

I'm adding this above your notes using edit-tracking. That is why it is in blue with underline. Most of my comment are in side-bar bubbles but in a few places I have made obvious corrections using the edit-tracking. Where you had a question in a bubble, I have added a response in the same bubble with my initials.

Don't be worried by the large number of comments. Take it instead as a measure of my appreciation of what you have done. I felt a need to respond with a comparable effort.

Many of the comments are trivial – final forms of consonants or typos. In some cases, although I had the source, I couldn't find the comment you report, so if you just check that will be enough. In some other cases, I am asking the question, where would I, as a user, expect to find certain sorts of information? If you, as a user, would expect to find it where you put it, again, fine. A question from me does not imply that I want change, just that you consider what I write.

If, at times, I seem a bit testy, it is not directed at you. You are just reporting what the source says and any testiness on my part is against the author of the source.

I hope you find my comments helpful. If you don't just ignore them.

CJS

NOTES TO THE 1ST DRAFT REVIEWERS:

The following are items that I have not yet implemented. Certainly, they need to be done, but please don't worry about marking their lack, at this first review.

- Transliteration of Hebrew words
- An introduction. (I've actually typed up a fair amount of it, but it is not yet in shape to be reviewed.)
- Discourse Unit divisions.
- Page numbers from Allen's commentary, found in Translator's Workplace. (I have yet to figure out how to find page numbers, in TW's resources.)
- For now, I put a hard page break between each verse. We'll no doubt want to delete this, before the final version, to save paper. But for now, it makes a nice divider.

Things to comment on - but that I am already aware of:

Style Definition: TransliteratedText: Font color: Red

Formatted: CL Clause

Commented [CJS1]: I hope we can do that computationally at a late stage.

Commented [CJS2]: In Logos, there is a little box at the top of a resource showing the reference. Click in that and you will see a drop-down with the page number. At least that is how it works in my set-up.

Additionally or alternatively, you can turn on display of page numbers using the 'visual filters' button at the top of the resource.

Commented [CJS3]: Fine. That can be done at a late stage.

- I'm inconsistent in format of citations for the lexicons. I'm unsure what is the approved format -- page # as in [BDB, p.###] or entry # [BDB, ###], name of entry [BDB, אבג {אבג} 3.a.], or nothing [BDB].

Various inconsistencies in formatting. E.g., how should the entries from the lexicons be punctuated? Sometimes I use ';' as separator, but sometimes '.' with following capital letter -- I need to make this consistent, but before messing with that, I want to know what The Official Ruling is (if any). Similarly, how should the entries from translations be listed?

In addition, there seems to be a problem(s) with the template file, such that some things are not rendered correctly, as listed below. Once fixed, then these items should suddenly be fixed (globally), due to the nature of Styles.

- Hebrew words are put into Times New Roman, instead of Ezra SIL. I think I've figured it out -- it changes the font to Ezra SIL only if the pre-existing characters are labeled "complex script", so if they are instead labeled "Latin script" then it doesn't change the font. Well, I need to study up on MS Word "style" settings, but probably can fix it.
-

Commented [CJS4]: My suggestion would be that, unless the entry differs from the form at the head of your entry, there is no need to give the name of the entry. Sometimes BDB and HALOT parse differently, so then you will need to specify. The sense number is helpful, so put it in. HALOT lists lexemes alphabetically so that should suffice for a user to locate the fuller information. BDB, however, groups lexemes by root, so a page number is helpful.

Commented [CJS5]: That is odd. As far as I can see, the HW style uses Ezra SIL for Latin text and Times New Roman for complex scripts. They should both be Ezra SIL. How that happened, I've no idea but it should be changed globally. I'm reluctant to do that myself because I know that I've not been in full control of styles since Office 2003, and any change would need to be applied to all existing text formatted as HW.

1:1 Then-it-was (that) (the)word(-of) Yahweh (came) to Jonah, (the)son(-of) Amittai, to-say^a

SYNTAX—The phrase “(the)son(-of) Amittai” is grammatically definite in Hebrew – “*the* son...”.

However, its definiteness derives automatically by influence of the proper noun, Amittai, and thus need not be interpreted as significant. See JM 139a (note also 139aN1 and 139c). In particular, there is *no* implication that Jonah is the *only* son of Amittai.

SYNTAX—a. This first phrase of the book entails both a syntax question and a usage consideration. The

first word is the verb “to be; become” (הָיָה - הָיָה) Qal-wayyiqtol-3ms). Syntactically, it

may have as its subject either the noun דָּבָר {דָּבָר} “word,” or else the built-in generic 3ms pronoun (“he/it”). However, this syntax question is secondary to the usage consideration. Verse 1 consists of

a phrase that is actually a standard prophetic introductory formula (excepting the naming of Jonah, which is of course replaced by some other person in each context in which the formula is used). The

phrase נִהְיָ דְבַר־יְהוָה אֵל...לְאָמַר {נִהְיָ דְבַר־יְהוָה אֵל...לְאָמַר} is translated: ‘Now the word of the LORD/Yahweh came to’ [NKJV, KJV, NRSV, RSV, Tucker, Baldwin, Limburg, Lessing]; ‘The word of the LORD came to’ [NAU, NIV, HCSB]; ‘Yahweh’s/YHWH’s word came to’ [Stuart, Youngblood]; ‘Now it once happened that Yahweh’s word came to’ [Wolff]; ‘The word of Yahweh was addressed to’ [NJB]; ‘And the word of Jehovah was communicated to’ [Lange]; ‘When the Lord’s command to...was’ [Sasson]; ‘The LORD said to’ [NET]; ‘The LORD gave this message to’ [NLT]; ‘A message from Yahweh was received by’ [Allen].

There are two syntactic options, as noted above. If we take it that the subject of the verb is ‘the word of Yahweh,’ then a literal translation is “Then the-word-of-Yahweh was to...”. On the other hand, if we take the subject of the verb as the built-in generic pronoun, then the verb stands on its own as “Then-it-was” (or better, “Then-it-happened”). In that case, we must take ‘the word of Yahweh’ as the subject of a verbless clause, and the literal translation is, “Then-it-happened [that] the-word-of-Yahweh [came/was] to...”. But in reality, the entire phrase is a common, standard formula for introducing a prophetic command in narrative literature. Therefore, the semi-literal translation above is probably *not* the best way to translate this phrase.

The formulaic phrase is in fact the most common formula for introducing a prophetic word from God.

Although Jonah is the only whole book that begins with this formula, it occurs 76 times throughout the Bible, the bulk of which are found in Jeremiah and Ezekiel. Variations of the same phrase occur an additional 7 times — twice the preposition אֶל {אֶל} “to” is missing (Zech. 8:1; Hag. 1:3); twice the concluding verb לְאָמַר {לְאָמַר} “to say; saying” is missing (Jer. 42:7; 1Kings 13:20); thrice in Zechariah “Yahweh” is expanded to “Yahweh of hosts.”

There is an alternate formula, also frequently used to introduce prophecies: דְּבַר־יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר הָיָה אֵל {דְּבַר־יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר הָיָה אֵל}

‘The word of Yahweh that was to...’. It is much less common overall, but it is used at the beginning of four books: Hosea, Joel, Micah, and Zephaniah. Sasson asserts that this alternate formula focuses attention on the message, whereas the first formula (the one we have in Jonah)

Commented [CJS6]: Is there any variation in the translation equivalent for this word? If not, then do nothing. If there alternatives are used, then a very brief lexical entry to list them might give translators some ideas

Commented [CJS7]: English requires a verb to be supplied. Most supply ‘came’ but, again, if there is variation a lexical entry might be useful.

Commented [CJS8]: Why not put this before ‘Jonah, son of Amittai, since it relates to an earlier phrase? Also, it does seem rather long. I wonder if it might be enough to treat this in a shorter LEXICON section?

Commented [CJS9]: הָיָה

Commented [CJS10]: The convention I was taught was that, in this sort of context, one should cite the lexical form, the absolute, rather than the bound form, the construct. If your convention is to cite the surface form, here the construct, stick to it.

Commented [CM11]: An age-old question of mine: how should this situation be punctuated?

CJS: If in doubt, follow the SBL style manual:

<https://simeon.org/cst/images/graphic/sbl-handbook.pdf>

This is on p 14, section 4.1.6.

focuses our attention on the prophet himself and his call and vision and *not* on the content of his message. [Sasson, 67] Walton also finds a distinction between the two formulas, with the formula found in Jonah introducing *instructions for the prophet*, and the alternate formula introducing the *message* that the prophet was to proclaim *to his audience* [Walton, 469]. Sasson is in agreement with this, as he concludes that whatever was God’s message in 1:2, it was meant for Jonah alone and not for the people of Nineveh. [Sasson, 68]

Scholars have sometimes found it peculiar that a book could begin with the word וַיְהִי {וַיְהִי} ‘And it was.’ This is the common verb הָיָה {הָיָה} in the Qal binyan, “to be; become,” conjugated as wayyiqtol-3ms. The wayyiqtol conjugation normally carries the sense of consecutiveness, so it is literally, ‘Then he/it was’ or, ‘Then it happened.’ However, this exact word (וַיְהִי {וַיְהִי}) sometimes also serves as a discourse marker, identifying the beginning of a new story unit. For a prime example, see Jonah 3:1, which clearly begins a new section of our narrative. Scholars describe the function of this discourse marker variously. It signals the beginning of a narrative which “presumably” follows some other event. [Tucker, 11] It introduces some new information at the beginning of a unit. [Youngblood, 43] Lessing suggests it is like the English phrases “once there was” or “and so it happened that.” [Lessing, 64]. The understanding of וַיְהִי {וַיְהִי} as a discourse marker is relatively new in biblical scholarship. Over a century ago, Gesenius [GKC 49bN2] asserted that וַיְהִי {וַיְהִי} at the beginning of a book intended to establish a connection to the preceding book in the canon. Some modern scholars continue in this vein; Lessing reasons that the author assumes a continuation from Jonah’s mention in 2Kings 14:25. [Lessing, 64] But even Gesenius also observed that וַיְהִי {וַיְהִי} often occurs at the beginning of a new section of a narrative [GKC 111f,g]. And in more recent scholarship, Muraoka (dealing with the wayyiqtol in general, not the specific word וַיְהִי {וַיְהִי}) states that the wayyiqtol conjugation eventually became so strongly associated as a past tense that it could be used at the very beginning of a narrative. [JM 118c] Buth finds it unremarkable that books can begin with a wayyiqtol, “Books and stories may begin with a sequential tense, though this is usually the verb וַיְהִי {וַיְהִי}.” [Buth, LBH3, 157; usage #59, with 1Sam.1:1 as example] Limburg agrees, saying that the verb וַיְהִי {וַיְהִי} is the “typical” way to introduce a narrative and indeed that it signals the reader that the following material will be a narrative story. [Limburg, 37] Note that other Bible books also begin with the exact same word וַיְהִי {וַיְהִי}: 1Samuel, Ruth, Esther, and Ezekiel – as well as Joshua and Judges (which add a temporal clause that actually does connect to the preceding book’s storyline). In the end, then, וַיְהִי {וַיְהִי} in Jonah 1:1 can be viewed as a discourse marker signaling that the book is a narrative, or as simply the first of a sequence of narrative verbs; but in any case, it is certainly part of a standard formula introducing a prophetic message from God.

Commented [CJS12]: וַיְהִי, as above.

Commented [CJS13]: I take it that your Hebrew teacher used that term, but my observation is that it is rare and many ES users might not know it. The term ‘stem’ is much more commonly used and, since that is what van der Merwe’s grammar uses, I think we should use it too.

Commented [CJS14]: A slippery word, to be avoided.

Commented [CJS15]: You have avoided direct quotations for most source – good – but you seem to be using them more for Buth than for others.

LEXICON—a. (came) to Jonah, (the)son(-of) Amittai, to-say לֵאמֹר {לֵאמֹר} (Qal-inf.constr. of אָמַר {אָמַר}) ‘saying’ [NAU, ESV, KJV, NKJV, RSV, NRSV, Lessing, Limburg]; ‘as follows’ [Stuart, Youngblood]; ‘It ran’ [Wolff]; *omitted* [NET, NIV, NJB, HCSB, NAB, Allen, Baldwin, Sasson, Tucker]. HALOT explains that the verb אָמַר {אָמַר} “introduces the actual statement” of a direct quote and that its literal sense “in order to say” generally means “by saying” or “in these words,” concluding “often it has no other sense than our colon, a breathing space before direct speech.” [HALOT, אָמַר {אָמַר}, 2, p.66] Tucker labels it a “complementizer” which introduces the quotation. [Tucker, 12].

Commented [CJS16]: Add, with prefixed lamed.

QUESTION: Is there any significance to the names “Jonah” and “Amittai”?

1. The Hebrew name יוֹנָה {יוֹנָה} “Jonah” is the word for “dove.” That meaning has no significance within the book. [e.g., Stuart, 431] Sasson notes some attempts of other scholars to find a significance, but disdains the idea, instead asserting that personal names taken from the animal world are unexceptional in either Hebrew or other ancient languages. [Sasson, 68] The name אֲמִיטַי {אֲמִיטַי} “Amittai” is thought to derive from the root for “true” [BDB 607]; again, there does not seem to be any significance within the story. Sasson notes that it is possible to read the name as “Yahweh is steadfast.” [Sasson, 69]

Commented [CJS17]: Is there a 2?

Commented [CJS18]: I assume you are planning a cross reference to 2 Kings in the introduction. If so, there is no need to add it here.

1:2 “Arise(ms)^a! Go(ms) to Nineveh, the large^b city, and-proclaim(ms)^c against-it, because their-wickedness^d has-ascended in-front-of-me^e.”

INTERTEXTUAL REFERENCE— This verse contains the first of many uses of the word גדול {גדול}, ‘great,’ the most often-repeated thematic word in the book of Jonah. The adjective is used twelve times in the book, as well as twice as a substantive referring to Nineveh’s leaders. Nineveh is described as “large” four times: 1:2, 3:2, 3:3, and 4:11. But in addition, “large” describes the wind (1:4), the storm (1:4, 12), the sailors’ fear in the storm (1:10) and of God (1:16), the fish (2:1), Jonah’s displeasure (4:1), and Jonah’s happiness (4:6). The “great ones” of Nineveh appear in 3:5, and the “great ones” of the king are in 3:7. Although the use of repetition is universally noted by commentators, not many of them offer an explanation. However, Buth comments, “The author of Jonah helps to tie his story together by continually repeating vocabulary, even where other choices would have been possible. The author has preferred repetition over diversity in vocabulary.” [Buth, 55]

LEXICON—

- a. **Arise! Go to Nineveh** קום לך {קום לך} (Qal-impv-ms of קום {קום}), followed by Qal-impv-ms of הלך {הלך}. ‘Arise, go’ [NAU, KJV, RSV, ESV, Lessing]; ‘Get up! Go’ [HCSB, Limburg]; ‘Up! Go’ [Baldwin, Youngblood]; ‘Go immediately’ [NET, Tucker]; ‘Go at once’ [NRSV]; ‘Go’ [NIV, Stuart]; ‘Set out for’ [NAB; Sasson]; ‘Set out, go’ [Wolff]; ‘Go off and visit’ [Allen]. Many commentators explain that the first verb קום {קום} ‘Arise!’ functions not as a literal, distinct command, but rather as an auxiliary to the following command (‘Go!’) or two commands (‘Go...cry!’), adding impetus. Buth glosses קום {קום} as “get up, get started!” and comments that it is a “common idiom” to use קום {קום} directly with another verb and that the two verbs are “treated almost as one thought or one command” [Buth, 100]. Sasson explains that קום {קום} followed by another verb, locates the actual activity in that second verb, so that קום {קום} should not be treated as an active verb. [Sasson, 69] Tucker comments that קום {קום} has a functional value rather than a semantic value. It functions as a hortatory particle, making the clause an exclamation, or else it functions as an interjection. [Tucker, 13] Youngblood agrees that it is an interjection or exclamation, and adds that it underscores the force of the following imperatives (in this case, both “go” and “condemn”). [Youngblood, 53] Commentators explain the exact meaning of קום {קום} as it influences the following imperative(s) in slightly different ways, but centering on a call for haste. Alexander applies that call for haste just to Jonah’s departure for Nineveh [Alexander, 108], whereas Youngblood applies it to both commands, to go and to condemn. [Youngblood, 53] Lessing agrees in principle, but also finds an ironic contrast between the command to “Arise” and Jonah’s response, which is to repeatedly “descend” (see 1:3,5 and 2:7, below). [Lessing, 66] Trible disagrees on the grammatical principle but her conclusion is almost the same; she believes that the

Commented [CJS19]: Does anyone comment on the function of *kiy*? Here it is straightforward, but it isn’t always, so sometimes an entry will be needed. If no one says anything worthwhile, don’t bother.

Commented [CJS20]: Sasson calls it a leitmotif, p72.

Commented [CJS21]: I wonder if this section might be better set out as options with any essential explanation for each and with a list of supporters for each. If any source hedges it bets and appears to support two, then it can appear twice. This might also work elsewhere, as I have noted in a few places. There would be a danger, however, that when a source explicitly rejects other options that would not be reported.

Commented [CJS22]: Handling these together in this way is good.

Commented [CJS23]: Final form of kaph.

Commented [CJS24]: Also NJB.

Commented [CJS25]: Strictly, this is Tucker citing Andersen, but I think Tucker agrees so, what you have will stand.

Commented [CJS26]: Page 98 in my copy. Mine is the original 1988 edition, not the 2009 reprint.

two adjacent imperatives create a rhythm that feels hurried and therefore calls for a prompt response. [Trible, 125] Sasson thinks that the effect of קום {קום} is to focus the command to “go” on volition rather than on direction of travel. [Sassoon, 70]

There are 14 other occurrences in the Bible of these two imperatives together. Perhaps the most instructive examples are Gen. 28:2, 1Sam. 9:3, 2Sam. 13:15, and 2Kings 8:1, which entail a distinct element of urgency. In addition, there are about fifty instances of קום {קום} paired with an imperative other than לך {לך} (e.g., Gen. 27:19), including Jonah 1:6, ‘Arise! Call!’

b. **Go to Nineveh, the large city, and-proclaim against-it** הגדולה {הגדולה} “Great” in some aspect: size, height, extent, number, intensity, significance, sound level, age, or social station [Holladay]; “Great” in some aspect: magnitude and extent, number, intensity, sound, age, or importance [BDB]. An “intensified concept,” like “many” in number, “loudness” in sound, “old” in years, or “great” in importance [TWOT]. For its intended nuance in our verse, see the QUESTION, below.

c. **and-proclaim against-it** וקרא עליה {וקרא עליה} (Qal-impv-ms of קרא {קרא}) Among general meanings of: to call (someone), to shout, to summon, to proclaim, to call on (a deity), HALOT also gives “to announce (as technical term for introducing what a prophet has to say or do),” with or without the prep. על {על}, and lists Jon. 1:2 as an example. [HALOT] This root “denotes primarily the enunciation of a specific vocable or message. {A message} is customarily addressed to a specific recipient and is intended to elicit a specific response (hence, it may be translated ‘proclaim, invite’).” [TWOT] ‘And cry against’ [NAU, KJV, RSV]; ‘and call/cry out against’ [NKVJ, NRSV, ESV, Lessing]; ‘and call against’ [Tucker]; ‘and preach against’ [NIV, HCSB, Limburg, Wolff, Stuart(secondary)]; ‘and speak against’ [Stuart]; ‘make proclamation against’ [BDB]; ‘and denounce’ [Allen, Stuart(secondary)]; ‘Announce my judgment against’ [NLT]; ‘and announce judgment against’ [NET]; ‘and condemn’ [Youngblood]; ‘and declare doom upon’ [Sasson]; ‘and make a proclamation about’ [Baldwin]; ‘and proclaim to’ [NJB]. In this verse, the verb קרא {קרא} is used with the preposition על {על}, and that combination can inform our interpretation. The question is made more difficult, however, by the parallel statement in Jonah 3:2, which uses a different preposition, אל {אל}. Because the two statements (1:2 and 3:2) are parallel, many authorities translate the two identically. But Sasson argues that the two uses, with their different prepositions, should be different. He observes other biblical and extra-biblical uses of קרא על {קרא על}, and concludes that the combination means “to impose an unpleasant fate.” [Sasson, 75].

{Baldwin simply notes that the statement creates an ominous feeling [Baldwin, 552]. Youngblood sees this command as the real climax of God’s commission to Jonah: going to Nineveh is merely a prerequisite to this command, and this ‘crying out against’ carries a sense of judgment

Commented [CJS27]: Sasson

Commented [CJS28]: You have this sort of thing in several places, but I’m not sure it helps.

Commented [CJS29]: Normally you would have the translations in this section, the LEXICON, but here you have chosen to put them in the QUESTION. I think that, as a user, I would look for them here.

Commented [CJS30]: I think the LEXICON should always include the lexical form, generally as found in BART and other Bible software, which is based on HALOT. If BDB differs that should be noted.

Commented [CJS31]: The lexical form should be pointed with pathah. There are several like this.

Commented [CJS32]: I think I see what you are trying to do here, because square brackets are already used for a different purpose. A brief direct quotation from TWOT is OK, but I suggest you terminate the quotation before this and start a new one afterwards:
... message.” This message is “...

Commented [CJS33]: I think this needs to be a distinct QUESTION to give it more prominence: Is there any difference ...? Whether it should go with this verse or with 3:2, I’m not sure.
In BDB, there is a note at the end of the entry for ‘el, p 41a, and in the entry for ‘al at p757a. There might be something worth harvesting there.

Commented [CJS34]: She says that it was ominous in 1k 13, but does she say that it is ominous here?

Commented [CJS35]: She also says that they are frequently interchanged

and warning of God's wrath. [Youngblood, 55]. Page considers that Jonah was instructed to just announce God's imminent judgment; this, Page feels, means that we should not translate as 'preach against it,' because that implies that Jonah was more personally involved than the Hebrew wording justifies. [Page, 224-5]. The footnote in NET concludes that the combination קרא על {קרא על} "refers to an oracle announcing or threatening judgment." Stuart asserts that Jonah would recognize not only that the command was to warn Nineveh that God was about to enforce penalties, but also that to give advance warning was to open the door to repentance. [Stuart, 449-50]

Commented [CJS36]: If you do follow my suggestion of a QUESTION, then you might include what he says about 'disapproval and warning'. Though he does not say here that 'el would differ, he does so on 3.2.

Commented [CJS37]: The same applies to NET.

- d. their-wickedness has-ascended in-front-of-me רָעָהָם {רָעָהָם} "Evil, harm; wickedness, perverseness; misery, trouble, disaster" [Holladay]; "evil, misery, distress; injury, wrong; ethical evil" [BDB]; HALOT summarizes, "The basic meaning of רָעָהָם {רָעָהָם} is probably 'that which is harmful,'" and lists "evil; wickedness; depravity; misfortune; calamity, disaster" [HALOT]; TWOT explains that this root can have either a passive sense ("misfortune, calamity") or an active sense ("wickedness"). If it occurs in moral contexts, then the sense is "evil, wickedness;" but in profane contexts, the sense is "bad, repulsive." [TWOT] 'Their wickedness' [NAU, NET, NJB, KJV, RSV, HCSB, Allen, Tucker, Wolff, Limburg]; 'its wickedness' [NIV]; 'their evil' [ESV, Lessing, Youngblood]; 'the wickedness of its citizens' [Sasson]; 'their trouble' [Stuart]; 'its calamity' [Baldwin]. The word רָעָהָם {רָעָהָם} is another word that is frequently repeated in Jonah (1:2,7,8; 3:10; 4:1,2,6). In general, it carries two distinct senses: "wickedness, wrongdoing" (moral evil) and "harm, disaster" (physical evil). The author of Jonah makes use of both senses, at different times in the book. In this verse, the vast majority of authorities understand its use as referring to wickedness [e.g., Youngblood, 55] Goldman narrows its reference specifically to moral and social sins, but excludes idolatry. [Goldman, 138] There are, however, a few authorities who allow that this verse has in mind a physical evil, rather than moral evil. Stuart feels that Jonah most likely understood it as referring to some unspecified kind of physical calamity and further that Jonah himself may have been unsure which kind of evil (physical or moral) Yahweh intended. [Stuart, 449] Tribble also feels that this term, and indeed Jonah's call, is ambiguous at this early point in the story; perhaps Jonah is to communicate doom to Nineveh *in the midst of* some physical calamity that Nineveh is experiencing, instead of *because of* moral evil that Nineveh is committing. [Tribble, 127] Disagreeing with this view, Limburg observes that other prophets are quite clear about the general prophetic attitude toward Nineveh. He quotes Zeph. 2:13-15 and Nahum 3:1-7 (although both of those books refer to centuries later than Jonah), to show that Nineveh was perceived as committing pervasive wickedness, deserving of judgment. [Limburg, 41-2].

Commented [CJS38]: Somewhere or other you might want to discuss whether Jonah thought his preaching was conditional or not and this sort of comment would be relevant there, but not, I think, here.

Commented [CJS39]: I hesitate to ask for extra work, but I think this might be clearer if it were restructured, setting out the options:

Option 1: moral evil committed by Nineveh

Option 2a: calamity that has already happened to Nineveh

Option 2b: calamity that will happen to Nineveh

Whether this is best as LEXICON or as QUESTION, I'm not sure.

According to the later QUESTION, Stuart is unique in considering option 2. Is that correct? If it is, then perhaps this should stand as it is.

Commented [CJS40]: Some translations [NET, NLT, NJPS and perhaps others?] render 'judgment' and that should be included.

- e. their-wickedness has-ascended in-front-of-me לִפְנֵי {לִפְנֵי} Etymologically 'to my face,' it is given by the lexicons under the root פָּנָה {פָּנָה} 'face': 'before' which can be either temporal or spatial (with or without movement) [Holladay, פָּנָה {פָּנָה} 12a]; "prop. *at the face or front of*, the

Commented [CJS41]: HALOT cites this instance explicitly so you probably should: "fig. for *in (or into) the full (mental) view of*,"

General principle here:

Citing the range of renderings in a lexicon is good, but, if the lexicon cites the current instance and gives a more specific rendering, then we need that, too.

most general word for *in the presence of, before*” [BDB, p.816, פָּנָה {פָּנָה}, II.4.] See the last QUESTION below.

QUESTION— Why is Nineveh described as “the large city,” and what is the significance of Nineveh?

For the historical significance of Nineveh, see the discussion in the [Introduction](#) to this book.

Note that the inclusion of the word הָעִיר {הָעִיר} “the city” is required by Hebrew grammar, because

“Normally an adjective cannot directly qualify a proper noun.” [JM, 141c] That is, נִינְוָה הַגְּדוֹלָה {נִינְוָה הַגְּדוֹלָה} “large Nineveh” would not have been normal Hebrew grammar.

1. The adjective “large” is primarily a device for literary effect. As a stylistic feature, the author of Jonah has chosen to use the repetition of words throughout the book. גָּדוֹל {גָּדוֹל} “large” is the first and most common of those repeated words. Therefore, it may be that “large” is used simply as a stylistic feature. “Throughout the book the word גָּדוֹל {גָּדוֹל} will be repeated as a key word for literary effect.” [Buth, 54]
2. The adjective simply designates the size of the city, and nothing more. [Page, 224]
3. The phrase means not only that Nineveh is large but also that its size is familiar to everyone. Sasson takes it that the definite article is used as a weak demonstrative, which he feels implies that everyone is well aware of Nineveh’s large size. He notes that the LXX translates similarly. [Sasson, 71-2] NET has a footnote to the same effect.
4. It signifies a royal capital city. [Baldwin, 552]
5. It signifies a capital city that is also a religious cultic center. It may be a national or regional capital city. The other uses of this phrase occur at Gen. 10:12 (Calah was the capital of Assyria at that time); Josh. 10:2 (Gibeon, the chief city of a Hivite region); and Jer. 22:8 (Jerusalem). [Youngblood, 54]
6. It refers to significance, not size. Nineveh was significant in God’s eyes, in Jonah’s commission, and as the capital of the Gentile world. [KD, 391]
7. It refers to importance, not size; the city has some characteristic of singular, specific greatness. The phrase הָעִיר הַגְּדוֹלָה {הָעִיר הַגְּדוֹלָה} may be a Hebrew rendering of the Assyrian term for “important city; capital.” But it would be overly specific to translate with the English word “capital.” It is best rendered as “the important city.” [Stuart, 448-9]
8. It not only means that the city is important and large, but implies that it is worth God’s effort to save. [Bruckner, 41]

Translation: ‘Nineveh, the great city’ [NAU, NJB, Tucker, Lessing, Wolff]; ‘The great city of Nineveh’ [NIV, NLT, NAB, HCSB]; ‘Nineveh, that great city,’ [KJV, RSV, ESV, Limburg]; ‘Nineveh, that large city,’ [Sasson]; ‘Nineveh, that great metropolis’ [Youngblood]; ‘the vast city of Nineveh’ [Allen]; ‘The important city, Nineveh,’ [Stuart]; ‘Nineveh, that large capital city’ [NET].

QUESTION— What is meant by ‘has-ascended-in-front-of-me’?

Most translations fall into two groups, a literal rendition or one that points to God taking notice: ‘has

Commented [CJS42]: Also vdm, p 233, para 30.2.2.vii

Commented [CJS43]: Does anyone make a point that seems obvious to me, that in Hebrew a proper noun is always definite so any appositional modifier should agree in definiteness? The presence of the article is thus required and should not be interpreted further.

Commented [CJS44]: I think it would be clearer if you include the word ‘status’ found in the source: the status of the city as a royal capital.

Commented [CJS45]: Youngblood does not cite Deu 1:28; 6:10; 9:1; Jos 14:12 or 1Ki 4:13. The three he does cite seem to support his conclusion, but I suggest giving only the conclusion and deleting the rest of the paragraph.

Commented [CJS46]: I have suggested above that these data might be better in the LEXICON section.

Commented [CJS47]: I wonder whether some of this material would be more appropriate in LEXICON?

Commented [CJS48]: Is REB one of your standard set? It has, ‘I am confronted by its wickedness.’

Commented [CJS49]: As I suggested above, this is a helpful way to introduce an entry, but should these be in the LEXICON?

Commented [CJS50]: ‘Rendition’ is a political hot potato. ‘Rendering’ would be both safer and more conventional.

come-up/arisen/ascended before me' [NAU, NIV, ESV, NKJV, RSV, NAB, Lessing, Tucker, Youngblood]; 'has risen up to me' [Wolff]; 'has come before me' [Limburg]; 'has confronted Me' [HCSB]; 'has forced itself upon me' [NJB]; 'has come to my notice' [Allen, Baldwin]; 'has come to my attention' [NET]; 'is obvious to me' [Sasson]; 'is of concern to me' [Stuart].

Commentators widely agree that this phrase points to Nineveh's wickedness becoming so bad that God decides to intervene. All of the commentators understand that God was aware of the wickedness all along, but the wickedness has now degraded to a such a low point that God will take action [e.g., Youngblood]. Their discussion brings out slight nuances:

1. Divine intervention was required due to Nineveh's offenses being both abundant and reckless; they had even put their sins intentionally on display. The phrase emphasizes that their sins were blatant. [Youngblood, 55]
2. God's patience had finally been overshadowed by His demand for justice. [Walton, 469]
3. The phrase expresses that the situation was so extreme that it merited God's special attention. [Stuart, 449] However, note that Stuart vacillates on what the "situation" refers to – perhaps moral evil committed by the Ninevites, or perhaps a calamity that Nineveh was experiencing, but in either case, the situation is unspecified. [Stuart, 449] Stuart is thus unique in translating vaguely: 'their trouble is of concern to me.'

QUESTION— Is there anything unusual about God's command to Jonah?

God's command to Jonah is unique within the Bible. Although other prophets issued prophecies against foreign nations, only Jonah is recorded as actually being sent to the foreign land to deliver the prophetic judgment. (Elijah was sent to a foreign land, but not to deliver judgment; cf. 1Kg 17:8.) Elsewhere in the Bible, there are prophecies about foreign nations, but those prophecies are delivered to the Jews and serve a variety of purposes for the Jews (a promise of deliverance from foreign oppressors; a warning against alliance with foreign nations; a dishonor that Israel is reduced to the same status as foreign nations that require God's judgment). [Youngblood, 53] Furthermore, it is significant that Nineveh is a *foreign* city. God's interest in it and his command to Jonah to preach against it, carry the implication that Yahweh is not limited to the borders of Israel. Such geographic limitations were a common feature of ANE religion. But the implication of the book of Jonah, is that Yahweh is sovereign world-wide. [Stuart 448]

Commented [CJS51]: Perhaps clarify by adding, 'in their inscriptions'

Commented [CJS52]: If he is unique – see my comment on the LEXICON – then it might be better to draw that out there rather than here.
My thinking is that when I use ES, or a commentary, I don't want to read everything. There are things I look for in particular sections, so I'm asking myself where I would expect to find this sort of information.

Commented [CJS53]: Either 'OT' or 'Hebrew Bible'. The NT is rather different!

Commented [CJS54]: I would see this as anachronistic, and would avoid the term, at least until after the exile, when the people were known as yehudiy.

Commented [CJS55]: I think it needs to be clearer how much of what precedes is from Youngblood. I see two ways:
- Move the round bracket to follow the square bracket
- Restructure the sentence so that 'Youngblood' comes before what he says.

Commented [CJS56]: Same here.

1:3 Then- Jonah -arose^a to-flee^b to-Tarshish from-the-presence-of^c Yahweh. Then-he-went-down (to) Joppa. Then-he-found (a) ship going/coming^d (to) Tarshish. Then-he-gave its-fare. Then-he-went-down in-it^e to-go/come with-them to-Tarshish, from-the-presence-of Yahweh.

INTERCLAUSAL RELATIONS— Throughout biblical narratives, when God commands a person to do something, it is followed with a report of the person then executing those command(s) using words that exactly parallel the words used in the command. [Youngblood, 56] Therefore, when God commanded Jonah to “Arise! Go!” the reader expects the following statement to be, “He arose and went.” And indeed, the following sentence begins exactly as expected: “Then Jonah arose...” The reader expects the usual report of obedience to continue. But suddenly the narrative takes a surprising turn, and the reader’s expectations are swept away. Jonah did not “Arise and go,” instead he “Arose to flee” in the opposite direction.

LEXICON—

- a. **Then- Jonah -arose to-flee to-Tarshish** וַיָּקֹם {קוּם} (Qal-wayyiqtol-3ms of קוּם {קוּם}). See Lexicon entry (a), above in 1:2. Here in 1:3, most authorities treat this verb as a straightforward, isolated usage – i.e., Jonah arose. But some authorities make it subservient to the following verb “to flee” – apparently because, as noted in the above INTERCLAUSAL RELATIONS, there is reason to view it as an echo of God’s command, given in 1:2, where this verb merely gives impetus to the following verb. ‘But *Jonah* rose-up/rose/arose/got-up’ [NAU, ESV, NKJV, KJV, RSV, Baldwin, Lessing, Limburg]; ‘However, *Jonah* got up’ [CSB]; ‘So *Jonah* got up’ [Baldwin, Youngblood]; ‘And he stood up (got started)’ [Buth]; ‘But *Jonah* set out’ [NRSV, Stuart, Tucker]; ‘Then *Jonah* set out’ [Wolff]; ‘But *Jonah* made ready’ [NAB]; ‘*Jonah* set about’ [NJB]; ‘*Jonah*, instead, sought’ [Sasson]; ‘Instead, *Jonah* immediately’ [NET]; ‘*Jonah* did go off—’ [Allen].

- b. **to-flee to-Tarshish from-the-presence-of Yahweh.** לָרֶחַק {לָרֶחַק} (Qal-inf.const. of בָּרַח {בָּרַח})) “Run away, flee; pass away; pass through” [Holladay]; “Go or pass through; flee; come quickly” [BDB]; “To go or pass through, and to flee or hurry,” it occurs mostly in narrative and almost always refers to fleeing from an enemy or a place. [TWOT] ‘To flee’ [NAU, CSB, ESV, KJV, RSV, NAB, Lessing, Stuart, Youngblood, Wolff]; ‘in order to flee’ [Tucker]; ‘to escape’ [NET, Sasson]; ‘to run away’ [Baldwin, Limburg]; ‘running away’ [NJB, Allen]. Sasson notes that when the verb בָּרַח {בָּרַח} is used with the preposition מִן {מִן}, the direction or manner of escape is in view, but so is the object being abandoned. [Sasson, 77-8] According to Lessing, the verb בָּרַח {בָּרַח} only rarely refers to fleeing from an acute danger, and usually refers to evading some unpleasant situation. [Lessing, 69]

- b. **to-flee to-Tarshish from-the-presence-of Yahweh.** מִלִּפְנֵי {מִלִּפְנֵי} “From the presence of (properly, from a position *before* a person or object)” [BDB, pg. 817, פָּנָה {פָּנָה} 5.a.]. “Away from; out of the reach of; on account of” [Holladay, פָּנָה {פָּנָה} 13]. “Away from; out from” [HALOT, pg.942-3, פָּנָה {פָּנָה} 4.h.]. ‘From the presence of’ [NAU, KJV, RSV, ESV, HCSB, Youngblood,

Commented [CM57]: This is etymologically a construct chain, but has become a compound preposition -- a word in its own right. Therefore, I've not put “the” and “of” in parens. CJS: OK

Commented [CJS58]: I suggest softening this by adding Youngblood’s ‘typically’ or an alternative such as ‘usually’ or ‘normally’.

Commented [CM59]: Technically, I’m violating the ES Guide’s instructions re: single-quotes for Bible quotations. But if I were to follow those here, I’d be switching back and forth between single- and double-quote marks, in a seemingly random fashion. So I just went with all double-quotes. CJS: British and US conventions differ, as I found out when I wrote an MA thesis at Westminster. I’m happy to accept what you have. Someone else will be copy-editor; if they raise the issue, then discuss it with them.

Commented [CJS60]: Final form of mem

Commented [CJS61]: 1. Which of them do this explicitly? 2. How do they do it? Your word ‘subservient’ doesn’t make it clear to me.

Commented [CJS62]: I think this needs ‘headed off’

Commented [CJS63]: What do you think NIV is doing here: ‘ran away ... and headed’

Commented [CJS64]: I notice that some render ‘try to escape’; that might be worthy of discussion. I have now found that you have a QUESTION on this issue. Good. You might want to look for translations that include something like ‘trying to’ or ‘sought to’, because, of course, he didn’t succeed.

Commented [CJS65]: Add: with prefixed lamed.

Commented [CJS66]: According to Sasson, what you have here would apply strictly only to min without panim. I think these comments would go better with your next entry, where you report more of Sasson’s connected discussion.

Baldwin]; ‘away from’ [NIV, NJB, NAB, Allen, Stuart, Wolff]; ‘away from the presence of’ [Tucker, Lessing, Limburg]; ‘sought to escape’ [Sasson]; ‘from the commission of ... far away from’ [NET] Tucker: This preposition indicates spatial position or movement away from something. [Tucker, 15] Sasson seems ambiguous on the implications of the preposition. As noted above in lexicon entry (a), he finds emphasis both on the direction of escape and on the object being abandoned. However, he also argues that when Hebrew wants to focus on the person or place left behind, it consistently uses a different preposition (מִפְּנֵי {מִפְּנֵי} “from the face of”) with this verb. In the end, he asserts only that the preposition here (מִלְפָּנֵי {מִלְפָּנֵי}) gives a direction and goal to Jonah’s travel. [Sasson, 77-8]

Commented [CJS67]: I think this is his rendering of the infinitive and he has no equivalent for millipney, in spite of the extensive discussion.

Commented [CJS68]: Is this not the second millipney, at the end of the verse? Do the other renderings you report here relate only to the first or to both?

- c. (a) ship going/coming (to) Tarshish. בָּאָה {בָּאָה} (Qal-part.-fs of בָּא {בָּא}) “Come in; come; go in; go” [BDB]; “Go in; come, arrive; come back, come home” [Holladay]. ‘(which/that was) going to’ [NAU, ESV, KJV, RSV, NAB, HCSB, Limburg, Lessing, Stuart, Wolff]; ‘(that) was coming (to)’ [Buth]; ‘heading to’ [NET]; ‘bound for’ [NIV, NJB, Youngblood]; ‘leaving for’ [NLT]; ‘about to leave for’ [Baldwin]; ‘had just come from’ [Sasson]; ‘coming from’ [Tucker]; *omitted* [Allen]. This verb is very common (used 1997 times) and thus has a broad range of meanings, but they center on the idea of arriving or entering. In a given context, the direction of movement may be viewed from the opposite starting point and may thus be translated “go” instead of “come.” Stuart: the verb בָּא {בָּא} can mean “go” instead of the usual “come,” when it is modified regarding direction or distance; he lists some passages as support, e.g. Gen 45:17. [Stuart, 451] But there is a more nuanced question here: how is the participle being used? The participle may be used as a simultaneous action, as Buth translates “a ship that [was] coming [to]...” [Buth, 55] However, the participle can instead indicate an impending action; for example, Baldwin identifies it as a “future *instans*” verb and translates, ‘about to leave.’ [Baldwin, 553] Sasson concedes that most scholars take the participle either as future (thus, the ship was going toward Tarshish) or as permanent (thus, the ship regularly traveled on the Tarshish route. However, Sasson disagrees, arguing that the verb almost always indicates movement toward the speaker, including maritime contexts; he cites 2Chr 9:21 for support. He concludes that the phrase implies that the ship was *returning from* Tarshish. [Sasson, 82-3] Youngblood considers the evidence of Sasson, but reaches the opposite conclusion (‘about to sail for Tarshish’) on the grounds of rhetorical effect. Because Yahweh had used הָלַךְ {הָלַךְ} (the typical verb for motion away from) to command Jonah to go, the author now uses the verb בָּא {בָּא} (the typical opposite verb, i.e. for motion toward). This creates a rhetorical effect that heightens the discrepancy between Yahweh’s command and Jonah’s rebellious response. [Youngblood, 58-9]

Commented [CJS69]: I think that what Sasson is saying is that the use of both prepositions with panim indicates both what/who he is leaving and his goal and that neither min, alone, nor mippney would do that. I think he is wrong about the lamed, but that doesn’t matter, if that is what he meant.

Commented [CJS70]: I wouldn’t worry about coming/going – languages differ in how they handle this sort of deixis. You could leave that out and move the rest of this paragraph to QUESTIONS.

- d. Then-he-went-down-in-it to-go/come with-them to-Tarshish. וַיֵּרֶד בָּהּ {וַיֵּרֶד בָּהּ} This may be an idiom. The phrase וַיֵּרֶד בָּהּ {וַיֵּרֶד בָּהּ} literally means ‘He went down into it [the ship],’ and most translators render it that way. However, Buth notes “וַיֵּרֶד (-בּ) {וַיֵּרֶד (-בּ)} may be an idiom

Commented [CJS71]: This might be another case where setting out options 1 and 2 might be a helpful way to handle it.

for ‘sail away’ [in a ship]. Cf. Psalms 107:23 with ‘in a boat’ and Isaiah 42:10 where ‘goers-down of the sea’ refers to ‘those who sail the oceans.’ [Buth, 55] Buth thus translates as, ‘and he sailed away in it.’ Sasson translates simply as ‘boarded it,’ but notes the same verses as Buth and identifies it as a simple idiom for sailing. [Sasson, 80] HALOT does not envision this, giving only “to go on board” for our verse. [HALOT, pg 435, יָרַד {ירד} 2.b.] Thus, the phrase could mean either that Jonah went onboard the ship [as most translate], or that the ship sailed away with Jonah onboard [as Buth translates]. Both Isa. 42:10 and Ps. 107:23 have the phrase very literally translated as ‘the goers-down of the sea,’ and the Psalm adds a key word, matching Jonah, ‘in ships.’ If one translates with Buth, then note that it weakens the book’s repetition of the verb ‘to go down’ – a fact which Buth himself notes; see the QUESTION about this verb, below.

QUESTION— Where was Joppa, and is there any significance to it?

Joppa (a.k.a. Jaffa, Yafo) was located on the Mediterranean coast on the west side of Israel; it is within modern-day Tel Aviv. It was a seaport -- and thus had some economic significance, especially because there were so few viable ports along that coastline. It was a well-known port city even in Egyptian, Mesopotamian, and Greek literature. [Sasson, 80] The port city of Dor was much closer to Jonah’s hometown, but perhaps Jonah received God’s instructions while away from home (e.g., in Samaria, the capital of northern Israel, which is much closer to Joppa). [Stuart, 445] During Jonah’s lifetime, Joppa was probably *not* under Jewish control. Indeed, Sasson notes that Joppa was almost never under Jewish control. [Sasson, 80] So in Joppa, Jonah was already outside of Jewish territory, and this may have some significance in the story, relating to Jonah’s attempted flight away from Yahweh; see the QUESTION about Tarshish, below.

QUESTION— Where was Tarshish, and is there any significance to it?

The location of Tarshish is, ultimately, unknown. Based upon 2 Chr 9:21, it appears that a round-trip voyage to Tarshish took 3 years. Various specific places have been suggested for its geographic location, including Tartessos (Spain), Taros (Sardinia), Tarsus (Turkey), Etruria (Italy), Rhodes, Carthage, Tunis, Phoenicia, as well as some generic places (simply “the sea” or any “port city”). Note that in other biblical passages, the same word “Tarshish” may refer to different places, people, or things. [Lessing, 70-73]

1. Tarshish was a far-distant location in the opposite direction from Nineveh. At least qualitatively, and possibly literally, it was the furthest place in the known world. This is why Jonah chose Tarshish. [Sasson, 79; Limburg, 43]. The fact that Jonah flees in this manner reveals his determined resistance to God’s commission. [Youngblood, 56]

1.1. In addition to being distant and in the opposite direction, Tarshish was known as a place where Yahweh’s revelation had not been spread; Jonah may have hoped to avoid further instructions from God. Several commentators note that Isaiah 66:19 includes Tarshish in a list of distant places where God’s reputation and presence were unknown. [Sasson, 79] Tarshish was therefore a refuge where Jonah could (perhaps) be free from any additional messages from God. [Youngblood, 56-7]

2. It was not a specific place, but rather a generic term for any place of great distance. “Tarshish”

Commented [CJS72]: As I read Sasson, he makes these comments on p 80 about the earlier instance of *yrd* in this verse. In that context, however, his comment about the idiom meaning ‘sail’ doesn’t fit, so I’m confused. On p. 84, where he discusses the second instance, he gives no back reference to p 80. What do you think?

Commented [CJS73]: This material is good stuff, but it seems to me to be more supporting argument than conclusion. I’m not sure it is required in ES.

Commented [CJS74]: Again, make clearer where your use of Sasson starts. You have developed a formalism elsewhere that makes this clear by putting, ‘Sasson:’ at the start of your report of his discussion.

Commented [CJS75]: I think that, somewhere I have suggested that this is an anachronism in the pre-exilic period and should be avoided.

Commented [CJS76]: Youngblood’s point, I think, is that, wherever Tarshish is to be found, it is to the west, in the opposite direction to Nineveh.

Commented [CJS77]: Again, make clearer where Sasson’s contribution starts, if necessary putting his name at the start. I won’t point out any more of these, but do look through.

would then be idiomatic for the farthest port imaginable -- akin to the modern English idiomatic usage of the city “Timbuktu.” [Walton, 469]

3. It indicates simply “the sea.” Jonah didn’t care where he went, he merely fled. [Luther] Stuart reasons that the word Tarshish probably had two meanings. It was a common place name, used for several different coastal areas, analogous to “Portland” in modern city names. Second, it had a basic meaning of “the open sea.” Stuart concludes that the usage in Jonah refers to the latter sense, indicating simply that Jonah went to sea. [Stuart, 451].
4. It was a double-entendre, being both a specific place named “Tarshish,” and also any place that offered luxury, pleasure, and safety. [Lessing, 73]

QUESTION— What is signified by the statement that Jonah fled ‘from the presence of Yahweh?’ What was Jonah’s purpose in fleeing?

Commentators universally observe that Jonah did not think he could actually escape God, citing both Jonah 1:9 and 4:2, as well as Psalm 139:7ff. They are then left to interpret the intent of the statement.

1. Jonah specifically wanted to stop being God’s prophet/servant/minister. [Goldman, 139; KD, 391; Wolff, 103] His flight indicates both his unwillingness to serve and his rebellion against God’s sovereignty. [Alexander, 111]
2. Jonah wanted to decrease the likelihood that he would hear God’s command again. To “flee from the presence of Yahweh” is idiomatic and means simply that Jonah wanted to get away to a place where Yahweh was not worshiped. He hoped that God’s word would not come to him again. [Stuart, 450]
3. It indicates the essential nature of Jonah’s sin, and is emphasized by its repetition. Jonah’s sin was to forsake God by disobeying his call and thus deny God’s omnipotence. [Calvin]

QUESTION— Is there any significance to the repeated use of the verb ירד {ירד} ‘He went down,’ in Jonah 1:3, 5, and 2:7?

Indisputably, the author of Jonah has chosen to repeat vocabulary. As Buth puts it, there is a “verbal echo within the text,” as the author continually repeats the same words. [Buth, 55]. Beyond this stylistic repetition, ירד {ירד} may have additional implications, according to some commentators.

1. Jonah is going downward not just geographically, but also spiritually. [Baldwin, 553] His downward direction is toward chaos and death. [Youngblood, 58]
2. Each additional usage of the verb progressively builds a psychological dimension. [Sasson, 80]
3. The verb intentionally contrasts with God’s command to ‘Arise!’ thus highlighting the conflict between Jonah and God. [Youngblood, 58]
4. It indicates how Jonah is separating himself from God -- both toward Tarshish and toward the bottom of the sea. [Limburg, 43] It strengthens the idea that Jonah is going in the opposite direction, away from Yahweh. [Lessing, 74]
5. It operates as a metaphor for Jonah’s action of fleeing.” [Tucker, 15]
6. It has no implication whatsoever. It is the natural verb to use, to describe movement to a lower

Commented [CJS78]: Luther isn't in the version of your bibliography that I have.

Commented [CJS79]: This paragraph would be the place to deal with my earlier comment about rendering that make ‘trying to flee’ explicit.

Commented [CJS80]: Again, I have this on p 101. The pagination in your edition must differ from mine. Is yours a hard copy? I won't mention it again, but please check.

Commented [CJS81]: Calvin isn't in the version of your bibliography that I have.

elevation -- e.g., from inland down to the coast, or from an upper deck down to a lower deck.
[Stuart, 451-2]

QUESTION— Is there a significant structure to the statements within verse 1:3?

Several commentators observe that, in addition to wider repetition of vocabulary, there appears to be a chiasmic structure to the phrases within this verse.

A Then-arose Jonah to-flee to-Tarshish from-the-presence-of Yahweh
B Then-he-went-down [to] Joppa
C Then-he-found [a]-ship
D going [to] Tarshish
C' Then-he-gave its-fare
B' Then-he-went-down into-it
A' to-return with-them to-Tarshish from-the-presence-of Yahweh

However, even the commentators who agree the structure is intentional do not derive much interpretive meaning from it. Page says that the structure highlights the contrast between God's command and Jonah's response. [Page, 226] Similarly, Allen implies that the structure emphasizes that Jonah does the exact opposite of what God told him to do, and that he is running away as a deserter. [Allen, page# unknown in TW] Lessing asserts that the structure demonstrates that Jonah is trapped, surrounded by Yahweh's presence despite his attempt to flee. [Lessing, 91] Tribble notes only that the center of the chiasm (D) emphasizes the trip to Tarshish is at the center of Jonah's disobedience. [Tribble, 130] Baldwin makes much of the structure, but her only interpretive comment is that it conveys Jonah's deliberate purpose. [Baldwin, 553] Sasson is convinced of the existence and literary flourish of the chiasm, but offers no interpretive significance. [Sasson, 77] Stuart not only denies any significance to the chiasm, but also asserts it is a mere accident, arising from the simple repetition of words. [Stuart, 452]

QUESTION— How much did Jonah pay to travel on the ship?

There is a centuries-old rabbinic tradition that Jonah hired the entire ship. Several commentators take this idea seriously and even maintain it. Other commentators note that the trip to Tarshish would be a long one, about a full year; thus the cost for simple passage on the ship would already be significant (even without hiring the entire ship).

QUESTION— How does the calling of Jonah compare with other prophets? ??add this?? (See comments in the side bubble.)

QUESTION— Why does the author wait until 4:2 to explain why Jonah fled?

The author intentionally withholds the explanation for Jonah's disobedience, instead recounting only Jonah's actions. He later (4:2) reveals Jonah's motive when the reader least expects it. The author's purpose is not only to build suspense, but also to expose readers' assumptions and prejudices. [Youngblood, 56]

Commented [CJS82]: 204-205. in later instances, I have replaced your ### by the numbers.

Commented [CJS83]: Fair comment.

Commented [CJS84]: Again, fair comment.

Commented [CJS85]: I can't find this. Would you just check, please.

Commented [CJM86]: I'm inclined to NOT include this. I feel that the concept of hiring the entire ship is rather unlikely, support from commentators notwithstanding. However, that's just my opinion, and given that some commentators take it seriously... maybe it should be mentioned. Also, perhaps a concept of the high cost of the fare – even if not hiring the entire ship – is significant to translators?
CJS: I would be very happy for you to leave it out. You already have a QUESTION on v. 2 'Is there anything unusual ...'. Does what you are suggesting here differ from that?

Commented [CJM87]: In Youngblood, p50 & 60 & 71, he has a discussion of the normal pattern of God's call on a prophet: call, OBJECTION RE: INADEQUACY, God's rebuke & assurance, etc. Jonah doesn't object but instead runs away, thus breaking the normal pattern. IS THIS SOMETHING THAT I SHOULD INCLUDE?
CJS: Again, probably not. Is Youngblood the only one who addresses this? If he is, then definitely leave it out.

Commented [CJS88]: Good point. Is Youngblood the only one to discuss this? Is it better here or at 4.2 where we find out. Put in a cross reference whichever way you choose to do it.

DISCOURSE UNIT: ch:vv-vv

1:4 But/And Yahweh hurled^a (a) large wind to the-sea. Then- (a) large storm -occurred on-the-sea. And-the-ship planned^b to-be-broken-up.^c

INTERTEXTUAL REFERENCE—The repeated word גְּדוֹלָהּ {גְּדוֹלָהּ} “large” occurs two more times in this verse. See discussion above, at 1:2.

INTERTEXTUAL REFERENCE— The phrase אֶל-הַיָּם ... הִטִּיל {הִטִּיל ... אֶל-הַיָּם} “hurl...to the-sea” is another repeated phrase; it occurs the first time here, but again in verse 5 (the cargo), and in verses 12 and 15 (Jonah).

SYNTAX— In the second statement (“Then [a] large storm occurred on the sea”) there are two syntactical possibilities. Just as in verse 1:1, the verb is “to be; become” (הָיָה - וַיְהִי) Qal-wayyiqtol-3ms) and may have as its subject either the noun סְעָר {סְעָר} “storm,” or else the built-in generic 3ms pronoun (“he/it”). Sasson notes that either reading is possible grammatically, and the choice is a matter of interpretation and of philology. [Sasson, 95]. The above semi-literal translation takes ‘storm’ as the subject of the verb. The distinction between that and the alternative syntax seems minimal. If one instead took the generic subject, the translation would be, ‘Then-there-was a-large-storm on-the-sea’ or ‘Then-it-happened (that) a-large-storm (was) on-the-sea.’

INTERCLAUSAL RELATIONS— In Hebrew narrative, the main story-line is usually carried forward by a sequence of wayyiqtol verbs. But this verse begins with a break in that sequence (the verb הִטִּיל {הִטִּיל} is a qatal conjugation). Buth explains that such a break in the wayyiqtol sequence usually indicates that the story’s chronological development pauses for some reason -- for example, the break often indicates an action that occurs “meanwhile.” But in this verse, the story line continues -- i.e., the next chronological event is indeed Yahweh hurling the wind onto the sea. In a case like this, Buth explains, the author is using the interruption of the wayyiqtol sequence “either to mark a new unit boundary (e.g. like a paragraph, scene or episode) or to use the pause for dramatic literary effect.” For this specific case, Buth concludes that the author is marking a new scene or paragraph. [Buth, 77, 113] Youngblood sees the same grammatical structure and thinks that it indicates the usual simultaneous action, i.e. “Meanwhile, YHWH flung...” [Youngblood, 60] Tucker asserts that the verb structure highlights a shift to a different participant in the story -- in this case, to God. [Tucker, 18; similarly, Baldwin, 556]

INTERCLAUSAL RELATIONS— Just as above, the final sentence of the verse again breaks the wayyiqtol sequence (a short sequence which had just begun, earlier within this verse). That is, the verb ‘planned’ is a qatal not a wayyiqtol. Again, the verb is not wayyiqtol despite the fact that ‘planning’ is the next chronological action. Buth reasons that in this case, the verb interruption is not marking a new paragraph but instead “illustrates the most expressive function of this structure ... the effect of the grammatical pause needs to be interpreted as a stylistic, literary device.” The author broke up the chronological events in order to create a dramatic pause, to match the dramatic incident in the story. [Buth, 77]

Commented [CJS89]: This is not so much syntax as information structure. You have reported what Sasson says, but I had already concluded that he had not got to grips with discourse analysis, cf. his misuse of ‘emphasis’. In the Hebrew syntax, ‘storm’ is the subject in any case, but English makes a syntactic distinction that Hebrew does not based on whether the clause is presenting a new participant, ‘there was a storm...’ or making a statement about the storm, ‘a storm was ...’.

Something to think about: does ES have any way to indicate whether a particular source is to be relied upon for certain categories of issues.

Commented [CJS90]: Youngblood seems to me to offer two explanations: simultaneous action and also a shift of attention. I don’t think it can be both, but that does seem to be what he says.

Commented [CJS91]: Tucker again explains it as a new participant.

LEXICON—

- a. **But/And Yahweh hurled (a) large wind to the-sea.** הָטִיל {הָטִיל} (Hifil-qatal-3ms of טִל {טִל}) HALOT gives ‘to throw far’ for the Hifil verb, but offers a nuance of downward motion when presenting the directly-related passive (the Hofal) as ‘to be hurled down.’ [HALOT, p.373] Holladay gives simply ‘throw’ for the Hifil and ‘be thrown’ for the Hofal. [Holladay, p.123] Meanwhile, BDB gives the Hifil as ‘cast, cast out; hurl (send violently)’ and adds some nuances for the Hofal passive, ‘be hurled, hurled down, hurled headlong; be overwhelmed; be thrown’ [BDB, p.376]. ‘Hurled’ [NAU, NET, HCSB, ESV, RSV, NLT, NAB, Allen, Baldwin, Lessing, Limburg, Sasson, Tucker]; ‘threw’ [NJB, Stuart, Wolff]; ‘threw down’ [Buth]; ‘flung’ [Youngblood]; ‘sent’ [NIV]; ‘sent out’ [KJV]. The verb root is used four times in this chapter (all as Hifil), but only ten other times in the entire Bible (five of which are Hifil, four are Hofal).
- b. **And-the-ship planned to-be-broken-up.** הִשָּׁקָה {הִשָּׁקָה} (Piel qatal-3fs of חִשַּׁב {חִשַּׁב}). The root has a basic idea of employing the mind in the activity of thinking; the most common sense is “plan, devise,” though there is also a sense of “account, reckon” and an infrequent sense of merely “think.” [TWOT] “Compute; think of; plan, devise; be about to” [HALOT], but note that the Piel verb is used 16 times in the OT and the last sense is identified only in this verse. “Calculate; consider; plan, think out” and for this verse, “be near to, almost” do some action [Holladay]. “Think upon, consider, be mindful of; think to do, devise, plan; count, reckon” [BDB]. ‘Threatened to’ [ESV, NRSV, NJB, NIV, NET, HCSB, Limburg, Youngblood, Wolff]; ‘was about to’ [NAU, NAB, NKJV]; ‘seemed about to’ [Stuart]; ‘seemed likely to’ [Baldwin]; ‘thought it would’ [Allen, Tucker]; ‘thought itself to be’ [Lessing]; ‘was determined to’ [Page]; ‘expected itself to’ [Sasson]. This is the only time in the Bible that the Piel verb חִשַּׁב {חִשַּׁב} is used with an inanimate subject. Usually, it refers to the thinking or planning of a human. [Limburg, 48] Several commentators notice the wordplay of repeated sounds, and most believe that the sounds of the words represent the sounds within the scene — the sound of the wind or waves, or of the ship’s planks breaking under force of the waves. [Sasson, 97; Tribble, 132; Tucker, 19; etc.]
- c. **And-the-ship planned to-be-broken-up.** לְהִשָּׁבֵר {לְהִשָּׁבֵר} (Nifal inf.constr. of שָׁבַר {שָׁבַר}) “Be smashed, break; be shattered; be destroyed” [HALOT]. “Be broken [up]” [Holladay]. “Be broken” [BDB]. ‘To break up’ [NAU, NAB, ESV, NRSV, NJB, NIV, NET, Limburg, Wolff]; ‘would break up’ [Allen, Tucker]; ‘to break apart’ [HCSB, Page, Stuart]; ‘to burst apart’ [Youngblood]; ‘to be broken up’ [NKJV]; ‘to be broken to pieces.’ [Baldwin]; ‘<thought> itself to be broken’ [Lessing]; ‘<expected> itself to crack up’ [Sasson]. In general, a Nifal can be the passive of a Qal root (just as both Holladay and BDB give for this verb), but a Nifal can also carry a reflexive sense (“break oneself”). There are no clearly reflexive uses of this verb in the Bible, though Ex. 22:9, 13 do seem to encompass that potential [HALOT, שָׁבַר {שָׁבַר} Nifal 1]. A possibility, then, is to render the usage in this verse as, “to break itself up,” and some of the translations seem to have this sense in mind.

Commented [CJS92]: The guidelines spell this Hiphil (also Hophal, Niphal) following van der Merwe’s grammar.

Commented [CJS93]: Isa 22.17 is the Pilpel. Is this your observation or does one of the sources make something of it? Unless they do, this is probably not needed.

Commented [CJS94]: 1. Clarify that this is your report of the entry in HALOT: ‘...but HALOT only identifies the last sense in this verse.’
2. Allen has a footnote (#21 in Logos) that refers to semantic development. This may explain HALOT’s otherwise puzzling sense. Also Stuart’s note 4c.

Commented [CJS95]: Clarify by citing the other meanings found by BDB and then say, ‘... and in this verse ...’

Commented [CJS96]: My NAB has ‘was on the point of’. Perhaps also add NJPS: ‘was in danger of’.
I have now done my homework on the NAB, as I should have done before. I find that there is a revised edition, 2011, which includes a revised OT. It looks though what you have is the revised edition, whereas both my copies, in Bible Works 7 and Logos, are the earlier edition.
Can you please just ignore my other comments of this type.

Commented [CJS97]: If you’ve done the work necessary to know that you need ‘etc.’ you might as well include others explicitly.

Commented [CJS98]: I suggest you add something from W & O’C, p 381, section 23.2.1.a, which discusses this instance. As I read it, the Niphal as middle corresponds to the English intransitive ‘to break’, whereas the Qal would correspond to the English transitive ‘to break’. That seems to me a better way to handle this than reflexive which doesn’t seem to be supported in the sources.

QUESTION—Why does the author portray the ship as being able to think?

Sasson concludes that the function of the ship's ability to think is to jolt and prepare the reader to expect the unexpected. [Sasson, 97] Youngblood suggests three possibilities: (1) a common belief held by ancient sailors that ships were imbued with the spirit of some guardian deity; (2) the use of the verb "to plan" along with the following word "to be broken up," provides a repetition of sounds (Sh-b, Sh-b), which is like the sound of waves pounding the ship; (3) it adds the ship to the list of God's tools to thwart Jonah's flight. [Youngblood, 72-3]. As noted above in Lexicon entry (a), many commentators notice the sound play which Youngblood describes. Baldwin suggests that the narrative gains power and eloquence both from the repeated sounds and from the personification of the ship. [Baldwin, 556]

Commented [CJS99]: 1. Several sources use the terms 'prosopopoeia' or 'personification'. I think the term 'personification' should appear in this paragraph. The follow-on question, of course, is why the author uses personification and that is what your discussion tries to answer.

2.Does anyone suggest metonymy of ship for sailors?

DISCOURSE UNIT: ch:vv-vv

1:5a Then- the-sailors -were-afraid.^a Then-they-cried-out,^b (every) man to his-gods. Then-they-hurled the-objects^c which (were) on-the-ship into-the-sea (in-order)-to-make-light^d (the ship) from-upon-them.^e

SYNTAX— The noun **אִישׁ {אִישׁ}** (“man”) functions as a collective noun and thus takes a plural verb. [Tucker, 20; JM §135c]. Translation: ‘each’ [NET, NIV, RSV, ESV, HCSB, Baldwin, Limburg, Sasson, Tucker]; ‘each one’ [NAB, Youngblood]; ‘each of them’ [NJB, Allen, Wolff]; ‘each man’ [Lessing]; ‘every man’ [NAU, KJV]; ‘They each’ [Stuart].

INTERTEXTUAL REFERENCE— During the storm at sea, the author states three times that the sailors fear. In this first occurrence, it is simply ‘The sailors were afraid’ or ‘feared.’ Then in 1:10, ‘The men feared a great fear.’ Finally in 1:16, ‘The men feared a great fear [of] Yahweh.’ Some commentators see this lengthening repetition as a literary device to show that the fear grows and develops with each occurrence. Sasson: the repetition shows the fear going deeper into the sailors’ hearts each time. [Sasson, 97] Youngblood: the author’s purpose is to trace out the sailors’ emerging faith in Yahweh, which contrasts with Jonah’s disobedience. [Youngblood, 74]

INTERTEXTUAL REFERENCE— As noted in 1:4, the verb ‘they-hurled’ with the destination ‘into-the-sea’ is the same combination used in 1:4 to describe Yahweh’s action of hurling the wind, and again in 1:12 & 15 of the sailors hurling Jonah into the sea.

LEXICON—

a. **Then- the-sailors -were-afraid.** **אִישׁ {אִישׁ}** (Qal wayyiqtol-3mp of **יָרָא {יָרָא}**) In reference to deity, as well as religious sanctuary and parents, HALOT gives “to fear God; to tremble for, to honour.” “Fear, be afraid; stand in awe of; fear, reverence, honour.” [BDB] The root can have five senses: “(1) the emotion of fear, 2) the intellectual anticipation of evil..., 3) reverence or awe, 4) righteous behavior or piety, 5) formal religious worship.” [TWOT, 0907.0] ‘Were afraid’ [NET, NIV, CSB, ESV, KJV, RSV, NAB, Limburg, Stuart, Tucker]; ‘feared’ [Youngblood]; ‘became afraid’ [NAU, Lessing, Wolff]; ‘grew frightened’ [Allen]; ‘took fright’ [NJB]; ‘were alarmed’ [Baldwin]; [were] ‘terrified’ [Sasson]. The Qal of the verb **יָרָא {יָרָא}** can be either transitive (“they feared X”) or intransitive (“they were afraid”), and both senses are found within Jonah. Here it is intransitive. [Tucker, 20] Sasson: In this verse, the potential for shipwreck indicates that the sailors felt total panic. [Sasson, 97]

b. **Then-they-cried-out, (every) man to his-gods.** **קָרָא {קָרָא}** (Qal-wayyiqtol-3mp of **קָרָא {קָרָא}**). “Call for help” [HALOT]; “Call, to one’s aid; cry, cry out, in need” [BDB]; “Cry out; call for help” [Holladay]. It is used “almost exclusively” for “a cry from a disturbed heart, in need of some kind of help;” it is not summoning anyone, but rather expresses a felt need. [TWOT] ‘Cried’ [NAU, KJV, RSV, NAB, Limburg, Wolff]; ‘cried out’ [NET, NIV, HCSB, ESV, NKJV, Baldwin, Tucker, Youngblood]; ‘called out’ [Lessing, Stuart]; ‘called on’ [NJB]; ‘shouted’ [NLT, Buth];

Commented [CJS100]: What would you think about ‘his own’?

Commented [CJS101]: In LEXICON, section d, you have square brackets.

Commented [CJS102]: I’m not sure that it is g/God whom they are fearing so much as the storm. Since HALOT does not assign this instance of the verb, so I suggest you summarise HALOT as ‘to fear, to be afraid’.

Commented [CJS103]: Do you mean HCSB?

Commented [CJS104]: My NAB has ‘became frightened’

‘appealed’ [Allen, Sasson].

- c. **Then-they-hurled the-objects which [were] on-the-ship into-the-sea.** {הַכֵּלִים} “Useful object in the widest sense” [Holladay]; “vessel, receptacle; piece of equipment; implement, instrument” [HALOT]. ‘The cargo’ [NAU, NET, NIV, NJB, NKJV, NLT, ESV, HCSB, Allen, Limburg, Stuart, Baldwin, Wolff, Youngblood]; ‘the wares’ [KJV, RSV]; ‘the vessels’ [Tucker]; ‘the gear’ [Lessing]; ‘their equipment’ [Sasson]. This word could refer to anything onboard the ship, but presumably refers primarily to the ship’s cargo. Sasson notes that many other words could have been used to indicate merchandise or cargo, but since Jonah doesn’t use them, it is possible that the author intends something other than cargo. [Sasson, 98]. Page concludes that the objects must be some kind of container for merchandise, either earthenware jars or baskets. [Page, 112] It was a common tactic to jettison cargo in threatening storm conditions, as attested also in the case of Paul in Acts 27:15ff, in which the sailors first jettison the cargo and later even the ship’s own gear.
- d. **(in-order) to-make-light [the ship] from-upon-them.** {לְהַקֵּל} (Hifil-inf.constr. of קָלַל) “to lighten (make lighter in weight)” [Holladay, קָלַל {קָלַל}, Hifil, 1]; “make light, lighten” [BDB, קָלַל {קָלַל}, Hifil, 1]; “to lighten; to make lighter; ... to lessen” [HALOT, pg.1104]. ‘To lighten’ [HCSB, NKJV, NAU, NRSV, ESV, NIV, NJB, NLT, NAB, Allen, Sasson, Youngblood]; ‘to make...lighter’ [NET, Limburg, Stuart]; ‘in order to lighten’ [Lessing, Wolff]; ‘in order to make...lighter’ [Tucker]; ‘to lessen’ [Baldwin]. See further discussion in the next Lexicon entry (e) and in the QUESTION about the direct object, below.
- e. **(in-order) to-make-light (the ship) from-upon-them.** {מֵעַלֵיהֶם} (Preposition מֵעַל {מֵעַל} + pron.3mp) “The compound preposition מֵעַל {מֵעַל} is used to mark relief from a harassment.” [JM 133f] “from upon, from over, from by—used with much delicacy of application in many different connexions...a. *from upon* idiomatically, when removal, motion, etc., from a *surface* is involved... b. Of relief from a burden or trouble: as of a plague, stroke, rod, etc.” [BDB, pg. 758a, עַל {עַל} IV.2.] “downwards from, above and outside, away from; over, on; beside.” [HALOT, pg 827, עַל {עַל} 8] ‘for them’ [NAU, NRSV, ESV, Tucker, Limburg, Stuart]; ‘from upon them’ [Lessing]; ‘that was upon them’ [Baldwin]; ‘of them’ [KJV]; ‘their load’ [Sasson]; ‘for themselves’ [NAB, Youngblood]; ‘so that it would not weigh them down’ [Allen]; *omitted* [NIV, NJB, NLT, NET, HCSB, NKJV, Wolff]. Elsewhere in the Bible, the two occurrences of this preposition that are most similar to our verse are Exod. 18:22 and 1Kg.12:10 — both of which use the same verb (“to lighten”).

QUESTION— To what god or gods did the sailors cry out?

In the end, we are not told anything specific about these pagan gods. Indeed, we don’t even know if it refers to many gods or just one god, since {אֱלֹהִים} is often used as a plural of respect/majesty. Throughout the Bible, this plural of respect usually refers to the one God of Israel

Commented [CJS105]: It is worth noting that HALOT assigns it to sense 2, ‘piece of equipment’. It is fine to survey the senses offered by a lexicon, if they don’t make an assignment of the instance under discussion, but if they do, their assignment should be indicated.

Commented [CJS106]: Also NAB

Commented [CJS107]: 1. I agree, but is this your conclusion or derived from a source?
2. Might this material be better as a QUESTION: What did the sailors throw overboard?

Commented [CJS108]: Again, is this you or a source?

Commented [CJS109]: Square or round?

Commented [CJS110]: Also NJPS

Commented [CJS111]: I think you need to adjust the punctuation to make it clear that JM supports what precedes and what follows is from BDB.

Commented [CJS112]: Make clear that it is homonym II that is in view.

Commented [CJS113]: Also RSV

Commented [CJS114]: Also NKJ

Commented [CJS115]: I have suggested elsewhere that, unless the comparison is close or receives comment in a source, it is not really necessary.

Commented [CJS116]: Later on you suggest moving this sort of discussion to the INTRO and I agreed. If you do, then you will need to take another look at sections like this.

(which would obviously not fit in this verse), but **אֱלֹהִים {אלהים}** is used at least occasionally of a single pagan god (e.g., 1Kg 11:5, which uses the plural **אֱלֹהִים {אלהים}** to refer to Ashtoreth, a pagan goddess). But most authorities take it as a true plural, thus translating ‘gods.’ Commentators suggest different ideas about the source, identity, and purpose of these deities.

1. Various national deities. The sailors probably came from different nations and therefore worshiped different gods. [Alexander, 114]
2. Various lesser deities, whom the sailors felt could approach the greater deities on their behalf.
- 2.1. City gods or family gods. The sailors would not feel confident in appealing to one of the main, cosmic deities, directly. Instead, each sailor would have had his own family and city gods. He would thus ask his lower deities to petition the cosmic deities for him. [Walton, 471]
- 2.2. Personal gods. Probably it refers to personal gods that the sailors believed had particular responsibility for their well-being. These lesser, personal gods would not have been capable of causing the storm -- but the sailors could ask them for help and information. So they were asking their personal gods which cosmic deity was causing the storm, as well as for help in terms of appealing to that cosmic deity. [Youngblood, 74]
3. There is no way to know if it was one god or as many gods as the sailors could think of. [Sasson, 98]

QUESTION— What exactly did the sailors “lighten?”

1. They lightened the ship. Most authorities insert the direct object, ‘the ship’ [NIV, NJB, NLT, NET, NAB, Allen] or ‘the vessel’ [Wolff], or else the pronoun ‘it’ (referring to the ship) [NAU, NRSV, ESV, Tucker, Limburg, Stuart]. The sailors’ obvious purpose was to improve the ship’s buoyancy and thus improve their chance of survival.
2. They lightened the load. Some authorities insert the direct object, ‘the load’ [HCSB, NKJV] or ‘their load’ [Sasson]. The distinction between the load and the ship seems to be quite inconsequential.
3. They lightened **the danger**. Baldwin inserts the direct object ‘[the danger]’ in brackets, and translates the phrase, ‘to lessen [the danger] that was upon them’. [Baldwin, 555-6]
- 3.1. Keil seems to identify two things simultaneously being lightened – the ship and the danger: “By throwing the goods overboard, they hoped to preserve the ship from sinking beneath the swelling waves, and thereby to *lighten*, i.e. diminish for themselves the danger of destruction which was so burdensome to them.” [Keil, 393]
4. They lightened the sea (which they may have viewed as a deity). Some authorities take a notably different view. Tribble notes that the infinitive “to lighten” lacks any explicit object. She then argues that the nearest antecedent should be the **direct object**; and that is “sea” not “ship.” She reasons that the sailors tried to appease the sea -- which they may have viewed as a deity -- not by simply jettisoning objects to make the ship lighter, but by actually sacrificing their cargo to the sea. [Tribble, 136] Additional support for this idea is given by Sasson, who states that the verb **לְהַקֵּל {להקל}** “to hurl” when used with the preposition **עַל {על}** focuses on the intention behind the act

Commented [CJS117]: Also RSV.

Commented [CJS118]: Normally I wouldn’t cite TEV = GNB, but I think it is worth citing here: ‘to lessen the danger’

Commented [CJS119]: For a work in copyright, this would be too close to verbatim, but should not be a problem for K&D.

Commented [CJS120]: Indirect? I don’t have the source to check.

of hurling (and not on the result of the action nor its direction. He concludes that the sailors threw the cargo overboard both to lighten the ship and as an offering to the sea. [Sasson, 94] However, he later drops any mention of this idea and discusses only lightening the ship's load. [Sasson, 99] Alexander is non-committal, but does allow for the idea of appeasing the sea or an offended god. [Alexander, 114]

DISCOURSE UNIT: ch:vv-vv

1:5b(continued) (Meanwhile/But Jonah had-gone-down into (the) innermost/rear-portions^f(-of) the-ship.^g Then-he-had-lain-down. Then-he-had-fallen-asleep.^h)

INTERCLAUSAL RELATIONS— The normal sequence of wayyiqtol verbs is interrupted with a qatal verb, at the beginning of these three statements about Jonah's actions. As noted earlier, this interruption of verb sequence may mark a discontinuity in the events (see 1:4, above, for the same structure when God hurled the wind and when the ship thought to break apart). Many authorities, including Calvin, understand the verbal action as having taken place previously, presumably before the storm arose. "Here, the grammatical pause or discontinuity in the story should be taken at face value. There is a discontinuity in time: Jonah 'had already gone down' in the ship to sleep before the sailors were calling out to their gods. One may translate this structure in English as 'Meanwhile, Jonah had gone down...'. [Buth, 78] Youngblood: The verb change calls attention to a prior event that is now relevant to the story. [Youngblood, 75] Sasson explicitly disagrees with this pluperfect sense, arguing that the pluperfect is unnecessary and misguided. He concludes that Jonah first saw that the ship expected to break up, and then went down into the ship's hold. [Sasson, 99-100] Lessing sides with Sasson and finds the scene indicative of Jonah's disposition. The author juxtaposes Jonah's actions against the sailors' terror in order to pose the question of what kind of person would turn to a deep sleep when everyone else is scrambling for their lives. [Lessing, 103] On the other hand, Goldman appeals to the simple logic of the situation and concludes that Jonah must have gone to sleep earlier, as it is unlikely that anyone would be capable of falling asleep during such a violent storm. [Goldman, 139]

There is a related question regarding the placement of the subject, 'Jonah.' Some commentators understand the syntactic placement of the word 'Jonah' at the beginning of the sentence to put emphasis on Jonah. They then interpret the author's intent to be a contrast between Jonah and the other characters. [e.g., Youngblood, 75] However, Buth disagrees. He explains that placing the subject (or any item) in front of the verb indicates only that there is some kind of "special purpose," but not necessarily to mark **emphasis**. Indeed, he asserts that "In Hebrew narrative, the most common reason for putting something in front of a verb is to break up the flow of the story." Buth explicitly identifies this verse (as well as 1:4) as a case in which there is no emphasis ("contrastive focus") on the fronted subject. He further explains that, sometimes, the item in front of the verb is merely a contextualizing "link" and, "These linking structures are the opposite of focus. They are not the main point of a sentence but provide a point for relating the sentence to what follows or precedes.

Commented [CJS121]: This is another place where setting out the two options, flashback/pluperfect or sequential/chronological, would clarify and simplify your presentation. You could cite supporting authorities with their translation, as appropriate.

Commented [CJS122]: I don't have Buth, but you mark it as a verbatim quotation. If that is so, can you find a way to avoid doing so?

Commented [CJS123]: How about moving this discussion to a QUESTION, Why is 'Jonah' fronted?

Commented [CJS124]: Does Buth actually use the word 'emphasis'?

In narratives, these links are especially common to mark a break in the flow of the story.” Here in verse 5, the narrator is not emphasizing the subject ‘Jonah,’ but rather, “marks a break in the narrative in order to set the stage with a new scene and timeframe...a new setting for the lively conversation that is to follow.” [Buth, 113-4]

Adopting the view of Buth et al, that this is a “flashback” event and out of chronological sequence, there is still the question of how many verbs are within this flashback. Youngblood concludes that the only action within the flashback is Jonah’s descent into the cargo hold of the ship, and the other two actions (laying down and falling asleep) take place back on the main timeline (i.e., during the storm). He concludes that the author wanted to emphasize the simultaneity of Jonah’s sleep amid the chaotic scene. [Youngblood, 75] However the great majority of authorities include within the flashback not only “had gone down” but also “had lain down” and “had fallen asleep.”

Translations: ‘But Jonah had gone down...had lain down...and was...’ [NKJV, ESV, Wolff]; ‘Jonah, however/meanwhile, had gone below/down...had lain down...and was...’ [NET, NJB, NRSV]; ‘But Jonah had gone down...lain down, and fallen...’ [NAU]; ‘But Jonah had gone below...had lain down, and had fallen...’ [Baldwin]; ‘In the meantime, Jonah had gone down...had lain down and fallen...’ [Tucker]; ‘And Jonah? He had gone down...had lain down and fallen...’ [Limburg]; ‘Meanwhile, Jonah had gone down...[and had stretched out]...and fallen...’ [HCSB, Allen] ‘As for Jonah, he had gone down...to lie down, and had fallen...’ [Stuart]; ‘But all this time Jonah was sound asleep...’ [NLT]; ‘But Jonah had gone below...he lay down and fell...’ [NIV]; ‘But as for Jonah, he had descended...he lay down and fell...’ [Youngblood]; ‘As for Jonah, he descended...lay down, and fell...’ [Sasson]; ‘But Jonah went down...lay down, and fell...’ [Lessing]

LEXICON—

- f. **Jonah had-gone-down into (the) innermost/rear-portions(-of) the-ship.** יִרְכָּה {יִרְכָּתִי} (ירכה) [but the word never occurs in the singular], noun-fp const.) “Rear; rear (portion); most distant part; farthest to the rear, inmost part” [Holladay, יִרְכָּה {ירכה}]; “rear, narrow area at the back of a building; far part: remotest part; inaccessible, innermost part” [HALOT]; “flank, side, extreme parts, recesses” [BDB]. Both Holladay and BDB identify our verse with the sense of the innermost part of the ship. ‘the hold of the ship’ [NAU, NRSV]; ‘the hold of the vessel’ [Limburg]; ‘the vessel’s hold’ [Sasson]; ‘the bowels of the ship’s hold’ [Youngblood]; ‘the farthest corner of the lower deck’ [Baldwin]; ‘the lowest part(s) of the ship/vessel’ [HCSB, NKJV, Wolff]; ‘the recesses of the ship’ [Tucker]; ‘a remote place below deck’ [Stuart]; ‘innermost recesses of the ship’ [Lessing]; ‘the inner part of the ship’ [ESV]; ‘the hold below deck’ [NET, Allen]; ‘below deck’ [NIV]; ‘the hold’ [NJB]. Youngblood connects the word to the idea of death, because יִרְכָּתִי {יִרְכָּתִי} refers to an extremity of any space and when used in contexts with death in view, it connotes the underworld. He suggests that the extremity of the ship may represent Sheol and foreshadow Jonah’s upcoming brush with death. [Youngblood, 75]

- g. **Jonah had-gone-down into (the) innermost/rear-portions(-of) the-ship.** הַסְפִּינָה {הַסְפִּינָה} (הספינה)

Commented [CJS125]: There is a lot of Buth here, and it is good stuff, but how much of it is quotation? Is it too much?

Commented [CJS126]: NIV ‘where he lay down and fell’ seems to me to be an exception. How do you read it?

Commented [CJS127]: LEXICON?

Commented [CJS128]: Also RSV. I think RSV is one you should cite consistently. It is one of the two versions used in the UBS handbooks and, I think, Translators Notes, as running text on which discussion is based, so it is widely used by translators.

Commented [CJS129]: Again, can you make it clear that HALOT assigns it to sense 2.b ‘inaccessible, innermost part’.

Commented [CJS130]: Similarly here.

Commented [CJS131]: Also NAB

Commented [CJS132]: Also RSV.

Commented [CJS133]: Many of the renderings of יִרְכָּתִי {יִרְכָּתִי} in the previous entry include a rendering for this word. I think they need to be separated out. Thus, ‘hold’ there and ‘vessel’ here. I’m not sure but I suspect that ‘deck’ in those that use it is the equivalent of this word. Perhaps the way forward is to use a continuation paragraph in section f beginning at the Limburg rendering, with an indication something along the lines of ‘rendering of the phrase yarketeq sepinah.

“Ship (with a deck)” [HALOT, Holladay]; “Vessel, ship (covered in, overlaid, with sheathing, deck, etc)” [BDB]. This is a hapax legomenon. It appears to be related to a noun for “ceiling” and a verb for “to cover,” though the lexicons do not make that explicit. Curiously, the author who is elsewhere so fond of repeated words, here uses a different word for ‘ship’ (as opposed to the more common **סִפִּינָה** {סִפִּינָה}), used in verses 3, 4, and earlier in 5). However, authorities do not comment much upon it. Tribble confesses not knowing what to make of it, and speculates that it might sharpen the contrast between the sailors and Jonah. [Tribble, 136] Sasson suggests that there may be a conceptual parallel with 2:1 (the belly of the fish) and 2:3 (the belly of Sheol), but does not explain how that dictates the choice of this term for ‘ship.’ [Sasson, 172] Some commentators suggest it may refer to a type of ship that has multiple decks. It is almost universally translated as ‘ship’ or ‘vessel,’ but sometimes is omitted in favor of specifying a ‘deck.’ See the translations in Lexicon (f), above.

Commented [CJS134]: BDB does by putting the entry for sephinah under the root spn which it defines as ‘cover, cover in, panel’. That is how BDB works.,

Commented [CJS135]: Fair enough, Sasson does say that, but does it help? You don’t have to include everything a source says so you could probably omit obscure comments like this if you don’t think it is useful.

- h. **Then-he-had-fallen-asleep.** **וַיִּרְדָּם** {וַיִּרְדָּם} (Nifal wayyiqtol-3ms of **רָדַם** {רָדַם}) “To sleep deeply; to be dazed, stunned” [HALOT]; “Be in, or fall into, heavy sleep; be or fall fast asleep” [BDB]; “Snore, be in deep sleep, lie stupefied” [Holladay]; “be asleep, be unconscious” [TWOT]. ‘fast asleep’ [NJB, NKJV, NRSV, ESV, Baldwin, Wolff, Youngblood, Allen]; ‘a deep sleep’ [NIV, HCSB, Stuart, Lessing]; ‘sound asleep’ [NAU, NET]; ‘asleep’ [Limburg, Tucker]; ‘a trance’ [Sasson]. Hebrew has a more common verb for sleeping, but the verb chosen here “seems to focus more on entering a state of sleep and doing that fully or deeply.” [Buth, 78] This verb, when conjugated as it is here with a yod prefix (for 3ms), sounds similar to the verb **יָרַד** {יָרַד} “to go down,” which the author has used repeatedly. “It may have been chosen because of its sound association with **יָרַד** {יָרַד}. This may be a kind of literary pun.” [Buth, 78] Youngblood: the verb usually refers to sleep that is induced by God and that results in either a revelation from God or a brush with death. Here, it seems to be both, which adds to the irony of Jonah’s situation. [Youngblood, 75-6] Stuart: it indicates a special state of deep sleep that would not allow for easy awakening. [Stuart, 458] Limburg: Jonah’s sleep was so deep that he was not awakened by the storm, the sailors, nor the approach of the captain. [Limburg, 50]

Commented [CJS136]: Can you try to avoid the verbatim quotation here.

Commented [CJS137]: Stuart also acknowledges that the sleep may have been divinely produced, though he does not seem to favour this.

QUESTION— Why did Jonah go down within the ship and fall asleep?

1. Jonah was sleepy.
 - 1.1. Because of physical exhaustion from his journey thus far. [e.g., Page’s first suggestion]
 - 1.2. As a response to being terrified by the storm. [e.g., Page’s second suggestion]
 - 1.3. As a symptom of a guilty conscience or of depression. [e.g., Stuart]
2. Jonah’s behavior was an expression of his lack of concern – for his divine calling, for his own life, and for the lives of the sailors. [e.g., Youngblood]
3. A combination of (1) and (2). [e.g., Bruckner]
4. To hide due to guilt after the sailors’ realization that the storm was caused by someone’s sin. His sleep was a response to sorrow and fear of God’s wrath. [Luther]
5. Sasson adopts a radically different view. He takes it that Jonah understood the storm to be God’s

Commented [CJS138]: I couldn’t find this in Stuart.

Commented [CJS139]: I can find some of this in Youngblood, but not all.

call for him to get ready for a new prophetic vision. Therefore, Jonah was merely obedient in seeking out an isolated place in the bottom of the ship, to await God's new message. [Sasson, 105]

Commented [CJS140]: Some of the others, e.g. Youngblood, also seem to consider this possibility.

DISCOURSE UNIT: ch:vv-vv

1:6 Then- (the) chief/captain(-of) the-mariners^a -came-near to-him. Then-he-said to-him, “What (problem) do you(ms) have,^b sleeping?^c Arise(ms)!^d Call(ms) to your(ms)-God/god!^e Perhaps^f the-God/god (of yours) will-consider^g about-us, and- we-will- -not -perish.”

INTERTEXTUAL REFERENCE— Many commentators note the irony of the captain’s words to Jonah – “Arise!” and “Call!” are imperatives identical to what God had commanded Jonah earlier in 1:2, which may be an ironic indication of the futility of Jonah’s attempt to flee from God and ignore his commission. [e.g., Youngblood, 76]

TEXT— A few Hebrew manuscripts have the verb “to call” instead of “to come near” – which is a difference of only one letter (יִקְרָא {וִיקְרָא} instead of יִקְרֶב {וִיקְרֶב}). This variant is [also](#) found in some Greek versions. [Sasson, 102]

LEXICON—

- a. **Then- (the) chief/captain(-of) the-mariners -came-near to-him.** רב החבל {רב החבל} The first word, רב {רב}, “Captain, chief ... the chief or executive of a group,” is of Babylonian origin; in Hebrew it appears to be used only as a rank of foreign officials. [TWOT] In general usage, רב {רב}: “numerous, many, varied, much, great” [HALOT]. The second word, חבל {חבל}, is just “sailor” and is related to חבל {חבל} “rope” [HALOT]. So the phrase is literally, ‘The chief of the sailor.’ ‘The captain’ [NAU, NIV, NKJV, RSV, ESV, NAB, HCSB, Allen, Baldwin, Lessing, Limburg, Wolff, Stuart]; ‘The captain of the sailors’ [Tucker]; ‘The ship’s captain’ [NET]; ‘The helmsman’ [Sasson, Youngblood]; ‘The shipmaster’ [KJV]; ‘The boatswain’ [NJB]. Sasson suggests the sense as, “chief of those who handle the ropes.” He then notes that Ezek 27:29 may show that the term חבל {חבל} could be used as a generic reference to anyone skilled in ship craft. [Sasson, 102] He also observes that the LXX of our verse has “first mate” but other Greek versions and the Vulgate have “captain.” Sasson’s own choice of translation is “helmsman,” which he bases upon ancient artistic drawings of ships. [Sasson, 103] Wolff: one who understood and managed the use of ropes, sails, and navigation. [Wolff, 113; similarly Baldwin, 556] Keil: one who “manages, steers, or guides the ship.” [Keil, 394]
- b. **Then-he-said to-him, “What (problem) do you have, sleeping?”** מה־לך {מה־לך} Literally, “What to you(ms)?” HALOT {מה־לך}, 4) gives, “What do you have?” followed by specific cases, including our verse. Essentially, the phrase means, “What ___ do you have?” with the blank being filled in from context, for example with “problem” or “right” or “topic/matter/item.” Muraoka identifies the phrase generally as “What is the matter with you?” and translates in our verse as “Why are you sleeping?” [JM, 161i] ‘What are you doing, sleeping/asleep?’ [NET, HALOT, Baldwin, Limburg, Tucker]; ‘What are you doing sound/fast asleep?’ [HCSB, NRSV, Allen]; ‘What are you doing in a deep sleep?’ [Lessing, Stuart]; ‘What meanest thou, sleeping?’ [GKC 120b];

Commented [CJS141]: I misread this at first and thought it implied that Jonah had a problem that he couldn't sleep. The comma should guard against this and I quickly realised what it did mean. I've tried to think of a way to rephrase it for your translation line. Does ‘what are you doing, sleeping?’ depart too far from semi-literal?

Commented [CJS142]: You have done the work to see who does this, so I suggest putting all of them in the square brackets with Youngblood.

Commented [CJS143]: Do any of your sources follow this variant? Either way you should report that.

Commented [CJS144]: Does any of the sources use the term ‘collective’ for this this singular word? That would communicate briefly and effectively and could be reported.

Commented [CJS145]: HALOT distinguishes two homonyms. What you have is for homonym I, but they assign this instance to homonym II. BDB also cites this reference under its homonym II.

Commented [CJS146]: 1. Cite BDB even though it adds nothing.
2. Both HALOT and BDB give an equivalent to the two-word syntagm, so that should also be included.

Commented [CJS147]: This is evidence, not conclusion.

Commented [CJS148]: If the early versions have significant translations, you can and perhaps should put them in along with the modern translations rather than citing them indirectly as a report of what Sasson says.

Commented [CJS149]: He also offers, ‘the upper-steersman’.

Commented [CM150]: I'm not at all sure where to place this. It's really an idiom. Where should that be placed -- Lexicon, Question, where?
CJS: Compare ES at John 2.4 and how the Greek equivalent of this phrase is handled there. You can use it as a model. It would seem that this is the right place.

Commented [CJS151]: Add the specific: ‘what are you doing sleeping’ from HALOT – OK, I see you have it later in the paragraph. Also ‘what ails you? or what do you want’ from BDB.
That raises a general question. Have you modernised the archaic language of BDB? Should you? Do you want to? In my work of the BART notes, I have done that because, like you, I'm not quoting but summarising.

‘Why are you sleeping?’ [JM 161i]; ‘What do you mean by sleeping?’ [NJB]; ‘What is with you sleeping?’ or ‘How can you sleep?’ [Buth]; ‘How is it that you are sleeping?’ [NAU]; ‘How can you sleep/be-sleeping?’ [NIV, Wolff, Youngblood]; ‘How canst thou sleep?’ [Calvin, as paraphrase]; ‘How can you sleep at a time like this?’ [NLT]; ‘How could you be in a trance?’ [Sasson]; ‘What meanest thou, O sleeper?’ [KJV]; ‘What meanest thou, fast sleeper?’ [Calvin]; ‘What do you mean, [you] sleeper?’ [ESV, RSV, NKJV].

Tucker identifies the ל usage here as a “lamed of interest” which indicates the person for or against whom the verbal action is directed. [Tucker, 24]; he cites the grammar discussion in [WO, 323]. See also Holladay (ל,7) the dative of advantage/disadvantage, “indicating the pers. for whose (dis)advantage an action is performed” [which leads to a meaning along the lines of ‘What is the advantage for you, sleeping?’. Other translators seem to take Holladay’s (ל,11) “Preparation, disposition, fitness” [which leads to ‘How is sleeping in your power?’.] Also see the QUESTION below, concerning the *tone* of the captain’s words.

- c. **Then-he-said to-him, “What (problem) do you have, sleeping?”** נִרְדַּם {נִרְדָּם} (Nifal-ptcp-ms of

רָדַם {רָדַם}). See Lexicon entry (h) in verse 1:5, above. A few authorities take the participle as a vocative noun usage, “O sleeper,” but the strong majority take it as a reference to Jonah’s action. JM labels this participle an attributive accusative of state [JM 127a]. Tucker: it refers to Jonah’s action (sleeping), because in hortatory discourse, a participial clause indicates a background activity. [Tucker, 24] Cf. Ezek.18:2 (‘What do you mean, using this proverb...’) – the only other example in the Bible in which the construction מַה־לֵּךְ {מַה־לֵּךְ} is followed by a participle. For translations, see Lexicon entry (b), above; note that only KJV, NKJV, RSV, ESV, and Calvin take the participle as a vocative noun.

- d. **Arise! Call to-your-God/god!** קוּם {קוּם קוּם} For the use of the imperative קוּם {קוּם} (‘Arise!’) in conjunction with a second imperative, see the discussion at Jonah 1:2. ‘Get-up/Up/Rise-up/Arise! [and] call/cry-out’ [NET, HCSB, NJB, NAU, NIV, NRSV, NKJV, Baldwin, Youngblood, Limburg, Stuart, Allen, Tucker, Lessing, Wolff]; ‘Get up and pray’ [NLT]; ‘Up! invoke’ [Sasson]. As in 1:2, Buth explains that the two imperatives are “treated almost as one thought or one command. This is a common idiom with קוּם {קוּם} ‘get up, get started!’” [Buth, 100] Tucker also reiterates discussion from 1:2, asserting that the verbal content comes from the second verb, while קוּם {קוּם} has only functional, not semantic, value. [Tucker, 24]

- e. **Arise! Call to-your-God/god! Perhaps the-God/god (of yours) will-consider about-us.** אֱלֹהֶיךָ ... אֱלֹהֵיכֶם {אֱלֹהֵיכֶם} Buth explains the use of various forms of this root word: אֱלֹהֵיכֶם {אֱלֹהֵיכֶם} “is the normal way to refer to the one God of creation in Hebrew... The singular form of this word, אֱלֹהֵי {אֱלֹהֵי} ‘God, god’, is quite rare in the Bible (57 times). Another related word is אֱלֹהִים {אֱלֹהִים} ‘God, god, El (the father of the Canaanite gods)’, plural אֱלֹהִים {אֱלֹהִים} ‘gods’. The word אֱלֹהִים {אֱלֹהִים}

Commented [CJS152]: Their comment might be worth including. ES assumes that users do not have access to the sources, so this way of doing it does not help them. Either delete this about WO or summarise it in the usual way.

Commented [CJS153]: Final mem.

Commented [CJS154]: I suggest moving the list of sources to this point.

Commented [CJS155]: The syntax here is different. There is an independent 2mp pronoun as well as the suffix, so the participial clause has an explicit subject.

Commented [CJS156]: Perhaps better to have this at the point I indicate above.

Commented [CM157]: I probably should break these two up into two entries, because...

CJS: I suggest that, if you do move most of this discussion to the Introduction, you should see what is left that is specific to this context and make a decision at that stage.

{אֱלֹהִים} occurs 235 times.” [Buth, 100] The use of the plural form אֱלֹהִים {אֱלֹהִים} to refer to a singular God is quite common in the Bible, occurring well over 2000 times. This is called a “plural of respect” or “plural of majesty.” Certainly, it usually refers to the singular God of Israel, but it can even refer to a single pagan god (e.g., 1Kg.11:5, referring to the goddess Ashtoreth). {} The same spelling can and does refer to plural “gods” (e.g. Exod. 18:11), and this must be determined from context. Heiser argues that this word is very general and, at its base, just indicates a being who belongs to the spiritual realm; thus, it can refer to God, angels, demons, and departed human spirits. [Heiser, ch. 4 in “The Unseen Realm”] See the QUESTIONS section below, for additional considerations.

Translation of **Arise! Call to-your-God/god!**: ‘your God’ [NKJV, Buth, Lessing, Wolff]; ‘your god’ [all others].

Translation of **Perhaps the-God/god (of yours) will-consider about-us.**: ‘the god’ [NRSV, RSV, ESV, Baldwin, Limburg, Stuart, Wolff]; ‘the deity’ [Youngblood]; ‘this god’ [HCSB, NAB]; ‘that god’ [Allen, Tucker]; ‘god himself’ [Sasson]; ‘your god’ [NAU]; ‘your god’ [NET]; ‘(your) God’ [Buth]; ‘your God’ [NKJV]; ‘that God of yours’ [Lessing]; ‘God’ [BDB, KJV]; ‘he’ [NIV, NJB, NLT].

f. **Perhaps the-God/god (of yours) will-consider about-us.** אֱלֹהִי {אֱלֹהִי} “May be (expression of hope, request, fear)” [HALOT, pg 21]; “Perhaps (expr. of hope, entreaty, fear)” [Holladay]; “Peradventure, perhaps: usually expressing a hope...but also a fear or doubt...” [BDB, pg 19]. The idea of a real possibility is heightened by the use of אֱלֹהִי {אֱלֹהִי} (and was communicated anyway by the function of a yiqtol verb within a hortatory statement). [Tucker, 25]

g. **Perhaps the-God/god (of yours) will-consider about-us.** יִתְעַשֶׂת {יִתְעַשֶׂת} This is a hapax legomenon, the Bible’s only usage of this root as a Hitpacl verb. (There is an unrelated and disputed occurrence of the same root as a Qal verb, in Jer.5:28.) “To recollect, bear in mind,” related to “opinion” in Job 12:5 and to “plan” in Ps.146:4 (both of which are also hapax legomena). [HALOT]; “turn out to take notice” [Holladay]; “to think” [BDB]. ‘will spare us a thought’ [NJB, NRSV, Page]; ‘will give [us] a thought [to us]’ [RSV, ESV, Limburg, BDB]; ‘will give thought to us’ [Tucker]; ‘will think upon us’ [KJV]; ‘will be mindful of us’ [NAB]; ‘will turn his mind to us’ [Baldwin]; ‘will take notice of us’ [NET, NIV]; ‘will pay attention to us’ [NLT]; ‘will pay heed to us’ [Allen]; ‘will consider us’ [HSCB, NKJV, Stuart]; ‘will consider our plight’ [Youngblood]; ‘will be concerned about us’ [NAU]; ‘will concern himself about us’ [Wolff]; ‘will show compassion toward us’ [Lessing]; ‘will intercede on our behalf’ [Sasson]. Sasson: the sense of the captain’s statement is clear, but we cannot determine a precise translation. Some earlier studies concluded that that the word means something like “to have favorable thought towards someone; to be gracious to someone.” [Sasson, 104] Lessing prefers to correlate this verse with Jonah 3:9 and thus to understand this unique verb by means of the familiar verb in 3:9, נָחַם {נָחַם}, meaning “have pity, compassion, good intention.” [Lessing, 106]

Commented [CJS158]: Not in my copy of your bibliography.

Commented [CM159]: This might be better removed from here & added to an item in the Introduction. Do you think? There could be a section in the Intro that discusses not only this term (Elohim) but also God’s name. ???
CJS: That seems a good idea. A section with general discussion of the issue, then the 16 instances case by case, and back-reference from each to the section x.y of the Intro. Would you see that as subsuming your QUESTION about the issue below? Similarly for YHWH, you could discuss generally the significance of the name in the mouth of pagans, such as the sailors and Ninevites.

Commented [CM160]: ...this is awkward.
CJS: Would the problem be solved by your suggestion of moving all the material to the INTRO?

Commented [CJS161]: Alexander notes a parallel in 3.9 but that is ‘who knows’ so I’m not convinced either that he is right or that you should report it. What do you think?

Commented [CJS162]: I think spelling this as two words must be a typo or something and it should be one word, ‘maybe’.

Commented [CJS163]: Hithpael as in vdm.

Commented [CJS164]: Both HALOT and BDB consider this a different, homonymic, root. I suggest using the word ‘homonym’ to make it clear that it is unrelated semantically; alternatively, don’t mention it at all.

Commented [CJS165]: Sasson gives a different reason for his choice, which he admits is fanciful, but it made me wonder whether he is thinking about a lesser god interceding with the greater god who is responsible for the trouble. Did you come across any hint of that?

Commented [CJM166]: Could add more, but probably not helpful. Is it?
Ultimately, Sasson offers a novel rendering. He adopts what he admits is a “fanciful notion” that the helmsman envisions Jonah’s god taking their case to an assembly of gods. With that in mind, he then concludes that the most appropriate ...

Commented [CJS167]: I suggest giving the lexical form without vowels. If you want to be more specific, say ‘the Niphal of ...’

Commented [CJS168]: I wonder if NJPS ‘be kind to us’ reflects the same thinking. Perhaps add it. TEV and CEV are similar but they are so free that sometimes I can’t even work out what they are doing.

QUESTION— How or why did the captain “draw near” to find Jonah?

The biblical text does not tell us, and most commentators do not discuss this. However, a few commentators (Allen, Stuart, and Youngblood) suggest that the captain was occupied with finding cargo to jettison, and happened upon the sleeping Jonah.

QUESTION— What was the emotional tone of the captain’s question to Jonah, ‘What problem do you have, sleeping?’

Only a few of the commentators discuss the tone of the captain’s question.

1. The question does *not* indicate a judgmental attitude, though possibly surprise. The captain’s words to Jonah are probably respectful but urgent, and are abridged by the author in order to avoid interrupting the flow of action. [Stuart, 458]
2. It indicates surprise and even indignation. [Trible, 137]
3. It is a reproach. The captain reproves Jonah for being devoid of thought and reflection while everyone else is filled with anxiety, fear, and alarm. [Calvin]
4. It is both angry and accusing. Furthermore, whenever this formulaic phrase is used in an accusing question, it is always from a superior to an inferior party. [Limburg, 50]
5. The question stresses that the purpose of Jonah’s behavior was to isolate himself from the human community and from sharing with others both shipboard life and danger. [Wolff, 113]

QUESTION— Did the captain refer to one God or to multiple gods?

See the Lexicon entry above, for the possibility that אֱלֹהִים {הָאֱלֹהִים} could refer to singular ‘God’ or plural ‘gods.’ The captain’s words appear to refer to one God. In this verse, the captain uses the word twice. We could interpret the first usage, ‘Arise! Call to-your-God!’ as either singular or plural – either ‘to your God’ or ‘to your gods.’ However, the captain’s second statement, ‘Perhaps the-God (of yours) will-consider about-us,’ uses a singular verb form. We therefore know that the captain’s words are referring to a singular “God,” not plural “gods.”

QUESTION— Is there any significance to the definite article on the second use of the word אֱלֹהִים (הָ) {הָאֱלֹהִים}?

1. Yes, it presents the captain’s reference to God in Jewish terms. The captain is speaking like a Jew at this point, using plural form but singular verb, and “the article הָ {הָ} ‘the’ in הָאֱלֹהִים {הָאֱלֹהִים} makes the reference to ‘God’ specific. In Hebrew אֱלֹהִים {הָאֱלֹהִים} would refer to the one true God.” [Buth, 100] Buth goes on to suggest that ‘Your God’ is a good way to translate here, as this foreigner (Phoenician) speaks to Jonah.
2. The article is used as a mild demonstrative. Cf. GKC, 126a,b. Sasson puts the meaning as ‘that god (of yours),’ and suggests translating as ‘God himself.’ [Sasson, 104]

QUESTION— Given that the captain referred to just one God, did he know that there was something unique about the God of Jonah (i.e., the God of Israel)?

1. Yes, the captain had a vague idea about a universal God. He realizes that the God of the Hebrews may be the true God. [Bruckner, 45] (Note, however, that at this point in the story, the sailors apparently do not yet know that Jonah is a Hebrew; see 1:8-9.) Suggested by the generic use of

Commented [CJS169]: 1. If you do move discussion of ‘elohim to the INTRO, this could go too.
2. Is this your assessment or derived from a source? The advantage of the INTRO is that you would be freer to give your own views.

Commented [CJS170]: How much of this is Buth? If necessary put ‘Buth suggests’ at the beginning of your summary of his discussion.

Commented [CJS171]: As I read it, 126.b is about a much more explicitly demonstrative use than this case, so 126.a is not really relevant either. I’m not sure gkc is helpful here. Does anyone suggest what I would see as most likely which is that the captain’s previous clause makes ‘your god’ discourse-active, so ‘the god’ here is identifiable as the same god and thus definite.

Commented [CJS172]: Is this a ‘note’ by Bruckner – I don’t have it – or your assessment of his comment?

Commented [CJS173]: But v. 10 shows that he had previously given them personal information including at least the name of his God.

“God,” the captain had a vague understanding of one supreme God. [Goldman, 140]

2. It is possible, but probably not. The vast majority of times that the Bible uses a plural subject with a singular verb, it refers to Israel’s God; so it is possible that the captain is doing that, here. However, similar constructions occur with foreign gods (e.g., Judg 11:24), so it may not be significant. Sasson suggest translating plainly as ‘god.’ [Sasson, 104]

3. No, the captain had in mind merely Jonah’s personal god, who was likely to be a different god than those of the sailors.

3.1. The captain is merely trying to enlist as much divine help as possible. In his thinking, everyone has a personal god whom he should surely call upon in a calamity. In addition, he may assume that Jonah, a foreigner to him, probably has a different god from anyone else on board. The captain would have been a Phoenician, and at this time in history, most inhabitants of that region believed in three kinds of gods: personal gods for individual problems; family gods, worshiped by a whole clan; and national gods, worshiped as the guardians of an entire nation. [Stuart, 459]

3.2. The captain supposes that Jonah’s god (though not a special god) may still be the one responsible for creating the storm. Jonah’s god was one god who was unconnected to any of the crewmen, and it was important to ask every possible deity for a solution. [Allen, ###12081]

QUESTION— Could Jonah and the sailors understand one another’s speech?

Yes. “The Hebrew and Phoenician dialects of Canaanite were probably close enough for considerable communication to take place.” [Buth, 100]

QUESTION— Did Jonah pray, after the captain exhorted him to do so?

We do not know the answer. Allen thinks not; Jonah would have just made a minimal reply to the captain and followed him up onto the deck. [Allen, ###-208] But Keil thinks it is so obvious that Jonah did pray, that the author doesn’t mention it. [Keil, 394] Most commentators don’t discuss the question, or else observe that the author does not tell us.

Commented [CJS174]: Most of this is from Sasson, so I suggest putting his name earlier

Commented [CJS175]: ‘Phoenician’ is correct, but my copy of this in Logos has ‘Palestine’ in this context. Is the hard copy different.

Commented [CJS176]: It’s not clear to me which imperative Keil is referring to by his phrase ‘this awakening call’ – ‘arise’ or ‘call’. Jonah certainly did the former, but I’m not sure the Keil is commenting on the latter.

DISCOURSE UNIT: ch:vv-vv

1:7 Then-they-said, (each) man to his-neighbor,^a “Go(mp)! Let-us-cast^b lots,^c so-we-will-know on-whose-account^d this calamity^e (is)-ours/(came)-to-us.” Then-they-cast lots. Then- the-lot - fell on/against Jonah.

SYNTAX— The noun **אִישׁ {אישׁ}** (“man”) functions as a collective noun and **thus** takes a plural verb, as in 1:5. [JM §135c]. See the Lexicon entry (a), below.

SYNTAX— Within the sailors’ quote, there are three coordinated volitional verbs, expressing their intentions. ‘Go!’ is an imperative; ‘Let us cast’ and ‘So we will know’ are cohortatives with waw prefixes. The relationship between these three volitives is discussed in some grammars and commentaries.

The imperative **לֵךְ {לכו}** (Qal-imp-mp of **הלך {הלכ}**) is universally understood as an introductory exhortation. BDB notes that the imperative **לֵךְ {לכו}** can be, “Weakened to [a] mere introductory word” [BDB, הלך {הלכ}, I 5 f, pg. 234]. A clear example is 1Sam. 9:9, ‘Go! Let us go...’. The functional meaning corresponds to modern English usage of an initial, “Come on...,” introducing a further exhortation. Tucker: when an imperative from the root **הלך {הלכ}** is followed by waw-cohortative, the imperative is an exhortation to execute the following cohortative. [Tucker, 27; similarly Youngblood, 76] All translations and commentators render it as either ‘Come’ or ‘Come on,’ except two: ‘Let’s get together’ [Sasson]; omitted [Stuart].

The two cohortatives (‘Let us cast lots’ and ‘Let us know’) each have a prefixed **ו {ו}** waw conjunction. This construction can be a simple copulative, meaning “and.” [JM, 114a] However, the waw can instead indicate either purpose or consecutiveness (labeled an “indirect volitive mood”), and the exact nuance of the verb “can be ascertained only from the context.” [JM, 116a] The sense of the first cohortative, **וְנִפְּלָה {ונפילה}** (Hifil-imp-1cp of **נפל {נפל}**), is tied to the introductory imperative, as discussed above. It is, therefore, the primary command.

The second cohortative, **וְנִדְעָה {ונדעה}** (Qal-imp-1cp of **ידע {ידע}**), is almost universally taken by authorities as indicating purpose. Youngblood: it expresses the goal of the previous cohortative, like a purpose clause. [Youngblood, 76] Translations that indicate purpose: ‘that we may know’ [KJV, RSV, ESV]; ‘so that we may/might know’ [NRSV, Buth]; ‘that we might discover’ [Youngblood]; ‘so we may learn’ [NAU]; ‘to find out’ [NET, NIV, NJB, Allen, Sasson]; ‘to discover’ [NAB]; ‘to see’ [NLT]. The one exception that apparently emphasizes consecution is, “Then we’ll know” [HCSB].

SYNTAX— The last word within the sailors’ quotation is ambiguous. **לָנוּ {לנו}** is the preposition **ל** lamed with a pronominal suffix (1cp, “us”). The lamed preposition often indicates possession (“our calamity”) or direction (“toward us”). Most authorities take the preposition as forming a verbless clause and thus must supplement it in English with some implied verb, usually “come,” though some do take it as possessive. Translations: ‘has come upon us’ [ESV, NKJV, RSV, Lessing, Limburg]; ‘has

Commented [CJS177]: Add the hireq.

Commented [CJS178]: This doesn’t follow. Collective singular nouns can take singular or plural verbs, cf. vdm §35.iii. if you delete the ‘thus’ it will be fine.

Commented [CJS179]: The material is fine, but elsewhere you have this sort of material in a section ‘interclausal relations’. Might that be a better label?

Commented [CJS180]: Final form of kaph, three times in this paragraph.

Commented [CJS181]: Add to this paragraph vdm pp 171-72, para 21.5.1. this may not be the best reference grammar, but it is familiar to translators since it has been part of TW for many years.

Commented [CJS182]: I think ‘the predicate of a verbless clause’

Commented [CJS183]: Would this be better in LEXICON.

come to us' [NAB, Tucker]; 'has overtaken us' [NET]; 'has struck us' [NAU]; 'has befallen us' [Baldwin, Wolff, Youngblood]; 'bringing us' [NJB]; 'is upon us' [KJV]; '<trouble/plight> we are in' [HCSB, Allen]; 'our <trouble>' [Stuart]; '<calamity> of ours' [Sasson]; omitted [NIV].

LEXICON—

- a. **Then-they-said, (each) man to his-neighbor** **אִישׁ אֶל-רֵעֵהוּ** This phrase is literally, “a-man to his-neighbor,” but it is a common construction that indicates reciprocity. [Tucker, 26]

רֵעַ {רע} - When used together with a verb and preposition, with **אִישׁ {איש}** “man” as subject, “one to the other” [HALOT, **רֵעַ {רע}** 5.a., pg 1254] “‘Neighbor’ in expressions of reciprocity.” [Holladay, **רֵעַ {רע}** II 2, pg 342]; generally “friend, companion, fellow,” and in reciprocal phrases, “one to another” or “each/one...the other” [BDB, **רֵעַ {רע}** II 3, pg 945]. ‘to one another’ [NKJV, RSV, ESV, NET, NIV, HCSB, Allen, Limburg, Wolff]; ‘to each other’ [NJB, Lessing, Stuart]; ‘one to another’ [Tucker]; ‘every one to his fellow’ [KJV]; ‘each to his mate’ [Baldwin]; ‘Each man...to his mate’ [NAU]; ‘each one...to his shipmate’ [Youngblood]; ‘Turning to one another’ [Sasson].

- b. **Go! Let-us-cast lots** **וְנָפִילָה {נפילה}** (Hifil-coh.-1cp of **נָפַל {נפל}**). In general, “let fall, make fall, let sink, throw down;” specifically with a lot, “cast” [Holladay]; in general, “cause to fall,” and especially with a lot, “casting” [BDB]. All authorities translate as ‘cast’ except: ‘draw’ [NJB]; ‘throw’ [Allen]. See the QUESTION below for a discussion of the process of casting lots. [Sasson] Elsewhere in the Bible, authors use various verbs for the process of casting lots. Most often, the phrasing is ‘drop/let-fall from something into something.’ But the verbs used include “shoot,” “give,” and two different roots for “cast,” in addition to the verb “drop” which occurs in our verse. [Sasson, 109] The OT uses six different verbs to designate the action of casting lots; they have the basic meanings of throw, give, or fall. [TWOT, **גִּזְרָל {גזרל}**]

- c. **Go! Let-us-cast lots** **גִּזְרָלוֹת {גזרלות}** “Lot (stones which are cast to get a decision)” [HALOT, **גִּזְרָל {גזרל}**, pg 185]. Nowhere does the Bible make clear what objects were used to cast lots. [TWOT] But, a ‘lot’ was some object among a group of objects, used for obtaining a divinely-controlled answer to a specific question. The etymology of the word is unsure (it may be related to an Arabic verb for “be stony” [HALOT, **גִּזְרָל {גזרל}**, pg 203]) but in Israel it referred generically to any of the various types of materials used in determining lot. [Sasson, 109] See the QUESTION below.

- d. **on-whose-account** **this calamity (is)-ours/(came)-to-us.** **בְּשָׁלְמִי {בשלמי}** This is a compound word, comprised of the preposition **בְּ {ב}**, the relative particle **שֶׁ {ש}**, the preposition **לְ {ל}**, and the interrogative **מִי {מי}**. ‘On whose account’ [NAU, RSV, ESV, Baldwin, Lessing, Limburg, Tucker, Youngblood, Wolff]; ‘who is to blame for’ [NJB, HCSB, Allen, Stuart]; ‘who is responsible

Commented [CJS184]: My copy of NAB has, ‘on whose account we have met with this misfortune’.

Commented [CJS185]: 1. Sense 3 is on p 946.
2. I'm not sure how to do it, but you need to distinguish between I or II when it is used a homonym number and I or II as a sense number, as for *hlk* above.

Commented [CJS186]: Since you have a QUESTION on the syntagm, might the rest of this para be better there?
In any case, it seems to me that, unless the sources draw an exegetical conclusion from the choice of verb, this lies outside the scope of ES

Commented [CJS187]: Add BDB, ‘a lot cast for the decision of questions, designation of persons, etc., for service or punishment, assignment of property, etc.’

Commented [CJS188]: BDB and HALOT both have something worthwhile under the particle *she*.

for' [NIV, Sasson]; 'whose fault it is that' [NET]; 'for whose cause' [KJV, GKC 150k]. This is an unusual construction in Hebrew, but there are a few similar constructions (compounding the preposition **בְּ** {ב} with the relative particle **אֲשֶׁר** {אשר} or **שֶׁ** {ש}) elsewhere in the Bible, and the meaning in our context is clear. Sasson: When used without a pronoun appended, the compound word means either 'that which' or 'because;' but with the pronoun suffix it always acts as a pronoun. Here it means 'on whose account.' [Sasson, 112] In addition, Buth notes that although **אֲשֶׁר** {אשר} as in v. 8 is the standard biblical Hebrew form for the relative pronoun, **שֶׁ** {ש} is dialectal for northern Israel. He also suggests that in this verse, "It may be mimicking the foreign speech of Phoenician sailors, who use **שֶׁ** {ש} in their related Canaanite dialect." [Buth, 101]

- e. **on-whose-account this calamity (is)-ours/(came)-to-us.** **הָרָעָה** {הרעה} See Lexicon entry 'wickedness' in 1:2. 'calamity' [NAU, NIV, NRSV, Baldwin, Sasson]; 'evil' [ESV, KJV, RSV, Lessing, Limburg, Wolff]; 'disaster' [NET, Buth, Tucker, Youngblood]; 'trouble' [HCSB, NKJV, Stuart]; 'plight' [Allen]; 'bad luck' [NJB]. This is one of the author's repeated words; it was used already in 1:2 meaning "wickedness." But here, it clearly refers to physical destruction from the storm.

QUESTION— What does "casting lots" mean and what exactly did the sailors do?

Casting lots was a method of getting an immediate answer from a deity. However, the Bible never describes the exact method nor objects that were used (other than the equally unexplained Urim and Thummim). Sasson: It was one of many methods of seeking an answer from a deity. We do know that neighboring cultures used various objects including bones, stones, clay/pottery, arrows, and wooden sticks. The process probably included an oath to the god(s) to obey the result. [Sasson, 108-9] In any case, note that in our verse, it is not Hebrews who do the casting; it is foreign sailors who perhaps had methods not practiced by Israel.

1. We simply don't know the objects nor the technique that was used. Given the different objects employed, the method of reading the answer necessarily varied. [Sasson, 108-9] We should assume that people used various objects and techniques at different places and times. [TWOT, גורל {גורל}]
2. Youngblood offers a more precise description of the method, asserting that they took small objects (e.g., stones) and marked them with the possible choices. They then placed all the objects in a container and shook the container until one of the lots fell out. [Youngblood, 77] He also suggests a possibility for the specific type of object that the sailors may have used. He refers to the archaeological excavation of an ancient shipwreck which found astragali (knuckle bones of sheep) onboard the sunken ship, proving that at least the crew of that particular ship had brought lot-casting materials with them. [Youngblood, 77n35] Note that the reference is to the Cape Gelidonya shipwreck, which dates to about 1200BC (and thus more than 400 years earlier than Jonah) and was a Greek ship that sank near today's Bodrum, Turkey.

3. Stuart thinks that the lots were two dice, each with light sides and dark sides. [Stuart, 459-60]

QUESTION— Why did the sailors cast lots? Why did they think somebody onboard was the cause of the

Commented [CJS189]: Do you mean 'preposition'? I'm not sure because I found the presentation a little bit confusing.

Commented [CJS190]: This is debated. You can point readers to the uncertainty by a simple change of word, 'Buth claims ...' or 'Buth suggests ...'.

Commented [CJS191]: Perhaps better: related dialect of Canaanite.

Commented [CJS192]: Good point. Is it yours or a source?

storm?

The events within the chapter clearly imply that the sailors believed the storm to be a divine act. Page: The sailors recognized a divine origin of the storm and tried to determine the cause. [Page, 232] Baldwin: Such an intense storm led the sailors to assume that someone onboard had offended a deity, even if unintentionally. They hoped to find the guilty person, correct the offense, and be granted a reprieve. [Baldwin, 559] Furthermore, we have ancient evidence that there was a widespread belief that divine judgment acted to stop guilty persons aboard ship. In *Antiquities*, Josephus comments about this event in Jonah, “But as the waves grew greater, and the sea became more violent by the winds, they suspected, **as is usual in such cases**, that some one of the persons that sailed with them was the occasion of this storm.” [Antiquities 10]. Limburg also relates that in ancient Rome, there was a belief that any ship that was transporting an enemy of the gods was in danger of destruction. And earlier in ancient Athens, already in the fifth century BC, Antiphon argued in a court case that his client, who was accused of murder, must have been innocent because the ship in which he traveled had arrived safely. [Limburg, 51]

QUESTION— Why did casting lots actually work, successfully revealing Jonah as the cause of the storm?

In general, we have the statement of Proverbs 16:33, ‘In the lap is cast the lot; and from Yahweh [are] all of its decisions.’ But more specifically within the book of Jonah, the entire plot development shows that God is sovereign, because everything and everyone obeys God (excepting only Jonah himself). So the fact that the lot revealed the truth is just further evidence demonstrating God’s sovereign control. [Alexander, 115] God used the lot to expose Jonah and to confront him with his prophetic calling. Not only the lot, but also the storm and the sailors are God’s agents in accomplishing this end. [Bruckner, 45]

QUESTION— Does the fact that the sailors cast lots have any larger significance in the story of Jonah?

It may portray the sailors in a positive light, in parallel with the Ninevites (chapter 3), showing them to be more pious than Jonah. Youngblood: Casting lots was the only form of divination that was allowed in Israel. So when the sailors cast lots, it was an approved, pious action, even from a godly Israelite’s viewpoint. Furthermore, in the large scope of the book, the sailors’ casting of lots is parallel to the Ninevites’ repentance in chapter 3, and both of those actions are surprisingly pious and even Israelite in character. The author intends to portray Jonah negatively by contrast with the pious sailors (and later with the pious Ninevites). [Youngblood, 77]

Commented [CJS193]: This seems to be a bit more than she actually says. Can you check it, please.

Commented [CJS194]: Is the bolding yours or your source. I don't think it could be Josephus'.

Commented [CJS195]: There is a convention for citing ancient authors such as Josephus.

Commented [CJS196]: Can you mark where Alexander's contribution starts to distinguish it from your own comments.

DISCOURSE UNIT: ch:vv-vv

1:8 Then-they-said to-him, “Tell(ms)- us -please, on-account-of whom^a (has)-this-calamity-(come) to-us? What (is) your(ms)-mission?^b And-from-where do-you(ms)-come? What (is) your(ms)-land? And-from-which^c people (are) you(ms)?”

TEXT— The first question, ‘on-account-of whom (has)-this-calamity (come) to-us?’, which almost exactly reiterates the phrase in 1:7, is missing in a few ancient manuscripts. BHS notes the variant, but gives no idea of the MS evidence. Page states that it is omitted from two medieval Hebrew and “some” LXX manuscripts. [Page, 233] Wolff lists MSS that omit the phrase as: plural MSS of the MT, some Greek, and “frequently elsewhere.” He reasons that the phrase is not original. First, the phrase’s function in this verse is both superfluous and clumsy. Second, we can imagine a process by which it was added — it could have been first written as a marginal note to v.7, and then later accidentally incorporated as part of the text, but inserted at v.8. Third, Wolff offers another textual variant, found in the Targum of Jonah (an Aramaic adaptation of Jonah, probably dating to the first century AD), which asks *why* this calamity came, instead of *because of whom*. Wolff prefers this reading because it makes better sense, since the person (Jonah) had already been determined by the lot. [Wolff, 107n8] Note that very few authorities omit the question entirely, though a few do insert ‘why?’ as found in the Targum. (See the translations in LEXICON entry (a), below). However, most commentators who discuss this clause do find it appropriate and not superfluous. A good example is Trible, who explicitly finds the repetition to be part of the rhetorical structure. She argues that the two occurrences of the phrase are warranted because they function differently in their different settings. In the first usage (in v.7), the sailors are speaking generally. But in the second usage (v.8), they are speaking to Jonah and they have a specific referent. So in v.8, the phrase links events as the plot advances, and it seeks new information in the following questions. [Trible, 139-40] See additional discussion below, under the QUESTION.

INTERCLAUSAL RELATIONS— The sailors ask Jonah a series of four questions. These are apparently arranged in two pairs, despite the Masoretic accents, which separate the latter pair. [Sasson, 113] There is some debate about the meaning of the first two questions. The first question is either “What is your occupation?” or “What is your mission?” See LEXICON (b), below, for details. The second question is superficially simple, “From where do you come?” However, as Sasson argues, it likely focuses more on Jonah’s purpose instead of on his geographic origin. Logically, the sailors want to know more about Jonah’s motivation for setting out on his journey, and the question מַאֲן תְּבוֹא {מַאֲן תְּבוֹא} (‘from where do you come?’) can be used for that. E.g., in Judges 17:9 and 19:17, it seeks the purpose of travel. Of course, the question can seek merely a geographic location, as in Gen. 29:4 and Josh. 9:8. [Sasson, 114-5] But if we take the four questions to occur in two pairs, as seems reasonable, then the first pair ought both to be concerned with Jonah’s purpose. Sasson: the sailors need to know what offense has caused the terrible storm, not about Jonah’s origins. [Sasson, 113-4] We might paraphrase the pairs of questions, then, as “What is your mission? And what is the purpose of your trip?” and “What is your homeland? And what people group are you from?” The first pair of

Commented [CJS197]: This seems to be longer than necessary. I suggest:

1. Set out the three option – ‘because of whom ...’ (= MT), ‘why ...’ or omit.
2. Note the ancient evidence in support of each.
3. List commentaries which explicitly adopt MT and also those which say nothing, and can thus be assumed to accept MT, plus modern versions which follow MT.
4. List commentaries and versions which follow the other options.

I don’t think you need to reproduce the supporting arguments from the commentaries.

Commented [CJS198]: Clause?

- Commented [CJS199]:** 1.Can you make it clearer that the variant in BHS is omission of the whole clause.
2.BHS says ‘nonn’ = nonnulli = some, several, though it does not specify which.

Commented [CJS200]: I am involved in a text critical project, CTP, and so I have access to the data for Jonah. This clause is missing from Codices Vaticanus and Sinaiticus.

Commented [CJS201]: CTP says two.

Commented [CJS202]: According to CTP, only ‘some’ Mss of Tg.

Commented [CJS203]: Of the 25 surveyed in CTP, only Moffatt, JB, NAB, NEB, NJB.

Commented [CJS204]: Only NRSV, NLT, ISV.

Commented [CJS205]: I’m not sure this paragraph is needed. If you think that the LEXICON does not clarify the questions adequately, you might add a QUESTION. My thought would be that there was an incoherent torrent of questions from questioners in a panic, which have to be recorded in some linear order. Some commentators seem to imply a careful courtroom-like interrogation, but that seems to me to be unlikely. Does anyone support my suggestion? Having read more of the commentaries, I find that Allen is one who does so, using the word ‘barrage’.

Commented [CJS206]: 1. I would say that there are actually five, though some take the first as an indirect question governed by the speech verb. Is this worth discussion?
2. Sasson gets to four by taking the first as a vocative relative clause in his translation, ‘you who are ...’. Later, though, on ...

Commented [CJS207]: I agree that this is what Sasson says, but the rules governing the accents are very complex and, in the modern era, only specialists have got to grips with them. I suspect Sasson is not one of them – nor am I, but I know the ...

questions focuses on what purposes Jonah has in being onboard their ship, and the second pair focuses on Jonah's national and ethnic background. Thus, the first pair of questions asks what Jonah plans to do in Tarshish and his purpose in leaving — seeking clues as to what might offend a god. The second pair of questions asks for Jonah's nationality and ethnicity, in order to know which god(s) might be involved. Separately, Tribble notes that the questions exhibit alliteration (the sound 'm' being repeated), which creates a staccato effect that gives a sense of urgency. [Tribble, 140]

LEXICON—

- a. “Tell- us -please, on-account-of whom (has)-this-calamity-(come) to-us?” בְּאִשֶּׁר לִמִּי {בְּאִשֶּׁר לִמִּי} See also the LEXICON entry (d), in 1:7 above. ‘On whose account’ [NAU, RSV, ESV, Baldwin, Lessing, Tucker, Youngblood]; ‘who is responsible for’ [NIV, Sasson]; ‘because of whom’ [Limburg]; ‘for whose cause’ [KJV]; ‘who is to blame for’ [HCSB, Allen, Stuart]; ‘whose fault is it that’ [NET]; ‘you who are responsible for this calamity of ours’ [Sasson]; ‘why’ [see *TEXT note, above*: NRSV, NLT, NAB, Wolff]; omitted [see *TEXT note, above*: NJB]. The wording here is slightly different than the similar phrase of 1:7; here we have בְּאִשֶּׁר {בְּאִשֶּׁר}, whereas 1:7 has שֶׁ {שֶׁ}. Sasson explains the difference of form by noting that although שֶׁ {שֶׁ} (used in v.7) can take suffixes, בְּאִשֶּׁר {בְּאִשֶּׁר} cannot. [Sasson, 112-3] Whether or not this distinction between v.7 and v.8 intends a distinct meaning is debated. Both states explicitly, “בְּאִשֶּׁר לִמִּי {בְּאִשֶּׁר לִמִּי} means exactly the same as בְּשִׁלְמִי {בְּשִׁלְמִי}”. [Buth, 101n30; also Youngblood, 78] However, Sasson sees a real distinction; he ultimately translates the phrase here in v.8 as a vocative, but explains it as a description of Jonah, functionally “because it is you who are bringing this calamity upon us.” [Sasson, 113]
- b. What (is) your-mission? מִלְאֲכָתְךָ {מִלְאֲכָתְךָ} “Trade mission, business journey; business, work; handiwork, craftsmanship; objects, wares; service; service in the cult, duty.” [HALOT, 586] “Business mission/trip; occupation; labor/task; an article (esp. of commerce); cultic service.” [Holladay, 4632]. “Occupation, business;” property being worked; object worked on; “workmanship; service, use” [BDB, 4746]. “Work, business, craftsmanship, goods, property...the activity of working, the requisite skills of work, or to the results of work.” [TWOT, 1068b] ‘occupation’ [NAU, NET, KJV, RSV, ESV, Lessing, Limburg, Stuart, Wolff, Youngblood]; ‘kind of work’ [NIV]; ‘business’ [HCSB, NJB, Allen]; ‘task’ [Tucker]; ‘mission’ [Sasson]; ‘what you are doing here’ [Baldwin]. All three lexicons (HALOT, Holladay, and BDB) specifically identify our verse as an example of the sense, “occupation.” However, the commentators who discuss the word generally conclude that it refers to Jonah's purpose on this specific trip. On this understanding, see the discussion of the four questions at INTERCLAUSAL RELATIONS, above. Sasson: The root has to do with “sending” and also gives us the word for “angel.” [Sasson, 114] Although Sasson acknowledges that the word usually refers to occupation or trade, he concludes that in this case, it refers to “mission.” Part of his reasoning is the observation that elsewhere in the Bible when someone inquires about a person's work (e.g., Gen 46:33; 47:3), they use a different noun and root,

Commented [CJS208]: I suggest that this might merit an entry in LEXICON.

Commented [CJS209]: Stuart's comment that, ‘The sometimes suggested translation “... since you are to blame for our bad situation” is not truly reflective of the Hebrew syntax’ is worth adding.

Commented [CJS210]: As I noted above, Sasson seems to change his mind in his notes at the end of his discussion of v. 7.

Commented [CJS211]: I can't find this on p 78.

Commented [CJS212]: Am I right in thinking that he changes his mind?

Commented [CJS213]: I'm not persuaded that ‘mission’ is right – even Sasson is uncertain – but if you are persuaded, then stick with it.

Commented [CJS214]: Lexical form?

Commented [CJS215]: Note the HALOT assigns this to sense 2, ‘business, work, occupation, trade’.

Commented [CJS216]: Similarly, BDB assigns this to sense 1, ‘occupation, business’. It's good to give the range of meanings given in a lexicon, but where one does make an assignment, you should report that. Where it doesn't, how to handle it is a more difficult decision.

OK, I see that you have done this below, but I leave this comment in for you to think where best to do this.

Commented [CJS217]: This looks like NIV2011. NIV84 just has, ‘what do you do’. Since they differ you should probably have both.

מַעֲשֵׂה {מַעֲשֵׂה}, not the noun מְלָאכָה {מְלָאכָה}. [Sasson, 114] Wolff allows for the possibility that it might refer to Jonah's specific task and reason for this business trip. [Wolff, 114] Goldman explains the meaning as the business that brought Jonah onto the ship. [Goldman, 140]

- c. **And-from-which** people [are] you? {וּמֵאֵי מָקוֹם} BDB gives the two-word phrase as “whence” [BDB, אֵי {אֵי}, 398]. Equivalently, “from where?” [Holladay, אֵי {אֵי}, pg352; and HALOT, אֵי {אֵי}, pg37-8]. ‘From what people’ [NAU, NIV, Baldwin, Lessing, Wolff, JM 143g]; ‘of what people’ [KJV, RSV, ESV, Limburg]; ‘who are your people’ [NET]; ‘which/what nationality’ [NJB, Allen, Stuart, Tucker]; ‘to which [one] of its people/s do you belong’ [Sasson, Youngblood]. The phrase is like a “directional locative” and is often translated “from where” or “from which” [Tucker, 31] Cf. 2Sam 15:2, אֵי מָקוֹם עִיר אֲתָה {אֵי מָקוֹם עִיר אֲתָה} ‘From which city [are] you?’ -- which, it may be worth noting, yields a response of which *tribe* he comes from rather than which *city*.

QUESTION— Why do the sailors still ask Jonah who the cause of the storm is, even after the lot had already indicated Jonah?

1. The sailors are presented favorably. They were being cautious and fair, giving Jonah a chance to deny (or confirm) the result of the lot. Limburg: they want to give Jonah a chance to defend himself. [Limburg, 52] The author makes it clear that the heathen sailors are far from violent. [Wolff, 114] Their caution in condemning Jonah is one of several evidences of their good character -- together with their piety (1:5), their politeness (1:8), and their reluctance to execute Jonah (1:13). [Lessing, 107]
2. The result of the lot needed to be verified. Baldwin: they ask Jonah because only he can corroborate the result of the lot. [Baldwin, 559] They want to make sure there is no mistake, so they give Jonah a chance to defend himself. [Allen, ###]208-209]
3. The sailors hope that Jonah will confess his guilt. [Bruckner, 45] They wanted Jonah to confess and to disclose his crime. [Keil, 395]
- 3.1 The sailors were already convinced of Jonah's guilt, but they now want to find out his specific crime. [Calvin]
4. The result of the lot merely identified Jonah as the person who could explain their predicament, not necessarily that he was guilty of anything. It was up to Jonah to clarify just what his involvement was. This explains why the sailors' questions covered a wide range. [Walton, 471-2]
5. The sailors are asking which *deity* caused the storm; they already know that Jonah is the human target of the divine anger. Jonah's response in 1:9 confirms that the sailors were asking for the deity involved. The book's original audience in antiquity probably understood all five questions as seeking to identify the offended deity. The sailors asked so many questions probably because they assumed that Jonah didn't even know which deity he had offended, nor what the offense was. So they were hoping to discover clues that would reveal both the deity and the offense. [Youngblood, 78]

Commented [CJS218]: Good. This phrase is awkward and does need discussion.

1. You should probably add something about *zeh* being used pleonastically in questions: gkc 136.c; jm 143.g; ibhs 17.4.3.c; vdm 36.2.2.v, cf. 43.3.1.i, 43.3.2.i.

2. I think the syntactic function of ‘*am*’ needs discussion. The simplest way might be to extend the phrase in this entry to include it. Then you could introduce the renderings of BDB ‘*whence*, as regards city’ and HALOT ‘from which town/people’ and it would justify your inclusion of ‘people’ in the renderings, as you have done. An alternative might be to have a SYNTAX or QUESTION paragraph, ‘What is the syntactic function of ‘*am*’? That seems a long way round, though.

Commented [CJS219]: Strictly, I think, only when ‘ey is used with min.

Commented [CJS220]: HALOT cites this verse and implies, ‘from which people’.

Commented [CJS221]: It may be worth reporting somewhere Allen's point that the questions are religiously loaded, p 208. Youngblood and others do the same.

6. The sailors wonder if they themselves have committed some offense. It is not obvious to them. They naturally wonder if they have somehow done something so bad that it has brought on the storm and threat of shipwreck. So they want to know if they have offended Jonah's god, either by offending Jonah himself or by helping him to do something wrong. [Stuart, 460]
7. The clause is an erroneous textual duplication and should be omitted. See the TEXT section, above.

Commented [CJS222]: List sources, if any.

Commented [CJS223]: Perhaps add a QUESTION about what underlies the other four questions. Several of the commentators contribute to this. Would thus subsume too much of the material in INTERCLAUSAL RELATIONS? Which is better?

DISCOURSE UNIT: ch:vv-vv

1:9 Then-he-said to-them, “(A) Hebrew^a am I. And Yahweh, (the) God(-of) the-heavens/Heaven,^b I fear/revere^c, who made the-sea and-the-dry-land.”^d

INTERTEXTUAL REFERENCE— The verb פָּרַח {פָּרַח} “to fear” is one of the author’s repeated words.

Several commentators note, furthermore, that its meaning here is in notable contrast to its meaning in 1:5, “Then the sailors were afraid.” Sasson: The two occurrences of the word create a contrast between the pagan sailors who are in a blind panic, and Jonah who calmly confesses faith in God. [Sasson, 118] Similarly, Wolff: The contrast is the presence or absence of the elemental fear of destruction. [Wolff, 116] But others see it differently: Jonah’s fear is ironic because he demonstrates that he doesn’t actually fear enough to obey, and in contrast the sailors fear such a powerful deity so much that it makes them increasingly obedient and sensitive to any possible disobedience. [Walton, 472; Youngblood, 79] Similarly, Allen: Jonah’s fear may be orthodox, but it is feeble. In contrast, the sailors experience a “numinous awe” of God. [Allen, ###] It is perhaps noteworthy that of the four uses of this verb in Jonah, this one has a unique form; it is a participle-ms here, but the other three are all wayyiqtol-3mp – perhaps a subtle cue to an intended distinction. Also see the LEXICON entry (c), below.

SYNTAX— The word order is significant in Jonah’s two statements. In both cases, an element has been moved to the front of the sentence; most commentators agree that this “fronting” places emphasis on that element. In Jonah’s first statement (‘A Hebrew am I.’), his ethnic identity is emphasized. “There is a focus on ‘Hebrew’.” The word order is not the subject-predicate of a simple description. ‘Hebrew’ is the answer to the question and the main point...In this context, it is possible that Jonah intended quite a bit of contrast and surprise.” [Buth, 124n13] In Jonah’s second statement (‘And Yahweh, the God of the heavens, I revere.’), God’s name is stressed. [Sasson, 118; Tucker, 2632] Youngblood agrees and adds that this statement is the climax of Jonah’s response and the key point of the entire episode. [Youngblood, 78]

INTERCLAUSAL RELATIONS— Commentators widely regard the description of Yahweh as a merism (referring to a whole by naming two opposites that are parts of that whole). Tucker and Tribble think that all three terms (sea, heavens, and dry land) function as a single merism that indicates Yahweh is the God of the entire cosmos. [Tucker, 33; Tribble, 141] Other commentators observe that the effect of a merism is achieved by just the last two terms, sea and dry land. Sasson interprets the implication that Jonah told the sailors that Yahweh is God of the heavens, and everything beneath the heavens (the sea and dry land). [Sasson, 118-9] In the end, there appears to be no difference.

LEXICON—

- a. (A) Hebrew am I. עִבְרִי {עִבְרִי} “Hebrew” [BDB, Holladay, and HALOT]. All authorities translate ‘I am a Hebrew.’ This name of the Israelite people is used 35 times in the Bible, most commonly in Genesis, Exodus, and 1 Samuel. There is much scholarly debate about the origin of the word, with at least three ideas put forward – (1) formed from the name עֶבֶר {עֶבֶר} Eber (Gen 10:24); (2)

Commented [CJS224]: I will leave this in but I have just seen your SYNTAX entry. Why follow Hebrew order rather than the more natural English order? The same applies to the next clause. The phrases that you have fronted are the new information in the clauses and are fronted in the Hebrew as focal. If you want to make this point, then it could be a QUESTION: why are ... fronted?

Commented [CJS225]: I see this in Walton, but I couldn’t find it in Youngblood.

Commented [CJS226]: I’m sure you’re right but I can’t find this in Allen.

Commented [CJS227]: The Westminster morphology, following HALOT has it as an adjective. This might cause confusion, so I suggest ‘participle or adjective’.

Commented [CJS228]: Does anyone suggest how that might work based on normal usage of the forms? If not, then it should probably go.

Commented [CJS229]: I know it is widely used, but ‘emphasis’ is an ill-defined term which covers a range of functions and which raises the hackles of linguists. The more precise terminology here would be focus. That said, you should, of course, report what sources say, not what they should have said. In this sort of discussion, however, you should give priority to sources that are more careful in their use of terminology and refer to this as focus, e.g. Tucker. As for your translation, there is no need to follow the Hebrew order because English handles focus differently, e.g. ‘it is YHWH ... whom I fear’, but that would be an over-translation.

Commented [CJS230]: In spoken English, we mark focus by stress, we can’t do it that way in written English. Hebrew marks it by word order.

Commented [CJS231]: This isn’t really an interclausal relation issue, though it does cross a clause boundary. This material might be better added to your QUESTIONS below.

Commented [CJS232]: The etymology is probably beyond the scope of ES though the usage is significant and should be retained. If you retain the material on etymology, you should say who supports each option.

formed from the noun עֵבֶר {עֵבֶר}, “a region across/beyond” and so “one from beyond [the Euphrates or the Jordan river];” or (3) derived from the word *Hapiru*, a name that is found in ancient Akkadian, Ugaritic, and Egyptian writings [the meaning of which is also debated, though it refers to some group of apparently non-Egyptian people]. But whatever its etymology, commentators universally observe that “Hebrew” was a common and easy way for Israelites to describe themselves to foreigners [e.g., Stuart, 460]. Sasson: When speaking to other Israelites, they would naturally identify themselves by their tribes, but when speaking to non-Israelite foreigners, they needed a term with wider scope and that was “Hebrew.” Sasson goes further by arguing that the writer of Jonah used “Hebrew” in order to create a separation between Jonah and the sailors, and that it conveys a certain amount of pride in Jonah’s pedigree. [Sasson, 115-7]. Youngblood asserts that “Hebrew” was also how foreigners usually designated Israelites. [Youngblood, 78] Wolff finds an implication of “Hebrew,” for the reader. He feels that Jonah would have been expected to call himself a prophet, but the author wants readers to recognize themselves in Jonah; they can identify with “Hebrew” but not with “prophet.” [Wolff, 115] Calvin thinks that Jonah was highlighting the distinction between the true God of the Hebrews (well-known to everyone in the region) and the fictitious gods of the pagans.

- b. **And Yahweh, (the)-God-(of) the-heavens/Heaven, I fear/revere.** הַשָּׁמַיִם {הַשָּׁמַיִם} “heaven(s), sky; firmament [having rain, fire, stars]; upper atmosphere (below the ‘firmament’), air, sky [with birds]; associated w. God as his dwelling” [Hol, שָׁמַיִם {שָׁמַיִם}, 8717]; “heavens, sky; *visible heavens*, sky, where stars, etc, are; as abode of God” [BDB, שָׁמַיִם {שָׁמַיִם}, 10062]. ‘the God of Heaven/heaven’ [all except...]; ‘the god of heaven’ [Youngblood]; ‘God of Heaven/heaven’ [NJB, NAU, Sasson]; ‘the God of the heavens’ [HCSB, Lessing]; ‘God of the heavens’ [Tucker].

- c. **And Yahweh, (the)-God-(of) the-heavens/Heaven, I fear/revere.** יָרָא {יָרָא} (Qal-participle-ms of יָרָא {יָרָא}). When used specifically in reference to God, HALOT lists “to fear God...to tremble for, to honour,” although it places Jonah 1:9 under an adjective entry and translates as “in fear of.” BDB lists “fear, be afraid; stand in awe of; fear, reverence, honour” (and places Jonah 1:9 in the last sense). The root can have five senses: “1) the emotion of fear, 2) the intellectual anticipation of evil..., 3) reverence or awe, 4) righteous behavior or piety, 5) formal religious worship.” [TWOT, 0907.0] As a stative verb, it has a different vowel pattern than most participles, with a long ‘A’ instead of the long ‘O’ of the normal pattern. Such participles are classified by some grammarians as adjectives or verbal adjectives. But whatever its classification, it functions as a true present tense, with the subject “I” (spoken by Jonah) and the direct object “Yahweh.” ‘Worship’ [HCSB, NET, NIV, NJB, NRSV, NLT, Allen, Calvin, Lessing, Limburg, Sasson]; ‘fear’ [ESV, NAU, KJV, RSV, Baldwin, Tucker, Wolff, Youngblood]; ‘believe in’ [Stuart]. Sasson has a nice discussion of the range of this verb. He lists different senses like the fear of death (e.g., while involved in a violent event), and the awe of being in the presence of majesty, and the apprehension of confronting mystery, and the anxiety of planning something evil, and the respect of interacting with ones

Commented [CJS233]: I suggest inserting [Sasson 115] here and changing the later one to [Sasson 117]. This will avoid a user who has access to the book searching right through, as I just did.

Commented [CJS234]: Youngblood give a footnote, 47 on p 78, to explain his choice of ‘god’. I suggest you add something like, ‘see p. 78, note 47’ within the square brackets.

Commented [CJS235]: I think this needs to be restructured. BDB incorporates all the Qal participles of this root under the verb, but HALOT separates all of them to the adjective. Since the Westminster morphology, widely used in Bible software, follows HALOT on this, as most parsing issues, you should acknowledge the alternative parsings.

Perhaps something like:

This form can be parsed in two ways:

Qal-participle-ms [BDB]

Adjective-ms [HALOT]

Under each option you can cite any others who support that parsing. HALOT’s discussion of the verb then ceases to be relevant and should be replaced by the discussion of the adjective. Of course, BDB’s discussion is relevant.

Commented [CJS236]: I take it this is your comment? It may function [here](#) as a present tense, but what about Jer 26.19? Even here, it could be described as a predicate adjective. Elsewhere, it often functions as an attributive, whether an adjective or adjectival participle. I’ve made my point, so I’ll shut up, but, in any case the translation equivalent is what really matters here, not grammatical quibbles.

parents. When Yahweh is the object of “fear,” then the type of fear is awe and reverence, and the verb has a theological significance. [Sasson, 97] Limburg likes the translation “worship,” and gives the meaning as to honor and have regard for Yahweh. [Limburg, 53] Stuart likes “believes in” but also lists “fear” and “worship” as good translations. [Stuart, 461] Wolff: the verb is a mere convention, having a technical meaning ‘worship,’ but in fact used only to indicate a vague religious affiliation. So, Jonah is merely declaring his official religion, without any intention of noting its crucial significance, nor of repenting. [Wolff, 116]

Commented [CJS237]: Favors?

Commented [CJS238]: Favors?

- d. **who made the-sea and-the-dry-land** יָבֵשׁ הָאֲדָמָה {יָבֵשׁ הָאֲדָמָה} “Dry land; mainland” [HALOT]; “Dry land, dry ground;...of dry land, [as opposed to] sea” [BDB, יָבֵשׁ הָאֲדָמָה {יָבֵשׁ הָאֲדָמָה}, 3767]; “Emphasizes ‘dry land’ in contrast to bodies of water.” [TWOT, 837b] Within Jonah, it is used two more times (1:13 and 2:11), even though it is a rare word, used only 11 times elsewhere in the Bible. Translations: ‘the dry land’ [all, except...]; ‘dry land’ [NJB]; ‘the land’ [NLT]; ‘land’ [Allen].

Commented [CJS239]: And NIV84 and Stuart

QUESTION— What is the implication in Jonah’s description of Yahweh as “the God of Heaven”?

1. The phrase describes Yahweh as the one true supreme God. [Baldwin, 560] Jonah declares that Yahweh is neither a local nor a national deity, and is superior to all other gods. [Wolff, 115]
 - 1.1. Yahweh is the supreme God and therefore is the one who caused the storm. As the supreme God, it is Yahweh who initiated this storm. [Page, 234]
 - 1.2. Yahweh is the supreme God and therefore is available to help any person of any nationality. [Allen, ###]209-10
2. It is a way to describe Yahweh to a polytheistic foreigner, and simultaneously to imply that He is the supreme God. Stuart asserts that the phrase was a helpful way for Israelites to describe who Yahweh is, to a syncretistic polytheist, because it not only answered the polytheist’s natural question (“Yahweh is a god of *what*?”) but also implied that Yahweh is chief of all gods. Stuart compares the phrase to its extrabiblical use with the Sumerian and Babylonian god Anu, who was the progenitor and had the title of ruler of all the gods. And if the gods dwell in heaven, then ‘the God of Heaven’ must be the supreme deity. [Stuart, 461]
3. It was a title that Phoenician sailors would understand as the god in control of storms at sea. There was a Phoenician deity called Ba`al Shemem (“Lord of Heaven”) who was associated with the raging sea and whom sailors especially feared. [Youngblood, 78]
4. It is a description that attributes the stormy sky conditions to Yahweh. Jonah was not thinking of theology, but rather merely explaining the immediate context for the sailors. The tempest at sea would surely have included not only wind but also black clouds, lightning, and thunder -- and these were recognized as weapons of a storm god. [Sasson, 118]

Commented [CJS240]: Sasson, 118, also refers to this possibility.

QUESTION— Why does Jonah use ‘the dry land’ in his description of God, ‘who made the sea and the dry land,’ when the Bible elsewhere uses ‘the earth’ in corresponding descriptions? (cf. Exod. 20:11; Neh. 9:6; Ps 135:6; Ps 146:6; however, Ps 95:5 does use a similar word meaning ‘dry land’, as does Gen. 1:10)

Commented [CJS241]: I wonder whether this might be a better place for your material on merismus, perhaps merged with the question.

1. It indicates that Yahweh is in control of both of these realms. It merely points out Yahweh’s

Commented [CM242]: This is probably superfluous. CJS: Agreed, but you could just say ‘rather than “earth”’.

jurisdiction and sphere of competence. [Wolff, 116] Both the sea and the dry land are significant within the story of Jonah; they are where Jonah and Yahweh interact as their conflict unfolds. Furthermore, the phrase underscores the fact that Yahweh continues to patiently work with people who flee from him, whether to the sea or to the desert. [Youngblood, 79]

2. It indicates both that Yahweh's control is without boundaries, and that He will guide the sailors safely to land. [Youngblood, 79]
3. The word יבִישָׁה {יבִישָׁה} ('dry land') is used as a literary device — one of the author's repeated words, used again in 1:13 and 2:11. [Sasson, 119]

DISCOURSE UNIT: ch:vv-vv

1:10 Then- the-men -feared^a (a) great fear.^b Then-they-said to-him, “What (is) this you(ms)-have-done!” because the-men knew that from-the-presence-of Yahweh he was-fleeing, because he-had-told^c them.

INTERTEXTUAL REFERENCE— As noted above in 1:2, the word “great” is the book’s most-repeated word. See the discussion at 1:2.

INTERTEXTUAL REFERENCE— As noted above in 1:5, the word “fear” is one of the book’s repeated words — but it carries a different sense for the sailors (1:5, 10, 16) as compared to Jonah (1:9). See the discussion at 1:5, above.

SYNTAX— The word order of the clause ‘from the presence of Yahweh he was fleeing’ places emphasis on the first element, ‘from the presence of Yahweh.’ This emphasis indicates that the problem and the cause of their present danger was not simply that Jonah had fled, but that he had fled *from Yahweh*. [Tucker, 35]

SYNTAX— The verb and direct object share the same 3-letter root, and a literal translation sounds redundant: ‘the men feared a great fear.’ This construction, employing a direct object from the same root as the verb is called a “cognate object” or “internal accusative” (among other terms). Both observes that “the repetition of a noun object having almost the same meaning as the verb” is a “common feature of Hebrew narrative.” [Both, 151] Tucker: This construction intensifies the verbal idea, and although the noun is the grammatical object of the verb, it should be understood adverbially, as “feared greatly.” [Tucker, 33] Both calls it “a stylistic device,” but does not describe its function. [Both, 124] Discussing the construction in general (not just this verse), Gesenius states that it “is never altogether without force, but rather serves...to strengthen the verbal idea.” [GKC, 117q]

LEXICON—

- a. **Then- the-men -feared (a) great fear.** וַיִּירָאוּ {וַיִּירָאוּ} (Qal-wayyiqtol-3mp of יָרָא {יָרָא}). See discussion in 1:5, above. For translations, see Lexicon entry (b), below.
- b. **Then- the-men -feared (a) great fear.** יִרְאָה {יִרְאָה} ‘fear, terror; obj. of terror; fear of God, reverence, piety’ [BDB, 4131]; ‘fear; fear of God’ [Hol, 3512]. ‘Were exceedingly/greatly afraid’ [ESV, NKJV, RSV, Tucker]; ‘were very (much) afraid’ [Limburg, Stuart]; ‘were terrified’ [NLT, Baldwin]; ‘This terrified them.’ [NIV]; ‘became extremely/exceedingly frightened’ [NAU, Wolff]; ‘became/were even more afraid’ [HCSB, NET, NRSV]; ‘were seized with terror/great-fear’ [NJB, NAB]; ‘were filled with the most dreadful fear’ [Sasson]; ‘feared a great fear’ [Lessing, Youngblood]; ‘were filled with fearsome awe’ [Allen].
- c. **because he-had-told them.** הִגִּיד {הִגִּיד} (Hifil-qatal-3ms of נָגַד {נָגַד}) “Present something prominently or meaningfully before someone: propose, announce, inform; provide an explanation.” [HALOT] “Put s.thg up conspicuously in front of s.one: put forward (an opinion &c.), report, announce, tell; explain, solve.” [Hol, 5349] “*Declare, make known, expound*, esp. of something

Commented [CJS243]: Yes. In a semi-literal translation, this is right. The SYNTAX entry gives the explanation and discusses translation.

Commented [CJS244]: This translation implies that *zoth* is functioning as a real demonstrative pronoun but the grammars would not see it that way, (though Tucker says it is anaphoric). See my comment on v. 8 about pleonastic *zeh*. It is redundant in English, but if it is represented in translation, it could be, ‘what, then, have you done?’ or ‘what ever have you done?’, with ‘what ever’ as two words. If you disagree, then then I think you should at least have a LEXICON entry to show that many translations have no equivalent and to discuss the grammars. OK: I see you have done that in the QUESTION section, but I’m leaving these comments for you to consider anyway.

Commented [CJS245]: 1.See my comment on v. 9 about fronting for focus.
2.This needs an entry in LEXICON even if only a cross reference to v. 2.

Commented [CJS246]: See my comment on v. 9 about emphasis. Tucker does not use that term here, or focus, for that matter. However, in his comments on ‘I am a Hebrew’ he uses ‘focus’ correctly.

Commented [CJS247]: An important point here is the pluperfect translation with ‘had’ which is almost universal, but note NJPS. I suggest making that point explicit, rather than letting users pick it up for the translations, and reporting any source that discusses it.

before not understood, concealed or mysterious; *avow, acknowledge, confess.*" [BDB, 5872] 'He had told *them* (so)' [KJV, ESV, NAU, NJB, RSV, NAB, Baldwin, Lessing, Limburg, Stuart, Tucker, Wolff, Youngblood]; 'he had already/previously told' [NIV, NLT, NET]; 'he had just told' [Allen]; 'now that he admitted it' [Sasson].

QUESTION— Is there any particular significance to the sequential order of statements in this verse?

The narrator may have deliberately sequenced the sentences from the end of verse 9 through verse 10, in order to maintain a close connection of concepts. In verse 9, Jonah proclaims that he "fears" Yahweh. Immediately in verse 10, the sailors fear, thus contrasting Jonah's fear. Then, the sailors express shock at Jonah's disobedience, thus connecting their shock with their fear. This effectively contrasts the sailors' piety with Jonah's impiety. [Youngblood, 79-80] Allen: The author highlights the ineffectiveness of Jonah's "fear" by immediately portraying the sailors' reaction of "fear." [Allen, ###] 210] Wolff: By shifting the sequence of statements in v.10a and v.10b, the author not only emphasizes the contrast between Jonah's confession of "fear" and the sailors' reaction of "fear," but also communicates the agitated back-and-forth conversation between the sailors and their passenger, Jonah. [Wolff, 117]

QUESTION— Does the question, 'What is this you have done?' indicate an exclamation (expressing shock and indignation), or does it actually seek more detailed information from Jonah?

All the consulted translations and commentaries identify this as an exclamation. In fact, Sasson directly states that among modern commentators, this is "almost unanimous." He identifies the reason as the obvious terror of the sailors' situation. [Sasson, 120-1] Tucker: The exclamation is positioned between two irreconcilable statements -- Jonah's confession of "fear" and Jonah's explanation of flight -- and thus expresses the astonishment of the sailors. [Tucker, 34] Wolff: It is a cry of terror. [Wolff, 116] Baldwin: It expresses astonishment that anyone would dare to respond to his god in such a way. [Baldwin, 560] Page: It expresses horror at the suicidal attempt to run from the God of heaven, who made both sea and land. [Page, 235] Note that the same form of question occurs 10 other times in the Bible (Gen. 3:13; 12:18; 26:10; 29:25; 42:28; Exod. 14:5,11; Jdg. 2:2; 15:11; Ecc. 2:2), and it never seeks additional information (with the possible exception of Gen. 42:28), but is always an exclamation. [cf. Youngblood, 79, who only refers to the 5 occurrences of the phrase with the same subject ("you" masc.sing.).] Furthermore, the interrogative מָה {מָה} is used widely in this way; "The originally interrogative מָה {מָה} is used to introduce exclamations of wonder or indignation." [GKC, 148a] Note also the exclamatory statement from the captain, "What (problem) do you have, sleeping?" in 1:6, which also begins with מָה {מָה}. Translations: 'What have you done?' [NET, NIV, Youngblood]; 'What have you done!' [Stuart, Wolff]; 'Whatever have you done!' [Baldwin]; 'What is this (that) you have done!' [ESV, RSV, Allen, Lessing]; 'What is this that you have done?' [Limburg]; 'How could you do this?' [NAU]; 'How could you have done this!' [Sasson]; 'How could you do such a thing!' [NAB]; 'Why ever did you do this?' [NJB]; 'Why have you done this?' [NKJV]; 'Oh, why did you do it?' [NLT]

QUESTION— What was the chronological sequence of statements in the conversation between the sailors

Commented [CJS248]: I appreciate that you are paraphrasing, as we discussed, but I don't find quite this in Youngblood. Their fear, yes, but not their im/piety.

Commented [CJS249]: 'deficiency' might be closer to Allen's thought.

Commented [CJS250]: Good point. It is the *zoth* that conveys the shock and indignation; see my comment above. Do any of the sources use the terminology 'real/rhetorical'? if so, it would be good to report that.

Commented [CJS251]: She has 'God'. Does it matter?

Commented [CJS252]: I think the question that Sasson is answering is, At what stage did Jonah tell them ...?' might that be a clearer way to phrase this QUESTION?
I suppose that I had assumed that he had told them much earlier but that not all of them knew.
Youngblood says that "The embedded causal clauses effectively disclose to the reader that Jonah's response recorded in 1:9b-d is merely a summary of what he shared" implying the same as Sasson.
EBC discusses two possibilities.

Sasson [121-2] enumerates the sequence of conversation as:

1. Jonah's statement in v.9.
2. A longer explanation from Jonah, explaining why he is on the ship. This is given to us at the end of v.10 simply as, 'because he had told them.'
3. The sailors then understood. This is given to us earlier in v.10 as, 'because the men knew that...'.
 4. The sailors exclaim, 'What is this you have done!'
5. The sailors then ask Jonah what to do (v.11).

DISCOURSE UNIT: ch:vv-vv

1:11 Then-they-said to-him, “What shall-we-do^a to/with^b-you(ms) so-that^c the-sea -will-become-calm^d from-against^e-us?” (Because the-sea was-going and-was-storming.)^f

SYNTAX— the-sea was-going and-was-storming. הולך ונסער {הולך ונסער} The two verbs are coordinated, idiomatically indicating a process that is increasing. “The construction of the verb הולך {הולך} ‘walk’ plus another verb describes a process that is growing stronger and stronger. Here, ‘walking and storming’ means ‘becoming more and more stormy’.” [Buth, 125] Wolff: The participle of הולך {הולך} functions as an adverb indicating a continued heightening of the second verb’s action. [Wolff, 107] Prov. 4:18 (“shining brighter and brighter”) is a clear example of this usage. Cf. BDB הולך {הולך} 4.d. Translations: ‘grew/was-growing more and more tempestuous’ [NRSV, RSV, ESV]; ‘was getting more and more stormy’ [Buth]; ‘was growing more tempestuous’ [NKJV]; ‘was/is becoming increasingly stormy/tempestuous’ [NAU, Sasson]; ‘was becoming even more stormy’ [Stuart]; ‘is growing stormier/more-stormy’ [Tucker, Lessing]; ‘was growing/getting worse and worse’ [NET, HCSB]; ‘was getting worse all the time’ [NLT]; ‘was raging more and more violently’ [Wolff]; ‘was getting/growing rougher and rougher’ [NIV, NJB, Baldwin]; ‘is getting rougher’ [Allen]; ‘went on growing agitated’ [JM 123s]; ‘was raging on relentlessly’ [Youngblood]; ‘kept on storming’ [Limburg].

LEXICON—

- What shall-we-do to/with-you** נַעֲשֶׂה {נַעֲשֶׂה} (Qal-yiqtol-1cp of עָשִׂי {עָשִׂי}) “do something to one” [BDB I.1.a.(2)], “do something for one” [BDB I.1.a.(3)]. [BDB, עָשִׂי {עָשִׂי} with ל preposition] “act, behave (towards).” [HALOT, עָשִׂי {עָשִׂי}, 12 (with ל preposition)] ‘What shall we do’ [NKJV, NRSV, ESV, Allen, Buth, Lessing, Limburg, Tucker, Wolff]; ‘What should we do’ [HCSB, NAU, NET, NIV, NLT, Stuart, JM 161m]; ‘What must we do’ [Sasson, Youngblood, JM 113m and 116e]; ‘What are we to do’ [NJB]; ‘What should be done’ [Baldwin]. Youngblood: We should understand this verb as an exhortation of necessity, i.e., “must do” [Youngblood, 80] Jouon-Muraoka lists this usage as an example of a modal nuance of obligation, i.e. “must,” and comments that the nuance “must” exists in almost every instance of a yiqtol that is used for injunction or prohibition. [JM 113m].
- What shall-we-do to/with-you** לָךְ {לָךְ} (Preposition ל + pron.-2ms) ‘to you’ [NAU, NET, NIV, NKJV, NRSV, ESV, HCSB, Baldwin, Buth, Lessing, Limburg, Sasson, Stuart, Tucker, JM 116e]; ‘with you’ [NJB, Allen, Wolff, Youngblood]. Tucker views this preposition as a “Lamed of interest” [Tucker, 36], which identifies the object for (or against) whom the verbal action is directed. [Tucker, 24]
- What shall-we-do to/with-you so-that: the-sea -will-become-calm** ׀ {׀} ‘that’ [NAU, NKJV, NRSV, ESV]; ‘so that’ [Baldwin, Lessing, Stuart, Wolff, Youngblood, JM 116e]; ‘in order that’

Commented [CJM253]: Or perhaps should I translate the idiom, and make the semi-literal read: “was getting stormier and stormier.” ???

CJS: When in doubt, I turn to the existing ES and find a similar hendiadys at Mal 1.4 where the semi-literal translation has, ‘but-we-will-return, and-we-will-rebuild’ = ‘we will build again’. I suggest leaving it as two verbs, as you have it. There is also the option of alternative translations as at Mal 1.1.

Commented [CJS254]: Did you come across anyone who specifically rejects the hendiadys reading?

Commented [CJM255]: Should this instead be in the LEXICON section?

CJS: Or, following Mal 1.4, as a QUESTION. I’m happy to leave it where you have it.

Commented [CJS256]: Add BDB’s specific rendering - *the sea was growing more and more stormy*;

Commented [CJS257]: Stuart has a footnote on ‘even more’ that might be worth reporting at an earlier point in this paragraph.

Commented [CJS258]: I think the grammars should be cited nearer the top of this paragraph, with their syntactic comment as well as the rendering if they give one. See gkc 113.u as well as jm 123.s.

Commented [CJS259]: The modality is important here, as you indicate, so I would suggest that your translation should reflect that. Perhaps, ‘what should we do’.

Commented [CJS260]: This is more a syntactic point, though it is fine here, so you should cite the grammars explaining that a weyiqtol following a question often expresses purpose or result, e.g. vdm 21.5.1.iv, p 172. As an alternative, it could go into an entry CLAUSE RELATIONSHIPS.

[Tucker]; ‘to make + **<to calm down>**’ [NET, NIV, NJB, Allen, Limburg]; ‘for + **<to calm>**’ [Sasson]; ‘**omitted + <to calm>**’ [HCSB]. The waw וְ is a general conjunction, and although it is usually translated “and,” here it should instead be translated ‘so that’. [Buth, 125] Tucker: In general, when a waw + yiqtol follows a question, it expresses a sense of purpose, as “in order that.” [Tucker, 36]

Commented [CJS261]: I see what you are doing, but does this use of angle brackets defined in ES?

- d. **so-that- the-sea -will-become-calm** וְשָׁתָק {שָׁתָק} (Qal-jussive-3ms of שָׁתָק {שָׁתָק}) “Become calm” [Hol, 8972]; “to grow silent” [HALOT, pg 1671]; “be quiet” [BDB, 10402, pg 1060]. ‘<to make> calm down’ [NET, NIV, NJB]; ‘<to make> grow calm’ [Allen]; ‘<to make> calm’ [Limburg]; ‘to calm’ [HCSB]; ‘calm its raging’ [Sasson]; ‘will calm down’ [Baldwin]; ‘will become calm’ [Stuart]; ‘may be/become calm’ [NKJV, NAU, JM 116e]; ‘may calm down’ [Lessing]; ‘may/might quiet down’ [NRSV, ESV, Tucker]; ‘might settle down’ [Youngblood]; ‘leaves us in peace’ [Wolff]. This form could be either yiqtol or jussive, but should be understood as a jussive. [Sasson, 122] Tucker: The verb is functioning modally, so the translation should convey a sense of possibility, “might.” [Tucker, 36]

Commented [CJS262]: The very brief entry in NIDOTTE is helpful.

Commented [CJS263]: Youngblood also states that it indicates purpose. Perhaps you might add that to your ‘so that’ paragraph.

Commented [CJS264]: Does this comment help? Sasson doesn’t make use of the observation.

- e. **so-that- the-sea -will-become-calm from-against-us?** מִעָלֵינוּ {מִעָלֵינוּ} See Lexicon entry (e) at 1:5, above. ‘for us’ [NAU, NET, NIV, NJB, NKJV, NRSV, ESV, Baldwin, Stuart, Youngblood, JM 133f]; ‘around us’ [Limburg, Tucker]; ‘against us’ [Sasson]; ‘from [raging] against us’ [Lessing]; ‘stop attacking us’ [Allen]; ‘leaves us in peace’ [Wolff]. Jouon-Muraoka comments, “The compound preposition מִעָל {מִעָל} is used to mark relief from a harassment,” and then gives this verse as the example. [JM 133f] Tucker identifies the preposition עָל {עָל} in this sentence as implying a locative sense, “around us,” and cites WO, 216. [Tucker, 36] Wolff envisions tall waves towering overhead, and takes the sense as “away from over us.” [Wolff, 117]

Commented [CJS265]: The context is sufficiently different that you might consider copying that material to this point and adjusting it to the new context.

Commented [CJS266]: Sasson supplies ‘its raging’ and I think you should include it here, as you do for Lessing, because on its own ‘against us’ does not make sense in this context.

- f. **Because the-sea was-going and-was-storming.** וְסָעַר {וְסָעַר} (Qal-ptcp-ms of סָעַר {סָעַר} with simple waw copulative prefix) “be stormy” [HALOT]; “rage, be violent” [Holladay]; “storm, rage” [BDB]. This is a rare word, as a Qal verb, occurring only once (Hab.3:14) outside of Jonah’s two uses (1:11,13). (It is also rare in the other binyanim.)

Commented [CJS267]: I suggest rephrasing: The Qal of this rare root occurs only once ...

Commented [CJS268]: I commented on this before.

Commented [CJS269]: Good point, but perhaps better: Is the explanatory phrase ‘...’ part of ...

QUESTION— Regarding the explanatory phrase, ‘for the sea was/is becoming increasingly stormy’ -- is that part of the sailors’ quote or is it a comment by the narrator?

- Most authorities take it as a comment by the narrator. The verbs (‘going’ and ‘being stormy’) are both participles, and allow for either past tense (in the words of the author) or present tense (in the words of the sailors). “A natural interpretation is that this clause is a comment by the author...The author repeats this comment [in 1:13]... Again, repetition is one of this author’s stylistic features.” [Buth, 125] Youngblood: This is probably an editorial remark, for two reasons. It matches the pattern of both 1:10 and 1:13, where there is an editorial remark that gives a motivation, immediately after a quotation of the sailors. Also, updates on the storm’s progress are naturally given from the author to the reader, not from characters within the story (for whom the storm’s intensity was obvious). [Youngblood, 80-1]

Commented [CJS270]: Where do Buth’s comments start? You have developed a good formalism for this, with the name at the start, as with Youngblood here.

Commented [CJS271]: In 1.10 that is true, but in 1.13 it is not a quotation of the sailors. Youngblood’s comments on 1.10 and 1.13 make slightly different points.

2. Only a few authorities take it as part of the sailors' quotation — none of the consulted English translations, and among the commentaries only Allen, Lessing, Sasson, and Tucker. Sasson notes that it is purely an interpretive choice, and then judges the phrase to be more dramatic if included within the sailors' quote, so that Jonah's response (1:12) can borrow from the sailors' own words. [Sasson, 123-4].

DISCOURSE UNIT: ch:vv-vv

1:12 Then-he-said to-them, “Pick(mp)-me-up and-hurl(mp)-me^a into the-sea, so-that/and^b the-sea will-become-calm from-against-you(mp), because I know^c that on-my-account^a this great storm [has come] against/upon-you(mp).”

SYNTAX— In the statement, ‘I know that on my account...,’ the word order places emphasis on the action “to know.” But the implications of that emphasis are open to interpretation. Tucker: It emphasizes Jonah’s awareness and — This indicates that Jonah acknowledges his responsibility. [Tucker, 38-9] The word order emphasizes Jonah’s acknowledgment of guilt. [Youngblood, 81] Buth explains that the “writer wants to mark the participle for focus” and therefore Buth glosses it as, “I really know, am sure.” [Buth, 126] See the LEXICON entry, below, for translations.

LEXICON—

- a. **Pick-me-up and-hurl-me into the-sea** הָטִילֵנִי {הָטִילֵנִי} (Hifil-impv-mp of טִיל {טִיל}, + suffix-1cs)
See the Lexicon entry for this verb in 1:4 (Yahweh hurled the wind) and 1:5 (the sailors hurled the cargo). ‘throw me’ [NAU, NET, NIV, NJB, CSB, NKJV, RSV, Stuart, Wolff]; ‘hurl me’ [ESV, NAB, Allen, Baldwin, Lessing, Limburg, Tucker]; ‘cast me’ [Sasson]; ‘cast me forth’ [KJV]; ‘fling me’ [Youngblood]. Tucker asserts that Jonah is not actually *instructing* the sailors, but rather *exhorting* them; he is trying to persuade the sailors to throw him overboard. [Tucker 37-8]
- b. **so-that/and the-sea will-become-calm** וְשָׁתַק {וְשָׁתַק} (Qal-jussive-3ms of שָׁתַק {שָׁתַק}) See Lexicon entry in 1:11. ‘Then... will become-calm/calm-down’ [NAU, NKJV, NJB]; ‘then...will quiet down’ [RSV, ESV]; ‘then...will...grow calm’ [Allen]; ‘Then...will leave...in peace’ [Wolff]; ‘and...will become-calm/calm-down’ [NIV, Baldwin, Limburg, Stuart]; ‘will calm its raging’ [Sasson]; ‘to make...quiet down’ [NET]; ‘so that...might quiet/settle down’ [Tucker, Youngblood]; ‘so that...may calm down’ [Lessing]; ‘so...may quiet down’ [HCSB]. Just as in 1:11, this verb should be considered a jussive. It gives the purpose of the preceding command. [Youngblood, 81]
- c. **because I know that on-my-account this great storm [has come] against/upon-you** יָדַעְתִּי {יָדַעְתִּי} (Qal-participle-ms of יָדַע {יָדַע}) “know” [BDB]; “notice; hear of, learn; know;...” [HALOT]. ‘know’ [all, except...]; ‘really know, am sure’ [Buth]; ‘am certain’ [Wolff]; ‘am well aware’ [Baldwin]; ‘realize’ [Youngblood]; ‘admit’ [Tucker]; ‘personally acknowledge’ [Sasson]. After noting the stress placed on the verb by the reversed word order [see SYNTAX above], Sasson adds that the verb can carry a legal sense (“to admit”) as response to a legal judgment. Jonah is thus admitting his guilt and also giving the sailors permission to throw him into the sea without incurring any blame. [Sasson, 125]
- d. **because I know that on-my-account this great storm [has come] against/upon-you** בְּשָׁלִי {בְּשָׁלִי} See LEXICON entry (d) in 1:7. ‘because of me’ [NKJV, RSV, ESV, Baldwin, Buth, Limburg, Wolff]; ‘on account of me’ [NAU]; ‘on my account’ [Lessing, Tucker, Youngblood]; ‘on my own account’ [Sasson]; ‘for my sake’ [Keil, Holladay שׁ {שׁ} pg. 355]; ‘it-is/it’s my fault’ [NET, NIV, NJB]; ‘is all my fault’ [NLT]; ‘I’m to blame’ [HCSB, Allen, Stuart].

Commented [CJS272]: You generally have an intertextual section for repeated terms.

Commented [CJS273]: Cross reference to v. 11.

Commented [CJS274]: Superscript ‘d’

Commented [CJS275]: Might this need an entry in LEXICON?

Commented [CJS276]: You appear to be committing yourself to that view. The problem is that any source which regards it as the unmarked order, as I do, would make no comment. As a result only those who see it as marked order make any comment. In fact, constituent order in Hebrew verbless clauses, especially participial clauses, is hotly debated. Your comments should be more neutral.

Commented [CJS277]: A very slippery word, as I have noted above. You can avoid it by saying something like: Some see the constituent order as marked and offer various explanations.

Commented [CJS278]: Buth avoids the term ‘emphasis’ and uses the more precise term ‘focus’.

Commented [CJS279]: 1. See my comments on the same form in v. 11. There it follows a question and here an imperative but the principles are the same. The grammars, though, may deal with it in different sections. Does any source translate differently in vv. 11 and 12? If they do, that would be noteworthy.
2. In v. 11 you used separate entries for the ‘so that’ and for from the verb. Does that matter?

Commented [CJS280]: Perhaps say, as elsewhere, ‘All translate “I know” except ...’

Commented [CJS281]: I don’t think this is quite what he is saying. Both in his translation ‘I personally (my emphasis) acknowledge’ and in his comments ‘the narrator stress Jonah’s awareness of his role’ he attributes the marked constituent order to a stress on the pronoun.

Commented [CJS282]: I have suggested there that you should add what BDB and HALOT say under *she*.

DISCOURSE UNIT: ch:vv-vv

1:13 Then- the-men -rowed^a to-bring-back^b (the ship) to the-dry-land, but they-were- not -able, because the-sea was-going and-was-storming against/upon-them.^c

SYNTAX— the-sea was-going and-was-storming. הולך וסער {הולך וסער} This is the identical construction as in 1:11; as before, the two verbs are coordinated, having the idiomatic meaning, ‘the sea was getting more and more stormy.’ See the SYNTAX entry in 1:11, above. In 1:13, several commentators note the increasing length of description of the storm (1:4, 11, and now 13) as a clue to its ever-increasing intensity [e.g., Limburg 55]. Lessing disagrees and thinks it just means that the storm continued without necessarily getting worse. [Lessing, 113] Translations: ‘grew more and more tempestuous/stormy’ [RSV, NRSV, ESV, NAB]; ‘continued to grow more tempestuous’ [NKJV]; ‘became increasingly tempestuous’ [Sasson]; ‘kept growing worse and worse’ [NET]; ‘raged...with growing intensity’ [Youngblood]; ‘was raging more and more violently’ [Baldwin, Wolff]; ‘was growing rougher and rougher’ [NJB]; ‘grew even wilder than before’ [NIV]; ‘growing even more stormy’ [Stuart]; ‘was becoming even stormier’ [NAU]; ‘was growing stormier’ [Tucker]; ‘getting rougher’ [Allen]; ‘kept on storming’ [Limburg]; ‘continued to storm’ [Lessing].

LEXICON—

- a. Then- the-men -rowed וַיִּחְדְּרוּ {וַיִּחְדְּרוּ} (Qal-wayyiqtol-3mp of חדר {חדר}) “Dig into; row (as digging into the water)” [BDB]; “break through, dig through” and specifically for our verse, “make one’s way by rowing” [Holladay]; “dig” and specifically for our verse, “work one’s way through by rowing” [HALOT]. ‘Rowed hard’ [KJV, RSV, ESV, HCSB, NJB, Lessing, Sasson]; ‘rowed hard to try’ [Limburg]; ‘rowed desperately’ [NAU, Tucker]; ‘did their best to row’ [NIV]; ‘tried to row’ [NET, Stuart]; ‘rowed’ [Allen]; ‘plied with their oars’ [Baldwin]; ‘bent to their oars’ [Wolff]; ‘dug in’ [Youngblood]. Sasson: The root has a basic meaning “to burrow, hollow out, dig.” In this verse, we could take it as the sailors trying to “break through” the storm’s waves. [Sasson, 130]
- b. Then- the-men -rowed to-bring-back (the ship) to the-dry-land לָשׁוּב {לָשׁוּב} (Hifil-inf.const. of שׁוּב {שוב}) “Cause to return, bring back; restore” [BDB]; “bring/lead/carry back; cause s.one to go/come back; take/guide s.one back; put back; restore; let onesf. be turned back” [Holladay]. ‘to bring the ship back’ [RSV, NRSV, Baldwin, Sasson]; ‘to get the ship back’ [Allen]; ‘to return (the boat/ship)’ [Buth, Lessing]; ‘to get the ship to the land’ [NLT]; ‘to bring it’ [KJV]; ‘to return’ [NAU, NKJV, Limburg, Tucker, Youngblood]; ‘to get back’ [ESV, HCSB]; ‘to reach’ [NJB, Wolff]; ‘row back’ [NET, NIV, Stuart]. Buth points out that the Hifil verb here (לָשׁוּב {לָשׁוּב}) means ‘to return something’ and implies a direct object, whereas the Qal verb (שׁוּב {שוב}) would mean ‘to go back, return’. Although they are related, they are distinct words. [Buth, 126] See the QUESTION below, about the unstated object, usually ‘the ship,’ in translations.
- c. the-sea was-going and-was-storming against/upon-them. עָלֵיהֶם {עָלֵיהֶם} (Preposition על {על} + suffix-3mp) “on, over; in front of; because of; with regard to; onto; against” [Holladay]; “upon;

Commented [CJS283]: Perhaps add LEXICON with cross reference to 1.9.

Commented [CJS284]: It may be worth segregating those translations that bring out the idea of ‘trying’ from those that are more straightforward, and noting the difference.

Commented [CJS285]: Hiphil, but I think I’ve flagged this before.

Commented [CJS286]: The intransitive rendering looks to me as though they have read a Qal instead of a Hiphil. Does anyone discuss this as a possibility? There’s nothing in CTP so I guess probably not. Perhaps add half a sentence to the QUESTION along the lines of: Intransitive renderings might suggest that they have read a Qal but no one comments to that effect. If there is any evidence of deliberate emendation, then you need a TEXT entry.

on account of; concerning; above, over, towards, against” [BDB]. ‘against them’ [RSV, NRSV, ESV, NKJV, NAU, Baldwin, Lessing, Limburg, Wolff, Youngblood]; ‘on them’ [Stuart]; ‘resisting their efforts’ [Allen]; ‘around them’ [Sasson, Tucker]; *omitted* [NET, NAB, NJB, NIV]. Tucker identifies this as a “locative sense” of the preposition and thus translates ‘around them.’ [Tucker, 41] Wolff: it indicates that the storm is worse and is now acting specifically counter to the sailors’ efforts. [Wolff, 119]

QUESTION— What is the unstated object that the men tried to ‘bring back’ to land?

The Hebrew verb is transitive, but there is no explicit object. Most versions and commentators alter the verb to an intransitive and thus do not supply an object. However, some commentators and translations retain the transitive verb and supply an explicit object. Buth takes care to point out that the specific Hebrew verb logically requires an object [Buth, 126] -- see Lexicon entry (b), above.

1. **The ship.** Those who identify the unstated object as the ship are Buth [126], Sasson [130], Baldwin [562], and Lessing [113]. In addition, the following translations **make clear** that the ship is the object: RSV, NRSV, NLT, KJV, and Allen.
2. **Jonah.** Because this comes immediately after v.12, it has in mind specifically Jonah, rather than the ship and crew. [Wolff, 119]
3. **Unstated.** Most translations choose wording that avoids stating any object.
 - 3.1. Many translations render the verb ‘to bring back’ as an intransitive. E.g., “...rowed **to return** to land...” [NAU] [Also LXX, ESV, NJB, HCSB, NKJV, NAB, Limburg, Tucker, Wolff, Youngblood]
 - 3.2. Some translations render the verb ‘to bring back’ as an adverb modifying the primary verb ‘rowed.’ E.g., “...tried to row **back** to land...” [NET] [Also NIV, Stuart]

Commented [CJS287]: See my comment above about intransitive renderings.

Commented [CJS288]: Also K&D

Commented [CJS289]: How? I assume the supply either ‘the ship’ or ‘it’.

DISCOURSE UNIT: ch:vv-vv

1:14 Then-they-cried^a to Yahweh; and-they-said, “Oh-please,^b Yahweh, please^c may-we- not -perish on-account-of^d (the)-person^e(-of) this man. And do- not -set(ms)^f against/upon-us innocent blood,

(MT₁) because you(ms) (are) Yahweh;

(MT₂) because you(ms), (O) Yahweh —

just-as you(ms)-desire/have-desired,^g you(ms)-do/have-done.”

INTERTEXTUAL REFERENCE— In the final sentence, there may be a reference to Ps. 135:6 and/or Ps. 115:3. [Wolff, 120; Baldwin, 562]

SYNTAX— The sailors’ first plea uses a 1st-person cohortative verb, ‘Please may-we- not -perish.’ However, in almost all translations, this is conveyed as a 2nd-person appeal to Yahweh, ‘Do not let us perish.’ Translations: ‘Do not let us perish/die’ [NAU, NET, NIV, NJB, NKJV, NRSV, HCSB; Allen, Baldwin, Limburg, Lessing, Stuart, Tucker, Wolff]; ‘let us not perish’ [KJV, RSV, ESV]; ‘do not have us perish’ [Sasson]; ‘don’t make us die’ [NLT]; ‘don’t destroy us’ [Youngblood]; ‘may we not perish (= do not make us perish)’ [JM 114f]

SYNTAX— There is a syntactic ambiguity at the beginning of the last line. אַתָּה יְהוָה {אַתָּה יְהוָה} (literally ‘you(ms) Yahweh’) could be construed as a nominal sentence, ‘You are Yahweh,’ or it could be construed as a vocative ‘O Yahweh’ following the nominative pronoun ‘You(ms)’ which functions as the redundant subject of the final verb ‘you have done.’ In either case, this appears to be a confession by the sailors of some degree of faith.

OPTION	TRANSLATION	SENTENCE STRUCTURE	COMMENT
Nominal sentenceclause	You are Yahweh. Just as you have desired, you have done.	Two sentences. The first is a simple nominal sentence. The second is a verbal sentence with an adverbial phrase “just as you desired,” which is emphasized by placing it at front.	The nominal sentence highlights God’s name. This is how the Masoretes grouped the words.
Vocative	You, O Yahweh – just as you have desired – have done [this].	One sentence. The pronoun ‘you(ms)’ is an explicit subject of the final verb, ‘have done.’ It is not emphasized. ^a God’s name is vocative, ‘O Yahweh.’ The adverbial phrase, ‘just as you	This would be the only sentence (in Jonah) that has three items moved in front of the verb (‘you,’ ‘O Yahweh,’ and ‘just as you desired’).

^a “In Hebrew, when two items of a clause are placed in front of the verb, it is normal for the first item to relate to the context or to provide a setting for what is about to be stated, a *link*. A second item in front of the verb is then the main point, and marked as focus.” [Buth, 243n4]

Commented [CJS290]: I think this needs an entry in LEXICON or possibly SYNTAX, since there are two possibilities – noun-adjective, as here, and construct pair.

Commented [CJS291]: I think she suggests only that they ‘connect’ so ‘reference’ is stronger than she claims. I don’t know about Wolff.

Commented [CJS292]: This is an excellent point, well set out. My comments are only on matters of detail.

Commented [CJS293]: Is this your comment? I would respond, how else could the Masoretes have marked the verse? There needs to be something like a zaqef between the athnah and the silluq and where else could it go? Sasson disagrees but does not address my objection.

Commented [CJS297]: I would regard a vocative as an extra-clausal element, embedded in the clause, so really there are at most only two items. I don’t have the book, but I suspect that is how Buth counts the pre-verbal constituents and gets to two.

Commented [CJS294]: In other work, when עֲשֵׂה has no object, I have used ‘act’ as an intransitive translation equivalent (cf. BDB p. 794a, sense I.4). What do you think? Or are you following those who assume an unexpressed object having a specific referent?

Commented [CJS295]: It’s that slippery term again. According to your footnote, this is not quite what Buth says. He avoids that term and uses more precise terminology. By the way, are footnotes permitted in ES? I’m not suggesting putting it in the Table, but perhaps moving it to the text below the Table.

		desired' probably carries the primary emphasis, based upon position in the sentence.	
--	--	--	--

Commented [CJS296]: 'is focal' as Buth says.

The versions universally render it with the vocative, as do many commentators [Allen, Baldwin, Lessing, Stuart, Tribble]. However, the following authorities take it as a nominal sentence: Buth[150], Limburg[56], Sasson[135], Tucker[43], Wolff[120], Youngblood[83]. Sasson notes that the nominal sentence is indicated by the MT accent marks; he considers it an important emphasis on God's name, and laments the failure of most translations to account for this. [Sasson, 135] To explain: the MT accents link "You(ms)" with "Yahweh" and then create a large separation between "Yahweh" and "just as."

Commented [CJS298]: Stuart notes the alternative in a footnote.

LEXICON—

- a. **Then-they-cried to Yahweh.** וַיִּקְרָא {וַיִּקְרָאוּ} (Qal-wayyiqtol-3mp of קרא {קרא}) HALOT gives the "basic meaning" of the Qal verb as "to draw attention to oneself by loudness of the voice." Then it specifically lists "call on, shout to a deity." [HALOT, קרא {קרא} Qal, 9] 'call; call on, appeal to' [Holladay]; 'call, cry, utter a loud sound; call unto; cry for help' [BDB]. 'cried out to' [NET, NIV, NKJV, NRSV; Limburg, Tucker, Youngblood]; 'cried to' [RSV; Baldwin]; 'called out to' [ESV; Lessing]; 'called to' [Stuart, Wolff]; 'called on/upon' [NAU, NJB; Allen]; 'appealed to' [Sasson]. Sasson takes the verb + preposition phrase as idiomatic for appealing to a deity. [Sasson, 131] The two verbs, קרא {קרא} followed by אמר {אמר} (which we have in this verse) can form a frame for quotations, most-often of humans to God. [Tucker, 41] In a book so given to repeated vocabulary, it is worth noting that this verb, קרא {קרא}, when the sailors appeal to Yahweh, is different than the verb, צעק {צעק}, in 1:5 when they frantically appealed to their own gods. It is, however, the same verb to which the captain exhorts Jonah to pray, in 1:6. (It is also one of the two verbs used in Jonah's poem, 2:2 [2:3 Hebrew].)
- b. **and-they-said, "Oh-please, Yahweh, אָנָּה {אָנָּה} "oh, please, I pray" [Holladay]; strong particle of entreaty, "Ah, now! I (or We) beseech thee/you!" [BDB, TWOT]; "please" [HALOT]. 'O/Oh please' [NET; Limburg]; 'Please' [NIV, NRSV, HCSB; Buth, Sasson, Tucker]; 'We pray' [NKJV; Lessing]; 'We earnestly pray' [NAU]; 'We beseech thee' [KJV, RSV]; 'We implore you' [Allen]; 'We beg of you' [Youngblood]; omitted [NJB, ESV; Baldwin, Stuart, Wolff]. It is an expression of terrified dismay. [Baldwin, 562]**
- c. **"Oh-please, Yahweh, please may-we- not -perish נָא {נָא} "Enclitic particle of urgency, translation difficult to specify, e.g. 'please' (come in), 'do' (come in), 'just' (listen to me)..." [Holladay]; "particle of entreaty or exhortation, I (we) 'pray,' 'now' (enclitic)." [BDB]; "I (we) pray; now." Particle of entreaty or exhortation." [TWOT]; "particle giving emphasis" [HALOT]. After the first entreaty particle (see Lexicon (b), above), most translations completely omit this**

Commented [CJS299]: I agree that Sasson appears to say this, but I don't think he can mean it. At 1.2, he discusses 3.2 which is a counter-example. A quick search also gives Gen 3:9; 19:5; 21:17; 22:11; 22:15; 28:1 without even getting to the end of Genesis. He must be saying something slightly different but I can't see what.

Commented [CJS300]: He actually says 'frequently' but I think your 'most often' makes a stronger claim. I suggest just 'often'.

Commented [CJS301]: Some, but not all, of the rest of this paragraph seems to come from Sasson, p. 131. Is the rest of it yours? The source should be made clearer. Does anyone else discuss this?

Commented [CJS302]: Youngblood also comments on both this and the second particle, calling them 'deferential particles'.

Commented [CJS303]: Their word order does suggest that they omit the first particle and translate the second, but if that is right, you should say that under the second, lexicon c, below.

Commented [CJS304]: Her translation only has the one 'please' but here she discusses both. That needs to be clearer.

Commented [CJS305]: Sasson claims, p 132, that the particle is vestigial, makes no difference and can be ignored in translation.

second entreaty particle, probably viewing it either as part of an imperatival phrase (“don’t let us die”) or as redundant -- or perhaps choosing to strengthen the opening entreaty because of it. But some authorities do give it explicit translation: ‘We pray, O LORD, please’ [NKJV]; ‘We beg of you, YHWH! Please’ [Youngblood]; ‘We implore you, Yahweh, please’ [Allen]; ‘We beseech thee, O LORD, we beseech thee’ [KJV]; ‘Please, O LORD, we pray’ [NRSV]. Elsewhere in the Bible, there are only two other uses of אֵלֶּיךָ {אֵלֶיךָ} (i.e., the combination of the negation particle and this entreaty particle) followed by a cohortative: 2 Sam. 13:25 (‘We shouldn’t all go’) and Job 32:21 (‘Let me not lift’ or ‘I will not lift’). With a jussive instead of a cohortative, there are 14 more instances, almost always carrying the sense of entreaty, “Please...not...” For the jussive, Holladay gives Gen. 13:8 as an exemplar and renders, “(for goodness’ sake) let there be no...” [Holladay, אֵלֶּיךָ {אֵלֶיךָ}, 6.b.]

d. **on-account-of (the)-person(-of) this man.** אֵלֶּיךָ {אֵלֶיךָ} This common preposition has a wide range of meanings, but the only applicable senses are ‘together with’ and ‘because of, for the sake of’ [Holladay, אֵלֶּיךָ {אֵלֶיךָ}, 12a and 18]; “with a causal force, ‘through; on account of” [BDB, אֵלֶּיךָ {אֵלֶיךָ}, III.5, which lists our verse]. ‘on account of’ [NAU, NET, NRSV; Lessing, Stuart, Youngblood]; ‘because of’ [HCSB, Limburg, Sasson, Tucker, Wolff]; ‘for the sake of’ [NJB]; ‘for’ [KJV, RSV, ESV]; ‘for taking’ [NIV, NAB; Baldwin]; ‘to pay for’ [Allen]. Sasson explicitly rejects the idea of reading it as ‘together with.’ [Sasson, 133] Wolff acknowledges the possibility of ‘together with,’ but discounts it as less probable. [Wolff, 119]

e. **on-account-of (the)-person(-of) this man.** נֶפֶשׁ {נֶפֶשׁ} ‘living being; man; person’ [Holladay]; ‘living being, life, self, person’ [BDB]; “people, person; personality, personal preference; soul as the centre and transmitter of feelings and perceptions, longing, desire, morale, feeling, intent, volition.” [HALOT]. TWOT states that the more common meanings are “life, soul, creature, person, appetite, mind.” It can refer to an “appetite” or “desire,” and thence to the possessor of an appetite, a “soul.” TWOT continues, “Since personal existence by its very nature involves drives, appetites, desires, [and] will, nepesh denotes the ‘life’ of an individual...It adds an intensely personal element to the notion of ‘self’...In some passages, nepesh is best translated ‘life’, but ‘life’ here denotes the living self with all its drives, not the abstract notion.” Also, in passages involving the saving of a נֶפֶשׁ {נֶפֶשׁ}, it is “equivalent to the person.” [TWOT] ‘life’ [NAU, NIV, NJB, KJV, RSV, ESV; Allen, Baldwin, Buth, Limburg, Lessing, Stuart, Tucker, Wolff]; ‘person’ [Sasson]; omitted [NET; Youngblood]. The word is very flexible and relies upon the context and/or associated words, to decide the specific sense. [Sasson, 133] Youngblood takes the phrase as idiomatic for ‘this individual.’ [Youngblood, 83] Several authorities point out that the Greek concept of a “soul” did not enter Hebrew thinking this early. [Baldwin, 562] As a possible sense, Holladay lists the “breath” that makes a living being, but emphasizes that this is distinctly different from the Greek idea of “soul.”

f. **And do- not -set against/upon-us innocent blood** תַּחַן עֲלֵינוּ {תַּחַן עֲלֵינוּ} (Qal-jussive-2ms of נתן

Commented [CJS306]: I take it that this is from you, not a source. Does it really help much?

Commented [CJS307]: I suggest adding HALOT, senses 12? and 19.
At some suitable point, perhaps add a comment from Tucker, p 42, that it indicates cause.

Commented [CJS308]: His footnote has ‘for taking’.

Commented [CJS309]: This seems to imply that he reads the beth as beth of price = HALOT, sense 17, BDB sense 3. The English ‘for’ alone, as KJV etc., could be taken to imply this, but need not.

Commented [CJS310]: Since the overwhelming majority translate ‘life’ why have you chosen person? I am sure you had good reason to dissent from the majority, but I would have stuck with it.

Commented [CJS311]: BDB lists this reference at p 659b, under sense 3.c. This should be added.

Commented [CJS312]: Hebrew or translit style.

Commented [CJS313]: Some of this material from TWOT does not fit the present context so could be omitted.

Commented [CJS314]: On p 133, it looks to me as though Sasson is using ‘person’ as the equivalent of the whole phrase, נֶפֶשׁ אִישׁ, not just of נֶפֶשׁ.

Commented [CJS315]: NET does not explain what it was doing, but I think Youngblood uses ‘this man’ for the whole phrase, as you note below. is this starting to suggest that you might consider using one entry for the whole phrase?

Commented [CJS316]: Specify הָאִישׁ הַזֶּה בְּנֶפֶשׁ

Commented [CJS317]: This point is sufficiently important to pile up authorities who hold this view, so add all those who do.

Commented [CJS318]: Is this relevant to this context? English ‘breath’ is used metonymically for ‘life’ but that doesn’t help.

Commented [CJS319]: Somehow or other, we need to direct people away from ‘soul’ as a translation for *nepesh*. Have you come across anything that would do that?

{נתנ}, followed by prep. על {על} + sfx-1cp) 'set, put, lay' [Holladay נתנ {נתנ} 12]; 'requite to' [BDB נתנ {נתנ} 1.v.] and 'put <something> upon <someone>' [BDB נתנ {נתנ} 2.b.]. 'set, place, lay; set against; add to; lay blood(guilt) on' with prep. על {על} [HALOT נתנ {נתנ} 12 & 12b] 'put/lay...on/upon us' [NAU, KJV, RSV, ESV; Tucker]; 'place/lay against us' [Baldwin, Lessing]; 'burden us' [Wolff]; 'hold us accountable/responsible' [NIV, NJB; Stuart, Youngblood]; 'assess against us' [Sasson]; 'charge us' [NKJV, NAB, HCSB]; 'hold us guilty' [NET; Limburg]; 'make us guilty' [NRSV]; 'punish us' [Allen].

- g. just-as you-desire/have-desired, you-do/have-done. תפצת {תפצת} (Qal-qatal-2ms of תפצ {תפצ}) 'want, desire, be willing' [Holladay]; 'delight in, have pleasure in' [BDB 2.a.]; 'to experience emotional delight' [TWOT]; 'take pleasure in, desire; be willing; feel inclined.' [HALOT] 'pleased' (active voice: 'You pleased') [NET, NIV, HCSB, Youngblood]; 'have pleased' (active voice) [NAU]; 'pleased' (passive voice: 'it pleased you') [NRSV, ESV, NKJV]; 'have purposed' [Baldwin]; 'have desired' [Tucker]; 'desired' [NAB]; 'wanted' [Stuart]; 'saw fit' [NJB]; 'wish' [Limburg]; 'want' [Buth]; 'please' (active voice) [Lessing]; 'pleases' (passive) [Wolff]; 'desire' [Sasson]. For discussion of the referent and the nuance of time/tense, see the last QUESTION, below.

QUESTION— To what do the sailors refer with the phrase, 'on account of the person of this man'?

1. The future action of throwing Jonah overboard, thus presumably killing him. [Most commentators seem to assume this; specific comments by Baldwin, 562; Bruckner, 48]
2. Jonah himself; Jonah's presence on their ship. [Youngblood, 83; Trible, 148]
3. Guilt that has accrued to the sailors because of what Jonah has already done. [Sasson, 132]
4. Jonah's guilt itself. [Targum]

QUESTION— Given that the sailors have tried their best to avoid killing Jonah and that Jonah himself has told them to kill him, why then do the sailors request, 'Do not set against us innocent blood'?

1. The sailors fear that they might still be held responsible, even though Yahweh intends Jonah's death. Murder is a criminal offense against Yahweh, as it would be against any worshipper's god. [Sasson, 132; Bruckner, 48; Page, 236-7; Alexander, 117] They fear the capriciousness of the gods, so that perhaps later Jonah's god might hold them responsible. [Youngblood, 83]
 - 1.1. In addition, they fear being condemned for executing Jonah without a full trial. [Allen, ###; 211; Baldwin, 562; Stuart, 463]
2. The sailors understand that Yahweh intends to punish Jonah, but they are not certain that it means death; it could be a lesser punishment. It is only Jonah's instruction that states he should be killed, and the sailors have no way to judge if this is correct and acceptable to Yahweh. [Wolff, 120; Baldwin, 562]
3. The sailors are not sure that Jonah is indeed guilty; if he turns out to be innocent, then they ask to not be held responsible. [Trible, 148]

Commented [CJS320]: Final form of nun as elsewhere in this paragraph.

Commented [CM321]: This brings up a question: there are often verb + preposition combinations with specialized meanings. It seems reasonable to treat these together, instead of as separate entries. ???

CJS: If there is a good reason, as there is such as here, where they are not separated in some of the translations, I would say, yes, definitely. For example, 'hold us accountable' has no equivalent for the preposition and I would not want to suggest say that 'hold' is a widely suitable equivalent for *ntn*.

Commented [CJS322]: BDB also has something useful under 'al at 756b, sense II > 7.a.(b), 'of retribution, reproach, the Divine wrath, etc.'

Commented [CJS323]: Can you make it clear that HALOT cites our verse explicitly, here. Perhaps move the 'with prep. על' to precede 'lay blood(guilt) on' to make it clearer that this rendering only applies with the prep.

Commented [CJS324]: NIDOTTE, vol 2, p233, claims that this is a legal formula. is that worth reporting?

Commented [CJS325]: Final form of tsade.

Commented [CJS326]: HALOT assigns our verse to sense 4, 'to be willing'.

Commented [CJS327]: It's probably clearer just to include the pronoun in these rendering than to specify active/passive: 'you pleased' or 'you have pleased'.

Commented [CJS328]: I would have described 'it pleased you' as impersonal rather than passive.

Commented [CJS329]: Both my copies of NAB has 'as you saw fit'.

Commented [CJS330]: This needs a bit of explanation. Can you quote an English translation? That would probably be enough.

Commented [CJS331]: This is true but I don't find it in Sasson or Alexander and I don't have the other two.

Commented [CJS332]: Perhaps better, 'proper'?

QUESTION— Why do the sailors refer to Jonah as ‘innocent’?

1. Jonah has committed no serious crime against the sailors; he is innocent in his relationship to the sailors, though not in his relationship to Yahweh. [Bruckner, 48; Lessing, 114]
2. Jonah has not actually been convicted in a trial, so he is not officially guilty. [Baldwin, 562; Stuart, 463-4]
3. The sailors are worried that Jonah might be innocent. [Limburg, 56]
4. Jonah is not called ‘innocent;’ instead ‘innocent’ refers to the action of executing Jonah. [Tucker, 43; Wolff, 120]

QUESTION— In the verse’s final statement, to what are the sailors referring — to the specific actions Yahweh recently took against Jonah (‘just as you have desired, you have done *with respect to Jonah*’), or to a universal truth (‘Just as you desire, you *always* do’)?

1. The statement refers to the specific actions that Yahweh took against Jonah.
 - 1.1. The statement refers to the specific divine act of indicating Jonah by the result of casting lots. [Tucker, 44; Goldman, 141]
 - 1.2. The statement refers to the act of killing Jonah; the sailors will physically do it, but they acknowledge that they are merely the agents of Yahweh. [Stuart, 464]
2. The statement refers to the universal truth of Yahweh’s sovereignty; Yahweh always does what he desires to do. In proverbial statements, Hebrew allows the use of a past perfective tense (e.g., the qatal in this verse) in reference to a description that is valid at all times. [Buth, 150] Here, the verb denotes an existing state, a present tense with iterative meaning. [Wolff, 120] The verbs are timeless, gnomic. [Lessing, 115]. As evidenced in their translations, Limburg and Sasson agree.

Commented [CJS333]: Tucker has a syntactic comment which could go in the LEXICON entry I suggested above.

DISCOURSE UNIT: ch:vv-vv

1:15 Then-they-lifted Jonah. Then-they-hurled-him into the-sea. Then- the-sea -stood-still^a from-its-raging.^b

INTERTEXTUAL REFERENCE— This is Jonah's fourth and final use of the verb הָטִיל {הַטִּיל} "to hurl" (cf. 1:4, 5, 12).

LEXICON—

- a. **Then- the-sea -stood-still from-its-raging.** וַיֵּעַמֵּד {וַיַּעֲמֵד} (Qal-wayyiqtol-3ms of עָמַד {עָמַד}) "Stand, take one's stand; stand still, stop moving" [Holladay]; "take one's stand, stand; stand still, stop; be inactive; cease doing a thing" [BDB]; "stand in position; remain standing, be motionless, come to a halt, stay, stand firm." [HALOT] 'stopped' [NAU, NET, NJB, HCSB, NKJV, NRSV, NAB, Baldwin, Limburg, Stuart, Wolff]; 'ceased' [RSV, ESV, Lessing, Tucker, Youngblood]; 'curbed' [Sasson]; 'grew calm' [NIV].
- b. **Then- the-sea -stood-still from-its-raging.** וַיִּפֹּץ {וַיִּפְּץ} This word can be identified as either a noun or a verb, though the meaning will be virtually identical, generally translated 'its raging.' If a noun, it is the noun וַיִּפֹּץ {וַיִּפְּץ} with possessive suffix-3ms. If a verb, it is the Qal-inf.constr. of וַיִּפֹּץ {וַיִּפְּץ}, with suffix-3ms. BDB classifies it as a noun, 'storming, raging, rage.' HALOT and Holladay classify it as a verb, 'rage against.' Other authorities who classify it as a noun include: Buth[150], Sasson[137], Tucker[45], and Youngblood[84]. Those who classify it as a verb include: GKC[61c] and Limburg[57]. Wolff[121] concludes it is probably a verb, based upon comparison of a similar construction in Gen.29:35 and 30:9, 'she stopped from bearing [children].' 'its raging' [NAU, HCSB, ESV, NKJV, NRSV, Allen, Baldwin, Buth, Limburg, Tucker, Youngblood]; 'its fury' [Sasson]; 'its anger' [Lessing]; 'raging' [NET, NJB, NAB, Stuart]; 'roaring' [Wolff].

QUESTION— Is there any significance in the change of verb from vv. 11 and 12 ('become calm') to this verse ('stood still')?

In v.15 the verb shows that the sea's action is involuntary; its movements are restricted by God; but in v.11, the verb in the sailors' quotation implies that they envision the sea as the agent putting them in danger. [Sasson, 136-7]

QUESTION— How long did it take for the sea to become calm?

1. It was immediate. [Alexander, Baldwin, Stuart, Youngblood]
2. It is unclear, but the reader is encouraged to think that it was immediate. [Sasson, 136]

Commented [CJS334]: Perhaps LEXICON with just a cross reference.

Commented [CJS335]: I suggest something brief on the function of min, but I'm not sure whether it should be SYNTAX or LEXICON because it introduces an adjunct of 'md.

Commented [CJS336]: BDB has a range of senses, but assigns this instance to 2.d 'stop, cease doing a thing'.

Commented [CJS337]: HALOT has our verse under sense 1.b 'to stand away from, stop' in a metaphorical sense when found with min.

Commented [CJS338]: Here, I don't think we need the reason but just the conclusion, '... and Wolff [121].

DISCOURSE UNIT: ch:vv-vv

1:16 Then- the-men -feared^a Yahweh (a) great fear. Then-they-sacrificed^b (a) sacrifice to-Yahweh. Then-they-vowed^c vows.

INTERTEXTUAL REFERENCE— This is the third time that the sailors are said to have “feared” (cf. v.5 and v.10). Most commentators observe that the narrator uses a literary technique of lengthening the statement about “fear” at each occurrence, thereby illustrating how the sailors’ fear grew and/or transformed. V.5 ‘feared.’ V.10 ‘feared a great fear.’ V.16 ‘feared Yahweh a great fear.’ Several commentators observe additionally that there is an intentional contrast between Jonah’s statement of “fearing” Yahweh (v.9) and the sailors’ final “fear” of Yahweh (v.16). Jonah merely repeated familiar words in lip service, whereas the sailors earnestly worshiped Yahweh, whom they had newly discovered. [See esp. Baldwin, 563.]

INTERTEXTUAL REFERENCE— Note the continued repetition of the adjective ‘great.’ (See 1:2, above.)

TEXT— BHS and a few commentators suggest deleting Yahweh’s name from the first sentence. The apparent motivation for this suggestion is the grammatical awkwardness of having two accusatives (‘a great fear’ and ‘Yahweh’); see SYNTAX below. However, there is no manuscript [or versional](#) evidence for this emendation, [and](#) most commentators agree that it is unwarranted [and all of the modern translations surveyed include it](#).

SYNTAX— In the first sentence, ‘Then the men feared Yahweh a great fear,’ there are two accusatives. JM labels ‘Yahweh’ as an “affected object” and ‘fear’ an “internal object.” Both explains that Yahweh is the more significant object and that ‘a great fear’ can be translated adverbially. [Both, 151n18]. As both JM and Both translate the sentence, the word ‘with’ is inserted to make the noun ‘fear’ function adverbially: ‘they feared Yahweh with a great fear’ [JM, 125uN54; [also Youngblood](#)]. This is [identical to Youngblood and](#) similar to ‘were seized by great/a-powerful fear’ [NAB, Sasson]; and ‘worshiped Yahweh with great worship’ [Lessing]. However, most translators render ‘a great fear’ as a simple adverb: ‘feared the Lord *greatly*’ [NAU, NET, NIV, Baldwin, Limburg] or ‘*exceedingly*’ [KJV, RSV, ESV], or ‘*even more*’ [NRSV, Tucker]. Somewhat paraphrastic renderings include ‘were seized with dread of Yahweh’ [NJB]; ‘were awestruck’ [NLT]; ‘arrived at great fear’ [Wolff]; ‘were filled with fearsome awe’ [Allen]; ‘really believed in’ [Stuart]. The LXX makes the phrase ‘great fear’ dative, and the NETS translation renders it ‘feared the Lord *in great fear*,’ while Sasson translates the LXX as ‘feared the Lord *very greatly*.’ Furthermore, Sasson asserts that the sequence of words is not significant; ‘a great fear’ is located near the verb merely because of Hebrew grammatical habit. [Sasson, 137; Lessing, 115]

INTERCLAUSAL RELATIONS— The NET version’s footnotes on this verse suggest that the two actions of sacrificing and vowing form a [hendiadys](#) – that is, the two phrases communicate one idea: ‘they earnestly vowed to sacrifice lavishly.’ However, none of the other consulted versions combine the two actions; among the commentaries, the only translation that combines the two verbs in any way is Sasson, ‘Offering sacrifices to the Lord, they made him solemn promises.’ Page does adopt the same view as the NET, though he doesn’t provide his own translation. [Page, 238]

LEXICON—

Commented [CJS339]: Perhaps (with)

Commented [CJS340]: This is what he says, so don’t change anything. However, he contradicts himself on p 138 by making a point that YHWH is at the end of the clause. If what he says on p 137 is right, then the constituent order is the default, unmarked, order so it is illegitimate to claim that the position of YHWH is significant. You see the confusion that arises from older uses of that slippery term emphasis.

Commented [CJS341]: You might add something from Tucker, p 46, about sequential vs. simultaneous. I don’t think he is implying hendiadys, though.

Commented [CJS342]: It may be worth noting the Sasson, p 139, considers hendiadys, though he does not use the term, but he explicitly rejects it.

a. **Then- the-men -feared** Yahweh (a) great fear. **{נִירָאוּ}** נִירָאוּ See discussion in INTERTEXTUAL REFERENCE, above, as well as at 1:5 and 1:10. For translations, see SYNTAX, above. Limburg concludes that the author is playing on the different meanings of the Hebrew verb; in v.5 and v.10, the sense is “to be afraid,” but in v.9 and here in v.16, the sense is to revere and honor Yahweh in a proper attitude. [Limburg, 57]

b. **Then-they-sacrificed** (a) sacrifice to-Yahweh. **{נִזְבְּחוּ}** נִזְבְּחוּ (Qal-wayyiqtol-3mp of זָבַח {זָבַח}) “To slaughter; to slaughter for a communal sacrifice” [HALOT]; “slaughter; slaughter for a (communion) sacrifice” [Holladay]; “slaughter for sacrifice” [BDB]. ‘offered a sacrifice’ [all except...]; ‘offered him a sacrifice’ [NLT]; ‘offered sacrifice to the LORD’ [NAB]; ‘offer lavish sacrifices’ [NET]; ‘sacrifice lavishly’ [NET footnote]. HALOT indicates that the verb + noun (“to sacrifice sacrifices”) is equivalent to the verb alone.

c. **Then-they-vowed** vows. **{נִדְּרוּ}** נִדְּרוּ (Qal-wayyiqtol-3mp of נָדָר {נָדָר}) “To perform a vow, keep a promise, a special achievement; to make a solemn promise” [HALOT]; “make a vow (promise a special deed)” [Holladay]; “vow” [BDB]. ‘made vows’ [all except...]; ‘vowed vows’ [Baldwin, Lessing, Limburg, Youngblood]; ‘earnestly vowed’ [NET]; ‘made...solemn promises’ [Sasson]; ‘vowed to serve him’ [NLT]. The verb is usually (but not always) used as it is here in Jonah — in conjunction with the noun “vow(s).” HALOT indicates that the verb + noun (“to vow a vow”) is the older form of usage, and the verb alone is a subsequent development of the same.

QUESTION— Is there any significance to the repetition of roots in the verb-noun pairs (“feared a fear,” “sacrificed a sacrifice,” and “vowed vows”)?

1. Yes, this construction adds emphasis in all three sentences. In the first sentence, it is a “cognate accusative construction” and means that they “greatly feared” the Lord. In the second and third sentences, it forms “an emphatic effected accusative” which emphasizes their earnestness and zeal in making sacrifices and vows. [NET footnote]
2. Only in the first sentence, where it focuses on intensity of action; in the latter two sentences, it is without meaning. Discussing the first sentence, Tucker refers back to 1:10 noting that this repetitive construction describes the intensity of the verbal idea. [Tucker, 33] However for the latter two sentences, he asserts that the same construction appears to lack any semantic value. [Tucker, 46] Cf. HALOT’s notation that the verb + noun combination “to sacrifice sacrifices” is equivalent to the verb alone; and HALOT’s notation that the verb “to vow” used alone is a chronological development from the verb + noun “to vow a vow.”

QUESTION— When and where did the sailors offer a sacrifice to Yahweh?

1. Onboard the ship, immediately. [Sasson, 137-138-140; Wolff, 121] There is evidence that in ancient times, animal sacrifices were routinely made onboard ships. [Sasson, 139]
2. Later, when they reached land. [Stuart, 464; Walton, 473; probable solution: Youngblood, 85] Stuart observes that throughout the Ancient Near East, the practice was to offer sacrifices at temples and shrines. [Stuart, 464-5] Multiple commentators argue that they couldn’t have had any animals on board to be sacrificed, since they had previously jettisoned all the cargo.

Commented [CJS343]: 1. What would you think about underlining the cognate noun and treating them as a phrase in this paragraph? Perhaps similarly, in the next two entries.
2. Baldwin, p 561, uses the phrase ‘and all of the modern translations surveyed include it’ – this might be worth recording.

Commented [CJS344]: This looks like an attempt to express the verb + cognate accusative, for which, I would suggest that there are potentially three categories of translation:

1. Those of the type ‘offer/sacrifice a sacrifice’ which follow the Hebrew forms, e.g. RSV.
2. Those of the type ‘sacrifice lavishly’ which transform the cognate accusative into an adverb to indicate the strengthening of the verb, e.g. NET.
3. Those that give no equivalent for the cognate accusative, though I’ve not found an example.

Commented [CJS345]: I can’t see this stated or implied in HALOT.

Commented [CJS346]: Similar comment to the one above about three categories of translation.

Commented [CJS347]: As I noted above, I couldn’t find this in HALOT.

Commented [CJS348]: In this context, diachronic might be less ambiguous, or say that the verb alone develops from verb + noun.

- 2.1. Additionally, their vow is precisely this – to offer sacrifice once they reach land. [Page, 237-8; NET footnotes]
- 2.2. Possibly at the Temple in Jerusalem, though more likely at any of the heterodox shrines to Yahweh that existed throughout Israel and Judah during this time. [Stuart, 464-5]
3. Both onboard ship immediately, and also vowing to sacrifice more, later. [Allen, ###; 212; Baldwin, 563; Goldman, 142; Keil, 397]
4. It is not known; any answer is speculative. [Limburg, 57-8]

QUESTION— Did the sailors convert to monotheistic faith in Yahweh?

1. It is not clear. [Page, 238; NET footnotes]
2. The sailors are profoundly awed at Yahweh and sincerely worship him; while this leads us to think that they converted, it is not certain. [Youngblood, 84]
3. No – or at least there is no particular indication of it in the text. [Walton, 473]
4. No, but they were impressed that Yahweh could do whatever he wanted and that he had (apparently) killed Jonah for disobedience; so they added Yahweh to their syncretistic worship of many gods. [Stuart, 464-5]
5. No, this fear merely convicted them because they had proof that the God of the Hebrews was the only true God. But some of them may have subsequently progressed further and for them, this fear would be a door to true godliness. [Calvin]
6. Yes, they share the same “fear of Yahweh” that Jonah had claimed in v.9. [Baldwin, 563; Limburg, 57; Lessing, 116]
7. Yes, even though the text is not explicit. God used Jonah, despite his disobedience, to bring others to faith. [Bruckner, 49]

QUESTION— What do the sailors vow to do?

1. That they will make a sacrifice to Yahweh, once they reach land. [NET footnotes; Allen ###; 212; Page, 238]
2. That they will make additional sacrifices or other cultic actions. [Baldwin, 563; Keil, 397; Walton, 473]
3. That they will continue to faithfully worship Yahweh. [Bruckner, 49]
- 3.1 Specifically to worship Yahweh with continued sacrifices, over the long term. [Stuart, 465]
4. That they now have a lasting bond of trust with Yahweh. [Wolff, 122]
5. It expresses the narrator’s surprise at the true devotion to Yahweh that the Gentile sailors possess. [Youngblood, 84]
6. The sailors are making a pledge, motivated by thanksgiving. The pledge may have been simply to give a testimonial to Yahweh. [Sasson, 140]
7. They are making a promise to Yahweh, but we cannot know what the promise was. [Limburg, 58]

Commented [CJS349]: Youngblood has reservations, so perhaps, ‘might lead us’.

Commented [CJS350]: I think that goes a little further than Baldwin does. I would put her in the ‘perhaps’ category. I don’t have access to Limburg or Lessing to check.

Commented [CJS351]: I think Allen should be in category 2. He writes “Their sacrifice and vows to offer him still more later ...” (my underlining).

Commented [CJS352]: I think that, according to Youngblood, it is the paronomasia that produces this effect. I couldn’t find anywhere where he gives an answer to this QUESTION.

Commented [CJS353]: Can you make clear the he doesn’t mean ‘testimony’ as in Christian jargon. He refers to ‘votive testimonial’ and footnote 18 seems to imply that this is cultic, not necessarily verbal.

DISCOURSE UNIT: ch:vv-vv

1:17 (English) **2:1** (Hebrew) .

INTERTEXTUAL REFERENCE—

TEXT—

SYNTAX—

INTERCLAUSAL RELATIONS—

LEXICON—

a.

b.

c.

d.

e.

f.

QUESTION—

QUESTION—

QUESTION—