And it was in the days of the judges judging. And it was a famine in the land. And a man went from Bethlehem of Judah to sojourn in fields of Moab, he and his wife and the two of his sons.

In the days when the judges judged, there was a famine in the land, and a man left Bethlehem of Judah to sojourn in Moab – he, his wife, and his two sons.
A clause that begins with Waw on a non-verb is an ‘offline’ clause or a ‘disjunctive’ clause because it indicates something other than simply the next event in the narrative.

This particular offline clause is supplemental; it gives background information, like a parenthetical statement in an English narrative.

The article indicates that this is the man who was previously mentioned (verse 1). This is called the ‘anaphoric’ use of the article (WHS §83).

The name Elimelech ("Elimelech") means "My God [is] king."

From the NET Bible: The name Naomi (na'omi) is from the adjective נאם (noam, "pleasant, lovely") and literally means "my pleasant one" or "my lovely one."

From the NET Bible: The name Mahlon (makhlon) is from מלח (malah, "to be weak, sick").

From the NET Bible: The name Kilion (khilyon) is from שלו (kalah, "to be frail").

This means that they are from the clan of Ephrath.

V_I = Qamets, which indicates a biconsonantal verb in the Qal or Hiphil Imperfect.

V_S = Holem, so this is Qal, not Hiphil. Hiphil would have Hireq-Yod.

And the name of the man Elimelech and the name of his wife Naomi and the name of the two of his sons Mahlon and Kilion. Ephrathites from Bethlehem of Judah. And they entered the fields of Moab and they were there.

The man’s name was Elimelech. His wife’s name was Naomi, and the names of his two sons were Mahlon and Kilion. They were Ephrathites from Bethlehem of Judah. The went into the country of Moab and settled there.
And Elimelech, the man of Naomi, died. And she was left and her two sons.

Then Naomi’s husband Elimelech died, and she and her two sons were left alone.

Then they married Moabite women. (One was named Orpah and the other was named Ruth). And they lived there about ten years.
וַיָּמִ֥וּתוּ גַּם־שְנֵיהֶָ֖ם מַחְלֹ֣וֹן וְכִּלְיָ֑וֹן וַתִּשְָאֵר֙ הָָאִָ֔ישִּׁ֖ה מִשְנִֵ֥י יְלָדֶָ֖הָ וּמֵאִּישָָֽהּ׃

- שְנֵיהֶָ֖ם = שְנַַ֫יִּם M Dual + 3mp (type 2).
- It is in apposition to מַחְלֹ֣וֹן וְכִּלְיָ֑וֹן
- Because one of the (sets of) terms is the name of the other, this is explicative apposition (WHS §70).
- יְלָדֶָ֖הָ = יֶַ֫לֶד MS + 3fs (type 2) ‘her sons’
- And they died also their two Mahlon and Kilion. And the woman was left from the two of her sons and from her man.
- And then both Mahlon and Kilion died, so the woman was left without her two sons or her husband.
וַתִּקְעַמָהּ וְכַלֹּתִּיהָ וַתָּשְׁבָה מִשְׂדֵי מֹאֲבָהּ כִּי שָׁמְעָהּ בִּשְׂדֵה מוֹאֲב כִּי פָּקַד יְהוָה אֶת־עַמּוֹ לָתִת לָהֶם לָחֶם׃

- **וַתִּקְעַמָה** = קוּם QIwc3fs
  - $V_P = \text{Qamets}$, so it is a biconsonantal verb in either the QIwc or the HIwc.
  - $V_S$ is not Hireq-Yod, so it is not Hiphil. Therefore it is Qal.
  - It has Qamets Hatuf in the last syllable, just like **וַיִּמָּת** in 1:3. Shureq shifts to Qamets Hatuf for biconsonantal verbs in the QIwc singular when the accent shifts to $V_P$.
  - The verb is singular even though the subject seems to be plural (Naomi and her daughters-in-law). When the verb precedes a compound subject, the verb is usually singular (WHS §230).

- **וְכַלֹּתִּיהָ** = וְ + כַלֹּה (fp) + 3fs type 2 pronominal suffix
  - We know it is feminine plural because the pronominal suffix is type 2 (it begins with vowel + Yod that is not Hireq-Yod).
  - We also know it is feminine plural because it has the FP ending ת (spelled defectively as ה ת).

- **וַתָּשְׁבָה** = שוּב QIwc3fs
  - Same comments as **וַתִּקְעַמָה** above.

- **שָׁמְעָה** = שמע QP3fs
  - The perfect verb is functioning as a pluperfect verb ‘she had heard’ (WHS §162(3)) because it precedes the main verb נָתַן, which is also past.

- **פָּקַד** = פקד QP3ms
  - $\text{P}^\text{ms}$ begins a direct object clause (WHS §490). The entire clause is the content of what Naomi had heard, so it is the direct object of the verb נָתַן.
  - The perfect verb is functioning as a pluperfect verb ‘she had heard’ (WHS §162(3)) because it precedes the verb נָתַן ‘she heard’, which is also past.

- **לָתִת** = נתן Q∞+ל
  - $R_1 (Nun)$ dropped out because in the Q∞, 1-Nun and 1-Yod verbs usually drop $R_1$.
  - The Taw at the end is there because when 1Nun and 1Yod verbs drop the 1Nun or 1Yod in the Q∞, they add Taw at the end.
  - $R_3 (Nun)$ dropped out because it assimilated to the final Taw, becoming a Dagesh Forte. But then the Dagesh Forte in the final Taw dropped out because it did not have a vowel after it, and it is impossible to double a consonant if there is no vowel after it.
  - The infinitive construct with prefixed ב is likely used to explain what it means that YHWH פקד ‘visited’ his people (WHS §195), so it should be translated ‘by giving’.
  - It is also possible that the $\infty$ with prefixed ב gives the purpose for which YHWH פקד ‘visited’ his people (WHS §197). This would lead to a translation like ‘to give them food’.
  - She and her daughters-in-law arose. And she returned from the fields of Moab because she heard in the fields of Moab that YHWH had visited his people to give to them food.
  - She arose, along with her daughters-in-law, in order to return from Moab because she had heard in Moab that YHWH had taken action for his people by giving them food.
וַתֵצִֵ֗א מִּן־הַמָקוֹם֙ אֲשֶֹ֣ר הָיְתָה־שִָ֔מָה וּשְתִֵ֥י כַלֹּתֶָ֖יהָ עִּמָָ֑הּ וַתֵלַֹ֣כְנָה בַדִֶ֔רֶךְ לָשָ֖וּב אֶל־אִ֥רֶץ יְהוּדָָֽה׃

- אֲשֶׁר = QIwc3fs
  - We know it is QIwc from a 1-Yod root because $V_P = $Tsere.
- הָיְתָה = QP3fs
  - This looks like the QP3fs of הָיִיתָ, but 3ָּה verbs take ending הָיִיתָ in the P3fs.
  - The perfect verb indicates a past state (WHS §161).
- שִָ֔מָה is שָם with the directional suffix ה. We know it is the directional suffix because it is unaccented ה.
- הָּ֑עִּמָ is ‘with her’ not ‘her people’ because it has a Hireq under the ע.
- וַתֵלַֹ֣כְנָה = QIwc3fp.
  - We know it is 1-Yod (וַלְכָן acts like 1-Yod) because $V_P = $Tsere.
- לָשָ֖וּב = Q∞+$שׁוב
  - This infinitive construct with prefixed ל indicates the purpose or goal toward which they וַתֵלַֹ֣כְנָה (WHS §197).
- And she set out from the place which she was there, and the two of her daughters-in-law with her. And they went in the way to return to the land of Judah.
- Then she set out from the place where she was, along with her two daughters-in-law, and they went on the way to return to the land of Judah.
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And Naomi said to the two of her daughters-in-law, “Go! Return — a woman to the house of her mother. May YHWH do with you loyalty as you did with the dead and with me.”

Naomi said to her two daughters-in-law, “Go, each of you return to her mother’s house. May YHWH treat you with covenant loyalty as you have done with the dead and with me.”

- 1= אָמְרָה אֲמָר QIwc3fs
- Vp = Holem and R1 is quiescent Aleph because this is an Angry Baker 18 verb in the QI.
- 1לָכְנָה = QM2fp
  - 1-Yod acts like 1-Yod in the Qal and Hiphil.
  - 1-Yod and 1-Nun verbs usually drop the 1-Yod or 1-Nun in the Qal imperative.
  - This imperative gives a command (WHS §188).
  - The two imperatives without a Waw to connect them form a verb hendiadys (WHS §225), ‘go back’.
- 1שִׁבְנָה = QM2fp.
  - Biconsonantal verbs with lexical vowel Shureq change Vs to Holem in the QM2fp.
  - The Dagesh Forte in the Shin may be because the two verbs are closely tied together, forming a verbal hendiadys.
  - This imperative gives a command (WHS §188).
  - The two imperatives without a Waw to connect them form a verb hendiadys (WHS §225), ‘go back’.
- 1אִּשָּׁה means ‘each’ here. WHS §131
- 1יַעֲשֶה (Qere) = 1עשה QJ3ms
  - This is a Kethib-Qere form.
  - The Kethib is יַעֲשֶה, presumably יָעשׁ.
  - Since it is jussive in meaning, the Qere corrects this to the shortened ‘jussive’ form יָעשׁ. 37 verbs end in יָע in the imperfect when there is no sufformative or pronominal suffix, but the יְע in the jussive.
- 1עִּמָכֶם uses the 2mp to refer to the 2fp. This happens often.
- 1עֲשִיתֶם = 1עשה QP2mp
  - Because there is vowel+Yod between the second root consonant and a sufformative that begins with a consonant (and R3 is missing), this is likely to be a 37 verb.
  - 1עשה uses the 2mp to refer to the 2fp. This happens often. WHS §234a.
- 1הַמֵּתִים = QPtMP+article
  - Vs = Tsere because יִמֵּת is a biconsonantal Tsere stative verb.
- 1ִּוְעֲמָד is an alternate form of יִמֵּת that is used with pronominal suffixes.

And Naomi said to the two of her daughters-in-law, “Go! Return — a woman to the house of her mother. May YHWH do with you loyalty as you did with the dead and with me.”

Naomi said to her two daughters-in-law, “Go, each of you return to her mother’s house. May YHWH treat you with covenant loyalty as you have done with the dead and with me.”
May YHWH give to you and find rest a woman house of her husband. And she kissed to them and they lifted their voice and they wept.

“May YHWH grant that you find rest, each in the house of her husband.” Then she kissed them, and they lifted up their voices and wept.

Note that a woman in that society needed a husband as a source of economic security.
1:10

And they said to her, “that with you will will return to your people.”

And they said to her, “No! We will return with you to your people.”

- $וַתֹּּאמַָ֖רְנָֽה—אמר QIwc3fp
  - $V_p$ = Holem and R₁ is quiescent Aleph because this is an Angry Baker 1N verb in the QI.
- Here $כִּי$ means ‘No! But instead’. See Williams §447.
- $וַתֹּּאמַָ֖רְנָֽה—אמר V P = Holem and R₁ is quiescent Aleph because this is an Angry Baker 1N verb in the QI.
- $כִּי$ is quiescent because this is an Angry Baker 1N verb in the QI.
- $ךְִ֥אִתָ$ = $אֵת + 2fs$
  - $אֵת$ is ‘with you’ not ‘you’ because it has Hireq under the $א$.
- $נָשָ֖וּב—שוּב$ QI1cp
  - $V_p$ = Qamets is usually a biconsonantal verb in the QI or HI.
  - $V_s$ is the lexical vowel, so it is Qal.
  - $V_s$ is not Hireq-Yod, so it is not Hiphil.
  - The imperfect verb may be future (WHS §167(3)) ‘we will return’, or it may indicate their desire (WHS §170) ‘we want to return’.
- $ךְָֽלְעַמֵּ$ is ‘to your people’ not ‘to you’ because it does not have Hireq under the $ע$. Contrast with $עִמָ$ in 1:7.
- $וַתֹּּאמַָ֖רְנָֽה—אמר V P = Holem and R₁ is quiescent Aleph because this is an Angry Baker 1N verb in the QI.
- $כִּי$ is quiescent because this is an Angry Baker 1N verb in the QI.
And Naomi said, “Turn back, my daughters! Why will you go with me? Still to me sons in my inner parts and they will become to you to men?”

But Naomi said, “Turn back, my daughters! Why would you come with me? Do I still have sons in my womb, that they could become your husbands?”

Naomi’s questions are rhetorical, meaning that she is not asking for information; instead she is making statements in the form of questions: ‘Don’t go with me! I don’t still have sons in my womb that they could become your husbands.”

Naomi’s last rhetorical question assumes the existence of the institution of leverite marriage: a brother was obligated to marry his dead brother’s wife as a way of providing for the widow and carrying on the name of the dead brother. It also assumes the cultural reality that a woman needed and wanted a husband in that society.
שֹּׁ֤בְנָה בְנֹּׁתַי לִֵ֔כְןָ כִִּ֥֔י זָקַָ֖נְתִּי מִּהְיֹ֣וֹת לְאִָּ֑יש כִּ֤י אָמַ֙רְת

- Biconsonantal verbs with lexical vowel Shureq change Vs to Holem in the QM2fp.
- לִֵ֔כְּנָה = הלך QM2fp
  - יֶשֶׁלָּה thinks it is 1Yod in the Qal and Hiphil.
  - 1Yod and 1Nun verbs drop R1 in the QM.
  - We expect the spelling הלכה, but the final vowel letter יָה is written defectively.
- כִִּ֥֔י זָקַָ֖נְתִּי begins a causal clause (WHS §533).
- זָקַָ֖נְתִּי = זקן QP1cs
  - This is a stative verb (WHS §161), so the perfect is translated ‘I am old’ rather than ‘I was old’
- מִּהְיֹ֣וֹת = היה Q∞+מִן
  - 3ה verbs take ending מ in the ∞
  - This is the absolute comparative use of מִן ‘too old to …’ (WHS §318)
- אָמַ֙רְתִּי = אמר QP1cs
  - (lit. ‘there is to me’) means ‘I have’. See the note on השוער-לִּ֤י בָנִּים in 1:11.
- יָלִַ֥דְתִּי = ילד QP1cs
  - Because a root consonant is missing and there is vowel+Yod between the last root consonant and a sufformative that begins with a consonant, this is likely to be a 3ה verb.
- "Return, my daughters! Go! For I am old from to become a man. That I said there is to me hope, even I became the night to a man and also I bore sons,
- "Go back, my daughters! Go, for I am too old to become a man’s [wife]. Even if I were to say that I had hope, even if I were to become a man’s [wife] tonight and even if I gave birth to sons,"
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הֲלָהֵן תְשַבִּרְנָה עַד אֲשֶר יִּגְדִלוּ הֲלָהֵן תֵּעָגִנָה לְבִּלְתִי הֱיֹוהֶ֣ל לְאִלְּשׁ אוֹלֵנָ֔ה כִּי הָ֥ר-לִי מְאֹּד מִכֵּ֖ם כִּ֣י־רַ

הֲלָהֵן is the interrogative particle + לָהֵן. This is typically translated as ‘therefore?’.

תְשַבִּרְנָה = שבר DI2fp

וּיִּגְדִּ֖ל = גדל QI3mp

• \( \text{ גדל} \) is a stative verb, so we expect \( V_S = \text{Pathach} \) in the QI.
• \( V_S = \text{Qamets} \) instead of Pathach because it is a pausal form (note the Zaqef Qaton accent).

תֵּעָגִּנָה = עגן NI2fp

• Taw is the imperfect preformative, with \( V_P = \text{Tsere} \) and \( V_I = \text{Qamets} \) and \( R_1 = \text{Guttural (or Resh)} \), this can be explained as a Niphal (\( \text{תִּ} \)) where the guttural rejects the Dagesh Forte and \( V_P = \text{Hireq} \) lengthens from \( \text{Hireq} \) to \( \text{Tsere} \) due to compensatory lengthening.
• The verbal root is a hapax legomenon, meaning that it occurs nowhere else in the Bible. It is clearly a NI2fp, but from what root?
• Holladay, HALOT, and BDB all list it as coming from \( עגן \), although the evidence for the final Nun from cognate languages is scant. If it is 3-Nun, then it is unclear why it lacks a Dagesh Forte in the Nun from R3 assimilating to the sufformative \( \text{נה} \). Nevertheless, the only other NP(2/3)fp in the Bible from a 3-Nun root is \( \text{תֵאָמַנָה} \) in Isa 60:4, also lacks a Dagesh Forte in the Nun.
• The alternative is to suppose that it is from a 3-He root, but the 9 such occurrences of such forms in the Bible all have the expected \( \text{יָּכָּ֗ה} \) before the \( \text{נה} \), so a 3-He root is unlikely.

הִיּוֹת = יהי Q∞

• 3י verbs have ending \( \text{יוֹת} \) in the ∞

כִּי־רַ לִּי מְאֹּד מִכֵּם מֶלֶֽך׃ כִּי דֹרֵֽךְ מֵאַֽה

• The meaning of this phrase is uncertain. A straightforward translation (taking the \( \text{מִן} \) as comparative, WHS §317) is “For it is more bitter for me than for you that (or ‘because’) YHWH’s hand has gone forth against me.” The problem with this is that it does not fit the context; why would Naomi tell her daughters-in-law that it is more bitter for her than for them?
• An alternative is to take the \( \text{מִן} \) as an absolute comparative (WHS §318), “For it is very bitter to me – too much for you.”
• A third alternative is adopted by the ESV “for it is exceedingly bitter to me for your sake that the hand of the LORD has gone out against me.” This interprets \( \text{מִן} \) as ‘because of’ (WHS §319).

מַר = מָרֶר QP3ms

• This is geminate. If it were biconsonantal, it would be \( \text{מר} \).
• The perfect has stative force here (‘it is bitter’; WHS §161).

יָצְאִ֥ה = יצא QP3ms

• יָצְאִ֥ה uses a 2mp pronominal suffix to refer to a 2fp antecedant. This is common.

לָהֵן = לָהֵן QP3ms

• This is the perfect use of the Perfect; it indicates a present state resulting from a previously completed action (WHS §162(2)).

לַעֲגֹת = לעֲגֹת QP3ms

• This is the adversative use of \( \text{לַעֲגֹת} \) (WHS §242)

• therefore will you wait until which they will grow? Therefore will you be withdrawn not to be to a man? No, my daughters, for it is bitter to me very from you that the hand of YHWH went out in me.”
• would you therefore wait until they grew up? Would you therefore remain unmarried? No, my daughters! For my bitter situation is too much for you, for YHWH’s hand has gone forth against me.”
The Dagesh Forte in the Sin can be explained as a 1Nun that assimilated: 

- The quiescent נ dropped out. We can tell that something weird happened because the finite verb sufformative is not preceded by a Shewa.

- The fact that it is missing a root consonant and there is Vowel+Yod before the sufformative (which begins with a consonant) suggests that the missing root consonant is ה.

- This is not Niphal because if it were Niphal, the vowel under the Shin would be Qamets, not Pathach.

- The Dagesh Forte in the Shin can be explained by a 1Nun that assimilated: ה, which fits the QIwc3fs.

- The accent is on the ש. Therefore it is a finite verb, and ש has the stem vowel. Therefore ש is R2, or if it is biconsonantal, ש is R1.

- If it were a 3ה verb, the accent would be on the ב, because ב would be R2 and have the stem vowel.

- The principle is that finite verbs accent the stem vowel (unless there is a heavy sufformative, or a pronominal suffix, or …), whereas Participles do not.

- The נ sufformative indicates that the noun is feminine.

- The ת suffix indicates that the noun is feminine.

- She kissed QM2fs

- And she said, “Behold, your husband’s brother’s widow has returned to her people and to her gods. Return after your husband’s brother’s widow.”

- Naomi said, “Look, your sister-in-law has returned to her people and her gods. Return after your sister-in-law.”
And Ruth said, “Do not pressure me to leave you [or] to turn back from [following] after you. For wherever you go, I shall go. And wherever you spend the night, I shall spend the night. Your people [shall be] my people. And your God [shall be] my God.

• And Ruth said, “Do not pressure in me to abandon you, to return from after you, for to which you will go, I shall go and in which you will spend the night, I shall spend the night. Your people my people. Your God my God.

• And Ruth said, “Do not pressure me to abandon you, to return from after you, for to which you will go, I shall go and in which you will spend the night, I shall spend the night. Your people my people. Your God my God.

• And Ruth said, “Do not pressure me to abandon you, to return from after you, for to which you will go, I shall go and in which you will spend the night, I shall spend the night. Your people my people. Your God my God.

• And Ruth said, “Do not pressure me to leave you [or] to turn back from [following] after you. For wherever you go, I shall go. And wherever you spend the night, I shall spend the night. Your people [shall be] my people. And your God [shall be] my God.
• ִִּ֥בַאֲשֶ֤ר תָמ֙וּתִּי֙ אָמִ֔וּת וְשָָ֖ם אֶקָבֵָ֑ר כֹּׁה֩ יַעֲשֶַּ֙ה יְהוִָ֥ה לִּי֙ וְכֹֹּׁ֣ה יֹּׁסִִּ֔יף כִֹּ֣י הַמִָ֔וֶת  יַפְרִָּ֖יד בֵּין יָֽֽוֹרֹת יּוֹרֹֽת לָ֔א אֵלֶּ֥ה נֶפֶשׁ כֹֹּּׁ֣י הַנָּהַר אִסְרָ֥ר בָּאָ֥יִן יָֽֽוֹרֹת.

• ִִּ֥תָמ֙וּתִּי֙ = מוּת QI2fs
  • Vₚ = Qamets for biconsonantal verbs in the QI or HI.
  • Vₛ = Shureq is the Qal, because biconsonantal verbs keep their lexical vowel in the QI, QM, and Q∞.

• ַֿ֥אָמִ֔וּת QC1cs
  • Same discussion as the previous verb.
  • It is first in its clause and a meaning of personal resolve fits, so it is parsed as Cohortative, even though it lacks the final ה.

• ֵֽֽוֶ֗ר = קבר NI1cs
  • ‘thus may YHWH do to me and thus may he add [to it]’ is a standard oath formula in the Bible. The specific thing that YHWH would do is never mentioned in the Bible, but Ruth is clearly pledging herself to be subject to extreme divine punishment if she breaks her oath.

• ַֿ֥עָשֶַ֙ה יְהוִָ֥ה לִּי֙ וְכֹֹּׁ֣ה יֹּׁסִִּ֔יף QJ3ms
  • A jussive meaning fits (‘may YHWH do’), so parse it as jussive, even though it is not first in its clause, and even though it has the ה ending that is usually dropped in the jussive.
  • Vₚ = Pathach is normally Hiphil, but for 1G verbs, it could also be Qal.
  • Normally, one then uses Vₛ to decide if the verb is Qal or Hiphil, but 3ֶה verbs take ה at the end when there is no sufformative, and that wipes out the stem vowel, so we have to decide the stem based on the context and the verb. The verbעשה never occurs in the Hiphil (see the lexicon), so it must be Qal.

• ָֽֽוֶ֗יף = יסף HJ3ms
  • Vₛ = Hireq-Yod, so this has to be Hiphil. (This doesn’t fit a Qal Biconsonantal pattern, and there is no biconsonantal root סף)
  • Vₚ = Holem. For 1Yod verbs in the Hiphil Imperfect, Vₚ = Holem Waw, so this fits if we assume that the Holem is a defectively written Holem Waw.
  • The context indicates that the meaning is jussive (‘may he add’), so we parse it as jussive, even though it does not come first in its clause and even though it is not shortened (We expect Vₛ to shorten to Tsere in the Hiphil Jussive).

• ַֿ֥ךְכִֹּ֣י הַמִָ֔וֶת יַפְרִָּ֖֣יד בֵּין יָֽֽוֹרֹת יּוֹרֹֽートָה לָ֔א אֵלֶּ֥ה נֶפֶשׁ כֹֹּּׁ֣י הַנָּהַר אִסְרָ֥ר בָּאָ֥יִן יָֽֽוֹרֹת is literally ‘that the death will come between me and you.’ But in this context, where Ruth is making an oath, it should be translated as ‘if anything except’.

• ִַַ֥פְרִָּ֖יד HI3ms
  • Vₚ = Pathach and Vₛ = Hireq Yod, so this is Hiphil.
  • In which you will die I will die and there I will be buried. Thus YHWH will do to me and thus he will add that the death will separate between me and between you.
  • In [the place] which you die, I will die, and there I will be buried. Thus may YHWH do to me and more if [anything except] death separates me from you.
And she saw that she strengthened herself to go with her. And she ceased to speak to her.

When [Naomi] saw that she was determined to go with her, she said no more.

Here we have to change idioms. The Hebrew ‘she ceased to speak to her’ sounds like Naomi was mad at Ruth and giving her the silent treatment. But the context makes it clear that it means that Naomi stopped trying to dissuade Ruth from coming with her.
And their two walked until their coming house of bread. And it was like their coming house of bread and all the city was in an uproar about them. And they said, “This Naomi?”

So the two of them walked until they came to Bethlehem. And when they came to Bethlehem, all the city was stirred up about them. And the women said, “Is this Naomi?”

And she said to them (fp), “Do not call to me Naomi. Call to me ‘bitter’ for Shaddai has made very bitter to me.”

She replied to them, “Do not call me Naomi (sweetie). Call me Mara (bitter), for the Almighty has dealt very bitterly with me.”
I went away full, and YHWH has brought me back empty. Why call me ‘Naomi’ (sweetie), since YHWH has testified against me and the Almighty has brought disaster upon me?

When bitter Naomi says that YHWH is bringing her back empty-handed, she is discounting Ruth. Naomi has no idea yet what a blessing Ruth will be to her. Naomi is bitter over the loss of her husband and two sons, but see verse 4:15 where the women of Bethlehem tell Naomi that Ruth is better to her than seven sons!
וַתָֹ֣שָב נָעֳמִִּ֗י וְר֙וּת הַמוֹאֲבִּיָ֤ה כַלָתָה֙ עִּ֔מִּ֖הּ הַשָָ֖בָה מִּשְדֵֹ֣י מוֹאָָ֑ב וְהִֵ֗מָה בַָ֚אוּ בֵֹ֣ית לִֶ֔חֶם בִּתְחִּ֣לַת קְצִִּ֥יר

= שָׁבַ֖תָה QIwc3fs
- \( V_p \) = Qamets, so this is a biconsonantal in either the Qal or the Hiphil. \( V_s \) isn’t Hireq-Yod, so it is Qal.
- Biconsonantal verbs keep their lexical vowel in the QI, QM, and \( Q^\infty \), but this is the QIwc, so they can lose it. In particular, they tend to lose their lexical vowel in the QIwc in the singular.
- \( \nu \) under the \( ש \) is in an unaccented closed syllable, so it is Qamets Hatuf.

- \( V_s \) = Qamets, so this is QP or QPt.
- Because the accent is on \( V_s \) instead of the ending, it should be a finite verb; participles always accent their ending (if they have one). BUT it has an article, so it can’t be a finite verb; it has to be a participle. Furthermore, there is no reduced vowel before the sufformative, so it can’t be a finite verb.
- So this is a rare example of a Participle that is accented like a finite verb. The same form reoccurs in 2:6.

- \( 
ָהַשָָ֖בָה \) is MP but it refers to Naomi and Ruth. The MP is sometimes used for the FP. Alternately, this may be an archaic dual pronoun that was mispointed as masculine plural.

- \( 
בַָ֚א \) = בָוֹא QP3cp
- \( V_s \) = Qamets, so this is QP or QPt.
- The sufformative \( \nu \) indicates that this has to be a P3cp. There is no way to get a Shureq at the end of a participle.
- QM2mp would have a reduced vowel under the Bet (\( בֶא \)).
- Finite verbs normally have a Shewa before the sufformative, except if the Shewa would go where there is an unchangeable long vowel (\( י, י', \) or \( י'' \)), or if the Shewa would be \( V_1 \) of the QP. Since there is no Shewa and \( V_1 \) isn’t unchangeable long, it must be the QP.

- \( יִשְׁרָיֹם \) is a plural of a natural product in an unnatural state (WHS §10) because it refers to barley that has been harvested.

- And Naomi returned and Ruth the Moabitess her daughter-in-law with her. She returned from the fields of Moab. And they came house of bread in beginning of harvest of barley.

- So Naomi returned, and with her [was] Ruth the Moabitess, her daughter-in-law, who returned from the fields of Moab.
- They left because of a famine. They return to the house of bread because YHWH has given his people bread. And they arrive at the beginning of barley harvest; YHWH has provided for his people.
- This is a summary of the previous scene. And it transitions to the next scene, which occurs in the process of harvesting barley.
A clause that starts with a non-verb is disjunctive, meaning that it is something other than simply the next event in the narrative. In this case, this begins a parenthetical statement that gives background information that serves as foreshadowing.

This is a Kethiv-Qere. The Kethiv דִּיוֹדַע is DpPtMS ‘one being known’ = ‘friend’, which would be vocalized דִּיוֹדַעְו. The Qere is מְיֻדָע, which is a noun that means ‘relative’.

Because the plot requires that Boaz be a relative, and this parenthetical statement makes sense as foreshadowing only if it indicates that he is a relative, the Qere is likely to be the correct reading. Somewhere along the way, someone probably wrote their Waw a little too short and the person who copied the manuscript misinterpreted it as a Yod.

This disjunctive clause is part of the preceding parenthetical statement.

And to Naomi (Kethiv: a friend) [Qere: a relative] to her man manly of power from the clan of Elimelek and his name Boaz.

(Now Naomi had a relative of her husband’s, a wealthy man from the clan of Elimelek, and his name was Boaz.)
And Ruth the Moabitess said to Naomi, “I shall go the field and I shall glean among the ears of grain after whom I will find favor in his eyes.” And she said to her, “Go, my daughter.”

Then Ruth the Moabitess said to Naomi, “Please let me go to the field and glean among the ears of grain behind whoever lets me.” Naomi replied, “You may go, my daughter.”
Notes on Ruth

2:3

וַתֵּלֶכֶת וַתָּבוֹא וַתְּלַקֵּט בַּשָּׁדֶה אַחֲרֵי הַקֹּּצְרִים וַיִּקָּרֶֽהָ חֶלְקַת הַשָּׁדֶה לְבִּעַז אֲשֶׁר מִמֵּֽישֶפֶךְ אֱלִיָּֽלֶךְ:

• וַתֵּלֶכֶת Diwc3fs
• בְּנוֹת הַשָּׁדֶה QIwc3fs

• Vp = Qamets for biconsonantal verbs in the Qal and Hiphil Imperfect.
• Biconsonantal verbs keep their lexical vowel in the QI, QM, and Q∞, so this is Qal, not Hiphil. The Hiphil would have Vs = Hireq Yod.

• וַתָּבוֹא DIwc3fs
• ההבקש DIwc3fs

• This is the substantival use of a participle to refer to people who do the action of the verbal root.

• וַתְּלַקֵּט DIwc3fs
• הקטר QPtMP+

• This is the substantival use of a participle to refer to people who do the action of the verbal root.

• וַיִּקָּר QIwc3ms
• וַיִּקֶּר מִּקְרִ֖הָ 'her happening happened'

• Because the direct object noun is from the same root as the verb, it is a cognate accusative. (WHS §51)
• The story strongly implies that God arranged this, so the point of this phrase is not that God wasn’t involved. Instead, the point is that Ruth did not intentionally pick out Boaz’ field. The later narrative indicates that Ruth did not yet know who Boaz is, and he arrived after Ruth.

• And she went and she came and she gleaned in the field after the harvesters. And her happening happened the portion of the field to Boaz who from the clan of Elimelech.
• So she set out and came and gleaned in the field after the harvesters. And it just so happened that she was in the portion of the field that belonged to Boaz, who was from the clan of Elimelech.

2:4

וְהִּנֵה־בִּ֗עַז בָּא מִבֵּית לִּכְחֶם וַיֹּאמֵר לַקֹּּצְרִים יְהוָֹ֣ה עִֽמָכֶּ֑ם וַיֹּאמְרֻ֥ו לָוֹ יְבָרֶ֥כְךִֽי יְהוָֽה׃

• בָּ֢א QPtMS

• This could be either QP3ms or QPtMS. But since it follows הניה, it is probably a participle.

• וְהִּנֵה־בִּ֗עַז 'and look! Boaz is coming'

• This is like the use of the historical present in Greek. It portrays a past event as currently happening, from the perspective of the harvesters.

• וַיֹּאמֵר QIwc3ms
• קָרָה QPtMP+

• This is jussive because a blessing is a jussive meaning, and because the verb is first in the clause.

• And look! Boaz coming from Bethlehem! And he said to the reapers, “YHWH with you!” And they said to him, “May YHWH bless you!”

• Now picture this – Boaz is coming from Bethlehem! And he said to the harvesters, “May YHWH be with you!” And they said to him, “May YHWH bless you!”
And Boaz said to his young man, the one standing over the harvesters, “To whom the young woman the this?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Tag</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>אמר</td>
<td>QIwc3ms</td>
<td>said</td>
<td>Normally we would use $V_S$ to distinguish the Qal and the Hiphil, but this is 355, so the 355 wipes out the normal $V_S$, so we need to rely on context. Since ‘he answered’ makes sense, this is Qal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נצב</td>
<td>NPtMS+7</td>
<td>standing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שקם</td>
<td>QPtMP+7</td>
<td>harvesters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>והנה</td>
<td>כפמן</td>
<td>&amp; the young man</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הנס</td>
<td>נב</td>
<td>answered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אהוב</td>
<td>אימ</td>
<td>young woman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מואב</td>
<td>שער</td>
<td>from Moab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEIR</td>
<td>THE</td>
<td>נאג</td>
<td>For the Hiphil, but for 1G verbs it could also be Qal. Normally we would use $V_S$ to distinguish the Qal and the Hiphil, but this is 355, so the 355 wipes out the normal $V_S$, so we need to rely on context. Since ‘he answered’ makes sense, this is Qal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מואב</td>
<td>שער</td>
<td>from Moab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEIR</td>
<td>THE</td>
<td>נאג</td>
<td>The servant in charge of the harvesters replied, “She is the young Moabite woman who returned with Naomi from Moab.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2:7

וַתִּֽאמֶר אֲלַקֳֹטָה־נָא וְאָסַפְתִֹּי בָָֽעֳמָרִִּ֔ים אַחֲרֵָ֖י הַקוֹצְרִָּ֑ים וַתָּבוֹא וַתַּעֲמִ֗וֹד מֵאָ֤ז הַבַֹּּׁ֙קֶר וְעַ

• אֲלַקֳֹטָה־נָא = לקט DC1cs
• אָסַפְתִֹּי = אסף QPwc1cs
• בָָֽעֳמָרִִּ֔ים = עומר QPtMP+
• הַקוֹצְרִָּ֑ים = קצר QPtMP+
• וַתָּבוֹא = בוֹא QIwc3fs
• וַתַּעֲמִ֗וֹד = עמד QIwc3fs
• הִ֥שִּׁבָּ֑ת = שבת Q∞+3fs
• זֶה = זה QIwc3fs

Heb "and she came and she has persisted." The construction וַתָּבֹא וַתַּעֲמִ֗וֹד (vattavo' vata'amod) forms a dependent temporal sequence: "since she came, she has persisted." Because עָמַד ('amad, "to stand, remain, persist"; BDB 764 s.v. עָמַד; HALOT 840-42 s.v. עמד) has a broad range of meanings, וַתַּעֲמִ֗וֹד has been understood in various ways: (1) Ruth had stood all morning waiting to receive permission from Boaz to glean in his field: "she has stood (here waiting)"; (2) Ruth had remained in the field all morning: "she has remained here" (NAB, NASB, NCV); and (3) Ruth had worked hard all morning: "she has worked steadily" (REB), "she has been working" (TEV, CEV), "she has been on her feet (all morning)" (JPS, NJPS, NRSV). For discussion, see F. W. Bush, Ruth, Esther (WBC), 118-19.

וַתִּֽאמֶר אֲלַקֳֹטָה־נָא וְאָסַפְתִֹּי בָָֽעֳמָרִִּ֔ים אַחֲרֵָ֖י הַקוֹצְרִָּ֑ים וַתָּбоֹא וַתַּעֲמִ֗וֹד מֵאָ֤ז הַבַֹּּׁ֙קֶר וְעַ

Heb "except this." The function and meaning of the demonstrative adjective זֶה (zeh, "this") is difficult: (1) MT accentuation joins זֶה with חָסְתָּה (shivtah, "this her sitting"), suggesting that זֶה חָסְתָּה functions as subject complement (see BDB 261 s.v. זֶה 2.a and Josh 9:12). (2) Others suggest that זֶה functions as an emphasizing adverb of time ("just now"; BDB 261 s.v. 4.h) and connect it with עַתָּה ("attah, "now") to form the idiom זֶה עַתָּה (zeh 'attah, "now, just now"; BDB 261 s.v. 4.h; GKC 442-43 §136.d; see F. W. Bush, Ruth, Esther [WBC], 118-19). The entire line is translated variously: KJV "until now, (+ save ASV) that she tarried a little in the house"; NASB "she has been sitting in the house for a little while"; NIV "except for a short rest in the shelter"; NJPS "she has rested but little in the hut"; "her sitting (= resting) in the house (has only been) for a moment." A paraphrase would be: "She came and has kept at it (= gleaning) from this morning
until now, except for this: She has been sitting in the hut only a little while." The clause as a whole is an exceptive clause: "except for this...."

- “And she said, ‘I shall glean and I will gather among ears of grain after the harvesters.’ And she came and she stood from then the morning and until now this her taking a break the house a little.”
- “And she said, ‘Please let me glean and gather among [the] ears of grain after the harvesters.’ So she came and has continued from the morning until now, except for a short rest in the hut.”

- The Pathach under the ה looks strange, but this is how the QP2fs is spelled for 3ת/ח verbs.
- The negative question ‘Have you not heard’ is equivalent to a positive statement, “you have heard,” which in this context is a gentle urging, “Listen carefully.”
- This is jussive because it is negated by אַל
- It is unusual to have a paragogic Nun on a singular imperfect verb (7 times in the Bible, 4 in Ruth).
- And Boaz said to Ruth, “Have you not heard, my daughter? Do not go to glean in another field. And also do not pass over from this. Instead, stick close to my female workers.”
- Then Boaz said to Ruth, “Listen carefully, my daughter. Do not go to glean in another field. And also do not go beyond the border of this [field]. Instead, stick close to my female workers.”
Your eyes in the field which they are harvesting and you will go after them (fp). Have I not commanded the young men not to touch you? And you will be thirsty and you will go to the vessels and you will drink from which the young men have drawn.

“Keep your eyes on the field that the men are reaping and follow after with the women. I have commanded the young men not to touch you. When you are thirsty, go to the water jars and drink from [the water] which the young men have drawn.”
Boaz answered and said to her, “It has surely been reported to me all that you did with your mother-in-law after the death of your man. And you abandoned your father and your mother and the land of your birth and walked to a people whom you did not previously know yesterday three-days-ago.

Boaz replied to her, “All that you have done for your mother-in-law after the death of your husband has been fully reported to me – how you left your father, your mother, and your native land to come to a people that you did not previously know.”
• יְשַלִּם = שלם DJ3ms
  - This is jussive because (1) a jussive meaning (a blessing in this case) fits the context where Boaz is talking about what YHWH will do for her, (2) it is first in its clause.

• והָּ֝יִּֽה = היה QJ3fs+
  - The conjunction Waw is a Shureq, so it can’t be Iwc. The Iwc would begin וַתְ.
  - V_P = Shewa, so this looks like a Piel or Pual, but it is from היה, so it is actually Qal. (יה only occurs in the Qal and Niphal). It ends in ב, so it looks like 2fs, but that is just what היה does in the Iwc and Jussive. Learn to recognize היה; it is very common and does not follow the normal paradigms.
  - This is jussive for the same reasons that the previous verb was jussive.

• בָּ֝אָת = בוא QP2fs
  - Biconsonantal verbs take V_1 = Qamets in the QP and QPt.
  - Aleph quiesced because it had a Shewa.
  - The 2fs sufformative ה lost its Dagesh Lene and Silent Shewa because it was preceded by a vowel (V_1 Qamets).

• לַחֲסִ֥וֹת = חסה Q∞+ל
  - 3ה verbs take an ה ending in the Infinitive Construct.
  - The only verb forms that can be the object of a preposition are the Infinitive Construct and the Participle.
  - The infinitive construct does not take the article.

• May YHWH repay your deed. And may your wages be complete from with YHWH, the God of Israel whom you came to seek refuge under his wings.

• “May YHWH repay you for what you have done, and your wages be full from YHWH, the God of Israel, under whose wings you have come to take refuge!”

• כָֽאָ֝ה = אמר QIwc3fs
• נִָּֽחַמְתִָ֔נִּי = נחמ QI1cs
• דִּבַָ֖רְתָ = דבר DP2ms+1cs
  - This could also be Niphal (1Nun assimilates, but ה rejects the Dagesh Forte), but the Niphal meaning ‘you regretted me’ does not fit the context, whereas the Piel meaning ‘you comforted me’ does.

• אֶָֽהְיִֶ֔ה = היה QI1cs
• אֶָֽהְיִ֖ה כְאַחַָ֖ת שִּפְחֹּׁתֶָֽיך׃

• And she said, “I found grace in your eyes, my lord, for you have comforted me and that you spoke on the heart of your maidservant. And I am not like one of your maidservant.”

• שִּפְחֹּׁתֶָֽיך׃ = שפתיך QI1cs
• וְאָנֹּׁכִּי֙  לֹּׁ֣א אֶָֽהְיִֶ֔ה כְאַחַָ֖ת שִּפְחֹּׁתֶָֽיך׃

• She replied, “I have found favor in your eyes, my lord, for you have comforted me and spoken kindly to your maidservant, even though it is not like I am one of your maidservants.”

• לַחֲסִ֥וֹת = חסה Q∞+ל
  - 3ה verbs take an ה ending in the Infinitive Construct.
  - The only verb forms that can be the object of a preposition are the Infinitive Construct and the Participle.
  - The infinitive construct does not take the article.
The Dagesh in the Gimel is a Dagesh Lene, since it is not preceded by a vowel.
1Nun and 1Yod drop out without a trace in the QM. We expected a Shewa under the Gimel because of the finite verb sufformative, but it didn’t happen. The Holem with the Gimel is the QM stem vowel Holem.

V_P = Tsere and we are missing a root consonant, so this is the Qal Imperfect of a 1Yod verb.
V_P = Holem and R_1 Aleph quiesced because this is an Angry Baker 1NS verb in the QI.
V_P = Holem is a defectively written Holem Waw. 1Yod verbs take V_P = Holem Waw in the Hiphil.
We expect V_S = Tsere in the HIwc, so the Pathach is unusual.

מָרָה = QIwc3ms
וָֽאֲכַלְתְ = QPwc2fs
וְטָבִַ֥לְתְ = QPwc2fs
וַ֙תֵשֶ = QIwc3fs
וַיִּצְבָּ֔ט = QIwc3ms
וַתִּאכַֽל = QIwc3fs
וַתִּשְבַָ֖ע = QIwc3fs
וַתֹּׁתַָֽר = HIwc3fs

Boaz said to her at [meal]time, “Come here and eat some of the bread and dip your bread pieces in the vinegar!” So she sat beside the reapers, and he passed roasted grain to her. And she ate until she was full and had some left over.
וַתָּקָם לְלַקֵּט וַיְצַו בַּעַז אֶת־נְעָרִי לֵאמֶר גַּם בֵין הָעָרִים תְלַקֵּט וְלִא תַכְּלִימָוּה׃

The vowel in קָם is in a closed, unaccented syllable, so it is a Qamets Hatuf (short O).

Biconsonantal verbs keep their lexical vowel in the QI, QM, and Q∞, but not necessarily in the QIwc and QJ.

לְלַקֵּט = לַקֵּט D∞+ל

The only verb forms that can be the object of a preposition are participles and infinitives absolute.

וַיְצַו = צוה DIwc3ms

The Vowel in צָו can’t be explained by the Rule of Shewa, so it is Iwc, not a regular Waw. It lost the Dagesh in צָו because Yod is a SQiN eM LeVY consonant with a Shewa.

V₁ = Shewa and V₁ = Pathach, so this is a Piel.

R₂ lost its Dagesh Forte because it does not have a vowel.

לֵאמֶר = אמר Q∞+ל

The spelling is strange but this is a very common verb form, so memorize it.

תְלַקֵּט = לַקֵּט DI3fs

And she rose to glean. And Boaz commanded his young men saying, “Even between the cut ears of grain she will glean and thou shalt not put her to shame!”

תַכְּלִימָוּה = כָּלָם HI2mp+3fs

When she rose to glean, Boaz commanded his young men, “Let her glean even among the cut grain, and do not rebuke her!”
2:16

וְגֶַ֛ם שֹּׁל־תָשִֹּׁ֥לוּ לָָ֖הּ מִן־הַצְבָתִָּ֑ים וַעֲזַבְתִֶ֥ם וְלִֹּׁ֥א תִּגְעֲרוּ־בָָֽהּ׃

- שֹּׁל = שלל QA
- Holem is the QA stem vowel. $R_2$ assimilated into $R_3$, so $R_1$ has the stem vowel.
- You expect an infinitive absolute because two verbs from the same root are right next to one another.

2:17

וַתְלַקִֵ֥ט בַשָדֶָ֖ה עַד־הָעָָ֑רֶב וַתַחְבֹּׁט אֵֹ֣ת אֲשֶר־לִֵ֔קָטָה

- והָלֵֹ֥ט = להקטי DIwc3fs
- וה挲 = חבט QIwc3fs
- $VP$ = Pathach is only for the Hiphil for strong verbs, but for 1G verbs it could also be Qal.
- $VS$ = Holem indicates that this is Qal, not Hiphil.
- An ephah of barley would weigh about 30 pounds (R.L. Hubbard, Ruth (NICOT), 179). This was an extraordinary amount for one person to harvest in a single day. As the NET Bible says, this shows Ruth’s hard work and Boaz’ generosity. It also shows God giving a plentiful harvest (contrasting with the earlier famine). Note Naomi’s response in 2:19.
- And she gleaned in the field until evening. And she beat out what she gleaned, and it was about an ephah of barley.
- So she gleaned in the field until evening. Then she beat out what she had gleaned, and it was about an ephah of barley.
And she lifted up and she came the city and her mother-in-law saw what she gleaned. And she brought out and she gave to her what she had left over from her satiation.

Then she carried it and went to the city. Her mother-in-law saw what she had gleaned. And she brought out and gave to her what she had left over after she was full (i.e., the roasted grain from her lunch).
And her mother-in-law said to her, “Where did you glean the day? And where did you work? May the one recognizing you be blessed!” And she told to her mother in law which she worked with him. And she said, “The name of the man which I worked with him the day Boaz.”

Then her mother-in-law said to her, “Where did you glean today? Where did you work? Blessed be the one who took notice of you!” So she told her mother-in-law with whom she worked, saying, “The name of the man with whom I worked today is Boaz.”
And Naomi said to her daughter-in-law, “Blessed he by YHWH who did not abandon his loyalty with the living and the dead!” And Naomi said to her, “Near to us the man from our redeemers he.”

And Ruth the Moabitess said, “He also said to me, ‘Stick with my young men until they finish my entire harvest.’”
And Naomi said to Ruth her daughter-in-law, “Good my daughter, that you go out with his young women, so that people do not assault you in another field.”

Then Naomi said to her daughter-in-law Ruth, “It is good, my daughter, that you go out with his young women, so that people do not assault you in another field.”

And she stuck with the young women of Boaz to glean until finishing the harvest of the barley and the harvest of the wheat. And she lived with her mother-in-law.

Then her mother-in-law Naomi said to her, “My daughter, should I not seek rest for you, that it may be well with you?”

Then her mother-in-law Naomi said to her, “My daughter, should I not seek rest for you, that it may be well with you?”
And now, not Boaz our relative which you were with his young women? Behold, he winnowing threshing floor the barley the night.

"Now, isn’t Boaz (with whose young women you were) our relative? Look, tonight he is winnowing barley at the threshing floor."

So wash, anoint yourself, get dressed, and go down to the threshing floor, but do not make yourself known to the man until he finishes eating and drinking."

As a poor widow, Ruth likely did not have a set of ‘dress clothes’. But by washing and anointing herself she was making it clear that her period of mourning for her dead husband was over.
It is jussive because (1) the context (instructions) fits a jussive meaning, (2) it begins a clause, (3) it is shortened (the 3rd verb dropped the final נו) 

- The verb begins וי, which comes from י by the Rule of Shewa.

- It is unusual to have a paragogic Nun on a singular imperfect verb (7 times in the Bible, 4 of them are in Ruth).

- And it will be in his lying down and you will know the place which he lies there. And you will go and you will uncover his feet and you will lie down. And he will tell to you what you will do.

- When he lies down, notice the place where he lies. Then go and uncover his feet and lie down. And he will tell you what to do.

- And she said to her, “All which you will say to me, I will do.”

- And she replied, “All that you say to me, I will do.”
Notes on Ruth

3:6

וַתֵּרֶד הַגָּרֶן וַתֵּעַש כְּלֵי אֲשֶׁר צִוָּתָה חֲמוֹתָּה׃

And she went down the threshing floor. And she did like all which her mother-in-law commanded.

This is a summary statement. The following verses give the details.

3:7

וַיֹּאכַל בֹּעַז וַיֵּשְׁתָּ וַיִּיטַב לִּבּוֹ וַיָּבֵא לִּשְׁכַּב בִּקְצֵה הָעֲרֵמָה וַתָּבַא בַּלְט וַתְגִל מַרְגֹּליָּו וַתִּשְׁכַּב׃

Then she went down to the threshing floor and did all that her mother-in-law had commanded.

This is a summary statement. The following verses give the details.

3:8

וַיְהִי בַחֲצִי הַלִּיְלָה וַיֶּחֱרִיד הָאִישׁ וַיִּלָּפַת וְהִנֵּה אִשָּׁה שָׁכַבְתָּ מַרְגֹּליָּיו׃

When Boaz had eaten and drunk and he was feeling good, he went to lie down at the end of the heap of grain. Then she came secretly, uncovered his feet, and lay down.

The text presents the situation from Boaz’ perspective: he suddenly discovers a woman lying at his feet and does not know who she is.
• גואל = גאל QPtMS

• 'A redeemer' is an adult male family member who is obligated to care for the widows of deceased kinsmen.

• And he said, “Who you?” And she said, “I Ruth your maidservant. And you will spread your wing over your maidservant, because a redeemer you.”

• And he said, “Who are you?” And she replied, “I am Ruth, your maidservant. Spread the corner of your garment over your maidservant, because you are a redeemer.”

• Ruth’s request is literally for Boaz to physically cover her with the edge of his garment (‘share your blanket, please?’), but it is also a symbolic action that indicates taking her under his protection and provision. In Ezekiel 16:8 God does this with Jerusalem as part of courting her for marriage. And Ruth’s reference to him being a גואל makes the symbolism explicit. The language is symbolic, but clear: Ruth is asking Boaz to marry her.

• בירוש עשה = בָּרוּךְ הַיָּיוֹת בִּתִּי הֵיטֶַ֛בְת חַסְדִֵ֥ךְ הָאַחֲרָ֖וֹן מִּן־הָרִּאשָ֑וֹן לְבִּלְתִּי־לִֶ֗כֶת אַחֲרֵי֙ הַבַֹ֣חוּרִִּ֔ים

• ‘you have made good your loyalty the last from the first’ = ‘you have made this last act of loyalty greater than the first’.

• Comparative use of הָלְכָּה.

• From the NET Bible notes: ‘Ruth's former act of devotion was her decision to remain and help Naomi. The latter act of devotion is her decision to marry Boaz to provide a child to carry on her deceased husband's (and Elimelech's) line and to provide for Naomi in her old age.’

• The PwC is functioning as a request.

• קָנַף = קָנָף HP2fs

• כְּנָפֶ֙ך֙ = ‘your wing’. This also refers to the corner of a garment (1 Sam 15:27)

• ‘A redeemer’ is an adult male family member who is obligated to care for the widows of deceased kinsmen.

• And he said, “Who you?” And she said, “I Ruth your maidservant. And you will spread your wing over your maidservant, because a redeemer you.”

• And he said, “Who are you?” And she replied, “I am Ruth, your maidservant. Spread the corner of your garment over your maidservant, because you are a redeemer.”

• Ruth’s request is literally for Boaz to physically cover her with the edge of his garment (‘share your blanket, please?’), but it is also a symbolic action that indicates taking her under his protection and provision. In Ezekiel 16:8 God does this with Jerusalem as part of courting her for marriage. And Ruth’s reference to him being a גואל makes the symbolism explicit. The language is symbolic, but clear: Ruth is asking Boaz to marry her.

• בְּרוּכָ֙ה = בָּרוּךְ HPpFS

• הֵיטֶַ֛בְת = הָיטִיב HP2fs

• Most 1-Yod verbs have $\text{VP} = \text{i}$ in the Hiphil, but four (רומל, ימל, ימלע, ימלל) have $\text{VP} = \text{v}$ instead, because they were originally 1-Yod instead of 1-Waw.

• Not all original 1-Yod verbs have $\text{VP} = \text{v}$, however. יברוח and יברוש have $\text{VP} = \text{i}$ in the Hiphil, as if they were originally 1-Waw, even though they were originally 1-Yod (Joüon-Muraoka §76d).

• In both יברוח and יברוש ‘you have made good your loyalty the last from the first’ = ‘you have made this last act of loyalty greater than the first’.

• Comparative use of הָלְכָּה.

• From the NET Bible notes: ‘Ruth's former act of devotion was her decision to remain and help Naomi. The latter act of devotion is her decision to marry Boaz to provide a child to carry on her deceased husband's (and Elimelech's) line and to provide for Naomi in her old age.’
וְעַתִּי בִּתִּי אַל־תִירְאִי כָל אֲשֶׁר־תֹאֲמְרִי אֶעֱשֶׂה לָךְ כִּי יְדֵעַ כָּל־שַׁעַר עַמִּי כִּי אִשֶּת חַּיִל אָתָּה:

- תִירְאִי = ירה, QJ2fs
- This is jussive because it is negated by אַל
- It is 1Yod because V_p = ע

- תֹאֲמְרִי = אמר, QI2fs
- Since Ruth has already made her request, a future translation does not work well here. Instead, the imperfect indicates imperfective aspect: ‘all that you are asking’

- אֶעֱשֶׂה =עשה, QI1cs
- The participle precedes the noun and is deprived of the article, so it is acting as a predicate adjective: ‘the entire gate of my people knows’

- כָּל־שַׁעַר עַמִּי = כל שער עמי, QPtMS
- ‘all the gate of my people’. This figure of speech may refer to the whole town (everyone who comes in and out of the town gate) or to the heads of household of the town (who transact business in the gate area).

- אִשֶּת חַַיִל = אשת חיל, QPtMS
- ‘a woman of power/valiant/etc’. Ruth is a woman of excellent character. This phrase is used in Prov 12:4 and Prov 31:10 to describe the ideal wife. And Boaz is described as אִישׁ גִּבּוֹר חִיוֹל in Ruth 2:1.

- יְדֵעַ =ידע, QPtMS
- “And now, my daughter, do not fear. All that you will say, I will do for you. For all of the gate of my people is knowing that you are a woman of noble character.”

- קֵי אָמְנִי... = כי אם אמתי, QPtMS
- The masora parva יִּ֖ם אֲמַ֣ם means ‘אם is written but not read’. The LXX reading καὶ ὅτι ἀληθῶς ἀγγίστηκε suggests that it was translated from a text that omitted the אֲמַּם. The syntax is awkward in both the Hebrew and the Greek, but the general meaning is clear: ‘It is true that I am a redeemer’.

- נָאֵל = נאל, QPtMS
- And now truly that redeemer I. And also there is a redeemer near from me.

- נָאֵל = נאל, QPtMS
- “And now, it is true that I am a redeemer. But there is also a redeemer who is closer than I.”
3:13 לִֹּ֣ינִּי׀ הַלִַ֗יְלָה וְהָיָ֤ה בַבַֹּּׁ֙קֶר֙ אִּם־יִּגְאָלִֵ֥כְ טוֹב֙ יִּגְאִָ֔ל וְאִּמ־לַֹּּׁ֙א יַחְפֵֹּּׁ֧ץ לְגָָֽאֳלֵֶ֛כְ וּגְאַלְתִִּ֥י אנָֹּׁ֖כִּי חַי־יְהוָָ֑ה

- This is jussive because the jussive meaning ‘let him redeem’ fits the context and because it is first in its clause (actually, it is the only word in its clause).
- The Waw is there to mark the beginning of the apodosis (the ‘then’ part of the conditional clause). WHS §440, 511.
- ‘[by] the life of YHWH’ = ‘as surely as YHWH lives’
- Spend the night tonight and it will be in the morning if he will redeem you, good, he will redeem. But if not he will desire to redeem you, and I will redeem you – I. The life of YHWH. Lie down until the morning.
- “Remain [here] tonight, and in the morning, if he will redeem you, good, let him redeem. But if he does not want to redeem you, then, as surely as YHWH lives, I myself will redeem you. Lie down until the morning.”
וַתִּשְׁכַּבּ מַרְגְלָתוֹ ֹּׁ֖֔קֶר וַתֵּקָּֽם בִּטְרוּם יַכִּיר אִָּ֖יש אֶת־רֵעֵהוּ וַ֙יֹּֽאמֶר֙ אַל־יִוָּדִַ֔ע כִּי־בִָ֥אָה הָאִּשָָ֖ה הַגָּרֶן׃

וַתִּשְׁכַּבּ = שכב QIwc3fs

מַרְגְלָתוֹ = מַרְגְלוֹתָו The Kethib מַרְגְלוֹתָו is singular and written defectively.

מַרְגְלוֹתָי = מַרְגְלוֹתָיו The Qere מַרְגְלוֹתָיו is plural and written plene, but it is unusual to have a holem over the final Waw. We would expect מַרְגְלוֹתָיו.

בְֶ֛רֶעם The Kethib בְֶ֛רֶעם has an unexpected Waw, presumably a Holem Waw.

בְֶ֛רֶם The Qere eliminates the Waw, producing the standard spelling בַּרֶּ֑ם.

יַכִִ֥יר = נכר HI3ms

וּיַכִִ֥יר אִָּ֖יש אֶת־רֵעֵהוּ ‘a man could recognize his friend’. The pair וּאִָּ֖יש אֶת־רֵעֵהוּ is used as a reciprocal pronoun ‘one another’.

וַ֙יֹּֽאמֶר = אמר QIwc3ms

יִוָּדִַ֔ע = ידע NJ3ms

This is jussive because it is negated by אַל. ‘Do not let it be known’.

בִָ֥אָה = הָוָֽא QP3fs

Finite verbs are accented on the stem vowel, not the ultima (unless the stem vowel is reduced, or there is a pronominal suffix or a heavy sufformative), whereas participles are accented on the ultima. So this is the Perfect, not a Participle.

And she lay down at his feet until the morning. And she arose before a man will be able to recognize his friend. And he said, “It will not be known that the woman came the threshing floor.”

So she lay down at his feet until the morning, and then arose before one could recognize another. And he said, “Do not let it be known that the woman came to the threshing floor.”

Boaz commands his servants to keep Ruth’s presence a secret. If the other man chose to marry her, then perhaps it would be embarrassing for it to be known that Ruth had come to Boaz rather than to the man that she ended up marrying.
And he said, “Give the garment which on you and seize with it! And she seized with it. And he measured six barleys. And he put on her. And she entered the city.

And he said, “Hold out your cloak and grip it.” And she gripped it. And he measured out six measure of barley and put it on her. And then she went into town.

And she came to her mother-in-law. And she said, “Who you, my daughter?” And she reported to her all that the man did for her.

Then she went to her mother-in-law. And Naomi asked, “Who are you, my daughter? Then Ruth reported to her all that the man had done for her.

The question seems strange. It may be a rare and disputed use of מִי to mean ‘how?’ (WHS §123) as in ‘How are you doing?’. Or Naomi might be asking, in essence, ‘Who are you? Are you now his fiancé?’
Just like in 3:5, the Kethib has nothing, and the Qere has אֵלִַ֔י 'to me’

And she said, “These six barleys he gave to me, for he said to me, ‘Do not come empty to your mother-in-law’.”

And Ruth said, “He gave me these six measures of barley, for he said to me, ‘Do not come to your mother-in-law empty-handed’.”

Boaz’ gift likely signals his assurance to Naomi that he will fulfil his family obligation to provide for them.

And she said, “Sit, my daughter, until you will know how a matter will fall, for the man will not have peace that if he finished the matter the day.”

Then Naomi said, “Stay put, my daughter, until you know how the matter turns out, for the man will not rest until he has settled the matter today.”

After a negative, can introduce an exception. Boaz won’t rest unless he has settled it. But in English idiom, we would say ‘until he has settled it’.
וַיִּשָּׁבוּ "and Boaz'. Waw on a non-verb at the beginning of a clause is a 'disjunctive waw.' A disjunctive waw indicates something other than the next event in a sequence; in this context, it indicates a change of scene.

- **וּבַֹּּׁ֙עַז** 'and Boaz'. Waw on a non-verb at the beginning of a clause is a ‘disjunctive waw.’ A disjunctive waw indicates something other than the next event in a sequence; in this context, it indicates a change of scene.

- **עָלָֹ֣ה הַשַעַר֘** 'he went up [to] the gate'. Once again, the book of Ruth gives a destination without a preposition or directional הָּהֹּוּ.

- **וַיֵֹ֣שֶב** = ישב QIwc3ms

- **הַגֹּׁאֵ֤ל** = גאל QPtMs+article

- **עֹּׁבֵר** =עבור QPtMS

- **דִּבֶר** = דבר DP3ms

- **וַיֶֹּׁ֛אמֶר** = אמר QIwc3ms

- **ִ֥סִּוּרָה** = סוּר QM2ms+paragogic Hay

- **שְבָה** = ישב QM2ms+paragogic Hay

- **פְלֹנִֹּ֣י אַלְמֹּׁנִָּ֑י** 'so and so' is an idiom used in a quote in a narrative when the actual speaker said a proper noun that the narrator is not reporting. In 2 Kgs 6:8 this idiom is used for ‘at such and such a place’.

  - From the NET Bible notes: The expression פְלֹנִּי אַלְמֹּׁנִּי is not the name of the nearest relative, but an idiom which literally means "such and such" or "a certain one" (BDB 811-12 s.v. פְלֹנִּי), which is used when one wishes to be ambiguous (1 Sam 21:3; 2 Kgs 6:8). Certainly Boaz would have known his relative's name, especially in such a small village, and would have uttered his actual name. However the narrator refuses to record his name in a form of poetic justice because he refused to preserve Mahlon's "name" (lineage) by marrying his widow (see 4:5, 9–10). This close relative, who is a literary foil for Boaz, refuses to fulfill the role of family guardian. Because he does nothing memorable, he remains anonymous in a chapter otherwise filled with names. His anonymity contrasts sharply with Boaz's prominence in the story and the fame he attains through the child born to Ruth. Because the actual name of this relative is not recorded, the translation of this expression is difficult since contemporary English style expects either a name or title. This is usually supplied in modern translations: "friend" (NASB, NIV, RSV, RSVS, NLT), "so-and-so" (JPS, NJPS). Perhaps "Mr. So-And-So!" or "Mr. No-Name!" makes the point.

- **וַיָָ֖סַר** =سوּר QIwc3ms

  - Biconsonantal verbs keep their lexical vowel in the Qal Imperfect, but not always in the Waw Consecutive. The QIwc3ms of biconsonantal verbs tends to accent the preformative, causing the lexical vowel to shorten. Normally the lexical vowel נָּא shortens to Qamets Hatuf (like וַיַָ֫קָם), but סוּר is unusual in that it shortens to Pathach.

- **וַיֵֶֽשָּׁב** =ישב QIwc3ms

  - And Boaz went up the gate and sat there. And behold, the redeemer passing by whom Boaz spoke. And he said, “Turn aside. Sit here a certain one a certain one. And he turned aside and he sat.

  - And Boaz went up to the gate and sat there. And – see! – the redeemer of whom Boaz had spoken was passing by. Then Boaz said, “Come and sit here, Mr. ____.” So he came and sat down.
And he took ten men from the elders of the city and he said “Sit here,” and they sat. Then Boaz chose ten of the village elders and said, “Sit down here.” So they sat down.

Then he said to the redeemer, “Naomi, who has come back from the region of Moab, is selling our relative Elimelech’s parcel of land.”

The legal and economic background of the sale, and why the purchase entailed marrying Ruth, is much debated in the commentaries and unclear.

From the NET Bible notes: The nature of the sale is uncertain. Naomi may have been selling the property rights to the land, but this seems unlikely in light of what is known about ancient Israelite property laws. It is more likely that Naomi, being a woman, held only the right to use the land until the time of her remarriage or death (F. W. Bush, Ruth, Esther [WBC], 202-4). Because she held this right to use of the land, she also had the right to buy it back from the its current owner. (This assumes that Elimelech sold the land prior to going to Moab.) Since she did not possess the means to do so, however, she decided to dispose of her rights in the matter. She was not selling the land per se, but disposing of the right to its redemption and use, probably in exchange for room and board with the purchaser (Bush, 211–15). If this is correct, it might be preferable to translate, "Naomi is disposing of her rights to the portion of land," although such a translation presumes some knowledge of ancient Israelite property laws.

From the Word Biblical Commentary: Proprietary rights to land in the OT were vested in the clan, while the individual held only the right of possession and usufruct, and the central concern of the OT system of inheritance was that ownership of property should remain with the clan to which it originally belonged (see above). Hence, one must conclude … that the widow held only usufructuary rights to her husband’s property and that she did so only until she married again or died in her turn, at which time such rights reverted to her husband’s clan in the normal order of inheritance.
4:4 Then I said to you: I will uncover your (ms) year saying, “Buy before the ones sitting and before the elders of my people. If you will redeem, redeem. And if he will not redeem, tell me so that I may know, for there is no one besides you to redeem, and I am after you.” And he said, “I, I will redeem.”

- The third-person verb form does not readily fit the context, since Boaz has been speaking directly to his relative using second-person verb forms. It is possible, however, that the third-person verb form indicates that Boaz briefly addresses the witnesses.
- Many manuscripts have ‘if you will not redeem’, which fits the context much better and is therefore likely to be a scribal correction.
- The Qere adds the paragogic ה to the cohortative, producing וְאֵָֽדְעָה. The cohortative with ה after an imperative indicates purpose (WHS §181a), so we translate ה as ‘so that’.
- And I, I said I will uncover your (ms) year saying, “Buy before the ones sitting and before the elders of my people. If you will redeem, redeem. And if he will not redeem, tell to me and I shall know that there is not except for you to redeem, and I after you.” And he said, “I, I will redeem.”
- So I am legally informing you: Acquire it in the presence of those who are sitting here and in the presence of the elders of my people. If you will redeem [it], redeem [it]. But if he will not redeem [it, then] tell me so that I may know, for there is no one besides you to redeem [it], and I am after you.” And he said, “I will redeem [it].”
And Boaz said, “In the day of your buying the field from the hand of Naomi, you must also acquire Ruth the Moabitess to raise up the name of the deceased on his inheritance.”

Whoever buys the land is obligated to have a child with Ruth, and that child will inherit the land and be considered Mahlon’s and Elimelech’s descendent rather than the buyer’s descendent.
And the redeemer said, “I will not be able to redeem to me lest I ruin my inheritance. You redeem for yourself my redemption for I will not be able to redeem.”

Then the redeemer said, “I am not able to redeem [it] lest I ruin my inheritance. You redeem [it] for yourself, because I am not able to redeem [it].”

From the NET Bible notes: “It is not entirely clear how acquiring Ruth and raising up an heir for the deceased Elimelech would ruin this individual's inheritance.”
4:8
And the redeemer said to Boaz, “Buy it for yourself.” And he took off his sandal.

So the redeemer said to Boaz, “Buy it for yourself” and took off his sandal.

4:9
And Boaz said to the elders and to all the people, “You witnesses the day that I bought all which to Elimelech and all which to Chilion and Mahlon from the hand of Naomi.”

And Boaz said to the elders and to all the people, “You are witnesses today that I have bought from Naomi all that belonged to Elimelech, Chilion, and Mahlon.”

4:10
And also Ruth the Moabitess the wife of Mahlon I have acquired for myself to a wife to raise up the name of the deceased on his inheritance and the name of the deceased will not be cut off from among his brothers and from the gate of his place. Witnesses you the day.

“And I have also acquired for myself Ruth the Moabitess, Mahlon’s widow, to be a wife, to raise up the name of the deceased on his inheritance so that the name of the deceased will not be cut off from among his brothers and from the gate of his [birth] place. You are witnesses today.”
And all the people who were in the gate and the elders said, ‘[We are] witnesses. And may YHWH make the woman who is coming into your house to be like Rachel and Leah, who together built up the household of Israel, so that you may prosper in Ephrathah and his may name be renowned in Bethlehem.’

They are blessing Boaz, so the jussive indicates their desire that YHWH would bless Boaz with children through Ruth.

“And may your house be like the house of Perez, whom Tamar bore to Judah, from the seed which YHWH will give to you from this young woman.”

“And may your household become like the household of Perez, whom Tamar bore to Judah, through the offspring whom YHWH will give to you through this young woman.”
And Boaz took Ruth and she was to him to a wife. And he went in to her. And YHWH gave to her conception and she bore a son.

So Boaz took Ruth, and she became his wife. And he went in to her, and YHWH gave her conception, and she bore a son.

And the women said to Naomi, “Blessed is YHWH, who has not caused to end to you a redeemer the day! And may his name be called in Israel!”

Then the women said to Naomi, “Blessed be YHWH, who has not left you without a redeemer today! And may his name be renowned in Israel!”
4:15

וְהָ֤יָה לָךְ֙ לְמֵשִֹּ֣יב נִֶ֔פֶש וּלְכַלְכֵָ֖ל אֶת־שֵיבָתֵָ֑ךְ כִֹּ֣י כַלָתֵ֤ךְ אֲֽשֶר־אֲהֵבַ֙תֶ
[36x692]

]וְהָ֤יָה[ = היה QPwc3ms
]לְמֵשִֹּ֣יב[ = שוּב H∞+ל
]וּלְכַלְכֵָ֖ל[ = כַלָתֵךְ Pilpel∞+ל+Waw

This is a rare parsing. I don’t expect you to be able to get it on your own.

The way to get it is (1) know the verb בָל, (2) notice that it is reduplicated (= pilpel), (3) notice the prefixed preposition, which indicates that it is either an infinitive construct or a participle, (4) notice that it does not have a Mem preformative, so it has to be an infinitive construct.

אֲהֵבַ֙תֶךְ֙[ = אוהב QP3fs+2fs

The P3fs ends in ה, but Hay vowel letters can only exist at the end of a word, so when the pronominal suffix is added, it becomes ה

ילָדִַ֔ת[ = ילד QP3fs+3ms

This is a rare spelling. I don’t expect you to be able to get it on your own.

The P3fs ends in ה, but Hay vowel letters can only exist at the end of a word, so when the pronominal suffix is added, it becomes ה. Normally, the 3ms pronominal suffix is ו, but out of the 26 times that there is a 3ms pronominal suffix on a P3fs verb, 8 of those 26 times the pronominal suffix combines with the sufformative in an unexpected way: וֹ+ה = הֹ.

“And he will be to you to one raising up life and to provide your gray-headedness, for your daughter-in-law who loves you bore him, who she good to you than seven sons.”

“He shall be for you a restorer of life and a provider for your old age, for your daughter-in-law, who loves you, who is better to you than seven sons, has given birth to him.”

4:16

וַתִּקַ֙ח נָעֳ

[36x338]

]וַתִּקַ֙ח[ = לָהַ נַחַק QIwc3fs
]וּ[ = לָהַ QIwc3fs+3ms

The Hireq stem vowel is the defectively written lexical vowel Hireq-Yod.

The reduced Vp is due to this being a biconsonantal (hollow) verb with a pronominal suffix.

Since the lexical vowel is Hireq-Yod, the spelling is the same for the Qal and the Hiphil. It is Qal because the meaning of the Qal fits, a Hiphil meaning (‘to cause someone to set something’) does not fit, and the verb does not occur in the Hiphil (discovered by looking in a lexicon).

וַתְהִּ֣י־לְאֹּׁ

[36x213]

]וַתְהִּי־[ = היה QIwc3fs
]לְאֹּֽׁנְתַּ[ = אֹנְתַּ QPtFS+ל

And Naomi took the child and set him in her lap and she because to him to a caregiver.

Then Naomi took the child and set him in her lap and became his caregiver.
And the female inhabitants called to him a name saying, “A son was born to Naomi!” And they called his name Obed. He the father of Jesse, the father of David.

By tracing a genealogy from Perez to David, the text shows the fulfillment of the blessing in 4:11–12 that Boaz’ house would be like the house of Perez (4:11) was fulfilled.