

C [Biblicæ V. T.] B. J. Faye
1850
NOTES,

CRITICAL, ILLUSTRATIVE, AND PRACTICAL,

ON

THE BOOK OF JOB:

WITH

A New Translation,

AND

AN INTRODUCTORY DISSERTATION.

BY THE

REV. ALBERT BARNES.

Carefully Revised

AND COMPARED WITH THE LAST AMERICAN EDITION,

BY THE REV. JOHN CUMMING, D.D.

VOL. II.

LONDON:

GEORGE ROUTLEDGE, 36, SOHO SQUARE.

1847.

1155

6 Whose house I have made

c. c. 24. 5.

(*ass*), see Notes on Isa. lviii. 6. These animals commonly "inhabit the dry and mountainous parts of the deserts of Great Tartary, but not higher than about lat. 48°. They are migratory, and arrive in vast troops to feed, during the summer, on the tracts to the north and east of the sea of Aral. About autumn they collect in herds of hundreds, and even thousands, and direct their course southward towards India, to enjoy a warm retreat during winter. But they more usually retire to Persia, where they are found in the mountains of Casbin, and where part of them remain during the whole year. They are also said to penetrate to the southern parts of India, to the mountains of Malabar and Golconda. These animals were anciently found in Palestine, Syria, Arabia Deserta, Mesopotamia, Phrygia, and Lycaonia, but they rarely occur in those regions at the present time, and seem to be almost entirely confined to Tartary, some parts of Persia and India, and Africa. Their manners resemble those of the wild horse. They assemble in troops under the conduct of a leader or sentinel, and are extremely shy and vigilant. They will, however, stop in the midst of their course, and even suffer the approach of man for an instant, and then dart off with the utmost rapidity. They have been at all times celebrated for their swiftness. Their voice resembles that of the common ass, but is shriller." *Rob. Calmet*. The Onager or wild ass is doubtless "the parent stock from which we have derived the useful domestic animal, which seems to have degenerated the farther it has been removed from its parent seat in Central Asia. It is greatly distinguished in spirit and grace of form from the domestic ass. It is taller and more dignified; it holds the head higher, and the legs are more elegantly shaped. Even the head, though large in proportion to the body, has a finer appearance, from the forehead being more arched; the neck by which it is sustained is much longer,

the wilderness, and the ¹ barren land his dwellings.

¹ salt places.

and has a more graceful bend. It has a short mane of dark and woolly hair; and a stripe of dark bushy hair also runs along the ridge of the back from the mane to the tail. The hair of the body is of a silver gray, inclining to flaxen color in some parts, and white under the belly. The hair is soft and silken, similar in texture to that of the camel." *Pict. Bible*. It is of this animal, so different in spirit, energy, agility, and appearance, from the domestic animal of that name, that we must think in order to understand this passage. We must think of them fleet as the wind, untamed and unbroken, wandering over vast plains in groups and herds, assembled by thousands under a leader or guide, and bounding off with uncontrollable rapidity on the approach of man, if we would feel the force of the appeal which is here made. God asks of Job whether *he*—who could not even subdue and tame this wild creature—had ordained the laws of its freedom; had held it as a captive, and then set it at liberty to exult over boundless plains in its conscious independence. The idea is, that it was one of the creatures of God, under *no* laws but such as *he* had been pleased to impose upon it, and wholly beyond the government of man. ¶ *Or who hath loosed the bands of the wild ass?* As if he had been once a captive, and then set free. The illustration is derived from the feeling which attends a restoration to liberty. The freedom of this animal *seems* to be as productive of exhilaration as if it had been a prisoner or slave, and had been suddenly emancipated.

6. *Whose house I have made.* God had appointed its home in the desert. ¶ *And the barren land his dwellings.* Marg., as in Heb., *salt places*. Such places were usually barren. Ps. cvii. 34, "He turneth a fruitful land into *barrenness*." Heb., *saltness*. Thus Virgil, Geor. ii. 238—240,

"Salsa autem tellus, et quae perhibetur amara,
Frugibus infelix: ea nec mansuescit arando,
Nec Baccho genus, aut pomis sua nomina
servat."

7 He scorneth the multitude of the city, neither regardeth he the crying of the ¹ driver.

8 The range of the mountains

¹ *exactor*, c. 3. 18.

Comp. Pliny, Nat. Hist. 31. 7. Deut. xxix. 23.

7. *He scorneth the multitude of the city.* That is, he sets all this at defiance; he is not intimidated by it. He finds his home far away from the city in the wild freedom of the wilderness. ¶ *Neither regardeth he the crying of the driver.* Marg., *exactor*. The Hebrew word properly means a collector of taxes or revenue, and hence an oppressor, and a driver of cattle. The allusion here is to a driver, and the meaning is, that he is not subject to restraint, but enjoys the most unlimited freedom.

8. *The range of the mountains is his pasture.* The word rendered *range* (רָמַד), means, properly, a *searching out*, and then that which is obtained by search. The word *range* expresses the idea with sufficient exactness. The usual range of the wild ass is the mountains. Pallas, who has given a full description of the habits of the Onager, or wild ass, states, that it especially loves desolate hills as its abode. *Acts of the Society of Sciences of Petersburg, for the year 1777.*

9. *Will the unicorn be willing to serve thee?* In the previous part of the argument, God had appealed to the lion, the raven, the goats of the rock, the hind, and the wild ass; and the idea was, that, in the instincts of each of those classes of animals, there was some special proof of wisdom. He now turns to another class of the animal creation in proof of his own supremacy and power, and lays the argument in the great strength and in the independence of the animal, and in the fact that man had not been able to subject his great strength to the purposes of husbandry. In regard to the animal here referred to, there has been great diversity of opinion among interpreters, nor is there as yet any one prevailing sentiment. Jerome renders it *rhinoceros*; the LXX,

is his pasture, and he searcheth after every green thing.

9 Will the unicorn ^a be willing to serve thee, or abide by thy crib?

^a De. 33. 17. Ps. 92. 10.

μονόκερος, *the unicorn*; the Chaldee and the Syriac retain the Hebrew word; Gesenius, Herder, Umbreit, and Noyes, render it *the buffalo*; Schultens, *alticornem*; Luther and Coverdale, *the unicorn*; Rosenmüller, *the onyx*, a large and fierce species of the antelope; Calmet supposes that the rhinoceros is intended; and Prof. Robinson, in an extended appendage to the article of Calmet (*Art., Unicorn*), has endeavored to show that the wild buffalo is intended. Bochart, also, in a long and learned argument, has endeavored to show that the rhinoceros cannot be meant. Hieroz. P. i. Lib. iii. c. xxi. He maintains that a species of antelope is referred to, the *rim* of the Arabs. De Wette (*Com. on Ps. xxii. 22*) accords with the opinion of Gesenius, Robinson, and others, that the animal referred to is the buffalo of the Eastern continent, the *bos bubalus* of Linnæus, an animal which differs from the American buffalo only in the shape of the horns and the absence of the dewlap. The word which occurs here, and which is rendered *unicorn* (רֵעֵם, or רֵעֵם), is used in the Scriptures only in the following places, where in the singular or plural it is uniformly rendered *unicorn*, or *unicorns*—Num. xxiii. 22; Deut. xxxiii. 17; Job xxxix. 9, 10; Ps. xxii. 21, xxix. 6, xcii. 10; and Isa. xxxii. 7. By a reference to these passages, it will be found that the animal had the following characteristics: (1.) It was distinguished for its *strength*. See ver. 11 of this chapter. Num. xxiii. 22, "He [that is, Israel, or the Israelites] hath as it were the strength of an unicorn"—רֵעֵם, *rēēm*. In Num. xxiv. 8, the same declaration is repeated. It is true that the Hebrew word in both these places (רֵעֵם) may denote *rapidity of motion, speed*; but in this place the notion of *strength* must be principally in-

tended, for it was of the *power* of the people, and their ability manifested in the number of their hosts, that Balaam is speaking. Bochart, however (Hieroz. P. i. Lib. iii. c. xxvii.), supposes that the word means, not strength or agility, but *height*, and that the idea is, that the people referred to by Balaam was a lofty or elevated people. If the word means *strength*, it was most appropriate to compare a vast host of people with the vigor and force of an untameable wild animal. The idea of *speed* or of *loftiness* does not so well suit the connexion. (2.) It was an animal that was not subjected to the service of tilling the soil, and that was supposed to be incapable of being so trained. Thus in the place before us it is said, that he could not be so domesticated that he would remain like the ox at the crib; that he could not be yoked to the plough; that he could not be employed and safely left to pursue the work of the field; and that he could not be so subdued that it would be safe to attempt to bring home the harvest by his aid. From all these declarations, it is plain that he was regarded as a wild and untamed animal; an animal that was not then domesticated, and that could not be employed in husbandry. This characteristic would agree with either the antelope, the onyx, the buffalo, the rhinoceros, or the supposed unicorn. With which of them it will *best* accord, we may be able to determine when all his characteristics are examined. (3.) The strength of the animal was in his horns. This was one of his peculiar characteristics, and it is evidently by this that he is designed to be distinguished. Deut. xxxiii. 17, "His glory is like the firstling of a bullock, and his horns like the horns of unicorns." Ps. xcii. 10, "My horn shalt thou exalt like the horn of an unicorn." Ps. xxii. 21, "Thou hast heard me [saved me] from the horns of the unicorns." It is true, indeed, as Prof. Robinson has remarked (Calmet, Art., *Unicorn*), the word *reem* has in itself no reference to *horns*, nor is there in the Hebrew an allusion anywhere to the supposition that the animal here referred to has only *one* horn. Wherever, in the Scriptures, the ani-

mal is spoken of with any allusion to this member, the expression is in the plural, *horns*. The only variation from this, even in the common version, is in Ps. xcii. 10, where the Hebrew is simply, "My horn shalt thou exalt like an unicorn," where the word *horn*, as it stands in the English version, is not expressed. There is, indeed, in this passage, some obvious allusion to the *horns* of this animal, but all the force of the comparison will be retained if the word inserted in the ellipsis is in the plural number. The horn or horns of the *reem* were, however, beyond question, the principal seat of strength, and the instruments of assault and defence. See the passage in Deut. xxxiii. 17, "With them he shall push the people together to the ends of the earth." (4.) There was some peculiar majesty or dignity in the horns of this animal that attracted attention, and that made them the proper symbol of dominion and of royal authority. Thus in Ps. xcii. 10, "My horn shalt thou exalt like the horn of an unicorn," where the reference seems to be to a kingly authority or dominion, of which the horn was an appropriate symbol. These are all the characteristics of the animal referred to in the Scriptures, and the question is, With what known animal do they best correspond? The principal animals referred to by those who have examined the subject at length, are the onyx or antelope; the buffalo; the animal commonly referred to as the unicorn, and the rhinoceros. The principal characteristic of the *unicorn* was supposed to be, that it had a long slender horn projecting from the *forehead*; the horn of the rhinoceros is on the *snout*, or the nose. I. In regard to the antelope, or the *rim* of the modern Arabs, supposed by Bochart to be the animal here referred to, it seems clear that there are few characteristics in common between the two animals. The onyx or antelope is not distinguished as this animal is for strength, nor for the fact that it is peculiarly untameable, nor that its strength is in its horns, nor that it is of such size and proportions that a comparison would naturally be suggested between it and the ox. In all that is said of the animal, we think of one

greater in bulk, in strength, in untameableness, than the onyx; an animal more distinguished for conquest and subduing other animals before him. Bochart has collected much that is fabulous respecting this animal, from the Rabbins and the Arabic writers, which it is not needful here to repeat. See the Hieroz, P. i. Lib. iii. c. xxvii., or Scheutzer, Phys. Sac. on Num. xxiii. 22. II. The claims of the *buffalo* to be regarded as the animal here referred to are much higher than those of the onyx, and the opinion that this is the animal intended is entertained by such names as those of Gesenius, De Wette, Robinson, Umbreit, and Herder. But the objections to this seem to me to be insuperable, and the arguments are not such as to carry conviction. The principal objections to the opinion are, (1.) that the account in regard to the horns of the *reem* by no means agrees with the fact in regard to the bison, or buffalo. The buffalo is an animal of the cow kind, (Goldsmith,) and the horns are short and crooked, and by no means distinguished for strength. They do not, in fact, surpass in this respect the horns of many other animals, and are not such as would occur ordinarily as the prominent characteristic in their description. It is true that there are instances where the horns of the wild buffalo are large, but this does not appear to be the case ordinarily. Mr. Pennant mentions a pair of horns in the British Museum, which are six feet and a half long, and the hollow of which will hold five quarts. Father Lobo affirms that some of the horns of the buffaloes in Abyssinia will hold ten quarts; and Dillon saw some in India that were ten feet long. But these were manifestly extraordinary cases. (2.) The animal here referred to was evidently a stronger and a larger animal than the wild ox, or the buffalo. "The Oriental buffalo appears to be so closely allied to our common ox, that without an attentive examination, it might be easily mistaken for a variety of that animal. In point of size, it is rather superior to the ox; and upon an accurate inspection, it is observed to differ in the shape and magnitude of the head, the latter being larger than in the

ox." *Robinson, in Calmet.* The animal here referred to was such as to make the contrast particularly striking between him and the ox. The latter could be employed for labor; the former, though greatly superior in strength, could not. (3.) The *reem*, it was supposed, could not be tamed and made to subservise domestic purposes. The buffalo, however, can be made as serviceable as the ox, and is actually domesticated and employed in agricultural purposes. Niebuhr remarks that he saw buffaloes not only in Egypt, but also at Bombay, Surat, on the Euphrates, Tigris, Orontes, and indeed in all marshy regions and near large rivers. Sonnini remarks that in Egypt the buffalo, though but recently domesticated, is more numerous than the common ox, and is there equally domestic, and in Italy they are known to be commonly employed in the Pontine marshes, where the fatal nature of the climate acts on common cattle, but affects buffaloes less. It is true that the animal has been comparatively recently domesticated, and that it was doubtless known in the time of Job only as a wild, savage, ferocious animal; but still the description here is that of an animal not only that *was not* then tamed, but obviously of one that could not well be employed in domestic purposes. We are to remember that the language here is that of God himself, and that therefore it may be regarded as descriptive of what the essential nature of the animal was, rather than what it was supposed to be by the persons to whom the language was addressed. One of the principal arguments alleged for supposing that the animal here referred to by the *reem* was the buffalo, is, that the rhinoceros was probably unknown in the land where Job resided, and that the unicorn was altogether a fabulous animal. This difficulty will be considered in the remarks to be made on the claims of each of those animals. III. It was an early opinion, and the opinion was probably entertained by the authors of the Septuagint translation, and by the English translators as well as by others, that the animal here referred to was the

unicorn. This animal was long supposed to be a fabulous animal, and it has not been until recently that the evidences of its existence have been confirmed. Those evidences are adduced by Rosenmüller, *Morgenland*, ii. p. 269, *seq.*, and by Prof. Robinson, *Calmet*, pp. 908, 909. They are, summarily, the following: (1.) Pliny mentions such an animal, and gives a description of it, though from his time for centuries it seems to have been unknown. *Hist. Nat.* 8. 21. His language is, *Asperrimam autem feram monocerotem reliquo corpore equo similem, capite cervo, pedibus elephanti, canda apro, mugitu gravi, uno cornu nigro media fronte cubitorum dūum eminentem. Hanc feram vivam negant capi.* "The unicorn is an exceeding fierce animal, resembling a horse as to the rest of his body, but having the head like a stag, the feet like an elephant, and the tail like a wild boar; its roaring is loud; and it has a black horn of about two cubits projecting from the middle of the forehead." (2.) The figure of the unicorn, in various attitudes, according to Niebuhr, is depicted on almost all the staircases in the ruins of Persepolis. *Reisebeschreib.* ii. S. 127. (3.) In 1530, Ludovico de Bartema, a Roman patrician, visited Mecca under the assumed character of a Mussulman, and among other curiosities that he mentions, he says, "On the other side of the caaba is a walled court, in which we saw two unicorns that were pointed out to us as a rarity; and they are indeed truly remarkable. The larger of the two is built like a three-year-old colt, and has a horn upon the forehead about three ells long. This animal has the color of a yellowish-brown horse, a head like a stag, a neck not very long, with a thin mane; the legs are small and slender like those of a hind or roe; the hoofs of the fore feet are divided, and resemble the hoofs of a goat. Rosenmüller, *Alte u. neue Morgenland*, No. 377. Th. ii. S. 271, 272. (4.) Don Juan Gabriel, a Portuguese colonel, who lived several years in Abyssinia, assures us that in the region of Agamos, in the Abyssinian province of Damota, he had seen an

animal of the form and size of a middle-sized horse, of a dark chestnut-brown color, and with a whitish horn about five spans long upon its forehead; the mane and tail were black, and the legs long and slender. Several other Portuguese, who were placed in confinement upon a high mountain in the district Namna, by the Abyssinian king Saghedo, related that they had seen at the mountain several unicorns feeding. These accounts are confirmed by Father Lobo, who lived for a long time as a missionary in Abyssinia. (5.) Dr. Sparrman, the Swedish naturalist, who visited the Cape of Good Hope and the adjacent regions in 1772-1776, gives, in his *Travels*, the following account:—Jacob Kock, an observing peasant on Hippopotamus river, who had travelled over a considerable part of Southern Africa, found on the face of a perpendicular rock, a drawing made by the Hottentots of an animal with a single horn. The Hottentots told him that the animal there represented was very like the horse on which he rode, but had a straight horn upon the forehead. They added, that these one-horned animals were rare; that they ran with great rapidity, and that they were very fierce. (6.) A similar animal is described as having been killed by a party of Hottentots in pursuit of the savage Bushmen in 1791. The animal resembled a horse, was of a light grey color, and with white stripes under the jaw. It had a single horn directly in front, as long as one's arm, and at the base about as thick. Towards the middle the horn was somewhat flattened, but had a sharp point; it was not attached to the bone of the forehead, but was fixed only in the skin. The head was like that of the horse, and the size about the same. These authorities are collected by Rosenmüller, *Alte u. neue Morgenland*, vol. ii. p. 269, *seq.*, ed. Leipz. 1818. (7.) To these proofs one other is added by Prof. Robinson. It is copied from the *Quarterly Review* for Oct. 1820, (vol. xxiv. p. 120,) in a notice of Frazer's Tour through the Himlaya mountains. The information is contained in a letter from Maj. Latter, com-

manding in the rajah of Sikkim's territories, in the hilly country east of Nepaul. This letter states that the unicorn, so long considered as a fabulous animal, actually exists in the interior of Thibet, where it is well known to the inhabitants. "In a Thibetian manuscript," says Maj. Latter, "containing the names of different animals, which I procured the other day from the hills, the unicorn is classed under the head of those whose hoofs are divided: it is called the one-horned *tso'po*. Upon inquiring what kind of an animal it was, to our astonishment, the person who brought the manuscript described exactly the unicorn of the ancients; saying that it was a native of the interior of Thibet, about the size of a *tattoo*, (a horse from twelve to thirteen hands high,) fierce and extremely wild; seldom if ever caught alive, but frequently shot; and that the flesh was used for food. They go together in herds, like wild buffaloes, and are frequently to be met with on the borders of the great desert, in that part of the country inhabited by wandering Tartars." (8.) 'To these proofs I add another, taken from the Narrative of the Rev. John Campbell, who thus speaks of it, in his "Travels in South Africa," vol. ii. p. 294. "While in the Mashow territory, the Hottentots brought in a head different from any rhinoceros that had been previously killed. The common African rhinoceros has a crooked horn resembling a cock's spur, which rises about nine or ten inches above the nose, and inclines backward; immediately behind this is a short thick horn. But the head they brought us had a straight horn projecting three feet from the forehead, about ten inches above the tip of the nose. The projection of this great horn very much resembles that of the fanciful unicorn in the British arms. It has a small, thick, horny substance, eight inches long, immediately behind it, and which can hardly be observed on the animal at the distance of one hundred yards, and seems to be designed for keeping fast that which is penetrated by the long horn; so that this species must look like the unicorn (in the sense "one-horned") when run-

ning in the field. The head resembled in size a nine-gallon cask, and measured three feet from the mouth to the ear; and being much larger than that of the one with the crooked horn, and which measured eleven feet in length, the animal itself must have been still larger and more formidable. From its weight and the position of the horn, it appears capable of overcoming any creature hitherto known." A fragment of the skull, with the horn, is deposited in the Museum of the London Missionary Society. These testimonies from so many witnesses from different parts of the world who write without concert, and yet who concur so almost entirely in the account of the size and figure of the animal, leave little room to doubt its real existence. That it is no better known, and that its existence has been doubted, is not wonderful. It is to be remembered that all accounts agree in the representation that it is an animal whose residence is in deserts or mountains, and that large parts of Africa and of Asia are still unexplored. We are to remember, also, that the *giraffe* has been discovered only within a few years, and that the same is true of the *gnu*, which, till recently, was held to be a fable of the ancients. At the same time, however, that the existence of such an animal as that of the unicorn is in the highest degree probable, it is clear that it is *not* the animal referred to in the passage before us: for (1.) it is in the highest degree improbable that it was so well known as is supposed in the description here; and (2.) the characteristics do not at all agree with the account of the *reem* of the Scriptures. Neither in regard to the size of the animal, its strength, or the strength of its horns, does it coincide with the account of that animal in the Bible. IV. If neither of the opinions above referred to be correct, then the only remaining opinion that has weight is, that it refers to the rhinoceros. Besides the considerations above suggested, it may be added that the characteristics of the animal given in the Scriptures all agree with the rhinoceros. In size, strength, wildness, untameableness, and in the power and use of the horn, those

characteristics agree accurately with the rhinoceros. The only argument of much weight against this opinion is presented by Prof. Robinson in the following language: "The *reem* was obviously an animal well known to the Hebrews, being everywhere mentioned with other animals common to the country, while the rhinoceros was never an inhabitant of the country, is nowhere else spoken of by the sacred writers, nor, according to Bochart, either by Aristotle, in his treatise of animals, nor by Arabian writers." In reply to this we may observe, (1.) that the *reem* is mentioned in the Scriptures only in seven places (see above), showing, at least, that it was probably an animal not *very well known* in that country, or it would have been oftener alluded to. (2.) It is not clear that in those places it is "everywhere mentioned with other animals common to that country," as in the passage before us there is no allusion to any domestic animal; nor is there in Num. xxiii. 22; xxiv. 8; Ps. xcii. 10. In Ps. xxii. 21, they are mentioned in the same verse with "lions;" in Ps. xxix. 6, in connexion with "calves;" and in Isa. xxxiv. 7, with bullocks and bulls—wild animals inhabiting Idumea. But the entire account is that of an animal that was untamed, and that was evidently a foreign animal. (3.) What evidence is there that the Hebrews were well acquainted, as Prof. R. supposes, with the *wild buffalo*? Is this animal an inhabitant of Palestine? Is it "everywhere" mentioned in the Scriptures? Is there any more evidence from the Bible that they were acquainted with it than with the rhinoceros? (4.) It cannot be reasonably supposed that the Hebrews were so unacquainted with the rhinoceros that there could be no allusion to it in their writings. This animal was found in Egypt and in the adjacent countries, and whoever was the writer of the book of Job, there are frequent references in the book to what was well known in Egypt; and at all events the Hebrews

had lived too long in Egypt, and had had too much intercourse with the Egyptians, to be wholly ignorant of the existence and general character of an animal well known there, and we, *in fact*, find just about as frequent mention of it as we should on this supposition. It does not seem, therefore, to admit of reasonable doubt that the rhinoceros is referred to in the passage before us. This animal, next to the elephant, is the most powerful of animals. It is usually about twelve feet long; from six to seven feet high; and the circumference of its body is nearly equal to its length. Its bulk of body, therefore, is about that of the elephant. Its head is furnished with a horn, growing from the snout, sometimes three and a half feet long. This horn is erect, and perpendicular to the bone on which it stands, and it has thus a greater purchase or power than it could have in any other position.—*Bruce*. Occasionally it is found with a double horn, one above the other, though this is not common. The horn is entirely solid, formed of the hardest bony substance, and so firmly growing on the upper maxillary bone as seemingly to make but a part of it, and so powerful as to justify all the allusions in the Scriptures to the horn of the *reem*. The skin of this animal is naked, rough, and knotty, lying upon the body in folds, and so thick as to turn the edge of a scimitar, or to resist a musket-ball. The legs are short, strong, and thick, and the hoofs divided into three parts, each pointing forward. It is a native of the deserts of Asia and Africa, and is usually found in the extensive forests which are frequented by the elephant and the lion. It has never been domesticated; never employed in agricultural purposes; and thus, as well as in size and strength, accords with the account which is given of the animal in the passage before us. The following engraving will furnish a good illustration of this animal:

10 Canst thou bind the unicorn with his band in the furrow? or will he harrow the valleys after thee?

11 Wilt thou trust him, because his strength is great? or wilt thou leave thy labour to him?



¶ *Be willing to serve thee.* In ploughing and harrowing thy land, and conveying home the harvest, ver. 12. ¶ *Or abide by thy crib.* As the ox will. The word here used (רָחַץ) means, properly, to pass the night; and then to abide, remain, dwell. There is propriety in retaining here the original meaning of the word, and the sense is, can he be domesticated or tamed? The rhinoceros never has been.

10. *Canst thou bind the unicorn with his band in the furrow?* That is, with the common traces or cords which are employed in binding oxen to the plough. ¶ *Or will he harrow the valleys after thee?* The word "valleys" here is used to denote such ground as was capable of being ploughed or har-

rowed. Hills and mountains could not thus be cultivated, though the spade was in common use in planting the vine there, and even in preparing them for seed. Isa. vii. 25. The phrase "after thee" indicates that the custom of driving cattle in harrowing then was the same as that practised now with oxen, when the person who employs them goes in advance of them. It shows that they were entirely under subjection, and it is here implied that the reem could not be thus tamed.

11. *Wilt thou trust him?* As thou dost the ox. In the domestic animals great confidence is of necessity placed, and the reliance on the fidelity of the ox and the horse is not usually misplaced. The idea here is, that the

12 Wilt thou believe him, that he will bring home thy seed, and gather *it into thy barn?*

13 *Gavest thou the goodly*

unicorn could not be so tamed that important interests could be safely intrusted to him. ¶ *Because his strength is great?* Wilt thou consider his strength as a reason why important interests might be intrusted to him? The strength of the ox, the camel, the horse, and the elephant was a reason why their aid was sought by man to do what he could not himself do. The idea is, that man could not make use of the same reason for employing the rhinoceros. ¶ *Wilt thou leave thy labor to him?* Or, rather, the *avails* of thy labor—the harvest.

12. *Wilt thou believe him?* That is, wilt thou *trust* him with the productions of the field? The idea is, that he was an untamed and unsubdued animal. He could not be governed, like the camel or the ox. If the sheaves of the harvest were laid on him, there would be no certainty that he would convey them where the farmer wished them. ¶ *And gather it into thy barn?* Or, rather, “to thy threshing-floor,” for so the word here used (רָבָא) means. It was not common to gather a harvest into a *barn*, but it was usually collected on a hard-trod place, and there threshed and winnowed. For the use of the word, see Ruth iii. 2; Judges vi. 37; Num. xviii. 30; Isa. xxi. 10.

13. *Gavest thou the goodly wings unto the peacocks?* In the previous verses the appeal had been to the wild and untamable animals of the desert. In the prosecution of the argument, it was natural to allude to the feathered tribes which resided there also, and which were distinguished for their strength or fleetness of wing, as proof of the wisdom and the superintending providence of God. The idea is, that these animals, far away from the abodes of man, where it could not be pretended that man had anything to do with their training, had habits and instincts peculiar to themselves, which showed great

wings unto the peacocks? or ¹ wings and feathers unto the ostrich?

¹ or, *the feathers of the stork and ostrich.*

variety in the divine plans, and at the same time consummate wisdom. The appeal in the following verses (13—18) is to the remarkable habits of the *ostrich*, as illustrating the wisdom and the superintending providence of God. There has been very great variety in the translation of this verse, and it is important to ascertain its real meaning in order to know whether there is any allusion here to the *peacock*, or whether it refers wholly to the *ostrich*. The LXX did not understand the passage, and a *part* of the words they endeavored to translate, but the others are retained without any attempt to explain them. Their version is, Πιέρυξ τερπομένων νεέλασσα, ἴαν συλλάβῃ ἀσίδα καὶ νίσσα—“the wing of the exulting Neelassa if she conceives [or comprehends] the Asis and Nessa.” Jerome renders it, “The wing of the ostrich is like the wings of the falcon and the hawk.” Schultens renders it, “The wing of the ostrich is exulting: but is it the wing and the plumage of the stork?” He enumerates no less than *twenty* different interpretations of the passage. Herder renders it,

“A wing with joyous cry is uplifted yonder;
Is it the wing and feather of the ostrich?”

Umbreit renders it,

“The wing of the ostrich, which lifts itself joyfully,
Does it not resemble the tail and feather of the stork?”

Rosenmüller renders it,

“The wing of the ostrich exults!
Truly its wing and plumage is like that of the stork!”

Prof. Lee renders it, “Wilt thou confide in the exulting of the wings of the ostrich? Or in her choice feathers and head-plumage, when she leaveth her eggs to the earth,” &c. So Coverdale renders it, “The ostrich (whose feathers are fairer than the wings of the sparrow-hawk), when he hath laid his eggs upon the ground, he breedeth them in the

dust, and forgetteth them." In none of these versions, and in none that I have examined, except that of Luther and the common English version, is there any allusion to the *peacock*; and amidst all the variety of the rendering, and all the difficulty of the passage, there is a common sentiment that the *ostrich* alone is referred to as the particular subject of the description. It is certain that the description proceeds with reference only to the habits of the ostrich; and it is very evident to my mind, that in the whole passage there is no allusion whatever to the *peacock*. Neither the scope of the passage, nor the words employed, it is believed, will admit of such a reference. There is great difficulty in the Hebrew text, which no one has been able fully to explain, but it is sufficiently clear to make it manifest that the ostrich, and not the peacock, is the subject of the appeal. The word which is rendered *peacock*, רֶנָּאִים—*rēnānim*, is derived from רָנָן—*rānān*, to give forth a tremulous and stridulous sound; and then to give forth the voice in vibrations; to shake or trill the voice; and then, as in lamentation or joy, the voice is often given forth in that manner, the word comes to mean to utter cries of joy, Isa. xii. 6, xxxv. 6; and also cries of lamentation or mourning, Lam. ii. 19. The prevailing sense of the word in the Scriptures is to rejoice; to shout for joy; to exult. The name is here given to the bird referred to, evidently from the sound which it made, and probably from its exulting or joyful cry. The word does not elsewhere occur in the Scriptures as applicable to a bird, and there is no reason whatever, either from its etymology, or from the connexion in which it is found here, to suppose that it refers to the peacock. Another reason is suggested by Scheutzer (*Phys. Sac. in loc.*) why the peacock cannot be intended here. It is, that the peacock is originally an East Indian fowl, and that it was imported at comparatively a late period in the Jewish history, and was doubtless unknown in the time of Job. In 1 Kings x. 22, and 2 Chron. ix. 21, it appears that *peacocks* were among the remarkable productions of distant coun-

tries that were imported for use or luxury by Solomon, a fact which would not have occurred had they been common in the patriarchal times. To these reasons to show that the peacock is not referred to here, Bochart, whose chapters on the subject deserve a careful attention (*Hieroz. P. ii. L. ii. c. xvi. xvii.*), has added the following:—(1.) That if the peacock had been intended here, the allusion would not have been so brief. Of so remarkable a bird there would have been an extended description, as there is of the ostrich, and of the unicorn and the horse. If the allusion is to the peacock, it is by a bare mention of the name, and by no argument, as in other cases, from the habits and instincts of the fowl. (2.) The word which is here used as a description of the bird referred to, רֶנָּאִים—*rēnānim*, derived from the musical properties of the bird, is by no means applicable to the peacock. It is of all fowls, perhaps, least distinguished for beauty of voice. (3.) The property ascribed to the fowl here of "exulting in the wing," by no means agrees with the peacock. The glory and beauty of that bird is in the tail, and not in the wing. Yet the wing is here, from some cause, particularly specified. Bochart has demonstrated at great length, and with entire clearness, that the peacock was a foreign fowl, and that it must have been unknown in Judea and Arabia, as it was in Greece and Rome, at a period long after the time in which the book of Job is commonly supposed to have been written. The proper translation of the Hebrew here, then, would be, "The wing of the exulting fowls moves joyfully"—נֶזְעַזְעַז. The attention seems to be directed to the wing, as being lifted up, or as vibrating with rapidity, or as being triumphant in its movement in eluding the pursuer. It is not its beauty particularly that attracts the attention, but its exulting, joyful, triumphant appearance. ¶ Or wings and feathers unto the ostrich? Marg., "or, the feathers of the stork and ostrich." Most commentators have despaired of making any sense out of the Hebrew in this place, and there have been almost as many