

## **The Many Faces of Job**

# **Handbooks of the Bible and Its Reception**

---

**Volume 5.1**

# The Many Faces of Job

---

The Premodern Period

Edited by  
Choon-Leong Seow

DE GRUYTER

ISBN 978-3-11-056822-6  
e-ISBN (PDF) 978-3-11-056929-2  
e-ISBN (EPUB) 978-3-11-056847-9  
ISSN 2330-6270

**Library of Congress Control Number: 2022942856**

**Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek**

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie;  
detailed bibliographic data are available on the internet at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2023 Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Berlin/Boston

Cover image: Job, his wife, and his friends. Illumination in a twelfth century MS of Gregory the Great's *Moralia*. Paris, [Bib. Nat. lat. 15307, fol. 1v]. © akg-images, AKG2082892.

Typesetting: Integra Software Services Pvt. Ltd.

Printing and binding: CPI books GmbH, Leck

[www.degruyter.com](http://www.degruyter.com)

## Acknowledgement

This collection of essays is the outcome of efforts by many, not least the authors of the essays with whom I have enjoyed working and from whose scholarship I have learned a great deal. I am especially thankful to Joy Schroeder, Nils Holger Petersen, Ute Possek, and Roberto Tottoli who have continued to respond to my research questions well beyond their essays in this volume. Jason Kalman has long been a generous friend and valued conversation partner on the history of Jewish reception of Job.

Much of my research would not have been possible, especially during the pandemic, without the help of the staff of the Jean and Alexander Heard Libraries. Chris Benda, in particular, provided invaluable assistance in tracking down and accessing numerous resources in my research. Rebekah Rochte Votral has been a model of efficiency in her work as my indispensable research assistant.

Finally, it is my pleasure to thank the staff of De Gruyter for making this volume possible, beginning with Albrecht Döhnert, who had encouraged the initiation of this project. Aaron Sanborn-Overby was a source of encouragement and counsel, and Katrin Mittmann has been a patient editor who went beyond her call of duty to help me secure permission for some of the images included in this volume.



# Contents

**Acknowledgement — V**

**Abbreviations — IX**

**List of Figures and Credits — XV**

C. L. Seow

**1 Job in Second-Temple Hebrew and Aramaic Receptions — 1**

C. L. Seow

**2 The Greek Book of Job and Other Second-Temple Greek Receptions — 33**

Jason Kalman

**3 Job in Rabbinic Literature — 65**

Jason Kalman

**4 Medieval Peshat Commentaries on Job — 79**

Jason Kalman

**5 Medieval Jewish Philosophers on Job — 93**

Jason Kalman

**6 Karaites, Mystics, and Anthologizers on Job — 113**

Jason Kalman

**7 Receptions of Job in Medieval Jewish Life — 135**

C. L. Seow

**8 Job in the New Testament and in the Early Church — 165**

C. L. Seow

**9 Job in an Age of Controversy in the Church: Greek Interpreters — 181**

C. L. Seow

**10 Job in an Age of Controversy: Latin Interpreters — 225**

C. L. Seow

**11 Job in an Age of Controversy: Syriac Interpreters — 269**

Ute Possekel

- 12 The Reception of the Book of Job in the Syriac Commentary Tradition — 281**

C. L. Seow

- 13 Gregory's the Great's *Moralia in Job* — 313**

C. L. Seow

- 14 Gregorian Exegesis of Job in the Latin West from the Seventh to Twelfth Centuries — 351**

Joy A. Schroeder

- 15 Interpreting Job in the Later Middle Ages — 391**

Jonathan Warren Pagán

- 16 Receptions of Job in Early Modern Theology (1500–1700) — 417**

Roberto Tottoli

- 17 Job in Islamic Traditions and Literature — 449**

Anthony C. Swindell

- 18 Job in Literature before 1700 — 469**

Nils Holger Petersen

- 19 Musical Receptions of Job from Antiquity to 1700 — 493**

C. L. Seow

- 20 Job in Christian Visual Art: From Late Antiquity to 1700 — 509**

**Index of Sources — 543**

**Index of Subjects — 569**

**Index of Names — 579**

**Index of Modern Authors — 583**



# Abbreviations

1QH <sup>a</sup>	Hodayot, Thanksgiving Hymns, from Qumran Cave 1
1QM	Serek ha-Milḥamah, War Scroll, from Qumran Cave 1
1QS	Serek ha-Yaḥad, Rule of the Community, from Qumran Cave 1
2QJer	2Q13, MS of Jeremiah from Qumran Cave 2
2QJob	2Q15, MS of Job from Qumran Cave 2
4Q184	Sapiential Admonitions from Qumran Cave 4
4Q264	Serek ha-Yaḥad MS <sup>j</sup> from Qumran Cave 4
4Q267	Damascus Document MS <sup>d</sup> from Qumran Cave 4
4Q429	Hodayot MS <sup>c</sup> from Qumran Cave 4
4Q432	Hodayot papyrus MS <sup>f</sup> from Qumran Cave 4
4Q501	Apocryphal Lamentations MS <sup>B</sup> from Qumran Cave 4
4Q511	Songs of the Sage MS <sup>b</sup> from Qumran Cave 4
4QAramJob	4Q157, 4QtgJob, from Qumran Cave 4
4QJer	Jeremiah MSS from Qumran Cave 4
4QJob <sup>a</sup>	MS of Job from Qumran Cave 4
4QJob <sup>b</sup>	MS of Job from Qumran Cave 4
4QpaleoJob <sup>c</sup>	Paleo-Hebrew MS of Job from Qumran Cave 4
4QpaleoParaJosh	Paleo-Hebrew MS of paraphrase of Joshua from Qumran Cave 4
4QpapTob	Papyrus MS of Tobit from Qumran Cave 4
4QpJub	Pseudo-Jubilees from Qumran Cave 4
8HevXIgr	Greek MS of the Book of the Twelve from Naḥal Ḥever
11QAramJob	11Q10, Aramaic MS of Job from Qumran Cave 11
AARAS	American Academy of Religion Academy Series
AB	Anchor Bible
ACO	<i>Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum</i> . Edited by Eduard Schwartz. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1914–1984
AARCRS	American Academy of Religion Classics in Religious Studies
ACW	Ancient Christian Writers
<i>Adnot.lob</i>	<i>Adnotationes in Iob liber 1</i>
AGJU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums
AH	Anno Hegirae (“in the year of the Hijra”)
AHAW	Abhandlungen der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften
<i>AJSR</i>	<i>Association for Jewish Studies Review</i>
ALGHJ	Arbeiten zur Literatur und Geschichte des hellenistischen Judentums
AS	<i>Aramaic Studies</i>
ATANT	Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments
<i>ATR</i>	<i>Australasian Theological Review</i>
<i>AugStud</i>	<i>Augustinian Studies</i>
AUSTR	American University Studies, Series 7: Theology and Religion
AW	<i>Athanasius Alexandrinus Werke</i>

AYBRL	Anchor Yale Bible Reference Library
BALaT	Belgian Art Links and Tools
BEO	<i>Bulletin d'études orientales de l'Institut Français de Damas</i>
BETL	Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium
<i>Bib</i>	<i>Biblica</i>
BIOSCS	<i>Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies</i>
BJs	Brown Judaic Studies
B-L	Hans Bauer and Pontus Leander, <i>Grammatik des biblisch-aramäischen</i> . Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1927
BO	<i>Bibliotheca Orientalis</i>
BThSt	<i>Biblisch-Theologische Studien</i>
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
BZNW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
CBiPa	Cahiers de Biblia Patristica
CBET	Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology
CBQ	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CBQMS	Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series
CCCM	Corpus Christianorum: Continuatio Mediaevalis
CCSG	Corpus Christianorum: Series Graeca
CCSL	Corpus Christianorum: Series Latina
CD	Damascus Document from Qumran
CEJL	Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature
CEU	Central European University
CF	<i>Classical Folia</i>
CFMM	Church of the Forty Martyrs, MS 66
CH	<i>Church History</i>
CO	Ioannis Calvini Opera Quae Supersunt Omnia. 59 vols. Corpus Reformatorum 29–88. Eds. G. Baum, E. Cunitz and E. Reuss. Brunswick/Berlin. 1863–1900
COS	<i>The Context of Scripture</i> . Edited by William W. Hallo. 3 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1997–2002
CRINT	Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum
CS	Cistercian Studies
CSCO	Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium. Edited by Jean-Baptiste Chabot et al. Paris, 1903
CSEL	Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum
CSS	<i>Commentaria in scripturam sacram</i>
CWS	Classics of Western Spirituality
DB	<i>Dictionnaire de la Bible</i> . Edited by Fulcran Vigouroux. 5 vols. Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1895–1912
DCLS	Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Studies
DJD	Discoveries in the Judean Desert
DRev	<i>Downward Review</i>

<i>DSD</i>	<i>Dead Sea Discoveries</i>
<i>EAC</i>	<i>Encyclopedia of Ancient Christianity</i>
<i>EBib</i>	<i>Etudes bibliques</i>
<i>EBR</i>	<i>Encyclopedia of the Bible and Its Reception</i> . Edited by Hans-Josef Klauck et al. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009–
<i>EDSS</i>	<i>Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls</i> . Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam. 2 vols. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
<i>EncJud</i>	<i>Encyclopedia Judaica</i>
<i>Ep(p).</i>	<i>Epistula(e), Letter(s)</i>
<i>Erlsr</i>	<i>Eretz-Israel</i>
<i>ETL</i>	<i>Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses</i>
<i>Exp.</i>	<i>Expositio</i>
<i>FC</i>	Fathers of the Church
<i>fol.</i>	folio
<i>FSBP</i>	Fontes et Subsidia ad Bibliam Pertinentes
<i>GEDSH</i>	<i>Gorgias Encyclopedic Dictionary of the Syriac Heritage</i>
<i>GCS</i>	Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten [drei] Jahrhunderte
<i>GEDSH</i>	<i>The Gorgias Encyclopedic Dictionary of the Syriac Heritage</i>
<i>GOF</i>	Göttinger Orientforschungen
<i>GNO</i>	Gregorii Nysseni Opera
<i>HBR</i>	Handbooks of the Bible and Its Reception
<i>Hen</i>	<i>Henoch</i>
<i>HKNT</i>	Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament
<i>HS</i>	<i>Hebrew Studies</i>
<i>HSAT</i>	<i>Die Heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments</i> . Edited by Emil Kautzsch and Alfred Bertholet. 4th ed. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1922–1923
<i>HThKAT</i>	Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Alten Testament
<i>HTR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
<i>HUCA</i>	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
<i>HUC-JIR</i>	Hebrew Union College Jewish Institute of Religion
<i>HUCM</i>	Monographs of the Hebrew Union College
<i>ICC</i>	International Critical Commentary
<i>IEJ</i>	<i>Israel Exploration Journal</i>
<i>IOS</i>	<i>Israel Oriental Studies</i>
<i>ISBL</i>	Indiana Studies in Biblical Literature
<i>JAC</i>	<i>Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum</i>
<i>JANESCU</i>	<i>Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society of Columbia University</i>
<i>JAOS</i>	<i>Journal of the American Oriental Society</i>
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>JBLMS</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature Monograph Series</i>
<i>JECS</i>	<i>Journal of Early Christian Studies</i>
<i>JEH</i>	<i>Journal of Ecclesiastical History</i>

<i>JHI</i>	<i>Journal of the History of Ideas</i>
<i>JJS</i>	<i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i>
<i>JNES</i>	<i>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</i>
<i>JQR</i>	<i>Jewish Quarterly Review</i>
<i>JQS</i>	<i>Journal of Qur'anic Studies</i>
<i>JR</i>	<i>Journal of Religion</i>
<i>JSHRZ</i>	<i>Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit</i>
<i>JSJSup</i>	Supplements to Journal for the Study of Judaism
<i>JSNTSup</i>	Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series
<i>JSOTSup</i>	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series
<i>JSP</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha</i>
<i>JSPSup</i>	Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series
<i>JSQ</i>	<i>Jewish Studies Quarterly</i>
<i>JSS</i>	<i>Journal of Semitic Studies</i>
<i>JTISup</i>	Journal of Theological Interpretation Supplements
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
<i>KS</i>	<i>Kirjath-Sepher</i>
<i>LCL</i>	Loeb Classical Library
<i>LSJ</i>	Liddell, Henry George, Robert Scott, Henry Stuart Jones. <i>A Greek-English Lexicon</i> . 9th ed. with revised supplement. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996
<i>LSTS</i>	The Library of Second Temple Studies
<i>LW</i>	<i>Luther's Works</i> (American Edition). 55 vols. St. Louis, MO/Philadelphia, PA: Concordia/Fortress, 1955–86
<i>ME</i>	<i>Medieval Encounters: Jewish, Christian and Muslim Culture in Confluence and Dialogue</i>
<i>MGH</i>	Monumenta Germaniae Historica
<i>MGWJ</i>	Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums
<i>MSU</i>	Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens
<i>NovTSup</i>	Supplements to Novum Testamentum
<i>NPNF<sup>2</sup></i>	<i>Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Series 2</i>
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
<i>NV</i>	<i>Nova et Vetera</i>
<i>OBO</i>	Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis
<i>OCA</i>	Orientalia Christiana Analecta
<i>OCP</i>	<i>Orientalia Christiana Periodica</i>
<i>OECS</i>	Oxford Early Christian Studies
<i>OECT</i>	Oxford Early Christian Texts
<i>OLA</i>	Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta
<i>OLP</i>	Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica
<i>ORA</i>	Orientalische Religionen in der Antike
<i>OrChr</i>	<i>Oriens Christianus</i>
<i>OTE</i>	<i>Old Testament Essays</i>

OTP	<i>Old Testament Pseudepigrapha</i> . Edited by James H. Charlesworth. 2 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1983, 1985
PAAJR	<i>Proceedings of the American Academy of Jewish Research</i>
Pap.	Papyrus
PG	Patrologia Graeca [= <i>Patrologiae Cursus Completus : Series Graeca</i> ]. Edited by J. P. Migne. 162 vols. Paris, 1857–1886
PGL	<i>Patristic Greek Lexicon</i> . Edited by Geoffrey W. H. Lampe. Oxford: Clarendon, 1961
PIASH	Proceedings of the Israel Academy of Sciences & Humanities
PL	Patrologia Latina [= <i>Patrologiae Cursus Completus: Series Latina</i> ]. Edited by Jacques-Paul Migne. 217 vols. Paris, 1844–1864
PMLA	<i>Proceedings of the Modern Language Association</i>
PO	Patrologia Orientalis
PS	Pseudepigrapha Series
PTA	Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen
PTS	Patristische Texte und Studien
PVTG	Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece
RB	<i>Revue biblique</i>
RBén	<i>Revue Benedictine</i>
REJ	<i>Revue des études juives</i>
RHR	<i>Revue de l'histoire des religions</i>
RHE	<i>Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique</i>
RQ	Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Altertumskunde und Kirchengeschichte Supplementheft
RSR	<i>Recherches de science religieuse</i>
RTAM	<i>Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale</i>
SAACT	State Archives of Assyria Cuneiform Texts
SEAug	Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum
Sef	<i>Sefarad</i>
SBLEJL	Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and its Literature
SBLSCS	Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies
SBLSymS	Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series
SBLTT	Society of Biblical Literature Texts and Translations
SBO	S. Bernardi Opera
SC	Sources chrétiennes
Sem	<i>Semitica</i>
SHC	<i>Codex Syro-Hexaplaris Ambrosianus</i>
sig.	signetur
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
Spec	<i>Speculum</i>
SSN	Studia Semitica Neerlandica
STDJ	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah

## XIV — Abbreviations

StPatr	Studia Patristica
SUNT	Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments
TBN	Themes in Biblical Narrative
TDOT	<i>Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament</i> . Edited by G. Johannes Botterweck and Helmer Ringgren. Translated by John T. Willis et al. 8 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974–2006
*Theod.	Asterisked text in the Greek book of Job
ThR NF	<i>Theologische Rundschau</i>
TRE	<i>Theologische Realenzyklopädie</i> . Edited by Gerhard Krause and Gerhard Müller. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1977–
TTH	Translated Texts for Historians
VC	<i>Vigiliae Christianae</i>
VChrSup	Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae
VT	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
VTSup	Supplements to Vetus Testamentum
WA	Weimarer Ausgabe (Weimar Edition), D. <i>Martin Luthers Werke, Kritische Gesamtausgabe</i> . 72 vols. Weimar: Hermann Böhlaus Nachfolger, 1883–
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WGRW	Writings from the Greco-Roman World
WSA	<i>Works of Saint Augustine, A Translation for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century</i> . 44 vols. Edited by J. E. Rotelle et al. Hyde Park, NY: New City Press, 1990
YJS	Yale Judaica Series
ZAC	<i>Zeitschrift für antikes Christentum</i>
ZAW	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
ZK	<i>Zeitschrift für Keilschriftforschung</i>
ZNW	<i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche</i>
ZPE	<i>Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik</i>

# List of Figures and Credits

## Chapter 7

- Figure 1** The Rothschild Miscellany; Unidentified scribe; Veneto, Northern Italy; ca. 1460–80 Handwritten on vellum; brown ink, tempera, gold and silver leaf; square and semi-cursive Ashkenazic script; H: 21; W: 15.9 cm; Gift of James A. de Rothschild, London; Accession number: B61.09.0803o.s.180/051 fol. 64v. Photo © The Israel Museum, Jerusalem, by Ardon Bar-Hama — **158**
- Figure 2** Illumination of the Golden Haggadah from Barcelona. (17th C).British Library [Add. MS 27210, fol. 9r.] <https://www.bl.uk/catalogues/illuminatedmanuscripts/ILLUMIN.ASP?Size=mid&IllID=57226>. Public domain image, courtesy of British Library — **160**

## Chapter 17

- Figure 1** Illumination of the Qiṣaṣ al-Albiyā by New York Public Library, Spencer Collection [Persian MS 1, fol. 119.] <https://digitalcollections.nypl.org/items/5e66b3e8-86af-d471-e040-e00a180654d7>. Public domain image, courtesy of New York Public Library — **467**

## Chapter 20

- Figure 1** Paris Syriac Bible, [Paris, Bib. Nat., syr. 341, fol. 46r], ca. 600 C.E. Public domain image, courtesy of Wikimedia Commons — **511**
- Figure 2** Wooden statue of Job, ca. 1510–1520, now in Museum Mayer van den Bergh, Antwerp. Photograph by Jean-Luc Elias, courtesy of KIK-IRPA, Brussels — **515**
- Figure 3** Statue of Job from Kerk Sint-Martinus (Church of Saint Martin) in Wezemaal, Belgium, ca. 1400–1430. Photograph by Jean-Luc Elias, courtesy of KIK-IRPA, Brussels — **516**
- Figure 4** Statue of Job from Sint-Jobkerk in Schoonbroek, Belgium, ca. 1541–1560. Photograph by Katrien Van Acker, courtesy of KIK-IRPA, Brussels — **517**
- Figure 5** Job as prophet. Painting by Fra Bartolomeo for the church of Santissima Annunziata, Florence, ca. 1516. Now in Galleria dell' Accademia di Firenze. Public domain image, courtesy of Wikimedia Commons — **518**
- Figure 6** *Pala di San Giobbe* (“Job Altarpiece”), painted by Giovanni Bellini for Chiesa di San Giobbe, ca. 1478. It is now in Gallerie dell'Accademia, Venice. Public domain image, courtesy of Wikimedia Commons — **520**
- Figure 7** Vittore Carpaccio, *Meditation on the Passion*, ca. 1490, now in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York. Public domain image, courtesy of Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York — **521**
- Figure 8** “Job the Righteous” as king, with his three daughters. Illustration of the end of a Coptic version of the book of Job. Naples, Bib. Nazionale di Napoli, Vittorio Emanuele III, [MS I.B.18, fol. 4v], from the 7th century. Public domain image, courtesy of Wikimedia Commons — **522**
- Figure 9** Junius Bassus Sarcophagus, Rome, 359 C.E., now in Museo Storico del Tesoro della Basilica di San Pietro, Vatican City. Public domain image, courtesy of Wikimedia Commons — **526**

- Figure 10** Picture Bible from Northern France. The Hague, Koninklijke Bibliotheek, [MS 76 F-5, fol. 8r], ca. 13th century. Image courtesy of Koninklijke Bibliotheek, the Hague, Netherlands — **527**
- Figure 11** *Jabach Altarpiece* by Albrecht Dürer, ca. 1504. The left panel is now in the Städelsches Kunstinstitut und Städtische Galerie, Frankfurt. The right panel is in the Wallraf-Richartz Museum, Cologne. Public domain image, courtesy of Wikimedia Commons — **527**
- Figure 12** *Job and His Wife*. Painting by Georges de La Tour, seventeenth century, now in Musée Départemental des Vosges, Épinal, France. Public domain image, courtesy of Wikimedia Commons — **528**
- Figure 13** *The Destruction of Job's Children*. Fresco painting by Bartolo di Fredi in the Duomo di San Gimignano, Tuscany, ca. 1367. Public domain image, courtesy of Wikimedia Commons — **530**
- Figure 14** *The Loss of Job's herds and servants*. Fresco painting by Bartolo di Fredi in the Duomo di San Gimignano, Tuscany, ca. 1367. Public domain image, courtesy of Wikimedia Commons — **530**
- Figure 15** Job paying musicians who entertained him. A scene from a triptych on the life of Job by the Master of the *Legend of Saint Barbara*, ca. 1466–1500. Wallraf-Richartz Museum, Cologne. Public domain image, courtesy of Wikimedia Commons — **532**
- Figure 16** Illumination of the initial letter of Job 1:1 in the Vg. on a MS of Philip the Presbyter's commentary on Job. Cambrai Bibliothèque Municipale, [MS 470, fol. 2] (eighth century). Image courtesy of Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes, France, with permission from Cambrai Bibliothèque Municipale — **534**
- Figure 17** [*Hortus Deliciarum*, fol. 84r, pl. 49] (now lost). Hohenburg Abbey, Alsace, twelfth century. Public domain image, courtesy of Wikimedia Commons — **535**
- Figure 18** God fishing for Leviathan and Job as prophet of the cross and resurrection. Herzogenburg Moralia, Stiftsbibliothek Herzogenburg, [Cod. 95, fol. 257v], thirteenth century. Photograph by Armand Tif/Martin Roland, courtesy of Stiftsbibliothek Herzogenburg — **536**
- Figure 19** The Antichrist enthroned upon Leviathan. *Liber Floridus*, ca. 1120. Ghent, Rijksuniversiteit, Centrale Bibliotheek, [MS 92, fol. 62v]. Public domain image, courtesy of Wikimedia Commons — **537**
- Figure 20** Job, his wife, and his friends. Illumination in a twelfth century MS of Gregory the Great's *Moralia*. Paris, [Bib. Nat. lat. 15307, fol. 1v]. © akg-images, AKG2082892 — **539**



C. L. Seow

# 1 Job in Second-Temple Hebrew and Aramaic Receptions

The Hebrew book of Job was copied, translated, re-imagined, and alluded to throughout the Second Temple Period. This essay explores various Hebrew and Aramaic iterations of the story in its early hermeneutical history.

## Hebrew MSS

Among the scrolls discovered at Qumran are fragments of 4 Hebrew MSS of Job.<sup>1</sup> The most important of these are 4QpaleoJob<sup>c</sup> and 4QJob<sup>a</sup>.<sup>2</sup>

### 4QpaleoJob<sup>c</sup>

This MS preserves portions of 13:18–20, 23–27, and 14:13–18.<sup>3</sup> Paleographic considerations lead scholars to posit a date near the end of the third century BCE.<sup>4</sup> The Paleo-Hebrew script is exceptional, for other biblical MSS from Qumran with this script are books of the Torah.<sup>5</sup> The Paleo-Hebrew script had given way to the Aramaic in the Persian period, the former retained mostly as an archaism.<sup>6</sup>

The orthography of the MS is conservative. Internal vowel letters are almost entirely lacking, thus reflecting the orthographic practice of the pre-exilic period, though the book itself was composed no earlier than the end of the sixth century

---

1 See, in general, Carol A. Newsom, “The Reception of Job in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *“When the Morning Stars Sang”: Essays in Honor of Choon Leong Seow on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, BZAW 500, ed. Scott C. Jones and Christine R. Yoder (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2017), 99–114.

2 Much less substantial is 4QJob<sup>b</sup>, containing portions of 8:15–17; 9:27; 13:4; 14:4–6; 31:20–21, with some orthographic variants. Even less, 2QJob, a single fragment preserving one complete word and a few letters of 33:28–30, though the fragmentary nature of this MS makes it impossible to know if it is a MS of the book or merely a quote from it.

3 Eugene E. Ulrich, “4QpaleoJob<sup>c</sup>,” in *Qumran Cave 4, IV. Palaeo-Hebrew and Greek Manuscripts*, DJD 9, ed. Patrick Skehan et al. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1992), 155–57, pl. 37.

4 Mark D. McLean, “The Use and Development of Palaeo-Hebrew in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods” (PhD diss., Harvard University, 1982), 47–52.

5 The only other example of Paleo-Hebrew in a non-Pentateuchal MS is 4QpaleoParaJosh, though it is unclear if this fragment represents a variant tradition or a paraphrase.

6 William M. Schniedewind, *A Social History of Hebrew: Its Origins through the Rabbinic Period*, AYBR (New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 2013), 160–61.

BCE.<sup>7</sup> Yet this conservatism is not an invention of the scribe, for there are clues corroborating the conservatism in the original composition.<sup>8</sup> The orthography and linguistic features typical of archaic texts are literary affectations by the narrator to lend credibility to the story's setting.<sup>9</sup> The two archaistic features in 4QpaleoJob<sup>c</sup> – its script and orthography – support this literary premise.

## 4QJob<sup>a</sup>

Dating to the first half of the first century BCE,<sup>10</sup> 4QJob<sup>a</sup> is the largest of the Hebrew MSS from Qumran and the earliest to present the text in poetic lines. This MS attests a number of significant variants, some of which may in fact be superior to the readings in the MT.<sup>11</sup>

Perhaps the most interesting of these is in 31:15a, part of Job's complaint against God (chs. 29–31), which culminates in an asseveration regarding his conduct (ch. 31). Among the merits he claims is his just treatment of his subordinates. In the MT, Job says in reference to his servant: *הֲלֹא־בִבְטֶן עָשִׂי עָשָׂהוּ*, “Did not the one who created me create him in the belly?” (31:15a). Instead of *בבטן עשני*, however, 4QJob<sup>a</sup> has *עשני בבטן* (“the one who made me in the belly . . .”). The word order in the latter is also evident in 11QAramJob (11Q10): *[. . . בכריסא ארו עבד]*,<sup>12</sup> “for the one who made me in the womb . . .”<sup>13</sup> Indeed, apart from the initial *הלא*, which serves both lines of the couplet, 4QJob<sup>a</sup> and 11QAramJob manifest the same chiasmic structure:

עשני בבטן עשהו	a	b	c
ויכננו ברחם אחד	c'	b'	a'

(Did not) the one who made me in the belly make him?  
And (did not) One form us in the womb?<sup>14</sup>

<sup>7</sup> See C. L. Seow, *Job 1–21, Illuminations* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015), 39–45.

<sup>8</sup> See David Noel Freedman, “Orthographic Peculiarities in the Book of Job,” *ErIsr* 9 (1969): 35–44; rpt. *Divine Commitment and Human Obligation*, ed. John R. Huddleston (Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1997), 44–60; C. L. Seow, “Orthography, Textual Criticism, and the Poetry of Job,” *JBL* 130 (2011): 63–85.

<sup>9</sup> Seow, *Job 1–21*, 15–26.

<sup>10</sup> See Eugene Ulrich and Sarianna Metso, “4QJob<sup>a</sup>,” *Qumran Cave 4. XI. Psalms to Chronicles*, DJD 16, ed. Eugene Ulrich et al. (Oxford: Clarendon, 2000), 171–78, pl. 21.

<sup>11</sup> See C. L. Seow, “Text Critical Notes on 4QJob<sup>a</sup>,” *DSD* 22 (2015): 189–202.

<sup>12</sup> It is possible that the underlying Hebrew text of 11QAramJob had *כי*, a variant but an understandable one, since *הלא* in the book of Job is usually rhetorical and affirmative. See, for instance, 4:6, 21; 7:1; 8:10; 10:10.

<sup>13</sup> Contrast the Tg. (בכריסא עבדני) and Syr. (ܒܚܡܝܐ ܕܥܒܕܢܝ).

<sup>14</sup> Note the juxtaposition of *עשה* and *בן* in the context of divine creation (Deut 32:6; Isa 45:18; Jer 10:12; 33:2; 51:12, 15; Ps 119:73). MT's *וַיַּכְנֵנוּ* (as if Qal) is unique and probably erroneous. We should read either *וַיַּכְנֵנוּ* (< וַיַּכְנֵנוּ\*) or *וַיַּכְנֵנוּ*.

This word order in the first line of the couplet in 4QJob<sup>a</sup> and 11QAramJob emphasizes God as the creator of all people, unequal though they may become in life. By contrast, the word order in the MT emphasizes the commonality of the formation of master and slave “in the belly.” According to the former, the oneness of the human creatures mirrors the oneness of the creator. The final term in the couplet, אחד (“one”), harks back to the creator mentioned in the beginning of the couplet. Here אחד is perhaps an allusion the affirmation of YHWH as אחד in Deut 6:4. Indeed, in the post-exilic period, אחד (“one”) appears to have become a designation for God.<sup>15</sup> Furthermore, the chiasmic structure places בטן (“belly”) and רחם (“womb”) at the center of each line. This word-pair recalls Job’s words in 3:11. Job, who in his first poem angrily decries his creation, now in his final poem offers a theologically profound ethical argument based on a theology of the creation of humanity by the God who is One.

## Aramaic Versions from Qumran

Commonly called 4QtgJob (4Q157) and 11QtgJob (11Q10), these Aramaic MSS are translations of the Hebrew without the midrashic expansions that typify the rabbinic *targumim*.<sup>16</sup> Rather than entering into a debate about the definition of the term *targum*, it is perhaps easiest to follow David Shepherd in referring to these MSS simply as Aramaic versions, thus, 4QAramJob and 11QAramJob.

### 4QAramJob

This MS survives in a single fragment, preserving portions of 3:5–6 and 4:17 – 5:4.<sup>17</sup> Yet this small portion contains three interesting readings. The MT reads in 5:1b, וְאֶל־מִי תִפְנֶה, “and to whom among the holy ones will you turn?” For Hebrew תִפְנֶה, the OG has ὁψη, “you see,” instead of “you turn.” While the verb ὁράω does not translate פנה elsewhere, its synonym βλέπω often does (Ezek 8:3; 11:1; 43:17; etc.). So ὁψη in the

<sup>15</sup> Zech 14:9; Mal 2:10, 15. See Cyrus Gordon, “His Name is ‘One’,” *JNES* 29 (1970): 198–99.

<sup>16</sup> See Sebastian P. Brock, “Translating the Old Testament,” in *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture. Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars*, ed. D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 95; David Shepherd, “Will the Real Targum Please Stand Up? Translation and Coordination in the Ancient Aramaic Versions of Job,” *JJS* 51 (2000): 113–116; *Targum and Translation: A Reconsideration of the Qumran Aramaic Version of Job*, SSN 45 (Assen: Van Gorcum, 2004).

<sup>17</sup> Joseph T. Milik, “Le targum de Job,” in *Qumrân Grotte 4*, DJD 6, ed. Roland de Vaux et al. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1977), 90.

OG of 5:1b does reflect Hebrew תִּפְנָה. Interestingly, 4QAramJob has תִּבְקָה, “you look,”<sup>18</sup> thus interpreting the term as the OG does.

In the first line of the next verse, the MT reads, בִּי־לְאִוִּיל יִהְיֶה־כָּעֵשׂ, “for/surely vexation kills the fool” (5:2a). Instead of בִּי, 4QAramJob has הֲלֵא, literally, “(Does) not . . . ?” though this is simply the rhetorical equivalent of an affirmation, “Surely!” – as indeed הֲלֵא typically means in Job (so 4:6, 21; 7:1; 8:10, etc.). That is, 4QAramJob interprets כִּי as emphatic rather than as causal.

This Aramaic version is certainly interpretive when it proffers רָשָׁע, “wicked” in 5:2, where the Hebrew has אִוִּיל, “fool,” in accordance with the common judgment of folly as inherent baseness (Prov 5:23; 14:8; Ps 69:6 [5]).

## 11QAramJob

Consisting of 38 columns of text, 11QAramJob preserves portions of 17:14b–42:12a.<sup>19</sup> The Herodian script indicates a mid-first century CE date for this MS, though the translation is no doubt earlier. The linguistic evidence leads Muraoka to date the composition as early as the mid-third century BCE,<sup>20</sup> but others suggest the second half of the second century BCE,<sup>21</sup> or as late as the first century BCE.<sup>22</sup>

### Translation as Interpretation

The judgment of the original editors regarding the similarity between the underlying Hebrew text of 11QAramJob and the MT has largely proven true.<sup>23</sup> The differences are most often in interpretation and do not reflect textual variants, as the following examples illustrate:

<sup>18</sup> Cf. 11QAramJob at 36:25, where Aramaic בְּקִי translate Hebrew נִבֵּט, “to look,” perhaps meaning “to inquire about.”

<sup>19</sup> The *editio princeps* is J. V. M. van der Ploeg et al. eds., *Le targum de Job de la Grotte XI de Qumrân* (Leiden: Brill, 1971). See also Michael Sokoloff, *The Targum to Job from Qumran Cave XI* (Ramat Gan: Bar-Ilan University, 1974); Bruce Zuckerman and S. A. Reed, “A Fragment of an Unstudied Column of 11QtgJob: A Preliminary Report,” *The Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon Newsletter* 19 (1993): 1–7; Florentino García Martínez, et al., eds., “11QtargumJob,” in *Qumran Cave 11, II*, DJD 23; ed. Florentino García Martínez et al. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 79–180.

<sup>20</sup> So Takamitsu Muraoka, “The Aramaic of the Old Targum of Job from Qumran Cave XI,” *JJS* 25 (1974): 425–43.

<sup>21</sup> So van der Ploeg et al., *Le targum de Job*, 3–5, 8; Sokoloff, *Targum to Job*, 9, 25.

<sup>22</sup> Stephen A. Kaufman, “The Job Targum from Qumran,” *JAOS* 93 (1973): 326–327; see also Bruce Zuckerman, “The Date of 11Qtargum Job: A Paleographic Consideration of its Vorlage,” *JSP* 1 (1987): 74–75.

<sup>23</sup> Van der Ploeg et al., *Le targum de Job*, 7; similarly, Sokoloff, *Targum to Job*, 6.

MT	11QAramJob
19:18 עוֹלָם, “children”	רשעין, “wicked ones” (= Heb. עוֹלָם or עוֹלָם) <sup>24</sup>
24:13 אֹר, “light”	[א]נור, “fire” (= Heb. אֹר)
30:2 עָלֵמֹ, “upon them”	וּאִכְפִּי[הוּ], “with their burdens” (= Heb. עָלֵמֹ)
30:13 יַעֲלֹ, “they benefitted”	יתון, “they came” (= Heb. יַעֲלֹ)

In many other cases, 11QAramJob explicates the Hebrew by rewording, as in these examples:

MT	11QAramJob
19:12 גְּדוּדָיו, “his gangs”	חַתְפוּהוּ, “his snatchers”
20:2 שְׁעָפִי, “my thoughts”	לִבִּי, “my heart/mind”
20:5 עֲדִירָנֶע, “up to a moment”	לַעֲבֹעַ תַּעֲדָא, “quickly passes”
25:2 פָּחַד, “dread”	רְבוּ, “greatness”
28:8a בְּנֵי־שַׁחַן, “proud ones”	תַּנִּין, “dragon”
37:17 נִפְלְאוֹת, “wonders”	גְּבוּרָה, “might”
40:25 לִיָּתָן, “Leviathan”	תַּנִּין, “dragon”
41:15 בְּלִי־מוֹט, “immoveable”	כַּפְרוֹזָא, “like iron”
41:26 כָּל־בְּנֵי־שַׁחַן, “all the proud ones”	כָּל רֶחַשׁ, “all reptiles”

Brock has characterized the translator of this Aramaic MS as *interpretes*, meaning one who adheres to the words of a text rather than what the words might signify.<sup>25</sup> By contrast, a traditional rabbinic targumist is an *expositores*, offering a translation that is an expansive explication of the text. The *interpretes* is subservient to the source text, typically passing on any difficulty in the original, “even if the rendering makes nonsense.”<sup>26</sup> By this definition, the Aramaic translator is not strictly an *interpretes*, though Brock no doubt recognizes a range of such translations. For instance, the translator renders לִיָּתָן in 40:25 as תַּנִּין, “dragon,” thus concurring with the OG, which Brock regards as an expository translation (contrast Λευιαθαν in Aq.). By this translation, 11QAramJob effectively equates Leviathan with the בְּנֵי־שַׁחַן (“sons of the proud”), also rendered as תַּנִּין in 28:8, though the translator interprets כָּל־בְּנֵי־שַׁחַן (“all the sons of the proud”) in 41:26 to mean כָּל רֶחַשׁ, “all reptiles.” Furthermore, this translator does not always adhere to the precise wording of the text. Thus, where the MT in 21:6 has the awkward expression, וְאִחֲזִי בְּשָׁרִי פִלְצוֹת, “and my body seized trembling,” 11QAram-

<sup>24</sup> The OG has τὸν αἰῶνά, reflecting עולם, but interpreted as “eternity” (עוֹלָם), whereas 11QAramJob interprets the same consonants as עוֹלָם, and the masoretes assume עוֹלָם. In the latter two cases, the internal *yod-mater* is interpretive. Similarly, in the examples from 30:2, 13, the *mater* is interpretive.

<sup>25</sup> Brock, “Translating the Old Testament,” 95–96.

<sup>26</sup> Sebastian P. Brock, “To Revise or Not to Revise: Attitudes to Jewish Biblical Translation,” in *Sep-tuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings*, SBLSCS 33, ed. G. J. Brooke and B. Lindars (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 312–13.

Job has *וְתַמְהָא אֶחָד לִי*, “and astonishment seized me” (IV, 5). Instead of *מְזִמָּה*, “scheme” (of God) in 42:1, the translator proffers *תְּקָה וְחִכְמָה*, “strength and wisdom” (XXXVII, 4), perhaps because *מְזִמָּה* can have negative connotations. This translator – like all translators, including the most literalistic ones – inevitably interprets the text to some extent.

Nevertheless, 11QAramJob is generally faithful to a Hebrew source text that is similar to the MT. Even when a translation appears to depart from the MT, closer examination often shows no divergence after all. Such is the case in 19:17a, which reads in the MT, *רוּחִי זָרָה לְאִשְׁתִּי*, “my spirit is alien to my wife” or “my spirit is loathsome to my wife.” For this, 11QAram reads, *רוּחַ הַמַּכְתָּ לְאִנְתִּי*, which most scholars take to mean something like, “I lowered (my) spirit to my wife,”<sup>27</sup> or, as García Martínez and Tigchelaar have it, “I have humbled (my) spirit before my wife.”<sup>28</sup> It is not clear, however, what this means or how it relates to the MT.<sup>29</sup> The OG has, “and I implored my wife,” and the Syr. offers, “I have been a stranger to my wife” – both apparently understanding *רוּחִי* to mean “I,” assuming a meaning analogous to *נַפְשִׁי*.<sup>30</sup> I take *רוּחַ* to be the subject of the verb *הַמַּכְתָּ* in 11QAramJob and parse the verb as Huphal perfect 3 fs.<sup>31</sup> The Huphal of *מָכַךְ* is attested in 24:24 – *הִמְכִּי*, an Aramaism,<sup>32</sup> which Rashi takes to mean, “they are crushed.” This may also be the meaning of *מָכַךְ* in 11QAramJob’s rendering of 19:17. The translator probably assumed the root *זָרַח*, as in 39:15, where it means “to press down, step down, crush” (// *דָּוַשׁ*, “trample”).<sup>33</sup> So *רוּחַ הַמַּכְתָּ לְאִנְתִּי*, means, “(my) spirit is crushed/depressed before my wife.” This is a perfectly valid interpretation of the Hebrew.<sup>34</sup>

27 So van der Ploeg et al., *Le targum de Job*, 15; García Martínez, et al., “11QtargumJob,” 92; Sokoloff, *Targum to Job*, 31.

28 Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls, Study Edition*, 2 vols. (Leiden/Grand Rapids, MI: Brill/Eerdmans, 1997–1998), 2:1185.

29 The reading of *רוּחַ* in 11QAramJob is either an error for *רוּחִי* or the suffix is understood (see *רוּחַ* in MS<sup>Kenn 99</sup>).

30 See 7:11, *רוּחִי // עֲמָדִי* and perhaps 6:4, where we have *רוּחִי // בְּצֵר רוּחִי*.

31 Anthony D. York suggests the Haphel perfect 3 fs, with *רוּחַ* as the subject and the *ל* in *לְאִנְתִּי* as marker of the object: “A spirit has depressed my wife.” Thus in “A Philological and Textual Analysis of the Qumran Job Targum (11QtgJob)” (PhD diss., Cornell University, 1973), 261; André Caquot, “Un écrit sectaire de Qoumrân: le ‘Targoum de Job’,” *RHR* 185 (1974): 25, analyzes the text similarly, though he takes *רוּחַ* to refer to a demonic spirit.

32 So GKC, §67y; B-L, 437.

33 See the use of *זָרַח* in this sense, see Judg 6:38; Isa 1:6; 59:6, precisely in the context of eggs being hatched.

34 For this sentiment, cf. *T. Job* 26:2–3, where Job chides his wife: “And my soul has never been depressed by my pain so much as by what you say, ‘Say something to the Lord.’”

## Portrayal of God

In a 1970 Groningen dissertation, E. W. Tuinstra investigates the theological predilections of the translator of 11QAramJob.<sup>35</sup> He argues that the translator deliberately altered the Hebrew text in many passages to accommodate his theological views. These “hermeneutical aspects” include the translator’s *Gottesvorstellung*, which emphasizes divine transcendence and sovereignty, a theology of creation, and the divine will to punish the wicked. Moreover, Tuinstra discerns in this version an elevated view of Job, not only as a righteous sufferer, as in the OG, but also as a man of knowledge with a special divine assignment. By contrast, he contends, the translator denigrates Elihu.<sup>36</sup>

There is a tension between the translations of 40:6 and 42:1 in 11QAramJob. In the former, the MT has, “Then YHWH answered Job from the storm-wind and said,” which the translator renders as, מִן־רוּחַ [ עֲנָא אֱלֹהָא לְאִיּוֹב וְעֲנִנָּא וְאָמַר לֵה ], “from the wind [ ] God answered Job and the cloud and said to him” (XXXIV, 1–2). The translator, not surprisingly, replaces the tetragrammaton with “God,” but the translation is otherwise unremarkable. The situation is different, however, in 42:1, where Job addresses God. The MT says, “Then Job answered YHWH and said,” but 11QAramJob reads, עֲנָא אִיּוֹב וְאָמַר קִדָּם אֱלֹהָא, “Job answered and said before God” (XXXVII, 3). In addition to the avoidance of the unutterable name, the translator has introduced the preposition, קִדָּם (“before”).

There is a theological difference between “said to” (אָמַר לֵ-) and “said before” (אָמַר קִדָּם), says Tuinstra, for the latter reflects a tendency in post-exilic Judaism to emphasize divine transcendence.<sup>37</sup> M. L. Klein makes a similar comparison between biblical language of human speech directed at God and the Aramaic translations thereof.<sup>38</sup> Yet, Klein recognizes the same translational markers of deference in speeches of people to their earthly superiors. Thus, whereas Nebuchadnezzar “said to” (אָמַר לֵ-) the Chaldeans (Dan 2:3, 5, 7) and “said to” (אָמַר לֵ-) Daniel (2:26, 47), the Chaldeans “said before” (אָמַר קִדָּם) the king (Dan 2:10, 24, 25, 25).<sup>39</sup> Similarly, Belshazzar “said to” (אָמַר לֵ-) Daniel (Dan 5:13), but Daniel “said before” (אָמַר קִדָּם) the king (Dan 5:17). Thus, the language in 11QAramJob at 42:1 (“Job answered and said before God”) simply signals deference and is not indicative of the translator’s

35 E. W. Tuinstra, “Hermeneutische Aspecten van de Targum van Job uit Grot XI van Qumrân” (DDiv diss., Rijksuniversiteit te Groningen, 1970).

36 Tuinstra, “Hermeneutische Aspecten,” summarized on pp. 51–57. See Caquot, “Un écrit sectaire de Qoumrân,” 9–27; A. S. van der Woude, “Job, The Targum of,” *EDSS* 1:413–14.

37 Tuinstra, “Hermeneutische Aspecten,” 42.

38 M. L. Klein, “The Preposition קִדָּם (‘Before’): A Pseudo-Anti-Anthropomorphism in the Targums,” *JTS* 30 (1979): 503–505.

39 Similarly, whereas Belshazzar “said to” Daniel (Dan 5:13), the latter “said before” the former (Dan 5:17).

theology. Even so, one should not overstate the case, for “said before” (אמר קדם) may also be used of a king addressing his *subordinates*, as in Dan 4:4, 5.

The MT of 26:11 refers to the effects of God's presence on cosmic structures: עמודי שמים ירופפו ויתמהו מגערתו, "The pillars of heaven are shaken, and they are astounded by his rebuke." The text of 11Q<sup>Aram</sup>Job, though fragmentary at this point, makes God the subject of an active verb in the first line, presumably with the pillars as the object: [ ] יע ויתמהו מן [ ] , "[. . . he] causes to shake and they are astounded by [ ]" (X, 2). For Tuinstra, this rendering emphasizes divine sovereignty.<sup>40</sup> Yet the translation need not reflect a more elevated theology than is in the Hebrew. Indeed, the 3 ms suffix at the end of the couplet in the MT leaves no doubt as to the cause of the trembling: "by his rebuke." Rather, the translator simply rendered according to sense, making explicit what is implicit. The plural verb in the second line remains intact because the meaning is sufficiently clear.<sup>41</sup>

Tuinstra also discerns theological intent in the translation of 34:13, which reads in the MT, **מִי־פָקֵד עָלָיו אֶרְצָה וּמִי שָׂם תֵּבֶל בְּכֶה**, literally, “Who visited upon him the earth? And who set the world – all of it?” The translation is close to the Hebrew, except at the end: [ **לְהוּא אֲרַעַא עֲבַד וּקְשַׁט תְּבֵל** ] (XXIV, 7–8). The translator appears to reframe the rhetorical questions as a statement of God’s role in creation. To be sure, nothing in the Aramaic corresponds to **עָלָיו** in the MT. Yet **עַל פָּקֵד** can be an idiom for charging someone with a task, with the preposition marking the one charged, in which case the preposition may be left untranslated, as in Num 4:27 and Jer 13:21. It is possible that 11QAramJob reflects the theological scruples of the translator, who leaves no room for doubt regarding God’s role.<sup>42</sup> Yet the translator may simply be clarifying what the rhetorical questions imply. The point of the translation is actually not different from the Hebrew. We find a similar translational clarification in 21:4b. In the MT, Job defiantly justifies his impatience: **וְאִם־מְדִיעַ רֹחִי**, “Why then should my spirit not be impatient?” As in 34:13, the translator turns a question into a statement: **אֲרוּ אִפּוּ לֹא ת[קַצֵּר רוּחִי]**, “Behold, then, [my spirit] is not im[patient]!” (IV, 3, translating 21:4b). What is implicit becomes explicit.

Occasionally, however, attempts at clarification do reflect divergence from the Hebrew. Such is the case in the translation of 21:21a, which reads in the MT: כִּי מֶה־הָפְצוּ בְּבֵיתוֹ אַחֲרָיו, “for what is his concern with his house after him?” Job refers to the wicked person who deserves to experience divine wrath (21:20). Against Zophar in 20:28–29, he contends that if the doctrine of retribution is to have any meaning, it must apply to those who do wrong and not to those who come after them. The translator, however, takes the 3 ms suffix in הִפְצוּ to refer not to the wicked person but to God: אֲרוּ מֵאֵל לֵאלֹהֵא בְּבֵיתָהּ, “[For what is] God’s desire with his house . . . ?” (V, 2).

<sup>40</sup> Tuinstra, "Hermeneutische Aspecten," 14–15.

<sup>41</sup> See York, "Philological and Textual Analysis," 90.

42 Tuinstra, "Hermeneutische Aspecten," 23.



Tuinstra perceives an emphasis here on God's will to punish the wicked: the house of the wicked, meaning their descendants, cannot count on divine mercy.<sup>43</sup> More plausibly, Caquot suggests that God is not concerned with the punishment of the descendants but of the wicked man himself.<sup>44</sup> The text is broken in any case, so we cannot be certain. Nonetheless, the translator does set forth a theological point not present in the MT, thus turning Job's charge of a lack of concern by the wicked to God's concern for just retribution. Whether this move is due to the translator's misunderstanding of the context or if it is a theological response to a perceived problem in the text, one can only speculate.

Themes of divine transcendence, sovereignty, and creation are indeed evident in 11QAramJob. Yet these are also in the Hebrew, though they are admittedly more pronounced in this translation, as they are in all ancient versions. Except in cases where the translator paraphrases a seemingly unintelligible text, as in 37:12 and 37:16,<sup>45</sup> there is little evidence of theological tampering with the text. Rather, 11QAramJob represents a good-faith effort to render the Hebrew, though the result inevitably reflects the translator's theological sensibilities.

### Portrayal of Job

Beyond aspects of theology, Tuinstra contends that 11QAramJob presents a more favorable view of Job than the MT. Thus, Tuinstra contends, the translator depicts Job as a righteous sufferer and man of knowledge commissioned to punish the godless. The first of these is akin to the OG, says Tuinstra, though the exaltation of Job is neither to the same extent nor with the same emphases.<sup>46</sup> Yet the favorable view of Job in the OG is due in large part to omissions therein, sometimes in large blocks. While there are also lacunae in the Aramaic version, they are limited to no more than a couple of lines here and there. Furthermore, these lacunae in the Aramaic text rarely alter the meaning of the text the way the omissions in the OG often do.<sup>47</sup> Tuinstra, however, attributes hermeneutical motivations for certain textual gaps. Thus, he notes the absence in the Aramaic version of 33:12a, where Elihu says of Job, "In this you are not right." According to the OG, which assumes the righteousness of Job, Elihu is challenging Job's claim of rectitude: "How then can you say, 'I am righteous . . . ?'" Tuinstra takes the absence of the line in 11QAramJob to be a deliberate omission – an

---

<sup>43</sup> Tuinstra, "Hermeneutische Aspecten," 12.

<sup>44</sup> Caquot, "Un écrit sectaire de Qoumrân," 20–21.

<sup>45</sup> See Shepherd, *Targum and Translation*, 136–37.

<sup>46</sup> Tuinstra, "Hermeneutische Aspecten," 62–64.

<sup>47</sup> For an investigation of the missing lines in 11QAramJob, see Shepherd, *Targum and Translation*, 41–73.

argument from silence that makes the same point as the OG.<sup>48</sup> Yet, unlike the OG, there is no comparable emphasis on Job's righteousness in this Aramaic version. In fact, the missing line in 11QAramJob may not be an omission but rather an inadvertent loss through a scribal error. If 33:12a were translated into Aramaic, the initial הן in the Hebrew text would probably have been rendered as ארו, which is precisely how the translation of v. 12 begins (XXII, 6). So a scribe simply skipped from the first ארו to the second. Similarly uncertain is the reason for the loss of 31:10b in 11QAramJob. The MT reads, "May my wife grind for another, and over her may others bend." While 11QAramJob has [ ] תטחן לן, "May she grind for [ ]," the rest of the verse is lacking and there is insufficient space to reconstruct everything there (XVIII, 3). The couplet in 31:10 carries sexual connotations, with the second line being more explicit than the first. Hence, some interpreters posit an omission prompted by the offensiveness of the image.<sup>49</sup> But it is unclear if an entire line is missing or if the couplet has been compressed, as other couplets are (XXIX, 1; XXXI, 3–4; XXXVI, 3; XXXII, 3).

Tuinstra's comparison of 11QAramJob and the OG leads him to conclude that the former does not persistently tone down Job's vitriolic rhetoric, as the latter does. Yet, in Tuinstra's reading, 11QAramJob not only exalts Job but also emphasizes Job's insight and special relationship to God.<sup>50</sup> Thus, where the MT in 21:3 refers to Job's "speaking" (דַּבָּרִי), the Aramaic has "knowledge" (מְנוּעִי) instead (IV, 2). By contrast, Elihu's "knowledge" (דָּעִי) in 32:10, 17 is "downgraded" to mere "words" (מְלִי, XXI, 1, 9).<sup>51</sup> To Tuinstra, these substitutions indicate the translator's promotion of Job as a man of knowledge, and a demotion of Elihu to a man of "mere words." This is an interesting contrast, though these are isolated examples. We cannot verify the translator's consistency in this regard, for 11QAramJob does not preserve any of the other references to Elihu's "knowledge" (32:6; 33:3; 36:3, 12).

To bolster the claim of Job's more exalted status in 11QAramJob, Tuinstra points to the translations that appear to underscore certain traits of Job (29:13, 25; 30:15; 34:31). Yet the significance of these translations is debatable and none refers to Job's knowledge. Indeed, 11QAramJob preserves references to Job's lack of knowledge.

Unavailable to Tuinstra when he wrote his dissertation was a fragment published subsequently.<sup>52</sup> It contains a translation of 23:1–8, where Job complains about not knowing where to find God (VIIA, 3, 5–6 = 23:3, 5–6). Elihu accuses Job of not knowing the ways of God in 37:15–19. The translator not only preserves this charge but also stresses Job's ignorance more than in the MT (XXIX, 6–9). As Sally Gold observes, the construction in the Aramaic eliminates ambiguities inherent in the Hebrew, leaving

<sup>48</sup> Tuinstra, "Hermeneutische Aspecten," 21; Caquot, "Un écrit sectair de Qoumrân," 16–17.

<sup>49</sup> So Tuinstra, "Hermeneutische Aspecten," 18; García Martínez et al., "11QtargumJob," 123.

<sup>50</sup> Tuinstra, "Hermeneutische Aspecten," 64.

<sup>51</sup> Tuinstra, "Hermeneutische Aspecten," 11, 20–21, 55; Caquot, "Un écrit sectair de Qoumrân," 15–16.

<sup>52</sup> Zuckerman and Reed, "A Fragment of an Unstudied Column of 11 QtgJob," 1–7, now incorporated as Col. VIIA in García Martínez et al., "11QtargumJob," 100–101.

no doubt whatsoever: אֵלֹהִים יָדַע מִדַּעְלָא, “Lo, it is he (God) who knows knowledge” (XXIV, 9).<sup>53</sup>

Similarly unconvincing is Tuinstra’s explication of the translation of 40:10–14. He perceives the translator turning YHWH’s ironic challenge to Job into a charge to humble the ungodly.<sup>54</sup> Remarkably, even though עֲדָה in 40:10a means “adorn yourself (with pride and haughtiness),” whereas the Aramaic causative of עָדָי means the opposite, “remove (pride and haughtiness),” the resultant translation is similar in meaning to the source text. The Hebrew is ironic, for YHWH is challenging Job to act as a divine king who is able to exercise מִשְׁפָּט. The translator, however, uses the causative of עָדָי, a homograph for the Hebrew root meaning, “adorn,” but with the opposite meaning, thus making explicit what YHWH’s challenge implies. Moreover, the causative of עָדָי harks back to 40:8a, where YHWH asks Job, הֲאֵפֶה תִּפְרֹא מִשְׁפָּטִי, “Will you indeed dismiss my judgment?” which the translator renders as, הֲאֵפֶה תַעֲדֵא דִינָה, “Will you indeed take away [my] judgment?” [XXXIV, 3–4].<sup>55</sup> Thus, the translator, understanding YHWH to be challenging Job’s pretentiousness, asserts the opposite of what YHWH says in 40:10a and yet conveys what YHWH means: הַעֲדִי נָא גֹהַר וְרוּם רִיחַ, “Remove now pride and haughtiness of spirit” (XXXIV, 6a). The expansive translation, “pride and haughtiness of spirit,” is exegetical. It echoes Daniel’s recounting of the fate of Nebuchadnezzar, whom God initially exalts but later humbles on account of his pride: “But when his heart was haughty and his spirit hardened with pride” (וּכְדִי רִם לִבָּהּ וְרוּחָהּ תִּקְפַּת לְהַזְדָּה), he is brought down and glory is “removed from him” (הַקְעִדִי מִנֶּה, Dan 5:20).<sup>56</sup> The full story of God’s take down of the arrogant king is in the preceding chapter, which ends with Nebuchadnezzar’s own account of his downfall and subsequent restoration once he has learned his lesson (Dan 4:31–33; ET vv. 34–36). Thereupon, all he lost is restored to him: מַדַּע (“knowledge”), יָקָר (“glory”), הֹדָר (“honor”), and זוּ (“splendor”) (Dan 4:33; ET v. 36). The last three terms appear together in 11Q1AramJob’s expansive translation of 40:10b (וְהוּד וְהֹדָר תִּלְבָּשׁ, “and clothe yourself with magnificence and majesty”) as זוּ וְהֹדָר וְיָקָר תִּלְבָּשׁ, “and clothe yourself with splendor and majesty and magnificence” (XXXIV, 6b). Thus, the translator interprets the first line in 40:10 to mean Job must remove his pride but takes the second to refer to the restoration Job can expect when he duly humbles himself. In any case, it is difficult to imagine how Job could have heard YHWH’s words in 40:10–14 as exaltation through a special commission. These verses follow the unmistakable divine rebuke in v. 8, which is linked to

53 Sally L. Gold, “Understanding the Book of Job: 11Q10, the Peshitta and the Rabbinic Targum: Illustrations from a Synoptic Analysis of Job 37–39” (DPhil diss., Oxford University, 2007), 154–55.

54 Gold, “Understanding the Book of Job,” 37–38.

55 The editors take דִּינָה to be the determined form, thus, “the judgment.” See van der Ploeg et al., *Le targum de Job*, 69; García Martínez et al., “11QtargumJob,” 161. Sokoloff, *Targum to Job*, 158, is no doubt correct that the form reflects מִשְׁפָּטִי owing to the graphic similarity of w and y, so, strictly, “his justice.” The determined form in this MS is usually שָׁ, not נָ.

56 See York, “Philological and Textual Analysis,” 304–305.

vv. 10–12 by the causative forms of the verb עדי. Nor could Job have missed the ironic challenge in v. 9: “Or behold, do you have an arm like God or do you thunder with a sound like his?” (XXXIV, 4–5).

A possible piece of evidence for Tuinstra’s hypothesis of the exaltation of Job as a man of knowledge is in XXXVI, 3–8, which corresponds to 42:1–6. Yet, the Aramaic version lacks 42:3, where God rebukes Job and Job acknowledges his guilt: “Who is this who obscures counsel without knowledge? Therefore, I have declared but did not understand – things too wondrous for me that I did not know.” Instead, 11QAramJob reads: חדה מללת ולא אחיב ותרתינ ועליהן לא אוסף, “One, I have spoken and will not answer, and two, even to them I will not add” (XXXVII, 5–6). This translation reflects 40:5, except for the extraneous ועליהן, “to them.” It is unclear if the omission (42:3) and addition (40:5) were both in the Hebrew text underlying 11QAramJob or if they were both the work of the translator. Perhaps there was only the lacuna in the translator’s text, which he fills with the couplet from 40:5.<sup>57</sup> Whatever the case, the translation leaves the impression that Job was not rebuked for lack of knowledge, which would arguably support Tuinstra’s claim that Job is portrayed as a person of knowledge. Surprisingly, however, Tuinstra demurs because of how he interprets the Aramaic in the first line of the couplet: חדה מללת ולא אחיב, “Once have I spoken and did not repeat” (XXXVII, 5–6, emphasis added).<sup>58</sup> He takes this couplet to be Job’s admission of guilt for having once spoken ignorantly (38:2), but Job insists he has not done so again. Without a second divine rebuke for Job’s lack of knowledge (42:3), the opening “I know” in 42:2 becomes even more pronounced. Yet the causative of the verb תוב, “return,” occurs 7 other times in 11QAramJob, always meaning, “to answer” (XX, 3; XXI, 6; XXV, 5; XXVII, 7; 3 times with פתגם: IX, 2; XXX, 1–2; XXIV, 3). It never indicates repetition.

Especially complicated is the translation of 42:6, where the MT reads: עֲלִיכֶן אֶמָּאֵס וְנִחַמְתִּי עַל-עֲפָר וְאֶפֶר. The Aramaic translator renders אמאס as אתנסך, “I am poured out,” apparently understanding מאס to be a II-Weak verb (מוס),<sup>59</sup> a by-form of מסס, “to melt, dissolve, become liquid.”<sup>60</sup> Such a meaning of מאס is evident in 7:5, עוֹרִי אֶמָּאֵס רָגַע וַיִּמָּאֵס, “my skin cracked and oozed.”<sup>61</sup> The OG has a double translation of אמאס in 42:6, ἐφάυλισα ἑμαυτὸν καὶ ἐτάκηγ, “I despise myself and I am dissolved.” The verb ἐφάυλισα ἑμαυτὸν, “I despise myself,” corresponds to מאס, “to despise,” as also

<sup>57</sup> Thus Shepherd, *Targum and Translation*, 135–36.

<sup>58</sup> Tuinstra, “Hermeneutische Aspecten,” 43.

<sup>59</sup> This is the root of form מָס in 6:14 – a form that I parse as the ms ptc. of מוס (thus also Rashi). Cf. the inf. form, מוס, in the Dead Sea Scrolls (1QH<sup>a</sup> 10:3, 30).

<sup>60</sup> Thus York, “Philological and Textual Analysis,” 324; Sokoloff, *Targum to Job*, 167; William Morrow, “Consolation, Rejection, and Repentance,” *JBL* 105 (1986): 215.

<sup>61</sup> Cf. Ps 58:8a, “Let the dissolve (יִמָּאֵס) like water that flows” (ET v. 7a).

elsewhere in the book (5:17; 7:16; 8:20; 9:21; 10:3; 19:18; 30:1).<sup>62</sup> The OG's second interpretation of אִמָּאס, ἑτάκην, "I am dissolved" assumes מֵאס to be a by-form of מָסס, as 11QAramJob does.

As with אִמָּאס, the Vrss interpret נִחַמְתִּי in different ways. Some presume נָחַם, "to repent" (the Vg.) or "to console" (Aq., Tg., Syr.). The OG has ἡγημαὶ δὲ ἐμαυτὸν, "and I regard myself," which seems to be conjectural, since נָחַם is never translated in this way. Here, 11QAramJob has וְאִתְמַהָּא, from the root מָהַ/מָּהָא, "to be liquid, liquefy," and hence, "dissolve." Some critics think 11QAramJob reflects a double translation of אִמָּאס, as in the OG.<sup>63</sup> If so, there is no equivalent of נִחַמְתִּי in the Aramaic. It is more likely that the translator, guided by the first verb, אִמָּאס, derived נִחַמְתִּי not with נָחַם, but rather with חָמַם.<sup>64</sup> The latter root can mean "to be warm, hot" (Qal), "to be warmed" (Niph., in post-biblical Hebrew), "to warm, heat" (Pi.), and so the Ethpa. form in Aramaic, "to be heated," and hence "to be liquefied, to melt" – a synonym of מֵאס, "to melt, dissolve, become liquid."

Tuinstra regards the Aramaic translation of this verse as a departure from the meaning of 42:6 in the Hebrew, which he understands to indicate Job's self-denigration and repentance.<sup>65</sup> For Tuinstra, this departure is in accordance with the translator's portrayal of Job as a righteous sufferer. The meaning of 42:6 has been hotly contested in the history of exegesis, however, and there has been no consensus. In fact, apart from "therefore" (עַל־כֵּן) and the first-person subject, "I," everything in this verse is open to divergent interpretations.<sup>66</sup> Indeed, the text may be polyvalent.<sup>67</sup> What 11QAramJob offers, therefore, is not a perspective that contradicts the single meaning of the Hebrew but rather one of several plausible meanings of the text.

Moreover, the proffer of 11QAramJob requires interpretation. The translation of אִמָּאס as אִתְנַסַּךְ, "I am poured out," is noteworthy. The verb נָסַךְ may refer to the pouring out of molten liquid, as it does in the translation of 41:15 (ET v. 23; see XXXVI, 8).<sup>68</sup> That is, נָסַךְ may suggest the dissolution of what is hard in order to mold something new. Accordingly, אִתְנַסַּךְ may indicate Job's yielding to the revelation of divine power in the preceding speeches of YHWH. This is in fact a possible nuance of אִמָּאס. Moreover, the second Aramaic verb (מָהַ) corroborates the first (נָסַךְ), and the sequence may

<sup>62</sup> This is also the understanding of Symm. (κατέγγων ἐμαυτοῦ) and the Vg. (*me reprehendo*). In these cases, as also in the OG, the verb is presumably Niph. (i.e., יִמָּאֵס). The Tg. also reflects מֵאס, but the object is Job's wealth, which he repudiates.

<sup>63</sup> Thus York, "Philological and Textual Analysis," 324; Morrow, "Consolation, Rejection, and Repentance," 212–14.

<sup>64</sup> Thus Sokoloff, *Targum to Job*, 167; García Martínez et al., "11QtargumJob," 170.

<sup>65</sup> Tuinstra, "Hermeneutische Aspecten," 44, 57.

<sup>66</sup> For a sampling of various proposals, see David J. A. Clines, *Job 38–42*, WBC 18b (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2011), 1207–1211.

<sup>67</sup> See Morrow, "Consolation, Rejection, and Repentance," 211–25.

<sup>68</sup> The MT has יָצוּק, "cast" (singular, in reference to Leviathan's body), but 11QAramJob has כִּפְרוֹל [ . . . ] גְּסִיכִי, "cast . . . like iron," with the subject being the "flakes of his body."

imply the dilution of the molten substance. Indeed, this verb is what makes Tuinstra's citation of Ps 22:15 (ET v. 14) appropriate: "Like water I am poured out . . . my heart dissolves like wax within my innards." The outpouring of water is a metaphor for the end of life, for water once poured out is no more. Thus, Job also speaks elsewhere of his life being poured out (30:16). The metaphor is particularly apt in 42:6 in 11QAramJob, where Job says, *ואהוּא לַעֲפָר וְקָטָם*, "and I become dust and ashes." The translator does not take *עַל-עֲפָר וְאֶפֶר* to refer to literal dust and ashes, as the Vg. does: "and I repent in dust and ashes" (similarly in most modern translations). Rather, the Aramaic translator takes "dust and ashes" figuratively. In this regard, he is not alone, for the OG has, "I regard myself as dust and ashes." The Tg., too, assumes a figurative meaning: "I am consoled concerning my sons who are dust and ashes." We have the same word pair, *אֶפֶר*//*עֲפָר*, in 30:19 as a figure of abasement and mortality: "He threw me to the mire (*חִמְרָא*), and I am like dust and ashes" (*עֲפָר וְאֶפֶר*; cf. v. 16a, "my life is poured out"). Indeed, the precise Hebrew expression, *עֲפָר וְאֶפֶר*, is always figurative for human baseness.<sup>69</sup>

What 11QAramJob suggests in 42:6, then, is Job yielding to divine power and his acceptance of his humanity. This view does not contradict the Hebrew; rather, it is one way to interpret the text. In part, 11QAramJob's interpretation of *אֶמַּס* concurs with the OG and the Syr., though the latter more freely renders the Hebrew as *אֶמַּס*, "I acquiesce." The translator's interpretation of *עַל-עֲפָר וְאֶפֶר* is similar to the OG and Tg. The only element unique to 11QAramJob is the rendering of *וְנַחֲמִי*. Perhaps we should understand *עַל נַחֲם* to indicate consolation concerning the lowly place of humanity in relation to the deity.<sup>70</sup> Alternatively, one might interpret *עַל נַחֲם* to indicate a change of mind about humanity's place.<sup>71</sup>

### Portrayal of Elihu

Tuinstra finds evidence of a bias against Elihu in the rendering of 32:2, where the MT identifies Elihu as "from the family of Ram" (*מִבְּשֵׁפְתַת רָם*). According to the editors, 11QAramJob has *זֶרַע רִימָא* [ה], "the family of Rumah" (XX, 7), as in the name *רִימָא* in 2 Kgs 23:36.<sup>72</sup> Tuinstra, however, takes *רִימָא* to be Rome and invokes a Jewish tradition regarding Elihu as a gentile prophet.<sup>73</sup> Accordingly, the translator means to dismiss Elihu's contribution as heterodox. Yet the identification of the familial name is uncertain. Raphael Weiss, who accepts the reading *רִימָא* [ה], associates the name with *רִאוּמָה*,

<sup>69</sup> See Gen 18:27; Sir 10:9; 40:3; 1QH<sup>a</sup> 18:7; 20:30; 23:27; 26:35; 4Q267, frg. 1, 5.

<sup>70</sup> For this meaning, see 2 Sam 13:39; Isa 22:4.

<sup>71</sup> For the meaning of *עַל נַחֲם*, see Exod 32:12, 14; Jer 18:8, 10.

<sup>72</sup> van der Ploeg et al., *Le targum de Job*, 51 n. 2; cf. García Martínez et al., "11QtargumJob," 126.

<sup>73</sup> Tuinstra, "Hermeneutische Aspecten," 20, 56. Ben Zion Wacholder in "Review of *Le targum de Job de la Grotte XI de Qumrân*," *JBL* 91 (1972): 414, also takes *רִימָא* to refer to Rome.

the concubine of Nahor in Gen 22:24.<sup>74</sup> He invokes *Tg. Job* 32:2, which says that Elihu the son of Buzi is from “the family of Abraham,” thus recalling Gen 22:20–24, which names Buz (בּוּז) as the son of Nahor (Gen 22:21). The translator associates רם with ראוּמָה (רומה in the Samaritan Pentateuch), Weiss avers, in part because of the mention of בּוּז in Gen 22:21. This is a much more compelling reading than the notion of Elihu as a prophet from “Rome.”

### Editorial Modifications?

Bruce Zuckerman finds two examples of what he regards as editorial modification in 11QAramJob.<sup>75</sup> The first is the translation of 36:14. The MT reads, תָּמַת בְּנֶעַר נַפְשָׁם, which Zuckerman translates as, “Their soul dies in youth, and their life among the sodomites.” The first line of the couplet is lacking in 11QAramJob, but the translator renders the rest of the verse as, [וּמְ] דִּינְתֵהוֹן בַּמִּמְתִּין, “[and] their [prec]int among the ones who bring death” (XXVII, 8). The first Aramaic term is easy enough to explain: instead of חַיָּתָם, “their life,” the translator assumes a homonym from the root חיה/חיה, meaning “(gathering) place,” or the like.<sup>76</sup> Zuckerman contends that the translator took בַּקְדִּישִׁים to mean “among the holy ones” (i.e., בַּקְדִּישִׁים instead of בְּקִדְשֵׁים). Unable to accept the notion of the impious being among such holy ones, however, the translator substituted קְדִישִׁים in the source text for the term מַמְתִּים, “a partial Hebraism” borrowed from 33:22. Zuckerman’s association of מַמְתִּין in the Aramaic translation of 36:14b with מַמְתִּים in 33:22 is surely correct. Indeed, the OG already makes this connection, for its translation of בַּקְדִּישִׁים in 36:14b as τὴν ὑπὸ ἀγγέλων, “wounded by angels,” recalls the translation of 33:22–23.<sup>77</sup> Yet there is no evidence that the translator of 11QAramJob interpreted קְדִישִׁים as “holy ones.” The OG does understand מַמְתִּים to mean angels bringing death, but no textual witness takes קְדִישִׁים to mean “holy ones.” It seems more likely that the translator of 11QAramJob regarded any association with the קְדִישִׁים (male prostitutes) as something that would bring death (so Saadiah, Ralbag, Malbim). Indeed, מַמְתִּין in 11QAramJob is probably a translation influenced by מַמְתִּים in 33:22, rather than a deliberate editorial modification.

Zuckerman’s second example is the translation of 34:31b. As he explains it, the MT presents Elihu as castigating Job: בְּיָדֶיךָ לֹא אָחַבְתָּ אֱלֹהִים, “For unto God has (one) said, ‘I have suffered (although) I have not acted badly to God?’” (Zuckerman’s

<sup>74</sup> Raphael Weiss, “זרע רומא in 11Q tg Job XX,7,” *IEJ* 25 (1975): 140–141.

<sup>75</sup> Bruce Zuckerman, “Two Examples of Editorial Modification in 11Q<sup>t</sup>gJob,” in *Biblical and Near Eastern Studies: Essays in Honor of W. S. LaSor*, ed. Gary Tuttle (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1978), 269–75.

<sup>76</sup> Cf. חַיָּתָךְ in Ps 68:11. In addition to Zuckerman’s evidence, see Phoenician and Ugaritic *ḥwt*, “town, country.”

<sup>77</sup> Note חַיָּתָם לְמִתָּתִים in 33:22 and the OG: ἐὰν ὡς χίλιοι ἄγγελοι θανατηφόροι, εἷς αὐτῶν οὐ μὴ τρώσῃ αὐτόν, “if there be a thousand death-bringing angels, not one of them shall wound him . . .”

translation). The only extant part of the translation of this verse is the end (XXV, 7). Hence, Zuckerman restores the line after the *Qeri* of 13:15a to read: הן יקטלני לה איחל, “[if he slay ]me, I will hope for Him.”<sup>78</sup> The translator replaced נשאתי לא אחבל in the Hebrew text with a quotation of a Hebrew tradition of 13:15a, says Zuckerman.<sup>79</sup> Accordingly, in answer to Elihu’s question regarding Job’s recalcitrance – “has one (Job) said . . . ?” – the translator responds by quoting Job’s pious statement of persistent hope. Thus, Elihu’s criticism is turned into an affirmation of Job’s piety. It is hardly clear, however, that Job is the subject of the verb אמר. In fact, האמר has been vocalized and interpreted in various ways in the history of interpretation, beginning with the *Vrss.*<sup>80</sup> Moreover, נשאתי is elliptical and ambiguous, and the root חבל is polysemous. In any case, without knowing how the translator understood the first line, one can hardly be confident in reconstructing the rest of the verse.

## Epilogue

The Epilogue in 11QAramJob contains some divergences from the MT that are difficult to explain. The MT in 42:9 has, “and YHWH will lift the face of Job,” but 11QAramJob offers instead, “and [G]od listened to the voice of Job and he forgave them their sins on account of him” (XXXVIII, 2–3). The last part of the verse is somewhat similar to the OG: “and he released them of their sins on account of Job.” In the beginning of the next verse, 11QAramJob again offers an interpretive translation. Whereas the MT says, “YHWH restored the fortunes of Job when he prayed for his friends” (42:10), 11QAramJob has, “and God turned to Job in compassion” (XXXVIII, 10), which has no parallel among the witnesses to the text of Job. In the MT of 42:11, all the brothers, sisters, and acquaintances come before Job, but in 11QAramJob, the friends, brothers, and acquaintances come, but there is no mention of the sisters (XXXVIII, 11). Apart from the end of v. 9, which may be compared to the reading of the OG, the divergences from the MT find no parallel in the other witnesses.

<sup>78</sup> Zuckerman’s reading of י- is uncertain. Others read יח (van der Ploeg et al., *Le targum de Job*, 60), י- (Sokoloff, *Targum to Job*, 76), and יו (García Martínez et al., “11QtargumJob,” 165). From what I can see in the photograph, י is almost impossible as the first letter.

<sup>79</sup> Syriac does attest the root ܥܕ in various verbal and nominal form, all suggesting “despair,” or the like, but Zuckerman rejects this root as appropriate here since it is Eastern Aramaic. However, Murao-ka has noted several Eastern Aramaic features in 11QAramJob, in “The Aramaic of the Old Targum of Job from Qumran Cave XI,” 425–43.

<sup>80</sup> The MT has הָאָמַר, but Theod. (ὁ λέγων) reflects מַר, the Tg. (הכשר דאמאר) perhaps assumes הָאָמַר; the Syr. (ܐܡܪܐܝܬܐ) takes the ܐ with the preceding word, thus reading ܐܡܪܐܝܬܐ.



## The Book of Jubilees

The book of Jubilees was composed originally in Hebrew probably by the first half of the second century BCE.<sup>81</sup> It contains a passage (Jub. 17:15–18:19) that scholars widely recognize to be a re-imagination of Job 1:6–12.<sup>82</sup>

The Jubilees passage retells the story of God's testing of Abraham in Genesis 22. It commences with a notice that "words came in heaven concerning Abraham," affirming Abraham's love of God and faithfulness to God's commandments despite all his afflictions (Jub. 17:15). On the one hand, "words" echoes Gen 22:1: "after these דברים, God tested Abraham."<sup>83</sup> On the other hand, the celestial context of the "words" recalls YHWH's affirmation of Job in the divine council (Job 1:8; 2:3). Jubilees thus re-conceives the divine affirmation of Job as applying to Abraham.

However, a figure known as "Prince of Mastema" (Hebrew מַשְׁטֵמָה, "hostility," see Hos 9:7–8) comes before God to call attention to Abraham's love of his son, Isaac, who pleases him above everything else.<sup>84</sup> Mastema proposes that God tell Abraham to offer Isaac as a sacrifice as a test of Abraham's faithfulness, for then "(God) will know if he is faithful in everything" (Jub. 17:16).<sup>85</sup> Mastema in this story is clearly the equivalent of the Adversary (הַשָּׂטָן) in the Hebrew book of Job.<sup>86</sup>

As the prologue of the book of Job has it, God is aware of Job's perfect character when the Adversary proposes to harm Job (Job 1:8; 2:3), but God goes along with

<sup>81</sup> For a thorough review of various proposals, see James C. VanderKam, *Jubilees 1: A Commentary on the Book of Jubilees*, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress, 2018), 25–38.

<sup>82</sup> So Menahem Kister, "Observations on Aspects of Exegesis, Tradition, and Theology in Midrash, Pseudepigrapha, and Other Jewish Writings," in *Tracing the Threads: Studies in the Vitality of Jewish Pseudepigrapha*, ed. John C. Reeves, SBLJL 6 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994), 1–34; James VanderKam, "The Aqedah, Jubilees, and Pseudo-Jubilees," in *The Quest for Context and Meaning: Studies in Biblical Intertextuality in Honor of James Sanders*, ed. Craig A. Evans and Shemaryahu Talmon (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 241–61; Michael Segal, *The Book of Jubilees: Rewritten Bible, Redaction, Ideology and Theology*, JSJSup 117 (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2007), 176–77; Devorah Dimant, "The Biblical Basis of Non-biblical Additions: The Binding of Isaac in Jubilees in Light of the Story of Job," in *Connected Vessels: The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Literature of the Second Temple Period*, Asuppt 3 (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 2010), 348–68; James L. Kugel, *A Walk Through Jubilees: Studies in the Book of Jubilees and the World of its Creation*, JSJSup 156 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 108–109. For a contrary view, see J. T. A. G. M. van Ruitten, "Abraham, Job and the Book of Jubilees: The Intertextual Relationship of Genesis 22:15–18:19," in *The Sacrifice of Isaac: The Aqedah (Genesis 22) and Its Interpretations*, ed. Ed Noort and Eibert Tigchelaar, Themes in Biblical Narrative; Jewish and Christian Traditions 4 (Boston/Cologne/Leiden: Brill, 2002), 58–85.

<sup>83</sup> Kister, "Observations on Aspects of Exegesis," 7–15; Kugel, *A Walk through Jubilees*, 108. Cf. *Gen. Rab.* 55:4; *b. Sanh.* 89b.

<sup>84</sup> The name Mastema was originally a common noun, so שר המַשְׁטֵמָה, "the Prince of Hostility" (4QpsJub<sup>a</sup>, frg. 2, i.9); מלאך המַשְׁטֵמָה, "the Angel of Hostility" (CD 16:5; 1QM 13:4).

<sup>85</sup> The motivation for this hostile act, according to *L.A.B.* 32:1–2, is jealousy over the election of Abraham.

<sup>86</sup> See, further, Moshe Bernstein, "Angels at the Aqedah: A Study in the Development of a Midrashic Motif," *DSD* 7 (2000): 263–91.

the affliction of Job anyway. The OG attends to the problem of divine injustice in this regard by implying divine foreknowledge of Job's vindication. According to this version, God says to Job near the end of the book: "And do you think I have dealt with you in any other way than that you might appear to be righteous?" (OG-Job 40:8b). Jub. 17:17–18 makes a similar move, asserting God's prior knowledge regarding Abraham's faithfulness. God knows this because of the multiple tests to which Abraham has been subjected in the chapters leading up to Genesis 22. Abraham proved to be faithful and patient in each case. On the one hand, we may understand דברים in Gen 22:1 to mean the "words" of affirmation of Abraham (Jub. 17:15). On the other hand, "after these דברים" can also mean "after these events" preceding Gen 22:1.<sup>87</sup> So God permits the test to proceed, knowing full well how it will turn out. Mastema proposed the test without knowing what the outcome might be, but the omniscient God knew.

Yet, the implication of divine foreknowledge is complicated by Gen 22:12, in the announcement of a stay of the slaying of Isaac: "Now I know you are a fearer of God." This sounds as if God knows of Abraham's faithfulness only at the end. To resolve this apparent contradiction, the author of Jubilees introduces a new detail in Jub. 18:9–10. As the angel stands before Abraham and Mastema, God announces the stay of execution: "because I know that he is a fearer of the Lord." Hence, when the angel reiterates the order to prevent the execution, he says, "now I know," for the angel has just learned what God has known all along.<sup>88</sup>

In reimagining the testing of Job as the testing of Abraham, Jubilees addresses the problem of God's command to slaughter an innocent child, as if only to see if Abraham will be obedient. Whereas Gen 22:1 says, "God tested Abraham," in this retelling, the initiative for the test lies with Mastema, just as the initiative for the test of Job lies with the Adversary. Yet, it is not only in response to Mastema's challenge that God allows the testing of Abraham. Rather, God's decision is purposeful. The test is in accord with Abraham's call to be a blessing to the nations: "and I have made known to everyone that you are faithful to me in everything that I have said to you. Go in peace!" (Jub. 18:16).

Jubilees provides a window into the early history of interpretation of Job. In the Hebrew book, Job depicts God as his enemy, who attacks him through human agents (16:9–14; 19:7–12). Employing the language of the laments in reference to human enemies, Job protests God's hostility: "His anger has torn me and he has attacked (שָׁטַח) me; he gnashed his teeth against me; my adversary has looked daggers at me" (16:9). Job says, "He has considered me as one of his adversaries" (19:11b). He accuses God of cruelty: "With the strength of your hand, you attacked (שָׁטַח) me" (30:21). By contrast, in Jubilees, the perpetrator of such hostility is Mastema, an epithet derived from the root שָׁטַח. As a

<sup>87</sup> See Kugel, *A Walk Through Jubilees*, 109.

<sup>88</sup> Segal, *Book of Jubilees*, 189–90; Kugel, *A Walk Through Jubilees*, 109. Similarly, according to Tg. Ps.-J., the angel of YHWH says in Gen 22:12, "For now it has been revealed to me that you are a fearer of YHWH."

fragment from Qumran has it: *ויבוא שר המ[ש]טמה [אל אל]והים וישטים את אברהם בישחק*, “The Prince of Ma[s]téma came [to G]od and attacked Abraham through Isaac” (4QpsJub, frg. 2, i.9–10).

Jubilees records the earliest interpretation of the Adversary in the book of Job as Satan, a designation for Mastéma in Jub. 10:8–11. In this view, it is Satan who is responsible for unjust suffering; God is entirely benign and the suffering of the faithful is in accord with God’s beneficent will.<sup>89</sup> Jubilees begins a tradition of intertwining the narrative about Job with the narrative about Abraham. Thus, like Jubilees, the *Testament of Abraham* adapts Job 1–2 for the story of Abraham. Instead of Satan coming before God to call into question God’s words regarding Abraham’s faithfulness, the archangel Michael comes before God to affirm the character of Abraham. Echoing God’s affirmation of Job’s incomparable goodness (Job 1:8; 2:3), Michael extols Abraham as one whose character is unmatched on earth, “merciful, hospitable, righteous, true, pious, refraining from every evil deed” (*T. Ab.*<sup>A</sup> 4:6; cf. OG-Job 1:1). Indeed, Michael insists on another occasion that “[t]here is no one like him on earth, not even Job, the marvelous man” (*T. Ab.*<sup>A</sup> 15:15).<sup>90</sup>

## The Book of Tobit

The discovery in Qumran of Hebrew and Aramaic MSS of the book of Tobit, which Joseph Fitzmyer published in 1995,<sup>91</sup> has radically transformed investigations of the story. We now know the story through a remarkable array of witnesses: Aramaic, Hebrew, Syriac, Greek, and Latin, as well as vernacular translations of them.<sup>92</sup> Recent scholarship has converged on a date of composition between the last quarter of the third century BCE and the first quarter of the second.<sup>93</sup> As for the original language

<sup>89</sup> The Book of Tobit is similarly theodic, for it attributes the suffering of the innocent Sarah to the wicked demon Asmodeus (Tob 3:7–8). Likewise, Tobit’s affliction – his blindness – is not caused by God but rather by the droppings of birds (Tob 2:10), though the birds are perhaps to be understood as agents of a demonic power. Cf. Jub. 11:11, where birds are agents of Mastéma.

<sup>90</sup> For these and other affinities between the two characters in the *Testament of Abraham*. See Dale C. Allison, “Job in the *Testament of Abraham*,” *JSP* 12 (2001): 136–47; *Testament of Abraham*, CEJL (Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 2003), 128–30, 316–189.

<sup>91</sup> Joseph A. Fitzmyer, “Tobit,” in *Qumran Cave 4, XIV: Parabiblical Texts, Part 2*, DJD 19; ed. Magen Broshi et al. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1995), 1–76.

<sup>92</sup> See Christian J. Wagner, *Polyglotte Tobit-Synopse. Griechisch-Lateinisch-Syrisch-Hebräisch-Aramäisch*, MSU 28 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003); Stuart Weeks, Simon Gathercole, and Loren Stuckenbruck, eds., *The Book of Tobit: Texts from the Principal Ancient and Medieval Traditions*, FSBP 3 (Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 2004).

<sup>93</sup> See Joseph Fitzmyer, *Tobit*, CEJL (Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 2003), 50–52.

of composition, Fitzmyer has argued persuasively for Aramaic,<sup>94</sup> though the story appears to draw on older traditions.

Interpreters have long recognized affinities between the stories of Job and Tobit, though there is no consensus on the extent or nature of the intertextualities.<sup>95</sup> Dimant, who regards the story of Job as a model for Tobit, points to a number of parallels between the two.<sup>96</sup> Both protagonists are pious (Job 1:1, 8; 2:3 Tob 1:6–12, 16–17) and prosperous (Job 1:2–3; Tob 2:2–5). Both lose their possessions (Job 1:14–19; Tob 1:15–20), suffer from illness (Job 2:7–8; Tob 2:9–10), and are provoked by their wives (Job 2:9; Tob 2:14). In each case, the protagonist prefers death to suffering (Job 3 and *passim*; Tob 2:1–6). Each is eventually vindicated and restored (Job 42:11–15; Tob 14:2–3) and dies in old age, blessed with offspring and wealth (Job 42:16–17; Tob 14:11–12). Some of these affinities are admittedly too general to be evidence of a literary relationship. Nonetheless, the shared tropes are undeniable. Most notably, both stories refer to the number of years each hero lives after his restoration. Job lives for 140 years after his restoration to see “his children and their children – four generations” (Job 42:16). The assumption is that he must have been 70 years old when he received twofold of everything he had, including his lifespan. Tobit’s post-restoration life is not as phenomenally long, and yet, according to the Vg., he continues long enough to see his descendants to the fourth generation (Tob 14:2).

Another tantalizing shared trope between the two is the speech of each protagonist’s wife. According to the MT, Job’s wife wonders about the benefit of her husband’s integrity:<sup>97</sup> *עֲדָךְ מִחַיִּיק בְּתַמְתָּךְ בְּרַךְ אֱלֹהִים וּמָת*, “Still you still hold fast to your integrity? ‘Bless’ God and die!” (Job 2:9).<sup>98</sup> In Tobit’s case, his integrity prompts him to question the integrity of his wife. He accuses her of theft and refuses to believe her denial (Tob

<sup>94</sup> Fitzmyer, *Tobit*, 22–27.

<sup>95</sup> See, among more recent studies, Paul Deselaers, *Das Buch Tobit: Studien zu seiner Entstehung, Komposition und Theologie*, OBO (Freiburg/Göttingen: Universitätsverlag/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982); Deborah Dimant, “Use and Interpretation of Mikra in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha,” in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, CRINT; ed. M. J. Mulder (Assen/Maastricht/Philadelphia: van Gorcum/Fortress, 1988), 417–19; Carey A. Moore, *Tobit*, AB 40A (New York: Doubleday, 1996), 8, 21, 135, 289, 294; Francis M. Macatangay, *The Wisdom Instructions in the Book of Tobit*, DCLS 12 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011), 32–33; Fitzmyer, *Tobit*, 35–36.

<sup>96</sup> Dimant, “Use and Interpretation of Mikra,” 417–19. Cf. George W. E. Nickelsburg, “Stories of Biblical and Early Post-Biblical Times,” in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*, CRINT; ed. Michael E. Stone (Assen/Philadelphia: van Gorcum/Fortress, 1984), 40–46.

<sup>97</sup> Moore (*Tobit*, 135) suggests that Job’s wife is angry with God rather than Job and that she “believed in his integrity.” This, however, is not clear in the Hebrew.

<sup>98</sup> Athanasius Miller goes too far in suggesting that the scene in Tobit is a repetition of the scene in Job 2:9. See his *Das Buch Tobias übersetzt und erklärt*, HSAT (Bonn: Hanstein, 1940), 48. Closer to the mark is the view that the author of Tobit wrote with an awareness of the related text in Job. Thus, Helen Schüngel-Straumann, *Tobit übersetzt und ausgelegt*, HThKAT (Freiburg/Basel/ Vienna: Herder, 2000), 73.

2:11–13).<sup>99</sup> Thereupon, she challenges him: “Where are your mercies (αἱ ἐλεημοσύναι σου) and righteous deeds (αἱ δικαιοσύναι σου)? Look, all things about you are well known!” (Tob 2:14 in MSS<sup>G1, G2</sup>).<sup>100</sup> The final sentence is unclear in the Greek, but later Hebrew and Aramaic versions attempt to clarify what is at stake. Thus, in MS<sup>H3</sup> (sixteenth century), she says, “Where are your steadfast acts (חסדִּיךָ) and your righteous deeds (צדקוֹתֶיךָ) which do not benefit you in the time of your distress? Yet your reproach is known to all people.” According to MS<sup>A5</sup> (fifteenth century) and MS<sup>H6</sup> (nineteenth century), even though Tobit’s goodness and virtue are widely known, it is his dishonor that becomes most readily manifest. In another late witness, MS<sup>H5</sup> (thirteenth century), Tobit’s wife says to him, “If you are righteous, as you say, why has this distress befallen you?”

According to the Vg., Tobias’ (Tobit’s) wife, Anna, challenges him, saying, “Your hope is obviously for nothing, and your acts of mercy now appear” (2:22). More interestingly, the Vg. makes explicit the connection between Job and Tobias (Tobit) in 2:12–18:

<sup>12</sup>However, the Lord permitted this trial to come upon him so that an example might be given to later generations of his patience, as also of holy Job. <sup>13</sup>For since he had always feared God from his infancy and kept his commandments, he did not become bitter against God that a plague of blindness had come upon him,<sup>14</sup> but steadfast in the fear of God, he persisted, giving thanks to God all the days of his life. <sup>15</sup>For just as the kings made insults over blessed Job, so too his (Tobias’) relatives and kinsfolks mocked his life, saying: <sup>16</sup>“Where now is that hope of yours, for which you gave alms and buried people?” <sup>17</sup>But Tobias rebuked them, saying: “Do not speak thus, <sup>18</sup>for we are the children of holy ones, and we await that life which God will give to those who never change their faith in him.

Although Jerome claimed indirect access to a “Chaldean” version of the book,<sup>101</sup> this passage in the Vg. reflects Christian interpretation of Job based on the Old Latin (OL) and the *Testament of Job* (*T. Job*), where the friends of Job are kings. The notice of their insult of Job is probably extrapolated from *T. Job* 32:6–12 and 37:18. Moreover, Jerome appears to have been influenced at this point by a passage in a treatise by Cyprian of Carthage in the third century CE.<sup>102</sup> Cyprian juxtaposes the afflictions of Job and Tobit and depicts the latter’s response to his wife in terms reminiscent of early Christian interpretation of Job. Tobit is steadfast in piety, endures all suffering, shows great patience, and does not succumb to his wife’s temptation.<sup>103</sup> While we cannot verify

<sup>99</sup> For this passage as a reception of Job 31:10, see Devorah Dimant, “Bible Through a Prism: The Wife of Job and the Wife of Tobit,” *Shnaton* 17 (2007): 201–11 [in Hebrew].

<sup>100</sup> For the MSS, see Weeks et al., *The Book of Tobit*, 10–59.

<sup>101</sup> Thus in the Preface to the translation of Tobit, originally written as a letter to Chromatius and Heliodorus (PL 29, 23–26).

<sup>102</sup> See Jean-Marie Auwers, “Tobie 2,12–18 (Vulgate) et la tradition latine d’interprétation du livre de Tobie,” *Lesegesi dei Padri latini: dalle origini a Gregorio Magno*, SEAUG 68 (Rome: Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, 2000), 82.

<sup>103</sup> Cyprian, *De mort.* 10; CCSL 3A, 21–22.

Jerome's claim of an Aramaic source, a medieval Hebrew MS (MS<sup>H5</sup>, late thirteenth century) does compare Tobit's blindness with Job's afflictions, each presented as a test by God. Tobit shares with Job not only the experience of undeserved suffering; he is even tormented by Job's friends, who scoff at him as they scoff at Job:

In order to test him, God did all this to him, even as he had done with Job. But Tobi feared YHWH from his youth, and in all this Tobi did not give offense to God. And he clung to the God of Israel and trusted (God's) steadfast love. Then the friends of Job – Eliphaz the Temanite, Bildad the Shuhite, and Zophar the Naamathite – were all scoffing at him, saying, "(Where is) your righteousness in which you trusted, saying, 'I have been righteous and I will bury the dead and I will recompense them with steadfast love?'"<sup>104</sup>

In the scene of Job's restoration, his siblings and others each bring him "a קשיטה and a gold ring" (Job 42:11). So too, according to MS<sup>H5</sup>, as Tobiah (Tobit) prepares to return to Nineveh, his friends and acquaintances each bring him "a gold ring and a קשיטה" (Tob 10:11).

Some of the explicit associations of Tobit with Job no doubt derive from later interpretations. Nonetheless, these interpreters clearly recognized the two stories as related. As with Job, Tobit's suffering is not retributive. Yet, whereas Job's ethnic origin is uncertain, since his home is in the Transjordan, Tobit is a Jew. If there is any doubt about the applicability for the Jews of the story of the suffering of the Job, who is possibly a gentile, in Tobit they have an undeniably Jewish role model.

Furthermore, the character of God is in question in the Hebrew book, as Job vehemently questions divine justice. By contrast, Tobit affirms the goodness of God, though not without moments of doubt.<sup>105</sup> According to the MSS from Qumran, the name of the protagonist is טובי, an abbreviation of טוביה (as in MSS<sup>H4, H7</sup>), meaning, "YHWH is good." His father's name is Tobiel ("God is Good") and his son is also named Tobiah. While these names may seem ironic through most of the story, as the justice of God is in question, the goodness of God is vindicated in the end. The divine intermediary sent to bring about healing is appropriately named Raphael ("God has Healed"), though he appears as a man named Azarel ("God has Helped"). When Tobit regains his sight and sees his son, Tobiah, he declares: "Now I see Tobiah, my son!" (Tob 11:15c). Yet we may understand Tobit to acknowledge to his son the meaning of the name they both share: "Now I see, YHWH is good, my son!" Furthermore, according to MS<sup>H5</sup>, Tobit acknowledges YHWH's goodness in the end, using a formula that plays on his own name: "Give thanks to YHWH, for he is good" (Tob 13:2). The closing chapter affirms that after regaining his sight, "he lived well" (Aramaic חי יטב, see 4QpapTob 14.2). Despite the suffering of Tobit, a man of impeccable character, the

<sup>104</sup> See Tob 2:10 in MS<sup>H5</sup>.

<sup>105</sup> See Micah D. Kiel, *The "Whole Truth": Rethinking Retribution in the Book of Tobit*, JSPSup 82 (London/New York: T&T Clark, 2012).

story affirms the goodness of God. Thus, the story provides encouragement to those who struggle with the viability of the doctrine of retribution.

## Ben Sira

There is a brief reference to Job in Sir 49:9, following a reference to Ezekiel's vision of the celestial chariot. The author, who completed the work by 190 BCE, notes concerning the prophet: וְגַם הַזִּכִּיר אֶת אֵיִיב נְ[בִ]אָה [ ] הַמַּכְבֵּל כָּל דְּרָכָיו צָדִיק [ ] וְהַמְּבַרְכֵּן כָּל דְּרָכָיו צָדִיק [ ] who maintained all the w[ays of ri]ghteousness" (Sir 49:9<sup>MS B</sup>). The Syr. translation is substantially similar at this point, though it does not call Job a prophet: "And he also said concerning Job, that all his ways are righteous."<sup>106</sup> In any case, Job is a steadfastly righteous character. Ben Sira is alluding to Ezek 14:14, 20, where the prophet mentions Job together with Noah and Daniel as persons whose righteousness had saved others. If the reconstruction of וְהַמְּבַרְכֵּן כָּל דְּרָכָיו צָדִיק in Sir 49:9<sup>MS B</sup> is correct, this would be the earliest identification of Job as a prophet, a view that would become prominent in Jewish, Christian, and Islamic traditions. So, too, Josephus lists Job among the prophets (C. Ap. 1.8), and we find the same assumption in Jas 5:10–11.

## Allusions to Job in Non-Biblical MSS from Qumran

Scholars do not agree on what counts as an allusion. In many instances, a putative intertextuality may consist of no more than a coincidence of a word or two in isolation, or an expression so general that one cannot be sure of its source. In search of greater methodological control, therefore, Julie Hughes sets forth several criteria for identifying antecedent texts.<sup>107</sup> These include: (1) the re-use of *hapax legomena*, (2) words with similar syntactical relation that occur in the same combination in an identifiable biblical passage, and (3) a more common phrase which nonetheless has similarities in meaning or context with an identifiable biblical passage. Along the same lines, Tooman proffers three principles for identifying allusions: (1) uniqueness or rarity of terms, (2) multiplicity, that is, a combination of multiple elements, and (3) thematic correspondence.<sup>108</sup>

<sup>106</sup> By contrast, neither the Greek nor the Latin refers to Job. Instead, they have "enemies" (LXX: τῶν ἐχθρῶν; Vg.: *inimicorum*), probably reflecting אֵיִיב, interpreted as collective. The confusion anticipates b. B. Bat. 16a, where God rebukes Job for entertaining the notion that God might have confused אֵיִיב, "Job," with אֵיִיב, "enemy."

<sup>107</sup> Julie A. Hughes, *Scriptural Allusions and Exegesis in the Hodayot*, STDJ 59 (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2006), 53–54.

<sup>108</sup> William A. Tooman, "Between Imitation and Interpretation: Reuse of Scriptures and Composition in 'Hodayot' (1QH<sup>a</sup>) 11:6–19," *DSD* 16 (2011): 58–59.

Adopting a similarly cautious approach, Newsom finds the most significant engagement of the book of Job among the non-biblical MSS from Qumran to be in several of the *Hodayot*, along with 1QS 11 and 4Q511 (4QShir<sup>b</sup>, frgs. 28–29).<sup>109</sup> She also helpfully distinguishes two types of allusions. First are those allusions that “merely appropriate language from Job that speaks of physical or emotional suffering (or, in one case, salvation).”<sup>110</sup> An example of this type is 1QH<sup>a</sup> 13:35–36, with a series of terms recalling Job 3:4–5, 24. To be sure, the former does not adopt the language of the latter wholesale. The poet speaks of the hostile obstruction by his adversaries: וישוּבוּ בְעָדִי, “and they shut me up in deep darkness” (1QH<sup>a</sup> 13:35).<sup>111</sup> Given that שֹׁךְ may be a by-form of שָׁכַךְ/שָׁכַךְ, this text recalls Job 3:23b, where Job accuses God of unjustly shutting off a גֹּבֵר, referring to himself: וַיִּסָּד אֱלֹהִים בְּעָדָיו, “and God shut him off.” By contrast, the subject of the shutting in this text is not God but human adversaries. Yet, just as Job says in 3:24a, לִפְנֵי לֶחְמִי אֲנָחְתִּי תָבֹא, “before my bread my sighing comes,” so the poet of the *hodayah* says, וְאוֹכְלָה בִלְחֶם אֲנָחְתִּי, “And I will eat the bread of my sighing.” The pairing of “bread” and “sighing” appears also in 4Q429 (H<sup>c</sup>), frg. 3, 7, 8 and 4Q432 (papH<sup>f</sup>), frg. 11, 1, but it is otherwise unattested in classical Hebrew. Job says in the second line in 3:24, וַיִּתְּכוּ בַמַּיִם שִׁאֲנָתִי, “and poured out like waters are my roarings,” which may refer to his screams of pain or angry protests. The author of the *hodayah*, however, clearly means his grief: וְשָׁקִי בְדַמְעוֹת אֵין כְּלָה, “and my drink with endless tears” (1QH<sup>a</sup> 13:36; cf. Pss 42:4 [3]; 80:6 [5]; 102:10). The poet thus borrows language from Job without intentionally interpreting the source text.

Newsom is no doubt correct that in many cases the intertextuality reflects nothing more than an appropriation of idioms, though such appropriations are not limited to the language and imagery of suffering. There are, for instance, a number of allusions to Job in 1QH<sup>a</sup> 11:6–19 that have nothing to do with suffering. Job 38:16–17 characterizes the netherworld as a watery realm, with גִּבְרֵי־יָם, “sources of the sea” // חֶקֶר תְּהוֹם, “the recesses of the deep” and שַׁעְרֵי־מָוֶת, “the gates of death” // שַׁעְרֵי צִלְמָוֶת, “the gates of the shade.” The first of these terms has a *hapax legomenon* in נֶבֶךְ, “source, spring.” Echoing this text, 1QH<sup>a</sup> 11:16 juxtaposes מַיִם גְּבוּרֵי־מַיִם, “sources of waters,” and תְּהוֹמוֹת, “deeps.” Moreover, the deeps boil (רָחַח), which recalls Job 41:23 (31) – the only instance of this image in the Bible. As in Job 38:17, too, there are gates in the netherworld: שְׁ[אוֹ]לָה וְ[אֵ]בֶרֶת:

<sup>109</sup> See Newsom, “The Reception of Job in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 107–14. Some of these overlap with those identified in Armin Lange and Matthias Weigold, *Biblical Quotations and Allusions in Second Temple Jewish Literature* (Göttingen/Oakville, CT: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011), 178–81 and Heidi Szpek, “On the Influence of Job in Jewish Hellenistic Literature,” in *Seeking Out the Wisdom of the Ancients: Essays Offered to Michael V. Fox*, ed. Ronald L. Troxel et al., (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2005), 357–59.

<sup>110</sup> Newsom, “The Reception of Job in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 110.

<sup>111</sup> For the text, see Hartmut Stegemann and Eileen Schuller, eds. and Carol A. Newsom, trans., *1QHodayot<sup>a</sup>, with Incorporation of 1QHodayot<sup>b</sup> and 4QHodayot<sup>c1-4</sup>*, DJD 40 (Oxford: Clarendon, 2009).



“Sh[eo]l [and A]baddon,” שְׁעָרֵי [עוֹלָם], “the gates of [eternity],”<sup>112</sup> and דְּלִיתִי שַׁחַת, “the doors of the pit” (1QH<sup>a</sup> 11:17–19). This domain is locked by eternal “bars” (1QH<sup>a</sup> 11:19), which echoes the confinement of the chaotic waters with “bars and doors” in Job 38:10. Hughes acknowledges that this cluster of terms in 1QH<sup>a</sup> 11 “undoubtedly evokes” and “echoes” Job 38.<sup>113</sup> Nonetheless, she hesitates to call this intertextuality an “allusion,” for these terms may belong to traditional motifs of creation myths. It is perhaps a matter of semantics to say a text “undoubtedly evokes” another but is still not an “allusion.” Yet the juxtaposition of the *hapax legomenon*, “sources of the sea,” with the nether-world is without parallel in cosmogonic myths preserved in the Bible. One can hardly doubt, therefore, that the passage is a major source of 1QH<sup>a</sup> 11:12–16, though the intertextuality is only at the level of language and imagery.<sup>114</sup>

Also in this poem is the peculiar reference to the conception of a גִּבֹּר, which echoes Job 3:3b. This is a noteworthy intertextuality, for גִּבֹּר is a term for adult men capable of procreation and indeed excludes children (Exod 12:37; Jer 43:6).<sup>115</sup> Not surprisingly, therefore, גִּבֹּר is never associated with birth or infancy elsewhere in biblical Hebrew and הָרָה, “to conceive,” never takes גִּבֹּר as object, or subject of a passive verb. At issue in Job 3:3b is not just the birth of a single, male baby, but the conception of humanity. Indeed, גִּבֹּר in the book of Job is a synonym for אָנוּשׁ (10:5; 4:17) and אָדָם (16:21; 14:10; 33:17), and hence often refers to a human in contrast to God (3:21; 14:14; 22:2; 33:29; 34:7, 9).<sup>116</sup> Yet 1QH<sup>a</sup> 11:10 speaks similarly of a woman “pregnant with a גִּבֹּר” (הָרִיתִי גִּבֹּר). The גִּבֹּר is identified as “wonderful, a counselor with his might,” and the text speaks, again, of the delivery of the גִּבֹּר (1QH<sup>a</sup> 11:10–11). Whatever the implications of the peculiar locution,<sup>117</sup> this *hodayah* echoes 3:3, though again the intertextuality is only in language and imagery.

The more important type of allusions to Job, according to Newsom, are those reflecting *Niedrigkeitdoxologien* – confessions of the utter baseness of humanity in

<sup>112</sup> This is the restoration in Stegemann and Schuller, *11QHodayot<sup>a</sup>*, 144, 150–51. Cf. 1QH<sup>a</sup> 14:34. The term עוֹלָם here is associated with death, as in בית עוֹלָם, “eternal abode” (Qoh 12:5), a common meaning in various Northwest Semitic inscriptions. Others have proposed other restorations, including מוֹת [מות], שְׁעָרֵי, “gates of [death]” (as in 1QH<sup>a</sup> 14:27; 4Q184 [Sapiential], frg. 1, 10; Pss 9:14 [13]; 107:18; Job 38:17a), or even צִלְמוֹת [צלמות], שְׁעָרֵי, “gates of [deep darkness]” (Job 37:17b).

<sup>113</sup> Hughes, *Scriptural Allusions and Exegesis in the Hodayot*, 199, 205.

<sup>114</sup> For various scriptural sources in this poem, see Tooman, “Reuse of Scriptures,” 54–73.

<sup>115</sup> See Hans Kosmala, “The Term *geber* in the OT and in the Scrolls,” in *Congress Volume, Rome, 1968*, VTSup 17 (Leiden: Brill, 1969), 159–69, esp. 164–69; see also *TDOT* II, 377–82, esp. 380–82, regarding the usage in Job and in the Dead Sea Scrolls.

<sup>116</sup> See Seow, *Job 1–21*, 319–20, 339.

<sup>117</sup> The meaning of this text is debated because of the allusion to Isa 9:6. For a summary of the different views, see Michael C. Douglas, “Power and Praise in the Hodayot: A Literary Critical Study of 1QH 9:1–18:14” (PhD diss., University of Chicago, 1998), 178, n. 89.

stark contrast to the righteousness of God.<sup>118</sup> Several of these refer to humanity as אִשָּׁה יָלִיד, “one born of a woman,” a designation occurring 3 times in the book of Job (14:1; 15:14; 25:4) but no elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible, though it appears in Sir<sup>MS A</sup> 10:18. The term appears in the *Hodayot* (1QH<sup>a</sup> 5:31; 23.13–14),<sup>119</sup> 1QS 11:21 (= 4Q264 [1QS<sup>j</sup>], frg. 1, 8) and 4Q501 (apocLam<sup>b</sup>), frg. 1, 5. As used in Job, אִשָּׁה יָלִיד refers to human finitude and moral inadequacies (14:1–4; 15:14–15; 25:4–5). The last two passages, from the speeches of Eliphaz and Bildad, respectively, reiterate the similar sentiments in 4:17–18.<sup>120</sup>

The notion that human beings are inevitably sinful is not new. It underlies the so-called “Sumerian Job,” where we read:

They say – the wise men – a word true and right:  
 “Never has a sinless child been born to its mother,  
 A mortal (?) has never been perfect (?),  
 A sinless man has never existed of old.”<sup>121</sup>  
*Man and His God*, ll. 103–105

The Sumerian poet’s attribution of the saying to the sages is no fiction, for we find precisely such an axiom in a Sumerian scribal exercise tablet:

A child without sin was never born by his mother. The idea was  
 never conceived that someone among people should have no sin.  
 It never existed.<sup>122</sup>

UET 6/2, no. 368, ll. 1–4

It is because of this low anthropology that the “Sumerian Job” and other pious sufferer texts from Western Asia assume that suffering is always for cause, even if the cause is unknown or unknowable.<sup>123</sup> The inevitable sinfulness of every human is a manifestation of human fragility. Hence, with exception of the Babylonian Theodicy, the pious sufferer texts from Mesopotamia are all doxological, for they point to the restoration

**118** Typical of this form are the interrogative מָה, “what?,” or מִי, “who?,” and reference to God as צַדִּיק, “righteous.” See Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn, *Enderwartung und gegenwärtiges Heil*, SUNT 4 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966), 27–29.

**119** See also 1QH<sup>a</sup> 21:2 ([יָלִיד] אִשָּׁה), 9–10 [אִשָּׁה] יָלִיד.

**120** The celestial hosts are “his servants” // “his angels” (4:18); “his holy ones” // “the heavens” (15:15); “the moon” // “the stars” (25:5).

**121** Translation by Jacob Klein in “Man and His God,” *COS* I, 574. See Samuel Noah Kramer, “Man and His God: A Sumerian Variation on the ‘Job’ Motif,” in *Wisdom in Israel and the Ancient Near East Presented to Professor H. H. Rowley*, ed. Martin Noth and D. Winton Thomas, VTSup 3 (Leiden: Brill, 1960), 170–82.

**122** Translation in Bendt Alster, *Proverbs of Ancient Sumer: The World’s Earliest Proverbs Collections* (Bethesda, MD: CDL, 1997), 324.

**123** Besides the Sumerian example, we find the same assumption in the Babylonian “Man and His God” (AO 4462), the Akkadian Hymn to Marduk from Ugarit (Ugaritica V, R.S. 25.460), and *Ludlul Bēl Nēmeqi*.

of the sufferers, either already experienced or anticipated.<sup>124</sup> This is precisely the perspective of the friends of Job, as Eliphaz best exemplifies in his first speech (Job 4–5). He contends that no human being is without sin (4:17–19), the proper response to suffering is doxology (5:8–16), suffering is not the final will of God, who wounds but heals (5:17–18), and one should look forward to restoration (5:19–26) – all elements we find in the majority of pious sufferer texts. Yet Eliphaz does not merely assert human finitude and fragility. Rather, he considers human beings to be of a lesser moral order than members of the celestial beings (4:17; 15:15; cf. Bildad’s formulation of the same view in 25:5).

Eliphaz, who calls God humanity’s “maker” (עֲשֵׂהוּ, Job 4:17b), refers to human beings as שְׁכֵנֵי בְּתִיחוֹמֵר אֲשֶׁר-בְּעֶפֶר יְסֻדִּים, “dwellers of houses of clay, whose foundation is dust” (4:19). These “houses of clay,” a metaphor for human bodies, are readily crushed (4:19–20). This view of the creation of humanity is evident as well in 10:8–9, where Job depicts God as a ceramist who is free to create or destroy:

Your hands fashioned me and made me;  
All at once you turned around and destroyed me.  
Remember now how you made me as clay,  
And to dust you will have me return.

The language in the first line recalls the image elsewhere of God as a ceramist (Isa 45:9; 64:7; Jer 18:5). The verb for “fashion” (עָצַב) is related to עֶצֶב, “clay vessel” (Jer 22:28), as well as to עֶצֶב and עֶצְבָּה, terms for figurines of gods (1 Sam 31:9; 2 Sam 5:21; Isa 46:1; 48:5; Hos 8:4; Mic 1:7; Ps 139:24), though Job is referring to the making of a human figurine. Yet Job does not merely proffer a general analogy. Rather, the imperative to “remember” points to something specific. The idea of the formation of a human out of clay furthers the image of God as a ceramist in the first, but the last line – “and to dust you will return me” – recalls Genesis 2–3. The creation account tells how God forms a human (אָדָם) from dirt (אֲדָמָה) and breathes life into it (Gen 2:7), but eventually promises to return it to dust, saying, “and to dust you will return” (Gen 3:19).

Elihu conveys the same idea of the creation, telling Job that the two of them are alike in their origin: מִחוֹמֶר קִרְצָתִי גִם-אֲנִי, “I, too, was pinched off from clay” (33:6). This usage of קִרַּץ, “pinched off,” is unique in the Hebrew Bible. Its cognate in Akkadian, however, is employed in reference to the fashioning of figurines, as well as in the cre-

<sup>124</sup> See Moshe Weinfeld, “Job and Its Mesopotamian Parallels: A Typological Analysis,” in *Text and Context: Old Testament and Semitic Studies for F.C. Fensham*, ed. W. T. Claassen, JSOTSup 48 (Sheffield: JSOT, 1988), 217–26; Karel van der Toorn, “Theodicy in Akkadian Literature,” in *Theodicy in the World of the Bible: The Goodness of God and the Problem of Evil*, ed. Antti Laato and Johannes C. de Moor (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 57–89.

ation of human beings,<sup>125</sup> as in the Atra-Ḥasīs Epic,<sup>126</sup> a Babylonian creation myth,<sup>127</sup> and the Babylonian Theodicy.<sup>128</sup> This same usage of קרץ appears in 1QS 11:22; 1QH<sup>a</sup> 18:6; 20:27; 4Q511 (Shir<sup>b</sup>), frgs. 28–29, 4.

Disdain for humanity is also indicated by another expression in Job, עפר ואפר, “dust and ashes” (30:19; 42:6) – attested elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible only in Gen 18:27, where it is a figure of human lowliness, as opposed to divine transcendence. The same locution occurs in Sir 10:9<sup>MS A</sup> and 40:3<sup>MS B</sup>, both passages referring to humanity’s baseness. It appears also in 1QH<sup>a</sup> 18:7; 20:30; 23:27; and 4Q267 (D<sup>b</sup>), frg. 1, 5. The abject nature of human being is likened to “maggot” and “worm” (25:6). Moreover, the pejorative designation of humanity as ילוד אשה, “born of a woman,” appears in each case with various terms of impurity and abhorrence: “unclean” (טמא, 14:4), “impure” (לא־יכו, 15:15; 25:5), “abominable” (נחעב, 15:16), and “foul” (נא־לח, 15:16). This characterization of humanity, Newsom suggests, reflects a belief that the impurity of every human originates during the period of gestation (Ps 51:7 [5]), perhaps on account of the fetus’s contact with menstrual blood (cf. Lev 20:18).<sup>129</sup>

Newsom identifies seven non-biblical texts – 1QH<sup>a</sup> 5, 18, 19, 20, 23; 1QS 11; 4Q511 (Shir<sup>b</sup>), frgs. 28–29 – that allude to the passages in Job.<sup>130</sup> All these emphasize the depravity of human beings as they have been created, thus offering a low anthropology that is antithetical to the high anthropology of Ben Sira. Following Shane Berg,<sup>131</sup> Newsom argues that Sir 17:7 reinterprets Genesis 1–3 in light of Deuteronomy 30, the latter countering the former’s prohibition of the knowledge of good and evil by insisting on the importance of the knowledge of good and evil for proper moral discernment. Such knowledge results in death, according to Gen 2:17, but the same knowledge may lead one to choose life instead of death, according to Deut 30:15. Furthermore, Ben Sira interprets the curse of return to dust (Gen 3:19) as a statement of the fact of mortality (Sir 16:30; 17:1–2). In contrast to Ben Sira’s positive anthropology, says Newsom, the *Hodayot* and related texts from Qumran that echo Job propound a negative anthropology. The latter texts deny “that human beings, as created, are capable of exercising free moral agency and choosing good over

**125** CAD 8, K, 209–210; see also Giovanni Pettinato, *Das altorientalische Menschenbild und die sumerischen und akkadischen Schöpfungsmythen*, AHAW (Heidelberg: Winter, 1971), 41–42.

**126** W. G. Lambert and A. R. Millard, *Atra-Ḥasīs: The Babylonian Flood Story* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1999), 60–61, Tablet I, 256 and K 3399 + 3934, obv. line 5.

**127** W. G. Lambert, *Babylonian Creation Myth* (Mesopotamian Civilizations; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns), 381, obv. 26 and 38.

**128** Takayoshi Oshima, *Babylonian Poems of Pious Sufferers*, ORA 14 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 164–65; *The Babylonian Theodicy*, SAACT 9 (Helsinki: The Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, 2013), XXVI, 277.

**129** Newsom, “The Reception of Job in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 113.

**130** Newsom, “The Reception of Job in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 110–14.

**131** Shane A. Berg, “Religious Epistemology in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Heritage and Transformation of the Wisdom Tradition” (PhD diss., Yale University, 2009).

evil.”<sup>132</sup> Whereas Ben Sira reinterprets Genesis 1–3 in light of Deuteronomy 30, these texts from Qumran reinterpret the narrative of the creation of humankind in light of various passages in Job.

The following *Niedrigkeitsdoxologie* illustrates the impact of Job:

What is the human being among your wondrous acts?  
 As for one born of woman, how shall he dwell before you?  
 He is kneaded from dust, his dwelling is (but) food for maggots;  
 He is concoction<sup>133</sup> of pinched-off clay and for dust is his longing.  
 1QS 11:20–22

The juxtaposition of the questions in the first two lines underscores an irony, given the doxological form and content of this poem. These questions imply a view of humanity opposite the high anthropology in a similar pairing of questions in Psalm 8. Whereas the poet of the latter text marvels at the wonder of the creation of humanity as “a little less than אֱלֹהִים” (Ps 8:5–6), the author of 1QS 11 emphasizes humanity’s lowliness. This subversion of the tradition is present already in Job 15:14–16; 25:4–6. The poet of Psalm 8 extols the exaltedness of human beings by minimizing the difference between them and celestial ones. By contrast, the Joban poet’s comparison highlights the impurity and unrighteousness of humans and the lack of divine trust in them. The reference to “his dwelling” recalls Eliphaz’s analogy of humans as “dwellers in houses of clay” (4:19–20), an allusion to their fragile bodies. At the same time, 1QS 11 also alludes to the biological decay of the human body – as “food for maggots,” thus echoing Job 26:6.

A particularly interesting example is 1QH<sup>a</sup> 20:27–39, for in addition to the *Niedrigkeitsdoxologie* (20:27–30) are idioms recalling Job’s words following YHWH’s theophanic speeches:<sup>134</sup>

What will dust and ashes answer [regarding your judgment? And how] can it understand his [a] cts? And how will it stand before the one who reproves it? And [ ] holiness [ ] eternal, and pool of glory and a fountain of knowledge and [won]drous power. They are not [abl]e to recount all your glory or to stand before your anger. And there is none who can give answer to your reproof,

<sup>132</sup> Newsom, “The Reception of Job in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 111.

<sup>133</sup> The text has מְצִירִיק, a form attested also in 4Q511 (Shir<sup>b</sup>), frgs. 28–29, 3, where the reading if י is similarly uncertain. In 1QH<sup>a</sup> the form is always מְצִירִיק (20:35; 3=23:28, 36). The root צִרַק is not attested elsewhere in Hebrew. It is perhaps related to Aramaic טַרַק, “to stir, mix.” A legal document written in Nabataean Aramaic attests the root *ṭrq*, “to prepare, put together, press together,” as a verb and in a noun, *ṭryq*. See Yigael Yadin et al., *The Documents from the Bar Kochba Period in the Cave of Letters: Hebrew, Aramaic and Nabataean-Aramaic Papyri* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2002), 178–82, pap. Yadin 1, ll. 8, 20, 47.

<sup>134</sup> Wally V. Cirafesi, “‘Taken from Dust, Formed from Clay’: Compound Allusions and Scriptural Exegesis in 1QHodayot<sup>a</sup> 11:20–37; 20:27–39 and Ben Sira 33:7–15,” *DSD* 24 (2017): 101–103. Cirafesi recognizes Job as one of the sources of the passage and notes in particular that Job 38–42 may lie in the background of 1QH<sup>a</sup> 20:33–34.

for you are in the right and there is none before you. So what, indeed, is the one who returns to his dust? As for me, I am dumbfounded. What shall I speak concerning this? I have spoken according to what I had known – a concoction, a creature of clay. What will I speak unless you open my mouth? How can I understand unless you give me insight? What can I sp[ea]k when you have not opened my mind?

1QH<sup>a</sup> 20:30–36

This confession evokes the speeches of Job in 40:4–5; 42:2–6. Following the first divine response, Job admits his own insignificance and inability to answer, and so silences himself (40:4). After the second divine response, Job acknowledges God's unlimited power to do anything (42:2). He confesses that he has spoken what he did not understand – matters too wondrous for him, which he had not known (42:3b). He had heard, but now he sees (42:4). He concludes with a reference to his being but “dust and ashes” (42:6).

## Conclusion

The story of Job inspired a rich hermeneutical history beginning at least by the third century BCE. Variations in understandings of the text are evident even in the earliest Hebrew MSS of Job extant – those from Qumran. They are manifest as well in two Aramaic translations, for every translation is inevitably interpretive. Among the sources this essay surveys are those that seek to defend the justice of God in this story of innocent suffering. Especially important in this regard is the re-imagination in Jubilees of the testing of Job as the testing of Abraham. On the one hand, this retelling asserts the beneficent purposefulness of God's will for innocent suffering. On the other hand, the author assigns blame for the initiation of the injustice to the malevolence of Mastema, a demonized personification of hostility, known also as Satan. Thus, the figure known in the Hebrew story as השטן, “the Adversary,” whose function in the original story is primarily literary and whose presence in the book does not extend beyond 2:7, becomes a maleficent anti-god. Henceforth in the history of reception, Satan will have a prominent role to play in the story of Job.

## Select Bibliography

- Brock, Sebastian P. “To Revise or Not to Revise: Attitudes to Jewish Biblical Translation.” Pages 301–38 in *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings*. Edited by George J. Brooke and Barnabas Lindars. SBLSCS 33. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1992.
- Cirafesi, Wally V. “‘Taken from Dust, Formed from Clay’: Compound Allusions and Scriptural Exegesis in 1QHodayot<sup>a</sup> 11:20–37; 20:27–39 and Ben Sira 33:7–15.” *DSD* 24 (2017): 81–111.
- Hughes, Julie A. *Scriptural Allusions and Exegesis in the Hodayot*. STDJ 59; Leiden/Boston, MA: Brill, 2006.

- Kister, Menahem. "Observations on Aspects of Exegesis, Tradition, and Theology in Midrash, Pseudepigrapha, and Other Jewish Writings." Pages 1–34 in *Tracing the Threads: Studies in the Vitality of Jewish Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by J. Reeves. SBLEJL 6. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1994.
- Kugel, James L. *A Walk Through Jubilees: Studies in the Book of Jubilees and the World of its Creation*. JSJSup 156. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Newsom, Carol A. "The Reception of Job in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 99–114 in *"When the Morning Stars Sang": Essays in Honor of Choon-Leong Seow on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*. Edited by S. C. Jones and C. R. Yoder. BZAW 500. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2017.
- Segal, Michael. *The Book of Jubilees: Rewritten Bible, Redaction, Ideology and Theology*. JSJSup 117. Leiden/Boston, MA: Brill, 2007.
- Tooman, William A. "Between Imitation and Interpretation: Reuse of Scriptures and Composition in 'Hodayot' (1QHa) 11:6–19." *DSD* 16 (2011): 54–73.
- Tuinstra, E. W. "Hermeneutische Aspecten van de Targum van Job uit Grot XI van Qumrân." DDiv diss., Rijksuniversiteit te Groningen, 1970.
- York, Anthony D. "A Philological and Textual Analysis of the Qumran Job Targum (11QtgJob)." PhD diss., Cornell University, 1973.
- Zuckerman, Bruce. "Two Examples of Editorial Modification in 11QtgJob." Pages 269–75 in *Biblical and Near Eastern Studies: Essays in Honor of W. S. LaSor*. Edited by Gary Tuttle. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1978.





C. L. Seow

## 2 The Greek Book of Job and Other Second-Temple Greek Receptions

### The Greek Book of Job

The earliest Greek translation of the book of Job<sup>1</sup> was produced between 150 and 100 BCE,<sup>2</sup> though additions were made to it at 2:9 and 42:17 before the mid-first century BCE. Commonly assumed to have originated in Egypt,<sup>3</sup> this translation is designated “the Old Greek” (OG), for other Greek translations would follow, most notably “the Three”: Aquila (Aq.), Symmachus (Symm.), and Theodotion (Theod.). Scholars have long dated Aq. to the first half of the second century CE and Symm. and Theod. to the second half of the century. This dating of Theod. is based on the identification of him with a historical figure by that name. Scholars now, however, recognize Theodotionic materials antedating the second century CE.

The discovery of fragments of a Greek MS of the Book of the Twelve in Naḥal Ḥever (8ḤevXIIgr) has corroborated the existence of a “Proto-Theodotion.” This MS, which Dominique Barthélemy initially published in 1963, bears traits of Theod., including its consistent and distinctive rendering of Hebrew וגם/גם (“also”) by Greek καίτε.<sup>4</sup> It is a revision of the OG to bring it into conformity with the Hebrew, according to Barthélemy, who calls it the “*kaige* recension.” Moreover, he argues, this version influenced Aq. and Symm.<sup>5</sup> Emanuel Tov’s full publication of 8ḤevXIIgr in 1990 supports Barthélemy’s view of *kaige* –Theod. as a recension of the OG dating to the late first century BCE.<sup>6</sup>

When the Christian scholar Origen collocated the Hexapla around 235–245 CE,<sup>7</sup> he quickly recognized the OG to be one-sixth shorter than the Hebrew, with 389 lines

---

1 Critical edition: Joseph Ziegler, ed., *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum* XI.4: *Iob* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982).

2 See Mario Cimosà, “La data probabile della traduzione greca (LXX) del libro di Giobbe,” *Sacra Doctrina* 51 (2006): 17–35; Claude Cox, “The Historical, Social and Literary Context of Old Greek Job,” in *XII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Leiden 2004*, SBLSCS 54, ed. Melvin Peters (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), 105–116; Markus Witte, “The Greek Book of Job,” in *Das Buch Hiob und seine Interpretationen*, ATANT 88, ed. Thomas Krüger et al. (Zurich: TVZ, 2007), 53–54.

3 So Gillis Gerleman, *Studies in the Septuagint. I. The Book of Job*, LUÅ 43/2 (Lund: Gleerup, 1946), 32–46; Cox, “The Historical, Social and Literary Context of Old Greek Job,” 105–116.

4 Dominique Barthélemy, *Les devanciers d’Aquila*, VTSup 10 (Leiden: Brill, 1963).

5 Barthélemy, *Les devanciers d’Aquila*, 15–21, 32–33, 81–88.

6 Emanuel Tov et al., eds., *The Greek Minor Prophet Scroll from Naḥal Ḥever (8ḤevXIIgr)*, DJD 8 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1990).

7 Two recent dissertations – Nancy Woods, “A Critical Edition of the Hexaplaric Fragments of Job: Chapters 1–21” (PhD diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2009); John Meade, *A Critical Edi-*

in the Hebrew not represented in the Greek – some 17% of the total number of lines. He reports in his epistle to Julius Africanus that omissions occur sometimes in blocks of contiguous lines – up “fourteen and nineteen” (δεκατέσσαρα καὶ δεκαεννέα).<sup>8</sup> The first figure refers to the second longest block, 26:5–11 and 34:28–33, each with 14 lines missing. The largest block, 36:29–37:5a, in fact has 20 lines rather than 19, for Origen seems to have misconstrued the OG’s translation of 37:1.<sup>9</sup> Origen filled the lacunae in the OG with material taken, as a rule, from Theod. Following the text-critical conventions developed by Aristarchus of Samothrace in Hellenistic Alexandria, he marked the beginning of each addition with an asterisk (✱) and the end with a metobelus (↯). As for materials present in the OG but not in the Hebrew, he marked these with an obelus (∕).

## A Short-Form *Vorlage*?

The relative brevity of the OG prompted Edwin Hatch in 1899 to hypothesize a Hebrew *Vorlage* of the OG that was correspondingly short and more primitive than the MT and other versions.<sup>10</sup> Instead of assuming the longer version to be secondary, however, Richard Gottheil raised in passing the possibility of two parallel Hebrew versions, one short and one long.<sup>11</sup> Citing Gottheil with approval, Harry Orlinsky argued in a series of essays for a Hebrew text underlying the OG is an alternate version that is vastly differed from the MT, though he did not lay out the precise nature of that difference.<sup>12</sup> Later, in a 1968 lecture, he compared the OG-Job with the OG-Jeremiah, both

---

tion of the *Hexaplaric Fragments of Job 22–42* (Leuven: Peeters, 2010) – are part of a project underway to produce a new critical edition (see <http://hexapla-public.azurewebsites.net/editions-of-the-hexaplaric-fragments/>).

<sup>8</sup> Origen, *Ep. Afr.* 6.4. See Marguerite Harl and Nicholas De Lange, eds., *Origène, Philocalie, 1–20: sur Écritures et la lettre à Africanus sur l’histoire de Suzanne*, SC 302 (Paris: Cerf, 1983), 250–31 (De Lange). The text has, δεκατέσσαρα καὶ δεκαεννέα καὶ ἕξ, “fourteen and nineteen and six,” but the ending is doubtful. De Lange prefers to read, δεκατέσσαρα καὶ ἐννέα καὶ ἕξ, “fourteen and nine and six,” which he takes to mean “fourteen and fifteen” (i.e., “fourteen and ‘nine plus six’”). This is logical, though that figure falls short of the number of asterisked lines in 36:29–37:5.

<sup>9</sup> Job 36:28e–f (the OG) in Ziegler’s edition corresponds to 37:1a in the MT, but 37:1b is lacking in the OG. Not recognizing the correspondence, however, Origen supplied 2 lines from Theod., rather than one. See C.L. Seow, “Text Critical Notes on 4Qob<sup>a</sup>,” *DSD* 22 (2015): 196–99.

<sup>10</sup> So Edwin Hatch, “On Origen’s Revision of the LXX Text of Job,” in *Essays in Biblical Greek* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1889), 215–45.

<sup>11</sup> Richard Gottheil, “Review of Carl Siegfried, *A Critical Edition of the Hebrew Text, Printed in Colours, with Notes. The Book of Job*,” *JQR* 6 (1894): 556.

<sup>12</sup> Harry M. Orlinsky, “Studies in the Septuagint of Job,” *HUCA* 28 (1957): 53–74 [see 53, note 1]. See also his essays by the same title in *HUCA* 29 (1958): 229–71; 30 (1959): 153–67; 32 (1961): 239–68; 33 (1962): 119–51; 35 (1964): 57–58; 36 (1965): 37–47.

with the OG being considerably shorter than the MT.<sup>13</sup> The case of Jeremiah is tantalizing, for some Qumran Hebrew MSS corroborate the existence of a short-form text like the OG (4QJer<sup>b</sup>; 4QJer<sup>d</sup>), while others support a longer text like the MT (2QJer; 4QJer<sup>a</sup>; 4QJer<sup>c</sup>).<sup>14</sup> Here, then, is one example of alternate forms of the Hebrew existing alongside one another, one long and one short. The same could have been true with Job. Yet, there is no such corroboration of a shorter Hebrew version of Job. Except for the omission of 34:25b in the OG, which has the support of 11Q10 (11QAramJob), the Qumran MSS of Job, wherever they do attest the passages where the OG is shorter, always preserve the portions missing in the OG. Indeed, apart from the OG, the textual witnesses support only a long Hebrew original. Orlinsky is right about the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the OG being different from the MT, for in many places the OG aligns with 11QAramJob, 4QJob<sup>a</sup>, and other witnesses against the MT. Yet the hypothesis of an alternate short-form Hebrew *Vorlage* of the OG is without evidence.

In many instances, what the OG lacks is a parallel line in a couplet, the loss of which may radically alter the meaning of the text.<sup>15</sup> Moreover, as George Buchanan Gray notes, the Hebrew of the missing lines is stylistically no different from the rest of the book, thus indicating their derivation from the same hand.<sup>16</sup> Very frequently, too, the omitted text is difficult to understand, digressive, or theologically awkward, and the translator tries to simplify matters. In other instances, the translator renders a couplet or triplet as a single prosaic sentence. If the underlying Hebrew text of the OG had been short, it is difficult to imagine why anyone would have expanded the text, thereby making it more awkward. Conversely, the omission of a line or more can make the text flow more smoothly (e.g., 7:8; 14:18–19). It seems likely, therefore, that the underlying Hebrew text of the OG is similar in length to the MT, as indeed the other primary versions also are. Suffice it to say, if the longer form were secondary, one must account for the expansions, and no scholar has yet done so.<sup>17</sup> As Claude Cox argues, the notion of a short Hebrew *Vorlage*, whether as the original which the Hebrew expanded, or a form existing alongside the longer form, must be abandoned.<sup>18</sup>

<sup>13</sup> Harry M. Orlinsky, “The Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Septuagint of the Book of Joshua,” in *Congress Volume, Rome, 1968*, VTSup 17, ed. G. W. Anderson (Leiden: Brill, 1969), 194.

<sup>14</sup> See Esther Eshel, “Jeremiah, Book of,” *EDSS* 1:397–400.

<sup>15</sup> See, for instance, 9:24b; 12:8b; 13:19b, 20b.

<sup>16</sup> So in Samuel Rolles Driver and George Buchanan Gray, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Job*, ICC (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1921; reprinted in 1950, 1958, 1964), lxxv.

<sup>17</sup> This point remains valid as regards the recent attempt to defend the hypothesis of an original “short form” in Francis A. Dalrymple-Hamilton, *Breaking through the Massoretic Barrier. A Reconsideration of the Old Greek Text of Job 24:13–20; 26:4–14; 28:12–22; and 30:25–31:4* (Edinburgh: Edina, 2013). To say the least, the small sample of texts examined in this study is insufficient to make the case for the entire book.

<sup>18</sup> See Claude Cox, “Does a Shorter Hebrew Parent Text Underlie Old Greek Job?” in *In the Footsteps of Sherlock Holmes: Studies in the Biblical Text in Honour of Anneli Aejmelaeus*, ed. T. M. Law et al. (Leuven: Peeters, 2014), 451–62.

Scholars proffer several explanations for the missing lines in the OG, though no single view explains all of them.<sup>19</sup> The omissions are not evenly distributed. The text is virtually intact in the first six chapters, with the first omission in 6:8. By Gray's estimate, 4% of the lines are missing in the first cycle (chs. 3–14), 16% in the second (chs. 15–21), 25% in the third (chs. 22–31), reaching a climax of 35% in the Elihu speeches (chs. 32–37), before the omissions taper off at the end, with 16% missing in divine speeches (chs. 38–41).<sup>20</sup> The Elihu speeches have the most omissions perhaps because they repeat what Job and his friends have already said. Édouard Dhorme posits that the increasing frequency of omissions may be evidence of the translator's fatigue.<sup>21</sup> Or, perhaps, the shortening of the work is simply to make it less tedious to read. One can only speculate.

## The Reception of Job in the OG

Origen's reconstructed Greek text of Job, then, consists of the OG, supplemented by \*Theod.<sup>22</sup> This is an odd combination, for the translation styles of the two are vastly different. The OG is literary, whereas \*Theod. is literal. As Sebastian Brock puts it, the translator of the former is *expositores*, whereas the latter is *interpres*.<sup>23</sup> The common characterization of the style of the OG as "free" or "paraphrastic" is pejorative, as if the translator were casual with the rendering of the text, when the translation style of the OG may have been intentional. As Brock explains, an expository translation is reader-oriented, rather than source-oriented. In the case of the OG of Job, orientation to the reader entails the accommodation to the cultural context of its readers in their Hellenistic context.<sup>24</sup> Hence, in Job 42:14, the third daughter of Job in the MT is קַרְנֵי זָפְרָה, literally, "the Horn of Antimony." In the OG, however, her name is Ἀμαλθείας κέρας, "Amaltheia's Horn," an expression well-known in classical sources for copious supply. It harks back to classical mythology, where Amaltheia is the name of the goat

19 See, most recently, Maria Gorea, *Job repensé ou trahi?: Omissions et raccourcis de la Septante*, EBib 56 (Paris: Gabalda, 2007).

20 Driver and Gray, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Job*, lxxv–lxxvi.

21 Édouard Dhorme, *Le livre de Job*, EBib (Paris: Gabalda, 1926), ciii. ET: *A Commentary on the Book of Job*, trans. H. Knight (London: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1967), cciii.

22 I find it convenient to designate the asterisked text as "\*Theod." and materials from Origen's Column VI (when not used by Origen to fill the lacunae in Column V) simply as "Theod." I do not mean by this distinction to question the Theodotonic character of the asterisked text, only to be clear when I am referring to the asterisked text and when I mean Origen's Column VI.

23 Sebastian P. Brock, "To Revise or Not to Revise: Attitudes to Jewish Biblical Translation," in *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings*, SBLSCS 33, ed. G. J. Brooke and B. Lindars (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1992), 301–38.

24 See Natalio Fernández Marcos, "The Septuagint Reading of the Book of Job," in *The Book of Job*, BETL 114, ed. W. A. M. Beuken (Leuven: Peeters/Leuven University Press, 1994), 256–61.

that suckled the infant Zeus, according to some sources (Hesiod, *Theogony* 484; Aratus, *Phaenomena*, 163; Callimachus, *Hymn to Zeus*, 1.46–48), or the nymph who nursed him with goat's milk, according to others (Eratosthenes, *Catasterismi*, 13). Also reflecting the Hellenistic cultural milieu are the terms ψυχή, “soul” (for Hebrew נֶפֶשׁ, 2:4, 6; 7:15; etc.), ᾍδης, “Hades” (7:9; 11:8; 14:3; 17:13, 16; 21:13; 26:6), κῆτος, “sea-monster” (3:8; 9:13; 26:12), δράκων, “dragon” (4:10; 26:13; 38:39; 40:25), σειρήν, “siren” (30:29), μονόκερως, “unicorn” (39:9), ἑωσφόρος, “morning star” (3:9; 11:17; 38:12; 41:210), and τάρταρος, a Greek name for the underworld (40:20; 41:24).

The last of these occurs initially (40:20) in reference to בְּהֵמָה (40:15), which the OG renders as θηρία, “beasts,” though it quickly becomes clear that a singular beast is in view.<sup>25</sup> This monster is identified as δράκων, “dragon” (for Hebrew לָחָשׁ) and is “mocked by angels” (40:19b; 41:25). Moreover, there is a reference to “the quadrupeds of Tartarus” (40:20b) and another to “Tartarus of the abyss” (41:24a), neither of which corresponds to the Hebrew. These Greek renderings, which cannot be explained text-critically, assume the beast to be a creature of the netherworld. The translation reflects the milieu of Hellenistic Egypt, where Apophis, known in Egyptian mythology as a marine, serpentine monster, represents darkness, evil, and chaos. All these details make the “dragon” the opposite of God and angels – a monster at home in the dark underworld representing everything evil.

As Brock has it, the translator as expositor has a “self-confident attitude,” as opposed to the “self-deprecating attitude” of the *interpretes*, who renders word-for-word, rather than according to sense.<sup>26</sup> The *expositores* does not hesitate to interpret and convey the broader sense of the text, whereas the *interpretes* adheres closely to words, even morphemes, and simply passes on any difficulties in the original, even if the result is a nonsensical rendering. The self-confidence of the former yields a version in fluent Greek literary style, virtually free of Hebraisms, with a liberal use of particles to smooth out the translation. Such a translator dares to employ phraseology from other parts of the book, or even from elsewhere in the LXX, to substitute for an obscure text or eliminate redundancies.<sup>27</sup> Indeed, more than a translation, the OG of Job is a literary work in its own right,<sup>28</sup> not least through its use of assonance and alliterations “to create a work of poetic appeal.”<sup>29</sup> In several instances, where the

<sup>25</sup> John G. Gammie, “The Angelology and Demonology in the Septuagint of the Book of Job,” *HUCA* 56 (1985): 14–15. Gammie notes that θηρία renders the singular, בהמה, in many places.

<sup>26</sup> Brock, “To Revise or Not to Revise,” 312–313.

<sup>27</sup> See Claude Cox, “Job,” in *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*, ed. A. Pietersma and B. G. G. Wright (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 667–68; “Tying it All Together: The Use of Particles in Old Greek Job,” *BIOSCS* 38 (2005): 41–54; Johann Cook, “Aspects of the Old Greek Job,” *OTE* 24 (2011): 527–321.

<sup>28</sup> Fernández Marcos, “The Septuagint Reading of the Book of Job,” 259–61; Witte, “Greek Book of Job,” 38.

<sup>29</sup> So John G. Gammie, “The Septuagint of Job: Its Poetic Style and Relationship to the Septuagint of Proverbs,” *CBQ* 49 (1987): 16–19.

MT repeats the same Hebrew word in parallel lines, the OG renders with two different words. Yet the different words in the OG may not indicate variants in its *Vorlage* but the translator's interpretive freedom. Sometimes the OG simply conveys the wordplay in the Hebrew, as in 11:7, where Hebrew מֵצֵא means, "to find," in the first line but "to reach" in the second. In other cases, the OG offers stylistic variation probably for no other reason than to enhance the poetry (8:3; 10:5; 13: 17:15).<sup>30</sup> Similarly, the translator tweaks the Epilogue in subtle ways to conform to the Prologue, so that, as Cox puts it: "It ends as it began, but more so in the OG translation than on the original."<sup>31</sup>

Some scholars perceive the OG to be a version tailored to suit the theological scruples of the translator.<sup>32</sup> Against these, Orlinsky argues in his *HUCA* essays that the OG likely reflects an earnest effort to render the Hebrew, as the translator understood it. Furthermore, in many cases where the OG differs from the MT, the former may not be erroneous but rather reflects a divergent Hebrew tradition than the MT. This point is true enough. Orlinsky insists, however, "[t]here is nothing theological or tendentious in the Greek; there is nothing but the usual factors involved in turning the Hebrew into Greek."<sup>33</sup> Yet, whatever the *Vorlage* of the OG might have been, whatever the translator might have intended, the outcome of the abridgements is significantly different from the face-value meaning of the Hebrew. A few examples will suffice to demonstrate this point.

The MT of 1:16 refers to a "fire of God" (אֵשׁ אֱלֹהִים) falling from the sky to destroy Job's sheep and shepherd. The OG, however, does not mention God, only that "fire fell from the sky," thus, whether intentional or not, avoiding the implication of divine malevolence. In the MT of 2:3, God admits to having been incited by the Adversary to destroy Job gratuitously: "He is still holding fast to his integrity, although you have incited me against him to destroy him for naught." In the OG, however, God tells the Adversary, whom the translator calls ὁ διάβολος, saying, "You said to destroy his possessions for naught." The OG thus sidesteps the issue of divine susceptibility to instigation of the Adversary. According to the Hebrew, God has destroyed Job for naught. By contrast, one may understand the OG to mean the Adversary is the one who caused

**30** Modern critics, who also prefer variation of terms, often emend to read different Hebrew words in the parallel lines, though Hebrew poetry abundantly attests such repetition of words in parallel lines, as Ugaritic poetry does as well.

**31** Claude E. Cox, "Old Greek Job 42 – A Surprise at the End of the Road: Intertextual Connections between the Epilogue and the Prologue Introduced by the Translator," in *Septuagint, Sages, and Scripture: Studies in Honour of Johann Cook*, VTSup 172, ed. Randall X. Gauthier et al. (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 180–89, the quote is on p. 189.

**32** So Gerleman, *Studies in the Septuagint*, 53–57; Henry S. Gehman, "The Theological Approach of the Greek Translator of Job 1–15," *JBL* 68 (1949): 231–40; Donald H. Gard, *The Exegetical Method of the Greek Translator of the Book of Job*, JBLMS 8 (Philadelphia, PA: Society of Biblical Literature, 1952); "The Concept of Job's Character According to the Greek Translator of the Hebrew Text," *JBL* 72 (1953): 182–86.

**33** Orlinsky, *HUCA* 32 (1961): 250.

the destruction: “You (ὁ διάβολος) said to destroy,” as opposed to “you incited me to destroy” (so the MT). As in 1:16, where the OG has “fire fell” instead of “God’s fire fell” in the MT, the translation of 2:3 in the OG, whatever the translator’s intention may have been, allows the deflection of responsibility on the part of God. Furthermore, according to the OG, Job is not destroyed, only his possessions, which is literally true, for Job is still alive. The translation clarifies the detail. However one accounts for the difference, the OG as it stands presents God in a manner more consistent with theological orthodoxy.

Similarly, in the MT, Job protests the injustice of a common end for the innocent and the guilty because God makes no distinction among them: “‘It is one,’ I say therefore, ‘the blameless and the guilty, it is he who brings to an end’” (9:22). In the OG, however, there is no implication of divine injustice, for Job says: “Anger destroys the great and powerful.” Though “anger” is the subject, divine anger is clearly in view (9:5, 13). Yet, instead of the injustice of God dealing a common fate for the “blameless and the guilty” (MT), according to the OG, “the great and the powerful” (Μέγαν καὶ δυνάστην) are the ones destroyed. Orlinsky doubts that δυνάστην (“the powerful”) renders Hebrew עֲשֵׂר (“the wicked”), for such a translation would be unique. The OG reflects neither עֲשֵׂר nor עָרֵךְ, he argues, for its *Vorlage* must have been different, though he declines to reconstruct it.<sup>34</sup> While it is true that δυνάστην does not render עֲשֵׂר elsewhere, the same Greek term in the OG does refer to powerful oppressors (5:15; 6:23; 15:5, 27:13 29:12). Whatever the explanation, the OG offers a synonymous pair (“the great and the powerful”) as substitute for an antonymous pair (“the blameless and the guilty”) in the Hebrew. The equal treatment of opposite characters is an injustice (MT). By contrast, according to the OG, the destruction wrought by “anger” is in fact just: it is retributive justice, for “the great and the powerful” will be destroyed. Thus, the OG manifests an alternative meaning than is evident in the MT and other versions. Job’s anti-theodic charge in the Hebrew gives way to a theodic claim in the OG! Whether this latter perspective is due to a different Hebrew *Vorlage*, or the work of a careless or errant tradent, or the proffer of a pious translator, one may never know. The implication of the resultant Greek text is consistent with the view of God as just and Job as steadfast.

The tension between the Hebrew and the Greek remains in the next verse. As the MT has it, Job is scathing in his portrayal of God’s cruel disregard for injustice: אִם-שׁוֹט יָמִית פְּתָאִם לְמַסֵּת נַקִּים יִלְעָג, “If a scourge suddenly brings death, he (God) mocks the despair of the innocent” (9:23).<sup>35</sup> The OG of the first line, ὅτι φαῦλοι ἐν θανάτῳ ἐξαίσίω, is uncertain because there is no verb. Greek φαῦλοι probably reflects Hebrew פְּתָאִם, though interpreted as “the simple,” that is, reading אִם-פְּתָאִם instead of פְּתָאִם.<sup>36</sup> The

<sup>34</sup> Orlinsky, *HUCA* 35 (1964): 69.

<sup>35</sup> Given the suddenness of the death, we should perhaps take שׁוֹט to mean “flood,” as Maimonides prefers (*Guide of the Perplexed*, III, 3.23). Cf. Isa 28:15, 28; LXX has καταγίγς φερομένη, which may refer to rushing storm (Ps 10:16 [MT 11:16]) or a flash flood (Ps 68:16 [MT 69:16]).

<sup>36</sup> Cf. פְּתָאִים in Ps 116:6; Prov 1:4; 7:7; 8:5; 9:6; 14:18; etc.; also written as פְּחִים elsewhere.

Hebrew term (singular פתִי) most often refers to the feckless, but it can be used of the unwitting, such as the young, whom God protects and delivers (so Ps 116:6).<sup>37</sup> M. V. Fox notes the פתִי “is not inherently culpable” and indeed, outside of Proverbs, “he never is inherently culpable.”<sup>38</sup> In fact, in the LXX, פתִי is translated as νήπιος, “child” (LXX-Pss 18:7; 114:6; 118:5; Prov 1:32) and ἄκακος, “innocent” (Prov 1:4, 22; 8:5; 14:15; 21:11). Such an interpretation of פתִי in OG-Job 9:23 may have been prompted by the term נָקִי (“the innocent”) in the next line.<sup>39</sup>

It is much more difficult to explain the phrase ἐν θανάτῳ ἐξαίσίῳ. Perhaps the Greek is translating something like מוֹת שׁוֹטִי, literally, “scourges of death” or “spates of death.” The OG as it stands is elliptical: ὅτι φαῦλοι ἐν θανάτῳ ἐξαίσίῳ, “for the simple (die) by violent death.”<sup>40</sup> Yet, שׁוֹטִי מוֹת פתִי — if this reconstruction is correct, derives by a mis-division of letters from שׁוֹטִי מוֹת פתִי, “by a scourge/flood one dies suddenly.” The form מוֹת, which has the support of MSS<sup>Kenn 118, 224</sup>, reflects a graphic confusion of ו for י in שׁוֹטִי מוֹת פתִי (MT). According to the MT, Job’s charge is tantamount to blasphemy: “If a flood suddenly brings death, (God) mocks the despair of the innocent” (9:23).<sup>41</sup> The OG, however, offers a passive translation in the second line: “but the righteous are laughed to scorn.” Job in the OG does not accuse God of mocking the innocent.

In the MT, Job wonders if God truly intends injustice: “Is it good for you (God) that you should act unjustly?” (10:3a). According to the OG, however, Job turns the judgment on himself: “Is it good for you if I be unrighteous?” In the MT, Job accuses God of harboring malicious intent: “But these things you have hidden in your heart. I know that this is with you” (10:13). In the OG, however, Job’s words are a confession of faith: “I know that you can do all things, for nothing is impossible for you.” Whatever the explanation for the difference,<sup>42</sup> the OG is theologically more orthodox than the MT. In 13:3, Job insists on speaking truth to power: “But I, I will speak to Shaddai, I want to argue with God” (MT). Job in the OG says pretty much the same thing, though the OG adds at the end: “if he (God) wishes.” He is not a presumptuous man but someone who, even when contemplating such a contentious conversation, will nonetheless subordinate his protest to God’s will. Later in the same chapter, Job is adamant to

<sup>37</sup> This sense is indeed more common in the LXX, which translates it as νήπιος, “child” (LXX-Pss 18:7; 114:6; 118:5; Prov 1:32) and ἄκακος, “innocent” (Prov 1:4, 22; 8:5; 14:15; 21:11).

<sup>38</sup> Michael V. Fox, *Proverbs 1–9*, AB 18A (New York, NY: Doubleday, 2000), 43.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. 17:18, where the OG has δίκαιος for Hebrew נָקִי. See also Frank Zimmermann, “Note on Job 9:23,” *JTS* 2 (1951): 165.

<sup>40</sup> ἐξαίσίῳ is apt for שׁוֹטִי, given the connotation of a rush (of wind or water). Cf. νότον μέγαν τε καὶ ἐξαίσιον, “a violent south wind” in Herodotus, *Hist.* 3.26.3.

<sup>41</sup> Interpreting שׁוֹטִי as “flood,” we may suggest a further word play with נָקִי. The latter is in fact polysemous. It can mean “despair” but also “testing”/“trial,” and “dissolving/liquesfying.” The flood brings death, and the innocent flows away.

<sup>42</sup> See Orlinsky, *HUCA* 30 (1959): 163.



speak, “come what may!” (MT 13:13c), but Job is not so defiant in the OG. Rather, he wants to speak “to be relieved of rage.”

Along with such examples are instances where an omission yields new meaning, regardless of the reason for the omission. Thus, Job’s rant against divine injustice in the MT, beginning in 9:22, reaches its denouement in a triplet v. 24, where God seems to blatantly perpetrate injustice, for no one else would have been able to act so universally:

אֶרֶץ נִתְּנָה בְּיַד רָשָׁע  
פְּנֵי־שֹׁפְטֶיהָ יְכַסֶּה  
אִם־לֹא אֶפּוֹא מִיָּהוּא

The earth is delivered into the hand of the wicked;  
The faces of its judges he covers.  
If not he, then who is it?

The OG reflects only the first line of the triplet. Furthermore, instead of the earth being delivered into the hands of the wicked, the OG has “they,” which must refer to the righteous ones (δίκαιοι): “but the righteous are laughed to scorn (v. 23b), for they have been delivered into the hands of the impious” (v. 24a). Whatever the reason, the effect of the missing lines leaves v. 24a as the climactic third line of a triplet beginning in v. 23. Job’s challenge is thereby softened. There is injustice to be sure, Job concedes, for the righteous are delivered into the hands of the wicked. Yet there is no blatant charge of God’s role in this injustice. In terms of reception history, what is at issue is neither what was in the *Vorlage* of the OG nor even the theological scruples of the translator. Rather, the text as it stands is a new text, where Job is not blasphemous and God not associated with divine injustice. The resultant text is theological, regardless of the translator’s intention.

Elsewhere, too, the absence of certain portions of the Greek text sometimes results in an image of a more pious Job than in the Hebrew. Thus, according to 7:8 (MT), Job imagines his demise having collateral consequences for God: “The eye of the one who sees me will not watch me; your eyes will be on me, but I will be no more.” The OG, however, does not have this verse and one can only guess the reason for its absence. Whatever the explanation, the effect of its absence makes Job sound orthodox. Similarly, Job in the MT of 12:23 speaks of God leading people astray, but this verse is also missing in the OG and a result of its absence is a more positive portrayal of both God and Job.

What Job says in 21:15 in the MT sounds dismissive of God: “What is Shaddai that we should serve him? And what do we profit when we plead with him?” This verse is absent in the OG. Whether the omission is due to the translator’s theological scruples or not is beside the point. In the resultant text, Job does not speak these impious words.

Witte highlights the recurrence of the term δίκαιος (“righteous”) to characterize Job.<sup>43</sup> The first occurrence is in 1:1, where the MT has four descriptors: תָּם וְיָשָׁר וְיָרָא מִן־הָאֱלֹהִים וְסָר מִכָּרַע, “blameless and just, and a fearer of God and one who turns away from evil.” By contrast, the OG has five: ἀληθινός, ἄμεμπτος, δίκαιος, θεοσεβής, ἀπεχόμενος ἀπὸ παντὸς πονηροῦ πράγματος, “true, blameless, righteous, God-fearing and one who eschews every evil thing.” Four of these are in 1:8 and 2:13, matching the four in the MT of 1:21; 1:8; 2:3.<sup>44</sup> The term that stands out in 1:1 in the OG – the one not repeated in 1:8 and 2:3 is δίκαιος, “righteous.” Elsewhere in the OG, δίκαιος renders Hebrew צַדִּיק and δίκαιος is used of Job in particular (6:29;<sup>45</sup> 9:15, 20; 12:4;<sup>46</sup> 13:18; 32:1; 40:8).

The introduction to the speeches of Elihu (32:1) explains the silence of Job’s friends in the rest of the book. According to the MT, the friends ceased to speak “because he was righteous in his own eyes” (כִּי הוּא צַדִּיק בְּעֵינָיו). In the OG, however, the friends stopped speaking because “Job was righteous before them” (Ἰωβ δίκαιος ἐναντίον αὐτῶν). Here the OG reflects a variant in its *Vorlage*, בעיניהם, “in their eyes,” as also in MS<sup>Kenn</sup> 148, Symm., and the Syr. In this reading, Job has won the debate with the friends, thus silencing them; they now know he is righteous. Hence, they will speak no more (chs. 32–38). Yet, according to the OG, Elihu, who has hitherto been silent, is not ready to give up, for he is angry with Job for declaring himself “righteous,” before God (OG in 32:2; 33:12; 35:2). Elihu is angry with the friends as well because they have been unable to answer Job, whom he regards as impious (32:3 in the OG). The OG is probably trying to account for the Elihu speeches, for if the dialogue between Job and his friends has ended, why now all these speeches? The OG highlights Job’s continued suffering, for even after he has proven himself to the friends, he must endure more suffering from yet another quarter.

The final reference to Job as δίκαιος is in 40:8. According to the MT, YHWH chastises Job for dismissing the divine prerogative of judgment: “Will you indeed dismiss my jurisdiction? Will you condemn me that you may be right?” The OG renders the first line as an injunction instead of a question, but the translation is otherwise faithful to the Hebrew. The second line, however, is a rhetorical question in the Greek, substantially at variance with the MT: οἶει δέ με ἄλλως σοι κεχρηματικέναι ἢ ἵνα ἀναφανῇς δίκαιος; “And do you think I have dealt with you in any other way than that you might appear to be righteous?” (40:8b). Stated thus near the end of the book, the OG suggests divine purposefulness in Job’s suffering: in order that Job might be

<sup>43</sup> Witte, “The Greek Book of Job,” 48–49.

<sup>44</sup> The only differences are: (1) 1:8 has ἄμεμπτος, ἀληθινός . . . , whereas the other two have ἀληθινός, ἄμεμπτος . . . , (2) 2:3 has ἄκακος in the beginning, which is not in 1:1, 8, and (3) 2:3 has παντὸς κακοῦ, instead of πονηροῦ πράγματος in 1:2, 8.

<sup>45</sup> The OG reads τῷ δικαίῳ where the MT has צַדִּיק, “my righteousness.”

<sup>46</sup> The MT has a triplet, but the OG reflects only the third line, חָסִיד צַדִּיק תָּקִים, probably because a scribe skipped from חָסִיד in the first line to the same word in the third. Thus, δίκαιος translates צַדִּיק.

deemed righteous. This divine assertion vindicates Job, who ought to know his suffering has not been because of his wrongful conduct. Indeed, in the OG, Job himself has anticipated this vindication: “Behold, I am near (the end of) my trial; I know that I will be shown to be δίκαιος (13:18). Apart from the other virtues of Job listed in the Prologue (1:1, 8; 2:3), Job is certainly δίκαιος in the OG. This one virtue stands out above all others in the OG.

## Expansions

Compared to the omissions, which are a distinctive feature of the OG, the expansions are not as noticeable; they are for the most part translational. Text critics rightly question their value for reconstructing the most primitive text. Yet reception historians must pay attention to them, for these expansions, however slight they may seem to text critics, can often be meaningful. Such is the case with δίκαιος in 1:1 in the OG. The term appears to be a plus in the OG rather than a Hebrew variant, צדיק. Yet even if it were a genuine variant, text critics would discount them in favor of the *lectio brevior*. As we have already seen, however, this plus is critically important in the OG’s portrayal of Job – that is, the OG not as a witness to the Hebrew but as a literary work in its own right.

The final phrase in the same verse of the OG, too, appears expansive: ἀπεχόμενος ἀπὸ παντὸς πονηροῦ πράγματος, “eschews every evil thing.” In comparison with the MT, which says only “and turning away from evil” (וְסָר מִרָע), the additional “every” and “thing” are simply translational. Yet these additional details reinforce the point about Job’s impeccable righteousness. The OG emphasizes the completeness of Job’s ethical conduct – not that he shunned the evil of suffering, which may have been his lot by divine will, but he avoided *doing* every evil thing. Indeed, early Christian interpreters noticed these nuances and marshalled them, *inter alia*, to emphasize human free will and the acceptance of the evil of suffering as being in accord with divine providence. At issue, again, is not the intention of the translator but the consequences of the translation.

## The Speech of Job’s Wife (2:9)

Quite different from such translational expansions is the rendering of the speech of Job’s wife in 2:9. The speech comes as a surprise, for there has been no mention of, or even allusion to, her in the narrative to this point. The MT is terse and her entire speech – her only words in the entire book – consists of only 6 Hebrew forms: וְאַתָּה עֹדֵךְ מְחִיצִיק בְּתַמְתִּיךְ בְּרַד אֱלֹהִים וּמָת, literally, “you are still holding fast to your integrity; bless God and die.” The first three Hebrew forms echo what God says in 2:3 (וְעֹדֵנִי מְחִיצִיק בְּתַמְתִּי, “and he is still holding fast to his integrity”). The second three recall the

prediction of the Adversary in 2:5 (5 יְבָרֶכְךָ, “he will ‘bless’ you [to your face]”). The first part of the speech is not marked as a question in the Hebrew; if it is one, it would have been only by tone. As for the second part, the Hebrew imperative, בָּרַךְ (“bless”), may be taken at face value (“bless”) or as a euphemism, meaning the opposite, “curse.”

The Greek text does not translate the Hebrew speech, with all its ambiguities, but offers a substantially longer version:

2<sup>a</sup>Then after a long time had passed, his wife said to him, “How long will you persist, saying, <sup>9a</sup>Behold, I will wait a little longer yet, awaiting the hope of my deliverance?” <sup>9b</sup>For behold, memory of you has vanished from the earth – sons and daughters, my womb’s birth pangs and pains; in vain did I labor with hardships. <sup>9c</sup>And as for you, you sit amidst the rot of worms as you spend the night in the open. <sup>9d</sup>As for me, I am one a wanderer and a handmaid from place to place and house to house, waiting for when the sun will set, so I can rest from the hardships and pains that now afflict me. <sup>9e</sup>But, say some word to the Lord and die!”

This longer form of the speech has all the appearance of a midrash, which one might indeed expect, given the terseness and ambiguity of her speech and the fact she had not been mentioned up to this point. There are gaps in the account, not least her reaction to what has happened and her suffering. Hence, interpreters sometimes raise the possibility of a Hebrew or Aramaic source for this account, though there is no evidence for it.<sup>47</sup>

Some scholars have tried to determine if this long version of the speech derives from the same hand responsible for the OG or if it reflects a later addition. In favor of the latter, Gray points to several expressions in 2:9 that are distinct from the OG of Job, thus indicating a different hand.<sup>48</sup> Homer Heater’s reinvestigation of the vocabulary of the passage leads to a similar conclusion.<sup>49</sup> Among the terms are two that do not occur at all in the LXX but are common in Classical Greek: λάρτρις (“[female] hireling”) and διανυκτερεύω (“spend the night”). Moreover, the use of προβαίνω with χρόνος reflects a classical idiom for the passage of time, whereas elsewhere in the OG the idiom is προβαίνω + ἡμέραι (Gen 18:11; 24:1; Josh 13:1; 23:1–2). Four Greek terms in 2:9 are attested elsewhere in the LXX but not elsewhere in Job: καρτερέω (“persists”), μόχθος (“hardships”),<sup>50</sup> δύνω (“sink,” used of the setting of the sun), and αἰθριος

47 So Georg Beer (*Der Text des Buches Hiob untersucht* [Marburg: Elwert, 1895], 11) imagines a “midrash or targum.” C. J. Ball (*The Book of Job: A Revised Text and Version* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1922], 115–16), who deems the Greek somewhat infelicitous, suggests a Hebrew original, which he reconstructs. Similarly Witte (“The Greek Book of Job,” 43) surmises that this expansion is “borrowed from the broad stream of Job” that is similar to what one finds in *T. Job*.

48 George Buchanan Gray, “The Additions in the Ancient Greek Version of Job,” *Expositor* 46 (1920): 435–36.

49 Homer Heater, *A Septuagint Translation Technique in the Book of Job*, CBQMS 11 (Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association, 1982), 31–36.

50 The Hebrew terms translated as μόχθος in the LXX includes, נָאָץ, גָּעַץ, and עָקַץ. Each of these occurs multiple times in Job, but in no case does the OG-Job have μόχθος, which occurs twice in 2:9.

(“outside”).<sup>51</sup> These are thought to indicate, even if not decisively, a later addition. Against such views, Johann Cook highlights the linguistic continuities between 2:9 and the rest of the book, arguing that the addition in 2:9 comes from the translator of OG-Job.<sup>52</sup> Yet these continuities do not rule out the possibility of a redactor. Indeed, Heater takes these continuities as evidence of the redactor’s efforts to weave the addition into the fabric of the existing account.<sup>53</sup>

Job’s wife has been absent from the story so far. Whereas in the MT she seems to speak upon seeing Job in his condition (2:8), in the OG she does so only “after a long time had passed,” as if she has heretofore been silent. She, too, has been patient, if admittedly not as patient as Job, who still wants to “wait a little longer.” Whereas the narrator has so far not considered her presumed share of suffering, this addition makes the reasonable assertion that the loss he suffered has not been his alone but hers as well. Indeed, the text seems to imply it is even more so hers since it was she who bore the pain of their children’s births. In vain she has undergone the hardships. To be sure, Job “sat” amid the rot worms, but she “wandered about” and was a hireling going from house to house and place to place. Job characterized human life as a trial, likening the life of such a one to a hireling longing for relief at the end of the day (7:1–2). Job’s wife, however, presents herself as the one who longs for the rest that might come when the sun sets. Job will later say “days of pain seize(s)” him (30:16). In 2:9, however, hardships and pains already beset her, thus anticipating Job’s speech. The expansion in 2:9 thus tells the story from her point of view – one that the Hebrew narrative, focusing on the male protagonist, ignores altogether. The OG at 2:9 takes into account her sufferings as well as his.

Only at the end of the speech do we find something remotely resembling the MT. Job’s wife tells him to “say some word unto the Lord and die” (εἰπόν τι ῥῆμα εἰς κύριον καὶ τελευτά). In the Hebrew text, she tells Job, בָּרַךְ אֱלֹהִים וּמָת, which is ambiguous, for it may be taken at face value to mean, “bless God and die!” Or, one may take the verb בָּרַךְ to be a euphemism meaning, “curse,” as indeed the Adversary must have meant in 2:5. The Greek here sidesteps the issue with “say some word unto the Lord.”<sup>54</sup>

<sup>51</sup> Elsewhere in the LXX only in 1 Esdr 9:11: It should not be confused with αἶθριον, “atrium,” which is used several times in Ezekiel for Hebrew מִקְדָּשׁ, an architectural term.

<sup>52</sup> Johann Cook, “Are the Additions in LXX 2:9a Deemed as the Old Greek Text?” *Bib* 19 (2010): 275–84; “Profile and Provenance: Job 2 – Job’s Wife,” in *Law, Prophets, and Wisdom: On the Provenance of Translators and their Books in the Septuagint Version*, CBET 68, ed. Johann Cook and Arie van der Kooij (Leuven/Walpole, MA: Peeters, 2012), 185–200.

<sup>53</sup> Heater, *A Septuagint Translation Technique*, 31–36.

<sup>54</sup> The expression λέγω + εἰς should mean “to speak unto,” not “speak against” (cf. LSJ, 491, s. v. I.3). While it is true that in Koine Greek the idiom may suggest hostile intent, as in Luke 12:10 and 22:65, in other cases, as Acts 2:25 and Eph 5:32, there is clearly no suggestion of hostility. Considering the possible difference in nuance between Attic Greek and Koine, one wonders if the usage in the latter may not in fact be a Hebraism, that is, for Hebrew דִּבֶּר/אָמַר, normally “speak unto,” but occasionally also “speak against.” In any case, the idiom in Greek is ambiguous.