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PREFACE

SOME eighteen months before his death in February 1914, Dr. Driver began the actual writing of the volume on "Job" for the "International Critical Commentary." In the middle of January 1914, when the very serious nature of his illness had become evident, he wrote a short memorandum on the state of his MS, and suggestions for the completion of his work. In this he expressed a strong desire that I should complete what he was compelled to leave incomplete. The task, I knew at once, would be arduous and absorb much time; but not to undertake it, or to do less than my best to discharge it, would have been an ill return for all that I had long owed to the friendship and scholarship of Dr. Driver. The time involved has even exceeded my expectations, partly because what remained to be done proved so much more than appeared at first. Finding that the mass of material would be very great, and wishing that the publication of the commentary should not be unduly delayed, Dr. Driver had earlier invited Dr. A. H. McNeile to undertake the exegetical notes and the Introduction, and, under conditions with regard to the claims of other work, Dr. McNeile had consented. It was naturally my own very strong desire that this arrangement should stand, and at first Dr. McNeile agreed that it should, and indeed, in looking through the MS with a view to his own part of the work, added on the first chapters some brief notes which, duly initialed, have been retained. But later the claims of his other work became so pressing that he wished to withdraw from co-operating in this com-
mentary, and, though it was with the greatest regret, I could but acquiesce in his wish. Thus by far the greater part of the work, and the final responsibility for the whole of it, has fallen on me. Of the actual division of the work I will speak further.

In the memorandum to which I have alluded, Dr. Driver wrote: "I began this in Aug. 1912; and have completed the first draft of virtually all the philological notes, and revised them as far as about c. 14: I have also completed virtually the translation and (fairly completely) the exegetical notes on c. 3–9 and 40–41." When the material was handed to me, I found that it contained less of the translation than this might seem to imply: the translation consisted of a text of the R.V. with the very extensive alterations placed on the margin; occasionally a choice between one or two renderings was left open for final judgement. These corrections of the R.V. began with c. 3 and extended (with the exception of 19\textsuperscript{25-27}) to c. 28, and again from 40\textsuperscript{15–41}\textsuperscript{31}. Of these parts, then, the translation in this volume is Dr. Driver's, except that (1) here and there I have modified certain renderings of the R.V. left uncorrected, out of regard to other passages or express statements in the notes; (2) that I have exercised the final judgement as between alternative renderings; and (3) that I have throughout determined how the divisions into lines, distichs, and tristichs should be represented. The exegetical notes, which extended only, and that with very varying degrees of completeness, from 3\textsuperscript{2–9}\textsuperscript{0} and 40\textsuperscript{15–41}\textsuperscript{30}, were not in form for publication: in another part of the memorandum the instruction runs: "Such exegetical notes as I have written, he [the editor] can utilize, supplement, or amend, as he likes. I should naturally like the explanations, etc., of my Job in the R.V. to be, as far as possible, adopted, but I do not make this a sine qua non." I have accordingly incorporated much of this material in the commentary on these parts of the text; to have distinguished it constantly from the additions and modifications required would have unduly
complicated the notes, but here and there, especially when
my own judgement slightly differed (e.g. on 38), I have
made use of inverted commas to indicate direct quotation.
Broadly, however, it may be said of pp. 31-87 and 354-371
that the notes on individual verses, as distinct from the
introductory and certain longer notes (e.g. on pp. 40ff.,
77 f.), are very largely in substance and largely also in ex-
pression, Dr. Driver's. For the rest the commentary is
mine, though in order to perpetuate Dr. Driver's point of
view, I have frequently cited not only his Book of Job in the
Revised Version, but also his Introduction to the Literature of
the Old Testament, and occasionally I have transferred to the
commentary, as being more appropriate there, a passage
from the philological notes, distinguishing this matter by
adding "Dr."

With the philological notes I have adopted a different
course. It was to these the greatest attention and the fullest
revision had been given. It seemed desirable then (1) that
they should to the fullest possible extent be reproduced and
their authorship made clear; yet (2) that these notes should
be as complete and homogeneous as possible. I have, there-
fore, while adding freely, perhaps to the extent of about a
third of the whole, distinguished all my own additions in
substance, except in cc. 1, 2, 321-6 and 427-17, which are
entirely mine, by placing them in square brackets; but I
have not thought it necessary unduly to multiply these signs
by using them for the filling in of obvious references left
blank in the MS, nor to distinguish slight formal changes
made in preparing the MS for press, or in proof. As men-
tioned in the passage already cited from the memorandum,
cc. 1-14 had been more fully revised than the rest; some
notes, or parts of notes, were still unwritten even in these
earlier chapters, but the blank spaces in the MS were far
more frequent in the later chapters, and unfortunately
occurred where many of the most important or difficult
passages, such as 1925f., were concerned.

Final responsibility for the whole must, as I have said,
under the circumstances rest upon me; but with this proviso the distribution of the work may be thus tabulated:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
<th>Philological Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Driver . .</td>
<td>3-28</td>
<td>3-9\textsuperscript{10}, 40\textsuperscript{15-19}, 41\textsuperscript{30} (in large part).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray . . .</td>
<td>1. 2. 29-42; also 19\textsuperscript{23-27}.</td>
<td>1. 2. 9\textsuperscript{11-14}, 42 entire, and the rest in part.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the Introduction I am entirely responsible.

The aim of the philological notes is indicated in these sentences of the memorandum: "On philological points I found there was a good deal to say, and I wished the philological basis of the commentary to be strong, and thought that many things deserved a fuller discussion than they generally received in the volumes of the ICC. Notes and explanations of the principal emendations of Du. and Be. ought also, I thought, to be given for the use of students (though I do not believe myself that 1 in 10 is necessary or probable),—sometimes also the conjectures of Bi. and others (though I content myself mostly with merely mentioning these from time to time, and do not polemize against them). . . . I have not thought it necessary to quote exhaustively authorities for renderings and readings: the principal recent ones seemed to me sufficient. Improbable conjectures I have also omitted (except sometimes those of Du. and Be\textsuperscript{T}). An emendation quoted at the end of a note is not intended to imply my acceptance of it." "In textual matters I generally find myself in agreement with Bu.; but I cannot adopt his view of the Elihu speeches. I intended to acknowledge generously in the Preface the great value and help which Be\textsuperscript{T} had been to me. But I cannot accept many of his
emendations; he seems to me often hypercritical and prosaic."

On account of the extent of and the importance attached to the philological notes, Dr. Driver had planned that they should be printed in the larger type, and issued in a separate volume. To this the publishers readily agreed, and on this understanding this part of the work was first printed. But the new conditions created by the war rendered the plan of two volumes undesirable; consequently these notes now appear with a pagination of their own at the end of the one volume.

I need not repeat here much that I wrote in the Preface to *Isaiah*; it applies, *mutatis mutandis*, to the present commentary; but in the matter of transliterations I may observe that owing to the circumstances under which the present volume has been prepared there remain, much to my regret, certain inconsistencies—the *p*, for example, being sometimes transliterated *k*, sometimes *q*; and similarly different abbreviations of some names and titles will be found to have been used; but I trust that neither the one inconsistency nor the other will occasion any practical inconvenience.

G. BUCHANAN GRAY.