a religious reinterpretation of old, empirical, non-religious wisdom. Only Kayatz and Murphy set out to do self-conscious form critical studies, and they ignore the shift in persons. Their only apparent justification for this procedure is the motifs of vv. 23-28 which are also found in Is. 1:15; 65:12; 66:4; Jer. 7:23-27; 11:11; Hos. 5:6; Mic. 3:4 and Psalms 2:4; 59:9. Motifs, however, do not make a form. Their nearest comparison would seem to be Mic. 3:4 which also uses the particle **וְ** and is construed in third person while v. 1 which introduces the unit is construed in second person. In the Micah passage, however, the shift from second to third persons occurs in v. 3, before **וְ**, not afterwards as in the present passage. The analysis of P. Tribble, "Wisdom Builds a Poem: The Architecture of Proverbs 1:20-33," *JBL* 94 (1975), 509-518, presents a more extensive and sophisticated analysis of this speech; her analysis agrees with the one above in placing a caesura between v. 27 and v. 28.

This part consists of a threat (v. 28), a reproach (vv. 29-30), an announcement of doom together with motivation (vv. 31-32) and a promise to anyone who heeds Wisdom (v. 33). The enemy behaviors are that they "hated" (שנא) and "despised" (נאץ), but the objects of this hostility are knowledge and reproof (vv. 29a, 30b) rather than people. Therefore, this animosity is best characterized as obstinate complacency (של וזה) as in verse 32.

The antecedent of "they" is unclear. It may be all three subjects of verse 22, thus including the simple, the scoffers and the stupid fellows, or it may include only the scoffers and stupid fellows who were the only characters construed with third person verbs in Part I of this speech. Of these two solutions the more likely seems to be the latter. Hostility is more properly applicable in connection with the stupid fellows and scoffers, although it must be admitted that the simple are drawn into this orbit of hostility by virtue of their context.¹⁶

The problem of the פתים, according to this speech, is not really their hostile attitude but rather their

¹⁶ Although the פתים are never again explicitly presented with animosity, the "son" of Prov. 5 is said to have hated (שנא) and despised (נאץ) discipline and reproof. The most likely un-wise designation for this "son" would be the פת' so that hostility may become an appropriate designation for him.

vacillation (v. 32).¹⁷ In fact, their very vacillation kills them; they are their own worst enemies. This characterization of the פתים fits with the common explanation that they are "young, inexperienced, blindly gullible."¹⁸

Although the "stupid fellows" (כסילים) are best seen as obstinate and complacent in this speech (and therefore not as enemies), they can easily be portrayed as enemies. In other places the כסילים are made the subject of virtually the whole range of enemy behavior. In addition to the hateful behavior described here,¹⁹ they are also guilty of uttering slander (10:18),²⁰ taking no pleasure in understanding (18:2), but nevertheless fancying

¹⁷ M. Dahood, *Proverbs and Northwest Semitic Philology* (Roma: Pontificum Institutum Biblicum, 1963), pp. 6f., takes משובה to be a derivation of ישב, "to sit," and translates "idleness." His reasons for rejecting the more obvious derivation from שוב are threefold: the parallelism with שלוה the context, and modern ignorance of Hebrew morphology (i.e., who says משובה could not derive from ישב rather than שוב). The argument is unconvincing.

¹⁸ S. Mandry, *There Is No God! A Study of the Fool in the Old Testament Particularly in Proverbs over an Qoheleth* (Rome: Catholic Book Agency, 1972), p. 71; cf. J. Crenshaw, *Old Testament Wisdom: An Introduction* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1981), p. 81; Oesterley, pp. lxxxv-lxxxvi.

¹⁹ Cf. also 10:23 where it is observed that wrongdoing is "like sport" (כשחוק) and 15:20 where the כסיל "despises" (בוזה) his mother.

²⁰ Cf. 15:2 where he "pours out folly" (יביע אולת) which 14:8 notes is "deceptive" (ואולת כסילים מרמה).

themselves wise (26:5), and their lips are a snare.²¹

Closer examination of the כסילים reveals why they are occasionally portrayed in enemy terms. They can be quite dangerous to other people. They bring forth all of their anger (29:11) and recklessly throw off all restraint (14:16). They flaunt their folly so disgustingly as to be reminiscent of dogs returning to their vomit (13:16; 26:11). They are dangerous characters because they exalt cursing (3:35), and their lips, being perverse (19:1), bring strife (18:6). Even to be a companion of one of these fellows is to be liable to injury (13:20) while to hire one renders the employer comparable to a wild archer (26:10). The *mashal* tradition urges quite understandably, therefore,

Let a man meet a she-bear robbed of her cubs,
rather than a fool in his folly.

Proverbs 17:12

Quite similar to the stupid fellow (כסיל) is the fool (איל). Although the איל appears less frequently as the subject of potentially dangerous behavior, he is just as perverse as the כסיל. These characters scoff at guilt (אשם 14:9).²² The אשם in this case might be taken to

²¹ 18:7; here, however, the enmity redounds to his own disadvantage: "his lips are a snare to himself (נפש).

²² MT of 14:9a is admittedly troublesome: אשם אילים יליץ אשם. To translate "guilt(-offering) scoffs at fools" as must be done to obtain subject-verb agreement is nonsense. The least violent solution seems to be that of R. Scott, *Proverbs, Ecclesiastes: Introduction*,

mean the guilt-offering as it commonly does in the Levitical prescriptions,²³ but the more likely meaning is simply the abstract one of guilt. Whatever interpretation of אשם is chosen, it is clear that it is certainly nothing at which one scoffs. Even Philistines were credited with more sense than to do that.²⁴

The fool is beyond the pale since he despises the discipline of his father (15:5), undoubtedly because his life is upright "in his own eyes" (12:15). While he deludes himself that his way is straight the sages pointedly observe that the devising of folly is quite simply sin (24:9). This character is always quarreling (20:3), and his mouth brings disaster near (10:14). The fool is so far beyond help that

Translation and Notes (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1965), p. 96, who reads "'ewil melis"= "A fool mocks at." Other solutions offered include those of McKane, pp. 231, 475-76, who calls the verse an "unsolved problem"; Ringgren, p. 59, who translates MT, "*Tore vetspotten Schuld (opfer) (?)*" and comments, "*Der erste halbversist unverstandlich*" (p. 62); Oesterley, 57-78, who emends אשם to אלהים; and Toy, pp. 286-87, who cites and rejects several possibilities. The most violent solution is proposed by Gemser, p. 50, who emends following the Greek οἰκία παρανομῶν οφειλησούτων καθαρισμόν, οἰκία δὲ δικαίων δεκταί, to read: בתי יאילים ילין אשם ובתי ישלים רצון, translating "*In den Zelten der Narren weilt Schuld, aber in den hausern der Rechtschaffenen Wohlgefallen.*"

²³ Lev. 5:6, 7, 14, 19.

²⁴ I Sam. 6:1-18.

one could,

Crush a fool in a mortar with a pestle
along with crushed grain,
yet his folly will not depart from him.

Proverbs 27:22

Apart from the כסיל and the אױל the only other foolish characters who might be considered enemies are the sluggard (עצל) who is "wiser in his own eyes than seven men who can answer discreetly" (26:16). Such misguided self-confidence could be dangerous to others, but in the sluggard's case it generally proves to be a danger to himself, not others.²⁵ Occasionally, however, the sluggard does irritate others, "like vinegar to the teeth and smoke to the eyes" (10:26). The last foolish enemy is the practical joker who deceives his neighbor:

Like a madman who throws firebrands,
arrows and death,
is the man who deceives his neighbor
and says, "I am only joking!"

Proverbs 26:18-19

Righteous Characters as Enemies

In a very few instances righteous characters may assume enemy stances. Agur prays,

Two things I ask of thee
deny them not to me before I die:
Remove far from me falsehood and lying;
give me neither poverty nor riches;
feed me with the food that is needful
for me,

²⁵ Cf. Prov. 13:4; 15:19; 19:24; 20:4; 21:25; 24:30-34.

lest I be full, and deny thee,
 and say, "Who is Yahweh?"
 or lest I be poor, and steal,
 and profane the name of my God.
 Proverbs 30:7-9

Here the supplicant admits the possibility that he might become an enemy. He might deny and say, "Who is Yahweh?" Or, he might steal and thereby profane the name of his God. The enemy behavior is not yet actual, but it is a very real prospect, one to be avoided by divine grace. Should the enmity become actual, however, there is no indication that the supplicant would still be a righteous character, one in a sound relationship with Yahweh. Quite the reverse, in fact, the potential enmity consists in cynicism (מִי יְהוָה), a rupture of the sound relationship which is evidenced by the prayer.

There are two cases, however, where hostility is attributed to the righteous as righteous.

A righteous man hates falsehood,
 but a wicked man acts shamefully and
 disgracefully.
 Proverbs 13:5

Those who forsake the law²⁶ prate the wicked,
 but those who keep the law²⁶ strive
 against them.

Proverbs 28:4

²⁶ The translation of תּוֹרָה as "law" (Toy, pp. 496f.; Oesterley, pp. 249f.; cf. Scott, pp. 164, 166), "Law" (McKane, pp. 255, 622-23), or "instruction" (Gemser, pp. 76f.; Ringgren, pp. 109, 112) is problematic. Either it refers to the תּוֹרַת יְהוָה which is rather unusual for Proverbs, or it refers to the חֻמֵּי תּוֹרָה which is

It is too much to say that the righteous are outright enemies of the wicked. In the first instance they are hostile toward "falsehood" (דבר־שקר), a thing rather than a person. In the latter case, however, the righteous ("those who keep the law") actively engage in strife (יתגר) against the wicked. This is more than an attitude; it is a specific hostile action against other people. The relation between the righteous and wicked, however, is carefully nuanced: the wicked are enemies while the righteous sometimes behave as enemies toward the wicked.²⁷

more frequent. If the latter option is chosen then the תורה עוזבי would belong to the category of the fool while the תורה שומרי would belong to the category of the wise. For Proverbs, this would be a unique correlation between the wicked-fool and righteous-wise. Such a correlation is not to be seen in Proverbs (see Chapter 2 above). On the other hand, if the תורה עוזבי and the תורה שומרי refer to those who forsake or keep the law of Yahweh then they belong to the categories of the wicked and righteous respectively who are continually opposed to one another. Hence, the translation "law" is here preferred.

It should perhaps be noted in this connection that this ambiguity of the Hebrew תורה was surely a contributing factor in the development towards the identification between Torah and Wisdom which is seen in later wisdom such as Sirach. The Greek text translates here, not surprisingly, νομον rather than παιδείαν.

²⁷ Prov. 29:10, "Bloodthirsty men hate one who is blameless, and the righteous seek his life" (MT) is textually suspect, or, if MT is in order, then בקש נפש has come to have the opposite of its normal meaning. Normally it signifies hostile behavior; here it would have to signify solicitous behavior. Cf. Toy, pp. 509f.; McKane, pp. 257, 637; Scott, p. 168; Oesterley, v. 261; Gemser, p. 78; Ringgren, p. 111.

Wisdom and Yahweh as Enemies

The speech of Wisdom noted earlier (1:20-33) portrays not only the foolish characters as potential enemies, but also Wisdom. In one of her threats she announces,

I also will laugh at your calamity,
 I will mock when panic comes upon you,
 when panic comes upon you like a storm,
 and your calamity comes like a whirlwind,
 when distress and anguish come upon you.
Proverbs 1:26-27

When Wisdom threatens to laugh and mock at the coming misfortune of the simple she does so to get their attention and to persuade them to hearken to her call. Therefore, this hostile behavior promised in her threat should not be regarded as simple enmity. Still, however, it must be taken seriously. She really does threaten to treat those who reject her in a very hostile fashion. Indeed, she threatens to treat them in a way that would destroy all hope.

Otherwise, Wisdom claims hostile attitudes for herself only one other time in Proverbs. She claims to hate "pride and arrogance and the way of evil and perverted speech" (8:13b). Indeed, "the fear of Yahweh is hatred of evil" (8:13a).²⁸ Such language of hostility, therefore, is not

²⁸ It has been suggested that this line is a gloss; cf. McKane, p. 348; Scott, pp. 67, 72 who admit this possibility; Oesterley, p. 59; Toy, pp. 164f.; and Gemser, p. 36, favor deleting the whole verse since it is out of place here. Nevertheless, the verse stands uncontested in all the ancient versions so the "gloss" is very old. It represents no striking development in the wisdom tradition preserved in Proverbs as, for example, in 3:7 and 16:6; cf. Job 28:28.

out of place for Wisdom, but it is not anything like a dominant trait of her disposition. Her behavior towards humanity is fundamentally one of primeval delight (8:31). Her ultimate threat lies not so much in her hatred of evil, but rather in the fact that her appearance places one in a life and death context (8:36-36). Such a crisis is always fraught with danger.

Yahweh as well assumes the hostile stance of hatred toward the traditional enemies.

There are six things which Yahweh hates,
 seven which are an abomination to him:
 haughty eyes, a lying tongue,
 and hands that shed innocent blood,
 a heart that devises wicked plans,
 feet that make haste to run to evil,
 a false witness who breathes out lies,
 and a man who sows discord among brothers.
Proverbs 6:16-19

The second line of this numerical saying leads to the inclusion of the תועבת יחוח sayings²⁹ as expressions of Yahweh's animosity. An examination of the objects of Yahweh's abomination reveals that they are figures who fall most naturally into the רשע-group of enemy figures.³⁰ Clearly the רשעים are in fundamental contradiction to any healthy relationship to Yahweh. It is also noteworthy

²⁹ 3:32; 11:1, 20; 12:22; 15:8, 9, 26; 16:5; 17:15; 20:10, 23.

³⁰ Possible exceptions would be the false weights and measures in 20:10, 23, although presumably weights and measures don't cheat people, people do.

that never do any of the traditional foolish characters became objects of Yahweh's abomination.

The climactic seventh member of the numerical saying above, however, is not a member of the רשע-group. The "man who sows discord among brothers" would more likely belong to the friends and kinfolk group of enemies. He is reserved to the final and most emphatic position in this numerical saying. Evidently, he is the object of Yahweh's hatred-abomination *par excellence*.

Proverbs 3:33-34 also presents Yahweh acting in a dangerous fashion. He has a curse and he scorns. The most interesting factor in this passage is verse 34a, "toward the scorners he is scornful."³¹ The scorners (לצים) here are better associated with the traditional רשע-group of enemies than with the derivative and non-traditional group of foolish characters. The reason for this preference is that the other negative characters in the context belong to the רשע-group.³²

³¹ On the problems of rendering MT see McKane, pp. 215, 302; Scott, p. 46; Oesterley, p. 28; Toy, pp. 81, 83; Gemser, p. 24; Ringgren, p. 23. Whatever solution is adopted the reciprocity of hostility between Yahweh and the scorners is maintained.

³² Cf. רשע in v. 31a; נלו, in 32a; חכמים in 33a. Only in v. 35 are the כסילים and the חכמים encountered. The sudden appearance of the wise and the fools in v. 35 and the disappearance of Yahweh as the subject raises the suspicion that this "tag" has been placed here to round off the instruction (vv. 21-35) with a specifically wisdom sound.

This verse is expressive of an intrinsic reciprocity of hostility between Yahweh and the scorners. The reciprocity is emphasized by the use of cognates (ללצים יליץ).

A similar formulation of this reciprocity appears in Proverbs 22:22-23.

Do not rob the poor, because he is poor,
or crush the afflicted at the gate;
for Yahweh will plead their cause
and despoil the life of those who
despoil them. וקבע את־קובעיהם נפש:

Such a reciprocal formulation is not limited to Proverbs. It appears also in the royal thanksgiving song of Psalm 18.

With the loyal you show yourself loyal;
with the blameless man you show yourself
blameless;
with the pure you show yourself pure;
and with the crooked you show yourself
perverse.

עם־חסיד תתחסד
עם־גבר תמים תתמים:
עם־נבר תתברה
ועם־עשק תתפתל:

Psalm 18:26-27

Based on the appearance of such a motif in both wisdom and a piece such as Psalm 18 it is obvious that this idea is not a sole possession of wisdom thought. It is unlikely that there is some kind of ideological borrowing by one sphere of Israelite life from another. Most likely, this idea of intrinsic reciprocity in Yahweh's relations to people is

simply Israelite and, therefore, part of the common heritage of sage and psalmist alike, as well as any other Israelite.³³

The perception of Yahweh as a threatening figure occurs in one other case. According to Proverbs 24:21-22 the hazard posed by Yahweh (and the king) is that of inscrutability. This inscrutability of Yahweh as a danger is articulated only once in the book of Proverbs.

My son, fear Yahweh and the king,
and do not involve yourself with those
who change,
for calamity from them will arise suddenly;
and the disaster from the two of them--
who knows?

Proverbs 24:21-22

The notion that Yahweh could always surprise people is, of course, a familiar thought in the *mashal* tradition of Proverbs,³⁴ but it is not generally portrayed as a hazard. The king shared in this incalculability.³⁵ Only with the single admonition above does this aspect of Yahweh's action take on a clearly threatening tone. The danger is explicit

³³ Of course, if the provenance of the wisdom tradition is limited to royal circles then a case could be made for some kind of influence in one direction or the other. It seems unlikely, however, that one would ever connect Psalm 18 with any kind of wisdom while, on the other hand, there is no trace of any royal concerns to be found in the instruction comprising Prov. 3:21-35,

³⁴ Cf. Prov. 16:1, 2, 9; 19:14, 21; 20:24; 21:30-31.

³⁵ 21:1.

with the mention of calamity and disaster, but the final rhetorical question (מִי־יֹדֵעַ) heightens the danger precisely by leaving open the content and scope of the disaster. Unknown, but potentially real, attacks are far more threatening than known distress.

Job

Within the book of Job members of the **אויב**-group of enemies do of appear as subjects of enemy behavior. Several times the traditional **רשעים**³⁶ and the **חנף**³⁷ appear.³⁸

In addition, some derivative, but nevertheless traditional, enemies are encountered who fit most comfortably in the **רשע**-group of enemies.³⁹ Only derivative, but traditional, enemies from the neutral and animal groups appear.⁴⁰

The traditional enemy category of friends and kinfolk is much more extensive and significant in the book of Job.

³⁶ Job 5:25-26, 31 (cf. v. 20); 18:7-10 (cf. v. 5); 20:12, 19, 24 (cf. vv. 5, 29); 21:14-15 (cf. v. 7).

³⁷ 8:13, 15:35; 20:12, 19, 24 (cf. vv. 5, 29); 34:30.

³⁸ The only other non-derivative member of the **רשע**-group to appear in this connection are the **מתי־און** in 22:17 (cf. v. 15).

³⁹ These include the **זורע־עמל** and **חורש־און** in 4:8; the **שוכח־אל** in 8:13; the **אהל־ישוחד** in 15:35 (cf. v. 34); and the **רוצח** in 24:14.

⁴⁰ The **כבירים** of 34:27 (cf. v. 24) are ambiguous figures akin to the **שר**, **נגיד**, **מלך**, etc. seen in Proverbs; the new animal enemy is the "tongue of an **אפה**" in 20:16.

That Job's friends Eliphaz, Bildad, and Zophar are enemy-friends has already been noticed in the previous chapter. Job charges them with mocking, tormenting and shattering him with words, and triumphing over him.⁴¹ They are further charged with scheming to work violence against him (21:27). Once he claims they "would even cast lots over the fatherless, and bargain over [their] friend" (6:26).

The most damning indictments against the friends fall in the realm, of their oppression and perversion of law. Job accuses them of "whitewashing with lies" (13:4). He asks rhetorically how long they intend to speak falsely and deceptively for God (13:7). He calls them "comforters of trouble" (16:2) and postulates that they would use his reproach as a basis to cross-examine him (19:5). The indictments of the friends for perversion of law come, however, not only from Job. The narrator summarizes their speeches with the note that not only had they failed to find any answer to Job, they had gone on to condemn (יִרְשָׁעוּ) God.⁴² The final verdict is reserved to Yahweh who says

⁴¹ 19:2, 5; 21:3.

⁴² 32:3 MT reads יִרְשָׁעוּ אֶת־אִיּוֹב, but אִיּוֹב is a *tiqqune sopherim* for הָאֱלֹהִים. Cf. R. Gordis, *The Book of Job: Commentary New Translation and Special Studies* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1978), PP. 360, 366f.; M. Pope, *Job: Introduction, Translation and Notes* (3rd ed., Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Co., 1977), pp. 240, 242; G. Holscher, *Das Buch Hiob* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1937), p. 76; G. Fohrer, *Das Buch*

twice in the epilogue, "You have not spoken truth to me as my servant Job" (42:7b β =8b β).

Apart from the friends who are traditional enemy figures there are some derivative figures which occur in connection with enemy behavior. In the prologue Job offers sacrifices on behalf of his sons who, he fears, may have "sinned and cursed God in their hearts" (1:5). Also in the prologue is introduced Job's wife who urges him to "Curse God and die" (2:9).

One final group of folk may well belong (derivatively) to the category of friends and kinfolk who become enemies. They appear in the context of Job's final soliloquy: the community who used to give Job unquestioning respect.

They listened to me, and waited,
and kept silence for my counsel.
After spoke they did not speak again,
my word dropped upon them.
They waited for me as for the rain;
they opened their mouths as for
the spring rain.
I smiled on them when they had no confidence;
the light of my countenance they did
not cast down.
I chose their way, and sat as chief,
and I dwelt like a king among his troops,
like one who comforts mourners.

Job 29:21-25

Hiob (Gutersloh: Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1963), p. 446; E. Dhorme, *A Commentary on the Book of Job*, trans. by H. Knight (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1961), pp. 473, 474; reading MT as it stands are N. Tur-Sinai, *The Book of Job: A New Commentary* Jerusalem: Kiryath Sepher Ltd., 1957), pp. 457f.; and H. Rowley, *Job* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), p. 208.

Such folk Job must have counted as friends. With chapter 30, however, they are described as laughing at him (30:1) and finally,

They abhor me, they keep aloof from me;
 they do not hesitate to spit at the
 sight of me.
 Because God has loosed my cord and humbled me,
 they have cast off restraint in my presence.
 On my right hand the rabble rise,
 they drive me forth,
 they cast up against me their ways of
 destruction.
 They break up my path,
 they promote my calamity;
 no one restrains them,
 As through a wide breach they come;
 amid the crash they roll on.
 Terrors are turned upon me;
 my honor is pursued as by the wind,
 and my prosperity has passed away like
 a cloud.

Job 30:10-15

The passage provides a good example of the movement from respectful neighborliness (29:21-25)⁴³ to outright hostility. With the movement to the present hostility (ועתה, 30:1, 9) Job impugns the pedigree of these "respectful neighbors." They are youngsters whose fathers

⁴³ The neighbors are simply referred to with third masculine plural verbs and suffixes throughout the passage; the antecedent is ambiguous. It would seem reasonable to conclude, however, that "they" must include at least the נערים and ישישים of 29:8, the שרים of 29:9 and the נגידים of 29:10. These figures would agree quite well with the imagery of chief, king and troops of 29:25a. The mourner-comforter image of 29:25b may reflect the afflicted members of the community mentioned in 29:12-13, 15-16: פסח, עור, אלמנה, אובד, יתום, עני, and אביונים.

he would not have chosen to put with his sheep dogs (30:1).

They are "senseless" (בני־נבל) and amount to

"nobodies" (בני בלי־שם, 30:8), nothing but

"rabble" (פרחח, 30:12).

The remaining subjects of enemy behavior are all derivative and non-traditional. These include the foreigners, the Sabeans and Chaldean (1:15, 17). Eliphaz speaks of the *wise" (חכמים) and the "wily" (נתפלים) from whose hand God delivers the needy (5:13, 15).⁴⁴ More significantly, the righteous occur as derivative enemies as well as Satan and Yahweh. One final figure is rather vague, but may be designated the "enemy behind the enemy."

Righteous Characters as Enemies

Eliphaz gives voice to the traditional dogma that God punishes the wicked (22:16) and follows by noting that

the righteous see it and are glad;
the innocent laugh them to scorn.

Job 22:19

The notion that the righteous as righteous engage in behavior which is characteristic of enemies is expressed

⁴⁴ The negative and absolute use of חכמים here is remarkable in the wisdom literature of the Hebrew Bible. The negative חכם is otherwise for the wisdom tradition always the בעיניו חכם as in Prov. 3:7; 26:5, 12, 16; 28:11, but never simply the חכם. The reason for this striking phenomenon is likely to be the employment of the doxology of Job 5:9-13; form has evidently overruled the stereotypical wisdom usage of חכם.

only this time in the book of Job. The character of Job himself, however, is frequently accused of enemy behavior. Job is, of course, to be viewed as a (or, the) righteous character.⁴⁵

Job's wife urges him to "Curse God,"⁴⁶ which would indeed be enemy behavior, but her very exhortation implies that he is not guilty of such behavior. Otherwise, it is only Job who is left to deny that he has acted like an enemy. He denies that he would shake his head at his three friends (16:4), nor would he speak falsehood or mutter deceit (27:4). In his negative confession of chapter 31 he denies many actions which are commonly ascribed to enemies. He denies walking with vanity and hurrying toward deceit, destroying the eyes of a widow by failing to support her, and rejoicing or being triumphantly excited over

⁴⁵ See the characterizations of Job as **תם** **וירא אלהים וסר מרע** in 1:1, 8; 3; he is **תם** in 2:9 according to his wife while in 2:10 the narrator notes that he did not **חטא** with his lips. Finally, Yahweh claims Job as his servant (**עבד**) who speaks truth (**נכונה**) concerning him in 42:7, 8.

⁴⁶ The Hebrew verb used by Job's wife here, as well as by Job in 1:5 and Satan in 1:11 and 2:5 is **ברך** which is customarily translated "bless." In these cases, however, it must be used "with the antithetical meaning curse" (BDB, p. 139), or "used euphemistically for **ארר**, **קלל**" (KBL, p. 154). If the verb can only be translated "bless" then Job's sacrifices on behalf of his children are silly, and Satan's accusation loses its force. This usage of **ברך** is not limited to Job, for Naboth is stoned for having (allegedly) cursed (**ברך**) God and the king (I Kgs. 21:10, 13). Cf. Psalm 10:3.

an enemy's misfortune. He never even asks for the life of his enemy with a curse.⁴⁷

Job stands alone in his explicit denials of enemy behavior, but those who accuse him of enmity have plenty of company. Indeed, every significant character in the book accuses Job of actions which are characteristic of enemies. Not surprisingly, it is the friends who accuse Job most frequently of such de facto enemy status.⁴⁸ The most scathing and extensive of these indictments is voiced by Eliphaz in Job 22 who begins with a series of rhetorical questions which demand a negative response (vv. 1-5a). He then proceeds with a list of specific offenses.

There is no end to your iniquities
For you have exacted pledges of your brothers
for nothing,
and stripped the naked of their clothing.
You have given no water to the weary to drink,
and you have withheld bread from the
hungry.
The man with power possessed the land,
and the favored man dwelt in it.
You have sent widows away empty,
and the arms of the fatherless were
crushed.

Job 22:5b-9

This leads to a description of the sentence with "therefore" (עַל־כֵּן, vv. 10-11) followed by another rhetorical question. and response (v. 12). Then Eliphaz

⁴⁷ 31:5, 16-18, 29-30.

⁴⁸ Eliphaz in 15:16 and 22:5-9, 13-15; Bildad in 18:4; Zophar in 11:3, 14; and Elihu in 35:16.

resumes his indictment by quoting Job's impious talk and questioning his intention for future behavior.

Therefore you say, "What does God know?
Can he judge through the deep darkness?
Thick clouds enwrap him, so that he does not
see,
and he walks on the vault of heaven."
Will you keep to the old way
which wicked men have trod?
Job 22:13-15

Eliphaz closes by describing the fate of the wicked men whose old way Job is presently walking and the exultant victory of the righteous (vv. 16-20). After this extensive indictment and sentence Eliphaz urges Job to be at peace with God (vv. 21-22) and tries to motivate the instruction with a series of promises (vv. 23-30).

Enemy behavior is also charged against Job in the prologue when Satan asks, "Is it without cause that Job fears God?" (1:9). Likewise, the narrator once characterizes Job with what may be considered an enemy disposition. The statement is made that "he was righteous in his own eyes" (32:1).⁴⁹

⁴⁹ MT **בְּעֵינָיו**, "in his eyes"; Greek, however, reads **ἐν ταῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς αὐτοῦ** which reflects a Hebrew text reading **בְּעֵינֵיהֶם** "in their eyes." MT is to be preferred. It should perhaps be observed that the Hebrew is also susceptible to the interpretation that Job was righteous "in his (i.e., Yahweh's) eyes." Such an interpretation would cohere well with the narrator's other characterizations of Job, always as a righteous person (cf. n. 45 above). Weighing against such an understanding is the frequent Hebrew usage of **בְּעֵינָיו** to mean "in his own eyes" as in Psalms 17:14; 36:3 and Prov. 12:15; 16:2; 21:2; 26:5, 12, 16; 28:11; 30:12.

The accusations which assail Job from his very own person, however, are more troubling than those which come from his, friends, and certainly more than Satan's or the narrator's (of which Job knows nothing at all).

Though I am innocent, my own mouth would
condemn me;
though I am blameless, he would prove
me perverse.

Job 9:20⁵⁰

Surely now God has worn me out;
he has made desolate all my company.
And he has shriveled me up,
which is a witness against me;
and my leanness has risen up against me,
it testifies to my face.

Job 16:7-8⁵¹

⁵⁰ Cf. Eliphaz's statement in Job 15:6.

⁵¹ MT is problematic, reading:

אֶךְ-עַתָּה הִלָּאֲנִי הַשְׁמוֹת כָּל-עֲדָתִי
וַתִּקְמָטֵנִי לְעֵד הָיָה וַיָּקָם בִּי כַחֲשִׁי בְּפָנַי יַעֲנֶה:

The problem is twofold: (i) change from third person to second person and finally back to third person is confusing, and (b) the length of lines seems defective. Several emendations have been suggested, including reading וַתִּקְמָטֵנִי with v. 7 as a third feminine singular with עֲדָתִי as subject; repainting הַשְׁמוֹת and construing it as the subject of הִלָּאֲנִי; reading רַעֲתִי for עֲדָתִי; and (after moving וַתִּקְמָטֵנִי to v. 7) moving the *athnah* of v. 8 to בִּי producing balanced lines. Cf. Dhorme, pp. 231-32; Pope, pp. 121, 123; Tar-Sinai, pp. 262-65; Holscher, p. 38; Fohrer, p. 278. All the suggested emendations have in common the result of removing the shift in person in favor of third person constructions. Gordis, p. 175, makes no changes in MT but argues, "The change from second to third person is frequent and virtually normal in biblical Hebrew. . . . The difficulties that scholars have found with the stichometry of vv. 7 and 8, on the basis of which the text has been emended, are not decisive." Therefore, his translation (p. 170) reads:

Now he has left me helpless;
He has laid waste my whole company.
He has shriveled me up--

This last saying, however, indicates the true nature of Job's perception of his self-incrimination. This leanness which rises up against him is a consequence of the attacks which God has already initiated. This intolerable state of affairs is due to Yahweh's having constituted the situation in such a way that Job can only incriminate himself--even though he is innocent and blameless (9:20). Indeed, God has made him an enemy of himself.⁵²

Yahweh finally comes forward, in the introduction to his second speech, with his own accusation. He asks Job,

Will you even frustrate my justice?

Will you condemn me (תִּרְשָׁעוּנִי) that

you may be righteous (תִּצְדָּק)?

Job 40:8

That Yahweh's accusations here are in the form of questions might leave some ambiguity to the charge (Will Job do such a thing? Has he already?), but the ambiguity is only apparent. Yahweh has already called him a contender and addressed him as the one who reproves with God (40:1). The accusations are probably phrased as questions then under the influence of Job 13:22 and, more closely, that of Job 40:7b ("I will question you, and you will declare to me") and in order to conform stylistically with verse 9.

this has been the testimony against me!

My leanness has risen up against me--

this has been the evidence against me!

⁵² Cf. 13:24 (33:10); 19:11.

Satan as an Enemy

Satan is something of a puzzling figure in the book of Job since he appears only in the narrative prologue. He is the one who prods Yahweh to take action against Job in order to prove that his piety is self-centered. In spite of this, however, Satan is only presented twice as the explicit subject of enemy behavior, and even then the reference to his enmity is somewhat oblique.

Yahweh says, "Behold, all that he has is in your hand; only toward him stretch not out your hand" (1:12). Yahweh's prohibition that Satan not stretch out his hand toward Job presupposes, of course, that Satan would do just that were it not for divine instruction to the contrary. In chapter 2:6-7 this hostile intent on Satan's part is made explicit when Yahweh prohibits the taking of Job's life, and then Satan "went forth from the presence of Yahweh and afflicted Job."

Otherwise, Satan is not explicitly presented acting in any hostile fashion toward Job, at least not directly. It may be that Satan is not such a great enemy after all, but is rather one of those more shadowy figures who have been designated the "enemy behind the enemy." This possibility will need to be discussed later.

Yahweh as an Enemy

Job's response to this intolerable situation of self-incrimination, in spite of his innocence, is to accuse God of acting the part of an enemy. It should be recalled in this connection that Job is actually quite reticent about designating God with explicit enemy terms, but all such reticence is gone when it comes to describing Yahweh's behavior towards him: Yahweh acts like an enemy.

Before examining Job's charges, however, it may be well to note that Job's friend Bildad denies such allegations against God by means of a rhetorical question demanding a negative response.

Will God pervert justice?
Or, does the Almighty pervert
righteousness?

Job 8:3

Elihu uses the same device (36:23) as well as making an explicit denial.

Therefore, hear me, you men of understanding,
far be it from God that he should do
wickedness,
and from the Almighty that he should do
wrong.

For according to the work of a man he
will requite him,
and according to his ways he will
make it befall him.

Of a truth, God will not do wickedly,
and the Almighty will not pervert justice,
Job 34:10-12⁵³

⁵³ In spite of these denials by Job's interlocutors, especially Bildad, it must be remembered that they did "cause God to be wicked" according to the narrator's summary in 32:3; cf. n. 42 above.

The narrator of the tale is hardly so kind in his treatment of Yahweh. Indeed, he explicitly alleges conduct, of him which would be entirely appropriate to an enemy. Satan's exhortation to Yahweh to "Stretch out your hand now and touch all that he has!" (1:11)⁵⁴ does, of course, have Yahweh for its grammatical subject. This admonition implies a potential enmity on Yahweh's part for he is certainly capable of such behavior or the admonition would be pointless. At the same time, however, the implication is present that Yahweh has not yet assumed this role.

More explicitly, the narrator portrays Yahweh confessing to Satan,

Have you considered my servant Job, that there is none like him on earth, a blameless and upright man, who fears God and turns away from evil? He still holds fast to his integrity, although you instigated me against him to destroy him without cause.

Job 2:3

Certainly it is arguable that Satan is here presented as an enemy, but even when that possibility is granted Yahweh is not thereby absolved. A "devil made me do it" confession is inevitably disingenuous, and scandalously so when Yahweh voices it. One wonders if this is indeed the same inscrutable, unapproachable Yahweh found in the speeches of Job 38-41. There Yahweh is overwhelming; here, he appears subject to the whim of Satan, one of the sons of God.

⁵⁴ Cf. 2:5.

These scandalous, although admittedly ambiguous, portrayals in the prologue are not, however, the narrator's last word. In the epilogue he finally makes an absolutely clear and unambiguous statement.

Then came to him all his brothers and sisters and
all who had known him before, and ate bread with
him in his house; and they showed him sympathy
and comforted him for all the evil that Yahweh
had brought upon him.

Job 42:11a

No longer is Satan in view. The facts are plain to see:
Yahweh had brought evil upon Job. Such behavior is that of
an enemy.

Turning now to Job's own allegations against Yahweh, they fall primarily in four speeches of Job.⁵⁵ Within these four speeches the allegations of enemy activity on God's part are made in third person when addressing the friends⁵⁶ and in second person when addressing God.⁵⁷ When the latter is the case, God is accused of condemning and going to law against Job, of oppressing and rejecting him while causing the counsel of the wicked to shine, and of hiding ulterior

⁵⁵ Chapters 9-10; 12-14; 16-17 and 19. Otherwise, Job alleges enemy behavior on the part of God in 6:4; 30:11, 19, 21-23.

⁵⁶ 9:13-21; 16:7-14; 19:6, 7-12, 13; the allegation in 12:23 that God destroys nations is part of a doxology (12:13-25) which celebrates the wisdom and power of God, known even to the beasts, birds, plants and fish (12:7-12), which Job claims to know just as well as his friends (12:1-6).

⁵⁷ 10:1b-22; 13:(18)19-28; 14:1-22; the second person allegations of 9:28b, 31 are part of Job's address to himself; cf. R. Murphy, p. 27.

motives while granting him life and steadfast love--all exceedingly duplicitous behavior.⁵⁸

In a poignant turn of expression Job complains that God "watches all my paths" (13:27).⁵⁹ In light of his human frailty Job maintains that it really goes beyond the bounds of propriety for God to pay quite so much attention to a human being (14:1-6).⁶⁰ And yet, as terrifying as such divine scrutiny and watchfulness is, it is precisely this watching which first comes to expression in his reminiscence of the "months of old" (29:2). Can it be that this watching of God's is just as duplicitous as his gifts of life and steadfast love?

When Job forms his allegations against God in the third person the focus seems not to be on the duplicity of God's concern but rather on God's explicit hostility toward Job. Thus, God is portrayed as an arbitrary tyrant who will not come out to meet one face to face. For this enemy it

⁵⁸ Cf. 10:2, 3, 12-13; even though the notion of hidden motives is not in 10:2 or 3 the problem of divine duplicity is still in view, for Job, with whom God contends, is the "work of thy hands" (v. 3). Verses 8-11 are a touching description of the creation of the human being (cf. Psalm 139:14-18)

⁵⁹ Cf. Elihu's citation of this complaint in Job 33:11 and a kindred formulation in 14:16.

⁶⁰ Similar thoughts are already expressed by Job in 7:17-20.

appears merely that might makes right (9:13-21).⁶¹ The whole point of this contention is most sharply put in Job's conclusion.

It is all one; therefore I say,
 he destroys both the blameless and the
 wicked.
 When disaster brings sudden death,
 he mocks at the calamity of the innocent.
 The earth is given into the hand of the wicked;
 he covers the faces of its judges--
 if it is not he, who then is it?

Job 9:22-24

Otherwise, God is portrayed as a ruthless warrior who sets Job up as a target, whose archers surround him, who breaches him and runs against him.⁶² The war images are also present when Job claims that God has

walled up my way, so that I cannot pass,
 and he has set darkness upon my paths.
 He has stripped from me my glory,
 and has taken the crown from my head.
 He breaks me down on every side, and I am gone,
 and my hope has he pulled up like a tree.
 He has kindled his wrath against me,
 and counts me as his adversary.
 His troops come on together;
 they have cast up siegeworks against me,
 and encamp round about my tent.

Job 19:8-12

In addition to these war images, God is portrayed as a hunter who has closed his net upon Job and as a wild beast

⁶¹ The doxology of 9:4-12 focuses attention entirely upon God's overwhelming might.

⁶² 16:12-14; cf. also the "arrows of the Almighty" (חֲצִי־שֶׁדִּי) in 6:4.

who tears and gnashes his teeth.⁶³ He may even be construed as a common criminal from whose attack one would cry out (as Job claims to have done), "Violence!" (19:7).

Job's final speech builds to a climax in his identification of God (יְהוָה) as the one who is his legal adversary. His cry for justice demands that God come forward with his accusations.

Oh, that I had one to hear me!
 (Here is my signature! let the Almighty
 answer me!)
 Oh, that I had the indictment written by
 my adversary (אֵשֶׁר־יָבִיטֵנִי)!
 Surely I would carry it on my shoulder;
 I would bind it on me as a crown;
 I would give him an account of all my steps;
 like a prince I would approach him.

Job 31:35-37

Job's confidence in this demand to meet his accuser can only stem from his conviction that he is innocent while God is unjust. Only one who is confident of his own innocence can issue such a bold challenge to an accuser.

In the Yahweh speeches, Yahweh assumes an enemy stance in his interrogation of Job.

Gird up now your loins as a man,
 I will question you and, you shall
 declare to me.

Job 38:3(=40:7)

Yahweh is here assuming the part of the enemy who asks of Job things which he does not know. Yahweh assumes the same kind

⁶³ 19:6; 16:9.

of character as those of whom the psalmist complained when he said,

Violent witnesses rise,
that which I do not know they ask me.
Psalm 35:11

The series of humiliating questions which comprise the *cantus firmus* of the Yahweh speeches are precisely that which Job does not know⁶⁴ and cannot declare.⁶⁵ Almost in a parody of Psalm 35:11,

Yahweh rises,
that which Job does not know, Yahweh asks him.

"The Enemy behind the Enemy"

A very few times in the book of Job a certain ambiguity appears surrounding precisely who is to be rightfully viewed as an enemy figure. Thus, although it is entirely possible that Job could "curse God" (this, after all, is the point of the heavenly wager), it is Job's wife who urges the assumption of enmity upon him. She may therefore be viewed as something of an enemy, although the only explicit evidence of her enmity lies behind the potential enmity of Job as an exhortation.⁶⁶

⁶⁴ לֹא-יָדַע as in Psalm 35: 11.

⁶⁵ הִוִּדַּע as in Job 38:3=40:7.

⁶⁶ On the various judgments of Job's wife ranging from *adiutrix diaboli*, assistant of Satan (Augustine), to loyal wife who sells her hair to support Job in his destitution (Testament of Job) see Gordis, p. 21, and *idem.*, *The Book of God and Man: A Study of Job*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965), pp. 10ff.

A kindred situation obtains in one place in the poetic dialogue when it appears that God would crush Job and cut him off (6:9). Clearly God is the subject of these two enemy activities, but both of these cases of God's enmity stand under the cry of Job,

O that I might have my request,
and that God would grant my hope.
Job 6:8

Here, it is Job who stands behind the potential enmity of God.

Of course, Job and his wife are not particularly troublesome in their roles as "enemy behind the enemy" for Job does not in fact curse God, and God does not ultimately cut Job off. With Satan, however, things are somewhat different for his "enmity behind enmity" does bring results. Satan urges Yahweh to stretch out his hand against Job's property (1:11), later against Job's "bone and flesh" (2:5), and certain consequences do follow from this exhortation to enemy behavior. Indeed, even Yahweh admits that Satan was capable of inciting him to destroy Job without cause (2:3).

The most potent of these "enemies behind the enemy" is Yahweh. The conclusion of the first exchange between Satan and Yahweh presents Yahweh giving all that Job has into the hand of Satan while placing immunity upon his person (1:12a). Rather than following this exchange with some notice that Satan or Yahweh then acted in some hostile fashion

against Job, the narrator simply notes that, "then Satan went out from the presence of Yahweh" (1:12b), which is followed by the fourfold disasters from the Sabeans (1:13-15), the fire of God (1:16), the Chaldean (1:17) and the great wind (1:18-19). Who is responsible for these attacks, Satan or Yahweh?

The second exchange between Satan and Yahweh is similar to the first in that Satan once again urges Yahweh to act as an enemy (2:5) while Yahweh this time gives Job into the power of Satan, prohibiting only the taking of his life (2:6). Following this exchange, however, the narrator clarifies the problem by relating that "then Satan went out from the presence of Yahweh and struck Job" (2:7).

Hence, it appears that the attacks against Job come in fact from Satan,⁶⁷ explicitly in chapter 2 and, on that basis, implicitly in chapter 1. Nevertheless, Yahweh is the one who gives Job into the power of Satan (1:12; 2:6), even after he has called him one who is blameless and upright, fearing God and turning away from evil (1:8; 2:3). Yahweh then is the final enemy behind all the attacks on Job. In this conviction the Job who speaks in the poetic dialogues

⁶⁷ Of course, neither Job nor his friends ever know this; they all argue that Job's misery is an attack coming from God.

is in fundamental agreement with the narrator of the prologue and epilogue.⁶⁸

Qoheleth

The most striking thing about the book of Qoheleth with regard to enemy figures is their relative absence. A few traditional enemies do appear.⁶⁹ When one inquires concerning the subjects of enemy behavior a few more enemy figures do come to light as derivative but traditional figures. The most significant of these derivative but traditional enemies is quite simply the human being, who must, of course, belong to the neutral group of enemy designations.⁷⁰

Qoheleth observes that it is a man's envy of his neighbor which is the source of toil (עמל) and skill

⁶⁸ Cf. 42:11 and the discussion above, "Yahweh as the Enemy."

⁶⁹ The רשע, חוטא and עושק; see Chapter 2 above.

⁷⁰ It should be recalled here that L. Ruppert includes just such characters in his study of the Psalms, but they were excluded from the primary stage of this investigation precisely because of their ambiguity (cf. Chapter 2, n. 2). Their reappearance with Qoheleth as derivatives confirms their recognition by Ruppert as enemy designations.

Other derivative, but traditional enemies which emerge from an examination of enemy behaviors are the חופר, גמוץ in 10:8 belonging to the רשע-group, the מלך in 8:2ff.; 9:14; של יט in 10:5 and גבוה in 5:7 from the neutral group and the עבד in 7:21 who fits in the friends and kinfolk category.

(כְּשֶׁר וְ) in work (4:4). This envy is perhaps related to the fact that although they were made upright, many devices have been sought out by humans (7:29). Indeed, the "heart of the sons of man" is full of evil (9:3); they are fully set to do evil (8:11). "Man lords it over man to his hurt" (8:9b).

The most significant non-traditional enemy figure for Qoheleth is God.⁷¹ It is God who has given to humanity an evil business (1:13). This betrays a kind of perverse caprice on God's part for

What is crooked cannot be made straight,
and what is lacking cannot be numbered.
Qoheleth 1:15

Consideration of God's work later prompts Qoheleth to ask, "Who can make straight what he has made crooked?" (7:13).

Aside from God's making things crooked, he also makes both good and bad days (7:14), and it is from God that one may have power to enjoy the good things which fall to one's lot (2:25).⁷² This motif is expanded upon in Qoheleth

⁷¹ The only other to appear is the כְּסִיל in 4:5, 17 (cf. 10:12, 15), but there is no important difference in Qoheleth's treatment of this figure from that observed in Proverbs.

⁷² MT reads מְמַנִּי; read מְמַנֵּנוּ with Scott, p. 218; R. Gordis, *Koheleth--The Man and His World: A Study of Ecclesiastes* (3rd aug. ed. New York: Schocken Books, 1968), pp. 152, 227; W. Zimmerli, *Prediger* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1962), p. 16.; but, A. Lauha, *Kohelet* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1978), pp. 40, 42; and C. Ginsburg, *The Song of Songs and Qoheleth*,

5:17-6:2.

Behold, what I have seen to be good and to be fitting is to eat and drink and find enjoyment in all the toil with which one toils under the sun the few days of his life which God has given him, for this is his lot. Every man also to whom God has given wealth and possessions and power to enjoy them, and to accept his lot and find enjoyment in his toil--this is the gift of God. For he will not much remember the days of his life because God keeps him occupied with joy in his heart.

There is an evil which I have seen under the sun, and it lies heavy upon men: a man to whom God gives wealth, possessions, and honor, so that he lacks nothing of all that he desires, yet God does not give him power to enjoy them, but a stranger enjoys them; this is vanity; it is a sore affliction.⁷³

Unfortunately, even with the righteous and the wise, God's disposition towards them is unknown. It is true that their deeds are in the hand of God, but "whether it is love or hate no one knows" (9:1). This arbitrariness in life (for which God is ultimately responsible) is most pointedly articulated a few verses later.

Again I saw that under the sun the race is not to the swift, nor the battle to the strong, nor bread to the wise, nor riches to the intelligent, nor favor to the man of skill; but time and chance happen to them all. For man does not know his time. Like fish which are caught in an evil net, and like birds which are caught in a snare, so the sons of men are snared at an evil time when it suddenly falls upon them.

Qoheleth 9:11-12

Vol. II (New York: KTAV, 1970), 301, read MT as it stands. Lauha takes the question to be a quote of God ("Who can eat or enjoy apart from me?") while Ginsburg takes it to mean "except I" (i.e., Qoheleth).

⁷³ See the same ideas in 8:14-15 and 9:9-10.

The problem with the times,⁷⁴ which are indeed fitting for certain kinds of activities, is that they take one unaware. The times and eternity are a work of God, that which is done (under the sun),⁷⁵ but they are opaque to human perception. Qoheleth's God, who structures the world and life in such an inscrutable fashion, is his greatest enemy.

Sirach

By far the majority of traditional enemies, both derivative and otherwise, encountered in the book of Sirach are quite unremarkable. They fall within the parameters set out earlier. Often, derivative but traditional enemies appear in parallelism with non-derivative enemy designations. Their usage in parallelism with designations found in the Psalms together with their appearance as subjects of characteristic enemy behavior is confirmation that they are, in fact, enemy designations.

⁷⁴ 3:1-11.

⁷⁵ נַעֲשֶׂה (תַּחַת הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ), "what is done (under the sun)," is set forth as Qoheleth's topic for investigation in 1:13. His conclusion is that it is "vanity and a striving after wind" (1:14). This is substantiated by the observations that "what is done" is unchanging (1:9), evil (2:17; 4:3) and oppressive (4:1). "What is done under the sun" is the "work of God" which no one can ever find out (8:16-17).

One set of derivative and traditional figures, however, does require some brief comment: businessmen.

A merchant can hardly keep from wrongdoing,
and a tradesman will not be declared
innocent from sin.

Many have committed sin for a trifle,
and whoever seeks to get rich will avert
his eyes.

As a stake is driven firmly into a fissure
between stones
so sin is wedged in between buying and
selling.

If a man is not steadfast and zealous in the
fear of the Lord,
his house will be quickly overthrown.

Sirach 26:29-27:3 ⁷⁶

Sirach realizes that one need not be ashamed of turning a profit (42:5), but he is also aware that those who customarily make their living in trade are especially liable to various kinds of sin. The gap between cost and profit, buying and selling, is subject only to the scruples of the merchant (and the acumen of the customer). Such intangible regulations of human acquisitiveness are hardly conducive to "fair trade." Sirach's only suggestion for one in such a precarious occupation is contained in the threat that should one not hold fast in all seriousness to the fear of the Lord

⁷⁶ It is difficult to decide whether these characters fit more appropriately in the neutral group or the friends and kinfolk group of enemies, but the friends and kinfolk group seems more likely. Certainly, the lender and borrower stand in a neighbor relationship (Sir. 29:1). Whether the merchant-tradesman is a community figure or an outsider would determine their category. Here they are being taken as community figures.

then his house (οἶκος, business, trading house?) would meet catastrophe.

Another set of derivative figures which belong to the economic sphere are the lenders and borrowers. This financial relationship is fraught with hazards. Sirach counts lending as "showing mercy to a neighbor" (29:1). Yet, occasions arise when the borrower defaults. In that case the possibility of needless enmity arises.

If he [the lender] exerts pressure, he will
hardly get back half,
and will regard that as a windfall.
If he does not, he [the borrower] has robbed
him of his money,
and he [the lender] has needlessly made
him [the borrower] his enemy;
he [the borrower] will repay him with curses
and reproaches,
and instead of honor will repay him with
dishonor.

Sirach 29:6

This enmity arising out of lending and borrowing is tragic because it all starts out as an exercise in doing mercy to a neighbor. Its end, however, is that many refuse to lend (29:7), to do mercy to the neighbor.⁷⁷

Historical Characters as Enemies

Gentile foes of Israel such as Sennacherib, the Philistines and Canaanites as well as Israelites who opposed

⁷⁷ The older *mashal* tradition of Proverbs, of course, had nothing good to say about lending and borrowing; cf. Prov. 6:1-5; 11:15; 17:18; 20:16=27:13; 22:7, 26.

Israel's leaders or Yahweh such as the six hundred thousand men, Ephraim and the kings of Judah have already been encountered as traditional enemies in the **אויב** and **רשע**-groups. When enemy behaviors are examined, however, other figures also appear. Joshua and David both acted as enemies against the historical enemies of Israel.⁷⁸ There are some within Israel who acted as enemies not against Israel's foes but against Israel herself. Thus, Solomon "brought wrath" upon his children so that the sovereignty was divided" (47:20-21a), and Elijah "brought a famine upon [Israel] and made them few in number" (48:2).

Dispositions, Actions and Things as Enemies

This group of derivative and non-traditional enemies comprises realities which are not people, but nevertheless attack people. Some are unambiguously negative dispositions such as gluttony and lust from which the sage requests God's deliverance (23:6), just as earlier supplicants asked deliverance, from enemies who were personal. Others of this group are ambiguous; sometimes helpful, at other times destructive.

⁷⁸ Joshua "waged the wars of the Lord" (Sir. 46: 1-3); David "wiped out his enemies" (47:4-5, 7). Samuel might be included here, but it is much more likely that is the antecedent of 46:18, "and he wiped out the leaders of the people of Tyre and all the rulers of the Philistines."

For there is a shame which brings sin,
and there is a shame which is glory
and favor.

Sirach 4:21

Besides shame, another such ambiguous reality is
cleverness which could be quite negative.

There is a cleverness which is abominable,
but there is a fool who merely lacks
wisdom.

There is a cleverness which is scrupulous
but unjust,
and there are people who distort kindness
to gain a verdict.

Sirach 19:23, 25⁷⁹

Yet, cleverness could also characterize a wise man like
Sirach himself.

He that is inexperienced knows few things,
but he that has traveled acquires much
cleverness.

I have seen many things in my travels,
and I understand more than I can express.
Sirach 31(34):10⁸⁰

Likewise, dreams are an ambiguous reality, Sirach's
predisposition is to denigrate dreams as a reliable guide
for life.

⁷⁹ Cf. 21:12.

⁸⁰ Note that *πανουργία* is used in an exclusively positive sense by the Greek translator(s) of Proverbs. It appears in two places: "in order that he might give cleverness (*πανουργιαν*) to the simple," Prov. 1:4a LXX; "Perceive, O simple ones, cleverness (*πανουργιαν*)!" Pray. 8:5a LXX. Surely, Sirach's translator-grandson was aware of this usage of those responsible for rendering "(the law itself, the prophecies) and the rest of the books" (Sir. prologue, 24-25).

For dreams have deceived many,
 and those who have put their hope in
 them have failed.
 Sirach 31(34):7⁸¹

He must concede, however, the outside possibility that they
 may be sent from the Most High. Unless such be the case,
 he urges against placing any confidence in them.⁸²

Gold and wine are two tangible things which may destroy
 people.

He who loves gold will not be justified,
 and he who pursues money will be led
 astray by it.
 Many have come to ruin because of gold,
 and their destruction has met them
 face to face.
 It is a stumbling block to those who are
 devoted to it,
 and every fool will be taken captive
 by it.
 Blessed is the rich man who is found blameless,
 and who does not go after gold.
 Who is he? And we will call, him blessed,
 for he has done wonderful things among
 his people.
 Who has been tested by it and been found
 perfect?
 Let it be for him a ground for boasting.
 Who has had the power to transgress and did
 not transgress,
 and to do evil and did not do it?
 His prosperity will be established,
 and the assembly will relate his acts of
 charity.

Sirach 34(31):5-11

⁸¹ Vv. 1-5 and 8 also portray dreams in a negative
 manner.

⁸² 31(34): 6, εαν μη παρα υψιστου αποσταλη εν
 επισκοπη μη δως εις αυτα την καρδιαν σου.

Wine and women lead intelligent men astray,
and the man who consorts with harlots is
very reckless.

Sirach 19:2⁸³

These two may also be good things in human life. Especially in the case of wine, Sirach affirms its goodness by using it as a metaphor for a friend (9:10).⁸⁴ Its ambiguity is expansively articulated in Sirach 34(31):25-30.

Do not aim to be valiant over wine,
for wine has destroyed many.
Fire and water prove the temper of steel,
so wine tests hearts in the strife of
the proud.
Wine is like life to men,
if you drink it in moderation.
What is life to a man who is without wine?
It has been created to make men glad.
Wine drunk in season and temperately
is rejoicing of heart and gladness of soul.
Wine drunk to excess is bitterness of soul,
with provocation and stumbling.
Drunkenness increases the anger of a fool to
his injury,
reducing his strength and adding wounds.
Both wine and gold are treated as penultimate goods.

This is seen most clearly when they are compared to something which is unambiguously good.

Wine and music gladden the heart,
but the love of wisdom is better than both.
Gold and silver make the foot stand sure,
but good counsel is esteemed more than both.
Sirach 40:20, 25⁸⁵

⁸³ Cf. also 8:2; 9:9.

⁸⁴ Other metaphorical uses of wine may be seen at 35(32):5, 6 and 49:1.

⁸⁵ Cf. also 7:18, 19; 30:15; 41:12.

Finally, among these non-personal realities is one which is certainly a good thing to do and which also acts in a warlike fashion, almsgiving.

Store up almsgiving in your treasury,
and it will rescue you from all affliction;
more than a mighty shield and more than a
heavy spear,
it will fight on your behalf against your
enemy.

Sirach 29:12-13

Fools and Sages as Enemies

Various kinds of fools have already been revealed as derivative enemies in Proverbs while even earlier in this investigation Sirach's identification of the "hateful man" (μισητος ανθρωπος) with the "fool" (αφρων) was encountered.⁸⁶ It is, therefore, scarcely surprising to find various terms for fools appearing as subjects of enemy behavior.⁸⁷ The most instructive of these appearances shows that although the fool is familiar with doxological traditions of scripture, he draws faulty conclusions from them.

Do not say, "I shall be hidden from the Lord,
and who from on high will remember me?
Among so many people I shall not be known,
for what is my soul in the boundless
creation?
Behold, heaven and the highest heaven,
the abyss and the earth, will tremble at
his visitation.

⁸⁶ 12:14-15.

⁸⁷ Μωρος in 18:18; 20:16; cf. 27:13; τολμηρος in 8:5; ελαττουμενος καρδια, αφρων and πλανωμενος in 16:23; cf. also υπολημψις in 3:24.

The mountains also and the foundations of
the earth
shake with trembling when he looks upon
them.

And no mind will reflect on this.

Who will ponder his ways?

Like a tempest which no man can see,
so most of his works are concealed.

Who will announce his acts of justice?

Or who will await them? For the covenant
is far off."

This is what one devoid of understanding
thinks;

a senseless and misguided man thinks
foolishly.

Sirach 16:17-23⁸⁸

This fool is very orthodox in his praise, but he understands God's overwhelming transcendence to mean that someone as unimportant as himself will somehow be overlooked by this mighty sovereign. Or, he is a complete sceptic who merely parodies praise but believes not a word.

⁸⁸ I. Levi, *The Hebrew Text of the Book of Ecclesiasticus* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1904), p. 26, suggests several parallels with Hebrew scriptures. The most obvious and convincing is v. 18a (Hebrew, 16a) $\text{ידֹן הַשָּׁמַיִם וְהַיָּם}$ and Deut. 10:14

and הַן [לִיהוּה אֱלֹהֵיךָ] הַשָּׁמַיִם וְהַשָּׁמַיִם הַשָּׁמַיִם

I Kgs. 8:27 הַנְּהָה הַשָּׁמַיִם וְשֵׁם הַשָּׁמַיִם, the Greek

text in both passages is a very straightforward translation.

The remainder of Levi's suggestions are otherwise more in the nature of reminiscences of this doxology than real

parallels. Cf. Sir. 16:19a(17a) with Jonah 2:7 and 19b(17b) with Psalm 104:32 and Nah. 1:5. After Sirach 16:19(17) the

Hebrew text differs from the Greek, reading: "Indeed he shall not consider me; and my ways, who will understand?"

If I sin no eye shall see me, or if I lie in all secret who will know? (What) is the work of righteousness? Who will

declare it? And hope of What? For I observe a decree."

גם עלי לא ישים לב ובדרכי מי יתבוננו:)

אם חטאתי לא תראני עין או אם אכזב בכל

סתר מי יודע [מה] מעשה צדק מי יגידנו

(ותקות מה כי אצוק חוק:

In spite of the fact that fools often pose the hazards of enmity, a God-fearing man who lacks intelligence is preferable to a highly prudent man who transgresses the law (19:24), because a sage may play the role of an enemy. Certainly this is the case of a counselor who counsels in his own interest (37:7-9). That the sage may be an enemy is clearest, however, when Sirach's own era is the subject of the enemy behavior.

Whoever winks his eye plans evil deeds,
 and no one can keep him from them.
 In your presence his mouth is all sweetness,
 and he admires your words;
 but later he will twist his speech
 and with your own words he will give
 offense.
 I have hated many things, but none to be
 compared to him;
 even the Lord will hate him.

Sirach 27:22-24

This enmity of the sage against one who winks his eye is not surprising, nor does it present any threat to the sage. The ego-enemy which Sirach fears most is not that of himself versus another, but rather that of himself versus himself. Fears of his own self-enmity are articulated only in prayer.

O that a guard were set over my mouth,
 and a seal of prudence upon my lips,
 that it may keep me from falling,
 so that my tongue may not destroy me!
 O Lord, Father and Ruler of my life,
 do not abandon me to their counsel,
 and let me not fall because of them!
 O that whips were set over my thoughts,
 and the discipline of wisdom over my mind!

That they may not spare me in my errors,
 and that it may not pass by my sins;
 in order that my mistakes may not be
 multiplied,
 and my sins may not abound;
 then I will not fall before my adversaries,
 and my enemy will not rejoice over me.
 O Lord, Father and God of my life,
 do not give me haughty eyes,
 and remove from me evil desire.
 Let neither gluttony nor lust overcome me,
 and do not surrender me to a shameless
 soul.

Sirach 22:27-23:6

This prayer is modeled after the individual laments of the Psalter. The interesting thing to notice is that the customary role of the enemies has been usurped by parts and actions of Sirach himself.⁸⁹ Traditional enemies⁹⁰ are seen in one verse, but Sirach is confident that if God will only deliver him from himself the external foes will present little danger.

Wisdom and the Lord as Enemies

The Lord assumed an enemy stance in earlier wisdom literature, and also does so in Sirach. For Sirach, however, this divine enmity is neither inscrutable (as it was already for Proverbs), nor criminal and unjust (as for Job), nor productive of the malaise which beset Qoheleth. By

⁸⁹ Mouth, lips and tongue in 22:27; thoughts, mind, errors and sins in 23:2; mistakes and sins in 23:3; eyes in 23:4; evil desire in 23:5; and gluttony, lust and shameless soul in 23:6.

⁹⁰ Ὑπεναντιῶν and ἐχθρὸς in 23:3.

comparison, Sirach's God is tame and predictable. In a quite orthodox fashion

the Most High also hates sinners
and will inflict punishment on the
ungodly.

Sirach 12:10⁹¹

Moreover, the Lord God is pro-righteous. He will fight for one who agonizes unto death on account of truth (4:28).⁹²

Sirach's orthodoxy enables him to pray very sincerely for God to "Have mercy upon us"⁹³ while the obverse side of that prayer is that God act as an, enemy toward the (obviously wicked) foreign nations who are Israel's enemies. The central section of the prayer urges this divine enmity most comprehensively.

Rouse thy anger and pour out thy wrath;
destroy the adversary and wipe out the
enemy.
Hasten the day, and remember the appointed
time,
and let people recount thy mighty deeds.
Let him who survives be consumed in the fiery
wrath,
and may those who harm thy people meet
destruction.
Crush the heads of the rulers of the enemy,
who say, "There is no one but ourselves."

Sirach 33(36):7-10

⁹¹ Also Sir. 1:30; 3:16; 5:3, 6; 10:13; 26:28; 27:24; 32(35):18-20.

⁹² Cf. also 4:5-6.

⁹³ 33(36):1; the prayer continues through v. 17. V. 12 makes clear that the "us" of v. 1 is Israel.

This orthodoxy is so taken for granted that Sirach can move easily from using God's wrath as a motive for caution with respect to vows to the mundane phenomena of plenty and hunger, wealth and poverty and other changing conditions.

Before making a vow, prepare yourself:
and do not be like a man who tempts the
Lord.

Think of his wrath on the day of deaths
and of the moment of vengeance when he
turns away his face.

In the time of plenty think of the time of
hunger;
in the days of wealth think of poverty
and need.

From morning to evening conditions change,
and all things move swiftly before the
Lord.

Sirach 18:23-26

The difference for Sirach compared with earlier wisdom literature is not in his knowledge of God's potential enmity, but rather in the sources of his knowledge. Earlier wisdom thinkers had gleaned their knowledge of God's hazardous activities from observation and experience. As the admonition in Sirach 2:10 probably indicates, Sirach also gained knowledge by reflection upon the experiences mediated through his cultural heritage.

Consider the ancient generations and see:
who ever trusted in the Lord and was
put to shame?
Or who ever persevered in the fear of the
Lord and was forsaken?
Or who ever called upon him and was
overlooked?⁹⁴

⁹⁴ Eliphaz had the same fundamental insight (Job 4:7) as did the (wise) psalmist (Psalm 37:25),

Sirach's experiences, observations and reflections, however, are shaped by a new factor. He is a man of the book(s), devoted to the study of the scriptures.⁹⁵ His knowledge of God's enmity, against the wicked and on behalf of the righteous, is grounded in two complexes of Jewish writings: praise and historical narrative.

The Lord has cast down the thrones of rulers
and has seated the lowly in their place.⁹⁶
The Lord has plucked up the roots of the
nations,
and has planted the humble in their place.
The Lord has overthrown the lands of nations,
and has destroyed them to the foundations
of the earth."
He has removed some of them and destroyed them,
and has extinguished the memory of them
from the earth.
Sirach 10:14-17⁹⁸

In an assembly of sinners a fire will be
kindled,
and in a disobedient nation wrath was
kindled.
He was not propitiated for the ancient giants
who revolted in their might.⁹⁹
He did not spare the neighbors of Lot,
whom he loathed on account of their
insolence.¹⁰⁰

⁹⁵ See his own characterization of the sage in Sir. 39:1-11.

⁹⁶ Cf. I Sam. 2:7-8.

⁹⁷ Cf. Psalm 44:2.

⁹⁸ Note also 36(33):12 which appears to be grounded in the same kind of hymnic tradition as well as the formula ο ταπεινωσ και ανυψωσ (= **ומשפיל** **מרם**, Levi, p. 9).

⁹⁹ Cf. Gn. 6:4.

¹⁰⁰ Cf. Gn. 19:14; Ezek. 16:49.

He showed no pity for a nation devoted to
 destruction,
 for those destroyed in their sins;¹⁰¹
 nor for the six hundred thousand men on foot,
 who rebelliously assembled in their
 stubbornness.¹⁰²

Sirach 16:6-10¹⁰³

Although Sirach offers no new formulations of God's enemy behavior, but rather only a new factor in perceiving it, he does articulate a new perception of Wisdom's potential hostility. Whereas in Proverbs Wisdom threatened to assume the stance of an enemy in order to persuade the fools and scoffers,¹⁰⁴ in Sirach she even assumes an enemy stance toward her (novice) devotees.

At first she will walk with him on tortuous
 paths,
 she will bring fear and cowardice upon
 him,
 and will torment him by her discipline
 until she trusts him,
 and she will test him with her ordinances.
 Then she will come straight back to him
 and gladden him,
 and will reveal her secrets to him.
 If he goes astray she will forsake him,
 and hand him over to his ruin.

Sirach 4:17-19

¹⁰¹ Probably Canaan; cf. Gn. 15:16; Ex. 23:23-33.

¹⁰² Cf. Num. 11:21.

¹⁰³ Note also Sir. 46:6-7 and 48:21 where the historical narratives of Joshua's conquests and the deliverance of Jerusalem from Sennacherib are the occasions for the recognition of God's enemy behavior.

¹⁰⁴ Cf. Prov. 1:26-27.

Unlike his knowledge of God's enmity, gleaned mostly from scripture, Sirach's knowledge of the enmity of Wisdom towards her novices results from his own experience. He can speak of her enemy behavior because he has known it in his own personal life. This experience of Sirach's is confirmed in his closing apology (51:13-30). The overall tone of this poem is one of great joy in the service of Wisdom. Yet, there is a single reminiscence that in his youth Sirach had striven with Wisdom (51:19a).

Wisdom of Solomon

The wisdom literature surveyed earlier has already disclosed several derivative and non-traditional enemies which likewise appear in Wisdom of Solomon. Fools appear who act like enemies¹⁰⁵ as well as God and Wisdom.¹⁰⁶ With these characters no significant change in the nature of their enmity occurs. Fools still act as enemies toward the righteous and God just as the ungodly do; God and Wisdom still act as enemies toward those who disobey.

¹⁰⁵ See ο εξουθενων σοφιαν και παιδειαν in Wisd. 3:11; αφρονες in 5:4 and απαιδευτοι ψυχαι in 17:1.

¹⁰⁶ See Wisdom in 10:19 (cf. αυτη in 10:1, 15) and κυριος in 4:18-19; 5:20 (cf. v. 15); 11:10, 15; 12:2, 4, 9, 122, 23; 18:5, 16; ο υψιστος in 5:20 (cf. v. 15); θεου κρισις in 16:18; πνευματος δυναμεως σου (=του κυριου in 11:20; and η δυναμις (του θεου) in 1:3. It is also likely that δικη in 18; 11:20; 14:31 and τα δικαia in 14:30 are to be related to God.

Righteous Characters as Enemies

With the righteous, who also appeared as enemies in earlier literature, one new development does appear. They are still anti-wicked, but their action as enemies of the ungodly is after death.

The righteous man who has died will condemn
the ungodly who are living,
and youth that is quickly perfected will
condemn the prolonged old age of the
unrighteous man.

For they will see the end of the wise man,
and will not understand what the Lord
purposed for him,
and for what he kept him safe.

They will see, and will have contempt for him,
but the Lord will laugh them to scorn.

After this they will become dishonored
corpses,

and an outrage among the dead for ever;
because he will dash them speechless to
the ground,

and shake them from the foundations;
they will be left utterly dry and barren,
and they will suffer anguish,
and the memory of them will perish.

Wisdom of Solomon 4:16-19

The righteous man who has died condemns the wicked, but this condemnation appears somewhat passive. As the following verses indicate this condemnation is not clear to the wicked; they continue to have contempt for him. Their condemnation, however, is clarified by the Lord's judging action. Only then do they come to the dreadful realization of the truth of the righteous man's life.¹⁰⁷ They speak

¹⁰⁷ Wisd. 4:20-5:3.

words of repentance and say,

This is the man whom we once held in derision
and made a byword of reproach—we fools!
We thought that his life was madness
and that his end was without honor.
Why has he been numbered among the sons
of God?
And why is his lot among the saints?
So it was we who strayed from the way of
truth,
and the light of righteousness did not shine
upon us,
and the sun did not rise upon us.
We took our fill of the paths of lawlessness
and destruction,
and we journeyed through trackless deserts,
but the way of the Lord we have not known.
What has our arrogance profited us?
And what good has our boasted wealth
brought us?

Wisdom of Solomon 5:4-8

Otherwise, the righteous appear stereotypically as a designation of Israel.¹⁰⁸ They plunder the ungodly and fight off their foes, the Egyptians, who are characterized throughout the book as enemies, lacked or ungodly and fools.

Idolatry as an Enemy

Idols, idol worshipers and idol makers appear as enemies in the Wisdom of Solomon. Idols, "though part of God's creation, became an abomination, and became traps for the souls of men and a snare to the feet of the foolish" (14:11). The striking, indeed tragic, thing about these idols is the fact that they are elements of God's creation.

¹⁰⁸ 10:20; 11:3.

Yet, people were "unable from the good things that are seen to know him who exists, nor did they recognize the craftsman while paying heed to his works" (15:1). It is, perhaps, understandable that they go astray while searching for God and thereby come to have confidence in what they see, for they are beautiful (15:6-7). Nevertheless, they are without excuse, "for if they had the power to know so much that they could investigate the world, how did they fail to find sooner the Lord of all these things?" (13:10).

As idols themselves are enemies, so also those who make them are enemies. The potter who works with clay takes life itself for an idle game, a festival held for profit, and rationalizes his activity with the saying, "one must get money however one can, even by base means" (15:12). This enmity of idol making extends even to the "evil intent of human art" and the "fruitless toil of painters" which would mislead people (15:4).¹⁰⁹

It may be that worship of idols originally emerged out of grief over a beloved child who died or out of the custom of erecting a king's image in a remote province (14:12-20) rather than from aesthetic considerations. But, whatever its origins, it delivered men to bondage (14:21). From then

¹⁰⁹ Those who love God, of course, are not deceived.

on they were guilty of all manner of wickedness.

Afterward it was not enough for them to err
 about the knowledge of God,
 but they live in great strife due to ignorance,
 and they call such great evils peace.
 For whether they kill children in their
 initiations, or celebrate secret mysteries,
 or hold frenzied revels with strange customs,
 they no longer keep either their lives or
 their marriages pure,
 but they either treacherously kill one another,
 or grieve one another by adultery,
 and all is a raging riot of blood and murder,
 theft and deceit, corruption, faithlessness,
 tumult, perjury,
 confusion over what is good, forgetfulness of
 favors,
 pollution of souls, sex perversion,
 disorder in marriage, adultery, and debauchery.

Wisdom of Solomon 14:22-27

It is hardly surprising then that the worship of idols is
 judged to be "the beginning and cause and end of every
 evil" (14:27).¹¹⁰

Creation as an Enemy

The Lord will take his zeal as his whole
 armor,
 and will arm all creation to repel his
 enemies;
 he will put on righteousness as a breastplate,
 and wear impartial justice as a helmet;
 he will take holiness as an invincible shield,
 and sharpen stern wrath for a sword,
 and creation will join with him to fight
 against the madmen.

Wisdom of Solomon 5:17-20

This text introduces creation itself as an enemy. It
 fights together with God against madmen. The passage goes

¹¹⁰ Cf. 14:12.

on to enumerate various items which are in creation's arsenal: lightning, hail, water of the sea, rivers and a mighty wind (vv. 21-22a).¹¹¹ Elsewhere this is set forth as a fundamental principle.

For the creation, serving thee who hast
made it,
exerts itself to punish the unrighteous,
and in kindness relaxes on behalf of those
who trust in thee.

Wisdom of Solomon 16:24

This enmity of creation against the enemies of God (and Israel) is illustrated in reflection upon the exodus experience. Various elements of nature which paralyzed the Egyptians with terror are mentioned (17:18-19).¹¹² None of the elements named (whistling wind, chirping of birds, rushing water, crash of rocks, leaping animals, roaring beasts, echoes from mountains) is actually mentioned in Exodus, of course, but the plagues recorded in Exodus are largely natural phenomena. It appears that this writer is

¹¹¹ Hypothetical parts of creation are also named as in 11:17-19, "For thy all-powerful hand, which created the world out of formless matter, did not lack the means to send upon them a multitude of bears, or bold lions, or newly created unknown beasts full of rage, such as breathe out fiery breath, or belch forth a thick pall of smoke, or flash terrible sparks from their eyes; not only could their damage exterminate men, but the mere sight of them could kill by fright"; as well as known animals such as the wasp (σφήκας) or wild beasts (θηρίοις δεινοῖς) mentioned in 12:8-9.

¹¹² Cf. 16:15-23.

merely elaborating on an older Israelite notion of creation at the service of God.¹¹³

More threatening than the macrocosm which acts as an enemy towards the ungodly (Egyptians), however, is the microcosm of the human psyche. The ungodly are assailed by specters, phantoms and fear. Indeed, they are paralyzed by their souls' surrender.¹¹⁴ The reason these attacks issue from such fearful delusions is that

. . . wickedness is a cowardly thing,
condemned by its own testimony;
distressed by conscience, it has always
exaggerated the difficulties.
For fear is nothing but surrender of the
helps that come from reason;
and the inner expectation of help, being weak,
prefers ignorance of what causes the torment.
Wisdom of Solomon 17:11-13

Summary

The preceding examination of characters who act like enemies has revealed greater breadth to the phenomenon of enmity than could be discerned by attention to enemy designations alone. Specifically, it has become clear that although the various designations of enemies are unilateral (i.e., "he is the enemy; I am not") enmity itself is, of course, a bilateral affair. There is enmity on both sides of an enemy designation. This is the significance of the

¹¹³ See the same idea in Josh, 10:11, 12-14 and already in the very old Song of Deborah, Judg. 5:20-21.

¹¹⁴ Wisd. 17:3, 15; cf. also 18:17.

appearance of such characters as the righteous, the wise (only in Sirach) and even God as subjects of enemy behaviors. Such folk would scarcely admit that they were themselves enemies, but their actions and dispositions indicate otherwise.

Also evident in the preceding examination is the fact that fools pose some of the same hazards for the wisdom tradition that enemies pose in the Psalter. This is especially evident in Proverbs and Sirach, but it is also true for Qoheleth and Wisdom of Solomon. With Job the portrayal of fools as enemies is insignificant, but the problem of the book is not with fools; it is rather with Yahweh.

With Sirach and Wisdom of Solomon new figures appear. The most significant for Sirach are the attacks from within his own ego. It is his own sins which threaten him the most. They are the only thine which prompts Sirach to pray for personal deliverance in the style of the individual laments of the Psalms.¹¹⁵ A similar perception emerges in Wisdom of Solomon where it is claimed that the most terrifying enemies to the Egyptians were not the various elements of creation which were arrayed against them nor even God (whom they, of course, refused to recognize), but

¹¹⁵ Sir. 22:27-23:6; the prayer of 33(36):1-17 is a corporate lament; that of 51:-12 is an individual thanksgiving song.

rather the various phantoms and delusions in their own minds. These internal enemies were inescapable.

Idolatry and creation also emerged as enemies in the Wisdom of Solomon. Creation is said to join together with God and fight against the Egyptians. A specially potent and tragic manifestation of this enmity issuing from creation was idolatry. The many gods of the heathen were, at best, beautiful parts of God's good creation. Nevertheless, they became a trap for much of humanity. The blame for this state of affairs cannot be placed on the creation, however, but must rest squarely on people who misconstrued these good things. Following from the fundamental mistake with regard to God there was then a false estimate of God's creation which itself became an enemy of ungodly humanity.

Throughout all the wisdom literature examined, God appeared acting like enemies act. There were, however, differences in these appearances. With Sirach and Wisdom of Solomon this enemy behavior on God's part had become quite orthodox and predictable: God acts like an enemy toward his enemies and like a friend toward his friends. To the audiences of these two works, this kind of divine enmity presented little threat since they counted themselves among God's friends.¹¹⁶

¹¹⁶ Of course, they would have confessed to some sin (cf. Sir. 8:5; Wisd. 15:2), but that would not change their basic posture as friends of God.

With the earlier perceptions of divine enmity in Proverbs, Job and Qoheleth, there was a threatening, unpredictable dimension to God's enmity. This dimension of Yahweh's character was, of course, a central concern with the book of Job, but also Qoheleth. It should not be overlooked, though, that there was a bare--but how terrifying!--hint at this dimension of Yahweh already in Proverbs. Who indeed ever knew what could come from the side of Yahweh (Prov. 24:22)? He was, after all, the Living God.

One final figure who appeared to behave as an enemy in this material must be mentioned: Wisdom. In Proverbs she promised to be one who would scorn her foes and laugh at those who refused her call. This behavior is quite to be expected since it has become evident that enmity was, in fact, a bilateral affair. With Sirach the portrayal of Wisdom's enmity took on another and more problematic dimension: she (temporarily) treated her devotees as an enemy. He had himself struggled with her in his youth. Although Sirach's God had become tame and predictable, there were still hazards which could issue from the divine realm, even against the righteous and wise.

Chapter 4

WISE RESPONSES TO THE ENEMY

The wisdom literature offers no monolithic guidelines on the question of how to respond to a personal enemy. With regard to the problem of enmity, as with other social phenomena, a range of responses is advised. A sage must choose between various options when responding to a specific person or circumstance. This element of discretion and flexibility is nowhere more evident than in Proverbs 26:4-5.

Answer not a fool according to his folly,
lest you be like him yourself,
Answer a fool according to his folly,
lest he be wise in his own eyes.

This flexibility on the part of the sages requires that the question concerning wise responses to an enemy and enmity deal with the problem of coherence. Are there any fundamental convictions undergirding the various responses from which a wise person might choose when faced with an enemy? What allows a sage to take various stances with regard to enemies?

Proverbs

The book of Proverbs reveals a variety of responses to the enemies and their behavior, as well as several convictions which may motivate them. The responses range from a

simple rejection of enemy behavior as a pattern of life through avoidance of the enemy to aid for the enemy. The motives which stand behind this range of responses include some of the fundamental presuppositions of the sages. The following discussion will proceed by noting the variety of responses which Proverbs counsels together with their motives.

The reasons given for the various responses seem to be somewhat *ad hoc*. Any of them may be encountered in connection with several different responses. Therefore, they will simply be noted as they arise. After all the various responses have been discussed the motives will be collected for discussion.

Rejection of Enemy Behavior

The most frequent counsel when confronted with the problem of enmity is an outright rejection of all kinds of hostility. Conduct which is characteristic of enemies is prohibited by the wise. These prohibitions are most evident in the instruction genre.

Do not plan evil (חַרַשׁ רָעָה) against
 your neighbor
 who dwells trustingly beside you.
 Do not contend (רִיב) with a man for no
 reason (חֵכֶם),
 when he has done you no harm.
 Do not envy (קִנְאָה, pi.) a man of violence,
 and do not choose (בַּחֵר) any of his ways;
 for the perverse man is an abomination to
 Yahweh,

but the upright are in his confidence.
 Yahweh's curse is on the house of the wicked,
 but he blesses the abode of the righteous.
 Toward the scorners he is scornful,
 but to the humble he shows favor.
 The wise will inherit honor,
 but fools get disgrace.

Proverbs 3:29-35¹

Such prohibitions, although more frequent in the instructions, are also evident in the *m^eshalim*. Proverbs 27:10 admonishes not to "forsake" (עזב) one's friend or the friend of one's father, while elsewhere "slander" (שׁוֹטֵף, hi.) is prohibited (30:10). Apart from straightforward prohibition the sentence literature expresses aversion to enemy behavior with "not good" sayings.

It is not good (לֹא טוֹב) to be partial
 to a wicked man,
 or to deprive a righteous man of justice.

Proverbs 18:5

Partiality in judging is not good (לֹא טוֹב).

Proverbs 24:23b

The implication of these sayings is, of course, that such "not good" things fall outside an acceptable pattern of life.

This kind of attitude toward patterns of behavior which are characteristic of enemies has interesting consequences.

¹ Cf. 110; 4:14-15; 22:22; 24:15, 17, 28-29 for other prohibitions against enemy behavior in the instructions. Prov. 24:28-29 falls in the "appendix" which has been added to the large instruction of 22:17-24:22. Most of this "appendix" (vv. 23-34) is not properly instruction, but vv. 27-29 are; cf. W. McKane, *Proverbs: A New Approach* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1970), p. 572.

To begin with, whoever heeds the instructions is prevented from becoming an enemy. If these instructions are followed then one cannot act like an enemy. When this attitude actually encounters an enemy it results in a refusal to respond in kind.

Do not say, "I will repay (אשלמה) evil";
wait for Yahweh, and he will help you.
Proverbs 20:22

Do not say, "I will do to him as he has done
to me (כאשר עשה לי כן אעשה לו);
I will pay the man back (אשיב) for
what he has done."
Proverbs 24:29

Do not rejoice (שמח) when your enemy falls,
and let not your heart be glad (גיל)
when he stumbles;
lest Yahweh see it, and be displeased,
and turn away his anger from him.
Proverbs 24:17-18

This refusal to engage in enemy behavior precludes the establishment of a cycle of hostility. Hostility cannot be met, with hostility. This response of non-aggression is much more than a way of simply avoiding conflict. By renouncing enemy behavior as an appropriate way of life the wise hold open the possibility of repentance, even for one already acting like an enemy.

If you have been foolish, exalting yourself,
or if you have been devising evil,
put your hand on your mouth.²

² V 32b β reads simply יד-לפה, "(the) hand to (the) mouth"; the verb is understood, and the 2nd person pronoun is implied by the context. McKane, pp. 260, 664-665,

For pressing milk produces curds,
 pressing the nose produces blood,
 and pressing anger produces strife (רִיב).
 Proverbs 30:32-33

The reference to "strife" (רִיב) above probably indicates that this non-aggression toward one's enemy is prior to any legal contest. A refusal to respond in kind preempts legal recourse. If legal recourse is sought (and is

construes it with v. 32bβ and adds, "(watch your step)"; R. Scott, *Proverbs Ecclesiastes: Introduction, Translation, and Notes* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Co. 1965), , p. 180, agrees regarding v. 32b and adds, "[Beware!]" to the beginning of v. 33. C. Toy, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Proverbs* (Edinburgh: T. Clark, 1899) p. 537, explains "Taken in connection with what follows, the meaning of the v. would be that silence is pacific; but text and sense are doubtful." B. Gemser, *Sprüche Salomos* (Tubingen: Mohr, 1937), pp. 82-83, supplies no verb, but translates, "--die Hand auf den Mund!" and comments, "Cf. Hi. 21;5; *Sich geltend machen ist eine gefährliche Sache; man erweckt leicht feindliche Gefühle; drum gilt es, schweigend seinen Weg zu gehen.*" H. Ringgren, *Sprüche: Übersetzt und Erklärt* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck Ruprecht, 1967) pp. 117-118, translates without supplying a verb just as Gemser does; he comments, "*Der Text ist vielleicht nicht ganz richtig überliefert. Der Sinn ist wohl: es ist besser zu schweigen als stolz und überheblich zu reden. Ein Wortspiel. . . soll ziegen, da zornige Worte nur Streit erregen und dass es besser ist, sich ruhig zu verhalten..*" The best explanation of the verse is that of W. Oesterley, *The Book of Proverbs with Introduction and Notes* (London:Thethuen and Co., 1929), p. 280, who remarks, "Usually the verb 'lay' goes with the phrase, e.g., Job 21:5; once in Ecclus. it is as here, simply 'hand to mouth.'" Evidently, he is referring to Sir. 5:12 which reads יָדָךְ עַל פִּי (see I. Levi, *The Hebrew Text of the Book Ecclesiasticus* [Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1904]). The parallel in Sirach also significant in that the phrase is preceded by two אִם clauses just as here.

Another response to the enemies which involves something which a person ought not do is non-anxiety. A few times, always in instruction passages, the counsel is given not to worry about various figures who are customarily associated with enemies.

In each of the four admonitions which advise against anxiety the pi'el stem of the verb **קנא** ("envy, be jealous") is used. It is paralleled synonymously by the hithpa'el stem of the verbs **תאה** ("desire") and **חרה** ("fret oneself"). Once it is paralleled antithetically by

⁵ Cf. 3:25-26, 31-35; 23:17.

the verb **בחר** ("choose").⁶ The most interesting parallel with this prohibition against "envying" the enemy, however, is the antithesis posed by Proverbs 23:17.

Let not your heart envy sinners,
but continue in the fear of Yahweh
all the day.

Proverbs 23:17

This abiding in the fear of Yahweh is a clue to the question of why the wise respond to enemies as they do. How could anyone be anxious over a wicked when Yahweh would be their "confidence" (**כסל**)?⁷

Although explicit admonition against being anxious over traditional enemies is limited to the instructional materials in the book of Proverbs, evidence of this attitude also appears in the sentence literature. One saying in particular is a very striking example of this lack of anxiety over the attacks which enemy figures might launch.

⁶ 3:31; McKane, pp. 215, 300 emends **תבחר** to **תתחר** on the basis of the Greek reading of ζηλωσῃς, "emulate" and the parallelism between **קנא** π. and **חרה**, hith. in Prov. 24:19 and Psalm 37:1.

⁷ Prov. 3:26; M. Dahood, *Proverbs and Northwest Semitic Philology* (Roma: Pontificum Istitutum Biblicum 713), p. 10, translates "For the Lord will be at your side," on the basis of "[t]he Ugar. balance between *p'n* (=Hebr. *regel*) and *ksl*" and the absence of the *beth essentiae* construction in Proverbs which is required to translate **בכסלך**, "(as) your confidence." Dahood's suggestion "counsels a return to St Jerome's *Dominus enim erit in latere tuo*." This suggestion by Dahood has merit, but does not really change the sense of the verse.

Like a sparrow in its flitting, like a swallow
 in its flying,
 a curse that is causeless (קללת חנם)
 does not alight.

Proverbs 26:2

Such a “rationalistic” estimate of curses without cause must have been revolutionary among the ancients.

Avoidance of the Enemy

In spite of the insight that anxiety is not necessary in the face of enemies, counsel to avoid associating with them is still valid. They are, after all, dangerous. Sometimes this is very explicit.

Thorns and snares are in the way of the
 perverse;
 he who guards himself will keep far
 from them.

Proverbs 22:5

Make no friendship with a man given to anger,
 nor go with a wrathful man,
 lest you learn his ways
 and entangle yourself in a snare.

Proverbs 22:24-25⁸

Because enemies are fundamentally duplicitous, they are not to be trusted (26:24-26).

Most often, however, this response of avoidance is not explicitly advised. Rather, it would be a wholly logical course of action after a bit of reflection upon various observations of the enemies.

⁸ Cf. 23:6-7 and 26:24-26 where the theme of avoidance is also voiced.

A bad messenger plunges men into trouble,
 but a faithful envoy brings healing.
 Proverbs 13:17

A man of violence entices his neighbor
 and leads him in a way that is not good.
 Proverbs 16:29

The soul of the wicked desires evil;
 his neighbor finds no mercy in his eyes.
 Proverbs 21:109

If a "bad messenger" (מלאך־רשע), a "man of violence" (איש־חמס) and a "wicked man" (רשע) are indeed this dangerous, then it is the better part of wisdom to avoid them altogether whenever possible. Surely a person could learn by others' experience and avoid "bread gained by deceit" (לחם־שקר).¹⁰ Who in their right mind would attempt to "correct" (יסר) or "argue with" (יכח, hi.) a "scoffer" (לץ) if it brings "abuse" (קלון) and "hatred" (שנא)?¹¹

Two figures in particular pose hazards which, it would seem, are best avoided: the king and the stranger. The "wrath of a king" (חמת־מלך) is best appeased (כפר, pi.), for it customarily brings death (16:14). If it cannot be appeased one surely ought to avoid him until it passes.

⁹ Cf. 9:7 8; 11:15; 19:12; 20:2; 20:16; 23:13

¹⁰ 20:17.

¹¹ 9:7-8.

The dread wrath (אַיִמַת), of a king is like
the growling of a lion;
he who provokes him to anger forfeits
(חַוְטָא) his life.

Proverbs 20:2

Nevertheless, the king can also provide a great deal of satisfaction. His displeasure certainly poses danger, but his "favor" (רֶצוֹן) is "like dew upon the grass" (19:12), This ambiguity surrounding him seems to be characteristic of the *mashal* literature. The king is unpredictable because his

. . . heart is a stream of water in the
hand of Yahweh;
he turns it wherever he will.

Proverbs 21:1

No one can ever know the direction Yahweh's guidance might take, for "it is the glory of God to conceal (הַסְתֵּר) something" (25:2a). Yet, in the face of this royal ambiguity, or perhaps because of it, the wise experience a certain fascination with kings. Indeed, "searching out their glory is glorious" (25:27b).¹² The "glory of

¹² This line is usually emended following the versions to something like, "so he sparing of complimentary words" Oesterley, pp. 229-230; Ringgren, pp. 101, 103; Toy, (RSV); cf. McKane, pp. 251, 587-589; Gemser, p. 72; pp. 470-471; Scott, p. 155. G. Bryce, *The Legacy of Wisdom: The Egyptian Contribution to the Wisdom of Israel* (Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 1979), pp. 139-147, argues that 25:2-27 is a small "wisdom book" which is structured in two parts (vv. 6-15 dealing with the ruler and vv. 16-26 dealing with the wicked) with an introduction (vv. 2-5) which encapsulates the dual concerns of the "book." Vv. 2, 16 and 27 "clearly demarcate the beginning, middle, and end of the book" (p. 146) by forming a chiasmus:

kings" is to "search things out" (25:2b).

Just as the glory of God resides in the concealment of meaning, the glory of the king is lodged in his capacity and ability to disclose truth hidden in the created order. The locus of revelation is not with the person of God but that of the king. It is the king who has access to the divine secrets. By his special relationship to the deity the king is privileged to inquire into that which is hidden from ordinary mortals. The discernment of the king is itself a matter for wonder and awe. It too is something mysterious and inscrutable.¹³

This high degree of ambiguity in the king (he is both dangerous and attractive¹⁴) explains why the wise can

glory (v. 2) - honey (v. 16) - honey (v. 27a) - glory (v. 27b). Therefore, the 3rd, masculine plural suffix in v. 27b (םך) refers to kings (and perhaps God). Bryce previously argued for the presence of this "wisdom book" in "Another Wisdom-'Book' in Proverbs," JBL 91 (1972), 145-157. Responses to Bryce's proposal, are instructive in the problem of scholarly subjectivity. R. Murphy, *Wisdom Literature: Job Proverbs, Ruth, Canticles Ecclesiastes, Esther* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981), p. 77, remarks, "This evidence is too fragile to support the existence of an original wisdom book in this chapter." On the opposite side, W. Humphreys, "The Motif of the Wise Courtier in the Book of Proverbs," in *Israelite Wisdom: Theological and Literary Essays in Honor of Samuel Terrien*, ed. Gammie, W. Brueggemann, W. Humphreys, and J. Ward (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1978), p. 185, says, "His arguments . . . are, on the whole, compelling, and his suggestion is attractive." The present writer is convinced by Bryce's proposal.

¹³ Bryce, *The Legacy of Wisdom*, p. 160.

¹⁴ This danger-attraction character of the king is, of course, reminiscent of the *mysterium tremendum et fascinans* explicated by R. Otto, *The Idea of the Holy: An Inquiry into the Non-Rational Factor in the Idea of the Divine and its Relation to the Rational*, trans. by J. Harvey (rev. ed., London: Oxford University Press, 1929), pp. 12-41.

virtually place him on an equal footing with Yahweh and
urge,

My son, fear Yahweh and the king,
and do not associate with those who change;
for disaster from them will rise suddenly,
and who knows the ruin that will come
from them both?

Proverbs 24:21-22

With the "stranger" (זר) none of this ambiguous
response appears. It is true that the stranger himself is
an ambiguous figure (he belongs to the "neutral group" of
enemies), but the responses to him in the context of surety-
ship are univocal. He is best avoided.

He who gives surety for a stranger will smart
for it,
but he who hates suretyship is secure
Proverbs 11:15¹⁵

Financial dealings with the stranger are indeed
dangerous and ought to be avoided. Sometimes, however, the
involvement with a stranger is already effective. In that
case, people are urged to go to extraordinary lengths to
extricate themselves.

My son, if you have become surety for your
neighbor,
have given your pledge for a stranger;
if you are snared in the utterance of
your lips,
caught in the words of your mouth;
then do this, my son, and save yourself,
for you have come into your neighbor's
power:

¹⁵ See also 20:16 and 27:13 on surety for a stranger;
cf. 22:26-27 on the problem of surety in general.

go, hasten, and importune your neighbor.
 Give your eyes no sleep
 and your eyelids no slumber;
 save yourself like a gazelle from the hunter,
 like a bird from the hand of the fowler.

Proverbs 6:1-5

Two final sayings urge avoidance of potential enemies:
 the "neighbor" (רע) and the "brother" (אח). Although
 a neighbor who is near (קרוב) is better than a brother
 who is distant (רחוק),¹⁶ there are times when one should
 avoid the neighbor.

Let your foot be seldom in your neighbor's
 house,
 lest he become weary of you and hate you.

Proverbs 25:17

Even a brother is best avoided "in the day of your calamity"
 (27:10b).

Securing Actions in the Face of Enemies

Up to this point the responses to enemies which have
 been discussed have been primarily negative. They have
 involved instructions like, "DO not act as an enemy,"
 especially, "Do not seek vengeance," "Do not envy them," and
 "Do not get too close to them."¹⁷ The following responses
 may be characterized as positive. They are steps which the
 wise may in order to acquire a measure of security.

¹⁶ 27:10c.

¹⁷ The king is only a partial exception to this response.
 He is fascinating and attractive, but the sayings still
 indicate that one should keep a prudent distance from him.
 He is certainly not a "buddy" with whom one may be casual or
 familiar.

Gifts work wonders. Several *m^eshalim* speak of the amazing power of a "bribe" (שֹׁחַד) or "gift" (מֶתֶן) in bringing security. It is a "magic stone" and brings its giver prosperity (יִשְׂכִּיל).¹⁸ Indeed,

Many seek the favor of a generous man,
and everyone is a friend to a man who
gives gifts (מֶתֶן).

Proverbs 19:6

A man's gift (מֶתֶן) makes room for him
and brings him before great men.

Proverbs 18:16

More than simply bringing prosperity, winning friends and influencing people, however, the bribe is effective within the context of anger (אָ), even excessive anger (חֲמַה עֲזָה).

A gift (מֶתֶן) in secret averts anger;
and a bribe (שֹׁחַד) in the bosom,
strong wrath.

Proverbs 21:14

This knowledge of the effectiveness of a bribe is applicable when the wicked are responsible for the administration of justice (17:23). In that situation, a bribe may well be one's only tangible assurance of a favorable decision.

Even "magic stones," however, have limits. Bribes are ineffective in dealing with the husband of a man's partner in adultery.

¹⁸ 17:8 (RSV).

For jealousy makes a man furious,
 and he will not spare when he takes
 revenge.
 He will accept no compensation,
 nor be appeased though you multiply
 gifts (תְּנוּנִים)

Proverbs 6:34-35

Heed wisdom. The jealous husband is associated with the "strange woman." Often the response to her is avoidance¹⁹ together with fidelity to a man's own wife (5:15-19). Still, however, a correlative avenue to security is open. If the young man heeds instruction it will preserve him from the snares of the "strange woman."

My son, keep your father's commandment,
 and forsake not your mother's teaching.
 Bind them upon your heart always;
 tie them about your neck.
 When you walk, they will lead you;
 when you lie down, they will watch
 over you;
 and when you awake, they will talk
 with you.
 For the commandment is a lamp and the teaching
 a light,
 and the reproofs of discipline are the
 way of life,
 to preserve you from the evil woman
 from the smooth tongue of the adventuress.
 Proverbs 6:20-24²⁰

This hearkening to wisdom, of course, also secures life in the face of the potential threat which Wisdom herself may

¹⁹ 5:8; 6:25; 7:25.

²⁰ See also 2:16 which is dependent upon the אִם ("if") clauses of vv. 1, 13; 2:12 indicates that hearing-obedience will so preserve one from "men of perverted speech."

pose. Her threats to assume an enemy stance toward the "simple" are obviously intended to persuade them to pay attention to her.²¹ She does not desire the death of anyone, but her appearance does place people in the position of "finding life" (מצא־חיים) or "loving death" can (אהב־מות).²² The only life-securing action possible in her presence is to "listen" to her (2:33).

Fear Yahweh. Twice the instruction is given to "fear" (ירא) Yahweh or God in an imperative form.²³ This is the only response possible in coping with the terrors which may arise from God himself, but it also has other life-securing consequences.

Be not wise in your own eyes;
fear Yahweh, and turn away from evil.
It will be healing to your flesh
and refreshment to your bones.

Proverbs 3:7-8

Otherwise the phenomenon of "fearing Yahweh" appears in the nominal construction "the fear of Yahweh" (יראת יהוה).²⁴ The fear of Yahweh is described as a "fountain of life" (מקור חיים) which enables people to avoid the

²¹ Prov. 1:26-28; see the discussion on "Wisdom and Yahweh as Enemies" in Chapter 3.

²² 8:35-36.

²³ 3:7 reads ירהוה; 24:21 reads אלהים.

²⁴ The expression appears in Proverbs at 1:7, 29; 2:5; 8:13; 9:10; 10:27; 14:26, 27; 15:16, 33; 16:6; 19:23; 22:4; 23:17.

"snares if death" (מוקשי מות).²⁵ By it, "evil" (רע)

is avoided (16:6).

The fear of Yahweh leads to life;
and he who has it rests satisfied;
he will not be visited by harm (רע)

Proverbs 19:23²⁶

The prayer of Agur (30:7-9) should also be recalled in connection with people's standing before Yahweh. The burden of the prayer is the possibility that Agur might become one of Yahweh's enemies by stealing and profaning his God's name or by self-assured smugness and denying Yahweh (v. 9). Prayer is the only defense against this enmity toward God which may emerge from within Agur himself.

Love for the Enemy

Explicit instructions to love the enemy do not appear in Proverbs (nor elsewhere in the Old Testament). Proverbs 25:21-22, however, does commend behavior toward the enemy which is best characterized as love.

If your enemy is hungry, give him bread to eat;
and if he is thirsty, give him water to
drink;
for you will heap coals of fire on his head,
and Yahweh will reward (שלם, pi.) you.

This admonition to come to the aid of one's enemy has received a great deal of attention from commentators,

²⁵ 14:27; cf. 13:14 where the תורת חכם ("teaching of the wise") is a "fountain of life."

²⁶ Cf. 10:27.

undoubtedly because Paul cites it in Romans 12:21.²⁷ Verse 22a, with its image of "heaping coals of fire on his head," has been interpreted in various ways. Among the church fathers, Origen and Chrysostom interpret the line to mean that doing good to one's enemy makes him liable to greater punishment. Augustine and Jerome, however, interpret the "coals of fire" to mean "burning pangs of shame" which lead to repentance and reconciliation.²⁸ The first understanding seems to be accepted by Scott who takes the "coals of fire" to be "a form of torture."²⁹ Doing good to the enemy is ultimately a more effective way of taking revenge.

The second interpretation is represented by McKane who comments,

Kindness shown to an enemy, because it is undeserved, awakens feelings of remorse. When the enemy has steeled himself to meet hate with hate and is impervious to threats of revenge, he is vulnerable to a generosity which overlooks and forgives, and capitulates to kindness. . . The pain of contrition purifies and recreates;

²⁷ Paul's citation omits the words "bread" and "water" from v. 21 and "the Lord will reward you," from v. 22. In his omission of "bread" and "water" his reading is identical to that of Vaticanus, as is his reading $\psi\omega\mu\iota\zeta\epsilon$ in place of $\tau\rho\epsilon\phi\epsilon$. His omission of v. 22b may indicate a rejection of doing good for some reward. On the New Testament meaning of this verse see W. Klasg, "Coals of Fire: Sign of Repentance or Revenge?" NTS 9 (1963), 337-350.

²⁸ The patristic interpretations are mentioned by M. Dahood, "Two Pauline Quotations from the Old Testament," CBQ 17 (1955), 19.

²⁹ Scott, p. 156.

it is the birth pangs of a new brotherhood.
Hence this is how to deal with an enemy and
to punish him in the most constructive way.
He is to have pain inflicted on him by his
experience of magnanimity and generous
forgiveness of the one from whom he expected
enmity.³⁰

McKane's loquent statement of the latter interpretation is
testimony to its powerful moral and spiritual insight.

Other modern interpreters' efforts to interpret the
"coals of fire" imagery have proceeded via the avenues of
textual emendation, philology and the history of religions.
Bickell suggested omitting the phrase "on his head" and
understanding it to mean, "thou wilt put away the burning
coals of hate."³¹ More recently, a text critical solution
has been put forward by Ramaroson.³²

He argues that since the word גחלים ("coals")
normally appears in connection with the word אש ("fire")
it is puzzling here.³³ Since there were, however, certain

³⁰ McKane, p. 592.

³¹ Cited by Toy, p. 468, and Dahood, "Two Pauline
Quotations from the Old Testament," 20.

³² L. Ramaroson, "'Charbons ardent': 'sur la tete,' ou
'pour le feu'? Proverbs 25:22a -- Rom. 12:20b," *Biblica* 51
(1970), 230-234.

³³ גחלים-אש appears in Ezek 1:13; 10:2; Lev. 16:12;
II Sam. 22:13; Psalm 18:13, 14. Otherwise, אש appears in
the same verse as גחלים in II Sam. 22:9 (=Psalm 18:9);
Isa. 44:19; 47:14; Job 41:13; and Prov. 26:21; it is in the
preceding verse in Ezek. 24:11 and Prov. 6:28; it is absent
from II Sam. 14:7 and Psalms 120:4 and 140:11.

styles of Hebrew script in which י and ך might be confused,³⁴ he suggests reading על־אשׁ ("upon his fire") instead of על־ראשׁ ("upon his head"). The meaning of the verse would then be, "if you heap coals from your own brazier upon his fire,"³⁵ then Yahweh will reward you. Thus, there would be three positive steps recommended: feeding, giving to drink, and helping to rekindle a fire.

He also points to the custom observed in villages of Africa and the near east of helping a neighbor rekindle his fire by taking coals from one's own hearth to the neighbor. Such a custom must be universal where there are no artificial means of starting a fire. In Ramaroson's judgment, Proverbs 25:22a refers to this neighborly consideration.

Mitchell Dahood suggests that this line should be translated, "you will remove coals of fire from his head."³⁶

³⁴ He points to two documents in particular: 4QSamb and Papyrus Nash; see F. Cross, "The Oldest Manuscripts from Qumran," JBL 74 (1955), 147-172; W. Albright, "A Biblical Fragment from the Maccabean Age: The Nash Papyrus," JBL 56 (1937), 145-176. With MT, the critical apparatus of BH³ suggests confusion of י and ך at Gen. 49:28; I Sam. 1:15; 22:8, 13; II Sam. 22:44; 23:21; Isa. 14:21; 24:15; and Psalms 39:2b; 69:27. J. Kennedy, *An Aid to the Textual Amendment of the Old Testament* (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1928), p. 81, offer examples of this confusion at Exod. 15:2; Psalms 72:9; 78:61; and Prov. 13:7.

³⁵ "Si tu apportes toi-meme des braises pour son feu," Ramaroson, p. 234.

³⁶ Dahood, "Two Pauline Quotations from the Old Testament " 22.

He arrives at this translation by taking the preposition **על**, which usually means "upon," to mean "from." The verb **חתה**, here translated "heap," is then translated "remove" as in the expression **לחתות אש מיקוד** ("to remove fire from the hearth") in Isaiah 30:14. Therefore, **תתה-על** means the same thing as **חתה-מן**.³⁷ The "coals of fire" in this case would be a metaphor for contentiousness just as in Proverbs 26:21.

As charcoal to hot embers (**גחלים**) and
wood to fire (**אש**),
so is a quarrelsome man for kindling
strife.

Siegfried Morenz³⁸ has offered a solution to this image from the perspective of the history of religions. He refers to an Egyptian ritual in which a person who had been an enemy approached the one toward whom he had been hostile carrying a tray of coals upon his head. The coals of fire on his head signified that repentance from the hatred had taken place and that the enemy sought reconciliation.

It thus quite certain that the Old Testament
saying . . . aims at [the enemy's] change of

³⁷ This is a good example of "emendation" by philology rather than textual criticism. He may, of course, be correct, but he achieves the same effect as a real emendation from **על** to **מן** would achieve. Cf. J. Barr, *Comparative Philology and the Text of the Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), pp. 28-29.

³⁸ S. Morenz, "Feurige auf dem Haupt," *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 78 (1953), col. 187-192.

mind which one obtains through good deeds in relation to him.³⁹

The difficulty with this suggestion is the fact that Proverbs 25:21-22 is Israelite rather than Egyptian. Could this Egyptian custom explain an Israelite image? Morenz points to the following verse where "the north wind brings rain" as a sign that this series of sayings does indeed reflect some Egyptian background.⁴⁰ In Palestine the north wind does not bring rain while in Egypt it does. Furthermore, rain is not an apt parallel to "angry looks" in a Palestinian context where rain is a supreme good. It receives, however, a "negative rather than a positive evaluation in Egypt, where the source of fertility is the inundation of the Nile, and so is an apposite metaphor for slander."⁴¹

Of the interpretations which have been offered, Morenz' suggestion seems best. It accounts for the image well. No need exists to emend the text or the lexica in order to explain the passage. It allows the line to accord well with the ethical perspective of verse 21, and it relieves Yahweh

³⁹ "Es ist ganz gewiss so dass der altestamentliche Spruch . . . auf [des Feindes] Sinnesanderung abzielt, die man durch Wohltaten ihm gegenüber . . . erreicht." Morenz, col. 191.

⁴⁰ Morenz, col. 191.

⁴¹ McKane, p. 583.

from the dubious role of approving an "enlightened" method of vengeance.⁴² Furthermore, if Bryce's arguments that Proverbs 25:2-27 is a wisdom "book" which may be called a "loyalist text" having an "aristocratic" background are correct,⁴³ then a sociological explanation for this Egyptian background is provided. Such circles would be easily susceptible to Egyptian influences. Some of the "men of Hezekiah" credited with transcribing this collection (25:1) may have actually been in diplomatic contact with envoys of the Ethiopian Pharaoh Piankhi.⁴⁴

A response to the enemy which involves meeting his needs (food and drink) and aims toward repentance⁴⁵ must be characterized as love. The result of this kind of treatment of one's enemy is that Yahweh will "complete" (שלם pi.)

⁴² Morenz' arguments are also accepted by H. Wolff, *Anthropology of the Old Testament*, trans. by M. Kohl (rev. ed., Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974), p. 190; G. von Rad, *Wisdom in Israel* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1972), p. 133, n. 25; and Ringgren, p. 103.

⁴³ Bryce, *The Legacy of Wisdom*, pp. 148, 150.

⁴⁴ J. Bright, *A History of Israel* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1959), pp. 263-5; M. Noth, *The History of Israel*, trans. by S. Godman (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958), p. 264; on the "men of Hezekiah" see R. Scott, "Solomon and the Beginnings of Wisdom in Israel," VTS 3 (1955), 272-279.

⁴⁵ Morenz, col. 192, speaks of μετανοια.

the deed for him. Elsewhere, the observation is made that

When a man's ways please Yahweh,
he makes even his enemies to be
at peace (שלם) with him.

Proverbs 16:7

Ultimately, Yahweh makes peace for a man with his enemies.⁴⁶

This constitutes the completion of considerate and helpful,
loving, treatment of enemies

Although Proverbs 25:21-22 does not say to "love" the enemy it is surely an example of a concrete form which love for the enemy could take. In other places Proverbs speaks of love (אהבה) as the kind of behavior which would issue in reconciliation and peace. It "covers (כסה) all offenses (פשעים)" while "hatred" (שנאה), a disposition of enemies, "stirs up strife" (10:12).

He who forgives an offense (מכסה--פשע)
seeks love,
but he who repeat a matter alienates
a friend (אלוף)

Proverbs 17:9

Within the home (and enemies may also be present there) love is the ruling attitude. Childrearing requires the attitude of love if the children are to receive proper "discipline" (מוסר).⁴⁷ Such loving parental discipline

⁴⁶ The subject of שלם is admittedly ambiguous; it could be either Yahweh (so Toy, p. 322) or איש (so McKane, p. 491; Gemser, p. 54; Ringgren, p. 68). The interpretation above agrees with Toy.

⁴⁷ 13:24.

is an appropriate analogy for Yahweh's discipline (3:11-12).

Anything less is a sign of "hatred" (שנאה).⁴⁸ Love

ought not be hidden (27:5). It far outweighs any practical concerns such as a well-supplied table.

Better is a dinner of herbs where love is
than a fatted ox and hatred with it.

Proverbs 15:17

Motives for Wise Responses to the Enemy

The motives which undergird the responses to the enemy are quite numerous. Sometimes they seem to be capable of almost infinite variety. Rather than trying to examine each of the multitude of possible reasons, however, it is perhaps more productive to direct attention to a more limited number which appear to be most important.

Self-destruction. A prime motive for rejecting all patterns of conduct which are characteristic of enemies is that they are self-destructive.

The wicked is overthrown through his evil-doing,
but the righteous finds refuge through
his integrity.

Proverbs 14:32(RSV)⁴⁹

In view of the conviction that these folk and their behavior are self-destructive, it is scarcely surprising that wise

⁴⁸ Failure to discipline is said to be "hating" (שנא) in 13:24.

⁴⁹ Cf. 6:32; 11:3, 5, 6, 27; 12:13, 26; 15:27; 18:7; 21:6,

responses to them include rejection and avoidance. The goal of wisdom is nothing short of life.⁵⁰

This perception of the self-destructive nature of the enemy occasionally appears in motive clauses of the instructions. Thus in the opening instruction, the young person is counseled,

My son, if sinners entice you,
do not consent (אֲבֹהֶה).

Proverbs 1:10

After an extended quotation of the invitation these "sinners" (חֲטָאִים) offer (vv. 11-14), the teacher gives the young man reasons for rejecting it. Their way is plainly immoral since they are in a hurry to do "evil" (רָע) and to "shed blood" (שָׁפַךְ־דָּם, v. 16).

Ultimately, however,

these men lie in wait for their own blood,
they set an ambush for their own lives.
Such are the ways of all who get gain
by violence;
it takes away the life of its possessors

Proverbs 1:18-19⁵¹

⁵⁰ R. Murphy, "The Kerygma of the Book of Proverbs," *Interpretation* 20 (1966), 3-14.

⁵¹ The proverb in v. 17, "For in vain is a net spread in the sight of any bird," is rather obscure. Does it mean that if a bird is watching the net will be ineffective? If so, it is equally foolish to follow people like these "sinners." Or, should Winton Thomas' translation, "For it is to no effect that the net is strewn (with seed for bait) in the sight of any winged fowl," (cf. "Textual and Philological Notes on Some Passages in the Book of Proverbs," VTS 3 01955], 281-282)? "The bird has been given every reason to exercise prudence and caution; . . . but it is so

This elf-destruction motif also appears on the lips of Wisdom. She urges the "simple" (פְּתִילִים) to hearken to her (1:23) and in Proverbs 1:24-28 pronounces judgment on them together with the "fools" (כְּסִילִים) and "scoffers" (לְצִיִּים). When struck by "panic" (פַּחַד), "calamity" (צָרָה וְצוּקָה) "distress and anguish" her indifference to their cries allows them to fall prey to their own deeds and dispositions.

Therefore, they shall eat of the fruit of
their way
and be sated with their own devices.
For the simple are killed by their turning away,
the complacency of fools destroys them.
Proverbs 1:31-32

Fate fixing actor. Closely related to the perception of the enemies as self-destructive is the fundamental conviction expressed in Proverbs that people are capable of acting in such a way as to fix their own fate. Life itself is such that a person's deed creates a "sphere" of well-being or ill, corresponding to the character of the deed, which surrounds the person. This "sphere" is a tangible reality which belongs to one almost like a personality.⁵²

much the slave of its appetite that it follows a compulsive desire to eat the grain. So it is with the highwaymen who cannot control their appetite for wealth" (McKane, p. 271). The latter option seems better.

⁵² K. Koch, "Gibt es eine Vergeltungsdogma im Alten Testament?" *Zeitschrift für Theologie Kirche* 52 (1955), 1-42. K. Koch, ed. *Um Das Prinzip der Vergeltung in*

Often the *m^eshalim* describe this phenomenon without any reference to Yahweh's activity. The impression of an immanent order easily emerges.

He who digs a pit will fall into it,
and a stone will come back upon him who
starts it rolling.

Proverbs 26:27

The eye that mocks a father
and scorns to obey a mother
will be picked out by ravens of the valley
and eaten by the vultures.

Proverbs 30:17⁵³

At other times the expressions of this conviction seem to hint that there is more involved in this than meets the eye. Something or someone seems to stand behind this "immanent order." These hints are particularly striking when passive or intransitive verbs are used.

If the righteous is requited (שלם, pu.)
on earth,
how much more the wicked and the sinner!

Proverbs 11:31

Religion and Recht des Alten Testaments (Darmstedt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1972), contains Koch's original article with critical response to it. Cf. also F. Horst, "Vergeltung im AT," RGG³, B. VI, col. 1343-1346; J. Gammie, "The Theology of Retribution in the Book of Deuteronomy," CBQ 32 (1970), 1-12; G. von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, Vol. I, trans. by D. Stalker (New York—Harper and Row, 1962), 264ff., 269ff., 384ff., 412, 427-428, 436, 458; and *Wisdom in Israel*, pp. 124-137; and W. Towner, "Retribution," 1DB Supp., ed., by K. Crim (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1976), pp. 742-744.

⁵³ Cf. 6:12-15; 10:7, 16, 24-25, 27, 28; 11:7-8, 19, 28; 12:5-7, 12, 19; 13:9, 21, 25; 15:6; 17:13, 20; 18:3; 20:17, 20; 21:12, 28; 24:19-20; 28:14.

The house of the wicked will be
 destroyed (נִשְׁמַד, ni.),
 but the tent of the upright will flourish.
 Proverbs 14:11⁵⁴

"The house of the wicked will be destroyed" by whom?

Certainly, the niph'al verb could be construed reflex-
 ively,⁵⁵ but the "looseness of thought at an early period
 of the language"⁵⁶ requires a certain amount of hesitation
 before deciding whether the agent is to be identified with
 the subject (reflexive) or someone else (passive). With the
 pu'al verb, however, no refuge from the question concerning
 the agent can be sought. By whom are the righteous, and
 even more the wicked and sinners, "completed" on earth?

Yahweh as "midwife."⁵⁷ The agent behind this process
 of completion is, of course, Yahweh. He brings to comple-
 tion (שָׁלַם, pi.) what people initiate. Yahweh cooperates
 with human actions by allowing deeds to work their way out
 in personal life, or by expediting the process.

The eyes of Yahweh keep watch over knowledge,
 but he overthrows (שָׁלַם, pi.) the words
 of the faithless.

Proverbs 22:12

⁵⁴ Cf intransitive qal verbs in 12:21 and 19:9; niph'al
 verbs in 9:5, 9 and 24:15-16; 11:23 has no verb, but the
 question arises, "Whose wrath (171:13) is in view?"

⁵⁵ G-K 51 c-e.

⁵⁶ G-K 51f.

⁵⁷ Th.s formulation of Yahweh as "midwife" comes from
 Gammie, 1.

He who is kind to the poor lends to Yahweh,
and he will complete (שלם, pi.) his
deed for him.

Proverbs 19:17

If your enemy is hungry, give him bread
to eat;
and if he is thirsty, give him water
to drink;
for you will heap coals of fire upon his head,
and Yahweh will complete (שלם, Pi.)
for you.

Proverbs 25:21-22⁵⁸

Three caveats are in order regarding these expressions of Yahweh's "midwifery" as well as the "immanent order" which he preserves. The first is terminological:

. . . it would be misleading if one thought one had to understand these and other sentences theologically, as if they were stating a 'doctrine of retribution'. These sentences are not concerned with a divine, juridical act which subsequently deals out to men blessing or punishment.⁵⁹

⁵⁸ Cf. 10:3, 29; 12:2; 15:25, 29; 22:22-23; 24:17-18.

⁵⁹ von Rad, *Wisdom in Israel*, p. 129; later (p. 133, n. 25) he remarks concerning-73722, "The translation given here ('Yahweh will complete it for you') sounds unusual. But the Hebrew verb should not be translated 'requite', as if Yahweh--from his pocket, as it were--added something to the human action. The verb *sillem* is to be understood here on the basis of the correspondence— between an act and its consequence and, means 'make complete', 'finish', in the sense that it is Yahweh, in the case of the good deed, for example, who completes the act-consequence relationship. Elsewhere this is described as if it were the functioning of a neutral order. . . There is nothing surprising in the fact that the act-consequence relationship is conceived sometimes as the operating of a rule, at other times as an occurrence directly caused by Yahweh."

It is better designated as the “act-consequence relationship” (“*Tun-Ergehen Zusammenhang*”).⁶⁰

A second caveat to be noted is the fact that the sentences which express this notion (with or without Yahweh's agency) are an attempt to predict the future, not to evaluate the past. These observations move from deed to fate, not from present condition back to some (hypothetical) prior deed. That is, the *m^eshalim* do not draw theoretical conclusions about a person's past behavior or character on the basis of their present condition. Instead, they promise and warn that present conduct and disposition is the seed of the future. This openness toward the future implies the possibility of change and repentance.

The third caveat is closely related to the second. This talk of an “act-consequence relationship” cannot be forced into a rigid mechanism. Kovacs has correctly seen that

The “order” does not lie in some automatic or mechanical relationship of act and consequence. The world, is not rigid and inflexible. Such an order undermines the meaning of ethical choice: the appearance of choice is a sham. Ultimately, the effect is to deprive Yahweh of any freedom,

⁶⁰ So von Rad in the quote above in n. 59 and elsewhere. Cf. Koch “Gibt es eine Vergeltungsdogma im Alten Testament,” 34.

which seems a curious doctrine to impute to either this literature or these people.⁶¹

Nevertheless, the world is consistent. Yahweh is purposeful. Certainly, his actions and their meaning are often mysterious, but he is still trustworthy. The pattern or consistency of the world, though not immutable, is ultimately dependable. Again, Kovacs remarks,

The overall pattern and sense of the world, the purposes of Yahweh, do not produce a rigid structure to the world that closes or confines courses of action to the extent that inexorable processes are at work. The world is not governed by fate or necessity. . . . The pattern does not produce an immutable sequence of events in which the individual or even Yahweh is impotent or must function mechanically. The options we face are real. The pattern exists at the second-order. We might say that it is the pattern of the pattern of events that is fixed.⁶²

Yahweh secures life. The final motive for wise responses to the enemy is the fact that Yahweh secures life. Rejection of enemy patterns of life and acceptance of wise and righteous conduct offer people the best chance available for security.

⁶¹ B. Kovacs, *Sociological-Structural Constraints upon Wisdom: The Spatial and Temporal Matrix of Proverbs 15:76-22:16* (Ph.D. Dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1978), p. 490; his table of "adversity sayings" (15:33[?]; 16:8, 19; 17:1, 17; 18:1[?]; 19:1; 21:9, 19) p. 559, demonstrates that the wise know that wisdom and righteousness do not always bring forth good, nor does folly and wickedness inevitably lead to disaster. They were not doctrinaire.

⁶² Kovacs, p. 493.

The teaching of the wise is a fountain of life,
 that one may avoid the snares of death.
 Proverbs 13:14

The fear of Yahweh is a fountain of life,
 that one may avoid the snares of death.
 Proverbs 14:27⁶²

These two sayings show that the "fear of Yahweh" and the "teaching of the wise" are interchangeable. Both hold open the promise of life. If Yahweh is indeed this kind of God, and the "teaching of the wise" is life-securing, then it is wholly consistent for Proverbs to counsel against taking vengeance. Who needs to engage in such behavior characteristic of (self-destructive) enemies? Rather, one should "wait for Yahweh, and he will help you" (20:22).

This trust in Yahweh also underlies the single explicit instruction to aid the enemy in his need (25:21-22). In addition to the repentance effected in the enemy, Yahweh himself may be counted upon to complete such behavior. This instruction, far from being "marred by the last line,"⁶⁴ expresses an abiding faith in Yahweh's life-securing activity on behalf of those who do good to those who hate them. In spite of the well-known inscrutability--even danger--of Yahweh, Proverbs maintains that he can be trusted.

⁶³ Cf. 11:9; 14:25.

⁶⁴ Oesterley, p. 229.

Job

The literary character of the book of Job makes it very difficult to reach any sure answers concerning "wise responses to the enemy." Certainly, Job claims that he had refused to rejoice over his enemy's misfortune, or even to "ask for his life with a curse" (Job 31:29-30). This response to the enemy is, of course, classic in the wisdom tradition. Indeed,

It is easy to establish that the transgressions which Job denies . . . play a substantial role in the Old Testament only in the Wisdom teaching.⁶⁵

Undoubtedly, the writer of the book intended to recommend the ethic of chapter 31.

Apart from this notice, however, the responses to the enemy must be inferred from the responses of the various characters.⁶⁶ The difficulty with this inferential

⁶⁵ G. Fohrer, "The Righteous Man in Job 31," in *Essays in Old Testament Ethics (J. Philip Hyatt In Memoriam)*---ed. by J. Crenshaw and I. Willis (New York: KTAV, 1974). p. 13.

⁶⁶ Job 27:7 ("let my enemy (אֹיְבִי) be as the wicked, and let him that rises up against me (מִתְקוֹמְמִי) be as the unrighteous") is a wish for the destruction of the enemy. But, to whom does this sentiment belong? MT presents it in a speech of Job, but there is surely some textual confusion in the transmission of the "third cycle" of speeches. If this belongs to Job, then he is somewhat less than truthful in 31:29-30. Cf. R. Gordis, *The Book of Job: Commentary, New Translation, and Special Studies* (New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1978); M. Pope, *Job: Introduction, Translation, and Notes* (3rd ed., Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Co., 1973).

procedure is compounded by uncertainties over how much "weight" should be given to various characters or themes. The question of "giving weight" to various characters or themes is fundamentally dependent upon "artistic" judgments. Dogmatism is ruled out of bounds by the book of Job.

Therefore, the following discussion will be organized around the responses which the characters of the book make to their various enemies. Of course, every character in the book is (allegedly) an enemy to somebody at some point. Attention Its best focused, however, on the responses of the friends, Elihu, Job and God.

The Friends

Job's friends are introduced in the prologue (2:11-13) when they "made an appointment together to come to condole (נָחַם) with him and comfort (נָחַם) him" (2:11). Upon seeing him, their first response was to mourn (2:12). Then they sat with him in silence for seven days and nights, "for they saw that his suffering was very great" (2:13).

In prologue, of course, Job is not yet considered an enemy by the friends. He poses no threat. He is simply

H. Rowley, *Job* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980); N. Tur-Sinai, *The Book of Job: A New Commentary* (Jerusalem: Kiryath Sepher, 1957J; G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob* (Guersloh: Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1963); E. Dhorme, *A Commentary the Book of Job*, trans. by H. Knight (London: Nelson, 196).

a suffering friend they seek to console. As soon as Job raises his curse against the day of his birth (3:1-26), however, he is perceived as a threat. His implicit challenge to God's wisdom and goodness in chapter 3 is rightly considered a threat to the friends' comfortable notions about righteousness and blessing and wickedness and disaster. Therefore, the friends all engage in disputation with Job.⁶⁷

Their disputations all rest upon one fundamental conviction: good comes to good people, and evil comes to evil people. Life simply works that way; God guarantees and enforces it.⁶⁸ This conviction was seen to be fundamental in Proverbs, but Job's friends use it in a new way.

Whereas in Proverbs this conviction is used to predict the future on the basis of present conduct and disposition, Job's friends use Job's present circumstance of suffering to deduce something about his past conduct and disposition. Zophar goes so far as to say, "Know then that God exacts of

⁶⁷ Eliphaz' speeches (chaps. 4-5, 15, 22) are disputation speeches; Bildad's speeches in Job 8 and 18 are disputation while that in 15:1-6 is a mixture of hymnic elements, rhetorical questions, and a wisdom saying. Undoubtedly, it intends to dispute Job; Zophar's speeches (11, 20) are disputations; cf. Murphy, *Wisdom Literature*, pp. 23-36; C. Westermann, *The Structure of the Book of Job: A Form-Critical Analysis*, trans. by G. Muenchow (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981), pp. 18-24.

⁶⁸ Cf. 4:8-11; 5:2-5; 8:3-7, 11-22; 11:20; 15:20-35; 18:521; 20:4-29; 22:10-20, 23-30.

you less than your guilt deserves" (11:6c). Eliphaz' indictment, however, is the clearest example of this reasoning.

Is not your wickedness great?
 For there is no end to your iniquities.
 For you have exacted pledges of your
 brothers for nothing,
 and stripped the naked of their clothing.
 You have given no water to the weary to drink,
 and you have withheld bread from the
 The man with power possessed the land,
 and the favored man dwelt in it.
 You have sent widows away empty,
 and the arms of the fatherless were
 crushed.
 Therefore snares are round about you,
 and sudden terror overwhelms you;
 your light is darkened, so that you cannot see,
 and a flood of waters covers you.
Job 22:5-11

How does Eliphaz know that Job is guilty of these offenses? They are nowhere mentioned. Indeed, if this is the kind of person Job is, then it is curious that the friends came to see him in the first place. Actually, of course, Eliphaz has only a single piece of "evidence" for these crimes. Job's present situation in the midst of suffering, terror and chaos (vv. 10-11) forms the ideological basis justifying the allegations against Job.

Finding his theory of Divine justice contradicted by the facts, Eliphaz proceeds to the time-honored device of adjusting the facts to the theory. Accordingly, he invents a long catalogue of crimes committed by Job.⁶⁹

⁶⁹ Gordis, p. 238.

Even the guilty will escape punishment,
 escaping through the purity of your
 hands.

Job 22:21-30⁷²

Finally, Job's friends fall silent in Job's presence (32:1). All their disputation accomplished nothing in moving Job to repentance. Neither did their "appointment to come together to condole with him and comfort him" (2:11) reach its goal. All they accomplished was to incur the wrath of young Elihu, and to condemn God (32:3).⁷³

Elihu

Elihu is suddenly introduced in Job 32:2.⁷⁴ His speeches comprise chapters 32 through 37. His responses to Job are not essentially different from those of the friends. The narrator notes that "he was angry at Job because he

⁷¹ The final two verses follow the translation of Gordis, p. 242; cf. *idem*, p. 252; Pope, pp. 164, 168-169; and Chapter 2, n. 142 above.

⁷² Other admonitions to repentance include 5:8, 17-27; 8:5-7, 20-22; 11:13-20.

⁷³ See Chapter 3, n. 42 above.

⁷⁴ The Elihu speeches give every indication of being a later addition to the book, either from the same author (so Gordis, pp. 546-553; N. Smith, *The Book of Job: Its Origin and Purpose* [London: SCM Press, 1976], pp. 72-91), or from another hand (so Pope, pp. XXVII-XXVIII; Rowley, pp. 12-13; Westermann, pp. 139-148). Whatever their literary status, of course, they still must be interpreted. Cf. M. Tate, "The Speeches of Elihu," *Review and Expositor* 68 (1971), 487-495.

justified himself rather than God" (32:2). Furthermore,

He was angry also at Job's three friends
because they had found no answer, although
they had declared God to be in the wrong.

Job 32:3

Accordingly, his speeches are all disputational.⁷⁵

Elihu agrees with the conventional understanding of
righteousness and blessing and wickedness and disaster. He
argue,

far be it from God that he should
do wickedness,
and from the Almighty that he should
do wrong.

For according to the work of a man he
will complete (שִׁלֵּם, pi.) for him,
and according to his ways he will make
it befall him.

Of a truth, God will not do wickedly,
and the Almighty will not pervert justice.

Job 34:10b-12

Although his statements are perhaps more subtle in regard to
repentance than those of the friends, his admonitions to
"take heed!" (שָׁמַר, ni., 36:21) and to "hear!"

(הִתְבַּחֵשׁ), "stop!" (עֲמֹד) and "consider!" (הִתְבַּחֵשׁ,

37:1d) point in that direction.

Yet, he does differ with the friends in at least one
respect. He concedes that it is possible for the righteous
to suffer. God may be testing and disciplining them. Thus,

⁷⁵ Murphy, *Wisdom Literature*, p 42.

⁷⁶ Cf. 34:21-30; 36:5-7.

it happens that

Man is also chastened (יָכָה, ho.) with
 pain upon his bed,
 and with continual strife (רִיב) in
 his bones;
 so that his life loathes bread,
 and his appetite dainty food.

Job 33:19-20

The point of this divinely enforced disciplinary suffering is, however, that one repents: he prays to God, is accepted, and then sings a song of thanksgiving (33:26-28). Ultimately, Elihu would have Job believe that God acts this way in order

to bring back his soul from the Pit,
 that he see the light of life.

Job 34:30

Yahweh

Only once does Yahweh accuse Job of being his enemy. As noticed in Chapter 3 above, Yahweh's accusation takes the form of rhetorical questions which intend to claim that Job would "frustrate" (הִפִּיר) God's "right" (מִשְׁפָּט) and "condemn" (הִרְשִׁיעַ) him in order to accomplish his own justification (40:8). Yahweh's response to this hostile action of Job is to rebuke him by pointing to human ignorance and divine wisdom. The outcome of this divine rebuke is Job's penitent confession in chapter 42:2-6. Surely,

Yahweh's intention was to bring precisely this response from the one he had "counted as his adversary."⁷⁷

Yahweh's real enemies, however, are the three friends who perjure themselves in their argument with Job. They had not spoken of God what is "right" (נכונה).⁷⁸ Ultimately, it appears that

Job's courageous and honorable challenge to God is more acceptable to Him than conventional defenses of God's justice that rest upon distortions of reality.⁷⁹

Yahweh's response is to provide a cultic means for their reclamation. They are to offer up for themselves a burnt offering (עולה) of seven bulls and seven rams.

Job will pray (התפלל) for them. Then Yahweh will hear Job's prayer and forgive them (42:7-9). The goal of Yahweh's response to these false witnesses against him is their repentance and reclamation.

Job

Job has two categories of enemies to whom he responds: Yahweh and the friends. His responses to his friends are customarily disputatious and accusing.⁸⁰ Occasionally they

⁷⁷ 19:21; cf. 13:24; 33:10.

⁷⁸ 42:7, 8.

⁷⁹ Gordis, p. 494.

⁸⁰ Cf. 6:14-27; 12:2-6 (7-25); 13:1-17; 16:1-5; 19:2-5; 21:2-3, 27-34.

involve a plea for help and comfort.⁸¹ In the epilogue, of course, Job obediently prays for his friends (42:9, 10) who had maligned him. Then, "Yahweh gave Job twice as much as he had before" (42:10).

Job's responses to Yahweh are more variegated than those to his friends. To begin with, Job responds to the disasters which strike his property and family with praise of Yahweh who "gives" (נתן) and "takes" (לקח); he pronounces a blessing upon the name of Yahweh (1:21). When afflicted with "loathsome sores" he "sat among the ashes" (2:8) which must be a sign of mourning,⁸² as well as his social alienation. Once again, however, Job affirms his faith in God, although this time with a rhetorical question, and without a blessing (2:10).

Job's responses to God within the poetic dialogue are two-fold: he laments, and he accuses. His opening (Job 3) and closing speeches (Job 29-31) are laments.⁸³ Within the

⁸¹ Cf. 6:28-30; 19:21-22.

⁸² So Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob*, pp. 101-102; Tur-Sinai, pp. 25-26 Rowley, p. 8; Pope, p. 21; *contra* Gordis, p. 21.

⁸³ Murphy, *Wisdom Literature*, pp. 38-39, classifies Job 29-31 as a "soliloquy," but Job is not really "talking to himself" here. God is supposed to hear this description of past righteousness, present distress and purificatory oath. Alternatively, chaps. 3 and 29-31 could be described as "curses" as J. Crenshaw, *Old Testament Wisdom: An Introduction* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1981), pp. 105-106, does. Even Crenshaw, however, writes, "Job's powerful lament begins and ends with a curse (p. 105, emphasis his).

dialogue between Job and his friends, lament also plays a vital part. For example, Job complains,

Therefore I will not restrain my mouth;
 I will speak in the anguish of my spirit,
 I will complain in the bitterness of
 my soul.
 Am I the sea, or a sea monster,
 that thou settest a guard over me?
 When I say, "My bed will comfort me,
 my couch will ease my complaint,"
 then thou dost scare me with dreams,
 and terrify me with visions,
 so that I would choose strangling
 and death rather than my bones.
 I loathe my life; I would not live for ever.
 Let me alone, for my days are a breath.
 What is man, that thou dost make so much
 of him,
 and that thou dost set thy mind upon him,
 dost visit him every morning
 and test him every moment?
 How long wilt thou not look away from me,
 nor let me alone till I swallow my spittle?
 If I sin, what do I do to thee, thou watcher
 of men?
 Why hest thou made me thy mark?
 Why have I become a burden to thee?
 Why dost thou not pardon my transgression
 and take away my iniquity?
 For now I shall lie in the, earth;
 thou wilt seek me, but I shall no be.
 Job 7:11-21⁸⁴

Within the context of these laments are to be found Job's accusations against God. In the one cited above, God is accused of treating Job like a sea monster (v. 12), of terrifying him (v. 14), testing him (v. 18), and of making

⁸⁴ See the lament elements in 6:4-20; 7:1-10; 9:17-31; 10:1-22; 13:20-28; 14:1-22; 16:6-22; 17:1-16; 19:7-20; 21:7-21; 23:1-17; 24:1-17, 21-25. Cf. Westermann, pp. 31-66; Murphy, *Wisdom Literature*, pp. 25-36.

him a target for attack (v. 20), among other things.
 Perhaps the most scathing indictment of God is in Job 9:22-24 where he claims,

It is all one; therefore I say,
 he destroys both the blameless and
 the wicked.
 When disaster brings sudden death,
 he mocks at the calamity of the innocent.
 The earth is given into the hands of
 the wicked;
 he covers the faces of its judges--
 if it is not he, who then is it?⁸⁵

Job's final response to Yahweh is repentance. This "repentance" of Job's, however, does not appear to be over any sin(s) in particular. It is not as if he now agrees with the friends (or Elihu) that he was guilty of some offense which brought on all his misery. Nor can this be taken as a repudiation by Job (or the author of the book) of his previous speeches.⁸⁶ Rather this is the only possible response of a man who is "blameless and upright, one who feared God, and turned away from evil" (1:1) when he is confronted by the Living God. Of course, he "despises" (*מֵאֲסָתִי*) and "repents" (*נִחַמְתִּי*, 42:6), but it must be noticed that he does so absolutely; no objects are construed with the verbs. How else can a human behave when face to face with God?

⁸⁵ Other accusations of God are found in 6:4; 9:17-21; 10:3-17; 13:24-27; 16:6-17; 19:6-22; 30:19-23.

⁸⁶ *Contra* Tur-Sinai, pp. 577-578.

Response to Satan?

Does the book of Job offer any guidance on how the wise respond to the Adversary? Certainly nothing is explicit in this regard. The fact that this figure disappears after Job 2:7 may intimate something. Human response to this heavenly Adversary is simply not an option. This is nowhere explicitly stated, of course, but it may be argued that had the writer wished to present a response to him he surely could have done so. His literary skills were quite adequate to the task. By refusing to mention the Adversary after the prologue he may well have intended to intimate that the problem of *homo sapiens* is not the Adversary but God. Otherworldly disputes may indeed be the backdrop to earthly events, but humans are to be concerned with one another, creation and God.

Qoheleth

It was suggested earlier in this study that Qoheleth's real enemies, those which pose a genuine threat to him, are life and God.⁸⁷ Certainly, he mentions other enemy figures,⁸⁸ but only life and God cause any real anxiety.

⁸⁷ See above Chapter 2, pp. 123-124, and Chapter 3, pp. 166-169.

⁸⁸ For example, "king," "prince," "human beings"; see Appendices I and III.

His responses to life include "quietism," hatred and enjoyment. He has only a single response to God: fear.

"Quietism"

The characterization of Qoheleth's response to life as "quietism" may not be entirely felicitous, but it does seem to fit his attitude in some passages. Thus, he once argues, "Better is a handful of quietness (נַחַת) than two hands full of toil and a striving after wind" (4:6). Qoheleth evidently makes this statement in order to counter the opinion in the popular saying immediately preceding:⁸⁹ "The fool (כַּסִּיל) folds his hand, and eats his own flesh" (4:5). The recommendation then is that "rest" (נַחַת) is better than the "toil" (עַמַּל) and "skill" (כְּשָׁרוֹן) proceeding from "envy" (קִנְיָה) which is "vanity and a striving after wind" (4:4).

Qoheleth's responses to civil government are likewise "quietistic" and "non-activist." Faced with oppression (עֲשָׂק) of the poor he advises against being "amazed"

⁸⁹ K. Gordis, *Koheleth--The Man and His World: A Study of Ecclesiastes* (3rd aug. ed., New York: Schocken, 1968), pp. 160, 241; Scott, pp. 224-225; C. Ginsburg, *Cohleth Commonly Called the Book of Ecclesiastes: Translated from the Original Hebrew with a Commentary Historical and Critical* 2 vol. in one (New York: K'AV, 1970, first published in 1861), pp. 324-326, takes v. 5 somewhat differently: "the sluggard foldeth his hands and yet eateth his meat."

(תמה, 5:7). His civil conservatism is especially noticeable in his responses to the king.

Keep (שמר) the king's command, and because of your sacred oath be not dismayed (בהל, ni.); go from his presence, do not delay when the matter is unpleasant, for he does whatever he pleases. For the word of the king is supreme and who may say to him, "What are you doing?" He who obeys a command will meet no harm, and the mind of a wise man will know the time and way.

Qoheleth 8:2-5

One should not curse the king or the rich, because even when done in secret,

a bird of the air will carry your voice,
or some winged creature tell the matter.

Qoheleth 10:20⁹⁰

This attitude is not limited to mundane considerations such as civil government and work. Qoheleth also applies this approach to morality. Righteous men perish in righteousness while the wicked sometimes live to a "ripe old-age" (7:15). Therefore, he advises against the extremes of excessive righteousness and wisdom as well as wickedness and folly (7:16-17). Thus, Qoheleth recommends "a sort of middle way, the path of least resistance."⁹¹

⁹⁰ Cf. 7:21-22 where this attitude extends even to over-hearing other's talk, "lest you hear your servant cursing you."

⁹¹ Crenshaw, *Old Testament Wisdom*, p. 131; cf. Ginsburg, pp. 379-382; Scott, pp. 236-237; Gordis, *Koheleth*, pp. 176-179, 275-278. *Contra* R. Whybray, "Qoheleth the Immoralist? (Qoh. 7:16-17)," in *Israelite Wisdom*, pp. 191-204.

Hatred

Qoheleth "hated" (אָנש) life. He sees with throbbing clarity that life finally issues in a single fate--death--for wise and fool alike.⁹² His response to social oppression is not only "quietism" (5:7). The perception of this social distortion also leads him to consider the dead

more fortunate than the living who are still
alive; but better than both is he who has not
yet been, and has not seen the evil deeds
that are done under the sun.

Qoheleth 4:2-3⁹³

Once, Qoheleth seems to grant the living some advantage over the dead. After reflecting upon the inscrutability of the "work of God," of which even a wise man is ignorant (8:16-17), and the single fate of death which comes to all, regardless of moral or cultic behavior (9:1-3), he says,

. . . But he who is joined with all the living
has hope (אִתְּחִיָּה), for a living dog is
better than a dead lion. For the living know
that they will die, but the dead know nothing,
and they have no more reward; but the memory
of them is lost. Their love and their hate
and their envy have already perished, and they
have no more for ever any share in all that is
done under the sun.

Qoheleth 9:4-6

⁹² 2:12-17; cf. 7:2-4 which values the "house of mourning" and "sorrow" over the "house of feasting/mirth" and "laughter."

⁹³ Cf. 6:1-6 which also rates the stillborn above the living.

"Hope" this may be, but one would scarcely write a "theology of hope" starting from here. Although caution is the watchword with Qoheleth's linguistic usage,⁹⁴ the word translated "hope" (בטחון) in this passage may well be a signal of Qoheleth's true intent. The only other appearance of this word in the Hebrew scriptures is in the Rabshakeh's speech before the walls of Jerusalem (II Kgs. 18:19=Isa. 36:4). He said to Hezekiah's envoys.

Say to Hezekiah, "Thus says the great king,
the king of Assyria: On what do you rest this
confidence (בטחון) of yours?"

Clearly the Rabshakeh used the word to indicate false, illusory "hope" or "confidence." He went on to ridicule Egypt as a source of confidence, and even denied Yahweh as a hope for Judah. He asked, "Is it without Yahweh that I have come up against this place to destroy it?" (II Kgs. 18:25). Perhaps Qoheleth Intends the same kind of "hope" by his use of the word בטחון.

Another linguistic factor may also be significant. The normal Hebrew word for "hope" (תקוה) never appears in Qoheleth. Neither does the verb קוה (pi., "hope, wait") appear, nor any nouns derived from that root. Furthermore, none of the words which appear in synonymous parallelism

⁹⁴ Cf. Gordis, *Koheleth*, pp. 59-62.

with **תקוה**⁹⁵ are to be found in the book with a meaning of "hope" or any related meaning. Although biblical Hebrew has a rich lexicon for "hope" Qoheleth has no need of it. His vision is hope-less.

Quite apart from linguistic considerations, however, the content of this "hope" must be taken into account. This content is that the living know that they shall die. If God were to redeem death through the gift of new life,⁹⁶ then knowledge of death might be hopeful, but Qoheleth denies this possibility.

For the fate of the sons of men and the fate of
beasts is the same; as one dies, so dies the
other. They all have the same breath (**רוח**),
and man has no advantage over the beasts; for
all is vanity. All go to one place; all are
from dust, and all turn to dust again. Who

⁹⁵ **מבטח** ("confidence, security") in Psalm 71:5; **כסלה** ("confidence") in Job 4:6; **תוחלת** ("expectation") in Prov. 10:28; 11:7; **תאוה** ("desire") in Prov. 11:23; **שאלה** ("request") in Job 6:8; and **אחרית** ("end, future") in Prov. 23:18; 24:14 (cf. Jer. 29:11; 31:17) appear in synonymous parallelism with **תקוה**. Only **אחרית**: appears in Qoheleth at 7:8 and 10:13 where it means simply "end," not "hope."

⁹⁶ Late pre-Christian Judaism entertained several different notions of "life after death" including "immortality" (Wis. 15:3), "assumption" (cf. the numerous "assumption" documents of the pseudepigrapha) and "resurrection" (Isa. 26:19; Dan. 12:1-3; II Macc. 7:9, 14, 23). The problem had still not been resolved in the New Testament period as is seen in Matt. 22:23-33 and par., Acts 23:6-10 and I Cor. 15:12-56. Cf. E. Schillebeeckx, *Jesus: An Experiment in Christology*, trans. by H. Hoskins (New York: Seabury Press, 1979), pp. 516-523, especially the bibliography on pp. 516-517.

knows whether the spirit (רוח) of man goes
upward and the spirit (רוח) of the beast
goes down to the earth?

Qoheleth 3:19-21

Qoheleth's question about the destination of the
"spirit of man" and the "spirit of the beast" does not
really grant a refuge from the finality of death. To make
such a distinction is merely rhetorical, for "they all have
the same spirit" (רוח אחד לכל, v. 19). Whatever
the destination of the spirit (and Qoheleth seems to leave
this question open⁹⁷), the effect of death is the annihila-
tion of all consciousness (9:5-6). "The hope that belongs
to the living scarcely provides grounds for exultation."⁹⁸

Enjoyment

Now if death affords rest for the weary,
and the living possess no *real* advantage over
the dead, while in certain circumstances the
stillborn or non-existent enjoys a superior
status, suicide offers a compelling alternative.
. . . The marvel is that, Qoheleth shuns this
easy resolution of his misery in favor of
another powerful answer.⁹⁹

⁹⁷ Cf. however 12:7 where the "spirit (רוח) returns to
God," but even this is "vanity of vanities" (הבלי הבלים,
12:8), for "round and round goes the wind (רוח), and on
its circuits the wind (רוח) returns" (1:6b).

⁹⁸ J. Crenshaw, "The Shadow of Death in Qoheleth," in
Israelite Wisdom, p. 210; cf, his discussion in *Old Testa-
ment Wisdom*, pp. 129-133. The discussion above owes much to
Crenshaw. Gordis, *Koheleth*, pp. 78-79, 305, takes a more
sanguine view of Qoheleth.

⁹⁹ Crenshaw, "The Shadow of Death in Qoheleth," p. 210.

The "powerful answer" to which Crenshaw refers is to enjoy whatever pleasures are afforded in life. Immediately following the "hopeful" passage in Qoheleth 9:4-6, the instructions are given to eat bread "with enjoyment" (בשמחה), to drink wine "with a merry heart" (בלב טוב), to wear white garments continually and "let not oil be lacking on your head" (9:7-8).¹⁰⁰ Elsewhere, Qoheleth similarly counsels enjoyment.

And I commend enjoyment (שמחה), for man has no good thing under the sun but to eat and drink, and enjoy himself (ולשמח), for this will go with him in his toil through the days of life which God gives him under the sun.

Qoheleth 8:15¹⁰¹

Indeed, such enjoyment is a "gift of God" (5:18-19).

¹⁰⁰ Commentators are fond of pointing to the strikingly similar advice of Siduri to Gilgamesh:

Gilgamesh, whither runnest thou?
The Life which thou seekest thou wilt not find;
(For) when the gods created mankind,
They allotted death to mankind,
(But) life they retained in their keeping.
Thou, O Gilgamesh, let thy belly be full,
Day and night be thou merry;
Make every day (a day of) rejoicing.
Day and night do thou dance and play.
Let thy raiment be clean,
Thy head be washed, (and) thyself be bathed
in water.
Cherish the little one holding thy hand,
(And) let the wife rejoice in thy bosom.
This is the lot of [mankind . . .].

A. Heidel, *The Gilgamesh Epic and Old Testament Parallels* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1949), P. 70.

¹⁰¹ Cf. 3:12, 22; 11:8-9.

This "enjoyment" which Qoheleth counsels, however, is not to be construed as "delight" or "glee." Rather, this "enjoyment" is tempered by the "vanity" of existence. The counsel to enjoyment in Qoheleth 9:7-8 is preceded by polemic against an overly hopeful view of life and followed by the observation that "time and chance" happen to everyone, "so the sons of man are snared at an evil time" (9:11-12). Indeed, all of Qoheleth's admonitions to rejoice are tempered by some somber note in the context.¹⁰² This joy of Qoheleth's is tempered by his testing of enjoyment which he found to be vanity.¹⁰³

Qoheleth 9:9-10 gives another hint that the counsel to enjoyment is not quite as delightful as it first appears.

Enjoy (אָנאַ) life with the wife whom you love, all the days of your vain life which he has given you under the sun, because that is your portion in life and in your toil at which you toil under the sun. Whatever your hand finds to

¹⁰² In 3:12 joy is tempered by the inability to "find out what God has done" (v. 11); 3:22 concludes a passage on the one fate of beasts and humans (vv. 18-22); 5:18-20 calls this enjoyment a "gift of god," but is followed by 6:1-6 which speaks of "a man to whom God gives wealth, possessions, and honor, so that he lacks nothing of all that he desires, yet God does not give him power to enjoy (אָנאַ) them, but a stranger enjoys (אָנאַ) them; this is vanity; it is a sore affliction" (v. 2); 11:8 reminds of the many "days of darkness" while 11:9 warns that God will bring a young man into judgment for "all these things" which must include Qoheleth's counsel.

¹⁰³ 2:1-2; cf. 2:10-11, 24-26; 7:4.

do, do it with your might; for there is no work
or thought or knowledge or wisdom in Sheol, to
which you are going.

Of course, the closing reminder of Sheol explicitly tempers
this admonition to enjoyment, but the hint is earlier when
Qoheleth counsels, **רֵאָה אֶת־חַיִּים**.

Is this really to be translated "Enjoy life"? The
Greek translates literally **ἰδε ζωῆν** ("see life"), but
nearly all other translations read it **רֵאָה** ("see") as
"enjoy."¹⁰⁴ Commentators also translate "enjoy."¹⁰⁵
explanations given for this curious translation of the verb
רֵאָה are to point to Qoheleth 2:1 which reads, "Come now,
I will make a test of pleasure (**שְׂמֵחָה**); enjoy yourself
(**וּרְאָה בְּטוֹב**)."¹⁰⁶ Or, Qoheleth 3:13 (**וּרְאָה טוֹב**) and
8:16 (**שְׂנֵה רֵאָה**) together with Koehler-Baumgartner
Lexicon are cited.¹⁰⁷ The difficulty is that the word

¹⁰⁴ So KJV, NEB, NASB, NIV, TEV, JPSA, RSV; JB translates, "Spend life . . ."

¹⁰⁵ Ginsburg, p. 416; Scott, p. 245; W. Zimmerli, *Prediger: Übersetzt und Erklärt* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1962), p. 244; A. Lauha, *Kohelet* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1978), p. 163; H. Hertzberg, *Der Prediger* (Gutersloh: Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1963), p. 169. Perhaps most interesting is Gordis, *Koheleth*, p. 188, who also reads "enjoy" as he had in his book *The Wisdom of Ecclesiastes* (New York: Behrman House, 1945), p. 71. The dedication of the latter, however, reads: "To Fannie, **רֵאָה אֶת־חַיִּים עִם אִשָּׁה אֲשֶׁר אַהֲבָה**
Behold life with the woman you love, Ecclesiastes IX, 9."

¹⁰⁶ Hertzberg, p. 172; Ginsburg, p. 416.

¹⁰⁷ Lauha, p. 169. KBL, p. 862, does indeed give a meaning "*mit Freude Betrachten*, enjoy to see," but it cites

("good") is absent from Qoheleth 9:9. The verb **ראה** ("see") stands alone, without any modifiers at all. Perhaps translators and commentators have been influenced by the parallel from Gilgamesh,¹⁰⁸ but that will not explain the King James translators. More likely, this tradition (**ראה**="enjoy") stems from Jerome who translates, "*Perfruere vita cum uxore.*"¹⁰⁹

Have translators been led astray by Jerome's translation of Qoheleth 9:9? If so, the "somber undertones"¹¹⁰ in this counsel begin to sound even before "all the days of your vain life" (9:9) is heard. Perhaps the counsel is merely, "Watch life with a woman whom you love." The admonition to enjoyment (9:7-8) then breaks off to become

I Sam. 6:19 and Qoh. 2:1. The I Sam. 6:9 citation is dubious. BDB, p. 908, suggests "*gaze at*" with joy or pleasure, and cites II Kgs. 10:16; Mic. 7:9; Jer. 29:32; Isa. 52:8; Job 20:17; 33:28; Psalms 43:9; 106:5; 128:5; Cant. 3:11; 6:11a; Qoh. 2:1. Only Jer. 29:32 appears to be an apt parallel; it reads, "... he shall not have any one living among this people, and he shall not see the good (**לא יראה בטוב**) i.e., "enjoy") that I will do to my people . . ." Neither KBL nor BDB offers Qoh. 9:9 as an instance of this meaning of **ראה**).

¹⁰⁸ Cf. n. 100 above.

¹⁰⁹ 2:1 reads "fruere bonis" for **ראה בטוב** 5:17 reads "*fruatur laetitia suo*" for **לראות טובה** (**בכל עמלו**); 6:6 reads—"et non fuerit perfruitus bonis" for **וטובה לא ראה**. Otherwise in Qoheleth, the verb **ראה** is always translated by expressions relating to sight, cognition and contemplation.

¹¹⁰ Crenshaw, *Old Testament Wisdom*, p. 142.

rather an exhortation to be "the spectator, only observing, registering and submitting."¹¹¹ Such a spectator role, however, will not square with verse 10a which counsels involvement: "Whatever your hand finds to do, do it with your might."

Therefore, it seems better to accept the tradition which translates **רָאָה** by "enjoy," but a modification is needed. If this verb, without any modifiers, can be translated "enjoy" in Qoheleth 9:9, then why not elsewhere in Qoheleth? It would provide an appropriate rendering in several places, especially where the form of the verb is *qal* imperative second masculine singular. For example:

Is there a thing of which it is said,
 "Enjoy, this is new"?
 It has been already,
 in the ages before us.
Qoheleth 1:10

Enjoy the work of God;
 who can make straight what he has
 made crooked?
 In the day of prosperity, be good (**הֵיחַדֵּשׁ**), and in the day of adversity enjoy;
 God has made the one as well as the other, so
 that man may not find out anything that will
 be after him.

Qoheleth 7:13-14

Enjoy this I have found, says Qoheleth, . . .
 One man among a thousand I found, but a woman
 among all these I have not found. Enjoy this
 I have found, that God made man upright, but
 they have sought out many devices.
Qoheleth 7:27-29

¹¹¹ von Rad, *Wisdom in Israel*, p. 142.

The translations offered above are not perhaps shining examples of the art; they are simply taken from the RSV with the minor change from "see, behold, consider" to "enjoy" introduced.¹¹² The "woodenness" of such a substitution, however, reveals a peculiar dimension to Qoheleth's commands to "see-enjoy." They seem to approach the meaning "be amused at or with something." This "amusement" is also fitting when Qoheleth speaks of what he has "seen," what has "amused" him. For example:

Better is a poor and wise youth than an old and foolish king, who will no longer take advice, even though he had gone from prison to the throne or in his own kingdom been born poor. I was amused at all the living who move about under the sun, as well as that youth who was to stand in his place; there was no end of all the people; he was over all of them. Yet those who come later will not rejoice in him. Surely this also is vanity and a striving after wind.

Qoheleth 4:13-16

I have also been amused at this example of wisdom under the sun, and it seemed great to me. There was a little city with few men in it; and a great king came against it and beseiged it, building great siegeworks against it. But there was found in it a poor wise man and he by his wisdom delivered the city. Yet no one remembered that poor man. But I say that wisdom is better than might, though the poor man's wisdom is despised, and his words are not heeded.

Qoheleth 9:13-16

¹¹² The only other changes are in 7:15 where RSV translates **היה בטוב** by "be joyful," and in 7:29 where the clause **זה מצאתי ראה** is handled differently and "Qoheleth" is read rather than "the Preacher."

There is an evil which I have been amused
at under the sun, as it were an error proceeding
from the ruler: folly is set in many high
places, and the rich sit in a low place. I have
been amused at slaves on horses, and princes
walking on foot like slaves.

Qoheleth 10:5-7¹¹³

However these and other passages¹¹⁴ are translated, the conclusion is easily drawn that Qoheleth's "seeing" (ראה) is more than simple observance. A grin is lurking in his eyes. Without the word טוב ("good") in the same syntactic unit, a meaning of "enjoy" is probably more than ראה will bear. Yet, Qoheleth's "seeing" does seem to connote a kind of savoring of life's ironies. It is evidently this savoring of life's ironies, this amusement in the face of life, this refusal to take himself too seriously, that preserves Qoheleth from choosing suicide. Although it may be a sign of how distant Qoheleth is from the twentieth century, perhaps it is necessary to draw out the meaning of the citation in Qoheleth 9:4 by amplifying it:

An amused living dog is better
than a dead lion.

¹¹³ Other occurrences of the qal pf. 1st common singular form of ראה which might be translated "be amused at" are 1:14; 2:13, 24; 3:10, 16, 22; 4:4, 5:12, 17; 6:1; 7:15; 8:9, 10, 17.

¹¹⁴ ראה also appears at 1:8, 16; 2:3, 12; 3:13, 18, 22; 4:1, 3, 7; 5:7, 17; 6:5, 6; 7:11; 8:16 (2x); 9:11; 11:4, 7; 12:3. The noun מראה at 6:9 and 11:9 could bear the meaning "amusement."

Fear

Qoheleth's vision of life is exceedingly pessimistic. Strangely, it is precisely this pessimistic attitude toward life which motivates his counsel of enjoyment and amusement in the face of such an existence. God stands behind all of the attacks which issue from life. Qoheleth's response to God is quite simply fear (יִרָא), for he knows better than to "dispute with one stronger than himself" (6:10).

The sources of Qoheleth's fear of God are stated clearly in two places. One is the knowledge that "the righteous and the wise and their deeds are in the hand of God; whether it is love or hate man does not know" (9:1). Human ignorance of God's intention surely explains one factor in this fearful response before God.

Human ignorance, however, is not its ultimate source. After his magnificent poem on the "times" for all of human existence, from birth to death and war to peace (3:1-9). Qoheleth reflects on the nature of existence and its implications.

I have seen the business that God has given to the sons of men to be busy with. He has made everything beautiful into in its time; also he has put eternity¹¹⁵ into man's mind, yet so that he cannot

¹¹⁵ The word translated "eternity" is **העלם**.

J. Crenshaw, "The Eternal Gospel (Eccl. 3:11)," in *Essays in Old Testament Ethics*, p. 40, comments that "four basic solutions to the meaning of this word have inevitably suggested themselves: (1) eternity, (2) world, (3) course of

find out what God has done from the beginning to the end. I know that there is nothing better for them than to be happy and enjoy themselves as long as they live; also that it is God's gift to man that every one should eat and drink and take pleasure in all his toil. I know that whatever God does endures for ever; nothing can be added to it, nor anything taken from it; God has made it so, in order that men should fear before him. That which is, already has been; and God seeks what has been driven away.

Qoheleth 3:10-15

The reason Qoheleth fears God is because God has structured creation in such a way as to bring about this fearful response. This "fear of God" is far removed from that of earlier wisdom literature. Generally the expressions "fear of Yahweh" (יראת יהוה) and "fear of God" (יראת) mean something like "religion," "piety," or "commitment."¹¹⁶ "Only for Koheleth, who has been drained of life's possibilities, does the primitive attitude

the world, and (4) knowledge or ignorance." Perhaps it is an attempt to speak of human "self-transcendence." Given the fact that biblical Hebrew was not used to articulate philosophical problems, Qoheleth's linguistic tradition may have hampered him, for he seems clearly to be aiming to discuss such issues. Later writers, of course, were able to use Hebrew as a vehicle for philosophical discussion (e.g. Maimonides). On the possible relation of this עולם to צלם of Gen. 1:26 see Zimmerli, p. 172. Crenshaw, p. 42, writes, "Whatever the meaning of *ha'olam* may be, the context emphasizes man's inability to discover." With regard to העולם, this writer must take his stand in solidarity with אדם.

¹¹⁶ Cf. von Rad, *Wisdom in Israel*, p. 66; J. Becker, *Gottesfurcht Im Alten Testament* (Rom: Papstliches Bibelinstitut, 1965), pp. 210-248.

reassert itself."¹¹⁷ With him the expression is filled with numinous dread.¹¹⁸

This fear before God also comes to expression in Qoheleth's extreme caution in cultic activities. "God is in heaven and you are upon earth; therefore let your words be few" (5:1). Especially is this true when it comes to vows. If a "mistake" (שגגה) be made, God might well be "angry" (קצף) and "destroy (חבל) the work of your hands" (5:5).¹¹⁹

Twice Qoheleth seems to indicate that fearing God is a positive virtue (much in the old style) rather than a numinous fear with little ethical content. Once he concludes that one who fears God "shall come forth from them all" (7:18b). This has been taken as a pious gloss,¹²⁰

¹¹⁷ Gordis, *Koheleth*, p. 233.

¹¹⁸ So J. Fichtner, *Die Altorientalische Weisheit in ihrer Israelitisch-Judischen Ausprägung: Eine Studie zur Nationalisierung der Weisheit in Israel* (Giessen: Verlag von Alfred Topelmann, 1933), p. 53, n. 7; Crenshaw, "The Eternal Gospel," p. 25; Becker, p. 250, writes, "*Fenner ist dem Begriff der Gottesfurcht im Prediger mehr als in der übrigen Weisheitsliteratur ein Zug numinoser Furcht beigegeben in Form eines starken Abhängigkeitsbewusstseins des Menschen.*"

¹¹⁹ Evidently, Qoheleth does not place much stock in the sacrificial rites which were specifically ordained in the event of an unintentional error (בשגגה); cf. Lev. 4:1-35; 5:14-19.

¹²⁰ G. Barton, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Ecclesiastes* (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1908), p. 114.

referring to the security which conventional wisdom found in the fear of Yahweh.¹²¹ Yet this is the concluding statement in the recommendation to avoid both excessive vice and virtue which makes nonsense of the conventional wisdom theme of the fear of God. Qoheleth still means a numinous fear in this passage. Indeed,

The deepest ground for the rejection of the extremes recommended here is the instinctive feeling, those ways may be merely human and thereby anti-God--**υβρις**! Whoever fears God will avoid both extremes and thereby their menacing consequences. . . .¹²²

The other passage where Qoheleth seems to speak of the fear of God in the conventional way is in chapter 8:12-13. He indicates a recognition of the doctrine that "it will be well with those who fear God" (v. 12) while the wicked will not be blessed with longevity "because he does not fear before God" (v. 13).

This conventional knowledge, however, is set in the midst of passages which deny this very thing. Qoheleth 8:10-11 records his (amused?) observation of the wicked being buried with pomp and eulogy. Their wickedness does

¹²¹ Prov. 3:7; 14:27; Job 4:6.

¹²² "Der tiefste Grund für die hier empfohlene Ablehnung der Extremes ist das instinktive Gefühl, jene Wege seien nur-menschliche und damit anti-göttlich—**υβρις**! Wer Gott fürchtet, wird beiden Extremen, und damit auch ihren. . . andrönten Folgen, entgehen." Hertzberg, pp. 137:755.

not catch, up with them soon enough for the conventional doctrine to be credible. Following verses 12-13, he remarks on the fact that

there are righteous men to whom it happens
according to the deeds of the wicked, and
there are wicked men to whom it happens
according to the deeds of the righteous.

Qoheleth 8:14

Therefore "enjoyment" (שמחה) is recommended (8:15).

Qoheleth 8:12-13 really does speak of the conventional doctrine of the fear of God, and denies that it is true.¹²³

Thus, Qoheleth lives in constant dread of "the God" (האלהים) who has given an "unhappy business" (ענין) to humanity (1:13). He affirms only this kind of fear rather than the conventional "fear of Yahweh" known and recommended by sages both before and after him.¹²⁴ He has no vital relationship to God.¹²⁵ One wonders if Qoheleth prayed. If so, to whom?

¹²³ Contra Becker, p. 253.

¹²⁴ Already in the epilogue to his book, a more conventional soul has added, "Fear God and keep the commandments; for this is the whole duty of man" (12:13); here, the "fear of God" is being swallowed up in a Torah-piety. Cf. Becker, pp. 254-255.

¹²⁵ His instruction to "Remember also your בראיך (RSV, "Creator")" is "more correctly understood as a derivative of the root bare', 'to dig, cut'. The word would then be a double entendre for grave and cistern (wife; cf. Prov. 5:15-19)." Crenshaw, "The Eternal Gospel," p. 29. The plural form is certainly troubling if it refers to God, in spite of the "plural of majesty" used in אלהים (cf. G-K 124k). BHS proposes to emend to בורך which would

Sirach

The responses to enemies and their behavior which Sirach counsels are, in several respects, consonant with those noticed in Proverbs. The similarities are not surprising for Sirach stands in continuity with the sages responsible for Proverbs. Therefore, his many counsels to reject patterns of behavior characteristic of enemies are predictable.¹²⁶ Likewise his admonitions to avoid enemies are expected,¹²⁷ although in this regard he also sounds a caution. If it is too late for avoidance because one is already in the presence of an enemy, he advises,

Do not get up and leave an insolent fellow,
lest he lie in wait against your words.

Sirach 8:11

The proverbial response of non-anxiety in the face of enemies is considerably less noticeable in Sirach.¹²⁸

accomplish by text critical means what Crenshaw achieves by philology. Lauha, p. 210, comments, "*Jedenfalls legen all, genannten Grunde die Annahme nahe, V. 1a als orthodoxen Zusatz zu Kohelets Text zu betrachten.*"

¹²⁶ Cf. Sir. 1:30; 3:10, 12-13; 4:1-5, 9, 20, 22, 27, 29-30; 5:1-9, 14-6:2; 7:1, 3, 7-9, 11-13, 16-18, 20, 26a, 34. 8:5-6, 10; 9:10; 10:6, 23, 26-27; 11:2, 4, 23-24; 13:10; 15:11-12; 16:17-23; 17:26; 18:15, 30; 19:7-12; 21:2; 23:9; 28:8-12; 30:38 (30:29); 34(31):21, 25, 31; 35(32)02,

¹²⁷ Cf. 7:2, 6, 26b; 15-16; 9:2-5, 8, 13; 11:9, 29-31, 33; 12:13-15; 13:1-7, 11, 15-20; 17:14; 19:26-28; 21:2; 23:12-13; 29:22; 32(35):3; 36:31(26); 37:11; 40:29.

¹²⁸ 9:11-12; 11:21.

Rather, Sirach seems to harbor some anxiety over these figures and their attacks.¹²⁹ This anxiety is perhaps surprising in view of the fact that the knowledge of the enemies' self-destructive nature is still affirmed.¹³⁰ It is also somewhat surprising from one whose God is as predictably orthodox as Sirach's.¹³¹ Surely, such an orthodox God would protect him from attack.

Four responses appear in Sirach which are either new in the wisdom literature, or represent some significant development compared with earlier literature. These four include caution, reconciliation, hostility and piety. The first two, of course, are in continuity with the earlier responses of avoidance and love while the latter two seem to be departures.

Hostility

One woe-saying (2:12) gives expression to Sirach's hostility toward "timid hearts," "slack hands," and the "sinner who walks along two ways."¹³² Woes are often

¹²⁹ 9:18; 26:5, 28; 27:14-15.

¹³⁰ 3:20, 26-28; 5:13; 6:2, 4; 12:3; 13:3-10; 19:2, 4-6; 20:4, 8, 18; 21:4, 8-10, 27-28; 23:8, 10-11, 15; 26:29; 27:3, 10, 25-29; 31(34):1, 7; 34(31):5-10; 40:13-15.

¹³¹ See above Chapter 3, pp. 179-183.

¹³² Vv. 13-14 utter woes against the "faint heart" and those who have "lost endurance."

encountered in the prophetic literature,¹³⁵ but are absent from wisdom literature of the Hebrew Bible.¹³⁴ It has been argued that this form developed from the curse.¹³⁵ Another source which has been proposed for the woe-saying is wisdom circles where it would have been a counterpart to the “happy” (אֲשֶׁר) sayings.¹³⁶ Whatever the original setting for the form, Sirach uses it to pronounce disaster upon the sinner.

The woes pronounced in Sirach 2:12-14 may not express hostility; it may rather be an emphatic way of clarifying the self-destructive nature of an enemy. With other passages, however, it is clear that Sirach does harbor hostility toward enemy figures. Twice he admits to “hating” (μισέω) people. He hates the one who “winks his eye” (27:22) while planning evil (27:24). Sirach 25:2b lists

¹³³ See Am. 5:18-20; 6:1-7; Isa. 5:8-10, 11-14, 18-19, 20, 21, 22-24; 10:1-3; 28:1-4; 29:1-4, 15; 30:1-3; 31:1-4; Mic. 2:1-4.

¹³⁴ אֲשֶׁר in Prov. 23:29 does not introduce a “woe-saying.”

¹³⁵ C. Westermann, *Basic Forms of Prophetic Speech*, trans. by H. White (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1967), pp. 192-198.

¹³⁶ E. Gerstenberger, “The Woe-Oracles of the Prophets,” JBL 81 (1962), 249-263; אֲשֶׁר-sayings occur in the wisdom literature at Job 5:17; Prov. 3:13; 8:32, 34; 20:7; 28:14 (cf. 14:21; 16:20; 29:18); Qoh. 10:17, Cf. W. March, “Prophecy,” in *Old Testament Form Criticism*, ed. by J. Hayes (San Antonio: Trinity University Press, 1974), pp. 164-165.

three figures that are hated: a proud beggar, a rich liar,
and an old adulterer.

Aside from hating some enemy figures, Sirach curses
them. Once he utters a curse on the evil wife.

Any iniquity is insignificant compared to a
wife's iniquity;
may a sinner's lot befall her!

Sirach 25:19

This might be taken as an imprecatory prayer rather than a
curse in the strict sense, but in the absence of any mention
of God in the passage,¹³⁷ it seems better to take it as a
curse. Once Sirach explicitly instructs, "Curse the
whisperer and deceiver" (ψιθυρον και διγλωσσον καταρασασθε)
because of his¹³⁸ socially disruptive behavior (28:13).

Where earlier wisdom had overwhelmingly refused to meet
hostility with hostility, Sirach's hostility toward his
enemies invades even his childrearing considerations. If a
man teaches (διδασκω) his son properly he will "make his
enemies envious" (παραζηλωσει τον εχθρον, 30:3). After his
death, the son will remain as an "avenger" (εκδικον)
against them, as well as one who can repay the kindness of

¹³⁷ The closest previous mention of the Lord is in 25:11
which closes the preceding unit (25:7-11); the next mention
of God is not until 26:3 which speaks of the "good wife"
(26:1-4).

¹³⁸ The singular verb απωλεσεν (28:13b) requires
ψιθυρον και διγλωσσον be taken as hendiadys.

friends. One of the things which "gladdens"¹³⁹ Sirach's heart is to observe "a man who lives to see the downfall of his foes" (25:7d). This is in striking contrast to earlier instructions.¹⁴⁰

Finally the communal lament in Sirach 33(36):1-17 virtually revels in hostility toward Israel's foreign foes. Although earlier wisdom scarcely ever mentioned foreigners, they seem not to have elicited any particular hostility. Indeed, earlier wisdom, appears to have been very open to insight from any source. With this prayer, however,

the reader stands before a new stage in sapiential thinking, one in, which the earlier universalism [has surrendered] to particularistic concerns. . . . Sirach [makes] distinctions solely on the basis of nationality.¹⁴¹

Caution

A wise man is cautious (εὐλαβηθησεται)
in everything
and in days of sin he guards against
wrongdoing.

Sirach 18:27

¹³⁹ The verb μακαρίζω, here translated "gladdened" is interesting. It is the usual LXX translation of אֲשֶׁר־י. The Hebrew text (Levi) has a lacuna at this point.

¹⁴⁰ Of course, Sirach knows and gives such advice himself (see the references in n. 126 above), but he nevertheless finds personal satisfaction in seeing the enemy's discomfiture and downfall.

¹⁴¹ Crenshaw, *Old Testament Wisdom*, p. 165, tenses changed for stylistic reasons. Cf. also the praise of Israel's holy war heroes in the "Hymn to the Fathers" (44:1-50:24).

Caution is Sirach's watchword in at least three contexts. Within the home he counsels fathers to "Keep strict watch (*στερεωσον φυλακην*) over a headstrong daughter,"¹⁴² for she may pose several threats. She could ruin his reputation (42:11) and sin against him by sexual promiscuity (26:11b-12). A father must "Be on guard (*φυλαξαι*) against her impudent eye" (26:11a). Such a daughter is the occasion of many sleepless nights (42:9-10).

Another context in which caution is appropriate is in the company of strangers (*αλλοτριον*, 8:18). In their presence, Sirach recommends against doing anything which demands confidentiality. Who can know where a stranger's loyalties lie? He might well generate (*τεξεται*) unimagined dangers.¹⁴³

The following verse (8:19) also has a bearing on this cautious response.¹⁴⁴ Sirach widens the scope and counsels

¹⁴² 26:10 = 42:11.

¹⁴³ 8:18b, *ου γαρ γινωσκεις τι τεξεται*, might be translated "for you do not know what it will bring forth" (RSV margin); in that case, the act of taking a stranger into confidence poses the unknown hazard, rather than the stranger himself. With either translation, however, caution in the presence of a stranger is enjoined.

¹⁴⁴ Actually, Sir. 8:1-19 is composed of independent prohibitions, each one of which is intelligible without reference to any of the others. It appears, however, that vv. 18 and 19 are linked topically, although no paronomastic devices are in evidence. V. 18 exhibits paronomasia in its use of *רֵץ* ("stranger") and *סֵרֵץ* ("secret"), but there are no links between the verses.

against revealing one's thoughts to everyone (παντι ανθρωπω)
and against banishing one's good fortune.¹⁴⁵ Alternatively,
do not allow everyone to return a favor.¹⁴⁶ In any case,
Sirach advises caution in the presence of strangers, and
everyone.

The relationship between friends, however, elicits the
most attention from Sirach. Friendship requires great
caution because

Every friend will say, "I too am a friend";
but some friends are friends only in name.
Sirach 37:1

The discovery is often made too late that such "friends"
become enemies (37:2).¹⁴⁷ They may be "fair weather
friends" who oppose one in hard times (37:4).¹⁴⁸ They may
pursue friendship for self-centered reasons, "for their
stomach's sake" as Sirach 37:5 puts it. Therefore, it is

¹⁴⁵ The Hebrew text of 19b (Levi) reads אל תדיה (אל) מעלך הטוב. RSV translates, "lest you drive away your good luck," but there is no פן. N. Peters, *Das Buch Jesus Sirach oder Ecclesiasticus* (Munster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1913), p. 76, translates, "aber stosse die Gute nicht von dir."

¹⁴⁶ The Greek text of 19b reads: και μη αναφερτω σοι χαριν. NEB follows it translating, "or accept favor from them."

¹⁴⁷ Cf. 6:9.

¹⁴⁸ Cf. 6:8, 10, 11; 12:9.

not surprising to hear the advice,

Keep yourself far (διαχωρισθητι) from
your enemies,
and be on guard (προσεχε) toward
your friends.

Sirach 6:15¹⁴⁹

In spite of these risks in friendship, however, Sirach urges against forgetting (μη επλαθη) a friend or being unmindful (μη αμνημονησης) of him when a person is wealthy (37:6) and might not need the help which a true friend can give. Undoubtedly, Sirach prizes friendship. Its potential for intimacy poses great danger, but also life itself.

A faithful friend is a sturdy shelter:
he that has found one has found a treasure.
There is nothing so precious as a faithful
friend
and no scales can measure his excellence.
A faithful friend is an elixir of life;
and those who fear the Lord will find him.
Whoever fears the Lord directs his friendship
aright,
for as he is, so is his neighbor also.
Sirach 6:14-17

¹⁴⁹ Cf. 12:10, 11 where Sirach says never to "trust" (μη πιστευσης) an enemy and to "watch oneself" (επιστησον την ψυχην σου) and "be on guard" (φυλαξαι) toward an enemy. This "enemy," however, is precisely the kind of person Sirach means in 37:1 who is a friend "only in name."

¹⁵⁰ The Hebrew formulation of v. 17b (16a, Levi), כִּי כִּמּוֹהוּ כֵּן רַעְהוּ, is a 3rd person allusion to Lev. 19:18 וְאָהַבְתָּ לְרֵעֶךָ כָּמוֹךָ. Throughout this passage on friendship the Hebrew text speaks of the אָהַב, but רַע appears in the final verse. V. 10 (Greek, v. 11) recalls the Leviticus passage ironically when it says of the false friend בְּטוֹבַתְךָ הוּא כָמוֹךָ ("In your prosperity he is as yourself").

Reconciliation

Although Sirach sometimes evidences hostility toward enemy figures, he is still able to counsel responses aimed at reconciliation. Regarding a household slave (οικετης) he naturally advises a prudent policy of bread and discipline (παιδειαν) and work" (30:33 [33:24]), for "idleness teaches much evil" (30:29 [33:28]). Of course, "for a wicked servant (οικετη κακουργω) there are racks and tortures " (30:35 [33:27]), but Sirach's basic perspective is revealed when he says,

If you have a servant, let him be as
yourself,¹⁵¹
because you have bought him with blood.
If you have a servant, treat him as a brother,
for as your own soul you will need him.
If you ill-treat him, and he leaves and
runs away,
which way will you go to seek him?
Sirach 30:39-40(33:31-33)

With friends and neighbors Sirach is just as cautious about breaking the relationship as he is in establishing it. Four times he says to "question" (ελεγχον) a friend or neighbor (19:13-17). He may have done or said nothing at all, but even if he had committed the offense, examination

¹⁵¹ "As yourself" (ως σου) may recall Lev. 19:18, although the LXX read ως σεαυτον in Leviticus. Unfortunately, this passage is not preserved in Hebrew, but it must have read כמך. At any rate, the instruction is motivated differently than Lev. 19:18 with its אַנִּי יְהוָה. Here the motivations are entirely mundane: slaves are expensive, they are necessary, and runaways cannot be found.

is urged so that it might not happen again (vv. 13-14). The alleged offense might be slanderous, and that possibility calls for caution in hearing (v. 15). Even if the charge is true, however, the question of intent may be raised.

A person may make a slip without intending it.
 Who has never sinned with his tongue?
 Question your neighbor before you threaten
 (απειλησαι) him
 and let the law of the Most High take
 its course.

Sirach 19:16-17

The last line of this instruction (v. 17b) is intriguing. Literally translated it reads, "And give place to the law of the Most High."¹⁵² What does it mean to "give place" to Torah? Is this a reference to a particular passage, or a more general allusion to some theme of Torah which is important to Sirach?

Most likely Sirach has in view a particular passage:
 You shall not hate your brother in your
 heart, but you shall reason with your neighbor,
 lest you bear sin because of him. You shall not
 bear any grudge against the sons of your own
 people, but you shall love your neighbor as
 yourself: I am Yahweh.

Leviticus 19:17-18

The fourfold "Question!" (ελεγεον) in Sirach 19:13, 14, 15 and 17 recalls the "reason (LXX, ελεγεεις) with your neighbor" of Leviticus 19:17. The Hebrew text of Sirach has not been preserved in this passage, but there can

¹⁵² **Και δος τοπον νομω υψιστου.**

be little doubt that it read **הוֹכַח** at this point, perhaps even **הוֹכַח תוֹכַח** as it is constructed in Leviticus. The alternating "friend" (**φίλον**) and "neighbor" (**πλησιον**) following the fourfold instruction to "question" in Sirach 19:13-17 may even recall the shift from the rare **עַמִּי** ("neighbor")¹⁵³ in Leviticus 19:17 to the more common **רֵעִי** ("neighbor") in Leviticus 19:18. What it means, therefore, to "give place to the law of the Most High" (Sir. 19:17b) is to love one's neighbor as oneself—even in the face of the possibility that the neighbor has acted as an enemy.¹⁵⁴

The only offenses against a friend for which Sirach holds out no hope of reconciliation are "reviling, arrogance, disclosure of secrets, or a treacherous blow (**ονειδισμού και υπερηφανίας και μυστηρίου αποκαλύψεως και πληγης δολως**

¹⁵³ **עַמִּי** occurs in the Hebrew Bible only in Lev. 5:21 (2x); 18:20; 19:11, 15, 17; 24:19; 25:14 (2x), 15, 17; Zech. 13:7.

¹⁵⁴ So also J. Smith, *Ecclesiasticus or the Wisdom of Jesus Son of Sirach* (Cambridge: Cambridge University P. 1974), p. 17; Peters, p. 162, writes, "*Das Gesetz gebietet genaue Untersuchung vor der gerichtlichen Verurteilung* (Dt. 13, 14f.; 17, 4; 19, 18) *so soll es auch jeder einzelne dem Nächsten gegenüber halten. Vgl. Lv. 19, 17.*" The passage in Sirach more likely refers to a situation prior to litigation. If the law of the Most High (in this case Lev. 19:17-18) takes its course, the passages in Deuteronomy to which Peters refers would be irrelevant. Deut. 13:14 and 17:4 are irrelevant anyway for they refer to investigations into charges of leading Israel to worship other gods; Deut. 19:18 refers to investigation of false witnesses. None of the three are particularly relevant to Sir. 19:17b.

in these cases any friend will flee" (22:22cd).¹⁵⁵ Violent actions against a friend like drawing a sword (22:21a) or even opening one's mouth against a friend (22:22a) need not cause undue alarm, "for reconciliation is possible" (22:22b). There remain, however, a few things which render reconciliation impossible.

Sirach 22:19-22 and 21:16-21 are instructions directed to an offender who wishes to seek reconciliation. Sirach 19:13-17, on the other hand, addresses the offended party in a friendship. It urges caution in allowing allegations to rupture a fundamentally sound friendship. The charges should be carefully assessed, and the law (i.e., Lev. 19:17-18) should be given its proper role. Sirach is able to draw even more implications from the law in Leviticus. The love of neighbor must ultimately involve forgiveness.

Anger (μηνις) and wrath (οργη), these also
are abominations,
and the sinful man will possess them,
He that takes vengeance (ο εκδικων) will
suffer vengeance from the Lord,
and he will firmly establish his sins.
Forgive (αφες) your neighbor the wrong he
has done,
and then your sins will be pardoned (λυ-
θησονται) when you pray.

¹⁵⁵ Sir. 27:16-21 also speaks of betrayal of confidentiality as a hopeless situation. V. 21 explains, "For a wound (τραυμα) may be bandaged, and there is reconciliation after abuse (λοιδοριας), but whoever has betrayed secrets is without hope (ο δε αποκαλυψας μυστηρια αφηλπισεν).

Does a man harbor anger (συντηρει οργην)
 against another
 and yet seek healing from the Lord?
 Does he have no mercy toward a man like
 himself (ομοιον αυτω)
 and yet pray for his own sins?
 If he himself, being flesh, maintains
 wrath (διατηρει μηνιν),
 who will make expiation (εξιλασεται)
 for his sins?
 Remember the end of your life, and cease from
 enmity (εχθραινων),
 remember destruction and death, and be
 true to the commandments.
 Remember the commandments, and do not be angry
 (μη μηνισης) with your neighbor;
 remember the covenant of the Most High and
 overlook ignorance.

Sirach 27:30-28:7

The temptation to see a reflection of Deuteronomy 32:25 ("Vengeance is mine") in Sirach's condemnation of the "one who takes vengeance" above (28:1) is appealing,¹⁵⁶ but Leviticus 19:18 seems more likely to be informing Sirach at this point. Although the lacuna in the Hebrew text from Sirach 26:13 through 30:10 makes the connections between this passage (27:30-28:7) and Leviticus 19:18 difficult to establish, they are present. A comparison of the Greek text of Leviticus 19:18 with Sirach 27:30; 28:1, 3, 5, and 7 reveals the allusive connections between the two passages.

Leviticus 19:18 LXX begins, "And your hand shall not exact vengeance (και ουκ εκδικεται σου η χειρ)." Sirach prefaces his instruction to "forgive your neighbor" (28:2)

¹⁵⁶ So Peters, p. 228.

with two verses (27:30-28:1) in which the root **εκδικ-** ("vengeance") appears three times. The next clause in Leviticus 19:18 LXX reads, "And you shall not be wrathful with the sons of your people (**και ου μηνιεις τοις υιοις του λαου σου**)." Sirach begins with the cognate noun **μηνις** ("wrath," 27:30) and closes with the verb **μηνισης** ("be wrathful," 28:7). These connections are relatively straightforward.

The connections between Sirach 28:3 and 5 and Leviticus 19:18 are less certain because of the lack of any Hebrew text of Sirach at this point. The Hebrew verb in Leviticus 19:18 translated "bear a grudge" is **נָטַר**. It is rare and may bear two different meanings: "to keep" or "to be angry."¹⁵⁷ The five times the verb appears in the Hebrew Bible with the meaning "be angry" it is rendered by either **μηνιω** ("be angry"),¹⁵⁸ or **εξαίρω** ("lift up, excite, arouse"),¹⁵⁹ or **διαμηνω** ("remain by, persevere").¹⁶⁰ The verb appears with the meaning "keep" three times in the

¹⁵⁷ The lexicographers do not agree on this verb. BDB, p. 643, lists one root **נָטַר** with two meanings: "keep, maintain (sc. wrath)" and "keep guard." KBL, p. 613, lists I **נָטַר**, "keep, guard," and II, **נָטַר** "be angry, have a grudge."

¹⁵⁸ Lev. 19:18; Jer. 3:12; Psalm 103:9 (102:9).

¹⁵⁹ Nah. 1:2.

¹⁶⁰ Jer. 3:5.

Hebrew Bible, and it is translated twice by τηρεω ("keep")¹⁶¹ and once by φυλακισσαν ("guard").¹⁶² It is quite possible that the words διατηρει μηνιν ("he maintains wrath") in Sirach 28:5 translate an original Hebrew reading of נט. This possibility is doubly strong since μηνιν is the cognate noun of a verb (μηνιω) used to translate II נט and διατηρει is a compound (δια + τηρεω) formed from a verb used to translate I נט. The link with Sirach 28:3 is weakest, for it depends upon the possibility that the compound συντηρει (συν+τηρεω) translates I נט.

On the basis of these connections, therefore, Sirach 27:30 through 28:7 may be described as a "midrash" of Leviticus 19:18. That Sirach 28:7 urges remembrance of the commandments is no accident; specifically, remembrance of Leviticus 19:18 is urged. This passage (Sir. 27:30-28:7) stands as a witness to what Sirach means when he says that a wise man will "devote himself to the study of the law of the Most High" (39:1). His study of Leviticus 19:18 leads him to draw out (εξαγω) several implications.

First, whoever seeks vengeance, which the law forbids, may expect vengeance (27:30-28:1), Secondly, whoever

¹⁶¹ Cant. 8:11, 12.

¹⁶² Cant. 1:6.

forgives his neighbor may confidently pray for forgiveness of his own sins (28:2). The rhetorical questions in Sirach 28:3-5 presuppose the insight that refusal to forgive a neighbor is a sign that one still "bears a grudge," which is prohibited by the second clause of Leviticus 19:18. How can anyone expect forgiveness, healing, mercy, or expiation and violate the clear expression of God's will? Sirach 28:6 undergirds the admonition to forgiveness with the command to remember death, and be true to the commandments (i.e., Lev. 19:18).

The third implication of Leviticus 19:18, appearing already in Sirach 28:2, is the characterization of the neighbor as one who has done "wrong" (αδικημα). This "neighbor" is thus an "enemy" of the "friends and kinfolk" category. When the implications of the commandment to love the neighbor are brought out (εξαγω) then it appears that even the neighbor-enemy cannot be the object of vengeance or grudges, but must be forgiven.¹⁶³

Sirach's "midrash" of Leviticus 19:18 anticipates Jesus' extension of the law from love of the neighbor to love of the enemy (Matt. 5:44). Sirach reveals that the commandment includes even the neighbor who has caused some

¹⁶³ An interesting variant in Sir. 28:7 appears in 307 reading εχθρω ("enemy") for πλησιον ("neighbor"); J. Ziegler, *Sapientia Iesu Filii Sirach* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Runrecht, 1965).

injury (αδικημα). Thus, at least some enemies have to be forgiven (i.e., loved) if a person intends to abide in the commandments (εμμενε ενολαις, Sir. 28:6). Of course, this forgiveness does not extend to all enemies; gentiles are excluded from the neighborhood (cf. Sir. 36 33 :1-17). Yet, in his attention to Leviticus 19:18, Sirach is on a trajectory which must eventually transcend racial barriers.

The difference between Sirach's exegesis of Leviticus 19:18 and Jesus', however, does not lie in the failure to extend the impact of love for the neighbor to gentiles. Jesus' instruction to love the enemy probably has the Jewish neighbor for its primary focus, for his mission was "only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Matt. 10:6; 15:24), not to the gentiles.¹⁶⁴ The differences between Sirach's and Jesus' extensions of Leviticus 19:18 to include enemies lie rather in their clarity, openness to new interpretation, and "center of gravity."

Jesus' use of the word "enemies" (εχθρους) is much clearer than Sirach's reference to a "neighbor" (πλησιον) who has done "wrong" (αδικημα). Jesus' reference to enemies without any modification¹⁶⁵ leaves the instruction

¹⁶⁴ This is not to say, of course, that Jesus would approve of hatred of Romans, Greeks, or other gentiles.

¹⁶⁵ The only modifier is that the enemies are "your" enemies, but what would be the point in loving someone else's enemies? Presumably, "even the Gentiles do the same" (Matt. 5:47).

open to include all enemies. Sirach's reference to the "neighbor," even one who has done "wrong," makes his instruction vulnerable to exclusivistic interpretations. Finally, the "center of gravity" for Sirach's instruction lies in the commandments and the "covenant of the Most High" (Sir. 28:7). Jesus' instruction, on the other hand, is grounded in his bold, "But I say unto you," which is set over against what "was said of old" (Matt. 5:43-44).

Piety

The role of Leviticus 19:18 in Sirach's response to personal enemies who are neighbors and friends is a clue to the importance which religious realities and practices play in his style of wisdom. One sphere in which religious practice impinges upon a context of potential enmity is the realm of almsgiving.

Do not avert your eye from the needy,
 nor give a man occasion to curse you;
 for if in bitterness of soul he calls down
 a curse upon you,
 his Creator will hear his prayer.

Sirach 4:5-6

Care for the poor had long been recognized in Israel as a peculiar concern to Yahweh. The law codes enjoined measures which aimed toward some mitigation of poverty in Israel.¹⁶⁶ Israel's prophets had taken up Yahweh's advocacy

¹⁶⁶ Cf. Exod. 23:10-11; 19:9-10; Deut. 15:7-11.

on behalf of the poor.¹⁶⁷ A primary duty of the monarchy had been to administer justice on behalf of the poor.¹⁶⁸ And, of course, the sages responsible for Proverbs had counseled compassion and aid for the poor.¹⁶⁹ Sirach's counsel to help the poor, therefore, is classical Israelite ethics. Even the motive in the passage above is reminiscent of Exodus 22:22-23:

If you do afflict them (i.e., widows and orphans), and they cry out to me, I will surely hear their cry; my wrath will burn, and I will kill you with the sword, and your wives shall become widows and your children fatherless.¹⁷⁰

With Sirach, however, almsgiving becomes more than simply a way of avoiding God's "affirmative action" on behalf of the poor. It becomes a life-securing action in its own right. True, discretion must be exercised in regard to whom one helps (Sir. 12:1-7). Lending, in particular, is a hazardous way of helping a poor neighbor (29:1-7). In spite of these cautions, these hedges, as it were, about charity, Sirach finally argues for the wisdom of giving alms.

¹⁶⁷ Cf. Am. 2:6-8; 4:1; 8:4-6; Isa. 3:13-15; 10:1-2; Jar. 5:28; 22:13-17; Zech. 7:8-1C.

¹⁶⁸ Psalm 72:2, 4, 12-14.

¹⁶⁹ Prov. 3:28; 11:24; 14:21, 31; 17:5; 19:17; 21:13; 22:2, 9, 16; 29:13, 14; 31:26.

¹⁷⁰ Cf. Exod. 22:26b.

responses of prayer about one's own sins. Such prayer, of course, involves confession and is already a part of repentance. Attacks emerging from within Sirach against Sirach are the occasion of his only personal lament.

O that a guard were set over my mouth,
 and a seal of prudence upon my lips,
 that it may keep me from falling,
 so that my tongue may not destroy me!
 O Lord, Father and Ruler of my life,
 do not abandon me to their counsel,
 and let me not fall because of them!
 O that whips were set over my thoughts,
 and the discipline of wisdom over
 my mind!
 That they may not spare me in my errors,
 and that it may not pass by my sins;
 in order that my mistakes may not be
 multiplied,
 and my sins may not abound;
 then I will not fall before my adversaries,
 and my enemy will not rejoice over me.
 O Lord, Father and God of my life,
 do not give me haughty eyes,
 and remove from me evil desire.
 Let neither gluttony nor lust overcome me,
 and do not surrender me to a shameless
 soul.

Sirach 22:27-23:6

Motives behind Sirach's Counsel

Several of the motives for Sirach's counsel in regard to enemies are naturally akin to those of earlier sages since his view of God is so orthodox. At one point he appears to be influenced particularly by Qoheleth for he affirms that God has made everything, good and evil alike, to be fitting and appropriate.

From the beginning good things were created
 for good people,
 just as evil things for sinners.
 Basic to all the needs of man's life
 are water and fire and iron and salt
 and wheat flour and milk and honey,
 the blood of the grave, and oil and
 clothing.
 All these are for good to the godly,
 just as they turn into evils for sinners.
 There are winds that have been created for
 vengeance,
 and in their anger they scourge heavily;
 in the time of consummation they will pour
 out their strength
 and calm the anger of their Maker.
 Fire and hail and famine and pestilence,
 all these have been created for vengeance;
 the teeth of wild beasts, and scorpions and
 vipers,
 and the sword that punishes the ungodly
 with destruction;
 they will rejoice in his commands,
 and be made ready on earth for their
 service
 and when their times come they will not
 transgress his word.
 Therefore from the beginning I have been
 convinced,
 and have thought this out and left it
 in writing:
 The works of the Lord are all good,
 and he will supply every need in its hour.
 And no one can say, "This is worse than that,"
 for all things will prove good in their
 season.
 So now sing praise with all your heart and voice,
 and bless the name of the Lord.

Sirach 39:25-35

The difference between Sirach and Qoheleth appears in verse 35. This goodness of all things "in their season"¹⁷³

¹⁷³ V. 34 $\epsilon\upsilon\ \kappa\alpha\iota\rho\omega$ = **לְבַעַתוֹ** (Levi) is (together with **זִמְן**) Qoheleth's expression in Qoh. 3:1-8.

provokes praise from Sirach. Qoheleth was unable to discern the times, and that inability reduced him to fear.

Two motives for Sirach's responses to enmity are new: death and shame. Death was also a factor in Qoheleth's thinking, and here again some impact from him upon Sirach must be recognized.¹⁷⁴ Yet, the implications which Sirach draws from the fact of death are different from its consequences in Qoheleth's thought. Theme implications require some discussion. Shame is likewise an important consideration for Sirach, and its role in his counsel must be examined.

Death. The reality of death is a motivating factor in Sirach's counsel to be a compassionate person. He enjoins care for the poor (7:32-33a) and proper consideration for the dead (7:33b).¹⁷⁵ One should "mourn with those who mourn" (7:34) and "not shrink from visiting a sick man" (7:35a). Deeds like these make a person beloved in the community (7:35b). Sirach 7:36 opens the imagination to all areas of a person's life when it admonishes,

¹⁷⁴ Crenshaw, "The Eternal Gospel," p. 47.

¹⁷⁵ See Sir. 38:16-23 for extended treatment of "mourning etiquette." Sirach advises appropriate, not excessive, mourning for the dead. V. 17bc counsels to mourn "according to his merit, for one day or two, to avoid criticism." Finally, however, one must banish sorrow, "remembering the end of life" (v. 20). Excessive sorrow does no good for the dead, but it can be self destructive (v. 21).

In all you do, remember the end of your life,
and then you will never sin.

The memory of the fact that "we all must die" prohibits exultation "over any one's death" (8:7).¹⁷⁶ Surely this must refer to enemies, for who would rejoice over the death of a friend? The knowledge of death also serves as a motive to "cease from enmity" in Sirach 28:6 where memory of death functions in tandem with abiding in the commandments. Earlier discussion of this passage (27:30-28:7)¹⁷⁷ has already revealed that the commandment in question is Leviticus 19:18.

Shame. The psychological experience of shame is a "highly ambivalent phenomenon."¹⁷⁸ Although it is often to be avoided, it may also be accepted with good graces.

Observe the right time, and beware of evil;
and do not bring shame on yourself.
For there is a shame which brings sin,
and there is a shame which is glory
and favor.
Do not be ashamed to confess your sins,
and do not try to stop the current of
a river.

Sirach 4:20-21, 26

¹⁷⁶ The preceding verse (8:6) provides a glimpse of Sirach's own awareness of encroaching age which inevitably ends in death. He commands, "Do not disdain a man when he is old, for some of us are growing old."

¹⁷⁷ See above under "Reconciliation."

¹⁷⁸ von Rad, *Wisdom in Israel*, p. 117,

Undoubtedly the "shame which brings sin" includes that which induces people to make promises to friends, promises which cannot be kept. Thus, a person may make an enemy of a friend without cause (*δωρεαν*, 20:23). On the other hand, "a man who has lost his sense of shame" may be expected to default on a neighbor's loan (29:14). Without shame (*αναιδους*) "begging is sweet" (40:30). A sense of shame is essential to proper etiquette.

The foot of a fool rushes into a house,
 but a man of experience stands respectfully
 (*αισχυνησεται*) before it.
 Sirach 21:22

It is no wonder, therefore, that the final petition in the lament of Sirach 22:7-23:6 prays for deliverance from a "shameless soul" (*ψυχη αναιδει*). A shameless soul would expose him to betraying neighborly benefactors, a life of begging, and a host of other hazardous patterns of life.

Such an ambiguous phenomenon as shame requires careful scrutiny. The long didactic poem of Sirach 41:14 through 42:8 seeks to bring some order out of the apparent chaos of human shame. The poem is composed of two parts (41:17-23 and 42:1-8) with an introductory summons to hear (41:14-16). The first major part (41:17-23) lists actions of which one should be ashamed. These include all manner of activities which are classic characteristics of enemies. The second part (42:1-8) lists those patterns of behavior of which one

should not be ashamed which include actions which are either prudent (vv. 3-8a) or just and faithful (vv. 1b-2).

Three points in the poem are particularly important to notice. The last verse of the introduction admonishes,

Therefore show respect for my words:
For it is not good to retain every kind
of shame,
and not everything is confidently
esteemed by everyone.

Sirach 41:16

The first section is governed by a single command, "Be ashamed" (αἰσχυνέσθε) in verse 17, and is closed with a sentence stating the consequences of obedience:

Then you will show proper shame (αἰσχυντήρος
ἀληθινῶς)
and will find favor with every man.

Sirach 41:23cd

The second section also opens with a command, this time, "Do not be ashamed (μὴ αἰσχυνθῆς, 42:1),¹⁷⁹ which loosely governs the remainder of the poems. The closing lines promise that whoever is obedient to the instruction "will be truly instructed (πεπαιδευμένος ἀληθινῶς), and will be approved before all men" (42:8cd).

¹⁷⁹ The shift from plural in 41:17 (αἰσχυνέσθε) to singular in 42:1 (αἰσχυνθῆς) is striking. The introduction is addressed to the plural "my children" (τέκνα) in 41:14. The Hebrew text reads בָּנִים together with the plural verb שָׁמַעַי in 41:14, but shifts to singular בִּישׁ in 41:17; 42:1 is also singular (שִׁבְחָת). Perhaps this was not composed at one time but in two (or more) efforts?

Response to Wisdom

Chapter 3 of this study noted that Sirach speaks of attacks from the side of Wisdom herself against her novice devotees. How does he counsel students to respond to her? Sirach 4:12-16 speaks of "loving" (αγαπων), "holding fast" (κρατων), "serving" (λατρευοντες), "obeying" (υπακουων), and "having faith in" (εμπιστευση) her. Sirach 51:19 speaks of having "grappled" (διαμεμαχισται) with her. The richest expression of the proper response to her, however, is that in Sirach 14:20-27.

Blessed is the man who meditates on wisdom
 and who reasons intelligently.
 He who reflects in his mind on her ways
 will also ponder her secrets.
 Pursue wisdom like a hunter,
 and lie in wait on her paths.
 He who peers through her windows
 will also listen at her doors;
 he who encamps near her house
 will also fasten his tent peg to
 her walls;
 he will pitch his tent near her,
 and will lodge in an excellent lodging
 place;
 he will place his children under her shelter,
 and will camp under her boughs;
 he will be sheltered by her from the heat,
 and will dwell in the midst of her glory.
 Sirach 14:20-27

This desire to be near Wisdom is palpably erotic. The desire is not to be frustrated; it is fulfilled. To the one who responds with this kind of longing for Wisdom,

She will come to meet him like a mother,
 and like the wife of his youth she will
 welcome him.

Sirach 15:2

Wisdom of Solomon

One of the most common responses to enemies witnessed in wisdom literature is that, of avoidance, and this appears in the Wisdom of Solomon as well.¹⁸⁰ A second response found in earlier wisdom literature, and shared in the book of Wisdom, is that of nonanxiety in the face of enemies.¹⁸¹ The self-destructive nature of enemies is also recognized in Wisdom,¹⁸² just as it is in previous literature.

Apart from these common responses to enemies and their attacks, a somewhat limited range of responses may be inferred from the Wisdom of Solomon. The response to strangers is evidently unique in the wisdom literature. A special problem in this book concerns idolatry. How does a wise man respond to idols and their worshipers? Finally, an impressive example of gentle non-aggression may be seen in the book of Wisdom.

Welcome to Strangers

Welcoming strangers appears only once in Wisdom, but it is a unique response in the wisdom literature. Actually, Wisdom 19:13-17 argues that the Egyptians received just

¹⁸⁰ Cf. Wisd. 1:5, 11, 12; 2:16.

¹⁸¹ Cf. 2:20; 5:1; 7:30; 15:2; 17:11,

¹⁸² Cf. 1:16; 2:21; 3:11, 16, 19; 4:3, 6, 20; 5:14; 10:3; 17:2.

punishment for their hatred of strangers.

The punishments did not come upon the sinners
without prior signs in the violence of
thunder,
for they justly suffered because of their
wicked acts;
for they practiced a more bitter hatred
of strangers.
Others had refused to receive strangers
when they came to them,
but these made slaves of guests who were
their benefactors.
And not only so, but punishment of some sort
will come upon the former
for their hostile reception of the aliens;
but the latter, after receiving them with
festal celebrations,
afflicted with terrible sufferings
those who had already shared the same rights.
They were stricken also with loss of sight--
just as were those at the door of the
righteous man--
when, surrounded by yawning darkness,
each tried to find the way through his
man door.

If such is the fate of people who hate and oppress strangers,
then it may be inferred that welcoming strangers is a positive virtue.

Other wisdom literature had cautioned avoidance of strangers, but this writer implies that they are rather to be welcomed with hospitality. Most likely, this response to strangers is due to the Alexandrian setting of the writer. In Alexandria, of course, Jews were strangers rather than natives. Diaspora Jews would have known the heart of a stranger (Exod. 23:9).

Responses to Idols and Their Worshipers

Chapters 13 through 15 of the Wisdom of Solomon contain a discussion of idolatry, its origins and consequences. As to its origins, three possibilities are mentioned. People misconstrued the elements of creation (fire, wind, stars, water) as gods (13:1-3). Another possible origin of idolatry is the image of a deceased child made by a bereaved father.

And he now honored as a god what was once
a dead human being,
and handed on to his dependents secret rites
and initiations.
Then the ungodly custom, grown strong with
time, was kept as a law,
and at the command of monarchs graven images
were worshiped.

Wisdom of Solomon 14:15c-16

The final alternative suggested for the origin of idolatry is that a statue of an absentee monarch may have been set up to honor the king. Artists, however, made the statues as attractive and flattering as possible in order to curry favor with their patron.

And the multitude, attracted by the charm
of his work,
now regarded as an object of worship the
one whom shortly before they had
honored as a man.

Wisdom of Solomon 14:20

Although the Wisdom of Solomon is unable to settle on a single origin for idolatry, no doubt exists about its consequences. It is "the beginning (ἀρχή) and cause (αἰτία) of every evil" (14:27b). The list of vices which

are the consequences of idolatry in Wisdom of Solomon 15:22-29 is truly encyclopedic. It covers offenses against family, friends and neighbors, property, sexuality, and judiciary.

Apart from discussing the folly, origins and consequences of this problem, however, Wisdom says very little about how to respond to these people.¹⁸³ Nevertheless, one general impression emerges quite clearly: they are ignorant fools deserving little, if any, sympathy.

With regard to people who worship the elements of nature some mitigation of this impression seems to appear. The concession is made that they are

. . . little to be blamed,
for perhaps they go astray
while seeking God and desiring to find him.
For as they live among his works they keep
searching,
and they trust in what they see, because
the things that are seen are beautiful.

Wisdom of Solomon 13:6-7

This concession, however, is immediately nullified in the following verses.

Yet again, not even they are to be excused;
for if they had the power to know so much
that they could investigate the world,
how did they fail to find sooner the Lord
of all these things?

Wisdom of Solomon 13:8-9

¹⁸³ The idols themselves, of course, require no response other than rejection.

Wisdom's greatest ire is reserved for those who worship the "works of men's hands" (13:10). They are subjected to a satire on the folly of a woodcutter who uses his scraps to make a god (13:11-19). The scrap from which a god is made is "useful for nothing" (εἰς οὐθεν εὐχρηστον, 13:13). This is followed by another satire on sailors whose god is "more fragile than the ship which carries him" (14:1). Following this satire appears the antithesis of God's providence which can bring even rank amateurs safely into port (14:3-7). Wisdom's clearest verdict on idols, their worshipers and their makers then appears.

But the idol made with hands is accursed,
 and so is he who made it;
 because he did the work, and the perishable
 thing was named a god.
 For equally hateful to God are the ungodly
 man and his ungodliness
 for what was done will be punished together
 with him who did it.
 Therefore there will be a visitation also
 upon the heathen idols,
 because, though part of what God created,
 they became an abomination,
 and became traps for the souls of men
 and a snare to the feet of the foolish.

Wisdom of Solomon 14:8-11¹⁸⁴

These people are simply "accursed." The tragedy of it is that although a man may make an idol,

he is better than the objects he worships,
 since he has life, but they never have.

Wisdom of Solomon 15:17

¹⁸⁴ Cf. 14:30-31; 15:6, 10.

Gentleness

The figure of the oppressed righteous man in the Wisdom of Solomon 2:12-20 is surely to be taken as an exemplar in the face of enemies.

Let us lie in wait for the righteous man
because he is inconvenient to us and
opposes our actions;
he reproaches us for sins against the law,
and accuses us of sins against our training.
He professes to have knowledge of God,
and calls himself a child of the Lord.
He became to us a reproof of our thoughts;
the very sight of him is a burden to us
because his manner of life is unlike that
of others,
and his ways are strange.
We are considered by him as something base,
and he avoids our ways as unclean;
he calls the last end of the righteous happy,
and boasts that God is his father.
Let us see if his words are true,
and let us test what will happen at the end
of his life;
for if the righteous man is God's son, he
will help him,
and will deliver him from the hand of his
adversaries.
Let us test him with insult and torture,
that we may find out how gentle he is,
and make trial of his forbearance.
Let us condemn him to a shameful death,
for, according to what he says, he will
be protected.

This speech of the wicked presents a portrait of the righteous man who is faithful to the law and is deeply pious (vv. 12-13). His piety makes him something of an alien in his milieu (vv. 14-15). He avoids the conduct of his enemies and affirms that ultimately the righteous are "happy" (μακαριζει, v. 16). Therefore, the wicked proceed

to test his gentleness (ἐπιεικείαν) and forbearance (ἀνεξικακίαν, v. 19). He is confident that he will be protected (ἐπισκοπή, v. 20)

Following a long digression on the blessed estate of the righteous (3:1-9) , the punishment of the wicked (3:10-4:6), and the blessed estate even of the righteous who die prematurely (4:7-9) which is illustrated by reference to Enoch (4:10-15), this righteous man reappears.

The righteous man who has died will condemn (κατακρίνει) the ungodly who are living, and youth that is quickly perfected will condemn the prolonged old age of the unrighteous man.

Wisdom of Solomon 4 : 16

The notice that the righteous man "condemns" the ungodly must not be taken to mean that he actively engages them in some legal contest. The text says nothing of any activity on his part. His mere appearance is a condemnation, just as his life had been a "reproof" (ἐλεγχον) to the ungodly, and the sight of him had been a "burden" (βαρυς) to them before his martyrdom (2:14-15). The text passes on immediately to speak of the incomprehension and scorn which the ungodly still have for the righteous man and then of God's judgment on them (4 :17-19) .

The next time this righteous man appears (5:1) he simply stands in the presence of his persecutors "with great confidence" (ἐν παρρησίᾳ πολλῇ). This time , however , they are

moved to terror (5:2). In "repentance" (μετανοοῦντες, 5:3) they confess:

This is the man whom we once held in derision
and made a byword of reproach--we fools!
We thought that his life was madness
and that his end was without honor.
Why has he been numbered among the sons
of God?
And why is his lot among the saints?
So it was we who strayed from the way of truth,
and the light of righteousness did not shine
upon us,
and the sun did not rise upon us.
We took our fill of the paths of lawlessness
and destruction,
and we journeyed through trackless deserts,
but the way of the Lord we have not known.
What has our arrogance profited us?
And what good has our boasted wealth
brought us?

Wisdom of Solomon 5:4-8

Thus, the gentle, patient and silent response of the righteous man to his enemies, together with the vindication of God, brings about the repentance and confession of the persecutors. Nothing is explicitly said about whether this change of heart by the ungodly effects anything toward their redemption. In view of their final confession that the "hope of the ungodly" is futile, "like smoke before the wind" (5:14c), however, the likelihood is that they simply cease to be. This is precisely what they had said would be their fate before they decided to lead a life of sensual gratification (2:1-5). The irony is exquisite, for the reasoning which led to their final demise turns out to be

tragically correct:

For our allotted time is the passing of a
 shadow,
 and there is no return from our death,
 because it is sealed up and no one turns back.
 Wisdom of Solomon 2:5

A similar response to enemies is attributed to Israel
 on its way out of Egypt. Speaking of the night of Israel's
 exit, the Wisdom of Solomon remarks,

Their enemies heard their voices but did not
 see their forms,
 and counted them happy (εμακαριζον) for not
 having suffered,
 and were thankful (ηυχαριστουν) that thy
 holy ones, though previously wronged,
 were doing them no injury;
 and they begged their pardon (χαριν εδεοντο)
 for having been at variance with them.
 Wisdom of Solomon 18:1b-2

Once again, a passive, non-aggressive response¹⁸⁵ to enemies
 (in this case the Egyptians) elicits a modicum of repentance.
 The Egyptians' begging Israel's pardon, of course, effected
 nothing toward their redemption. Scripture answered that
 problem for the writer of the Wisdom of Solomon.

Motives behind Responses to the Enemy

The motives which undergird these responses to enemies
 are not essentially different from those noticed in earlier
 wisdom literature. Wisdom still secures life,¹⁸⁶ as does

¹⁸⁵ The motif of the plundering of the Egyptians (Exod.
 3:21-22; 11:2-3; 12:35-36) is conveniently overlooked.

¹⁸⁶ Wisd. 10:1-21.

God.¹⁸⁷ God still brings judgment against, the ungodly,¹⁸⁸
 although in this connection the motif of God's extreme
 patience in judgment is given quite a lot of emphasis.¹⁸⁹
 This patience aims toward the correction and reformation of
 the sinner.¹⁹⁰ God exercises this patience in judgment,
 which aims toward repentance, out of love for creation.

But thou art merciful to all, for thou canst
 do all things,
 and thou dost overlook men's sins, that they
 may repent.
 For thou lovest all things that exist,
 and hast loathing for none of the things
 which thou hast made,
 for thou wouldst not have made anything
 if thou hadst hated it.
 How would anything have endured if you
 hadst not willed it?
 Or how would anything not called forth by
 thee have been preserved?
 Thou sparest all things, for they are thine,
 O Lord who lovest the living.
 For thy immortal spirit is in all things.
 Therefore thou dost correct little by little
 those who trespass,
 and dost remind and warn them of the things
 wherein they sin,
 that they may be freed from wickedness and
 put their trust in thee, O Lord.

Wisdom of Solomon 11:23-12:2

A new note occurs in connection with God's judgment and
 its appearance to the world. God's acts of judgment are

¹⁸⁷ 4:10-15.

¹⁸⁸ 4:18-19; 11:6-8, 15-20; 12:3-11, 23-27; 16:15-23;
 18:5-19.

¹⁸⁹ 11:9-10; 12:2, 8-9, 11; 16:1-4.

¹⁹⁰ 12:10, 19:22; 16:5-14.

ambiguous. Even when described in such hyperbole as is heard in Wisdom, these acts of God are hardly transparent. Their evaluation is dependent upon one's prior stance toward God. Therefore, after describing the waters which covered the Egyptians, the notice is made that

by the same means by which thou didst punish
our enemies
thou didst call us to thyself and glorify us.
Wisdom of Solomon 18:8

Perhaps the most striking motive behind the responses to the enemy in the Wisdom of Solomon is the role of creation. The notion that creation turned a beneficent face toward the righteous and a hostile one toward the wicked is, of course, nothing new with the Wisdom of Solomon.¹⁹¹ The exaggeration of this theme, however, is striking. In the Wisdom of Solomon 5:15-16 the blessed estate of the righteous is described in glowing terms. Then, without any transition, the theme of creation as God's warrior appears to close the passage.

The Lord will take his zeal as his whole
armor,
and will arm all creation to repel his enemies;
he will put on righteousness as a breastplate,
and wear impartial justice as a helmet;
he will take holiness as an invincible shield,
and sharpen stern wrath for a sword,
and creation will join with him to fight
against the madmen.
Shafts of lightning will fly with true aim,
and will leap to the target as from a well-
drawn bow of clouds,

¹⁹¹ See Chapter 3, n. 113.

and hailstones full of wrath will be hurled
as from a catapult;
the water of the sea will rage against them,
and rivers will relentlessly overwhelm them;
a mighty wind will rise against them,
and like a tempest it will winnow them away.
Lawlessness will lay waste the whole earth,
and evil doing will overturn the thrones of
rulers.

Wisdom of Solomon 5:17-23¹⁹²

So ends the discussion of the contrasting fates of the
righteous and the ungodly (1:16-5:23).

Summary

This chapter has discerned a broad range of responses
to enemies in the wisdom literature which extends from
hostility to love. Between these two extremes have appeared
responses to enemies which have been characterized as rejection
of enemy behavior patterns, avoidance and caution,
"quietism" and gentleness, non-anxiety, piety, praise,
lament, disputation and reconciliation. Some securing
actions against enemies and their attacks have been noted,
including gift-giving, fearing Yahweh, and heeding Wisdom.

The motivations for these responses have shown less
variety. Indeed, the motives which appeared to stand behind
the various wise responses to enemies form a remarkably
coherent set of convictions. Predominant among these are
the traditional beliefs in the self-destructive nature of

¹⁹² Cf. 16:24-25; 19:18-21.

enemy figures and the "act-consequence relationship," as well as the action of Yahweh who secures life against death. The later writers, Qoheleth and Sirach, both allow considerable scope to death as a motive in their responses to their enemies. Sirach adds the phenomenon of shame as a significant factor.

A question posed in the first chapter of this study may now be raised for consideration. Are beneficent, non-aggressive responses to enemies characteristic in the wisdom literature?¹⁹³ The answer seems to be affirmative, with some qualification.

The great variety of responses uncovered qualifies an affirmative answer somewhat. Occasionally (in Sirach), outright hostility toward some enemies is in evidence. Notes of self-interested caution *vis-a-vis* enemies also appear. In the book of Job disputation between enemies is apparent, though the question may arise as to whether this disputation is recommended or merely used as a literary device. It is probably to be taken as a literary device. Job is, after all, *in extremis*. Qoheleth, ever the renegade, exhibits hatred and fear toward his "enemies," life and God.

Although these qualifications must be kept in mind, the question posed still requires an affirmative answer

¹⁹³ See pp. 20-21.

Admonitions aiming at reconciliation between people and their enemies, or at least aiming at repentance in the enemy appear time and again. Even such apparently negative responses as simple rejection of enemy behavior and avoidance of enemies issue in conciliatory responses. The cycle of hostility meeting hostility is precluded. Avoidance of enemies may yield time and space for healing to occur.

Never does a sage appear to seek vengeance against enemies. Vengeance lies with Yahweh. The sages seek rather to restore health to their social setting. They are well-aware that two self-destructive people can never be an improvement on one healthy, peaceful person and one self-destructive person. The goal of wisdom is nothing short of life. Actions which tend always toward death and away from life strike at the heart of any authentic wisdom. Therefore, when the wisdom literature is most true to its own goals, only loving, forgiving and life-securing responses to enemies are appropriate.

Chapter 5

CONCLUSION

This investigation has demonstrated that the sages of Israel were in fact aware of the folk designated and described as enemies in the Psalms. Chapters 2 and 3 located a host of enemy designations and, descriptions from the Psalter which also appear in the wisdom literature of Israel. Clearly, the sages had some concern to deal with the problems posed by the traditional enemies.,

Chapter 4 revealed that the responses to these enemies counseled by the sages were frequently concerned to achieve a measure of peace and reconciliation between themselves and their enemies. To be sure, not every response had this for its goal; not every response of the sages to their enemies can be harmonized with the beneficent, loving response urged by Proverbs 25:21-22. Overwhelmingly, however, their responses were certainly not contradictory to such an aim.

Time and again counsel appeared which would rule out involvement in a cycle of hostility. Room was left open for repentance and eventual restoration of relationships. The wise evidently judged their best interests to be in fostering neighborliness rather than insisting upon their

rights to redress of grievances. Wise consideration, of the other was in one's own best interest.

Does this attitude on the part of the sages of Israel represent a departure from the dominant Old Testament attitude toward enemies? Certainly the examples of Joseph and his brothers and David and Saul mentioned in Chapter One cohere with the attitude found in the wisdom literature.

The law of Exodus 23:4-5 evidences a similar coherence with this attitude. Does this phenomenon appear elsewhere in the Old Testament?

The irenic spirit of the patriarchs also coheres with the attitude found in the wisdom literature. Apart from Abraham's response to the four kings of the east in Genesis 14:1-16, the impression of the patriarchal narratives is that the patriarchs went out of their way to avoid conflict and to mitigate it when it arose. Even Jacob the trickster displays this attitude. He avoids open conflict with Esau by leaving home in obedience to his mother (Gen. 27:41-45). He tolerates (and outwits) Laban for years, and then leaves stealthily (Gen. 29:30; 30:25-31:21). He seeks to assuage Esau's anger with a multitude of gifts and a "soft answer" (Gen. 32:14-22; 33:1-11; cf. Prov. 15:1). He rebukes Simeon and Levi for their attack on Shechem (Gen. 34:30). It seems that many of the patriarchal episodes turn on the

issue of conflict: how it arose, what were its consequences, and how it was resolved.

The fact that this irenic spirit appears in the patriarchal narratives and the wisdom literature ought not be taken as evidence of "wisdom influence." Although the patriarchal narratives still reveal some of the kinds of conflict which beset Israelite families and communities (e.g., rivalry between wives and concubines, sibling rivalries, disputes over water and grazing rights, marriage outside the clan), they do not intend to handle these issues didactically. Their intention is rather to present the way of the promise in the lives of the fathers. Disputes and their resolutions are simply obstacles to the fulfillment of the promise.

The appearance of non-aggression toward personal enemies in such diverse complexes as the patriarchal narratives and the wisdom literature more probably indicates that it was a broadly based Israelite attitude. The wisdom literature, however, articulates and recommends this typically Israelite attitude most often and most explicitly. Its relative absence from other bodies of Old Testament literature compared with its frequent appearance in the wisdom writings is to be explained in terms of their respective intentions.

The intention of the prophetic literature is, of course, to present the word of Yahweh concerning Israel and the nations. It is not concerned with personal disputes between individual Israelites. Even the opponents of the prophets themselves come into view solely on the basis of their standing with regard to the word of Yahweh. Israel's historical writings are concerned to interpret Israel's story by reference to Yahweh, his word and deed. Individual Israelites come under consideration when they are necessary to tell Israel's story.

This is precisely the reason that the doublet of David's sparing of Saul appears. It is not concerned to teach how one should treat personal enemies. Its concern is to offer explanations of how it came about that David supplanted Saul's house. The reason is given in Saul's response to David:

And now, behold, I know that you shall surely be king, and that the kingdom of Israel shall be established, in your hand. Swear to me therefore by Yahweh that you will not cut off my descendants after me, and that you will not destroy my name out of my father's house.

I Samuel 24:21-22

Blessed be you, my son David! You will do many things and will succeed in them.

I Samuel 26:23

The relative absence of this attitude in Israel's law codes is likewise due to their intention. The most explicit treatment of personal enmity, Exodus 23:4-5, probably aims to

limit enmity to the institutional setting of the court, lest it invade the neighborhood. Within the judicial setting itself, however, situations of conflict are resolved by means of judgments (משפטים) and sanctions, not by tolerance, and certainly not by the offended party helping the offender.

The commandment to love the neighbor as oneself (Lev. 19:18), of course, has a bearing on the problem of personal enmity. If it is observed enmity is excluded from the neighborhood. Conflict is resolved not by legal means but by love. Yet, this instruction to love the neighbor requires some "exegesis" in order to address the problem of enemies who are neighbors. A sage, Sirach, is required to draw out the commandment's implications for neighbors who are enemies.

The frequent appearance of non-aggressive, even loving, responses toward personal enemies in the wisdom literature, on the other hand, is due to its peculiar concerns. One of these concerns is to instruct people in the difficult task of getting along with one another. The task of life in a neighborhood which is inhabited by enemies as well as friends requires a great deal of insight. The task is complicated by the fact that enemies may appear to be friends, and friends may become enemies.

This attitude toward enemies which aims to resolve conflict and restore harmony in the daily life with one's fellows was not the sole possession of the wisdom tradition; it was the common inheritance of all Israelites. Nevertheless, some of the particular concerns of the wisdom tradition predisposed the sages to trace out its implications in some detail. The particular concerns of other circles in Israel, on the other hand, predisposed them to deal with problems other than personal enemies.

Impressions of the dominant attitude toward personal enemies in the Old Testament, however, are not formed on the basis of the historical literature, nor the prophetic literature, nor the law codes. They are formed rather on the basis of the Psalms which regularly ask for vengeance upon personal enemies. What is to be made of the striking difference between the attitude toward personal enemies expressed in the wisdom literature and that expressed in the Psalter?

The answer to this question is to be sought in the religious life of the sages, for, at bottom, the primary motivations behind their counsel stand or fall with Yahweh's reliability and intentionality. Yahweh's faithfulness is the presupposition of wisdom and the laments which were uttered in the cult. Qoheleth shows that the disintegration of this faith in God's faithfulness and intention for good

renders the traditional counsel incredible. The sages believed in the effectiveness of the laments.

If Yahweh had been informed of the enemies and their attacks, then the sage could quit worrying about them so much. Why should valuable time be spent planning vengeance or seeking legal recourse when Yahweh was fully competent to bring enemies to judgment--in his own good time? Therefore, the sages set about the task of examining, testing and recommending ways of getting along with enemies, friends and neighbors (and they were often identical) which would secure life until Yahweh acted.

Does the wisdom literature of Israel then depart in a remarkable way from the dominant Old Testament attitude toward personal enemies? As with the closing question of Chapter Four, this too requires a qualified affirmation. The attitude toward enemies expressed in the wisdom literature is a part of all Israel's common inheritance. Due to its particular concerns and intentions, however, the wisdom tradition had more cause to preserve, transmit and explicate this cultural inheritance. Other strands of Old Testament tradition do not ultimately contradict it. They simply fail to do anything significant with it.

The responses in the Psalms, on the other hand, provide the religious underpinnings for the practical responses which appear most often in the wisdom literature. Without

the practice of bringing the enemies and their attacks before the face of Yahweh and the conviction that such a practice was effective, the sages could not have been secure enough to offer counsel against vengeance and for compassionate aid, patience and forgiveness toward the enemy. Ultimately, trust in Yahweh led to a renunciation of vengeance and cursing. With that avenue closed, the way to reconciliation was opened ever more broadly until one should come who was "greater than Solomon" (Matt. 12:42). His prayer would be, "Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do" (Luke 23:34). His witnesses would learn to pray, "Lord, do not hold this sin against them" (Acts 7:59).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Primary Sources

- Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of the Jordan*. 6 vols.
Oxford: Clarendon Prb .7735=1977.
- Epstein, I., ed. *Hebrew-English Edition of the Babylonian Talmud*. 6 vols. Londozi, 760-.
- Levi, I. *The Hebrew Text of the Book of Ecclesiasticus*.
Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1904.
- Nova Vulgata Bibliorum Sacrorum*. Libreria Editrice Vaticana,
1979.
- Rahlfs, A., ed. *Septuaginta: Id est Vetus Testamentum graeca iuxta LXX interpretes*. 2 vols. 9th ed.
Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1935.
- Yadin, Y. *The Ben Sira Scroll from Masada with Introduction, Emendations and Commentary*—Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society and Shrine of the Book, 1965.
- Ziegler J., ed. *Sapientia Iesu Filii Sirach*. Gottingen:
Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1965.
- _____. ed. *Sapientia Salomonis*. Gottingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1962.

B. English Translations

- The Five Megilloth and Jonah: A New Translation*. Introductions by H. Ginsberg. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1969.
- Good News Bible: The Bible in Today's English Version*.
New York: American Bible Society, 1976.
- Heidel, A. *The Gilgamesh Epic and Old Testament Parallels*.
Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1949.
- The Holy Bible: Authorized King James Version*. London and New York: William Collins Sons and Company, Ltd., 1957.

- The Holy Bible: New International Version*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Bible Publishers, 1978.
- The Jerusalem Bible*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, 1966.
- New American Standard Bible*. Philadelphia: A. J. Holman Company, 1977.
- The New English Bible with the Apocrypha*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1971.
- The New Oxford Annotated Bible with the Apocrypha: Revised Standard Version*. H. G. May and B. Metzger, eds. New York: Oxford University Press, 1973.
- Pritchard, J., ed. *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*. 2nd ed. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1955.
- C. Concordances, Grammar, and Encyclopedias
- Barthelemy, D. *Konkordanz zum Hebraischen Sirach: mit syr.-hebra. Index*. Gottingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1973.
- Botterweck, G. and H. Ringgren, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. 4 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974-1980.
- Buttrick, G., ed. *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible: An Illustrated Encyclopedia*. 4 vols. with Supplementary Volume. K. Crim, ed. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962, 1976.
- Campanhausen, Hans Frhr. von, E. Dinkler, G. Gloege, und K. Logstrup, eds. *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart: Handwörterbuch für Theologie und Religionswissenschaft*. 6 vols. with Index. K. Galling, hrsg. 3 Aufl. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1957.
- Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar as Edited and Enlarged by the Late E. Kautzsch*. A. E. Cowley, ed. 2nd English ed. rev. in accordance with the 28th German ed. (1909). Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910.

- Hatch, E. and H. Redpath. *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament including the Apocryphal Books*, Supplement by H. Redpath. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1897, 1906.
- Lisowsky, G. *Konkordanz zum Hebraischen Alten Testament*. 2 Aufl. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1958.
- Mandelkern, S. *Veteris Testamenti Concordantiae Hebraicae atque Chaldaicae*. Tel Aviv: Sumptibus Schocken Hierosolymis, 1978.
- Santos, E. Camilo dos. *An Expanded Hebrew Index for the Hatch-Redpath Concordance to the Septuagint*. Jerusalem: Dugith Publishers, Baptist House, n.d.

D. Secondary Sources

- Ackroyd, P. "A Note on the Hebrew Roots בִּאֵשׁ and בִּשְׁבִי." *Journal of Theological Studies*, 43 (1942), 160-161.
- Albright, W. F. "A Biblical Fragment from the Maccabaeon Age: The Nash Papyrus." *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 56 (1937), 145-176.
- , "Some Canaanite-Phoenician Sources of Hebrew Wisdom," *Supplements to Vetus Testamentum*, 3 (1955), 1-15.
- Anderson, A. *The Book of Psalms*. 2 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981.
- Aubert, L. "Les psaumes dans le culte d'Israël." *Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie*, NS 15 (1927), 211-240.
- Baker, and E. Nicholson, eds. and trans. *The Commentary of Rabbi David Kimhi on Psalms CXX-CL*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.
- Balentine, S. "Jeremiah, Prophet of Prayer." *Review and Expositor*, 78 (1981), 331-334.
- Barr, J. *Comparative Philology and the Text of the Old Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968.
- , "Vocalization and the Analysis of Hebrew among Ancient Translators." *Supplements to Vetus Testamentum* 16 (1967), 1-11.

- Barton, G. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Ecclesiastes*. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1908.
- Baumgartner, W. *Die Klagegedichte des Jeremias*. Giessen: Alfred Topelmann, 1917.
- Beauchamp, P. "Le salut corporel des justes et la conclusion du livre de la Sagesse." *Biblica*, 45 (1964), 491-526.
- Becker, J. *Gottesfurcht im Alten Testament*. Rom: Papstliches Bibelinstitut, 1965.
- Berridge, J. *Prophet, People, and the Word of God*. Zurich: EVZ-Verlag, 1970.
- Beyerlin, W. *Die Rettung der Bedrangten in den Feindpsalmen der Einzelnen auf institutionelle Zusammenhänge untersucht*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1970.
- Birkeland, H. *The Evildoers in the Book of Psalms*. Oslo: I Kommissjon Hos Jacob Dybwad, 1955.
- _____. *Die Feinde des Individuums in der israelitischen Psalmenliteratur*. Oslo: Grondahl and sons, 1933.
- Blau, J. "Zum Hebräisch der Übersetzer des Alten Testaments." *Vetus Testamentum*, 6 (1956), 98-100.
- Boecker, H. *Law and the Administration of Justice in the Old Testament and Ancient East*. Moiser, trans. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1980.
- Bonnard, P. *Le Psautier selon Jeremie*. Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1960.
- Bostrom, G. *Proverbastudien: die Weisheit und das Fremde Weiss in Spr. 1-9*. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1934.
- Bright, J. *The Authority of the Old Testament*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1961.
- _____. *A History of Israel*. Philadelphia: Westminster press, 1959.
- Bryce, G. "Another Wisdom-Book in Proverbs." *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 91 (1972), 145-157.
- _____. *The Legacy of Wisdom: The Egyptian Contribution to the Wisdom of Israel*. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 1979.

- Burnham, J. *Women in the Book of Proverbs*. Th.M. Thesis, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1956.
- Calvin, J. *Commentary on the Book of Psalms*. 5 vols. J. Anderson, trans. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1949.
- Clarke, E. *The Wisdom of Solomon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.
- Clements, R. *A Century of Old Testament Study*. London: Lutterworth Press, 1976.
- Coats, G. "The Joseph Story and Ancient Wisdom: A Reappraisal." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 35 (1973), 285-297.
- Cook, R. *The Neighbor Concept in the Old Testament*. Ph.D. Dissertation, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1980.
- Crenshaw, J. "Method in Determining Wisdom: Influence on 'Historical Literature'." *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 88 (1969), 129-142.
- _____. *Old Testament Wisdom: An Introduction*. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1981.
- _____, ed. *Studies in Ancient Israelite Wisdom*. New York: KTAV, 1976.
- _____. and J. Willis, eds. *Essays in Old Testament Ethics J. Philip Hyatt In Memoriam*. New York: KTAV, 1974.
- Cross, F. "The Oldest Manuscripts from Qumran." *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 74 (1955), 147-172.
- Dahood, M. *Proverbs and Northwest Semitic Philology*. Roma: Pontificum Institutum
- _____. "Two Pauline Quotations from the Old Testament." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 17 (1955), 19-24.
- Deane, W. *The Book of Wisdom*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1881.
- Delekat, L. *Asylie und Schutzorakel an Zionheiligtum*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1962.

- Dhorme, E. *A Commentary on the Book of Job*. H. Knight, trans. London: Nelson, 1967.
- Driver, S. R. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy*. 3rd ed. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1901.
- _____. *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*. New York: Meridian Books, 1957.
- Duhm, B. *Die Psalmen*. Leipzig and Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul-Mack), 1899.
- Eaton, *Kingship and the Psalms*. Naperville, Ill.: Alec R. Allenson, 1976.
- Eissfeldt, O. *The Old Testament: An Introduction*. P. Ackroyd, trans. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.
- Engnell, I. *Studies in Divine Kingship in the Ancient Near East*. Upsalla: Almqvist and Wiksells boktr., 1943.
- Feininger, B. "A Decade of German Psalm-Criticism." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*, 20 (1981), 91-103.
- Feldmann, F. "Zur Einheit des Buches der Weisheit." *Biblische Zeitschrift*, 7 (1909), 140-150.
- Fichtner, J. *Die Altorientalische Weisheit in ihrer Israelitisch-Jüdischen Ausprägung: Eine Studie zur Nationalisierung der Weisheit Israel*. Gießen: Verlag von Alfred-Topelmann, 1933.
- Fohrer, G. *Das Buch Hiob*. Gutersloh: Verlagshaus G. Mohn, 1963.
- Gammie, J. "The Theology of Retribution in the Book of Deuteronomy." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 32 (1970), 1-12.
- _____, W. Brueggemann, W. Humphreys, and J. Ward, eds. *Israelite Wisdom: Theological and Literary Essays in Honor of Samuel Terrien*. Missoula: Scholars Press
- Gemser, B. *Sprüche Salomos*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1937.

- Gerleman, G. "The Septuagint Proverbs as a Hellenistic Document." *Oudtestamentische Studien*, 8 (1950), 15-27.
- _____. *Studies in the LXX III: Proverbs*. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1956.
- Gerstenberger, E. "The Woe-Oracles of the Prophets." *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 81 (1962), 249-263.
- Gese, H. *Lehre und Wirklichkeit in der Alten Weisheit: Studien zu den Sprüchen Salomon und zu dem Buche Hiob*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1958.
- Ginsburg, C. *The Song of Songs and Coheleth*. 2 vols. in one. New York: KTAV, 1970, first published in 1861.
- Gordis, R. *The Book of God and Man: A Study of Job*. Chicago: University Chicago Press, 1965.
- _____. *The Book of Job: Commentary, New Translation and Special Studies*. New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1978.
- _____. *Koheleth--The Man and His World: A Study of Ecclesiastes*. 3rd aug.ed. New York: Schocken Books, 1968.
- _____. *Poets, Prophets and Sages: Essays in Biblical Interpretation*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1971.
- _____. *The Wisdom of Ecclesiastes*. New York: Behrman House, 1945.
- Gunkel, H. *Die Psalmen, Übersetzt und Erklärt*. 5 Aufl. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1968, 1 Aufl., 1926.
- _____. und J. Begrich. *Einleitung in die Psalmen: Die Gattungen der religiösen Lyrik Israels*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1933.
- Label, N. "The Symbolism of Wisdom in Proverbs 1-9." *Interpretation*, 26 (1972), 131-157.
- Hayes, J., ed. *Old Testament Form Criticism*. San Antonio: Trinity University Press, 1974.

- Hebgin, S. and F. Corrigan, trans. *St. Augustine on the Psalms*. 2 vols. Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1960, 1961.
- Hermisson, H. *Studien zur Israelitischen Spruchweisheit*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1968.
- Hertzberg, H. *Der Prediger*. Gotersloh: Verlaghaus Gerd Mohn, 1963.
- Heinisch, P. *Das Buch der Weisheit*. Munster: Aachendorffsche-Wrlagsbuchhandlung, 1912.
- Holscher, G. *Das Buch Hiob*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1937.
- Hooke, S., ed. *The Labyrinth: Further Studies in the Relation between Myth and Ritual in the Ancient World*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1935.
- Katz, P. "Zur Übersetzungstechnik der LXX." *Die Welt des Orients*, 2 (1956), 267-273.
- Kayatz, C. *Studien zu Proverbien Eine Form- und Motivgeschichtliche Untersuchung unter Einbeziehung Agyptischen Vergleichsmaterials*. NeukirchenVluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1966.
- Keel, O. *Feinde und Gottesleugner: Studien zur Image der Widersacher in den Individualpsalmen*. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1969.
- Kennedy, J. *An Aid to the Textual Amendment of the Old Testament*. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1928.
- Kirkpatrick, A. *The Psalms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1902.
- Klassen, W. "Coals of Fire: Sign of Repentance or Revenge?" *New Testament Studies*, 9 (1963), 337-350.
- Koch, K. "Gibt es eine Vergeltungsdogma im Alten Testament?" *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, 52 (1955), 1-42.
- _____. *Was Ist Formgeschichte? Methoden der Bibelexegese*. 3 Aufl. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener verlag, 1974.

- _____, ed. *Um Das Prinzip der Vergeltung in Religion and Recht des Alten Testaments*. Darmstedt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1972.
- Kohler, L. *Hebrew Man*. P. Ackroyd, trans. London: SCM Press, 1956.
- Kovacs, B. *Social-Structural Constraints upon Wisdom: The Spatial and Temporal Matrix of Proverbs 15:28-22:16*. 2 vols. Ph.D. Dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1978.
- Kraus, H. J. *Psalmen*. 2 vols. 5 Anti. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag des Erziehungsvereins, 1978.
- _____. *Worship in Israel: A Cultic History of the Old Testament*. G. Burwell, trans. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1966.
- Laney, J. "A Fresh Look at the Imprecatory Psalms." *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 138 (1981), 34-45.
- Lang, B. *Die weisheit Lehrrede: Eine Untersuchung von Spruch 1-7*. Stuttgart: Katholische Bibelwerk Verlag, 1972.
- Laura, A. *Kohelet*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1978.
- Loader, J. *Polar Structures in the Book of Qoheleth*. Berlin: Walter deGruyter, 1979.
- Mandry, S. *There Is No God! A Study of the Fool in the Old Testament Particularly in Proverbs and Qoheleth*. Rome: Catholic Book Agency, 1975.
- Manson, T. *The Sayings of Jesus as Recorded in the Gospels according to St. Matthew and St. Luke Arranged with Introduction and Commentary*. London: SCM Press, 1949.
- McKane, W. *Prophets and Wise Men*. Naperville, Ill.: Alec R. Allenson, 1965.
- _____. *Proverbs: A New Approach*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1970.
- Meyer, S. "The Psalms and Personal Counseling." *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 2 (Winter 1974), 26-77.

- Mowinckel, S. *The Psalms in Israel's Worship*. 2 vols.
D. Ap-Thomas, trans. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962.
- _____. *Psalmestudien*. 6 vols. Kristiania: In
kommission bei Jacob Dybwad, 1921.
- _____. "Zwei Beobachtung zum Deutung der
פַּעַל י־אָן." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche
Wissenschaft*, 43 (1925), 260-462.
- Morenz, S. "Feurige auf dem Haupt." *Theologische
Literaturzeitung*, 78 (1953), col. 187-192.
- Morgan, D. *Wisdom in the Old Testament Traditions*.
Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1981.
- Murphy, R. "The Kerygma of the Book of Proverbs."
Interpretation, 20 (1966), 3-14.
- _____. *Wisdom Literature: Job, Proverbs, Ruth,
Canticles, Ecclesiastes, Esther*. Grand Rapids:
Eerdmans, 1981.
- Noth, M. *The History of Israel*. S. Godman, trans. New
York: Harper and Brothers, 1958.
- _____. *Die Israelitischen Personennamen im Rahmen der
Gemeinsemitischen Namengebung*. Stuttgart: Verlag von
W. Kohlhammer, 1928.
- _____. *The Laws in the Pentateuch and Other Essays*.
D. Ap-Thomas, trans. Philadelphia: Fortress Press,
1967.
- _____ and D. Thomas, eds. "Wisdom in Israel and the
Ancient Near East." *Supplements to Vetus Testamentum*
Vol. 3. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1955.
- Oesterley, W. O. E. *The Book of Proverbs with Introduction
and Notes*. London: Methuen and Company, Ltd., 1929.
- Olshausen, J. *Die Psalmen*. Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1853.
- Otto, R. *The Idea of the Holy: An Inquiry into the Non-
Rational Factor in the Idea of the Divine and its
Relation to the Rational*. J. Harvey, trans. Rev. ed.
London: Oxford University Press, 1929.
- Pelican, J., ed. *Luther's Works*. 55 vols. St. Louis:
Concordia Publishing House, 1956-1959.

- Ringgren, H. and W. Zimmerli. *Sprüche-Prediger: Übersetzt und Erklärt*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1962.
- Perdue, L. *Wisdom and Cult: A Critical Analysis of the Views of Cult in the Wisdom Literature of Israel and the Ancient Near East*. Missoula: Scholastic Press, 1971.
- Peters, N. *Das Buch Jesus Sirach oder Ecclesiasticus*. Münster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1913.
- Pops, M. *Job: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*. 3rd ed. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, 1973.
- Rad, Gerhard von. *Genesis: A Commentary*. J. Marks, trans. Rev. ed. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1972.
- _____. *Old Testament Theology*. 2 vols. D. Stalker, trans. Harper and Row, 1962, 1965.
- _____. *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays*. E. Dickens, trans. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1951.
- _____. *Wisdom in Israel*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1972.
- Ramaroson, " 'Charbons ardent': 'sur la tête' ou 'pour le feu'? Proverbs 25:22a - Rom. 12:20b." *Biblica*, 51 (1970), 230-234.
- Reese, J. *Hellenistic Influence on the Book of Wisdom and Its Consequences*. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1971.
- Riddle, D. "The Logic of the Theory of Translation Greek." *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 51 (1932), 13-30.
- Rife, J. "The Mechanics of Translation Greek." *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 52 (1933), 244-252.
- Ringgren, H. *Word and Wisdom: Studies in the Hypostatization of Divine Qualities and Functions in the Ancient Near East*. Lund: Man Ohlssons Boktryckeri, 1947.
- Rowley, H. H. *Job*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980.
- Ruppert, L. *Der leidende Gerechte und seine Feinde: Eine Wortfelduntersuchung*. Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1973.

- Schillebeeckx, E. *Jesus: An Experiment in Christology*.
H. Hoskins, trans. New York: Seabury Press, 1979.
- Schmid, H. *Wesen und Geschichte der Weisheit: eine Untersuchung zur Altorientalischen und Israelitischen Weisheitsliteratur*. Berlin: Verlag Alfred Topelmann, 1966.
- Schmidt, H. *Das Gebet der Angeklagten im Alten Testament*.
Giessen: Alfred Topelmann, 1928.
- _____. *Die Psalmen*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck) 1934.
- Scott, R. B. Y. *Proverbs, Ecclesiastes: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, 1965.
- _____. "Solomon and the Beginnings of Wisdom in Israel." *Supplements to Vetus Testamentum*, 3 (1955), 262-279.
- Skehan, P. "A Single Editor for the Whole Book of Proverbs." *Studies in Israelite Poetry and Wisdom*. Washington: Catholic Biblical Association, 1971.
- _____. "The Text and Structure of the Book of Wisdom." *Traditio*, 3 (1945), 1-12.
- Skladny, U. *Die Altesten Spruchsammlungen in Israel*.
Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1962.
- Snaith, J. *Ecclesiasticus of the Wisdom of Jesus the Son of Sirach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974.
- Snaith, N. *The Book of Job: Its Origin and Purpose*.
London: SCM Press, 1968.
- Snidgers, L. "The Meaning of חֵכֶם in the Old Testament." *Oudtestamentische Studien*, 10 (1954), 1-154.
- Speiser, E. "The Hebrew Origin of the First Part of the Book of Wisdom." *Jewish Quarterly Review*, 14 (1923-24), 455-487.
- Tate, M. "The Speeches of Elihu." *Review and Expositor*, 68 (1971), 487-495.
- _____. *A Study of the Wise Men of Israel in Relation to the Prophets*. Dissertation, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1958.

- Thomas, D. Winton. "Textual and Philological Notes on Some Passages in the Book of Proverbs." *Supplements to Vetus Testamentum*, 3 (1955), 280-292.
- Toy, C. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Proverbs*. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1899.
- _____. "On Maccabean Psalms." *Unitarian Review and Religious Magazine*, 26, No. 1 (July 1886), 1-21.
- Trible, P. "Wisdom Builds a Poem: The Architecture of Proverbs 1:20-33." *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 94 (1975), 509-518.
- Tur-Sinai, N. H. *The Book of Job: A New Commentary*. Jerusalem: Kiryath Sepher, Ltd., 1957.
- Way, A., trans. *St. Basil: Exegetic Homilies*. Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1963.
- Weiser, A. *The Psalms: A Commentary*. H. Hartwell, trans. London: SCM Press, 1962.
- Westerman, C. *Basic Forms of Prophetic Speech*. H. White, trans. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1967.
- _____, ed. *Essays on Old Testament Hermeneutics*. J. Mays, ed. English translation. 2nd a: Richmond: John Knox Press, 1964.
- _____. *Praise and Lament in the Psalms*. K. Crim and R. Soulen, trans. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1981.
- _____. *The Structure of the Book of Job: A Form-Critical Analysis*. C Muenchow, trans. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981.
- _____. "Struktur und Geschichte der Klage im Alten Testament." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 6b (1954), 44-80.
- Whybray, R. *The Intellectual Tradition in the Old Testament*. Berlin: DeGruyter, 1974.
- _____. *Wisdom in Proverbs: The Concept of Wisdom in Proverbs 1-9*. Naperville, Ill. Alec R. Allenson, 1965.

- Winston, D. *The Wisdom of Solomon: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Garden City, New or Doubleday and Company, 1979.
- Wolff, H. W. *Anthropology of the Old Testament*. M. Kohl, trans. Rev. ed. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974.
- Wright, A. "The Riddle of the Sphinx: The Structure of the Book of Qohelet." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 30 (1968), 313-334.
- Wright, G. *The Biblical Doctrine of Man*. London: SCM Press, 1954.
- Zimmerli, W. "The Place and Limit of Wisdom in the Framework of the Old Testament Theology." *Scottish Journal of Theology*, 17 (1964), 146-158.
- _____. "Zur Struktur der alttestamentlichen Weisheit." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, NS 10 (1933), 177-204.
- Zimmermann, F. "The Book of Wisdom: Its Language and Character." *Jewish Quarterly* 57 (1966), 1-27, 101-135.

APPENDIX I

Enemy Designations within the Wisdom Literature

The **אויב**-Group

אויב	enemy	Prov. 16:7; 24:17; Job 13:24; 27:7; 33:10
מתקומם	one who raises himself	Job 27:7
צר	foe	Job 6:23; 16:9; 19:11
שטן	adversary	Job 1:6, 7 (2x), 8, 9, 12 (2x); 2:1, 2 (2x), 3, 4, 6, 7
שונא	hater	Prov. 25:21; 26:24; 27:6; Job 8:22; 34:17
משנא	enemy	Job 31 :29
ανθεστηκως	opponent	Wisd. 2:18; Sir. 46:6
αντιδικος	opponent	Sir. 33(36):7
εξουθενων	one who sets at nought	Wisd. 3:11; Sir. 19:1
εχθρα	enmity	Sir. 6:9; 37:2
εχθρος	enemy	Wisd. 5:17; 10:12, 19; 11:3, 5; 12:20, 22; 15:14; 16:4, 8, 22; 18:5, 7, 10; Sir. 5:15; 6:4, 9, 13; 12:8, 9, 10, 16 (2x); 18:31; 19:8; 20:23; 23:3; 25:7, 14, 15; 27:18; 29:6, 13; 30:3, 6; 33(36):7, 10; 42:11; 45:2; 46:1, 5, 6, 16; 47:7; 49:9; 51:8
θλιβων	oppressor	Wisd. 5:1; 10:15
θυμος	rage	Wisd. 16:5; 18:21; 19:1

κατισχυων	one who has power over	Wisd. 10:11
μισητος	hateful	Sir. 20:15
ονειδιζων	reproacher	Sir. 22:20
παρεστηκως	bystander	Sir. 51:2
πολεμιος	enemy	Wisd. 11:3
πολεμιστης	warrior	Wisd. 18:15
σαταν	adversary	Sir. 21:27
υπεναντιος	opponent	Wisd. 11:8; 18:8 Sir. 23:3; 47:7
The רשע-Group		
אביר	mighty	Job 24:22
איש-חמס	man of violence	Prov. 3:31; 16:29
איש-עול	unjust man	Prov. 29:27
אנשי-דמים	men of blood	Prov. 29:10
בוגד	treacherous	Prov. 2:22; 11:3, 6; 13:2, 15; 21:18; 22:12; 23:28; 25:19
בוצע	one who gains by violence	Prov. 1:19; 15:27
גאווה	pride	Prov. 29:23
גאה	pride	Prov. 15:25; 16:19; Job 40:11, 12
גזל	robber	Prov. 28:24
דורש-רעה	one who seeks evil	Prov. 11:27
זד	ruthless	Prov. 21:24

חוטא	sinner	Prov. 1:10; 13:21; 23:17
חורף	reproacher	Prov. 27:11
לשון-שקר	false tongue	Prov. 6:17, 24; 10:31; 12:19; 17:4, 20; 21:6; 25:23; 26:28; 28:23
מרע	evildoer	Prov. 17:4; 24:19; Job 8:20
עד-בל יעל	worthless witness	Prov. 19:28
עד-חנם	witness without cause	Prov. 24:28
עד-כזבים	lying witness	Prov. 21:28
עד-שקר	false witness	Prov. 6:19; 12:17; 14:5; 19:5, 9; 25:19
עריץ	ruthless	Prov. 11:16; Job 6:23; 15:20; 27:13
עושק	oppressor	Prov. 14:31; 22:16; 28:3; Qoh. 4:1
פי-רשע	wicked mouth	Prov. 4:24; 5:4; 6:2, 12; 8:13; 10:6, 11 (2x), 14; 11:9, 11; 14:3; 15:28; 18:6, 7; 19:28; 22:14; 26:28
פועל-י-און	worker of iniquity	Prov. 10:29; 21:15 Job 31:3; 34:8, 22
רשע	wicked	Prov. 2:22; 3:33; 4:14, 19; 5:22; 9:7; 10:3, 6, 7, 11, 16, 20, 24, 25, 27, 28, 30, 32; 11:5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 18, 23, 31; 12:5, 6, 7, 10, 12, 21, 26; 13:5, 9, 17, 25; 14:11, 19, 32; 15:6, 8, 9, 28, 29; 16:4; 17:15, 23; 18:3, 5; 19:28; 20:26; 21:4, 7, 10, 12 (2x), 18, 27, 29; 24:15,

		16, 20, 24; 25:5, 26; 28:4, 12, 15, 28; 29:2, 7, 12, 16, 17; Job 3:17; 8:22; 9:22, 24; 10:3; 11:20; 15:20; 16:11; 18:5; 20:5, 29; 21:7, 16, 17, 28; 22:18; 24:6; 27:7, 13; 34:18; 36:6, 17; 38:13, 15; 40:12; Qoh. 3:17; 7:15; 8:10, 13, 14 (2x); 9:2 Prov. 4:24; 5:3; 10:18; 12:22 Sir. 4:9 Wisd. 3:19; 4:16; 10:3; 12:12; 14:31; 16:24; Sir. 17:14; 27:10; 32(35):18; 40:13 Wisd. 5:1
שפת־יֶשֶׁקֶר	lying lips	
αδικων	wrongdoer	
αδικος	wrongdoing	
αθετων	one who sets aside	
αμαρτανων	sinner	
αμαρτια	sin	
αμαρτωλος	sinner	
αναιδης	shameless	
ανομος	lawless	
ασεβεια	impiety	

ασεβων	one who is	Wisd. 14:9
ασεβης	impious impious	Wisd. 1:9, 16; 3:10; 4:3, 16; 5:14; 10:6, 20; 11:9; 12:9; 16:16, 18; 19:1
αφαιρουμενος	one who takes away for oneself	Sir. 31(34):22
γλωσσα	tongue	Sir. 5:13, 14; 20:16 27:25; 28:14, 15, 17,, 18; 51:2, 5, 6
γλωσσωδης	babbler	Sir. 8:3; 9:18; 25:20
διαβολη	slander	Sir. 26:5; 28:9; 51:2, 6
δολιος	treacherous	Sir. 11:29
δωρον	gift	Sir. 20:29; 40:12
εγκαταλιπων	one who forsakes	Sir. 3:16
επικαταρατος	more accursed	Wisd. 14:8
εργαζομενος	worker	Sir. 27:10; 51:2
θρασυς	bold	Sir. 22:5
κακια	badness	Wisd, 2:21; 4:11; 5:13; 7:30; 12:2; 16:14
κακος	bad	Wisd. 14:6; 16:8; Sir. 7:1; 20:18; 36(33):1
κακων	one who harms	Sir. 33(36):8
κακουργος	scoundrel	Sir. 11:33; 30:35(33:27)
καταρωμενος	nursed	Wisd. 12:11; Sir. 31(34):24
ληστης	robber	Sir. 36:31(26)

λοιδορος	abuse	Sir. 23:8
παραβαινων	transgressor	Sir. 10:19; 19:24; 23:18; 40:14
παρανομος	lawless	Wisd. 3:16; Sir. 16:3
πονηρευμενος	rascal	Sir. 19:26
πονηρια	badness	Wisd. 4:6, 14; 10:7; 17:11; Sir. 12:10; 25:13; 34(32):24
πονηρος	bad	Sir. 4:20; 5:14; 14:5, 6, 8, 9, 10; 19:5; 27:27; 34(31):13, 24; 51:12
προσεχων	one who holds to	Sir. 28:16, 26
στομα	mouth	Wisd. 1:11
υβρις	insolence	Sir. 10:6, 8; 21:4
υβριστης	insolent	Sir. 8:11; 32(35):18
υπερηφανια	one arrogance	Sir. 10:7; 15:8; 51:10
υπερηφανος	arrogant	Wisd. 14:6; Sir. 3:28; 11:30; 13:1, 20; 21:4; 23:8; 27:15, 28; 34(31):26; 35(32):18; 51:10
χειλος	lip	Sir. 5:12
<u>The Neutral Group</u>		
רִי	stranger	Prov. 2:16; 5:3, 10, 17, 20; 6:1; 7:5; 11:15; 14:10; 20:16; 22:14; 27:13; Job 19:15, 27
רֶשֶׁת	prince	Qoh. 10:16, 17

αλλοτριος	alien	Wisd. 19:15; Sir. 8:18; 11:34; 21:25; 23:22, 23; 29:22; 33(36)2; 35(32):18; 40:29 (2x); 45:18; 49:5
αρχων	ruler	Sir. 10:14; 33(36):10; 46:18
βασιλευς	king	Wisd. 10:16; 18:11; Sir. 10:3
βοηθων	helper	Sir. 12:17
βουλη	counsel	Sir. 23:1
δυναστης	lord	Sir. 8:1; 10:3
εκκλησια	assembly	Sir. 26:5
ετερος	other	Sir. 11:6
καταδυναστευσας	one who exercises power over	Wisd. 15:14
κραταιος	mighty	Wisd. 6:8
οχλος	crowd	Sir. 26:5
πληθος	multitude	Wisd. 4:3; 11:17; 16:1; Sir. 5:6; 7:9; 31(34): 19; 36(33):11; 51:3
πλουσιος	rich	Sir. 8:20; 13:2, 3, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23; 25:2
συμβουλος	counselor	Sir. 6:6; 37:7, 8
συναγωγη	assembly	Sir. 16:6; 21:9
<u>The Friends and Kinfolk Group</u>		
אָב	brother	Prov. 19:7; Job 6:16; 19:13
עִדְוָה	close acquaintance	Job 19:14
בֵּרֵךְ	neighbor	Job 19:14

עָר	companion	Prov. 6:1, 3 (2x); 12:26; 14:20; 17:18; 18:17, 24; 19:4 (2x); 25:8, 9, 17; Job 12:4; 16:20, 21
αδελφος	brother	Wisd. 10:10
γονεις	parent	Wisd. 12:6
εσθιων	one who eats	Sir. 20:16
εταιρος	companion	Sir. 11:6; 37:2, 4, 5
πατηρ	father	Wisd. 14:15; Sir. 41:7
πλησιον	neighbor	Sir. 10:6; 19:14, 17; 27:18, 19; 28:2; 31(34):22
υιος	son	Sir. 16:1
φιλος	friend	Wisd. 1:16; Sir. 6:8, 9, 10, 13; 12:9; 13:21; 19:13, 14, 15; 20:23; 22:20, 21, 22 (2x); 36(33):6; 37:1, 2, 4, 5, 6
The Animals Group		
אֶרֶב	lion	Prov. 28:15
אֶרֶיָּה	lion	Job 4:10
כַּפְרִי	young lion	Prov. 19:12; 20:2; 28:1
לְבִיא	lion	Job 4:10
λεων	lion	Job. 4:11 Wisd. 11:17; Sir. 4:30; 21:2; 25:16; 27:10; 28:23

APPENDIX II

Enemy Behavior within the Wisdom Literature

אבד	(Pi.)	destroy	Prov. 1:32; 29:3; Job 12:23; Qoh. 3:6; 7:7; 9:18
און		mischievous	Prov. 17:4; 19:28; 30:20; Job 4:8, 11:14; 15:35; 18:7
אכל בשר		eat flesh	Qoh. 4:5
אלה		curse	Prov. 29:24; Job 31:30
אלח	(Ni.)	be	Job 15:16
באף		corrupt in anger	Job 18:4
ארב		lie in wait	Prov. 1:11, 18; 7:12; 12:6; 23:28; 24:15
בוש	(Hi.)	put to shame	Prov. 10:5; 12:4; 14:35; 17:2; 19:26; 29:15
בזה		despise	Prov. 14:2; 15:20; 19:16
בטח בעשר		trust in riches	Prov. 11:28
לא-בין		not understand	Job 9:11; 23:8; 42:3
בקש	(Pi.)	seek	Prov. 17:11, 19; 29:10 Job 10:6; Qoh. 7:29
ברך	(Pi.)	bless	Prov. 27:14; Job 1:5, 11; 2:5, 9
גדל	(Hi.)	triumph over	Job 19:5
דבה		whispering	Prov. 10:18; 25:10

דכא	(Pi.)	crush	Prov. 22:22; Job 6:9; 19:2
דלק		burn	Prov. 26:23
הגה		moan	Prov. 24:2; Job 27:4
הוה		destruction	Prov. 17:4; 19:13 Job 6:2, 30; 30:13
הלך	(Hith.)	walk about	Job 18:8
הלל	(Hith.)	boast	Prov. 25:14
הלל	(Pi.)	praise	Prov. 28:4
המה		murmur	Prov. 7:11; 9:13
הרג		kill	Prov. 1:32; 7:26; Job 5:2; 20:16; Qoh. 3:3
הרה		conceive	Job 15:35
זמם		devise	Prov. 30:32
זמה		device	Prov. 10:23; 21:27; 24:9
חדה		sharp	Prov. 5:4
חלק	I (Pi.)	dis- tribute	Prov. 16:19; Job 21:17
חלק	II (Hi.)	flatter	Prov. 2:16; 7:5; 28:23; 29:5
חמה		poison	Job 6:4
חמס		violence	Prov. 4:17; 10:6, 11; 13:2; 26:6; Job 16:17; 19:7
חנה		encamp	Job 19:12
חנם		without cause	Prov. 1:11, 17; 3:30; 24:28; 26:2; Job 1:9; 2:3; 9:17; 22:6
לא-חפץ		take no pleasure	Prov. 18:2

חפר		dig	Qoh. 10:8
חץ		arrow	Prov. 7:23; 25:18; 26:18; Job 6:4; 34:6
חרב		sword	Prov. 5:4; 12:18; 25:18; 30:14; Job 1:15, 17; 5:15, 20; 15:22; 19:29 (2x); 27:14
חרף		reproach	Prov. 27:11; Job 27:6
חרף	(Pi.)	reproach	Prov. 14:31; 17:5
חרק		gnash	Job 16:9
חשב		devise	Prov. 16:30; Job 6:26
טפל		whitewash	Job 13:4
טרף		tear	Job 16:9; 18:4
ילד		bear	Job 15:35
לא־ירא		not fear	Job 9:35
כזב		lie	Prov. 6:19; 14:5, 25; 19:5, 9; 21:28; 30:8
כלה	(Pi.)	destroy	Prov. 16:30; Job 9:22
כרה		dig	Prov. 26:27
ליץ	(Hi.)	scorn	Prov. 3:34; 14:9; 19:28
לעב		mock	Prov. 1:26; 17:5; 30:17; Job 9:23; 11:3; 22:19
מוקש		snare	Prov. 12:13; 13:14; 14:27; 18:7; 20:25; 22:25; 29:6, 25; Job 34:30
מזמה		device	Prov. 12:2; 24:8; Job 21:27; 42:2
משבה		device	Prov. 6:18; 15:26; Job 5:12; 21:27
מרמה		deceit	Prov. 12:5, 17, 20; 14:8, 25; 26:24; Job 15:35; 31:5

נאץ		despise	Prov. 1:30; 5:12; 15:5
נבע	(Hi.)	pour out	Prov. 15:2; 15:28
נדח	(Hi.)	compel	Prov. 7:21
נוע	(Hi.)	shake	Job 16:4
אין־נכונה		not true	Job 42:7, 8
נפל	(Hi.)	cast (lot)	Job 6:27
נקף	II (Hi.)	en- compass surround	Job 19:6
סבב		depart	Job 16:13; Qoh. 9:14
סור			Prov. 5:7; Job 21:14; 22:17; 34:27
עול		injustice	Job 34:10, 32
עולה		injustice	Prov. 22:8; Job 6:29, 30; 13:7; 15:16; 27:4; 36:23
עות	(Pi.)	pervert	Job 8:3; 19:6; 34:12 Qoh. 7:13
עזב		forsake	Prov. 27:10; Job 20:19
עזז	(Hi.)	show boldness	Prov. 21:29
בע־יניו		in his own eyes	Prov. 3:7; 12:15; 16:2; 21:2; 26:5, 12, 16; 28:11; 30:12; Job 32:1
עמל		trouble	Prov. 24:2; Job 3:10; 4:8; 5:6; 7:3; 11:16; 15:35; 16:2; Qoh. 1:3; 2:10, 11, 16, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24; 3:13; 4:4, 6, 8, 9; 5:14, 17, 18; 6:7; 8:15; 9:9; 10:15
ענה	III (Pi.)	af- flict	Job 30:11

ערץ		tremble	Job 31:34
עשק		oppress	Prov. 14:31; 22:16; 28:3, 17; Job 10:3; Qoh. 4:1 (2x)
פוח	(Hi.)	breathe	Prov. 6:19; 12:17;
		out	14:5, 25; 19:5, 9; 29:8
פח		trap	Prov. 7:23; 22:5; Job 18:9; 22:10; Qoh. 9:12
פצה		open	Job 35:16
פרש		spread	Prov. 29:5
צפן		hide	Prov. 1:11, 18; Job 10:13; 17:4; 21:19
קום		rise	Prov. 24:22; 28:12, 28; Job 16:8; 24:14; 30:12; 31:14
קלל	(Pi.)	curse	Prov. 20:20; 30:10, 11; Qoh. 7:21, 22; 10:20 (2x)
קללה		curse	Prov. 26:2; 27:14
קרץ-עין		wink the eye	Prov. 6:13; 10:10; 16:30
קשת		bow	Job 20:24
רדף		pursue	Prov. 28:1; Job 13:25; 19:22, 28; 30:15
רום		be high	Prov. 30:13
רוע	(Hi.)	shout	Job 30:5
רוץ		run	Prov. 1:16; 6:18; Job 15:26; 16:14
רחק		be far	Prov. 19:7; 22:5 Job 30:10
רעע	(Hi.)	do evil	Prov. 4:16; 24:8

רע		evil	Prov. 1:16; 2:12, 14 (2x); 3:7; 4:14; 5:14; 6:14, 24; 8:13 (2x); 12:20, 21; 13:17; 14:19, 22; 16:6; 20:22; 21:10; 23:6; 25:20; 26:23; 28:5, 10, 22; 29:6; Qoh. 1:13; 2:17; 4:3, 8, 17; 5:13; 6:2; 8:3, 5, 9, 11, 12; 9:3 (2x), 12; 10:13; 12:14
רעה		evil	Prov. 3:29, 30; 6:18; 11:19, 27; 14:32; 15:28; 16:27, 30; 17:13 (2x), 20; 24:1, 16; 26:26; 28:14; Job 20:12; 42:11; Qoh. 2:21; 5:12 (2x), 15; 6:1; 7:14, 15; 8:6, 11; 9:12; 10:5; 11:2, 10; 12:1
רשע	(Hi.)	condemn	Prov. 12:2; 17:15; Job 9:20; 10:2; 15:6; 32:3; 34:12, 17, 29; 40:8
רשת		net	Prov. 29:5; 18:8
שטם		bear a grudge	Job 16:9; 30:21
שמח		rejoice	Prov. 24:17; Job 31:29
שנא		hate	Prov. 22, 29; 5:12; 6:16; 8:13 (2x); 9:8; 13:5, 24; 15:27; 19:7; 25:17; 26:28; 28:16; 29:10; 29:24; 30:23; Qoh. 2:17, 18; 3:8
שנאה		hatred	Prov. 10:12, 18; 15:17; 26:26; Qoh. 9:1, 6
שאל		request	Job 31:30; 38:3; 40:7; 42:4
שדד		devastate	Prov. 11:3; Job 12:6; 15:21
שוא		emptiness	Prov. 30:8; Job 15:31; 31:5

שׁוּחַד		bribe	Prov. 17:8, 23; 21:14; Job 15:34
שׁחַת	(Hi.)	ruin	Prov. 6:32; 11:9
שׁחַת		pit	Prov. 26:27; Job 9:31
שׁכַּח		forget	Prov. 2:17; 3:1; 4:5; Job 8:13
שׁלַח-יָדוֹ		stretch out his hand	Job 1:11, 12; 2:5
שׁלַם	(Pi.)	repay	Prov. 20:22
שׁמַר		watch	Job 10:14; 13:27; 14:16; 24:15; 29:2; 33:11; Qoh. 5:7
שׁנַיִם		teeth	Prov. 30:14; Job 16:9
שׁקֶר		falsehood	Prov. 6:17, 19; 10:18; 12:17, 19, 22; 13:5; 14:5; 17:4, 7; 19:5, 9; 20:17; 21:6; 25:14; 25:18; 26:28; 29:12; Job 13:4; 36:4
תַּעַה		err	Prov. 7:25; 14:22; 21:16
αγαπαν		love	Sir. 3:26; 34(31):5
αγειν		lead	Wisd. 14:23
αγοραζειν		buy	Sir. 20:12; 37:11
αγρυπνια		sleeplessness	Sir. 34(31):1, 2, 20; 42:9
αδικειν		do wrong	Wisd. 14:29; Sir. 4:9; 13:3; 32(35):13; 33(36):9
αδικημα		injury	Sir. 10:6; 28:2
αδικια		injustice	Wisd. 1:5; 11:15; Sir. 7:3, 6; 10:7, 8; 14:9; 17:20, 26; 20:28; 27:10; 32(35):3; 40:12; 41:18

αδικος	unjust	Iliad. 1:8; 3:19; 406; 10:3; 12:12, 23; 14:30, 31; 16:24; Sir. 1:21; 5:8; 7:2; 10:7; 17:14; 19:25; 27:10; 31(34): 18; 32(35):12, 18; 40:13; 51:6
αδικως	unjustly	Wisd. 12:13, 23; 14:28, 30
αθετειν	set aside	Wisd. 5:1
αθωος	unpunished	Sir. 7:8
αιρειν	take	Sir. 27:25
αισχυνειν	shame	Sir. 4:20; 13:7; 41:17
αισχυνη	shame	Sir. 4:21; 5:14; 20:22, 23, 26
ακουειν	hear	Sir. 19:9, 10
αλισκειν	be caught	Sir. 9:4; 27:26, 29
αλλασσειν	change	Wisd. 4:11; 12:10; Sir. 7:18
αμαρτανειν	sin	Wisd. 11:16; 12, 2, 11; 14:31; 15:2 (2x), 13; Sir. 5:4; 7:7, 36; 10:29; 15:20; 19:4, 16, 28; 20:21; 21:1; 23:11; 24:22; 35(32):12; 53:15; 42:1
αμαρτια	sin	Sir. 5:5; 10:13; 12:14; 13:24; 16:9; 17:20; 18:27; 19:8; 21:2; 23:12, 13, 16; 26:28; 27:13; 28:2; 35(32):12; 48:15, 16
αμαρτωλος	sinner	Sir. 11:9, 32; 12:14; 16:13; 19:22; 23:8; 28:30; 28:9; 29:16, 19; 35(32):17
αμελειν	neglect	Wisd. 3:10

αναβαινειν	go up	Sir. 48:18
αναιρειν	raise	Wisd. 1:11; 14:24; Sir. 21:2
αναπτερειν	excite	Sir. 31(34):1
αναστρεφειν	turn upside down	Sir. 12:12, 16
ανατελλειν	make to rise up	Wisd. 5:6
ανατρεπειν	turn over	Sir. 12:12, 16; 29:16
ανελεημων	merciless	Wisd. 12:5; 19:1; Sir. 13:12; 32(35):18; 37:11
ανθισταναι	oppose	Wisd. 2:18; 5:23; 10:19; 11:3; 12:12; Sir. 8:2; 46:6, 7
ανιεναι	send up	Sir. 30:8
ανοιγειν	open	Sir. 20:15; 22:22
ανομημα	lawless deed	Wisd. 1:9; 3:14; 4:20
ανομια	lawlessness	Wisd. 5:7, 23; Sir. 23:114 41:18
ανοσιος	profane	Wisd. 12:4
απαγειν	lead away	Sir. 46:3
απαιρειν	carry off	Sir. 48:18
απαναινεσθαι	disown	Sir. 4:4
απανταν	meet	Sir. 34(31):22; 36(33):1
απειθειν	disobey	Sir. 2:15; 23:23; 30:12
αποδιδοναι	give back	Sir. 29:6 (2x)
αποκτεινειν	kill	Wisd. 16:14; 18:5; Sir. 30:23

απολλυειν	destroy	Sir. 6:4; 8:2; 10:3, 16, 17; 22:27; 27:16, 18; 28:13; 29:18; 30:23; 34(31):25; 46:6; 49:7
αποπλαναν	lead astray	Sir. 13:6
αποστελλειν	send	Wisd. 16:18; Sir. 48:18
αποστερειν	rob	Sir. 4:1; 29:6, 7; 31(34):21, 22
αποστρεφειν	turn back	Sir. 4:4, 5; 14:8; 21:15; 27:1; 29:7, 9; 46:11
αποτινειν	pay back	Sir. 20:15
απτεσθαι	fasten	Sir. 13:1
απωθειν	thrust away	Sir. 13:10
αρκειν	ward off	Wisd. 14:22
αρπαζειν	steal	Wisd. 4:11; Sir. 6:2
αρρωστια	weakness	Sir. 18:19
ασεβειν	be impious	Sir. 15:20
ασπαζεσθαι	greet	Sir. 41:20
ατιμαζειν	dishonor	Sir. 3:13; 8:4, 6; 10:23, 29; 22:5
ατιμια	dishonor	Wisd. 5:4; Sir. 1:30; 3:10; 5:13; 20:26; 29:6
αφαιρειν	take from	Wisd. 18:15; Sir. 9:13; 31(34):22
αφιειν	send forth	Wisd. 10:14; Sir. 23:1
αφισταν	depose	Wisd. 1:5; 3:10; 10:3; Sir. 10:12; 13:10; 15:11; 16:7; 19:2; 47:24
αφρων	without sense	Sir. 16:23

αχρηστος	useless	Wisd. 3:11
βαλλειν	cast	Sir. 27:25; 37:8
βασκανειν	envy	Sir. 14:6, 8
βασκανος	envious	Sir. 14:3; 18:18; 37:11
βδελυγμα	abomination	Sir. 10:13; 19:23; 27:30
βδελυσσειν	loathe	Sir. 11:2; 16:8; 20:8
βοηθειν	help	Sir. 12:17
βοθος	hole	Sir. 12:16; 27:26
βουλουειν	deliberate	Wisd. 18:5; Sir. 12:16
βουλη	counsel	Sir. 19:22; 23:1; 37:7
γογγυζειν	mutter	Sir. 10:25
γογγυσμος	murmuring	Wisd. 110, 11; Sir. 46:7
δανειζειν	lend	Sir. 20:15
διαβολη	slander	Sir. 28:9; 38:17; 51:6
διαβουλιον	counsel	Wisd. 1:9
διαιρειν	divide	Sir. 27:25
διαμαχεσθαι	fight	Sir. 8:1, 3; 51:19
διαμενειν	stand by	Sir. 12:15
διαστρεφειν	distort	Sir. 11:34; 19:25; 27:23
διατηρειν	watch closely	Sir. 28:1, 5
διαφθειρειν	destroy	Wisd. 16:19; 18:2; Sir. 47:22
διαφθορα	utterly	Sir. 34(31):5
διαχωριζειν	destruction	Sir. 6:13; 12:9
διδοναι	separate	Sir. 4:5; 11:33; 13:6; 20:15; 27:23
	give	

διηγεισθαι	describe	Sir. 19:8; 21:25
διιστανειν	set apart	Sir. 28:14
δικαζειν	judge	Wisd. 2:19; Sir. 8:14
διοδευειν	travel through	Wisd. 5:7
διωκειν	pursue	Wisd. 16:16; 19:2, 3; Sir. 11:10; 29:19; 34(31):5
δολιος	deceitful	Sir. 22:22
δολος	guile	Wisd. 14:25, 30
δοξαζειν	magnify	Sir. 10:26, 27
δυναστυειν	be powerful	Sir. 12:5; 48:12
δωρεαν	in vain	Sir. 20:23; 29:6, 7
εγκαθιζειν	seat upon	Sir. 8:11
εγκαλειν	bring change	Wisd. 12:12
εγκατακειπειν	forsake	Sir. 3:16; 4:19; 7:30; 9:10; 29:14, 17; 41:8
ειπειν	say	Wisd. 2:1; 5:3 (2x); 12:12; Sir. 5:1, 3, 4, 6; 7:9; 11:19, 23, 24; 12:16; 13:6, 23; 15:11, 12; 16:17; 19:14 (2x); 20:16; 34(31):12; 37:1, 8; 39:17, 34
εκβαλλειν	throw out	Wisd. 19:3; Sir. 7:26; 28:9, 15
εκδικειν	avenge	Sir. 28:1; 39:30; 46:1
εκδιωκειν	chase away	Sir. 39:30
εκζητειν	seek out	Sir. 47:25
εκκαieiν	kindle	Sir. 28:8, 11
εκκλινειν	turn aside	Sir. 8:2; 12:15; 35(32):17; 46:2

εκπιπτειν	drive out	Sir. 31(34):7
εκτεινειν	stretch out	Sir. 46:2
εκτηκειν	waste away	Sir. 18:18; 34(31):1
εκτριθεναι	set out	Wisd. 18:5
εκτριβειν	destroy	Wisd. 11:19; 12:9; Sir. 33(36):7; 46:18; 47:7; 48:21
εκφαινειν	disclose	Sir. 14:7; 19:25
εκχειν	pour out	Sir. 16:11; 28:11; 31(34):22; 33(36):7
ελεγχειν	reprove	Wisd. 1:3; 2:11; 4:20; Sir. 20:2
ελπιζειν	hope	Sir. 31(34):7
εμβαλλειν	throw in	Sir. 28:9
εμπιπλαναν	fill	Wisd. 5:7; Sir. 12:16; 14:9
εμπιστευειν	entrust	Sir. 19:4
ενδρευειν	lie in wait for	Wisd. 2:12; 10:12; Sir. 5:14; 11:31, 32; 27:10, 28; 28:26
ενεδρον	ambush	Sir. 8:11; 11:29
ενθυμεισθαι	consider	Wisd. 3:14; Sir. 17:31
ενθυμημα	thought	Sir. 32(35):19
εντρεπειν	hesitate	Wisd. 2:10
εξαιρειν	lift up	Sir. 10:15, 17; 26:29; 32(35):18; 33(36):7; 37:7
εξαλλασειν	change	Wisd. 2:15
εξολεθρευειν	destroy	Wisd. 12:8
εξομολογειν	confess	Sir. 51:2, 12

εξουθενειν	set at	Wisd. 4:18; Sir. 34(31):
	nought	22, 31
εξουθενουν	set at nought	Sir. 34(31):22, 31;
		47:7
επαγειν	bring on	Sir. 1:30; 4:17, 21;
		23:16; 46:3; 47:20;
		48:2
επαιρειν	be elated	Sir. 33(36):3; 46:2;
		47:4; 48:18
επεγειρειν	awaken	Sir. 46:1
επεχειν	hold upon	Sir. 5:1, 8; 13:11;
		32(35)02
επιβαινειν	go upon	Sir. 2:12; 9:2
επιβλεπειν	look upon	Sir. 11:30
επιγινωσκειν	observe	Wisd. 5:7; Sir. 19:27
επιλανθανειν	forget	Sir. 7:27; 23:14; 29:15;
		37:6
επιπιπτειν	fall upon	Sir. 25:19
επισπαν	pursue	Wisd. 1:12; 19:3
επισυναγειν	collect	Sir. 16:10
επιτιθεναι	put on	Sir. 11:31
επιχαιρειν	rejoice over	Sir. 8:7; 23:3
επιχειν	pour over	Wisd. 17:15
εργαζεσθαι	work	Wisd. 3:14; Sir. 51:2
εργον	work	Wisd. 1:12; Sir. 10:6
εριζειν	strive	Sir. 8:2; 11:9
εταζειν	examine	Wisd. 2:19; 6:6
ευδοκειν	be well pleased	Sir. 18:31
ευφραινειν	delight	Sir. 19:5; 27:29;
		32(35):19

ευφροσυνη	joy	Wisd. 2:9
εφισταναι	set upon	Wisd. 18:17; 19:1
ζητειν	seek	Sir. 12:12; 51:3
θελημα	will	Sir. 8:15; 35(32):17
θλιβειν	oppress	Wisd. 5:1; 10: Sir. 4:4; 30:21, 34(31):31; 46:5, 16
θλιψις	oppression	Sir. 32(35):20
θορυβος	tumult	Wisd. 14:26
θρασυς	rash	Sir. 4:29
θυμος	anger	Wisd. 10:3; 11:18; Sir. 39:28 (2x); 45:18, 19
ιδειν	see	Wisd. 2:17
ισταναι	stand	Wisd. 18:16; Sir. 27:26; 37:9
ισχυειν	prevail	Sir. 29:6
καθαιρειν	purge	Sir. 28:14; 31(34):23
κακια	bad	Wisd. 16:14
κακοποιειν	do bad	Sir. 19:28
κακος	bad	Wisd. 15:12; Sir. 12:3
κακουν	do bad	Wisd. 19:16; Sir. 3:26; 7:20; 11:24; 30:40 (33:31); 33(36):9; 38:21; 49:7
κακως	badly	Wisd. 14:29, 30
καλος	beautiful	Sir. 12:16; 13:6
καταβαλλειν	overthrow	Sir. 1:30; 7:7; 8:16; 47:4
καταγειν	lead down	Sir. 32(35):15; 48:3, 6

καταγελαν	mock at	Sir. 7:11; 20:17
καταδικαζειν	condemn	Wisd. 2:20; 11:10
καταδυναστευειν	exercise power over	Wisd. 2:10; 15:14; 17:2; Sir. 48:12
καταισχυνειν	put to shame	Sir. 2:10; 22:4, 5; 42:11, 14
καταλαμβάνειν	seize	Sir. 7:1; 11:10; 23:6
καταλειπειν	forsake	Sir. 13:4, 7; 23:8, 22, 26; 28:23; 29:14; 49:4
καταμανθανειν	observe well	Sir. 9:5, 8
κατανοησις	observation	Sir. 41:21
καταπαυειν	lay to rest	Sir. 5:6; 10:17
καταρα	curse	Sir. 23:26; 29:6
καταρασθαι	curse	Sir. 3:16; 4:5, 6; 21:27; 23:14; 28:13; 31 (34):24; 36(33):12
καταρασσειν	shatter	Wisd. 17:4; Sir. 46:6
καταστρεφειν	turn down	Sir. 10:13, 16; 27:3; 28:14
καταφθειρειν	destroy	Wisd. 15:19, 22
καταφρονειν	think contemptuously	Wisd. 14:30
κατισχυειν	overpower	Wisd. 7:30
καυχασθαι	boast	Sir. 11:4
κενος	empty	Wisd. 1:11; 3:11; Sir. 23:11
κινειν	remove	Sir. 12:18; 13:7
κρινειν	decide	Wisd. 6:4; 12:10
κρυφαιος	secret	Wisd. 17:3

κτασθαι	acquire	Sir. 6:4; 20:23; 29:6
κυκλοθεν	all around	Sir. 46:5, 16; 47:7; 51:4
κυλιειν	roll along	Sir. 27:27
λαλειν	speak	Sir. 13:6, 22
λαλια	speech	Sir. 5:13; 13:11
λαμβάνειν	take	Sir. 4:22, 27; 42:1
λεγειν	say	Sir. 12:16; 23:18; 35(36):10
λικμαν	winnow	Wisd. 11:18, 20
λογιζεσθαι	reckon	Wisd. 2:1, 16, 21; 5:4
λοιδορια	abuse	Sir. 29:6
λυμαινειν	treat with indignity	Sir. 28:23
λυπειν	grieve	Sir. 3:12; 4:2; 26:28; 30:9
λυπη	pain	Sir. 12:9; 18:15; 22:4
μαινεσθαι	be mad	Wisd. 14:28
μαστιγουν	flog	Wisd. 12:22; 16:16
μαχαιρα	sword	Sir. 28:18
μαχη	battle	Sir. 8:16
μεγαλαυχειν	boast	Sir. 48:18
μετερχεσθαι	go with	Wisd. 14:30
μισειν	hate	Wisd. 12:3; Sir. 9:18; 12:6; 19:9; 20:8; 21:28; 25:2; 27:24 (2x); 34(31):16
οδοντες	teeth	Wisd. 16:10
	cause pain	Wisd. 14:24

οδυνη	pain	Wisd. 4:19; Sir. 27:29
ολεθρος	destruction	Sir. 39:30
ομνυειν	swear	Wisd. 14:29, 30, 31; Sir.. 23:10, 11
ονειδιζειν	reproach	Wisd. 2:12; Sir. 8:5; 18:18; 20:15; 22:20; 41:7, 22
ονομαζειν	name	Sir. 23:10
οραν	see	Wisd. 4:18; Sir. 13:7
οργη	wrath	Wisd. 10:3; 11:9; Sir. 28:3; 33(36):9; 45:18, 19
ορκος	oath	Sir. 23:9
ορυσσειν	dig	Sir. 27:26
οφθαλμος	eye	Sir. 4:5; 12:16; 14:8; 26:11; 27:1, 22, 23
παγισ	trap	Wisd. 14:11; Sir. 9:3, 13; 27:20, 26, 29; 51:2
παραβαινειν	transgress	Sir. 10:19; 19:24; 23:18; 42:10
παραλυειν	undo	Wisd. 17:15, 19
παραμενειν	stay beside	Sir. 6:8, 10
παραταξις	placing in line of battle	Wisd. i2:9
παρεχειν	hold beside	Sir. 29:4
παρισταναι	make a stand	Sir. 23:22, 23; 51:2
παροδος	passage	Wisd. 17:9
πατασσειν	beat	Sir. 48:21
περιεχειν	surround	Sir. 51:7
περιπατειν	walk	Sir. 10:27

πικρία	bitterness	Sir. 4:6
πιμπλανάι	fill full	Sir. 23:11 (2x)
πλαναν	mislead	Wisd. 2:21; 5:6; 11:15; 12:24; 13:6; 14:22; 15:4; 17:1; Sir. 3:24; 9:8; 15:12; 31(34):7 Wisd. 1:12; 12:24
πλανη	error	
πλεοναζειν	be abundant:	Sir. 20:8
πληθυνειν	make full	Sir. 23:16; 48:16
πληρης	full	Wisd. 5:22; 11:18; Sir. 1:30; 19:26
πληρουν	fill	Wisd. 18:16
ποιειν	do	Sir. 7:1, 12; 8:15, 16; 14:7; 18:31; 19:13(2x); 20:4; 27:27; 28:17; 30:38(33:29); 31(34): 26; 32(35):18; 34(31): 10; 45:19
πολεμειν	fight	Sir. 4:28; 29:13
πολεμος	battle	Wisd. 14:22; Sir. 47:5
πονηειν	toil	Sir. 13:5
πονηρευεσθαι	be evil	Sir. 19:26
πονηρια	evil	Wisd. 10:5; Sir. 34(31): 24; 46:7
πονηρος	evil	Sir. 11:33; 17:31; 19:5
πορευεσθαι	go	Wisd. 1:11; Sir. 5:9; 8:15; 12:11; 18:30
προσαγειν	bring to	Sir. 31(34):20
προσαγορευειν	greet	Wisd. 14:22
προσδεχεσθαι	receive favorably	Wisd. 19:15

προσεχειν	hold to	Sir. 11:33; 28:16, 26
προσκαλειν	summon	Wisd. 1:16; Sir. 13:9
προσπορευεσθαι	come to	Sir. 12:14
προστιθεναι	put to	Sir. 3:27; 5:5; 19:13; 21:1
προσωπον	face	Sir. 4:4, 22, 27; 6:12; 7:6; 12:18; 14:8; 18:24; 19:27; 22:25; 26:5; 32(35):12, 13; 34(31): 6; 42:1
προφθανειν	outrun	Sir. 19:27
ρηγνυναι	shatter	Wisd. 4:19; Sir. 19:10
ρομφια	sword	Sir. 21:3; 22:21; 26:28; 46:2
σαλευειν	shake to and fro	Wisd. 4:19; Sir. 28:14; 29:18
σκανδαλον	trap	Wisd. 14:11
σκληρυνειν	harden	Sir. 30:12
σπαν	draw (a sword)	Sir. 22:21
σπειρειν	sow	Sir. 7:3
στερειν	deprive	Sir. 28:15
συγκυπτειν	conspire	Sir. 12:11; 19:26
συμβουλευειν	advise	Sir. 37:7
συμπολεμειν	join in war	Wisd. 5:20
συνεκπολεμειν	join in war	Wisd. 5:20
συντριβειν	crush	Sir. 13:2; 32(35):18 (2x); 33(36):10
ταπεινουν	humble	Sir. 12:11; 31(35):26
ταραχη	confusion	Wisd. 14:25; Sir. 11:34

ΤΕΚΤΑΙΝΕΙΝ	devise	Sir. 11:33; 27:22
ΤΙΚΤΕΙΝ	beget	Sir. 8:18
ΥΒΡΙΣ	insolence	Wisd. 2:19; 4:18; Sir. 10:6
ΥΠΑΝΤΑΝ	go to meet	Sir. 12:17
ΥΠΕΡΗΦΑΝΙΑ	arrogance	Sir. 22:22; 48:18
ΥΠΕΡΗΦΑΝΟΣ	arrogant	Sir. 35(32):12
ΥΠΕΡΙΔΕΙΝ	show	Sir. 23:11; 32(35):14
ΥΠΕΡΟΡΑΝ	contempt for show	Sir. 14:8
ΥΣΤΕΡΕΙΝ	contempt for be behind	Sir. 7:34; 13:4
ΦΑΥΛΟΣ	trivial	Sir. 20:16
ΦΙΛΙΑΖΕΙΝ	love	Sir. 37:1
ΦΘΕΓΓΕΣΘΑΙ	utter a sound	Wisd. 1:8; Sir. 13:22
ΦΘΟΡΑ	destruction	Wisd. 14:25
ΦΟΝΕΥΕΙΝ	murder	Sir. 9:13; 31(34):22
ΦΟΝΟΣ	murder	Wis. 14:25
ΦΡΟΝΕΙΝ	have understanding	Wisd. 14:30
ΦΥΛΑΣΣΕΙΝ	guard	Wisd. 18:4; Sir. 19:9
ΨΕΥΔΗΣ	false	Wisd. 14:28
ΨΕΥΔΟΣ	lie	Sir. 7:12, 13
ΨΙΘΥΡΙΖΟΝ	whisper	Sir. 12:16; 21:28

APPENDIX III

Derivative Enemy Designations

Derivative, but Traditional

The אֹיֵב-Group

בעל-אף	lord of anger	Prov. 22:24
גולל-אבן	one who rolls a stone	Prov. 26:27
חולק-עם-גנב	partner of a thief	Prov. 29:24
חופר-גומץ	one who digs a pit	Qoh. 10 :8
כורה-שחת	one who digs a pit	Prov. 26:27
ρομφαία	sword	Sir. 39:30
The רשע-Group		
אדם-בל-יעל	worthless man	Prov. 6:12; 16:27
אהל-י-שוחד	tents of bribery	Job 15:35 (cf. v. 34)
איש-און	wicked man	Prov. 6:12
אנשי-לצון	scoffers	Prov. 29:8
בוטח-בעשרו	one who trusts in his riches	Prov. 11:28
בעל-מזמות	lord of devices	Prov. 24:8
זונה	harlot	Prov. 23:28

זורע-עולה	one who sows injustice	Prov. 22:8
זורע-עמל	those who sow trouble	Job 4:8
חרדת-אדם	dread of man	Prov. 29:25
חורש-יאון	those who devise mischief	Job 4:8
חורש-ירע	those who devise evil	Prov. 14:22
לועג-לרש	one who mocks the poor	Prov. 17:5
מחליק	one who flatters	Prov. 28:23
מנאף	adulteress	Prov. 30:20
מקשה-לבו	one who hardens his heart	Prov. 28:14
מרדף	one who pursues	Prov. 11:19
משגה	one who misleads	Prov. 28:10
נואף	one who commits adultery	Prov. 6:32
נהפך-בלשונו	one with a perverse tongue	Prov. 17:20
נלוז	one who is devious	Prov. 14:2
סלף	crookedness	Prov. 11:3
עוזב-יתורה	those who forsake the law	Prov. 28:4
עוצה-עיניו	one who winks his eyes	Prov. 16:30

עקש-לב	one of crooked heart	Prov. 17:20
פה-חלק	flattering mouth	Prov. 26:28
פשע-שפתיו	transgression of his lips	Prov. 12:13
קורע-שקתיו	one who compresses his lips	Prov. 16:30
רועה-זונות	one who keeps company with harlots	Prov. 29:3
רוצח	murderer	Job 24:14
שומח-איד	evil eye one who is glad at calamity	Prov. 23:6; 28:22 Prov. 17:5
שוכח-אל	those who forget God	Job 8:13
תחבלות-רשעים	counsels of the wicked	Prov. 12:5
αγαπων χρυσιον	one who loves gold	Sir. 34(31):5
ανηρ πολυορκος	man of many oaths	Sir. 23:11
αχαριστος	ungrateful one	Sir. 29:16
βασκανος	envious one	Sir. 18:18
βασκανων οφθαλμων	one who is envious of eyes	Sir. 14:8
γλωσσα	tongue	Sir. 28:18, 23
γλωσσα τριτη	triple-tongue	Sir. 28:14, 15
διανευων οφθαλμω	one who winks the eye	Sir. 27:22

διωκων διαφορα	one who	Sir. 34(31):5
ος εκει εξουσιαν	pursues profit	
φονευειν	whoever has	Sir. 9:13
κρατων αμαρτιαν	power to kill	
υπερηφανιαν	one who	Sir. 10:13
λογων αυτου ακοη	clings to sin	
	pride	
	report of	Wisd. 1:9
	his(=ungodly's)	
	words	
λυπη	pain	Sir. 30:23
πλεονεκτου	eye of a	Sir. 14:9
οφθαλμος	greedy one	
υπονοια πονηρα	wrong	Sir. 3:24
	opinion	
ψαλλουση	woman singer	Sir. 9:4
ψιθυριζων	whisperer	Sir. 21:28
ψιθυρον-διγλωσσον	whisperer	Sir. 28:13
	deceiver	
ψυχη πονηρα	evil soul	Sir. 6:4
<u>The Neutral Group</u>		
אָדאָם(ה)	(the) man	Prov. 21:16; 20:25; Qoh. 1:3; 7:29
אִישׁ	man	Qoh. 4:4
אִישׁ-עֲשִׂיר	rich man	Prov. 28:11
גָּבוֹה	high one	Qoh. 5:7
גֶּבֶר	man	Prov. 29:5
גֶּבֶר-רָשׁ	poor man	Prov. 28:3
דּוֹר	generation	Prov. 30:11, 12, 14
כְּבִירִים	mighty ones	Job 34:27 (cf. v. 24)

לב־בני־אדם	heart of the sons of man	Qoh. 6:11; 9:3
מלך	king	Prov. 16:12; 24:21; Qoh. 8:2; 9:14
מושל	ruler	Prov. 29:12
נגיד	prince	Prov. 28:16
של־יט	ruler	Qoh. 10:5
αντιλημπτορες (πλουσιου)	helpers (of a rich man)	Sir. 13:22
πνευματα	winds	Sir. 39:28
σαρξ και αιμα	flesh and blood	Sir. 17:13
The Friends and Kinfolk Group		
אדון	master	Prov. 30:10
אשה	wife	Prov. 12:4; Job 2:9
בן	son	Prov. 10:5; 17:2; 19:26; Job 1:5
בני־בל־י־שם	sons of no reputation	Job 30:10 (cf. v. 8)
בני־נבל	sons of folly	Job 30:10 (cf. v. 8)
נער	youth	Prov. 29:15
עבד	servant	Prov. 30:10; 14:35; Qoh. 7:21
עין	eye	Prov. 30:17
פרח	rabble	Job 30:12
δανειζομενος	borrower	Sir. 29:6
δανειζων	lender	Sir. 29:6
γυνη	woman/wife	Sir. 9:2, 3; 19:2; 23:22; 42:14

καλλει γυναικος	beauty of a woman	Sir. 9:8
εμπορος	merchant	Sir. 26:29
ζητων πληθυναι	one who seeks to get rich	Sir. 27:1
θυγατηρ	daughter	Sir. 22:4, 5; 26:10; 42:9, 11
καπηλος	tradesman	Sir. 26:29
τεκνον	son	Sir. 3:12; 4:1; 11:10; 18:15; 21:1; 30:9; 54(51):22; 41:7
<u>The Animals Group</u>		
נֶפֶשׁ יִשְׁלִי	tongue of a viper	Job 20:16
εχεις	vipers	Sir. 39:30
θηριοις δεινοις	dread wild beasts	Wisd. 12:9
θηριων οδοντες	teeth of wild beasts	Sir. 39:30
νεοκτισους θυμου πληρεις θηρας αγνωστους πυρ- πνοον φυσιωντας ασθμα βρομον λικμωμενους καπνου δεινους απ ομματων σπινθηρας αστραπτου- τας	newly created unknown beasts full of rage, or such as breathe out fiery breath, or belch forth a thick pall of smoke, or flash terrible sparks from their eyes	Wisd. 11:18
οψις	sight	Wisd. 11:19
σκορπιοι	scorpions	Sir. 39:30
σφηκας	wasps	Wisd. 12:8

Derivative and Non-Traditional

אִילִים	fools	Prov. 12:15; 14:9; 15:5; 24:9
אִיּוֹב	Job	Job 1:9, 11; 2:5, 9; 9:11, 20, 35; 11:3, 14, 15; 15:6, 16; 16:4, 8; 18:4; 22:6; 23:8; 27:4, 6; 31:5, 16, 29, 30; 32:1; 35:16; 40:8; 42:3
אֲנִי	I	Qoh. 2:17, 18, 20
חִכְמָה / חִכְמוֹת	Wisdom	Prov. 1:26 (cf. 20); 8:13 (cf. v. 1)
חֲכָמִים	wise men	Job 5:15 (cf. v. 13)
יֹשְׁרִים	upright	Prov. 29:10
כְּסִילִים	stupid fellows	Prov. 1:29 (cf. v. 22), 32; 10:18, 23; 14:8; 15:2, 20; 18:2, 7; 26:5; Qoh. 4:5, 17
כַּשְׂדִּים	Chaldeans	Job 1:17
לֹצִים	scoffers	Prov. 1:29 (cf. v. 22)
הַמַּעֲשָׂה	the work	Qoh. 2:17
מַתְּלֵה־לָהּ	madman	Prov. 26:18
נַפְתָּלִים	wily	Job 5:15 (cf. v. 13)
נָקִי	innocent	Job 22:19
עֲצֵל	sluggard	Prov. 26:16
עֲרוּמִים	crafty	Job 5:15 (cf. v. 13)
פְּתִים	simple	Prov. 1:29 (cf. v. 22)
צַדִּיק	righteous	Prov. 13:5; Job 22:19
שָׂטָן (הַ)	(the) Satan	Job 1:11, 12; 2:5
זַבְעָנִים	Zabeans	Job 1:15

שומרי־תורה	those who keep the law	Prov. 28:4
αἰσχυνή	shame	Sir. 4:21
ανθρωπος κακατεχνος επινοια	evil intent of human art	Wisd. 15:4
ανθρωποι συμ- φορα η τυραν- νιδι δουλευσαντες	men in bondage to misfortune or royal authority	Wisd. 14:22-26 (cf. v.
αντανakλωμενη εκ κοιλοτητος ορων εχω	echo thrown back from a of the mountains	Wisd. 17:18
απαιδευτοι ψυχαι	uninstructed souls	Wisd. 17:1
αρχαιοι γιγαντοι	ancient giants	Sir. 16:7
αφρων βασιλεις Ιουδα	fool kings of Judah	Sir. 16:23; Wisd. 5:4 Sir. 49:4, 7
Δαυιδ δεομενου δικαιος δικη	David needy righteous justice	Sir. 47:4, 5, 7 Sir. 4:5 Wisd. 4:16; 10:20 Wisd. 1:8; 11:20; 14:30, 31
εγω	I	Sir. 22:25, 27; 23:1; 27:24
ειδωλοι εθνων	heathen idols	Wisd. 14:11
εκκλησια ελαττουμενους καρδια	congregation one who is devoid of understanding	Sir. 46:7 Sir. 16:23
ελεημονσυνη	almsgiving	Sir. 29:13 (cf. v. 12)

ενυπνια	dreams	Sir. 31(34):7
εξακοσιας	six hundred	Sir. 16:10
χιλιαδας	thousand men	
εξουθενων σοφιαν	one who	Wisd. 3:11
και παιδειαν	despises	
	wisdom and	
	instruction	
Εφραιμ	Ephraim	Sir. 47:24-25 (cf. v. 23)
Ηλιας	Elijah	Sir. 48:2-3, 6 (cf. v. 1)
Ιησους	Joshua	Sir. 46:1-3
ινδαλμα	specters	Wisd. 17:3
κεραμευς	potter	Wisd. 15:12 (cf. v. 7)
κλαδους ορνεων	melodious	Wisd. 17:17
	sound of birds	
κοιλιας ορεξις	gluttony	Sir. 23:6
ο κοσμος	the world	Wisd. 5:20
κτησις	creation	Wisd. 16:24
κτυπος απηνης	harsh crash	Wisd. 17:17
καταρριπτομενων	of rocks	
πετρων	hurled down	
λαον	people	Sir. 46:7
μωρος	fool	Sir. 18:18; 20:16
νεοτης τελεσθεισα	youth	Wisd. 4:16
ταχεως	quickly perfected	
οινος	wine	Sir. 19:2; 34:31):25
πανουργια	cleverness	Sir. 19:23, 25
περισσευων εν	highly	Sir. 19:24
φρονησει	prudent man	

πηλουργος	worker in clay	Wisd. 15:12, 13 (cf. v. 7)
πλανωμενος	misguided man	Sir. 16:23
πνευμα δυναμεως	mighty wind	Wisd. 5:23
πνευμα συριζον	whistling wind	Wisd. 17:17
ποταμοι	rivers	Wisd. 5:22
πυρ	fire	Wisd. 16:22
ρυθμος υδατος πορευμενου βια	rhythm of violently rushing water	Wisd. 17:17
Σαλωμων	Solomon	Sir. 47:20 (cf. v. 13)
Σενναχηριμ	Sennacherib	Sir. 48:18
σκιαγραφων πονος ακαρπος	fruitless toil of painters	Wisd. 15:4
σκιρτωντων ζων ορομος αθεωρητος	unseen running of leaping animals	Wisd. 17:18
σοφια	wisdom	Sir. 4:17, 19 (cf. v. 11); Wisd. 10:19
συμβουλος	counselor.	Sir. 37:7, 8
τολμηρος	foolhardy fellow	Sir. 8:15
υδωρ θαλασσης	water of the sea	Wisd. 5:22
υπολημψις	hasty judgment	Sir. 3:24
φαντασμα	specters	Wisd. 17:15
φαντισιασια	apparitions	Wisd. 18:17

φλοξ	flame	Wisd. 16:19 (cf. v. 18)
φοβος	fear	Wisd. 17:15; 18:17
χαλαξαι	hailstones	Wisd. 5:22
χρυσιον	gold	Sir. 8:2
ψυχη προδοσια	soul's surrender	Wisd. 17:15
ωρυομενων	sound of	Wisd. 17:18
απηνεστατων	the most	
θηριων φωνη	savage roaring beasts	
God (This includes both names and terms such as לֵא , יְהוָה , יְהוָה , יְהוָה , יְהוָה , יְהוָה δυναμεις (του θεου), θεος θεου κρισις , κυριος , πνευμα δυναμεως σου (=του θεου) ο ποιησας , ο ταπεινων , ο υψιστος .)		Prov. 3:33-34; 6:16; 22:23; 24:22; Job 1:11; 2:3, 5; 6:4, 9; 8:3; 9:17, 20, 22, 23, 31 (cf. vv. 2ff., 13); 10:2, 3, 13, 14 (cf. vv. 2, 8); 12:23; 13:25, 27 (cf. 33:11); 14:16; 16:9, 13, 14 (cf. vv. 7-9, 11); 19:6, 12, 22; 21:17, 19; 30:11, 21; 34:10, 12; 36:23; 38:3 (=40:7); 42:4, 11; Qoh. 1:13; 2:25; 5:17-19; 6:1-2; 7:13, 14; 9:1, 9-10, 11-12; Sir. 1:30; 3:16; 4:6, 28; 5:3, 6; 7:11; 10:13-17; 12:6; 16:6-11; 18:24 (cf. v. 23); 26:28; 27:24; 32(35):18-20; 33(36):3, 7, 9; 36(33):12 (cf. v. 11); 46:6; 48:21; Wisd. 1:3; 4:18; 5:20 (cf. v. 15); 11:10, 15, 20; 12:2, 4, 9, 22-23; 16:18; 18:5, 16

Abstract

THE "ENEMY" IN ISRAELITE WISDOM LITERATURE

John Keating Wiles, Ph.D.

The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1982

Chairman: Marvin E. Tate

The purpose of the dissertation was to demonstrate that the Israelite sages were aware of the enemies known from the Psalms. Following a brief survey of interpretations of the enemies in the Psalms, the study began by noting and discussing all designations of enemies located in individual laments, thanksgiving songs, and songs of confidence which also appeared in the wisdom literature.

A second avenue was to note which figures were described as enemies were described in the Psalter. This involved determining how enemies were portrayed in the Psalms and then locating similar presentations in the wisdom literature. Some figures were portrayed with enemy characteristics in the wisdom literature who did not appear in the Psalms. These new enemy figures were called "derivative enemies."

Following this groundwork the possibility of asking aster wise responses to the enemy emerged. The leading question was whether or not Proverbs 25:21-22, with its

beneficent treatment of the enemy, was characteristic of the responses counseled in the wisdom literature.

The investigation revealed that the sages were aware of the enemies encountered in the Psalms. The responses counseled by the wise were frequently concerned to achieve peace and reconciliation between themselves and their enemies. Counsel appeared which ruled out involvement in a cycle of hostility.

The suggestion was made that this attitude was not the sole possession of the wisdom tradition, but rather the common inheritance of Israel. Nevertheless, some of the particular concerns of wisdom predisposed the sages to trace out its implications in some detail while other circles in Israel were predisposed to deal with other problems.

The key to the conciliatory responses of the wise was suggested to be their religious life. They believed in the effectiveness of the laments and, therefore, had no need to seek vengeance. They were liberated to set about the task of finding ways of getting along with enemies which would secure life until Yahweh acted.

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA

John Keating Wiles

PERSONAL

Born: September 1, 1950, Louisville, Kentucky
Parents: John C. and Ruth K. Wiles
Married: Carolyn Joy Winsett, June 11, 1977
Child: Sarah Winsett Wiles, born March 6, 1982

EDUCATIONAL

Public Schools, Flagstaff and Buckeye, Arizona,
Tucumcari, New Mexico, and Comanche, Texas,
1955-1968
B.M. Oklahoma Baptist University, Shawnee, Oklahoma,
May, 1972, Theory and Composition major
M.Div., Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary,
Kansas City, Missouri, May, 1977

MINISTERIAL

Music and Youth Director, Calvary Baptist Church,
Shawnee, Oklahoma, 1970-1971
Music and Youth Director, First Baptist Church,
Stroud, Oklahoma, 1971-1972
Music and Youth Director, First Baptist Church,
Eufala, Oklahoma, 1972-1973
Interim Music Director, First Baptist Church,
Comanche, Texas, 1973
Music and Youth Director, Claycomo Baptist Church,
Claycomo, Missouri, 1974-1976
Interim Music Director, Berea Baptist Church,
Kansas City, Kansas, 1976

ACADEMIC

Grader, Dr. Ben Philbeck, Midwestern Baptist
Theological Seminary, 1977
Fellow, Dr. Marvin Tate, The Southern Baptist
Theological Seminary, 1978-1979
Instructor, Biblical Languages and Interpretation,
Simmons University Bible College, 1979-1981
Instructor, Hebrew, The Southern Baptist Theological
Seminary, 1981-1982

ORGANIZATIONAL

Omicron Delta Kappa, National Leadership Fraternity
The Society of Biblical Literature