

Spring 4-19-2016

Intertextual Discourse and the Problem of God: The Intersection of the Speeches of Job and Deuteronomy

James Kipp Swinney

Abilene Christian University, jks07b@acu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.acu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Swinney, James Kipp, "Intertextual Discourse and the Problem of God: The Intersection of the Speeches of Job and Deuteronomy" (2016). Digital Commons @ ACU, *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 13.

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at Digital Commons @ ACU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ ACU. For more information, please contact dc@acu.edu.

ABSTRACT

Common understandings of the books of Job and Deuteronomy cast them as contradictory documents. Some scholarship concurs with this view. Despite this understanding, scholarship has not thoroughly investigated the relationship of these two texts. The book of Job carries allusion and references to much literature in the Hebrew Bible and the ancient Near East. In this thesis, I argue that the speeches of the character Job create a constructive dialogue with the book of Deuteronomy. While the views of the books are not identical, I argue that the speeches of Job largely evidence affirmation of Deuteronomy rather than derision or deconstruction. In order to demonstrate this claim, I examine the views of socio-religious expectations and retributive justice exhibited in each book. After these investigations, I examine the many intertextual connections between the speeches of Job and Deuteronomy. Three conclusions emerge from the study. (1) The socio-religious expectations, especially social ethics, of the book of Job are strikingly similar to Deuteronomy's expectations. It is possible that the author(s) of the book of Job used Deuteronomy as source material. (2) The views of retributive justice in the speeches of Job and Deuteronomy are similar, as opposed to popular belief. (3) Rhetorical analysis of Job's uses of allusions and references to Deuteronomy reveals far more affirmation and agreement than disagreement and derision.

Intertextual Discourse and the Problem of God
The Intersection of the Speeches of Job and Deuteronomy

A Thesis

Presented to

The Faculty of the Graduate School of Theology

Abilene Christian University

In Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

Old Testament

By

James Kipp Swinney

May 2016

לאשתי
אשר תלמד אתי לאהב את־יהוה בכל לבבי

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The number of people whom I ought to acknowledge in the writing of this thesis is quite large. I cannot list all of the numerous other students who listened to me make my case, which helped me articulate my thoughts more clearly. Among my fellow students, none was more helpful than James Prather who read and critiqued an early version of this thesis. I would like to acknowledge and thank Carolyn Thompson for her careful eye in the editing process as well as Kayla Hewitt for her work with technical issues.

I would like to thank Edward Greenstein, Mark Hamilton, and Melinda “Mindi” Thompson for serving on my thesis committee and providing feedback. Dr. Greenstein’s work has been paramount to the formation of this thesis, as I have cited his work more than any other scholar. I consistently found Dr. Greenstein’s arguments compelling and robust and I am honored that he agreed to serve on my thesis committee. Dr. Hamilton’s instruction and direction was essential to the formation of this thesis. This thesis originated in his course *Job and the Literature of Doubt*, and he was the first to clue me in that Job and Deuteronomy were not the polar opposites that some claim them to be. Dr. Hamilton’s feedback on numerous versions of chapters was critical without being discouraging, and I am grateful for my time as his student.

I also need to thank Nathan Swinney for not pushing the delete key too many times when I was trying to be a father and write my thesis simultaneously—a task more difficult than it sounds. And of course, I need to thank Kaitlyn Swinney, to whom I dedicated this thesis. She put up with long hours of listening to me read my thesis aloud,

and would graciously say, "That doesn't make any sense." I love you and Nathan very much.

J.K.S.

Abilene, TX
April 8, 2016

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS	v
INTRODUCTION: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DEUTERONOMY AND JOB	1
Intertextuality?	4
The Relative Dating of Deuteronomy and Job	5
A Late Sixth-Century BCE Terminus Post Quem for the Book of Job	5
A Seventh-Century BCE Core for the Book of Deuteronomy	14
Concluding Comments about Relative Dating of Job and Deuteronomy ..	19
Texts Requiring Special Treatment	19
The Narratives of Job	20
Job's <i>Hymn of Praise</i> (Job 26)	22
The <i>Wisdom Speech</i> and Preceding Material	23
The Elihu Speeches	25
The <i>Song of Moses</i> (Deuteronomy 32)	26
Concluding Comments about Texts Requiring Special Treatment	27
Job and Deuteronomy's Conversation on God	28
I. INDIVIDUALITY, COMMUNITY, SOCIO-RELIGIOUS EXPECTATIONS, AND AFFLICTION IN DEUTERONOMY	30
Socio-Religious Expectations in Deuteronomy	31
Theology in Deuteronomy	32

Orthopraxy in Deuteronomy	34
Piety in Deuteronomy	37
Social Ethics in Deuteronomy	38
Concluding Comments on Socio-Religious Expectations in Deuteronomy	44
Community and Individuality: Identity in Deuteronomy	44
A Continuum of Individuality and Community	45
The Individual and Family in Deuteronomy	47
Concluding Thoughts of Individuality and Community in Deuteronomy	49
Affliction and the Retributive Justice Principle in Deuteronomy	50
Israel's Experience of Affliction in Egypt	51
Deuteronomy and Suffering Members of Society	53
Deuteronomy and Innocent Blood	55
Concluding Thoughts about Suffering and Retributive Justice in Deuteronomy	55
Recasting Deuteronomy	56
II. JOB ON THE NATURE OF SOCIO-RELIGIOUS EXPECTATIONS, AFFLICTION, AND RETRIBUTION	58
The Nationalistic Metaphor	59
Socio-Religious Expectations according to Job	62
Theology in the Book of Job	63
Orthopraxy in the Book of Job	65
Piety in the Book of Job	68
Social Ethics in the Book of Job	69

Concluding Comments on Socio-Religious Expectations	71
Joban Movement and Development.....	72
Job in the First Cycle (Job 3–11)	72
Job in the Second Cycle (Job 12–20).....	75
Job in the Third Cycle (Job 21–25).....	78
The Broken Cycle (Job 26–28).....	79
Job’s Monologue (Job 29–31)	80
Job, the Friends, and Retribution	81
The Friends on Retributive Justice	81
Job’s Understanding of Retributive Justice	86
Concluding Thoughts on Retributive Justice in Job	89
Job and Deuteronomy at Odds?	90
III. JOB MEETS MOSES: REFERENCES TO DEUTERONOMY IN THE	
SPEECHES OF JOB.....	91
Defining Types of Author-Oriented Intertextuality	92
Types of Intertextual Connection.....	92
Michael Fishbane’s Methodology of Aggadic Exegesis	95
Specific Examples of Intertextual Connections: Job and Deuteronomy	96
Possible References to Deuteronomy in the First and Second Cycles.....	97
Prosperity of the Wicked: Job 21.....	99
Storing Up Calamity for Children?.....	100
Job Refers to God’s Commandment?	104
Job, Justice, and Pledges: Job 24	105

The <i>Song of Moses</i> (Deuteronomy 32)	110
The Social Ethics of the Wealthy Job: Job 29	113
The Innocence of Job: Job 31	114
Intertextual Partners: Job and Deuteronomy.....	127
CONCLUSIONS.....	129
BIBLIOGRAPHY	133
APPENDIX A: Translation of Select Joban Speeches	140
APPENDIX B: Table of Possible Intertextual Connections.....	146

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Bibles: Critical Editions, Translations, and Text Types

BHS	Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia
ESV	<i>English Standard Version</i>
LXX	Septuagint
MT	Masoretic Text
NASB	<i>New American Standard Bible</i>
NJPS	<i>New Jewish Publication Society Tanakh</i>
NRSV	<i>New Revised Standard Version</i>
RH	Rahlfs-Hanhart: Septuaginta

Biblical/Deuterocanonical Texts

Amos	Book of Amos
1 Chron	Book of First Chronicles
2 Chron	Book of Second Chronicles
Deut	Book of Deuteronomy
Exod	Book of Exodus
Ezek	Book of Ezekiel
Ezra	Book of Ezra
Gen	Book of Genesis
Isa	Book of Isaiah
Jer	Book of Jeremiah
Job	Book of Job
Josh	Book of Joshua
Judg	Book of Judges
1 Kgs	Book of First Kings
2 Kgs	Book of Second Kings
Lam	Book of Lamentations
Lev	Book of Leviticus
Mal	Book of Malachi
1 Macc	Book of First Maccabees
Mic	Book of Micah
Neh	Book of Nehemiah
Num	Book of Numbers
Prov	Book of Proverbs
Psalms	Book of Psalms
Qoh	Book of Qohelet or the Book of Ecclesiastes
Ruth	Book of Ruth

1 Sam	Book of First Samuel
2 Sam	Book of Second Samuel
Sir	Book of Ben Sira

Commentary Series

ABC	<i>Anchor Bible Commentary</i>
ICC	<i>International Critical Commentary</i>
Illum.	<i>Illuminations</i>
Int.	<i>Interpretation</i>
JPSTC	<i>Jewish Publication Society Torah Commentary</i>
NIB	<i>New Interpreter's Bible</i>
OTL	<i>Old Testament Library</i>
SHBC	<i>Smyth and Helwys Bible Commentary</i>
WBC	<i>Word Biblical Commentary</i>

Encyclopedias, Dictionaries, and Lexicons

ABD	<i>Anchor Bible Dictionary</i>
HALOT	<i>Koehler, Baumgartner: Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament</i>
TDOT	<i>Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament</i>

Monograph Series

BZAW	<i>Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
FAT	<i>Forschungen zum Alten Testament</i>
JSOTSup	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series</i>
LHB/OTS	<i>Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies</i>
NTM	<i>New Testament Monograph Series</i>
VTSup	<i>Vetus Testamentum Supplement Series</i>

Peer Reviewed Journals

AntS	<i>Anatolian Studies</i>
AT	<i>Acta Theologica</i>
BibInt	<i>Biblical Interpretation</i>
Bib	<i>Biblica</i>
CBQ	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
Did	<i>Didaskalia</i>
HTR	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
HUCA	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
Ir	<i>Iraq</i>
Int.	<i>Interpretation</i>
JCS	<i>Journal of Cuneiform Studies</i>
JBL	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
JBQ	<i>Jewish Bible Quarterly</i>
JSOT	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
LA	<i>Literature and Aesthetics</i>

<i>PEGLMBS</i>	<i>Proceedings, Eastern Great Lakes and Midwest Bible Society</i>
<i>PSB</i>	<i>Princeton Seminary Bulletin</i>
<i>RE</i>	<i>Review and Expositor</i>
<i>ResQ</i>	<i>Restoration Quarterly</i>
<i>VT</i>	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
<i>ZAW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>

Primary Sources (Non Biblical)

Adapa	Myth of Adapa (Dalley 1989)
CTH	Catalogue des Textes Hittites (Singer 2002)
Enuman Elish	Enuma Elish or The Babylonian Epic of Creation (Dalley 1989)
<i>Ludlul</i>	<i>Ludlul Bel Nemeqi</i> (Wiseman 1980)
TestJob	Testament of Job
VTE.....	Vassal Treaties of Esarhaddon (Wiseman 1958)

Other Abbreviations

ANE	Ancient Near Eastern
BCE.....	Before Common Era
CE	Common Era
EBH.....	Early Biblical Hebrew
LBH.....	Late Biblical Hebrew
Yhwh.....	The divine name, Yahweh, or the Tetragrammaton

INTRODUCTION

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DEUTERONOMY AND JOB

This thesis had its beginnings in the realization that the book of Job is a profoundly intertextual work. Its author(s) was/were familiar with large and diverse sections of literature. Copious references and allusions in the book of Job to literature from the Hebrew Bible and ancient Near Eastern myths and stories, such as the Myth of Adapa and Enuma Elish, evidence this.¹ The plethora of literary allusions helps to demarcate the book of Job as a literary masterpiece. As useful as a comprehensive study of the intertextuality of the book of Job would be, such a project would be unwieldy and beyond what one study could handle, thus limitation is necessary to allow thorough work. Deuteronomy emerges as a compelling intertextual partner with the book of Job. My central argument for this thesis is that the speeches of the character Job create a constructive dialogue with Deuteronomy rather than deconstructing or opposing Deuteronomy.

While many have examined the relationship between the book of Job and other books from the Hebrew Bible, David Wolfers noticed in 1995 an omission of such studies and Deuteronomy.² This is a curious omission since semi-popular belief about the

1. Eliphaz refers to the Myth of Adapa in Job 15:7. See Choon Leong Seow, *Job 1–21: Interpretation and Commentary*, Illum. 14 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013), 700. Yhwh refers to the Enuma Elish (The Epic of Creation) in Job 41:17 (Job 41:25 English). See David Wolfers, *Deep Things out of Darkness: The Book of Job, Essays and a New English Translation* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 459.

2. Wolfers, *Deep Things out of Darkness*, 118.

books cast them as polar opposites.³ American poet Robert Frost evidences this belief by placing the following words on the lips of God directed at Job in *A Masque of Reason*:

Too long I've owed you this apology
 For the apparently unmeaning sorrow
 You were afflicted with in those old days.
 But it was of the essence of the trial
 You shouldn't understand it at the time.
 It had to seem unmeaning to have meaning
 And it came out all right. I have no doubt
 You realize by now the part you played
To stultify the Deuteronomist
 And change the tenor of religious thought.⁴

Regardless of this perceived incongruity, Deuteronomy carries extensive intertextual connections to Job, which merit further study and investigation.⁵

Scholarship has progressed on the subject since 1995. Markus Witte and Edward Greenstein each contributed an article broaching the subject to an edited volume in 2013.⁶ However, much of the relationship between the two books remains unexplored. For this thesis, I focus on the relationship between the speeches of the character Job and Deuteronomy.⁷ I address other sections of the book of Job because the speeches of Job are dialogical. Removing speech from a dialogical context would invariably corrupt its

3. This position also finds a life in the work of Gerald Janzen and Stephen Cook. See Gerald Janzen, *Job*, Int. 14, Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1985), 5; Stephan Cook, "A Reading of Job as a Theatrical Work: Challenging a Retributive Deuteronomistic Theology," *LA* 24 (2014): 39–62.

4. Robert Frost, "A Masque of Reason," in *The Poetry of Robert Frost*, ed. Edward Connery Lathem (New York: Holt Rinehart, and Winston, 1969), 475. I added the emphasis.

5. I will note the extensive connections starting on page 96.

6. Edward Greenstein, "Parody as a Challenge to Tradition: The Use of Deuteronomy 32 in the Book of Job," in *Reading Job Intertextually*, LHB/OTS 574; ed. Katharine Dell and Will Kynes (New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2013), 66–78; Markus Witte, "Does the Torah Keep Its Promise? Job's Critical Intertextual Dialogue with Deuteronomy," in *Reading Job Intertextually*, LHB/OTS 574, ed. Katharine Dell and Will Kynes (New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2013), 54–65.

7. Job 3, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12–14, 16, 17, 19, 21, 23, 24, and 26–31 contain the speeches of Job.

meaning. Thus this study does not aim at being an exhaustive analysis of the book of Job's relationship to Deuteronomy, but I have limited the discussion to the speeches of the character Job.

A working assumption for this thesis is that the speeches of Job are the most useful source for establishing the main arguments for the book of Job. While the speeches of Yhwh may seem like a more useful source, Yhwh does not answer Job's questions or the questions of the book. Additionally, Job's is the dominant voice of the book and far outweighs Yhwh's.⁸ A strictly canonical reading of the book of Job also privileges the voice of Job because Yhwh commends Job and condemns the friends (Job 42:7). While the book may make a different argument than Job, the commendation of Job, the condemnation of the friends, and the silence on Elihu make Job's speeches the most useful source. I do not take a completely canonical approach to the book of Job, but I believe that the majority of the dialogue and the narrative framework form a coherent work. Source critical scholarship on Job remains complex and contested,⁹ but reading the majority of the speeches and the narrative portions as integral to the book is a position that Carol Newsom and others support.¹⁰ Establishing whether a text is useful for the conversation between the speeches of Job and Deuteronomy is more pertinent to this thesis than arguing that a single author was responsible for the material in question. I discuss this issue in detail beginning on page 19.

8. Edward Greenstein, "In Job's Face/Facing Job," in *The Labour of Reading: Desire, Alienation, and Biblical Interpretation*, ed. Fiona Black, Roland Boer, and Eric Runions (Atlanta: SBL Press, 1999), 301–17.

9. James Crenshaw provides a brief summary of the factors that have caused varied understandings of the compositional history of Job. See James Crenshaw, "Job, Book of," *ABD* 3:863.

10. Carol Newsom, *The Book of Job: A Contest of Moral Imaginations* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 17.

Intertextuality?

I use the term “intertextuality” cautiously. My use of the term does not match perfectly Julia Kristeva’s¹¹ understanding of the term. However, her work is still valuable for understanding how two texts function. Kristeva’s methodology is less concerned with determining the direction of influence between two texts, but seeks to illuminate the interpretation of texts by placing them in conversation. Thus she uses intertextuality rather than “transtextuality.” Kristeva’s understanding of the term does not include diachronic study of texts, but diachronic study will be important to this thesis. While transtextuality would be a logical name for the phenomenon considered, few if any scholars of the Hebrew Bible use this term. Alternatives such as “inner-biblical exegesis,”¹² and “inner-biblical allusion,”¹³ have emerged, but neither has become widespread.¹⁴ Inner-biblical allusion is a better description of the phenomenon than inner-biblical exegesis. However, for economy of language, I will continue to use intertextuality to mean the phenomenon of one text deliberately using a former text to enhance rhetoric or to critique the former text. Many scholars of the Hebrew Bible have adopted the terminology of “author-oriented intertextuality” to describe this phenomenon.¹⁵

11. Julia Kristeva, *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*, ed. Leon S Roudiez, trans. Thomas Gora, Alice Jardine, and Leon S. Roudiez, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1980).

12. Michael Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985).

13. Lyle Eslinger, “Inner-Biblical Exegesis and Allusion,” *VT* 42 (1992): 47–58.

14. Paul M. Joyce, “‘Even if Noah, Daniel, and Job were in it...’ (Ezekiel 14:14): The Case of Job and Ezekiel,” in *Reading Job Intertextually*, LHB/OTS 574. Ed. Katherine Dell and Will Kynes, (New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2013), 123.

15. Katherine Dell and Will Kynes, introduction to *Reading Job Intertextually*, LHB/OTS 574, ed. Katherine Dell and Will Kynes (New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2013), xxii; Joyce, “Even if Noah,

The Relative Dating of Deuteronomy and Job

Precise dating of any book of the Hebrew Bible is difficult, but a lack of explicit historical references and its truly unique language compound the problem of dating the book of Job. Thus it is beyond the scope of this thesis to argue for a precise date for the book of Job. However, I will present evidence and an argument for dating the majority of the book to the late sixth-century BCE at the earliest. While it is possible that Job legends existed before the sixth-century BCE,¹⁶ these legends do not represent the canonical book of Job. The important point for the development of my argument is simply that the author(s) of Job had access to a form of Deuteronomy—perhaps not its current form, but a work relatively close. To establish Deuteronomy’s priority over the book of Job, I will provide evidence and argument for a seventh-century BCE emergence of a core of Deuteronomy.

A Late Sixth-Century BCE Terminus Post Quem for the Book of Job

A sixth-century terminus post quem for the book of Job arises from three factors. (1) Useful linguistic dating of the book exposes similarities to other Persian period texts. (2) Limited allusions and relationship to the Babylonian exile. (3) Abundant allusions to other texts from the Hebrew Bible. Few of these are useful for assigning a precise date for the book of Job, but each supports a dating of the book of Job to the sixth-century at

Daniel, and Job were in it...” 123; Greenstein, “Parody as a Challenge to Tradition,” 68; Christian Frevel, “Telling the Secrets of Wisdom: The Use of Psalm 104 in the Book of Job,” in *Reading Job Intertextually*, LHB/OTS 574, ed. Katherine Dell and Will Kynes (New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2013), 158.

16. Ezek 14:14, 20 seem to reflect a Job legend where the protagonist was able to save his children—a trope from which the canonical form of the book of Job has consciously departed. More discussion of Ezekiel’s Job legend lies below.

the earliest. I do not wish to argue for a sixth-century dating, but only that the majority of the book of Job cannot be older than the sixth-century BCE.

Linguistic Dating of Job

Avi Hurvitz wrote an influential article in 1974 concerning the linguistic dating of the prose tale of Job.¹⁷ Hurvitz provided persuasive evidence that the author(s) of the Joban prologue archaized the language in order to give it a patriarchal feel. However, forms of Hebrew words characteristic of Persian period books occasionally appear, exposing its later composition.¹⁸ Hurvitz found seven forms characteristic of Late Biblical Hebrew (LBH), which was sufficient to classify it accordingly, despite the attempt of the author(s) to write in the style of Early Biblical Hebrew (EBH).

Many have accepted Hurvitz's argument, but Ian Young contested the conclusions of Hurvitz's study.¹⁹ Although Young presented some legitimate critiques of Hurvitz's evidence, I argue that Hurvitz's argument remains valid. Young's central critique was that according to Hurvitz's own meticulous methodology the prose tale of Job does not have enough features of LBH to justify classifying it in such a manner. Young dismissed two of the forms Hurvitz used for his argument because of insufficient evidence.²⁰ While Young is correct that these forms have little evidence, the best explanation of these forms is, as Hurvitz argued, LBH. Young did not insist that the prose

17. Avi Hurvitz, "The Date of the Prose Tale of Job Linguistically Reconsidered," *HTR* 67 (1974): 17–34.

18. *Ibid.*, 32.

19. Ian Young, "Is the Prose Tale of Job in Late Biblical Hebrew?" *VT* 59 (2009): 606–29.

20. Young throws out *יַמְשׁ . . . הַיָּדָה שִׁינָה* and *יִצְוֶהוּ* as evidence of LBH. Young, "Is the Prose Tale of Job Late Biblical Hebrew?" 618.

tale of Job is earlier than the sixth-century,²¹ but only that EBH is a better stylistic classification for it. Hurvitz noted that the author(s) emulated EBH, thus Young's argument applies stylistically to the prose tale of Job but not chronologically. The best explanation of the linguistic evidence for the prose tale of Job is that it developed in the exilic or post-exilic period.

The unique vocabulary and style of the poetic portions of the book of Job make assigning a date to those portions difficult. Edward Greenstein has shown that the numerous Aramaic loan words are deliberate stylizing of the poetry to make it sound foreign.²² Thus the mere presence of the Aramaic loan words may not represent a world where Aramaic was the lingua franca.²³ The vocabulary of Job is purposeful and not haphazard infiltrations of other languages. Examinations of loan words from Phoenician led Anthony Ceresko to conclude that the location of the Joban poet was in the northern Israelite diaspora in the seventh or early sixth-century BCE.²⁴ If Greenstein's theory on the purposeful use of the foreign elements in Job is correct, the Phoenician loan words, like the Aramaic, are a sign of the erudition of the Joban author(s) rather than an indication of setting.

While the language of Job makes linguistic analysis difficult, the best evidence points to a postexilic date for the work including the poetic portions. Leong Seow argued

21. *Ibid.*, 629.

22. Edward Greenstein, "The Language of Job and its Poetic Function," *JBL* 122 (2003): 651–66.

23. I find it likely that Aramaic was the lingua franca at the time and location of the composition of the Joban poetry. However, Aramaisms are not sufficient evidence to make such a conclusion.

24. Anthony Ceresko, *Job29–31 in the Light of Northwest Semitic* (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1980), 195–96.

that the poetry belongs to a similar time as the prose and lists numerous Hebrew words that appear only in exilic or post-exilic texts.²⁵ This evidence in concert with other evidence provides solid grounds for a sixth-century limit to Job's antiquity.

The Book of Job and the Hebrew Bible

This short discussion of the book of Job and the whole Hebrew Bible serves two purposes. (1) It demonstrates the awareness of the book of Job with much of the Hebrew canon. This awareness implies that Job postdates other parts of the canon. Although Job likely predates some of the material discussed, the majority of the books discussed appear to predate Job. (2) This discussion will demonstrate that Job's relationship with Deuteronomy is neither accidental nor an aberration. The Joban author(s) frequently referred to other texts from the Hebrew canon; thus connections to Deuteronomy seem to be deliberate rather than haphazard.

The book of Job is vague concerning its precise setting, but as Hurvitz has shown, the book contains archaized language to make it appear contemporary to the patriarchs.²⁶ The LXX and other traditions connected Job to Jobab,²⁷ king of Edom (Gen 36:33–34), in the era prior to the Israelite monarchy (Job 42:17d LXX). While the etymology of Job (אִיּוֹב) is unlikely to be from Jobab (יּוֹבָב), as Job introduces a new consonant, aleph (א), the juxtaposition of other similar names to the Edomite kings with Eliphaz, Bildad, and Zophar indicates that the author(s) of the book of Job intended to connect Job and Jobab.

25. Seow, *Job 1–21*, 25–6.

26. Hurvitz, "The Date of the Prose Tale of Job," 18.

27. For more on this, see Annette Yoshiko Reed, "Job as Jobab: The Interpretation of Job in LXX Job 42:17b–e," *JBL* 120 (2001): 31–55.

Greenstein, among others, has shown how the Joban author(s) created the names of the characters from the list of Edomite kings in Genesis 36.²⁸ The name of Eliphaz (אֵלִיפַז) is from Esau's son (Gen 36:10), Bildad (בִּלְדָד) is an alteration of Bedad (בְּדָד), the father of Hadad (Gen 36:35), and Zophar (צוֹפָר) is an alteration of Zepho (צִפּוֹ), a son of Eliphaz (Gen 36:11). This play on the texts of Genesis demonstrates an awareness of a developed Genesis; thus indicating the book of Job postdates most of Genesis.

Other notable literary connections to Genesis exist. Michael Fishbane argued that Job 42:2 contains an indirect quotation from Genesis 11:6, and certain grammatical features make it nearly impossible to read it as Genesis quoting Job.²⁹ Job lives an extraordinarily long life (Job 42:16), paralleled only by the Genesis patriarchs.³⁰ The author(s) of the book of Job gave it a patriarchal setting; thus connections with Genesis exist. There is not space to cover the scholarly debate concerning the dating of Genesis, but Genesis 36, the section of the book with the most connections to Job, is aware of the Israelite monarchy (Gen 36:31).³¹

28. Edward Greenstein, "The Invention of Language in the Poetry of Job," in *Interested Readers: Essays in Honor of David J. A. Clines*, ed. James K. Aitken, Jeremy M. S. Clines, and Christl M. Maier (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013), 335–36.

29. Michael Fishbane, "The Book of Job and Inner-Biblical Discourse," in *The Voice from the Whirlwind: Interpreting the Book of Job* (Ed. Leo Perdue and Clark Gilpin, Nashville: Abingdon, 1994), 86–98.

30. Note: Moses, Joshua, and Caleb all live extraordinarily long lives, but Job's 140 years postdate his sufferings and restoration. Thus it seems that the text wishes to make him comparable with Abraham's 175 years or Isaac's 180 years.

31. The language of Gen 36:31 is vague: לְפָנֵי מַלְכֵּה־מְלָכֵה לְבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל ("before the reigning of a king of the children of Israel.") However, this phrase may represent post-facto knowledge of the Israelite monarchy, meaning Genesis 36 may date to a time after the demise of Israelite and Judean monarchy. All quotations from the Hebrew Bible are taken from the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (BHS) and the English translations are my original renderings unless otherwise noted.

Deuteronomy's connection to the speeches of Job will receive ample attention later. For this section, it will suffice to remark that the literary connections to Deuteronomy in the book of Job are extensive. The speeches of Job have as many as thirty independent allusions or references to Deuteronomy. Wolfers has listed some of the striking overlaps between the Joban prologue and Deuteronomy, which include some precise word linkages.³² The phrase *קַדְקֵדוֹ מִכַּף רַגְלֹו עַד* ("From the sole of his foot to his head,") appears in Job 2:7 and in Deut 28:35 with minor differences. A similar phrase occurs in Isa 1:6, but the precise use of head (*קַדְקֵד*) matches in Deuteronomy and Job, but not in Isaiah (*שֵׁאֵר*). It seems very likely that the Joban prologue alludes to Deut 28:35.

The book of Job shares some striking parallels with Jeremiah. The protagonist of each of the books offers a lament for the day of his birth, wishing he had never been born (Job 3:1–26; cf. Jer 20:14–18). Job and Jeremiah both have the audacity to bring a lawsuit against God (Job 9:15–16; 31:35–37; cf. Jer 12:1), but know that such a lawsuit would be fruitless. The prosperity of the wicked is also a major theme widespread in both books (Job 21:7–16; 24:21–23; cf. Jer 12:1–2). Greenstein has addressed these similarities and has argued that Jeremiah serves as an inspiration for Job rather than the reverse.³³ Although many believe that much of Jeremiah comes later, descriptions of impending Babylonian captivity date the setting of Jeremiah to the early sixth-century, reinforcing a sixth-century limit to Job's antiquity.

32. Wolfers, *Deep Things out of Darkness*, 112–14.

33. Edward Greenstein, "Jeremiah as an Inspiration to the Poet of Job," in *Inspired Speech* (ed. J. Kaltner and L. Stulman, New York: T&T Clark International, 2004), 98–110; Katharine Dell, "'Cursed Be the Day I Was Born!': Job and Jeremiah Revisited," in *Reading Job Intertextually*, LBH/OTS 574, ed. Katherine Dell and Will Kynes (New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2013), 106–17.

The poetry of Job refers to Prov 13:9 twice (Job 18:5–6; 21:17). The first reference is on the lips of Bildad in affirmation, and the second is on the lips of Job in a deliberate reversal. The speeches of Job have a penchant for this type of reversal, which is most satirical in its reversal of Psalm 8 (Job 7:17).³⁴ These reversals seem to highlight Job’s antithetical position to the other wisdom and lyrical literature. The book of Job seems to deconstruct simple wisdom statements such as Prov 14:11, *בֵּית רְשָׁעִים יִשְׁמָד*, *וְאֶהֱל יִשְׂרָיִם יִפְרִיחַ* (“The house of the wicked is decimated, but the tent of the righteous blossoms”). Yet not every reference to Psalms or Proverbs is negative in the book of Job. Yhwh’s speech about Leviathan seems to overlap in theme with Psalm 104, and Christian Frevel has shown other places where Job uses Psalm 104.³⁵ The poetic portions of Job carry rich interplay with other wisdom and lyrical texts from the Hebrew Bible.

Qohelet shares some interesting connections to the book of Job. Job’s initial lament (Job 3) echoes the major themes of Qohelet, namely that all peoples end in death and are thus the same (Job 3:13–15; cf. Qoh 6:1–6). Job and Qohelet seem to answer questions about death and resurrection similarly (Job 14:7–10; cf. Qoh 3:20–21).³⁶ Qohelet shares the feature with Job of frequent Aramaisms. While there is little evidence to build a case that one book predates the other, the similarities indicate that the two books may have developed chronologically close to each other, but many date Qohelet later.³⁷ Thus scholars such as Richard Schultz discuss Job’s influence on Qohelet.³⁸

34. Fishbane, *Biblical Exegesis in Ancient Israel*, 285–86.

35. Frevel, “Telling the Secrets of Wisdom,” 157–68.

36. David L. Smith, “The Concept of Death in Job and Ecclesiastes,” *Did.* 4 (1992): 2–14.

37. Some date Qohelet as late as the Hellenistic period, but this may still represent a relatively close date to Job. See Carol Newsom, “Job and Ecclesiastes,” in *Old Testament Interpretation* (ed. J. L. Mays, D. L. Petersen, and K. H. Richards, Nashville: Abingdon, 1995), 184.

With the exception of Qohelet, the books from the Hebrew Bible discussed above appear to predate Job in some form. Without an extensive foray into the scholarship of each of these books, it suffices to say that this shows that Job could not have emerged before the sixth-century.

Job and Babylonian Exile

Edouard Dhorme argued that the book of Job is aware of Judah's Babylonian exile. Dhorme cites Job 12:17–19 as supporting his case, which possibly depicts the demise of Jehoiachin or Zedekiah as king of Judah and the deportation of the aristocracy (2 Kgs 24:12; 25:7, 18–21).³⁹ Wolfers argued that these verses necessarily represent the disintegration of a nation, and Judah and Israel are the logical victims of such a catastrophe.⁴⁰ Additional evidence emerges from the prologue, where the Chaldeans (כַּשְׂדִּיִּם) are the agents responsible for carrying off Job's camels and killing many of his servants (Job 1:17).⁴¹ Despite the connection to Genesis 36 and its patriarchal feel, the book of Job appears to have a few features intended to incite sympathy from peoples who experienced Babylonian exile.

David Wolfers has drawn parallels between Job's family and Judah's experience of Assyrian conquest. Job's ten children, whose death was the result of a wind coming

38. Richard Schultz, "Job and Ecclesiastes," in *Reading Job Intertextually*, LBH/OTS 574, ed. Katherine Dell and Will Kynes (New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2013), 192.

39. Edouard Dhorme, *A Commentary on the Book of Job* (trans. Harold Knight, Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1967), clxvi–clxvii.

40. David Wolfers, "Job: A Universal Drama," *CBQ* 21 (1993): 13–23.

41. Seow believes that Chaldeans (כַּשְׂדִּיִּם) do not represent the imperial forces of Nebuchadnezzar, but possibly the forces of Nabonidus. Nabonidus was the final Babylonian or Chaldean king before the rise of Cyrus the Great and the Persian Empire. See Seow, *Job 1–21*, 279.

from across the desert, represent the ten tribes of Israel destroyed and deported by the Assyrians. Seven sons represent the cis-Jordanian tribes and three daughters represent the three trans-Jordanian tribes. Job and his wife represent the tribes of Judah and Benjamin, who survive but at great cost.⁴² Wolfers used the nationalistic metaphor in Job to argue that the author(s) of the book of Job composed it in a time of Assyrian hegemony.⁴³ However, I argue his evidence and argument supports a Babylonian period composition equally well, as there are significant weaknesses in his theory. Job's restoration at the end of the book mirrors the return from exile rather than the survival of Assyrian oppression, but the extravagance of Job's restoration mirrors neither survival of Assyrian oppression nor reestablishment of a Judean puppet state in the Persian period. I will cover the nationalistic metaphor in Job more extensively on page 59.

Both explicit references to Job in the Hebrew Bible outside of the book of Job occur in Ezekiel 14. However, the story of Job as Ezekiel's author(s) knew it departs from the canonical Book of Job in a key way. Ezekiel lifts up three exemplars of righteousness, Noah, Danel, and Job (Ezek 14:14). Ezekiel claims that these righteous individuals would not be able to save their children if they presently lived in the land. Ezekiel's rhetoric and juxtaposing of Job and Noah indicate that Ezekiel understood Job to be a figure able to save his children through his righteousness. The rhetoric of Ezekiel requires examples of righteous people able to save their children, as Noah saved his family from the flood (Gen 6:18–8:18). In the canonical form of the book of Job, Job's righteousness is unable to save his children, despite daily purification and sacrifices on

42. Wolfers, *Deep Things out of Darkness*, 117.

43. *Ibid.*, 69.

their behalf (Job 1:5). Thus the story of Job, as told by Ezekiel and others contemporary to the Babylonian exile, was likely different from the canonical version of the story.⁴⁴ Yet Ezekiel's Job and the canonical Job seem related in that they are examples of supreme righteousness (Job 1:1, 8; 2:3 cf. Ezek 14:14, 20). Thus Ezekiel's Job and the book of Job probably have some level of connection. It follows that the canonical form of the book of Job probably developed from the legend the author(s) of Ezekiel knew and after the sixth-century BCE literary setting of Ezekiel.

A Seventh-Century BCE Core for the Book of Deuteronomy

Theories continue to multiply concerning the date for Deuteronomy, and sorting through all of these theories would be unwieldy. I will examine three factors evidencing a seventh-century emergence of a core of Deuteronomy.⁴⁵ (1) Connections to the Vassal Treaties of Esarhaddon (VTE) indicate awareness of Assyrian propaganda. (2) Connections with the Josianic reforms indicate a book of Deuteronomy probably existed, although canonical Deuteronomy represents a heavily edited version of this book. (3) The book contains subtle hints that it is aware of an Assyria-like invader. While not all find these arguments compelling,⁴⁶ the crux of my argument needs one only to assume that a version of Deuteronomy existed prior to the Joban speeches.

44. Newsom, *The Book of Job: A Contest of Moral Imaginations*, 17; Bruce Zuckerman, *Job the Silent* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 29–31. Zuckerman discusses the ambiguous case of Danel, who is possibly the father of Aqhat from the Ugaritic myths. While Danel is unable to save Aqhat in the extant story, it is likely that Aqhat returns to life in the fragmentary portion of the myth.

45. German scholarship frequently calls this book Urdeuteronomy.

46. C. L. Crouch, *Israel and the Assyrians: Deuteronomy, the Succession Treaty of Esarhaddon and the Nature of Subversion* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2014).

Deuteronomy and the Vassal Treaties of Esarhaddon

A pivotal element in the argument for dating an early core of Deuteronomy to the seventh-century BCE is its connection to the Assyrian propaganda of Esarhaddon and specifically the VTE. D. J. Wiseman first began to note similarities between the VTE and Deuteronomy in his publication and English translation of the treaties in 1958.⁴⁷ Moshe Weinfeld was a major proponent that the treaties evidenced a core of Deuteronomy emerged relatively close to the composition of the VTE.⁴⁸ While the similarity does not necessitate close temporal composition, such a similarity would be strange if Babylon or Persia had already ascended to power and spread its own propaganda.

The area of greatest similarity between the treaties and Deuteronomy are in the curses (VTE 6:414–493; cf. Deut 28:15–68). The punishment for transgressing the VTE is retaliation from the gods of the land. Similarly, Deuteronomy 28 depicts Yhwh bringing punishment upon Israel for transgressing the laws. Both lists of curses share the distinctive features of starvation-induced infant cannibalism, infertility of wombs, locust plagues decimating harvests, drought, disease, foreigners stealing wives or betrothed women, failure of progeny to inherit possessions, failure of bread-making processes, failure of the sun to shine, and failure in battle. The similarities are significant and appear deliberate rather than haphazard.⁴⁹ Assyria's extensive influence make it far more likely that the VTE influenced the emerging core of Deuteronomy rather than vice versa.

47. D. J. Wiseman, "The Vassal-Treaties of Esarhaddon," *Ir.* 20 (1958): 1–99.

48. Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1–11*, ABC 5 (New York: Doubleday, 1991), 6–8.

49. C. L. Crouch claims that the relationship between the VTE and Deuteronomy 28 is superficial, and incidental. She claims that language barriers would have prevented use of the VTE for the composition of Deuteronomy in the seventh century, and no evidence has emerged that a translation was available. See Crouch, *Israel and the Assyrians*, 53. I disagree with Crouch. The connections are more substantial than her depictions.

The similarities between Deuteronomy and the VTE may not indicate that there is direct literary dependence from one to the other, but rather that Deuteronomy relies on formulae common in Assyrian propaganda. This would necessitate Assyrian propaganda being readily available. If there is a connection between Assyrian propaganda and Deuteronomy, it follows that the early core of Deuteronomy would need to begin emerging before the demise of the Assyrian Empire. While I expect that the core of Deuteronomy began to develop earlier than the last few years of Assyrian dominance, the battle of Carchemish in 605 BCE represents the demise of Assyrian hegemony; thus marking the latest date Deuteronomy would plausibly be able to emulate Assyrian propaganda. This indicates a seventh-century origin to the early core of Deuteronomy.

De Wette, Deuteronomy, and the Josianic Reforms

In 1805, Wilhelm De Wette suggested in a footnote that the “book of the law” from Hilkiah and Josiah’s reforms was the Book of Deuteronomy (2 Kgs 22–23).⁵⁰ De Wette’s suggestion became widely influential, and if correct, supports an emergence of a core of Deuteronomy prior to the reign of Josiah in the late seventh-century BCE. One may contest the historicity of the Josianic reforms, but the texts describing these reforms rely on Deuteronomy. Josiah swore to follow the commandments (מִצְוֹתַיִם), testimonies (עֲדוּתַיִם), and statutes (חֻקֵּי־יְהוָה) of the book of the law with all of his heart (לֵב) and self (נַפְשׁוֹ) (2 Kgs 23:3). All of these terms are paradigmatic for Deuteronomy,⁵¹ and the commitment of the heart and self echo Deuteronomy’s paradigmatic statement of

50. Wilhelm M. L. De Wette, *Dissertatio critico-exegetica qua Deuteronomium a prioribus Pentateuchi Libris diversum* (Jena: Etzdorf, 1805), 13–14.

51. Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972), 334, 336–37.

monolatry (Deut 6:4–5). In the summary evaluation of Josiah's reign, the text uses similar language, claiming that Josiah was the supreme example of a king who turned toward Yhwh with all of his heart, self, and might (יְהוָה) (2 Kgs 23:25).

De Wette's theory would not be sufficient grounds to conclude that a core of Deuteronomy emerged in the seventh-century, as a later Deuteronomist could have easily engineered both accounts to corroborate. However, the striking similarities between Deuteronomy and the reforms of Josiah reveal that a significant tradition held that Josiah was distinctly committed to upholding the principles of Deuteronomy.⁵² Thus one cannot lightly dismiss the evidence. While some date the core of Deuteronomy that influenced Josiah earlier than Josiah's reign, many American and German scholars believe that this document existed for Josiah's reforms.⁵³

Deuteronomy and the Problem of Assyria

Internal tensions exist in the book of Deuteronomy about the status of foreigners. While there is a repeated call for the people of Israel to be kind to the foreigner (גֵּר) (Deut 1:16; 5:14; 14:29; 24:14, 17, 19, 20, 21; 26:12, 13; 27:19), Deuteronomy demonstrates a heightened anxiety about a foreigner's (גֵּרִי) ruling over the people (Deut 17:15). If the text were from an exilic or postexilic time, the author(s) and redactor(s) would be struggling with the reality of a foreigner ruling over the people. As the text stands, it seems more likely that foreign hegemony is an increasingly likely possibility rather than present reality. Assyrian domination of the region provides such a setting.

52. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1–11*, 66.

53. For a brief history of the scholarship on Deuteronomy and its relationship to Josiah's reform, see Thomas Römer, "The Book of Deuteronomy" in *The History of Israel's Traditions: The Heritage of Martin Noth*, ed. S. L. McKenzie and P. Graham (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 184–95.

Mark Hamilton argued that a text from the position of exile is more likely to display a powerful king or remove the position of king entirely.⁵⁴ Yet Deuteronomy severely limits the economic, diplomatic, and militaristic options for the king (Deut 17:16–20). This indicates that Deuteronomy’s restrictions on kingship stand as a critique of reigning monarchs rather than wishful thinking about past regimes.

While the literary setting of Deuteronomy prevents it from mentioning the Assyrians, its authors describe an enemy that fits Assyria best. During the long description of the consequences of disobedience to the commands of Yhwh, the text describes a nation about whom neither the people nor their ancestors had knowledge will be the agents of destruction (Deut 28:36).⁵⁵ The subsequent description of the destruction this nation brings with it (Deut 28:49–57) fits well the conquest of Assyria. While one may demur and claim it represents Babylonian conquest, the text would then be strangely silent about Assyria. If the text had awareness of both conquests, emphasizing two destroying nations would strengthen its rhetoric. The text’s awareness of one nation implies Assyria is the foreign nation, and it follows that part of Deuteronomy developed before Babylon became the dominant power in the Levant. Assyrian domination of the Levant begins in the eighth century BCE and concludes in the late seventh-century BCE. This provides a window of greatest plausibility for the emergence of Deuteronomy 28 and the early core of Deuteronomy.

54. Mark Hamilton, “The Past as Destiny: Historical Visions in Sam’al and Judah under Assyrian Hegemony,” *HTR* 91 (1998): 215–50.

55. *Ibid.*, 234.

Concluding Comments about Relative Dating of Job and Deuteronomy

Especially considering the redactional strata likely present in Deuteronomy, it would be beyond the scope of the evidence to argue that all of Deuteronomy predates all of Job. Ezekiel evidenced a Joban legend that may be older, but canonical Job has adapted significantly from that legend.⁵⁶ Similarly, there are strata in Deuteronomy that may be late in its composition and possibly post-date Job. Establishing a chronology for all of the strata between the books would be nearly impossible, as precision with dating specific strata is extraordinarily difficult. I argue that the majority of the books of Job and Deuteronomy are useful for examination of the conversation between the speeches of Job and Deuteronomy. However, a few texts will require special treatment due to significant evidence that they developed independently for the main books to which they belong.

Texts Requiring Special Treatment

While the previous arguments apply to the majority of the books of Job and Deuteronomy, a few texts require special attention. Scholarship has long recognized diachronic problems with the book of Job, and some scholarship has discounted certain passages entirely. Similarly, scholarship has found evidence of diachronic development in Deuteronomy.⁵⁷ These progressive developments in Deuteronomy may cast doubt on various parts of this thesis if the passages used appear to be later than the book of Job. Additionally, in the analysis of Job's argument, various scholars have determined that certain speeches are displaced, corrupt, or a later addition from a less coherent author. The most pertinent question for all of these texts is not whether it is original to Job or

⁵⁶. See 13.

⁵⁷. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1–11*, 9.

Deuteronomy, but rather whether the text should play a meaningful role in the conversation between Deuteronomy and the speeches of Job.

There are six texts/groups of texts that I will consider in this section: (1) the narrative prologue and epilogue portions of Job, (2) Job's *Hymn of Praise* (Job 26), (3) the *Wisdom Speech* (Job 28), (4) the material preceding the *Wisdom Speech* (Job 27:11–23), (5) the Elihu speeches (Job 32–37), and (6) the *Song of Moses* (Deut 32). The Elihu speeches are the least significant for the purpose of this thesis, thus I will spend the least amount of time covering these texts.

The Narratives of Job

The vast majority of Job is a poetic dialogue (Job 3:1–42:6), but narrative prose at the beginning (Job 1–2) and end (Job 42:7–17) of the book frames this dialogue. Claus Westermann supported the position that these narratives are independent of the poetic portions and older, but that the Joban poet situated the dispute between Job and his friends in the context of an established story.⁵⁸ Many accept that there is a fundamental disagreement between the narrative and poetic sections. Loren Fisher believes the distinction is so great that consideration of the narratives is not important to Joban scholarship.⁵⁹ The disagreement between the two portions of the book centers on two factors: (1) the personality of Job and (2) the fate of Job's children.

(1) The first disagreement centers on the portrayal of the person Job and his suffering. In the narrative prologue, Job responds to his calamity with acceptance. Job

58. Claus Westermann, *The Structure of the Book of Job*, trans. C. Muenchow (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1981), 6–7.

59. Loren Fisher, *Who Hears the Cries of the Innocent?* (Willits, CA: Fisher, 2002).

does not question the justice of God, but says וַיֹּאמֶר עָרִים יִצְתִי מִבֶּטֶן אִמִּי וְעָרִים אָשׁוּב נְשָׁמָה (Job 1:21). Job even rebukes his wife for her response to the calamity (Job 2:10). However, the personality of Job seems to have changed rapidly when the poetic dialogue begins. In Job’s first speech (Job 3), Job curses the day of his birth and calls for the dissolution of order in the world.⁶⁰ Later, Job contests the justice of God (Job 12:6). The Job of the narrative portions would never make such claims.

(2) There is disagreement as to the fate of Job’s children. In the narratives, Job’s original children died in the house of his first born when an easterly wind struck and razed the house (Job 1:19). Yet Job complains that the יְחִנְתִּי לִבְגִי בִטְנִי: (“children of my belly loathe me” [Job 19:17]), indicating that his biological children still lived. Clearly, Job’s wife survives in both the poetic and narrative portions (Job 2:9; cf. Job 19:17). Yet many translations have elected to smooth the tension by providing translations such as “my family” in Job 19:17.⁶¹ However, there is even tension within the poetic portions concerning the fate of the children. Bildad implies that Job’s children received due punishment for sin (Job 8:4). While he does not explicitly mention their deaths, this seems like the most plausible insinuation.

While these inward tensions exist, neither the poetic nor the narrative portions seem to be able to stand alone. If the poetry stood without the narrative, the severity of Job’s suffering would be unknown and Job’s righteousness would be in doubt. This

60. Seow, *Job 1–21*, 325–6.

61. NRSV, ESV, NIV et al.

would totally recast the theme of Job because the reader would have no reason to sympathize with Job against the friends. Similarly, the story of Job lacks much substance without the poetic portions. The story of Job would be little better than a parable that makes some unrealistic claims about righteous suffering. The power of the book requires both components to reach its apogee.

While there are inconsistencies, the poetic portions and narrative portions strengthen the overall rhetorical power of the book. My argument is not that a single author is responsible for both the narrative and poetic portions, but rather that the book profits from both sections and that they are both integral to the efficaciousness of the book of Job.⁶² With the copious connections between the narrative prologue and Deuteronomy as shown by Wolfers,⁶³ I conclude that the narrative portions, especially the prologue, present useful data for understanding the conversation between the speeches of Job and Deuteronomy.

Job's Hymn of Praise (Job 26)

Job 26 is problematic for interpreters of Job. Since the *Hymn of Praise* (Job 26) does not carry much significant connection to Deuteronomy, it does not merit extensive treatment in this thesis. While not antithetical to Job's arguments, Job 26 seems out of place, especially as a response to Bildad's final speech (Job 25). John Gray argues that the *Hymn of Praise* is slightly corrupt and should be part of Bildad's final speech rather than its rebuttal.⁶⁴ This idea has significant merit. Bildad's final speech is

62. Newsom, *The Book of Job: A Contest of Moral Imaginations*, 17.

63. Wolfers, *Deep Things out of Darkness*, 112–14.

64. John Gray, *The Book of Job*, ed. David Clines (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2010), 325.

uncharacteristically short, and the *Hymn of Praise* seems to fit better with Bildad's argument than with Job's argument. I am ambivalent about Gray's suggestion. The text seems to be corrupt in some way, thus Gray's suggestion seems plausible, but not irresistible. The *Hymn of Praise* is not directly contrary to Job's arguments, however out of place they may seem. Gray suggested that the movement of the *Hymn of Praise* to the lips of Job was a deliberate orthodox adjustment to Job's argument by a redactor.⁶⁵ Perhaps a redactor was attempting such a task, but whether the hymn belongs to Bildad is questionable. In summary, Job 26 will not play a major role in the conversation between the speeches of Job and Deuteronomy. Job 26 does not carry significant overlap with Deuteronomy and Job 26 does not seem integral to Job's character.

The Wisdom Speech and Preceding Material

The *Wisdom Speech* (Job 28) certainly fits with the style of much of the Joban poet(s). It contains the same penchant for the obscure and esoteric that marks much of the dialogue. However, the words of the *Wisdom Speech* seem to be out of place on the lips of the suffering Job. The *Wisdom Speech* harmonizes with the larger corpus of wisdom literature in its conclusion that הֵן יְרֵאת אֱלֹהֵי הָיָא הַכְּמָה וְסוּר מִרַע בִּינָה: (“The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom” [Job 28:28]). Proverbs affirms the same type of orthodoxy (Prov 1:7). Yet the character Job has served as an anti-wisdom until Job 26. Job specifically contradicts Bildad and Proverbs 13:9 (Job 21:17). It seems bizarre that Job would radically change his argument so quickly, yet revert to his original argument in the subsequent chapters (Job 29–31).

65. Ibid., 328.

Job 27 contains significant problems for its belonging to Job. While the chapter begins with some words that appear only to fit on Job's lips, from Job 27:11 the chapter is nearly antithetical to Job's position. It is difficult to construe this change as a development in the character Job because in Job 29–31 Job maintains his former position. I see four possible solutions to the problem of Job 27. (1) Job 27 contains intense sarcasm and irony. Sarcasm highlights the beginning of the chapter; thus the reader should understand that Job is using sarcasm to deride the position of the friends. (2) Job 27 represents a brief capitulation of Job to the three friends, but he returns to his original position. (3) Job 27 is corrupt, and a new speech, likely one from Zophar, should begin at Job 27:11. (4) A later redactor, who either did not understand Job or wanted to make Job more orthodox, added Job 27:11–23.⁶⁶

I argue that solution 3 satisfies the evidence most sufficiently and that the words of Job 27:11–23 belong to Zophar. As the book stands, Zophar fails to comment during the third cycle of the dialogue.⁶⁷ Solution 1 suffers from a lack of internal evidence that points to extreme sarcasm. Perhaps as an oral production, the performers could have communicated sarcasm, but the text fails to communicate this. Solution 2 does not make strong sense of the text either. The speech of the character does not sound like one capitulating; instead, the speaker uses instructional language (Job 27:11). Solution 4 suggests that a redactor successfully inserted words into Job's mouth that are contrary to the majority of his argument.

66. Newsom, *The Book of Job: A Contest of Moral Imaginations*, 161.

67. Dhorme is so convinced that Zophar is responsible for Job 27:13–23 that he amends the text to represent Zophar's otherwise missing third speech. Dhorme, *A Commentary on the Book of Job*, 386.

A similar argument applies to Job 24:18–20, 24. These verses are out of step with the rest of Job’s thought in Job 24. It seems likely that Job 24:18–20, 24 is a later addition in order to bring Job back into the spectrum of orthodoxy. Dhorme and Clines each argue that these verses are misplaced.⁶⁸ Samuel Balentine and the NJPS translation follow older versions of the LXX and Peshitta, which amend the text to read as Job’s wishes rather than statements of fact.⁶⁹

The Elihu Speeches

The character Elihu is ambiguous at best in both synchronic and diachronic readings of the text of Job. Westermann and others have determined that Elihu is one of the latest additions to the book of Job and actually disrupts the flow of the text.⁷⁰ Sorting through the diachronic issues of the Elihu speeches would require far more space than is justifiable for this thesis, but there is significant reason to doubt the authenticity of the Elihu speeches on the basis of diachronic study. When considering the text synchronically, Elihu represents a disjunction in the text. While the premise of much of the book is dialogue between Job, the friends, and ultimately Yhwh, Elihu does not participate in this dialogue. The Elihu speeches represent an extended monologue, and none of the other characters responds to his words. Elihu is absent from God’s condemnation of the friends and commendation of Job. Thus the text’s position on Elihu is cloudy at best. Thus for both synchronic and diachronic reasons, I will assume that the

68. David Clines, *Job 21–37*, WBC: 18a (Nashville: Tomas Nelson, 2006), 651–676; Dhorme, *A Commentary on the Book of Job*, 386–93.

69. Samuel Balentine, *Job*, SHBC 10 (Macon, GA: Smyth and Helwys, 2006), 371.

70. Westermann, *The Structure of the Book of Job*, 139–41.

speeches of Elihu are not essential to the main arguments of the book of Job, and these speeches will not significantly factor into the shape of this thesis.

The Song of Moses (Deuteronomy 32)

Scholarly output on the *Song of Moses* is considerable and varied. While it seems very likely that the song has an alternative composition history, scholarship is not in agreement about whether this represents an old tradition incorporated into a newer Deuteronomy⁷¹ or if it was a song developed late that was intended to look old.⁷² Despite its compositional history, I argue that the *Song of Moses* plays a legitimate role in the conversation between the speeches of Job and Deuteronomy.

Some internal evidence indicates that Job's speeches postdate the *Song of Moses*. Job's speech in chapter 29 gives a possible allusion to the *Song of Moses* (Deut 32:1–43). Job begins this speech by reminiscing about the previous days before the great calamity came upon him (Job 29:1–25). The author(s) use(s) distinct language about the way of Job being washed in curds⁷³ and a rock pouring forth streams of oil (Job 29:6). This text is strikingly similar to Deuteronomy 32:13b, which speaks of oil coming from a flinty rock. Both texts use the Hebrew word צֹרֶר for rock and שֶׁמֶן for oil. The connection is strong enough that Greenstein claims that the intertextual connection is clear.⁷⁴ Deuteronomy 32:14 also mentions curds, thus making the connection stronger. The texts

71. Steven Schweitzer, "Deuteronomy 32 & 33 as Proto-Deuteronomic Texts." *PEGLMBS* 22 (2002): 79–98.

72. Jack Lundbom, *Deuteronomy: A Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013), 853.

73. This is the variant from the MT, but clearly superior reading that the BHS editors note for Job 29:6a.

74. Greenstein, "Parody as a Challenge to Tradition," 72.

use the imagery in similar rhetorical ways, as they are both descriptions of God's providence. These are the only two texts in the Hebrew Bible that describe oil coming from a rock. The distinct nature of this imagery, combined with its lack of appearance in other texts of the Hebrew Bible, implies direct literary connection.

The priority of the *Song of Moses* over Job 29 should be relatively clear from internal clues. The imagery of the oil-producing rock invokes the images of water gushing from the rock as reported in the stories of the Israelites leaving Egypt, which the speeches of Moses recount (Deut 6:16, 8:15).⁷⁵ Deuteronomy 8:15 uses the same adjective to describe the rock as “flinty” (שִׁינִיָּהוּ) as the *Song of Moses* uses for the oil producing rock (Deut 32:13). Thus the inspiration for the oil producing rock in the *Song of Moses* does not appear to be Job 29:6, but the stories of the water producing rocks. It follows that the apparent literary connection implies that Job 29:6 is an allusion to Deuteronomy 32:13.

Concluding Comments about Texts Requiring Special Treatment

While these are not the only texts from the books of Job and Deuteronomy that show diachronic development, these texts may be pertinent to the discussion between the speeches of Job and Deuteronomy. While the discussion above is largely diachronic, it does not limit the text to diachronic conclusions. While there are many sources involved in the creation of any book, the various sources are able to work in symphony, which has happened in the case of both Job and Deuteronomy. Thus I have identified and discussed passages with diachronic problems as a necessary step to discuss plausible direction of

75. *Ibid.*, 71.

influence and to show how the speeches of Job are able to interact with the texts of Deuteronomy.

Job and Deuteronomy's Conversation on God

The previous data show that it is logical to discuss the influence that Deuteronomy had on the Joban speeches. The central claim of this thesis is that Job's many allusions and references to Deuteronomy begin an intertextual discourse between the books that is constructive, not deconstructive. I will argue that the speeches of Job and Deuteronomy have more points of agreement than disagreement, but the texts do not support identical positions.

Chapter 1 will focus on Deuteronomy and will seek to find Deuteronomy's response to Job's situation. I will examine Deuteronomy's understanding of socio-religious expectations, community identity, and the role of affliction/suffering. I will argue that Deuteronomy does not teach a universal retributive justice that applies to all peoples everywhere. Deuteronomy requires covenant and Israelite identity to have jurisdiction. I will also argue that Deuteronomy's retributive justice is not rigid, as it allows for exceptions. However, the view of retributive justice that Job's friends take departs from Deuteronomy in both its universality and rigidity. Thus the friends either misapplied retributive justice from Deuteronomy or did not use Deuteronomy to develop their view.

Chapter 2 will focus on the Joban speeches. I will examine Job's understanding of socio-religious expectations and retributive justice. I examine the national metaphor in Job supported by Wolfers, which would imply that Job represents Israel. If Wolfers is

correct, it would greatly undermine the position of this thesis. In chapter 2, I will seek to trace the movement and development in Job's rhetoric, especially concerning his position on retributive justice. The allusions and references in the speeches of Job to Deuteronomy center in Job's later speeches, primarily Job 21 and later.

Chapter 3 explores the specific nature of author-oriented intertextuality between Job and Deuteronomy. I propose criteria for classifying instances of intertextual connectedness as quotations, references, allusions, or close thematic similarity. I explore Michael Fishbane's methodology for inner-biblical exegesis and Aggadic exegesis⁷⁶ as a possible model for the relationship between Deuteronomy and the book of Job. Chapter 3 considers specific connections between Deuteronomy and the Joban speeches and demonstrates extensive connectedness between the two books.

In my concluding chapter, I seek to synthesize the data from the thesis. I note that the similarities between the books are far greater than the points of disagreement. I propose a robust understanding of the relationship between Deuteronomy and the book of Job, which is that the books create healthy dialogue rather than dissonance.

76. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*, 281.

CHAPTER I
INDIVIDUALITY, COMMUNITY, SOCIO-RELIGIOUS
EXPECTATIONS, AND AFFLICTION IN DEUTERONOMY

Before beginning this chapter, I wish to affirm that this thesis analyzes Deuteronomy and not the Deuteronomistic literature or its theology.¹ Deuteronomy was influential in deciphering the characteristics of the Deuteronomists, but frequently theology and perspectives from the Deuteronomists found in other texts do not line up perfectly with Deuteronomy. While the friends in Job may represent Deuteronomistic thinking, their positions are not the same as the book of Deuteronomy. As a means of supporting the central argument of this thesis, I argue that the book of Deuteronomy appropriates a more nuanced and complex stance on the nature of suffering and retributive justice than the friends of Job appropriate. Because there are further problems with identifying the position of Job's friends as Deuteronomistic, I will describe their position as the universal and rigid retributive justice principle. While the friends advocate a rigid and universal or near universal retributive justice principle, Deuteronomy advocates a different version of retributive justice, which focuses on the community rather than the individual. This distinction will affect Deuteronomy's relationship with the book of Job.

1. Scholarship primarily defines the Deuteronomistic literature as Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, 1–2 Samuel, and 1–2 Kings. See Steven Mckenzie, "Deuteronomistic History," *ABD* 2:161–68.

In this chapter, I will examine certain socio-religious expectations of Deuteronomy broken down into the categories of theology, orthopraxy, piety, and social ethics. In chapter 2, I will examine the same categories in the book of Job² and I will argue that the two books are compatible in the categories of piety and orthopraxy, that they share significant agreement in their theology, and that they have the greatest amount of agreement in their social ethics. These categories are heuristic distinctions; thus they are descriptive of the text, but the text does not always make these distinctions. As the examination of these categories will demonstrate, they overlap and share material. After examining these four categories, I will examine Deuteronomy's view of the covenanted community versus the individual as a means to determine how Job, the individual, would fit into its world. Lastly, I will argue in this chapter that Deuteronomy has a complex and nuanced version of retributive justice, which is not the view posited by Job's three friends.

Socio-Religious Expectations in Deuteronomy

The juxtaposition of theology, orthopraxy, piety, and social ethics in Deuteronomy is most notable in the summary of the law provided in Deuteronomy 10.

עֲתָה יִשְׂרָאֵל מָה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ שְׂאֵל מֵעַמְּךָ כִּי אִם-לְיִרְאָה אֶת-יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ לְלַבֵּת בְּכָל-
 דְּרָכָיו וּלְאַהֲבָה אֹתוֹ וּלְעַבֵּד אֶת-יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ בְּכָל-לִבְבְּךָ וּבְכָל-נַפְשְׁךָ:
 לִשְׁמֹר אֶת-מִצְוֹת יְהוָה וְאֶת-חֻקֹּתָיו אֲשֶׁר אֲנֹכִי מְצַוֶּנְךָ הַיּוֹם לְטוֹב לָךְ:
 הֵן לִיהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ הַשָּׁמַיִם וְהַשָּׁמַיִם הַשָּׁמַיִם הָאָרֶץ וְכָל-אֲשֶׁר-בָּהּ:
 רַק בְּאַבְרָהָם חָשַׁק יְהוָה לְאַהֲבָה אוֹתָם וַיִּבְחָר בְּנֹרְעָם אַחֲרֵיהֶם בְּכֶם מִכָּל-הָעַמִּים כִּי־
 הָיָה:
 וּמִלֵּתָם אֵת עַרְלַת לִבְבְּכֶם וְעָרְפְּכֶם לֹא תִקְשׁוּ עוֹד:
 כִּי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם הוּא אֱלֹהֵי הַשָּׁמַיִם וְהָאָרֶץ הָאֵל הַגָּדֹל הַגִּבּוֹר וְהַנּוֹרָא אֲשֶׁר לֹא-
 יִשָּׂא פָנָיִם וְלֹא יִגַּח שֹׁסֵד:

2. For the corresponding material in Job, see 62–71.

עֲשֵׂה מִשְׁפָּט יְתוֹם וְאַל־מַגֵּה וְאַהֲבֵב גְּר לְתַת לוֹ לֶחֶם וְשִׁמְלָה:
 וְאַהֲבַתְּם אֶת־הַגֵּר כִּי־גֵרִים הָיִיתֶם בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם:
 אֶת־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ תִירָא אֹתוֹ תַעֲבֹד וְכוּ תִדְבֹק וּבְשִׁמּוֹ תִשָּׁבַע:

Now Israel, what does Yhwh, your God, seek from you? It is that you would fear Yhwh, your God, walking in all of his ways, loving him, and serving Yhwh with all of your heart and all of your self. Keeping the commandments of Yhwh and the statues which I am commanding you today will be good for you. Behold! To Yhwh, your God, belongs the heavens and the heavens of the heavens, the earth, and all that is in it. Yhwh only drew out your ancestors to love them and to choose their descendants after them from all the peoples, according to what has happened today. Excise the foreskin of your heart(s) and stiffen your neck(s) no longer. For Yhwh, your God, is the God of gods and the lord of lords, the great God, heroic and awesome, who does not show favoritism and does not take a bribe. [Yhwh] is the one who does justice for the orphan and the widow and loves the foreigner, giving him bread and clothing. You shall love the foreigner for you were foreigners in the land of Egypt. You shall fear Yhwh, your God, serve him, cling to him, and swear by his name. (Deut 10:12–20)

Deuteronomy is not unique in advocating these principles. However, Deuteronomy emerges as the strongest advocate for a number of principles that emerge from this text. Deuteronomy has unusually strong socio-religious expectations concerning monolatry and inclusion of marginalized groups, such as orphans, widows, and strangers/foreigners.

Theology in Deuteronomy

The crux of theological orthodoxy in Deuteronomy is the singular devotion (monolatry) to Yhwh. The most famous statement of this monolatry appears in Deut 6:4–5.

שְׁמַע יִשְׂרָאֵל יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ יְהוָה אֶחָד:
 וְאַהֲבַתְּ אֶת יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ בְּכָל־לִבְבְּךָ וּבְכָל־נַפְשְׁךָ וּבְכָל־מְאֹדֶךָ:
 Hear, Israel, Yhwh is our God—Yhwh alone.³ You will love Yhwh, your God, with all of your heart, with all of your self,⁴ and with all of your might. (Deut 6:4–5)

3. Or “Yhwh is one.”

4. Or “with all of your life.” Frequently rendered as soul, but this imposes Hellenistic understandings on the text.

Monolatry is paramount to Deuteronomy's understanding of orthodoxy. Deuteronomy 6:4–5 is a mandate to practice monolatry rather than a statement of monotheism.⁵ The text repeatedly commands the community to worship Yhwh only and not to worship אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים (“other gods” [Deut 5:7; 6:14; 8:19; 10:20; 11:16; 13:1–18; 28:14 et al.]). Occasionally, the text affirms the existence of other gods (Deut 33:27). However, as Braulik has argued, even though Deuteronomy does not depict a monotheistic world, the seeds of monotheism arise from the theology of Deuteronomy.⁶ Deuteronomy does not argue that Israel should choose Yhwh among a multitude of roughly equal deities. Yhwh is the אֱלֹהֵי הָאֱלֹהִים (“god of gods” [Deut 10:17]) or the superlative deity. Deuteronomy 10:17 uses epithets for Yhwh similar to what Ugaritic and Akkadian sources use for the divine king or the most powerful of the gods.⁷ Deuteronomy argues that no other deity merits the devotion of Israel compared to Yhwh.⁸

However, the superlative nature of Yhwh's divine traits may persuade Israel to practice exclusive worship, as Deuteronomy wishes. Thus another component of Yhwh's nature emerges. Deuteronomy claims that Yhwh is אֵל קַנָּה (“a jealous god” [Deut 4:24; 5:9; 6:15]). Yhwh prohibits shared devotion with other deities and threatens punishment for Israel if the nation does not keep the mandate.⁹

לֹא תִלְכוּן אַחֲרֵי אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים מֵאֱלֹהֵי הָעַמִּים אֲשֶׁר סָבִיבוֹתֵיכֶם:
כִּי אֵל קַנָּא יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ בְּקִרְבֵנוּ פֹּי־יִחָרָה אַפ־יְהוָה אֵלֵינוּ בְּיָד וְהִשְׁמִידָנוּ מֵעַל פְּנֵי הָאֲדָמָה:

5. Georg Braulik, *The Theology of Deuteronomy: Collected Essays of Georg Braulik*, trans. Ulrika Lindbald (North Richland Hills, TX: Bibal Press, 1994), 101.

6. *Ibid.*, 111.

7. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1–11*, 438.

8. Braulik, *The Theology of Deuteronomy*, 109.

9. Jeffery Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, JPSTC 5 (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1996), 65.

Do not follow other gods from the gods of the peoples who surround you. For Yhwh, your God among you, is a jealous god. Otherwise, the anger of Yhwh will burn against you and he will destroy you from the face of the land. (Deut 6:14–15)

Because of Yhwh's nature, Deuteronomy argues that engaging in the slightest acts of worship directed at other deities is fatal. Thus a strict and compelling monolatry emerges, which has a decreasing amount of space for the acknowledgement of other deities.

Deuteronomy 4, which redactors incorporated into Deuteronomy late in the exilic period,¹⁰ has a developed understanding of monotheism. This text argues that Yhwh is unique among the history of the world; thus Israel is unique by virtue of a special relationship to Yhwh (Deut 4:32–34). The text affirms and requires Israel to affirm that Yhwh has an exclusive claim on the status of godhood (אֱלֹהִים).

אַתָּה הָרֵאָתָּ לְדַעַת כִּי יְהוָה הוּא הָאֱלֹהִים אֲיִן עוֹד מִלְּבָדָּו:
וְיָדַעְתָּ הַיּוֹם וְהִשְׁבַּתָּ אֶל-לִבְבְּךָ כִּי יְהוָה הוּא הָאֱלֹהִים בְּשָׁמַיִם מִמֶּעַל וְעַל-הָאָרֶץ מִתַּחַת
אֲיִן עוֹד:

You were caused to see so that you may know that Yhwh is God—there is no other besides him. . . You shall know today and shall set in your hearts that Yhwh is God in heaven above and on the earth beneath—there is no other. (Deut 4:35, 39)

Yhwh as the only deity enforces Deuteronomy's mandate to monolatry most strongly. While this monotheistic voice is a minority opinion in Deuteronomy, it represents the desire of the rest of Deuteronomy's monolatry. Namely, exclusive worship of Yhwh is imperative, and worshipping other deities is useless, foolish, and fatal.

Orthopraxy in Deuteronomy

Deuteronomy has a high level of anxiety about the presence of idols in the community. Thus a significant piece of orthopraxy according to Deuteronomy is aversion

10. Braulik, *The Theology of Deuteronomy*, 115; Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1–11*, 212.

from idols (aniconism). The Decalogue prohibits idolatry (Deut 5:8). However, idolatry is not just prohibited as prevention from worshiping gods other than Yhwh, but Deuteronomy prohibits the creation of an idol in Yhwh's image (Deut 4:15; 12:3–4). Deuteronomy argues that because Israel's main encounter with Yhwh did not include seeing any form, Israel should not create an image of Yhwh. Nathan MacDonald argues that aniconism in Deuteronomy is a product of its monotheistic desires.¹¹ If there were only one deity, there be no need for idols to distinguish between gods. The book of the law takes on the role that talismans and small idols filled for surrounding cultures for giving people and places protection (Deut 6:8–9).¹² Thus idols are unnecessary at best in the ideal religious world of Deuteronomy. However, the presence of idols in the surrounding cultures causes Deuteronomy to maintain this high level of anxiety concerning all images.

Deuteronomy includes location as part of its depiction of orthopraxy.

Deuteronomy allows Israel to worship at a variety of locations before the community crosses the Jordan. However, once Israel occupies the land, they are to worship Yhwh only in a specified place (Deut 12:13–14). Cultic shrines and sacred trees are forbidden locations for worshiping Yhwh (Deut 12:2–4). The unspecified place in Deuteronomy is the designated location for the celebration of particular festivals (Deut 15:20; 16:2–16), offering tithes (Deut 14:24–25; 26:2), settling difficult court cases (Deut 17:8, 10), and reading the book of the law every seventh year (Deut 31:11). Various theories have

11. Nathan MacDonald, *Deuteronomy and the Meaning of Monotheism*, FAT 2/1 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 183–84.

12. *Ibid.*

emerged about the exclusive claim that the chosen (בְּחֵר) place enjoys.¹³ It may be a function of monotheism or monolatry,¹⁴ but it facilitates the cult's ability to regulate religious practices and beliefs.

Deuteronomy forbids any human sacrifice,¹⁵ soothsaying, divining, sorcery, and magic. Even if the aforementioned practices are intended to praise Yhwh (Deut 18:9–14), Deuteronomy claims that these practices are detestable to Yhwh (Deut 18:12). The moral superiority of prohibiting human sacrifice may seem relatively clear, but it is not obvious why Deuteronomy considers these other practices as heterodox. While the Urim and the Thummim are only a footnote in Deuteronomy (Deut 33:8), perhaps augury, soothsaying, and divining are direct competitors to the monopoly that the priests and prophets have with determining the future and the will of Yhwh.¹⁶ However, Deuteronomy's sole mention of the Urim and Thummim depicts them as status symbols for the priesthood. Deuteronomy lacks discussion of casting lots¹⁷ and inquiring of Yhwh, which were the primary functions of the Urim and Thummim.¹⁸

Deuteronomy has an expectation of sacrifice, but it is not as detailed in its description of the sacrifices or their function as other books from the Torah.¹⁹

13. Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, 120, 459–64.

14. *Ibid.*

15. *Ibid.*, 464.

16. 1 Sam 9:7–8 implies that prophets may have made a livelihood from making predictions concerning the future.

17. The Urim and Thummim may not have been used for casting lots, but rather for confirming oracles of priests. See C. Houtman, "The Urim and Thummim: A New Suggestion," *VT* 40 (1990): 229–32.

18. See Num 27:21; 1 Sam 14:41; Ezra 2:63.

19. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*, 213.

Deuteronomy acknowledges that sacrifice is a normal part of deity worship, but it does not provide the pleasing odor (ריח נִיחֻחַ) or serve as the food of God (לֶחֶם אֱלֹהִים), as it does in other places in the Torah (Gen 8:12; Exod 29:18; Lev 1:19; 3:16; 21:6; Num 15:3 et al.).²⁰ Sacrifice in Deuteronomy serves an important role in cultic festivals and other occasions to provide food. During festivals, sacrifice serves as the source of meat for the people to eat in celebration (Deut 16:7–8). Sacrifice alongside tithes serves as a means to provide for demographics that are otherwise unable to produce food (Deut 14:29; 18:1–5; 26:12).²¹ Deuteronomy uniquely transforms this aspect of orthopraxy into an exercise in social ethics, demonstrating the priority that Deuteronomy places on ethics and social justice.

Piety in Deuteronomy

Social ethics and orthopraxy obscure piety in Deuteronomy. There is little description of piety beyond what one can infer from the other categories discussed. The reverberating concept of loving Yhwh with all of one's heart, self, and might is somewhat elusive, but holds the essence of piety in Deuteronomy. Another key facet of piety in Deuteronomy is walking in the ways of Yhwh. Deuteronomy claims that the fullest expression of worshiping Yhwh, loving Yhwh, and walking in the ways of Yhwh is in the fulfillment of the social ethic of Deuteronomy. Thus social ethics come into the practice of sacrifice, tithes, and festivals (orthopraxy). Deuteronomy expresses piety primarily through these communal-religious actions.

20. Ibid., 210.

21. Braulik, *The Theology of Deuteronomy*, 145.

Deuteronomy lacks discussion concerning individualized piety. Individualized prayer and Nazarite vows are absent in Deuteronomy. With the exception of the prayers of Moses on behalf of Aaron and Israel in Deuteronomy 12, the only prayers in Deuteronomy are part of communal ritual practice (Deut 21:7; 26:5–10).²² Brief discussions of vows appear in Deuteronomy 12 and 23. Deuteronomy 23 mandates timely fulfillment of vows, but discourages vowing regularly (Deut 23:21–23). וְכִי תִחַזְקֶנָּה לְנֶגֶד לֹא יִחַשְׁבֶּנָּה כְּפִי הַקָּטָן: (“For if you refrain from vowing, sin will not [count] against you” [Deut 23:23]). However, vows are not unequivocal expressions of piety. They may be a type of bargain with God for special assistance.²³ The information on piety independent of social ethics and orthopraxy is sparse in Deuteronomy, but practices better described as orthopraxy and social ethics fill the space in Deuteronomy that Job fills with piety.²⁴

Social Ethics in Deuteronomy

I do not presume to give a systematic description of social ethics in Deuteronomy, but as I will demonstrate, a significant component of social ethics is justice for potentially oppressed members of society. When I use the phrase “social ethics” I refer to the social ethical practices regarding marginalized people. Deuteronomy is distinctly concerned about the ethical behavior of the community and sets out detailed description of its ideal ethic. Some basic understandings of that ethic are present in the Decalogue, but the Decalogue presents mostly general understandings of community ethics that are common to many societies, for example do not murder and do not steal. However, central to the

22. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*, 32.

23. Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, 218.

24. For a discussion of piety in Job, see 68.

community and social ethic that Deuteronomy posits is the protection of vulnerable members of society. The text depicts this special concern and protection as being part of the nature of God (Deut 10:18). Thus ethics in Deuteronomy flow from its theology.²⁵

Deuteronomy makes the most provision for widows in the community.

Deuteronomy mandates several levels of protection for widows beginning with the laws regarding levirate marriage (Deut 25:5–10). Levirate marriage served two purposes. (1) It ensured the paternal succession of land from father to son,²⁶ and (2) it served as a system of social security for widows.²⁷ While the practice may seem primitive to modern readers, it was somewhat effective for providing for widows (Ruth 4:7–15). However, the text acknowledges the possibility of the failure of levirate marriage and pronounces social shame for the family failing to fulfill its familial duties (Deut 25:7–10). The practice assumes that a woman's male children will be able to make provision for her in her widowhood. Thus one invokes levirate marriage only in the case where a widow has no male children.

Deuteronomy commands the community to lend to anyone without reservation (Deut 15:7–15) and not to charge interest to other Hebrew people (Deut 23:19). However, creditors were able to require pledges from people to ensure repayment. Deuteronomy makes sure to protect widows from this practice by prohibiting creditors from taking a widow's garments (Deut 24:17). While creditors are to return garments taken in pledge to

25. Braulik, *The Theology of Deuteronomy*, 104.

26. Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, 482–83.

27. Carolyn Pressler, *The View of Women Found in the Deuteronomic Family Laws*, BZAW 216, Berlin: de Gruyter, 1993), 63–77.

poor people before sunset (Deut 24:13), Deuteronomy protects the garments of widows from this practice entirely. For especially destitute widows, this conglomeration of laws ensures financial security for widows in the community of Israel.

Several laws group widows and orphans together as vulnerable members of society. They function as a hendiadys to represent the most vulnerable and afflicted members of society. Deuteronomy uses the term orphan (יתום) only once without immediately following it with the inclusion of the widow (אלמנה) or widows (Deut 24:17), but a command specifically addressing widows follows in the same verse. Deuteronomy commands agricultural landowners to refrain from harvesting all of the produce from their fields. What remains in the field after the initial harvest belongs to the poor, the foreigner, the orphan, and the widow.²⁸

כִּי תִקְצֹר קִצְיֶיךָ בְּשִׂדְךָ וְשָׁכַחְתָּ עֵמֶר בְּשִׂדְךָ לֹא תָשׁוּב לְקַחְתּוֹ לְגֵר לְיִתּוֹם וְלְאַלְמָנָה יְהוָה
 לְמַעַן יְבָרְכֶךָ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ בְּכָל מַעֲשֵׂה יָדֶיךָ:
 כִּי תַחַבֵּט זַיְתֶיךָ לֹא תִפְאַר אַחֲרָיִךְ לְגֵר לְיִתּוֹם וְלְאַלְמָנָה יְהוָה:
 כִּי תִבְצֹר פְּרִמֶיךָ לֹא תַעֲוֹלֵל אַחֲרָיִךְ לְגֵר לְיִתּוֹם וְלְאַלְמָנָה יְהוָה:

When you gather your harvest in your field and you forget a sheaf in the field, do not return and take it. It will be for the foreigner, orphan, and widow, so that Yhwh, your God, will bless you in all the works of your hands. When you beat your olive tree, do not strip the remainder. It will be for the foreigner, orphan, and widow. When you harvest your vineyard, do not glean the remainder. It shall be for the foreigner, orphan, and widow. (Deut 24:19–21)

Ideally, there will be enough food to provide for these demographics. This is the same demographic that the tithes of Israel are supposed to provide for (Deut 14:29; 26:12–13), thus helping to insure that there is enough food for the disenfranchised.

In regards to cultic festivals, Deuteronomy makes special provision to ensure that the community does not marginalize vulnerable members of society.²⁹ In connection to

28. Braulik, *The Theology of Deuteronomy*, 145.

29. *Ibid.*, 57–60.

the celebration of the festivals of *Shavuoth* (Weeks) and *Sukkoth* (Booths), Deuteronomy distinctively commands the community to include foreigners, slaves, orphans, and widows (Deut 16:11, 14).³⁰ Circumstances frequently prevent these demographics from participating in cultic practices.³¹ The location for celebrating the festival of *Sukkoth* is at one's threshing floor and winepress. Most of the people in the aforementioned demographics would not have owned property, and thus would not have a threshing floor or winepress. The invitation of these demographics to these festivals may have served as a means of provision as well.³²

The emphasis on remembering in Deuteronomy is a safeguard against heterodox practices,³³ and the festivals represent reenactments of the events where Yhwh led the people out of Egypt.³⁴ The participation of the entire community in the cultic festivals increases their ability to prevent heterodoxy from penetrating the community at any point. While one may interpret this as cooption, it also validates the status of widows, orphans, and foreigners as potentially influential members of society. Deuteronomy expresses a strong commitment to the orthodox practices of the entire people. Deuteronomy's special concern for vulnerable members demands that these

30. The discussions of the festivals from Exodus (Exod 23:14–18; 34:18–25) and Leviticus (Lev 23:1–44) do not command the inclusion of foreigners, slaves, orphans, and widows. See Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*, 220–21; Christiana van Houten, *The Alien in Israelite Law* (JSOTSup 107, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1991), 68–106.

31. In the case of foreigners, laws prevent them from participating in the cult. Without this explicit command, it is likely that foreigners would have been excluded. See Deut 23:1–8.

32. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*, 290.

33. Braulik, *The Theology of Deuteronomy*, 183.

34. This is especially true for *Pesach* (Deut 16:1–6) and *Sukkoth*. *Sukkoth* is the occasion for the seven-year reading of the law (Deut 31:9–13; cf. Ezra 3:4; Neh 8:18).

demographics be included in cultic festivals and in the practices that insure continued monolatry.

The Decalogue also ensures that some of the same categories are able to celebrate the Sabbath (Deut 5:14). Orphans and widows are absent from this command perhaps because their circumstances do not typically prevent them from celebrating the Sabbath. However, the Decalogue includes foreigners, slaves, and various animals as groups that are to celebrate the Sabbath. The justification for including slaves and other groups in the celebration of the Sabbath³⁵ is so that the people may זָכְרוּ כִּי־עַבְדֵי הָיִיתוּ בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם (“Remember that [they] were slaves in Egypt” [Deut 5:15]), which corresponds to the justification of the inclusion of the marginalized groups, including orphans and widows, in the celebration of the feast of *Shavuoth* (Deut 16:12).³⁶ This further demonstrates Deuteronomy’s special concern for marginalized groups.

Roy Heller has demonstrated how the care of widows in Deuteronomy was a communal defense against heterodoxy. A strong stereotype persisted claiming that widows and otherwise unattached women had a higher proclivity towards sorcery, divination, and prostitution.³⁷ Tamar (Gen 38:13–19) provides evidence of a widow participating in prostitution.³⁸ In 1 Sam 28:7, Saul’s assumptions that a medium would be

35. Deuteronomy’s Decalogue differs from the Decalogue in Exodus concerning the explanation of the Sabbath. For Exodus, Sabbath emerges from the pattern of creation (Exod 20:11). See Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*, 222.

36. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1–11*, 309.

37. Roy Heller, “The Widow in Deuteronomy: Beneficiary of Compassion and Co-option,” in *The Impartial God: Essays in Biblical Studies in Honor of Jouette M. Bassler*, ed. Calvin J. Roetzel and Robert L. Foster, NTM 22 (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2007), 7–8.

38. Tamar’s case may be better described as covert levirate marriage. In this case, Judah, the father-in-law, plays the part of the levir rather than a brother-in-law.

a woman provides evidence for this stereotype, and the apparently unattached medium of Endor fulfilled his expectations (1 Sam 28:7–25). The social expectation that all women marry³⁹ implies that widows are the largest demographic of unattached women. Care for widows helped to regulate the orthodox practices of those widows. Thus Deuteronomy is concerned with the care of all widows, not just those that represent the poor of the community.⁴⁰ This demonstrates the inseparable nature of orthodoxy and social ethics in Deuteronomy.

Deuteronomy spends less time on a few other categories of disenfranchised people, but still calls for protection of these groups. Deuteronomy calls for the members of the community to open their hands to the poor (Deut 15:11), to love and care for the stranger (Deut 10:19), and to help Levites (Deut 12:19). In contrast, Deuteronomy calls curses on those that mislead the blind (Deut 27:18).

Deuteronomy's frequency of language demonstrates its special concern for the marginalized. Considering the categories of orphans and widows, Deuteronomy addresses these groups with the greatest frequency and total occurrence among books in the Hebrew Bible.⁴¹ The majority of these references to widows and orphans are commands to protect and give special provision for them. While caring for orphans and

39. In Judg 11:37–38, Jephtha's daughter takes companions with her into the mountains to bewail her virginity. This evidences the social expectation that nearly all women would marry. Deuteronomy also assumes that women would marry, and they usually had no right to refuse a marriage. For a discussion of the social assumptions of Deuteronomy, see Pressler, *The View of Women*, 43.

40. Heller, "The Widow in Deuteronomy," 10.

41. By my count, among the books of the Hebrew Bible, Deuteronomy contains the most occurrences and greatest frequency of widow (approximately 1.36 occurrences per 100 verses) and Job contains the second most (approximately .56 occurrence per 100 verses, cf. Lev .23/100v, Isa .41/100v, Jer .36/100v, Ezek .39/100v, Ps .20/100v). Deuteronomy contains the most occurrences of orphan (1.15/100v), and Job contains the third most after Psalms, but with greater frequency (Job .65/100v, Ps .31/100v, cf. Isa .33/100v, Jer .29/100v).

widows is a concern of much of the Hebrew Bible, Deuteronomy presents a social ethic that is most concerned with these groups and incorporates care for these groups as a vital piece of social ethics and the nature of Yhwh (Deut 10:18).

Concluding Comments on Socio-Religious Expectations in Deuteronomy

The distinctions between the categories of theology, orthopraxy, piety, and social ethics are not clear in the text. Deuteronomy gives directives towards the cultic religious practice and the community's social ethics. Two dominant themes emerge from these categories: (1) Yhwh is the supreme power in the realm of existence and thus deserves full devotion and honor. (2) Yhwh demands a high standard for social ethics and treatment of marginalized, vulnerable, and disenfranchised members of society. Deuteronomy has a special focus on widows, orphans, the poor, and strangers/foreigners as the majority demographics among marginalized populations.⁴²

Community and Individuality: Identity in Deuteronomy

The central figures of the book of Job and Deuteronomy create a fundamental difference between the books. Deuteronomy deals primarily with the covenanted community of Israel. Job deals primarily with Job, an individual non-Israelite.⁴³ However, Deuteronomy is not uninterested in the individual, as Job is not uninterested in the community. Thus in order to bridge the gap between the two books, it is necessary to investigate the expectations Deuteronomy casts for the individual compared with its expectations for the community. As I cover beginning on page 81, the friends of Job

42. Levites frequently make this list also, but not as commonly as the other disenfranchised demographics (Deut 14:29).

43. J. J. M. Roberts, "Job and the Israelite Religious Tradition," *ZAW* 89 (1977): 112.

apply their notions of retributive justice universally to communities and rigidly to individuals, not allowing for exceptions. I am positing in this section that culpability is tied to identity. One must be able to identify with a group in order to be responsible for the actions of that group.⁴⁴

A Continuum of Individuality and Community

The binarization of community versus individuality fails to explain life or Deuteronomy's understanding of life. Identification with community happens at a myriad of frequently overlapping levels.⁴⁵ Identification with community happens at large levels, such as the level of nations or species. Specific laws address oxen (Deut 25:4). However, some laws address Israelite people and oxen (Deut 5:14).⁴⁶ Similarly, oxen are culpable for the sins of the entire nation of Israel (Deut 28:31). Although not in Deuteronomy, Exodus holds oxen and owners of oxen culpable for the misconduct of oxen in different circumstances (Exod 21:28–29). This illustrates that the different levels of community are highly complex.

Identification with community happens at small levels, such as direct family units. The family bears the disgrace of one who reneges on a levirate marriage (Deut 25:10). However, the continuum does not end with reaching the individual person, as Deuteronomy recognizes a distinction between body and will. Deuteronomy 19:5–7

44. For example, an Israelite person may not be culpable for the sins of an Edomite group. However, an Israelite may be culpable for the sins of humanity, where both Edomites and Israelites are equally culpable.

45. Since levels of community are overlapping, even a linear continuum is not sufficient for describing the difference between individuality and community. A true description would be nearly infinitely complex with far more dimensions than are perceptible to the human mind. Thus in order to engage in productive conversation, I will describe the difference as a roughly linear continuum.

46. Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, 68.

recognizes that a person may shed blood, but if it were not intentional, the community should not punish the individual the same as if it had been intentional. Yet intention does not bear the sole weight of guilt. Deuteronomy 22:8 implies that constructing a house poorly may incur bloodguilt if someone dies because of the construction, even if the builder intended no harm.⁴⁷ Thus the individual is also comprised of complex parts in a community.

The book of Job establishes communal identity primarily for Job's family and estate. The presence of the three friends implies another level of community, and the text implies other levels of community in which Job participates. Job describes a world where he was at the pinnacle of society and many people sought his advice and counsel (Job 29:7–16).⁴⁸ However, neither the friends nor these other levels of community create a communal identity that implies shared accountability. Job's family and his estate bear possible accountability for an unknown sin of Job.⁴⁹ Job's nationality does not affect the narrative. No people outside of Job's family are identifiably Uzite in Job.⁵⁰ Thus nationalistic identities in Deuteronomy do not seem to apply to the case of Job. Family identity applies in Job; thus passages in Deuteronomy that address clans, families, or individuals may be pertinent texts. However, even the passages in Deuteronomy that address families as opposed to the nation still assume that these families exist within the

47. *Ibid.*, 201.

48. Mark Hamilton, "Elite Lives: Job 29–31 and Traditional Authority," *JSOT* 32 (2007): 72.

49. Bildad seems to reject family culpability, claiming that Job's children died for their own sins (Job 8:4), not Job's sins. See Seow, *Job 1–21*, 517.

50. All of Job's friends have alternative nationalities, which are fictitious and rely upon the descendents of Esau as recorded in Genesis 36. See Greenstein, "The Invention of Language," 335–36. The nationality of Elihu seems to rely on Gen 22:21, which records Buz as the younger brother of Uz.

nation of Israel. The numerous references in Deuteronomy to Yhwh's bringing up Israel from Egypt (Deut 5:15; 6:12; 8:14; 13:5 et al.) serve as the basis for Yhwh's exclusive claim on Israel and right to give the law. Without Israelite identity and covenant, Deuteronomy has no jurisdiction.

The Individual and Family in Deuteronomy

The majority of the material discussing individuals in Deuteronomy implies that the community is responsible for enforcing the laws. Ze'ev Weisman argues that the laws of Deuteronomy applied to individuals and to the community.⁵¹ Individuals are responsible for keeping the laws, but the community is responsible for enforcing these laws.⁵² Thus God does not need to enforce the majority of the laws because the community bears responsibility. Deuteronomy claims God will act against individuals in only a few places. The most important area of retribution against individuals that belongs to God is enforcing the law against secret perpetrators. Deuteronomy 27:15–26 proclaims curses over a variety of sins and twice mentions secrecy (סֵּתֶר) of these sins (Deut 27:15, 24).⁵³ The sins mentioned in Deut 27:15–26 are not special categories reserved for God to punish. Deuteronomy calls the community to punish several of these categories throughout its text as I discuss on page 53.

51. Ze'ev Weisman, "The Place of People in Making Law and Judgement," in *Pomegranates and Golden Bells*, ed. D. P. Wright, D. N. Freedman, and A. Hurvitz (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1995), 408.

52. Deuteronomy calls for the people to purge the evil from their midst (Deut 13:5; 17:7, 12; 19:13, 19; 21:21; 22:21, 22–24; 24:7). See Dale Patrick, "The Rhetoric of Collective Responsibility in Deuteronomic Law," in *Pomegranates and Golden Bells*, ed. D. P. Wright, D. N. Freedman, and A. Hurvitz (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1995), 421–36.

53. Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, 253.

Deuteronomy 29:17–20 [29:18–21 English] claims that Yhwh will separate out for disaster any Israelite man, woman, family, or clan who turn away to serve other gods. While it mentions individuals, the focus is on the tribe or clan (Deut 29:20 [29:21 English]). When considering Job’s condition, this prescription of divine punishment fits best. Deuteronomy 29:19 [29:20 English] mentions כָּל־הַאֲלֹהִים הַכְּתוּבָה בַּסֵּפֶר הַזֶּה (“All the curses written in this book”), which, as discussed on page 10, connects to the Joban prologue with a few precise word linkages.⁵⁴ However, the passage still disconnects from Job in two ways. (1) It mentions the tribes of Israel. Job’s family is not Israelite. This is not a general statement against families everywhere. If Job is a nationalistic metaphor for Israel or Judah, the comparison makes more sense.⁵⁵ However, as I will argue on page 59, the nationalistic metaphor is not the best way to read Job. (2) Deut 29:19 [29:20 English] claims that Yhwh will blot out the name of the cursed individual, which entails destruction of the body and the memory of an individual or group (Deut 9:14; 25:6). Job survives. If Yhwh acts against individuals or families, according to Deuteronomy, it is completely fatal, and this disconnects from Job.

Jeffery Tigay argues that the family was the basic unit of Hebrew society and that individuals are inextricably bound into the family.⁵⁶ Tigay offers as evidence from the destruction of the families of Dathan and Abiram (Deut 11:6) because of these two men’s rebellion. In counterpoint, he cites Saul’s promise to honor the family of the one who

54. The phrase “from the sole of the foot to the head” appears in Deut 28:35 and Job 2:7. A similar phrase occurs in Isa 1:6, but the precise use of head (רִגְלֵי) matches in Deuteronomy and Job, but not in Isaiah (רִגְלֵי). See 59. See Wolfers, *Deep Things out of Darkness*, 112–14.

55. Wolfers, *Deep Things out of Darkness*, 69.

56. Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, 436.

slew Goliath (1 Sam 17:25) as a positive example of this principle.⁵⁷ However, Deut 24:16 restricts humans from dispensing justice by punishing families. Thus there is a limited amount of autonomy. In Deuteronomy, the right to punish a family belongs to God. Yet Deuteronomy is conflicted about Yhwh's execution of justice in this manner (Deut 5:9 cf. Deut 7:10).⁵⁸ Familial-social structures in other ANE cultures were similar.⁵⁹ There was a strong emphasis on having the *Pater Familias* represent the family and hold the most power, but male members of the family had ability to own property and conduct business separate from the core family.⁶⁰ Thus while family identity was strong, autonomy existed.

Concluding Thoughts of Individuality and Community in Deuteronomy

As I have demonstrated, when considering the different expectations of the community and the individual in Deuteronomy, little overlap with Job's situation emerges. Job and presumably his family are Uzite, not Israelite. Israelite identity is integral to the Deuteronomic covenant. The majority of the commands in Deuteronomy are communal in nature and enforcement. God acts only in extreme circumstances, such as a breach in the covenant or the inability of community to identify perpetrators. For God's actions regarding Job to comply with Deuteronomy, Job and his family must have committed heinous and secret sins. The friends appear to make this assumption, but

57. Ibid.

58. Ibid., 227.

59. Mogens Trolle Larsen, "Individual and Family in Old Assyrian Society," *JCS* 59 (2007): 93–106.

60. Larsen, "Individual and Family," 95–6.

Eliphaz claims to know the transgressions of Job (Job 22:5–9).⁶¹ If Eliphaz’s accusations were true, Job’s sins could not have been clandestine and they do not fit the category that would cause God to bring all of the curses of Deuteronomy on Job. The reasoning of Job’s friends does not conform to the presentation of Deuteronomy concerning retribution against families or individuals.

Affliction and the Retributive Justice Principle in Deuteronomy

It would be naïve to argue that Deuteronomy does not share any ideas with Job’s friends. However, the subtle difference in the way the friends and Deuteronomy apply the retributive justice principle makes a large difference in its functionality. As I will discuss beginning on page 81, the friends apply the principle nearly universally and rigidly, that is, to all ethnic groups and without exceptions. Such an understanding is in conflict with that of Deuteronomy. Applying retributive justice universally and rigidly allows one to make moral/religious assumptions about the character of those who suffer, as the friends make concerning Job and his children (Job 8:4; 11:4–6).⁶² Deuteronomy, however, presents three cases of suffering completely disconnected from moral or religious commitments and practices. (1) Deuteronomy describes the Israelite condition in Egypt as affliction and bondage.⁶³ (2) Deuteronomy calls the community to protect vulnerable members of society, especially afflicted ones such as orphans and widows. Deuteronomy calls the community to purge evildoers from its midst (Deut 13:5; 17:7 et al.). The two actions are mutually exclusive. One cannot give special provision for a group of people

61. For a possible alternative explanation of Eliphaz’s accusations, see 69n32.

62. Newsom, *The Book of Job: A Contest of Moral Imaginations*, 106.

63. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy I–11*, 288.

within the community and purge the same group. Thus Deuteronomy considers afflicted orphans and widows as innocent. (3) Accidental or wrongful death results in suffering that the sufferer did not merit. These three cases present exceptions to Deuteronomy's retributive justice principle.

Israel's Experience of Affliction in Egypt

Two texts from Deuteronomy specifically identify Israel's experience in Egypt as affliction: (1) the "wandering Aramean" credo (Deut 26:5–10), and (2) the instructions regarding the practice of Passover (Deut 16:1–8). Neither implies religious or moral fault on the part of Israel, and the credo specifically identifies the response of Israel as crying out to Yhwh (Deut 26:7), which is ostensibly a pious act. Six times Deuteronomy identifies Egypt as the house of bondage (Deut 5:6; 6:12; 7:8; 8:14; 13:5, 10).⁶⁴ While this is not explicit identification of suffering, the text implicitly uses this formula to emphasize the distress of Israel's former state before Yhwh delivered them from Egypt (Deut 7:8).

(1) The wandering Aramean credo makes connections to two categories of innocent sufferers. The recitation of the credo was to remind the people to give a tithe of produce to vulnerable members of society, which includes foreigners, orphans, and widows.⁶⁵ But the primary emphasis is on Egypt's affliction (עַנְוָה) of the great nation (Deut 26:6) and Yhwh's rescue of Israel from their affliction (עַנִּי), (Deut 26:7). The term for affliction can represent a type of just punishment in Deuteronomy as Yhwh afflicted

64. בַּיַּת עֲבָדִים or "house of slaves."

65. Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, 242–43.

or humbled Israel by leading them into the wilderness for forty years (Deut 8:2, 3, 16). The credo makes no implications that Israel was receiving just punishment in Egypt. In much of the Hebrew Bible and especially in Deuteronomy, the exodus from Egypt represents the defining moment for the relationship between Yhwh and Israel. The credo contains the phrase paradigmatic of Yhwh's deliverance, וַיּוֹצֵאֲנוּ יְהוָה מִמִּצְרַיִם בְּיָד חַזָּקָה וּבְרִיחַ נְטוּיָהּ (‘‘Yhwh brought us out from Egypt with a strong hand and an extended arm’’⁶⁶ [Deut 26:8]). This does not appear to be the truncation of punishment, but the rescuing from undeserved affliction.

(2) Deuteronomy identifies the unleavened bread, which Israel was to eat during the Passover, as the bread of affliction (עֲנִי), (Deut 16:3). The bread served as a reminder of the time Israel spent in Egypt and specifically Israel's departure from Egypt.⁶⁷ Eating the bread is commemorative of Yhwh's deliverance, not a type of punishment. The instructions for the Passover are free of calls to repentance that would be appropriate if deliverance from Egypt were contingent upon Israel's repentance from sin. None of the language regarding the Passover in Deuteronomy implies that Israel received just punishment in Egypt. Thus Deuteronomy leaves open the possibility that innocent people may suffer affliction; thus the retributive justice principle has exceptions in Deuteronomy.

Deuteronomy's continued identification of Egypt as the house of slaves or house of bondage (Deut 5:6; 6:12; 7:8; 8:14; 13:5; 13:10) demonstrates the oppression that

66. Note the similar passages in Deuteronomy that describe the deliverance similarly: Deut 4:34; 5:15; 7:19; 9:29; 11:2.

67. Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, 154.

Egypt represents. While Deuteronomy does not explicitly make the connection between slavery and oppression, Lev 25:42–43 makes the connection more clearly in its discussion of buying and selling Hebrew slaves.⁶⁸ The implied suffering of bondage is both communal and intense in Deuteronomy. The entire community experienced suffering without breaking a covenant to merit that suffering. The implied suffering of Egyptian slavery demonstrates that Deuteronomy makes exception to its understanding of retributive justice even for intense suffering.

The Decalogue ties the command to remember the Sabbath to the experience of Egyptian slavery (Deut 5:15). The Sabbath serves as a reminder to the people that they were slaves in Egypt, but are no longer because of the work of Yhwh. Thus Deuteronomy punctuates the week with a remembrance of being slaves, which is, in Israel's case, an experience of suffering unjustly. Israel's own existence must allow for situations where the righteous can suffer at least for a time.

Deuteronomy and Suffering Members of Society

Before the invocation of the curses, Deuteronomy calls upon the community of Israel to purge (בער) evil from the midst of the community. Deuteronomy specifically calls for false prophets/diviners (Deut 13:5), people leading Israel to worship idols (Deut 17:7), people insubordinate to the priest (Deut 17:12), people shedding innocent blood (Deut 19:13), false witnesses (Deut 19:19), rebellious children (Deut 21:21), promiscuous women (Deut 22:21), adulterers (Deut 22:22–24), and kidnappers (Deut 24:7) to be killed in order to purge evil from the community. While this is not an exhaustive list of crimes,

68. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1-11*, 369.

it does address most of the Decalogue. It also overlaps with some of the categories on which Deuteronomy 27 specifically calls curses.⁶⁹

The overlap between the sins that the curses are to punish and that the community is to punish reveals no distinction between those whom God is to punish and those whom the community is to punish. The curses seem to apply mostly to the secret sinner⁷⁰ whom the community is not able to identify (Deut 29:28 [29:29 English]). Thus there are not guilty people within the community whom God punished with some type of affliction, but whom the community is supposed to protect. Yet Deuteronomy calls the community to protect a few categories of afflicted people, namely the poor, orphans, and widows. Thus Deuteronomy does not portray the plight of orphans and widows as a punishment for sin. The consistent juxtaposition of orphans and widows in Deuteronomy suggests they serve as a hendiadys representative of innocent suffering people who are especially vulnerable. Deuteronomy requires the community to alleviate injustice in the face of the impossibility of eradicating social injustice.

כִּי לֹא־יִחַדֵּל אֲבִיוֹן מִקְרֵב הָאָרֶץ עַל־כֵּן אֲנֹכִי מְצַוְךָ לֵאמֹר פְּתַח תְּפִתָּח אֶת־יָדְךָ לְאֶחָיךָ
לְעִנִּיךָ וּלְאֶבְיֹנְךָ בְּאַרְצְךָ:

Since there will never cease to be poor in the midst of the land, therefore I am commanding you, saying, “You shall surely open your hand to your brothers, to the afflicted among you, and to the poor among you in your land.” Deut 15:11

Deuteronomy calls the community to alleviate innocent suffering, but it will unlikely be able to bring all of the suffering in the community to full justice.⁷¹

69. The categories of idol making, disrespecting parents, sexual misconduct, and murder overlap with the cursed sins in Deuteronomy 27 and the sins the community was supposed to punish. Idol makers who lead Israel away from God also receive the sum total of Deuteronomy’s curses in Deut 29:17–21. See Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, 253.

70. Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, 253.

71. E. Gerstenberger, “עָנָה II ‘ānâ,” *TDOT* 11:251.

Deuteronomy and Innocent Blood

Another category in Deuteronomy implies unjust suffering. Deuteronomy is significantly concerned with the shedding of innocent blood (Deut 19:1–13; 21:1–9; 27:24–25). While Deuteronomy goes to great lengths to punish the murderer or the one who shed the innocent blood (Deut 19:13), the judicial system cannot attain justice for the victim, but only for the perpetrator. In the majority of cases, this is the consequence of sin in the community, and the community has the duty to purge the sin. Thus in some sense, the judicial system restores justice, even if it is unsatisfactory to all parties involved. However, Deuteronomy presents a case of innocent blood that was not the result of sin in the community, but an axe head flying off its handle and mortally wounding a person (Deut 19:5). Accidental death and unintentionally shedding of innocent blood are realistic possibilities. In this case, the community is unable to resolve the injustice. Deuteronomy does not promise that the innocent victim will return to life, which is the only way to maintain a rigid retributive justice. In this scenario, there is no way to restore justice. The man swinging the axe still suffers the consequence of confinement to a city of refuge.⁷² But this does not restore an unsettled justice. An innocent person suffered and died for no reason other than faulty equipment. No sin was present in this case, but there was still suffering and death.

Concluding Thoughts about Suffering and Retributive Justice in Deuteronomy

One may demur based on Deuteronomy's theme of ending the suffering of the groups that I have examined. The fundamental piece of Israel's story is the deliverance

⁷² Deuteronomy does not proscribe an end for the time that the unintentional killer must live in the city of refuge. Num 35:25 permits unintentional killers to return home after the death of the high priest.

from Egypt, not the suffering in Egypt. Deuteronomy identifies Yhwh as the one doing justice for the orphan and widow (Deut 10:18). Thus Deuteronomy attempts to curtail any situations that do not follow the retributive justice principle. Righteous people receive justice ultimately, if not immediately. However, even as Deuteronomy calls for the community and Yhwh to do justice for vulnerable members of society, there is no expectation that these categories will end (Deut 15:11).⁷³ There will always be orphans and widows in the community that did not merit their current plight. Thus suffering/injustice will continue in the community, and the community will constantly have the responsibility to respond to that injustice. Deuteronomy certainly maintains a retributive justice system, but it is by no means rigid.

Recasting Deuteronomy

I have demonstrated that Deuteronomy adopts a more nuanced and complex view of retribution than a simple universal and rigid retributive justice principle. Deuteronomy's special concern for oppressed people and its depiction of them as innocent demonstrates this. Deuteronomy calls its community to participate in alleviating injustice in social situations, which implies that injustice continues to exist (Deut 15:11). Retribution is central to the Deuteronomic covenant; however, covenant does not exist apart from community, particularly the community of Israel. Thus Deuteronomy does not portray a world where God holds members of other communities equally responsible and culpable. Deuteronomy does not apply its principles of retribution rigidly to the people of Israel or universally to the people of the world.

⁷³. Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, 147.

Job is an individual who exists outside of the Israelite community. Assuming that Job's sin is responsible for his calamity based on Deuteronomy requires multiple leaps of logic.⁷⁴ However, as I will demonstrate, Job respects the words of Deuteronomy and attempts to uphold a similar social ethic and theology. It is odd for characters to force the demands of Deuteronomy onto Job, but Job willingly accepts these demands and requirements.

74. Roberts, "Job and the Israelite Religious Tradition," 112.

CHAPTER II

JOB ON THE NATURE OF SOCIO-RELIGIOUS EXPECTATIONS, AFFLICTION, AND RETRIBUTION

Many have claimed that the ideas of the book of Job are in tension with retributive justice.¹ However, the character Job is unwilling to eschew retributive justice completely. Certainly, Job contests the view of retributive justice posited by his three friends, but retributive justice is still integral to Job's reasoning. Job's final speech (Job 31) is a definitive statement of his innocence, and he wishes to have the indictment written against him (Job 31:35), assuming that there must be an indictment. While Job does not believe that he has sinned, his argument assumes that innocence should prevent him from suffering. In this chapter, I will examine the views of retributive justice found in the book of Job as a means of contrasting between views of the friends and Deuteronomy. Job's view of retribution does not necessarily correspond to Deuteronomy's, but I will argue it shares some affinities. However, the speeches of Job are not consistent on retributive justice. Some of Job's inconsistencies are likely due to corruption in the text, as discussed beginning on page 23, but I will argue that other inconsistencies are due to character development. Additionally, I argue that Job and

1. For example, Matitahu Tsevat does not mention Deuteronomy, but claims that Job's main purpose is the dismantling of retributive justice. See Matitahu Tsevat, "The Meaning of the Book of Job," *HUCA* 37 (1966): 73–106. Similarly, Daniel Simundson suggests that Deuteronomy and its notions of retributive justice are source material for the friends' understanding, which Job strongly contests. See Daniel Simundson, "Suffering," *ABD* 6:220; Cook, "A Reading of Job as a Theatrical Work," 39–62.

Deuteronomy contain large amounts of agreement in regard to socio-religious expectations.

Before exploring the socio-religious expectations exhibited in the book of Job, I will address a viewpoint that opposes my central argument. I will refer to this viewpoint as the “nationalistic metaphor.” In the nationalistic metaphor, Job stands as a cipher for Israel. David Wolfers has championed this perspective.² While there is merit to reading Job as a metaphor for Israel, I do not believe that this is the best way to read Job. If one reads Job through the lens of the nationalistic metaphor, the curses of Deuteronomy and Israel’s experience of exile become the central conversation partners for the book. However, this metaphor heightens the tensions between the books. While the author(s) may have wanted to draw parallels between Job and Israel, Job as a cipher for Israel is too simplistic for the complexities of the book of Job. Restricting the book to a single metaphor obscures some of the depth of the book of Job.³

The Nationalistic Metaphor

David Wolfers argues at length that Job stands as a cipher for the nation of Israel.⁴ If the book leads the reader to this conclusion, it would undermine the position of this thesis. This move would strengthen the connection between Deuteronomy and the book of Job, but it would inevitably cast the two books in direct opposition to each other. Job

2. Wolfers, *Deep Things out of Darkness*, 117. Roberts notes several other authors who adopt this view as well, but he specifically eschews this interpretation. See Roberts, “Job and the Israelite Religious Tradition,” 109.

3. Roberts, “Job and the Israelite Religious Tradition,” 108.

4. Wolfers believes that the reign of Hezekiah provides the most likely context for a righteous king to suffer the consequences of the Deuteronomic curses. Wolfers cites B. D. Napier as one who also supports the nationalistic metaphor, but notes that Napier does not argue persuasively for this position. Wolfers, *Deep Things out of Darkness*, 69, 116.

and his family would be responsible for the covenant, and communal responsibility would apply to them. It would be nearly inescapable that Job had suffered at the hand of the curses found in Deuteronomy 28.⁵ As Wolfers has pointed out, מִכַּף רַגְלְךָ עַד רִגְלְךָ (‘‘From the sole of your foot to your head’’ [Deut 28:35]) relates strongly to קְדָדוֹ מִכַּף רַגְלוֹ עַד (‘‘From the sole of his foot to his head’’ [Job 2:7]).⁶ This would magnify the injustice, as Job was blameless and upright (Job 1:1). Yhwh’s yielding to the Satan’s requests would be a deliberate breach in the Deuteronomic covenant (Deut 28:13). The logical conclusion for the book of Job would be that Deuteronomy had failed.

A great weakness with the nationalistic metaphor is that nearly all of the evidence for it centers in the prologue. Applying the nationalistic metaphor to the dialogue in isolation is strange at best and nonsensical at worst. None of the characters appears to be from Israel in either the dialogue or narratives. The characters retain their connections to the descendants of Esau found in Genesis 36.⁷ If Job and his family represent the Israelites, an Edomite or Uzite heritage weakens the metaphor. The strongest connection between the dialogue and the people of Israel is great suffering. Yet many peoples and people suffer. This connection is too weak to assume metaphorical equivalency in the dialogue.

5. Stephen Cook follows Wolfers closely in this regard and makes this assumption. However, Cook fails to acknowledge that Wolfers uses the nationalistic metaphor to argue that Job is a reflection of Assyrian conquest, not Babylonian. Cook notes some connections to Deuteronomy and then attacks the Deuteronomistic historian, not Deuteronomy. See Cook, ‘‘A Reading of Job as a Theatrical Work,’’ 42–45.

6. Wolfers, *Deep Things Out of Darkness*, 112–14.

7. Greenstein, ‘‘The Invention of Language,’’ 335–36.

Wolfers proposed that the twelve people in Job's family, ten children, the patriarch, and matriarch, represent the twelve tribes of Israel.⁸ He specifically identified the three daughters as the trans-Jordanian tribes and the seven sons as the cis-Jordanian tribes under the Israelite monarchy. Job and his wife represent the tribes of Judah and Benjamin. While the numbering of the tribes of Israel is problematic in many texts and the ten and two split of twelve has precedent (1 Kgs 11:31), this split between cis-Jordanian Israel, trans-Jordanian Israel, and South Judah does not represent the arrangement of the tribes well. There are only two and a half trans-Jordanian tribes, as Manasseh had territory on both sides of the Jordan. Simeon had its territory within the boundaries of Judah (Josh 19:1). The Hebrew Bible does not discuss the allegiance of the tribe of Simeon in the Jeroboam rebellion, but at least its territory remained as part of Judah. Levi maintained a stronger presence in Judah than it did in Israel. Several other tribes disappear in the record before the Assyrian conquest, making the split of seven and three between cis-Jordan and trans-Jordan tenuous at best. The prologue never identifies the members of Job's family as twelve, even though that is a logical conclusion; thus the narrative does not seem interested in the number twelve.

Wolfers's suggestion of seven sons and three daughters as representative of the tribes of Israel destroyed by the Assyrians also ignores the seven and three split common in the prologue. Job has seven thousand sheep and three thousand camels (Job 1:2). Job has three friends who come to visit him for seven days (Job 2:11, 13). The repetition of this split implies that it points to something different from the destroyed tribes of Israel.⁹

8. Wolfers, *Deep Things out of Darkness*, 117.

9. Athalya Brenner, "Job the Pious?: The Characterization of Job in the Narrative Framework of the Book," *JOT* 43 (1989): 41.

The number of Job's animals does not equal twelve by any count. The three friends and the seven days do not receive calamity. Athalya Brenner argued that it points to the special holiness of Job based on three other texts using the same three and seven split.¹⁰ Wolfers's suggestion may be appealing on a surface level, but it does not handle all of the data well.

It is plausible that aspects of Job's calamity purposefully elicit sympathy from Israelites who experienced exile; however, a unilateral application of the nationalistic metaphor oversimplifies the book of Job.¹¹ Only a few have supported the nationalistic metaphor unilaterally; however, a few use the historical backdrop of Israel's experience as a key interpretive lens for the book.¹² The book of Job is more complex than a product of Israel's experience of exile. The book of Job is multifaceted, and constraining it to the history of Israel produces less compelling understandings of the book. Thus I argue that the national metaphor is not the best way to read the book of Job.

Socio-Religious Expectations according to Job

As I discussed concerning Deuteronomy, the categories of theology, piety, orthopraxy, and social ethics are inseparable. However, for a heuristic discussion of Job, I will attempt to make some distinctions between the groups. The book of Job is not as explicit as Deuteronomy concerning its views of orthopraxy, thus I will explore what

10. Ibid., 43.

11. Roberts, "Job and the Israelite Religious Tradition," 108.

12. Marvin Pope's commentary adopts such a view. See Marvin Pope, *Job*, ABC 15 (New York: Doubleday, 1965). Walter Brueggemann insinuates such a view as well. He claims that the book of Job responds to the crisis of theodicy of the 586 BCE fall of Jerusalem. Gerald Janzen concurs. See Walter Brueggemann, *Theology of the Old Testament* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1997), 385; Janzen, *Job*, 5.

appears to be the assumptions of the text. The book of Job is more expansive than Deuteronomy concerning piety, which serves a similar role in Job as orthopraxy in Deuteronomy. I will demonstrate that social ethics in the book of Job are greatly similar to social ethics in Deuteronomy. The book of Job has much to say about theology, and I will argue that it does not disagree with Deuteronomy on this matter. Piety in the book of Job receives a significantly different emphasis from Deuteronomy, but the books are not in tension here either.

Theology in the Book of Job

The largest point of agreement in theology between the book of Job and Deuteronomy is the devotion to a singular deity. Taking the dialogue (Job 3–31) in isolation provides little evidence that Yhwh is the God whom the characters discuss.¹³ When reading the book as a whole, the characters clearly discuss Yhwh (Job 1:21; 42:7), and Yhwh is the deity that enters the dialogue (Job 38:1). However, the characters only discuss a singular God in the dialogue. They use many names for this singular deity, but they fail to acknowledge polytheistic practices and beliefs common in the ancient Near East. The only awareness of polytheism in the book of Job occurs in the Yhwh speeches (Job 38–41) when Yhwh subtly refers to the *Enuma Elish* or at least a similar story¹⁴ and Tiamat/Leviathan (*Enuma Elish* 2.85–90; Job 41:17 [41:25 English]).¹⁵ Even here, no other god appears in the book of Job. The book of Job portrays a world where everyone is

13. The singular use of Yhwh (יהוה) in the dialogue occurs in Job 12:9. For a discussion of this occurrence, see 75.

14. Wolfers, *Deep Things out of Darkness*, 459.

15. See also Job 38:7 for a possible polytheistic reference, but this also occurs in the Yhwh speeches. (בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים) “The sons of God” or “The sons of the gods.”

aware of the single God, yet many flippantly ignore the deity (Job 21:15). Thus in the view of Job and his friends, people need not answer the question of which god to serve, but only whether to serve the singular God.¹⁶

The book of Job depicts a monotheistic world. While Deuteronomy occasionally depicts a monotheistic world (Deut 4:35, 39), it primarily depicts a world uncertain of other deities (Deut 33:27), but mandates monolatry. Thus the monotheistic world in the book of Job is a realization of the theological desires of Deuteronomy. This datum provides further evidence that Job belongs within the conversation of Israelite religion.¹⁷ It is unlikely that another group in the ancient Near East would have such an extended conversation with monotheistic assumptions. Deities such as Marduk or Hadad do not fit within the discussion of the book of Job.¹⁸

Deuteronomy unequivocally focuses on Yhwh (יהוה), but the characters of the book of Job do not. While Yhwh is the only deity in the Joban narratives and gives the speeches concluding the dialogue, Eliphaz, Bildad, Zophar, and Elihu never use the tetragrammaton, Yhwh (יהוה). The characters in the dialogue prefer El (אל) and Eloah (אלוה) most, Shaddai (שדי) frequently, and Elohim (אלהים) infrequently.¹⁹ Job once uses

16. Edward Greenstein, “The Problem of Evil in the Book of Job,” in *Mishneh Todah: Studies in Deuteronomy and Its Cultural Environment in Honor of Jeffery Tigay*, ed. Nili Sacher, David A. Glatt-gilad, and Michael Williams (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2009), 336.

17. William Green provides some counterpoints. See William Scott Green, “Stretching the Covenant: Job and Judaism,” *RE* 99 (2002): 569–77.

18. Some, such as Joseph Klausner, have argued that the concept of “Satan” in the Hebrew Bible grew out of associations with Persian Zoroastrianism and the concept of Angra Mainyu. This viewpoint implies that Job may belong within the conversation of Persian Zoroastrian religion. However, Aron Pinker and others have demonstrated the significant difference that Satan plays in both the book of Job and the entire Hebrew Bible from that of Angra Mainyu in Zoroastrianism. The book of Job nearly certainly belongs in the context of Israelite/Jewish religion. See Aron Pinker, “Satanic Verses—Part II,” *JBQ* 25 (1997): 225–33.

19. G. Steins, “שדי šadday,” *TDOT* 14:437.

the tetragrammaton in the dialogue (Job 12:9), but only as a means to refer to and critique Isa 41:20.²⁰ While El (לֵא) and Eloah (אֱלֹהִים) may describe many deities in the ancient Near East, Shaddai (שַׁדַּי) may describe only a limited number of deities,²¹ and Yhwh (יהוה) is the most prominent. Because of the use of Shaddai and the assumption of monotheism, I argue that readers of the dialogue in isolation of the narratives would assume that the characters discuss the singular god of the Hebrews, Yhwh. However, not using the divine name gives the book a universal feel. When reading the canonical version of Job, there is little doubt that Yhwh is the focus. In this matter, Job has a strong degree of concurrence with Deuteronomy.

The book of Job and Deuteronomy agree on their understandings of theology/orthodoxy. That individuals ought to worship Yhwh is a logical conclusion of both books. However, the different settings of the books cast that theology in different perspectives. The theology, which these two books share, is a similar theology to many books in the Hebrew Bible. Thus it is difficult to note a strong correlation based on theology alone. However, orthopraxy, piety, and social ethics are inseparable from theology in both the book of Job and Deuteronomy, and the books contain further agreement in these other categories.

Orthopraxy in the Book of Job

Orthopraxy is not a significant concern of the book of Job because it gives no systematic description of cultic life. Piety is a greater concern in the book of Job as

20. For a discussion of this occurrence, see 75.

21. H. Niehr, “שַׁדַּי šadday,” *TDOT* 14: 422–424.

opposed to orthopraxy. However, one may determine a few articles of orthopraxy from the book of Job.

Idols are not a significant anxiety of the book of Job, as opposed to Deuteronomy. There is limited evidence that suggests that Job repudiates idols. Job 12:6 possibly equates robbers, those who provoke El (אֵל), with the לְאִשָּׁר הֵבִיא אֱלֹהֵי בְיָדוֹ (“one who brings Eloah in his hand”). This may connect to the ridicule that Jeremiah and Isaiah heap upon immobile idols (Isa 45:20; 46:1; Jer 10:5). However, Seow, Gray, and Dhorme each argue for a different meaning for this verse, none of which includes a rejection of idols. This verse has many different interpretations, but the majority of commentators interpret this to mean a person who has disdained the power of God.²² The lack of discussion of idols is a significant difference between the Joban depiction of orthopraxy and Deuteronomy’s depiction of orthopraxy.

The lack of discussion about idolatry in Job may represent its commitment to monotheism. As discussed above, Job has very little awareness of polytheistic practices. As Nathan MacDonald argued concerning Deuteronomy’s aniconism as a means of enforcing monotheistic practices,²³ Job’s assumption of a monotheistic world relieves any necessity to oppose idols. If there be no other gods to distinguish between, there be no reason to create idols to distinguish them. If there be no reason to create idols, there be no reason to oppose them. Thus the silence of the book of Job concerning idols may be due to its assumptions of monotheism.

22. Gray, *The Book of Job*, 216; Seow *Job 1–21*, 632; Dhorme, *A Commentary on the Book of Job*, 171.

23. MacDonald, *Deuteronomy and the Meaning of Monotheism*, 183–84.

The dialogue lacks discussion of sacrifice and offerings to God. The friends never exhort Job to make sacrifices for his alleged sins, but only to repent and pray to God (Job 22:27). The omission is significant for two reasons. (1) Sacrifice is an expectation in Deuteronomy, and (2) social expectations of landed ANE elite included sacrifice.²⁴ Despite sacrifice's role as a significant part of Deuteronomy, its omission in the Joban speeches may reflect a respect for Deuteronomy and Yahwistic religion. In the attempt of the author(s) to cast Job as a pious individual, Job must not violate commands from Deuteronomy. Job's Uzite nationality would prohibit him from participating in the Israelite cult until the third generation (Deut 23:8).²⁵ Deuteronomy 12:5–6 prohibits sacrifices to Yhwh in an alternative location.²⁶ Thus it is better for Job not to engage in sacrifice at all than to transgress nationality or location requirements of Deuteronomy.²⁷ However, in the narrative prologue and epilogue, sacrifice plays an important role. Job offers sacrifices for each of his children every day to mitigate potential sin (Job 1:5). In the epilogue, Yhwh commands the friends to make sacrifices for their sin of not speaking rightly (נְכַוְנָה) concerning God (Job 42:8). Since the focus of this thesis is the speeches, Job's omission of sacrifice is significant.

24. Hamilton, "Elite Lives," 79.

25. This assumes that Uz is analogous with Edom. See Greenstein, "The Invention of Language," 336.

26. Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, 459.

27. Hamilton, "Elite Lives," 79.

Piety in the Book of Job

Reflections on piety in the book of Job emphasize prayer.²⁸ A significant disagreement between Job and the friends is the utility of prayer (Job 21:15; 24:12 cf. 22:27).²⁹ Job argues that this form of piety does not benefit the ones praying, while the friends are confident that it does. Prayer is not an emphasis in Deuteronomy, which has few references to the practice (Deut 9:20, 26).³⁰ Prayer serves as a necessary piece of intercession in the Joban epilogue, as Job prays for the forgiveness of his friends (Job 42:8–9). One of the few mentions of prayer in Deuteronomy also broaches intercession (Deut 9:25–29), thus illustrating a similar understanding of the function of prayer. However, the two books place different emphases on prayer.

A significant disagreement between Job and his friends is piety in speech. Job acknowledges that his words are bold. כִּי-עַתָּה מִחֹל יָמַי יִכָּבֵד עַל-פְּנֵי דְבָרַי לְעוֹ: (“For now [my vexations] would be heavier than the sand of the seas, *therefore my words were brazen*” [Job 6:3]).³¹ However, despite his boldness, Job continues to argue that he is innocent (Job 9:17, 20, 21). The logical conclusion is that Job does not view his boldness as impiety. However, the friends do view Job’s brash words as impious. Zophar and Eliphaz each exhibit this understanding.

כִּי יִאָלֶף עֲוֹנֶךָ כִּי יִתְבַּחֵר לְשׁוֹן עֲרוּמַיִם:
יִרְשָׁעֶנָּה כִּי יִלְא־אֲנִי וְשִׁפְתָי יִעֲנוּ-בָךָ:

28. Newsom, *The Book of Job: A Contest of Moral Imaginations*, 109; Carol Newsom, “Job and His Friends: A Conflict of Moral Imaginations,” *Int.* 53 (1999): 245.

29. Newsom, *The Book of Job: A Contest of Moral Imaginations*, 96.

30. Weinfeld classifies Deut 21:7 and Deut 26:5–10 as prayers. However, not all categorize these texts as prayers. See Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*, 32; Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, 238.

31. Seow, *Job 1–21*, 469.

For your iniquity instructs your mouth, and you choose a tongue of crafty words. Your mouth declares you guilty, not I, and your mouth testifies against you. (Job 15:5–6; cf. Job 11:2–6)

In the view of the friends, if Job were innocent before, he is no longer. His mouth makes him guilty; thus the conversation regarding Job's innocence is moot. Reading the book of Job canonically, Yhwh's disapproval of the friends against Job (Job 42:7) implies that Job's words were not impious. Yhwh condemns the friends for not speaking rightly (נְכוֹנָה) as Job did, which affirms that words can be pious or impious.

The majority of piety as expressed in the book of Job falls more under the category of social ethics. The pious support a rigorous social ethic (Job 29:11–17) and the wicked neglect or abuse that social ethic (Job 24:2–17).

Social Ethics in the Book of Job

Job and Deuteronomy have major agreement concerning their understanding of the poor and marginalized members of society. Job uses the example of abusing the orphan as a form of great depravity (Job 6:27). Eliphaz concurs on this point and accuses Job of severe mistreatment of orphans (Job 22:9), which is one of the few specific accusations the friends make against Job.³² Job does not immediately claim innocence of this crime, but explicitly does so later (Job 29:12). Job uses orphans as evidence in his argument that God does not punish the wicked for their actions (Job 24:1–12). In Job's summary defense of his actions (Job 31), Job claims to have upheld the cause of the orphan (Job 31:17–18) and implies that failure to do this would have been condemnable.

32. Greenstein notes an alternative interpretation for Eliphaz's accusations, which Tur-Sinai initially proposed. It is possible that Eliphaz is pseudoquoting God to demonstrate to Job that God would not say these things. I am skeptical of this interpretation. The text lacks clues that Eliphaz speaks ironically. See Greenstein, "The Problem of Evil in the Book of Job," 347. The majority of interpreters do not follow Tur-Sinai's suggestion. See Newsom, *The Book of Job: A Contest of Moral Imaginations*, 106.

Job 31 is not a catalogue of all the great things that Job has done, but it demonstrates Job has not broken any legal commands that could possibly implicate him. For Job, his treatment of orphans is part of the social-ethical requirements of all people of substance.

Similar to Job's belief about orphans, Job believes that beneficial treatment of widows is part of a proper social ethic. The characters also cast the mistreatment of widows as a repugnant sin (Job 22:9; 24:3, 21). As Roy Heller has argued, Deuteronomy has an interest in the social welfare of all widows, not just those that represent the poorest people.³³ Job also is concerned about widows as a category beyond those that are destitute, as Job condemns the practice of taking a widow's ox in pledge (Job 24:3). While the possession of an ox does not necessarily mean wealth, owning an ox implies that the widow has some resources and likely has land. This concern for the widow of substance implies that Job respects the social ethic for widows that Deuteronomy posits. While protection for widows is a common motif in the Hebrew Bible, it is especially strong in both Deuteronomy and the book of Job.³⁴

Job is especially concerned about the plight of the poor. Zophar and Job equate mistreatment of the poor as wickedness (Job 20:19; 24:1–12). Eliphaz asserts that God will protect the poor (Job 5:15–16). Job uses his exceptional treatment of the poor to prove that he is innocent multiple times (Job 29:12; 30:25; 31:16, 19), which later traditions concerning Job greatly expanded (TestJob 3:4–5, 9–25). The characters expect

33. Heller, "The Widow in Deuteronomy," 10.

34. See also 43n41 for a brief examination of the occurrences of orphan and widow in the Hebrew Bible.

people with means to help the poor. Failing to help the poor in Job's first state of wealth would be a transgression of the implied legal requirements (Job 31:16, 19).

Job refers to several other categories of vulnerable or disenfranchised people. He does not discuss any of the categories discussed below in great length, but it demonstrates his concern for vulnerable members of society and the role of correct treatment of these people in his understanding of social ethics. Job mentions the stranger as being in need of special protection (Job 31:32; cf. 29:16). He addresses fair treatment of slaves (Job 31:13). Job talks about the blind and lame (Job 29:15). Orphans, widows, and the poor receive the majority of attention, but Job also demonstrates that protection of many categories of oppressed and disenfranchised people is part of social ethics.

Concluding Comments on Socio-Religious Expectations

Of the four categories, Job and Deuteronomy have the greatest amount of concordance in their view of social ethics. Job's depiction of social ethics as demanding good treatment of vulnerable and disenfranchised members of society appears to draw from Deuteronomy as source material.³⁵ While these concerns are present in other places in the Hebrew Bible, Job and Deuteronomy each exhibit a strong penchant for protection of the marginalized. The similarity in understandings of social ethics in the two books is especially strong. Job and Deuteronomy also have strong agreement regarding theology. However, their agreement is not as distinctive as their agreement in social ethics because their theology is common in the Hebrew Bible. In regard to orthopraxy and piety, the different national and cultic settings explain many of the points of disconnection. On the

35. For a discussion of social ethics in Deuteronomy, see the material beginning on 38.

whole, the socio-religious expectations of Deuteronomy and Job are entirely compatible and occasionally distinctively similar.

Joban Movement and Development

The speeches of Job demonstrate movement in thought and argument. However, the most significant changes in Job's thought seem to be the result of corruptions in the text rather than actual changes in the character. My discussion of the corrupt sections is brief, as they do not fit on Job's character arc. The first section of Job's argument covers the first cycle (Job 3–11).³⁶ The second section in Job's argument covers the majority of the second cycle (Job 12–20), but Job begins to transition to his third argument in Job 19:23. Job's third stage of argument is limited as is the third cycle (Job 21–25). Job's speeches in 21 and 23–24 comprise the majority of his third argument. Job 26–28 represents a most likely spurious set of speeches. Job 27:1–11 appears to be legitimately the words of Job, but the rest is problematic at best. Job's final argument covers Job 29–31 and corresponds to Job's monologue.

Job in the First Cycle (Job 3–11)

Job begins this cycle with the lament for his birth (Job 3) and concludes it in a similar way (Job 10:18–22). Job focuses on his own sufferings in this section; only a few times does he examine the ill fate of the entire human race (Job 7:1–2; 9:22–24; 10:5).

36. Note: I organize the cycles with Job's speeches as beginning each new cycle and Zophar ending the first and second cycle. The third cycle has no clear ending. However, Bildad functionally ends the productive portion of the third cycle in Job 25. Job begins the first cycle in Job 3, or Job 3 is outside the first cycle. Thus I organize the cycles as such: First Cycle, Job 3–1; Second Cycle, 12–20; and Third Cycle, Job 21–25. Dhorme organizes the cycles as follows: First Cycle, Job 4–14; Second Cycle, Job 15–22; and Third Cycle as Job 22–31. See Dhorme, *A Commentary on the Book of Job*, xxxvi–liii. Gray arranges the cycles as such: First Cycle, Job 4–14; Second Cycle, Job 15–21; and Third Cycle Job 22–27. See Gray, *The Book of Job*, 56–57. Seow follows Gray, but removes 27 from the Third Cycle. See Seow, *Job 1–21*, 66–67.

Job's language is extreme in the first cycle. He calls for the chaotic leviathan to undo creation (Job 3:8)³⁷ and claims that God treats him as the dragon (Job 7:12). The first cycle presents Job as exploring the depth of his own experience with God. While making strong accusations against God, Job also engages in a miniature doxology (Job 9:4–12).³⁸ However, even the doxology may be ironic and serves Job's rhetorical purpose of depicting the hopelessness of his case.

Job alludes to retributive justice several times through the first speech, but usually as a response to the friends who raise the subject most explicitly. Job introduces the legal/lawsuit metaphor in Job 6:2, which says לֹא שָׁקוֹל יִשְׁקָל כַּעֲשֵׂי וְהַוְתִּי בְּמֵאֻנָּיִם יִשְׂאוּ (‘‘If only my vexation were surely weighed, and my calamity³⁹ laid together on scales’’). The legal metaphor culminates in Job 31 and uses the legal code of Deuteronomy most, which I will demonstrate on page 114. However, there are few references to the legal code of Deuteronomy in the first cycle.⁴⁰ The legal metaphor is subtle in Job's second speech (Job 6–7), but Job develops it explicitly beginning in Job 9:2.⁴¹ Job's legal metaphor assumes a type of retributive justice. He posits a judicial system involving God (Job 9:2–3), which assumes that Job may have a valid complaint against God because of his suffering.

37. Seow, *Job 1–21*, 323–27.

38. Dhorme, *A Commentary on the Book of Job*, xli.

39. This is the variant from Qumran, as noted by BHS.

40. A possible allusion to Deuteronomy is in Job 6:22, where Job says, ‘‘Have I said, ‘Give to me!’ or ‘From your power offer me a bribe!’’’ Deut 10:17; 16:19; 27:29 condemn bribery, which is the strongest connection to Israelite legal code. However Psalms, Proverbs, and various prophets widely condemn the practice. See Isa 1:23; 5:23; Ezek 22:12; Amos 5:12; Mic 3:11; 7:3; Ps 15:5; 26:10; Prov 6:35; 15:27; 17:23. C. L. Seow does not believe that Job refers to bribery here. See Seow, *Job 1–21*, 481. John Gray supports this verse as being about bribery. See Gray, *The Book of Job*, 175.

41. Newsom, *The Book of Job: A Contest of Moral Imaginations*, 151.

In Job's legal metaphor, there is both suit and countersuit resulting in Job's filling the roles of plaintiff and defendant. God serves as the plaintiff, defendant, judge, jury, and prosecutor, fulfilling multiple roles at any given time.⁴² The absurdity of the court case is clear to Job in the first cycle, but he entertains the possibility to advance his argument. In the metaphor, when Job is the defendant (Job 9:14), despite his innocence (Job 9:15, 17, 20, 21; 10:7), he is unable to answer the charges. Job claims, אֲשֶׁר אִם־אֶעֱנֶה לְמִשְׁפָּטֵי אֱתֶחְנֶנּוּ: (Job 9:15, 17, 20, 21; 10:7), he is unable to answer the charges. Job claims, אֲשֶׁר אִם־אֶעֱנֶה לְמִשְׁפָּטֵי אֱתֶחְנֶנּוּ: (“Even though I am innocent, I will not answer; I will seek mercy from my judge” [Job 9:15; cf. 9:17, 21]). His verbal defense incriminates him even more, and he claims, אִם־אֶעֱנֶה לְמִשְׁפָּטֵי אֱתֶחְנֶנּוּ: (“Even If I am innocent, my mouth implicates me; I am blameless, but he determines me to be crooked” [Job 9:20]). Job's situation reduces him to appealing for mercy rather than acquittal.⁴⁴ At this point, Job believes he must plead *nolo contendere*. The cruelty of this metaphor reaches its peak in Job 10:7, עַל־דַּעְתְּךָ כִּי־לֹא אֶרְשָׁע וְאִין מִיָּדְךָ מִצִּילִי: (“Although you know that I am not guilty, there is no one to deliver me from your hand”). God alone knows that Job is innocent but withholds that knowledge and refuses to acquit Job.

Because of the futility of arguing with God, Job does not present evidence in the first cycle. As I will show on beginning on page 114, Deuteronomy is the source material for demonstrating Job's innocence. The lack of initiative on Job's part to demonstrate innocence explains the lack of references to Deuteronomy or its legal code. In the first

42. Michael Brennan Dick, “The Legal Metaphor in Job 31,” *CBQ* 41 (1979): 38–39.

43. Amy Erickson, “‘Without My Flesh I Will See God’: Job’s Rhetoric of the Body,” *JBL* 132 (2013): 301–2.

44. Seow, *Job 1–21*, 548.

cycle, Job both assumes and challenges the retributive justice principle. He appears ready to dismiss the retributive justice principle completely in Job 9.

אֶחָד הִיא עַל־כֵּן אֶמְרָתִי תָם וְרָשָׁע הוּא מְכַלָּה:

אִם־נָשׁוּט יָמִית פְּתָאֵם לְמַסַּת נְקִיִּים יִלְעָג:

אֶרְצוּ נִתְּנָה בְּיַד־רָשָׁע פְּגִי־שִׁפְטִיָּה יִכְסֶה אִם־לֹא אִפּוּא מִי־הוּא:

It is one; therefore, I say he destroys the blameless and the wicked. If there is a scourge and one dies suddenly, he mocks the despair of the innocent. The earth is given into the hand of the wicked. He covers the face of its judges. If it is not him, who is it? (Job 9:22–24)

However, Job also affirms retributive justice in the first cycle of speeches.

שְׁבוּ־נָא אֶל־תְּהִי עוֹלָה וְשָׁבִי עוֹד צְדָקִי־בָּהּ:

הֲיִשְׁבַּלְשׁוּנִי עוֹלָה אִם־חָפִי לֹא־יָבִין הַזֹּת:

Relent please, and let no wrong be done, relent, my acquittal is still possible. Is there any wrong on my tongue? Cannot my pallet discern calamity? (Job 6:29–30)

Job does not abandon the retributive justice principle, but if he agreed with the friends prior to his experience of calamity, he has radically altered the way he views retributive justice.

The first stage of Job’s argument ends with the conclusion of his third speech (Job 9–10). Although Zophar still must speak to complete the first cycle of conversations, Job’s language returns to lamenting his birth (Job 10:18–22), providing an *inclusio* for his rhetoric.

Job in the Second Cycle (Job 12–20)

Job transitions the flow of the argument to the second cycle in Job 12. Now that all of the friends have spoken, Job rejects their reasoning with biting sarcasm. אֲמַנָּם כִּי אֲתֵם־עִם וְעַמְלֹכְם תָּמוּת חַכְמָה: (“Surely, you are the people and wisdom will die with you” [Job 12:2]). Job broadens the scope of his lament in the second cycle. His lament focuses on the injustice that is integral to the fabric of existence (Job 12:5–9). The singular use of

the divine name, Yhwh (יהוה), in the Joban dialogue appears in this speech on the lips of Job (Job 12:9). Job bitterly reverses the role of creation in Isa 41:20 where it serves as a testament of Yhwh's/God's goodness. Job changes it to a testament of Yhwh's/God's unjust rule.⁴⁵ This is further evidence of Job's awareness of at least some other Israelite literature and his willingness to challenge prophetic tradition.⁴⁶

The second cycle develops the lawsuit metaphor. Job harangues the friends for taking God's side in the trial (Job 13:2–12),⁴⁷ and Job predicts that God will sternly rebuke the friends for doing so. The narrative epilogue confirms Job's words, as Yhwh rebukes the friends for their words (Job 42:7–8). Job changes his assertion about the metaphorical trial, and now believes that he could win the lawsuit. הִגְהֵנָּא עֲרֻכְתִּי מִשְׁפָּט (‘‘Look! I have arranged a case. I know I will be acquitted’’ [Job 13:18]).⁴⁸ Job's anger with the friends emboldens him toward God. He begins to assert the lawsuit as a reality in the second cycle rather than as a metaphor.⁴⁹ Job does this because he believes that he can win the case, as Catherine Chin has argued, as either the

45. Dhorme amends the text to read אֱלֹהִים (God) rather than יהוה (Yhwh) to conform with the rest of the language in the dialogue of Job. See Dhorme, *A Commentary on the Book of Job*, 173. I disagree with Dhorme. The rhetorical effect of reversing Isa 41:20 is powerful. Seow discusses several other possibilities. See Seow, *Job 1–21*, 624.

46. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*, 436.

47. Newsom, *The Book of Job: A Contest of Moral Imaginations*, 154.

48. The translation of the second half of the verse could also mean ‘‘I know that I will be vindicated’’ or ‘‘I know that I am innocent.’’ Each of these renderings supports the lawsuit metaphor, and I argue that this line communicates all three meanings. See William Reyburn, *A Handbook on the Book of Job* (New York: United Bible Society, 1992), 258.

49. Edward Greenstein, ‘‘A Forensic Understanding of the Speech from the Whirlwind,’’ in *Texts, Temples, and Traditions: A Tribute to Menahem Haran*, ed. M. Fox, V. Hurowitz, A. Hurvitz, M. Klein, B. Schwartz, N. Shupak (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1996), 243.

plaintiff or the defendant.⁵⁰ Although the lawsuit metaphor implies a system of retributive justice, Job still does not turn extensively toward the text of Deuteronomy in the second cycle.⁵¹

The second cycle contains the most vivid imagery to describe God's malicious attack on Job.⁵² *Ludlul Bel Nemeqi* uses similar language to describe Marduk's execution of punishment (*Ludlul* 21, 34).⁵³ Job uses the second cycle to produce evidence against God rather than his own innocence. Job piles up metaphors that would produce beyond lethal results (Job 16:9–14). In the second cycle, Job describes himself as a hunted person/animal, a parched plant or leaf, the prey of a ferocious beast, a target for archery sport, the victim of a military attack, a besieged city, an uprooted tree, and a disowned member of a family (Job 16–17, 19). Although Job mounds up the evidence against God, he still recognizes the possibility that his actions have caused the great calamity that has befallen him (Job 13:23), thus continuing to acknowledge retributive justice as a possibility.

50. Catherine Chin, "Job and the Injustice of God: Implicit Arguments in Job 13.17–14.12," *JSOT* 64 (1994): 95.

51. A possible exception is the use of *לְשׂוֹן* in Job 17:6 as an allusion to Deut 28:37. This phraseology is common in the Hebrew Bible (Jer 24:9; Ps 44:15 [44:14 English]; 69:12 [69:11 English]; 2 Chron 7:20 et al.) and is not an explicit allusion to Deuteronomy, although I find it likely that Job does allude to Deuteronomy here. See 97; Dhorme, *A Commentary on the Book of Job*, 246; Seow, *Job 1–21*, 756; Gray, *The Book of Job*, 259.

52. Newsom, *The Book of Job: A Contest of Moral Imaginations*, 138.

53. D. J. Wiseman, "A New Text of the Babylonian Poem of the Righteous Sufferer," *AntS* 30 (1980): 101–7.

Job in the Third Cycle (Job 21–25)

Job begins to transition to his third line of argument in Job 19:23–29. As with the first cycle, Zophar must speak before the formal completion of the second cycle (Job 20), but Job has already begun transitioning the argument. The crux of the discussion in the third cycle falls on larger discussions of God’s action regarding the entire world. Job makes plentiful allusions to Deuteronomy in the third cycle, and I will cover this material in greater depth in chapter 3. Job spends much of his first speech in the third cycle (Job 21) reversing the language of Deuteronomy, claiming that God does not punish the wicked as Eliphaz, Bildad, and Zophar each explicitly claimed in the second cycle (Job 15:17–35; 18:5–21; 20:5–29).

Job 23 breaks the mold for the third cycle. Job 21 and 24 are each about the larger picture of God, and not as much about Job. However, Job 23 shifts the focus to Job briefly before turning towards the fate of the vulnerable in Job 24. Job 23 continues to build upon the legal metaphor. Job’s boldness continues to show, as Job is increasingly confident that he could win a court case between him and God.⁵⁴

מִי־יִתֶּן גְּדַעְתִּי וְאֶמְצָאָהוּ אָבוֹא עַד־תְּכַוְּנֶנּוּ:
 אֶעְרֹכֶה לְפָנָיו מִשְׁפָּט וְכִי אֶמְלֵא תוֹכְחוֹת:
 אֲדַעַה מִלִּים יַעֲנֵנִי וְאֶבִּינֶה מֵה־יֹאמֵר לִי:
 הַבְּרִב־כֶּחַ עֲרִיב עֲמָדִי לֹא אֶדֹּאֲהוּ וְיֵשֶׁם בִּי:
 שֵׁם יִשָּׂר נֹכַח עֲמֹו וְאֶפְלָטָה לְנִצָּח מִשְׁפָּטִי:

Who would grant that I may know where I could find him—I would enter his house. I would arrange my case before him and fill my mouth with arguments. I would know the words with which he answers me and I would understand what he says to me. Would he go to trial with me in the greatness of his strength? No, surely he sets himself against me. There the upright person may argue with him, and I may escape my [unjust] verdict forever. (Job 23:3–7)

54. Sylvia Huberman Scholnick, “The Meaning of Mišpāt (Justice) in the Book of Job,” in *Sitting with Job: Selected Studies on the Book of Job*, ed. Roy B. Zuck (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 1992), 352.

In Job 23, Job returns to the stand as the defendant, whereas Job assumes the role of plaintiff in Job 21 and 24. Thus Job affirms his piety with language that may contain Deuteronomic echoes. I examine this connection on page 104.

Georg Braulik was one of the first to write about the extensive connections between Job 24 and Deuteronomy.⁵⁵ Braulik argued that Job 24 demonstrates an awareness of a developed Deuteronomy. I will develop my argument on the connection between Job 24 and Deuteronomy on page 105, but it will suffice to say that the connection is especially strong to Deuteronomy 24. Job argues in Job 24 that God pays no attention to the prayer of the vulnerable innocent members of society (Job 24:12). The wicked continue to oppress the vulnerable, yet God does not rescue them. Job assumes the role of the plaintiff. He uses specific examples of the powerful oppressing the vulnerable in ways that Deuteronomy prohibits, but God does not seem to care.

Corruptions in the text appear to begin in Job 24. As the texts stands, Job goes back and forth between contradictory arguments. I covered the critical issues of Job 24 on page 25. Job 24:1–17 is the end of the useable portion of Job’s speeches before Job’s monologue (Job 29–31).

The Broken Cycle (Job 26–28)

Job’s speeches from Job 26–28 do not fit into Job’s character arc, and most interpreters deem them to be spurious for one reason or another.⁵⁶ Job 27:1–10 is an exception to this. However, there is not enough material in this section to make strong

55. Georg Braulik, “Das Deuteronomium and die Bücher Ijob, Sprichwörter, Rut,” in *Die Tora Als Kanon für Juden und Christen*, Ed. E. Zenger (Freiburg: Herder, 1996), 61–138.

56. See the discussion of these texts beginning on 22; see Gray, *The Book of Job*, 325.

conclusions about a progression of Job's argument. Additionally, establishing a dialogue between Job 27:1–10 and the friends is difficult. It is entirely possible that Job 27:11–23 belongs to Zophar, who otherwise failed to speak during the third cycle.⁵⁷ Thus one might ask if Job 27:11–23 serves as a response to Job 27:1–10. Job 27:1–10 fits best within the language of the second cycle but also carries elements of the first and third cycles.

Job's Monologue (Job 29–31)

Job's monologue contains many of the elements that are present in the three cycles. Job laments losing his former social status and wealth (Job 29:1–10), complains about the way God has treated him (Job 30:21–23), and argues for his innocence (Job 31:1–40). I do not believe that Job is rehashing his arguments from his previous speeches systematically, but thematically Job has not radically changed his position. Job still affirms a form of the retributive justice principle, but believes that God has misappropriated it in his case.⁵⁸ Thus Job's argument has not developed, but Job's demeanor has developed. Job has become bolder toward God, but also more calculated in his words. The raw emotion found in Job 3 and Job 16 has subsided, but Job's regained composure allows him to articulate his position more clearly than before and thus to challenge God more directly. As Newsom argues, Job's words in Job 29–31 represent a better relationship with language than in the previous material.⁵⁹ Job is able to use language more to his advantage.

57. Dhorme amends the text to introduce Zophar as the speaker at the end of Job 27:12. The lack of introduction of any character until Job 29:1 implies then that Zophar is responsible for the *Wisdom Speech* (Job 28). See Dhorme, *A Commentary on the Book of Job*, 386.

58. Greenstein, "The Problem of Evil in the Book of Job," 338.

59. Newsom, *The Book of Job: A Contest of Moral Imaginations*, 183.

Job's speeches come to a dramatic crescendo with the full implementation of the legal metaphor in Job 31.⁶⁰ Job lays out his case before God and believes that there is no evidence against him. He believes that the divine court will surely acquit him. The formal presentation of evidence demonstrates a legal code most similar to Deuteronomy, which I will demonstrate on page 114. The infractions in which Job claims innocence are from Deuteronomy, and Job calls down curses on himself if he has infringed these laws in the style of Deuteronomy 28.

Job, the Friends, and Retribution

As I have demonstrated, Job is unwilling to depart entirely from a system of retribution in his rhetoric. While Job challenges the traditional understandings of retributive justice, the majority of his arguments assume retributive justice at some level. The friends, however, do not adjust their rhetoric significantly through the dialogue. They maintain a system of retributive justice in their rhetoric that is universal and rigid. This applies more broadly than punishment because they tell Job that repentance will bring him even greater wealth and blessings (Job 8:5–7; 11:13–19; 22:21). Job, his friends, and Deuteronomy disagree, but they disagree on the extent of retributive justice, not the existence of retributive justice.⁶¹

The Friends on Retributive Justice

The characters are not Israelite, and placing them in the context of Israelite covenant would be strange; thus the friends argue for a system of retribution that is

60. Dick, "The Legal Metaphor in Job 31," 38.

61. For a discussion of Deuteronomy's view of retributive justice see the material beginning on 50.

independent from covenant. Eliphaz begins this argument in his first speech, implying that the innocent never perish⁶² and, conversely, that God always destroys the wicked.

זָכַרְנָא מִי הוּא נִקְי אֲבָד וְאִיפָּה יִשָּׁרִים נִכְחָדוּ:
כַּאֲשֶׁר רָאִיתִי תְּרָשִׁי אֲנִי וְזָרְעִי עָמַל קִצְרָהוּ:
מִנְשַׁמַּת אֱלֹהִים יֵאָבְדוּ וּמְרוּחַ אִפּוֹ יִכָּלוּ:

Consider this: Who is he that is innocent and has perished? Have the upright ever been cutoff? As I have seen, those plowing and sowing iniquity reap it as trouble. By the breath of God, they perish and by the wind of God's nostrils they come to an end. (Job 4:7–9)

Bildad and Zophar agree with Eliphaz on this point (Job 8:3, 20; 11:20). However, Eliphaz hedges his rhetoric with a caveat by implying that humans cannot actually be innocent and deserve good things. Eliphaz asks, הַאֲנוּשׁ מֵאֱלֹהִים יִצְדֵּק אִם מֵעֲשָׂהוּ? טָהֳרָה־גִבּוֹר׃ (“Can a human be righteous before God? How can a man be pure before his maker?” [Job 4:17; cf. 4:18–21; 15:14–16]).⁶³ This caveat liberates Eliphaz from needing to explain the suffering of any given individual, including Job. When taken to its logical conclusion, Eliphaz's caveat makes good things the injustice of the world. All would deserve punishment, and those not receiving punishment would be outside of the retributive justice of God.⁶⁴ Bildad's final speech concurs with Eliphaz's caveat (Job 25:4).⁶⁵

The weight of the argument of the friends is that the wicked suffer and come to an end.⁶⁶ The friends do not spend a large amount of time defending Eliphaz's suggestion that the innocent never perish (Job 4:7). Consequently, they do not address Job's

62. Note the stark contrast with Deuteronomy, which has significant anxiety about innocent blood (Deut 19:5, 10, 13; 21:8–9). For a discussion of innocent blood in Deuteronomy see 55.

63. Gray, *The Book of Job*, 148; Seow, *Job 1–21*, 389.

64. David Clines, “Job 5, 1–8: A New Exegesis,” *Bib.* 62 (1981): 189.

65. Gray, *The Book of Job*, 325.

66. Newsom, *The Book of Job: A Contest of Moral Imaginations*, 116.

situation, but only his rhetoric. The dialogue quickly ends as a means to comfort the suffering Job and becomes a conversation on theodicy. Bildad is the most obsessed with the destruction of the wicked, as he spends the majority of his first and second speeches asserting this (Job 8:11–19; 18:5–21). Zophar addresses this in his first speech (Job 11:11–12, 20) and devotes the entirety of his second speech to this (Job 20:5–29). Eliphaz spends the second half of his second speech on the ill fate of the wicked (Job 15:20–35), but he addresses this concept in each of his speeches (Job 5:3–6; 22:15–16). Eliphaz is the only one of the three friends that spends a significant amount of time on the innocent receiving good things (5:11, 15–16), but it is still not the crux of his argument.

The friends lack significant discussion about the marginalized members of society, about which Deuteronomy is deeply concerned.⁶⁷ Conversely, Job appears significantly concerned about these demographics.⁶⁸ Eliphaz provides the most discussion of these demographics (Job 5:15–16; 22:9), but even his discussion is brief.⁶⁹ Due to the lack of discussion of these categories, it is difficult to determine whether the friends view the poor as receiving just punishment for sin, as they view Job. In the least, Eliphaz and Zophar depict the mistreatment of these people as injustice (Job 20:19; 22:9). Eliphaz insinuates that God protects the poor and needy (Job 5:15–16), which may erode a concept of inflexible retributive justice. If the poor are righteous enough to merit God's protection, why are they poor? It is possible that Eliphaz believes that being poor turns

67. For a discussion on Deuteronomy's concern for marginalized members of society, see the material beginning on 38.

68. For a discussion on Job's concern for marginalized members of society, see the material beginning on 69.

69. Zophar uses seeking the favor of the poor as an example of social embarrassment for the children of the wicked (Job 22:10).

one to God and at that point they merit God’s protection. As Newsom points out, “How or why the lowly came to be lowly is not part of the story.”⁷⁰ The greater emphasis in Eliphaz’s argument is the transformation of individuals in the favor of God.⁷¹ The brevity of Eliphaz’s discussion prohibits clarity on the matter.

The view of the friends concerning retribution is universal. Their understanding departs significantly from Deuteronomy’s by their application of the retributive justice principle to all peoples everywhere. They see no need for covenant to bind people to God’s justice. The friends claim that their wisdom is from the ancient times, relying on the *Myth of Adapa* or a similar story.⁷² According to the myth, Adapa was the wisest of mortal humans and among the first generation of humans. “[Ea] made broad understanding perfect in [Adapa] to disclose the design of the land. To him he gave wisdom, but did not give eternal life” (Adapa 3–4).⁷³ This compares to Eliphaz’s logic in Job 15.

הֲרֵאִישׁוֹן אָדָם תִּנְלָד וְלִפְנֵי גְבַעוֹת חוֹלְלָתָּ:
הֲבִסּוֹד אֱלֹהִים תִּשְׁמָע וְתִגְרַע אֵלַיִךְ חִכְמָה:
מִהֲיָדַעְתָּ וְלֹא גִדַּע תִּבְיִן וְלֹא־עֲמַנּוּ הוּא:
גַּם־שָׁב גַּם־יָשִׁישׁ בָּנוּ כִּבִּיר מֵאֲבִיךָ יָמִים:

Are you the first human born? And were you delivered before the hills? Have you listened in on the council of God? And have you limited wisdom to yourself? What do you know that we do not? Or what do you understand that is not with us? Also gray hair and age are with us—those with greater days than your father. (Job 15:7–10)

70. Newsom, “Job and His Friends,” 241.

71. Ibid.

72. Seow, *Job 1–21*, 700.

73. Stephanie Dalley, *Myths from Mesopotamia: Creation, the Flood, Gilgamesh, and Others* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), 184.

By this reasoning, retributive justice is part of the fabric of the universe by which God rules all of humanity. Thus the friends see no need for an enactment of covenant for a retributive justice system.

The understanding of the friends departs from Deuteronomy in a second way in that they are unwilling to acknowledge exceptions to the principle. Either an uncompromised application of the retributive justice principle or the severity of Job's situation prevents them from acknowledging Job's case as an exception to retributive justice. If the severity of Job's suffering precludes the possibility that Job is an exception to retributive justice in the view of the friends, Deuteronomy was not the source material for such a conviction. As I argued beginning on page 51, Deuteronomy allows exceptions to the retributive justice principle, even in cases of extreme suffering. Deuteronomy prescribes extreme punishment for Israel if Israel breaches the covenant, but this does not apply to Job.⁷⁴

When taking the dialogue in isolation, whether Job is an exception to retributive justice is the word of the friends versus the word of Job. Job's words concerning his innocence are stronger than the words of the friends declaring him guilty. When read as an entire book, it is clear that Job is an exception to retributive justice.⁷⁵ The prologue describes Job as blameless and upright (Job 1:1). The friends and Job agree that it appears that God has laid a guilty verdict against Job.⁷⁶ However, they disagree whether Job

74. See 59–62.

75. Tsevat, "The Meaning of the Book of Job," 74.

76. Dick, "The Legal Metaphor in Job 31," 39; Scholnick, "The Meaning of Mišpāṭ (Justice) in the Book of Job," 352.

merited that verdict.⁷⁷ If the friends would allow exceptions to retributive justice, the severity of Job's calamity has precluded his case from being such an exception.⁷⁸ However, they do not express this. They continue to assert that God fully orders the world according to a rigid retributive justice.

Job's Understanding of Retributive Justice

As discussed on page 80, Job still holds some version of retributive justice at the end of his speeches. His precise view of retributive justice is not clear because his experiences have changed him significantly. What is clear is that Job believes his actions could not have merited a guilty verdict (Job 31).⁷⁹ The dialogue casts the suffering of Job as the sentencing from a verdict, but the narrative casts the suffering as the trial of the allegations that Job serves God for profit. Either way, Job perceives a breakdown in a rigid retributive justice system. Assuming that Job has not sinned in the dialogue, either way a rigid retributive justice system has broken down or never existed from the beginning.⁸⁰

Some evidence exists for Job's never having embraced a rigid retributive justice system. Job implies an expectation that God has a special concern for the poor and needy, yet believes that God does not fulfill these expectations (Job 24:12). A special concern

77. Greenstein, "The Problem of Evil in the Book of Job," 338.

78. It is not entirely clear what is Job's calamity in the dialogue. The dialogue is conflicted about the state of Job's children. Bildad seems to allude to their deaths (Job 8:4), but Job depicts ostracism between him and his children (Job 19:17). In both accounts, Job's wife survives (Job 2:9; 19:17), Job has severe physical maladies (Job 2:8; 30:17, 30) and a loss of social status (Job 2:12; 29:1–10). See Roberts, "Job and the Israelite Religious Tradition," 112.

79. Greenstein, "The Problem of Evil in the Book of Job," 338.

80. Tsevat, "The Meaning of the Book of Job," 74.

for the poor and needy on God's part undermines a rigid retributive justice system. For, if all receive according to their actions and the poor are innocent, they would no longer be poor or needy. God would give them wealth. The expectation that God should have a special concern for the poor and needy appears to be part of Job's disintegrating worldview. It was a position that Job believed before his calamity challenged his view of the world. However, as with Eliphaz, how the poor and needy became disenfranchised is not part of the story.⁸¹ Job transitions his lament for the oppressed, poor, and disenfranchised in Job 24 to further exploration of the fate of the wicked. Not only do righteous people continue to suffer, but also it is at the hand of the wicked.

Job clings to a hope of some system of retributive justice because that is his only hope for relief of suffering.⁸² Job knows that he is innocent; thus retributive justice should play in his favor. His experiences have taught him that any system of retributive justice cannot be rigid and inflexible. Sometimes good people suffer and the wicked go unpunished, and Job knows this firsthand. However, Job 31 illustrates that Job longs for a world similar to the depiction of Deuteronomy 28. In Job 31, it appears that Job affirms a retributive justice like Deuteronomy's version. I examine precise intertextual connections between Job 31 and Deuteronomy beginning on page 114. Deuteronomy 28 presents a world where right actions are motivated by covenant curses (Deut 28:15–68). These conditional curses go into effect only if Israel breaches the covenant. In Job 31, Job attempts to apply a similar formula retroactively. If Job has sinned, he calls down curses on himself. It illustrates how confident Job is concerning his innocence.

81. Newsom, "Job and His Friends," 241.

82. Greenstein, "The Problem of Evil in the Book of Job," 343.

Job 31 is not a prolonged rhetorical dismantling of retributive justice. While it is not clear where the monologue of Job should begin due to possible corruptions in the text, Job 29 marks a clear return of the protagonist's voice. Job 29–31 is a monologue in which the friends are no longer the addressees.⁸³ While it is not clear that God is the addressee, God hears Job's request for an answer in Job 31:35 and speaks in Job 38–41. Since the friends are not the addressees of Job 29–31, they do not respond to these speeches. If Elihu is an interloper,⁸⁴ Yhwh responds to Job's monologue. If the three friends were the addressees of Job's monologue, Job's rhetoric would appear as sarcastic ridicule of retributive justice, but this is not the case. As an address to God or no one, Job 31 appears to function as a plea for retributive justice to return.

Thus Job 31 evidences a view of retributive justice where justice is an expectation, but injustice persists. Yet Job continues to hope that injustice in his situation may become right again. There is resonance with Deuteronomy's version of retributive justice on this point. Deuteronomy views the case of the orphan, widow, and poor as persistent injustice. If the community upholds the divinely sanctioned social ethic, there is hope for things to become right again. However, even in the restoration of justice in unjust situations the retributive justice principle is not rigid. Justice appears in other forms than direct reversal of injustice. Bereaved orphans and widows receive care, not the restoration of their spouses and parents. The bereaved Job cannot receive his children

83. Newsom, *The Book of Job: A Contest of Moral Imaginations*, 183.

84. For a brief discussion of the Elihu material, see 25.

back, but he may have other children, his physical suffering may end, and he may recover his social position (Job 42:10–17).⁸⁵

Concluding Thoughts on Retributive Justice in Job

As a masterpiece, the book of Job engages in many conversations. I doubt that there is one purpose or reason for the book of Job. Its complexities are too great to silo under one monolithic purpose. However, the question of retributive justice is integral to the book of Job.⁸⁶ While the prologue dismisses the possibility of Job's suffering as the result of retributive justice, the Satan's accusations against Job and God stem from a rigid retributive justice undermining piety.⁸⁷ The friends cannot imagine a world that does not conform to a rigid and universal application of that justice. Job's experience has greatly challenged his view of retributive justice, but he adopts a nuanced version of retributive justice rather than eschewing it altogether. Tsevat believes that the whole purpose of the book of Job is to remove any kind of retributive justice from the world.⁸⁸ I disagree with Tsevat, whose reading privileges the narratives but ignores the restoration of Job and retributive justice in the final narrative (Job 42:10–17).⁸⁹ Whether considering the narratives or not, retributive justice remains in the book of Job. However, it is clear that retributive justice does not explain Job's universe in its totality. Thus a rigid and

85. Hamilton, "Elite Lives," 72.

86. Tsevat, "The Meaning of the Book of Job," 97.

87. Greenstein, "The Problem of Evil in the Book of Job," 340.

88. Tsevat, "The Meaning of the Book of Job," 98.

89. Clines also concludes that the book of Job opposes retributive justice categorically, but acknowledges the problem with the final narrative. David Clines, "Job's Fifth Friend: An Ethical Critique of the Book of Job," *BiblInt* 12 (2004): 247.

uncompromising retributive justice is untenable, but this is not the position of Deuteronomy.

Job and Deuteronomy at Odds?

After an examination of the answers of both Deuteronomy and Job to questions of retributive justice, socio-religious expectations, and community, I conclude that the two books are not at odds with each other. Stultifying the Deuteronomist was not the purpose of Job as Frost suggested.⁹⁰ The two books do not support identical positions, but they show concordance in regard to socio-religious expectations. As I have argued, Job adopts a social ethic very similar to the social ethic of Deuteronomy. The temporal relationship between the books implies that the similarity of their social ethics is not haphazard. The author(s) of Job used Deuteronomy to create the character Job. While the books do not have identical positions, a careful reading of Job's speeches and Deuteronomy reveals more commonality between their positions than either does with the position of the friends. Both adopt a nuanced version of retributive justice that acknowledges the existence of persistent injustice. Job's Uzite heritage and Deuteronomy's Israelite focus cause some separation between the books. However, this separation is a difference of application more than a difference of understanding.

To elucidate the relationship between the speeches of Job and Deuteronomy further, I will investigate points of intertextual connection in the next chapter. As I will argue, examination of these intertextual connections shows further alignment and concordance with Deuteronomy and the speeches of Job.

90. Robert Frost, "A Masque of Reason," 475.

CHAPTER III
JOB MEETS MOSES: REFERENCES TO
DEUTERONOMY IN THE SPEECHES OF JOB

The connection between the speeches of Job and Deuteronomy moves beyond similarities in thought. As I demonstrated earlier,¹ it is plausible given the history of composition of the two books that Deuteronomy influenced Job. In this chapter, I demonstrate that the author(s) of Job specifically used texts from Deuteronomy. The texts of Job began a conversation with Deuteronomy—a conversation that continues when one reads Deuteronomy again after having read Job. I will examine the places where there is an apparent allusion or reference to Deuteronomy in the speeches of Job. The rhetorical use of the allusions and references illuminates the position that Job takes in regard to Deuteronomy. If Job uses references to deride or undermine Deuteronomy, one may assume that he has a negative view of the book. But if Job uses references and allusions in affirmation of the words of Deuteronomy, it is logical to assume that Job has a positive view of the book. I argue in this chapter that the allusions in the speeches of Job to Deuteronomy affirm and support Deuteronomy rather than deriding and deconstructing it.

1. See the discussion beginning on 5.

Defining Types of Author-Oriented Intertextuality

I have previously stated that I use a different definition for intertextuality from that of Julia Kristeva.² I mostly examine author-oriented intertextuality as opposed to reader-oriented intertextuality, which is where Kristeva focused.³ In order to further establish the level of connection between the speeches of Job and Deuteronomy, I will define various types of intertextual connections. Connections can occur without one text directly using the former text, but by shared source material. However, direct connections between texts are more interesting for this thesis. Due the temporal relationship between Job and Deuteronomy,⁴ I find it unlikely that the author(s) of Job could be unfamiliar or unaware of Deuteronomy. The types of intertextual connections I will seek to define are (1) direct quotations, (2) indirect quotations, (3) references, (4) allusions, and (5) thematic similarity. I list the characteristics of each type, but for each type, there will be exceptions to these characteristics. As a method of examining the rhetorical use of the intertextual connections, I will discuss the model Michael Fishbane proposed, Aggadic exegesis.

Types of Intertextual Connection

(1) Direct quotations are the most easily identifiable type of intertextual connection. To qualify as a direct quotation, a text must contain a significant amount of identical words and syntax from the former text. The latter text will frequently have

2. See 4.

3. Dell and Kynes, "Introduction," xxii.

4. For a discussion of the temporal relationship of the books, see 5–19.

explicit signposts marking the quotation.⁵ In the Hebrew Bible, a common signpost for a quotation is the infinitive construct from of the verb “to speak” (לְאָמַר). This word frequently denotes quotations from individuals or people rather than texts, but can denote quotations of texts, as in Jer 26:18, which quotes Mic 3:12.

מִיִּכָּה הַמּוֹרֶשִׁיתִי הָיָה נֹפֵא בְיַמֵּי חֲזַקְיָהוּ מֶלֶךְ־יְהוּדָה וַיֹּאמֶר אֶל־כָּל־עַם יְהוּדָה לֵאמֹר כֹּה־אָמַר יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת צִיּוֹן שָׂדֵה תִּחְרַשׁ וִירוּשָׁלַיִם עֵינִים תִּהְיֶה וְהָר הַבַּיִת לְבָמוֹת יַעַר:
Micah the Moreshite, who prophesied in the days of Hezekiah, king of Judah, and he said to all of the people of Judah saying, “Yhwh of hosts has said, ‘Zion shall be a plowed field, and Jerusalem shall be a heap, and the mountain of the house shall become a high place of a thicket.’” (Jer 26:18)

לְכֹן בְּגִלְלֶכֶם צִיּוֹן שָׂדֵה תִּחְרַשׁ וִירוּשָׁלַיִם עֵינֵינוּ תִּהְיֶה וְהָר הַבַּיִת לְבָמוֹת יַעַר:
Therefore, because of you, Zion shall be a plowed field, and Jerusalem shall be a heap, and the mountain of the house shall become a high place of a thicket. (Mic 3:12)

I am not aware of any texts in the book of Job that qualify as a direct quotation of another text.

(2) Although not as explicit as direct quotations, indirect quotations are relatively easy to identify. Indirect quotations contain similar wording and syntax to the former text, but may not be verbatim. Indirect quotations frequently contain subtle or no signposts marking the quotation. As Greenstein has argued, deictic pronouns may subtly indicate a quotation in the book of Job.⁶ In Job 18:5–6, Bildad indirectly quotes Proverbs.

גַּם אֹר רְשָׁעִים יִדְעָךְ וְלֹא־יִגָּה שְׂכִיב אִשׁוֹ:
אֹר חֲשֵׁךְ בְּאֶהְלֹו וְנֵרוֹ עָלָיו יִדְעָךְ:

Also the light of the wicked is extinguished, the flame of his fire does not shine, light darkens in his tent and his lamp is extinguished upon him. (Job 18:5–6)

אֹר־צַדִּיקִים יִשְׁמַח וְנֵר רְשָׁעִים יִדְעָךְ:

5. Michael Lyons, “I also Could Talk as You Do” Job 16:4: The Function of Intertextual Quotation and Allusion in Job,” in *Reading Job Intertextually*, LBH/OTS 574, ed. Katherine Dell and Will Kynes (New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2013), 170.

6. Edward Greenstein, “Truth or Theodicy: Speaking Truth to Power in the Book of Job,” *PSB* 27 (2006): 48.

The light of the righteous rejoices, the lamp of the wicked is extinguished. (Prov 13:9)

There are no explicit signposts, and the wording is not exact. However, the syntax and vocabulary are similar. Thus it qualifies as an indirect quotation. Indirect quotations may use synonyms to communicate the idea *mutatis mutandis*.

(3) References and (4) allusions are similar. In my definition, references are more explicit forms of intertextual connection than allusions. A reference may use similar words but will make clear connection to the former text and will frequently use signposts to indicate the connection. An allusion is frequently a vague form of intertextuality. Allusions may use a few similar words but will not contain explicit signposts marking the allusion.⁷ Job 7:17 alludes to Psalm 8.

מַה־אֲנוֹשׁ כִּי תִגְדָּלְנוּ וְכִי־תִשִּׁית אֱלֹהֵי לְבָבְךָ:

What is humanity that you magnify it, that you set your heart to it? (Job 7:17)

מַה־אֲנוֹשׁ כִּי־תִזְכְּרֵנוּ וְיָבֹא־אֵלֶיךָ כִּי תִפְקַדְנוּ:

What is humanity that you remember it, the son of a human that you visit him?
(Ps 8:5 [8:4 English])

While the connection between the two verses is strong, there are lexical and syntactic differences that prevent it from qualifying as an indirect quotation.⁸ Additionally, Job 7:17 carries no signposts indicating that this may be a quotation. Readers unfamiliar with Psalm 8 will probably be unaware of an intertextual connection.

When discussing the innocence of Job, Elihu in Job 34:5–6 refers to Job 9:2, 15.

כִּי־אָמַר אֲנִי אֵיבֹב צָדִיקָתִי וְאֵל הַסִּיר מִשְׁפָּטִי:

עַל־מִשְׁפָּטִי אֶכְזָב אֲנוֹשׁ חֲצִי בְלִי־פָשַׁע:

For Job has said, “I am innocent, and God has denied my justice. In (upon) my justice, I am considered a liar. My wound from an arrow is incurable, but I am without transgression.” (Job 34:5–6)

7. Lyons, “I also Could Talk as You Do,” 171.

8. Fishbane, *Biblical Exegesis in Ancient Israel*, 285.

אַמְנֵם יָדַעְתִּי כִּי־כֵן וּמִה־יִצְדַק אֲנִי עִם־אֱלֹהִים:

Surely, I know it is true, how can a mortal be innocent with God? (Job 9:2).

אֲשֶׁר אִם־צִדְקוֹתַי לֹא אָעִנָּה לְמִשְׁפָּטַי אֶתְחַנֵּן:

Though I am innocent, I will not answer him. I shall seek mercy from my judge. (Job 9:15).

The reference carries close connection, some common vocabulary, and the speaker of the words has used a clear signpost to demarcate the reference, but the words have significant syntactical differences. Thus this connection qualifies as a reference. Connections may qualify as a reference if the latter text addresses the former text specifically. Whereas, it may be an allusion if the latter text uses only the language or ideas of the former, but does not address the former specifically.

(5) Thematic similarity is the vaguest form of intertextuality. Thematic similarity relies on concepts and themes for intertextual connectedness. Thematic similarity will contain few, if any, signposts demarcating the intertextual connection. The connection will usually lack shared syntax or vocabulary. Job 27:13–23 contains thematic similarity with Deuteronomy 28:15–68. Job 27 lacks signposts demarcating the connection, significant shared syntax, and significant shared vocabulary. Claiming a direction of influence based on thematic similarity is difficult, and strong connections are difficult to demonstrate. A reader-oriented intertextuality is frequently more useful with this type of connection.

Michael Fishbane's Methodology of Aggadic Exegesis

“Aggadic exegesis” is a term used for certain types of rabbinic interpretation of texts.⁹ Fishbane is aware that using the term *Aggadic* is anachronistic with the Hebrew Bible, but he believes that it is analogous to the phenomenon that he otherwise identifies

9. Ibid., 281.

as “inner-biblical exegesis.” Fishbane argues that a biblical text referencing another text exegetically binds the latter text to the former text and that the latter almost certainly offers interpretation of the former. He claims that only a few texts in the Hebrew Bible contain explicit citations of other texts; thus the majority of cases are “implicit citations.”¹⁰ What Fishbane identifies as implicit citation is analogous to my definition of references and allusions. His definition also fits well within the scope of author-oriented intertextuality.

Many cases of intertextuality between Deuteronomy and the speeches of Job fit within Fishbane’s model of Aggadic exegesis. However, it is not clear in every case that Job offers interpretation of the Deuteronomy text. Thus I do not believe that it applies unilaterally. Yet when Fishbane’s model applies, it offers the greatest insights into how the character Job views Deuteronomy. Thus Fishbane’s model will be important in the examination of intertextuality between the speeches of Job and Deuteronomy.

Specific Examples of Intertextual Connections: Job and Deuteronomy

As stated before, the intertextual connections between the speeches of Job and Deuteronomy are concentrated in the third cycle (Job 21–25) and Job’s concluding monologue (Job 29–31). Thus I briefly examine the intertextual connections appearing prior to Job 21. Job 21, 24, 29, and 31 have the most connections, and I devote the majority of time to these chapters and address them sequentially.

10. *Ibid.*, 284–85.

Possible References to Deuteronomy in the First and Second Cycles

Intertextual connections between the speeches of Job and Deuteronomy are relatively few before Job 21. A possible allusion to Deuteronomy is in Job 6:22, where Job says: הֲכִי־אָמַרְתִּי הִבּוּ לִי אִמְכַתְּכֶם שְׂחָדוּ בְעַדִּי: (“Have I said, ‘Give to me!’ or, ‘From your power offer me a bribe!’?”). Deuteronomy 10:17; 16:19; 27:29 condemn bribery, which is the strongest connection to Israelite legal code. However, Proverbs, Psalms, and various prophets widely condemn the practice (Isa 1:23; 5:23; Ezek 22:12; Amos 5:12; Mic 3:11; 7:3; Ps 15:5; 26:10 Prov 6:35; 15:27; 17:23). C. L. Seow does not believe that Job refers to bribery here.¹¹ John Gray agrees that this verse is about bribery.¹² There is a lack of specific lexical connections; thus this may categorize as an allusion. The best supporting evidence that this example is an allusion to Deuteronomy is the abundant references and allusions to Deuteronomy in subsequent chapters. This example is tenuous at best.

In one of Job’s possibly snide affirmations of retributive justice, he may allude to the curses of Deuteronomy 28. Job claims, לְחַלֵּק נִגִּיד רְעִים וְעֵינָי בְּנֵי תִכְלָנָה: (“Those who denounce their friend for gain, the eyes of their children will fail” [Job 17:5]). The book of Job uses the image of failing eyes multiple times (Job 11:20; 17:5; 31:16). Each time may be a reference to Deut 28:65, but the first example is on the lips of Zophar, and the final example is not in affirmation of retributive justice. וְנָתַם יְהוָה לְךָ . . . וְכָלִיוֹן עֵינָי (“Yhwh will give you . . . failing eyes.” [Deut 28:65]). The image of failing eyes appears elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible (Jer 14:6; Ps 119:82, 123; Lam 4:17), but it occurs as

11. Seow, *Job 1–21*, 481.

12. Gray, *The Book of Job*, 175.

direct punishment from God in Job and Deuteronomy alone.¹³ Deut 28:65 represents the strongest connection outside of the book of Job to Job 17:5.¹⁴ However, the connection is not especially strong.

The presence of another possible connection to the curses of Deuteronomy 28 in the next verse strengthens the connection. Job claims, וְהִצַּגְנִי לְמַשָּׁל עַמִּים (“[God] has made me a byword for peoples” [Job 17:6]).¹⁵ This is one of the curses that Deuteronomy promises to Israel if they turn from Yhwh. וְהָיִיתָ לְשִׂמָּה לְמַשָּׁל (“You shall become an object of horror, a byword” [Deut 28:37a]). However, this phraseology is common in the Hebrew Bible (Jer 24:9; Ps 44:15 [44:14 English]; 69:12 [69:11 English]; 2 Chron 7:20 et al.).¹⁶

Since Job 17 has juxtaposed two possible allusions to Deuteronomy 28, it is possible that these also are allusions to Deuteronomy. The author(s) of Job juxtapose(s) allusions to texts relatively close to each other in Deuteronomy in other locations, which I discuss on page 110. However, the case for these two verses containing allusions to Deuteronomy is not strong. In the context of Job 17, Job alludes to the concept of retributive justice. Both possible allusions to Deuteronomy also come from the context of retributive justice. Fishbane’s model would be interesting in the case of Job 17 and Deuteronomy 28. However, a lack of information prohibits clarity concerning how Job 17 might interpret Deuteronomy 28.

13. A similar usage appears in Jer 14:6. It appears to be indirect punishment from God.

14. Wolfers, *Deep Things out of Darkness*, 281.

15. This reading requires a repointing of מַשָּׁל.

16. Dhorme, *A Commentary on the Book of Job*, 246; Seow, *Job 1–21*, 756; Gray, *The Book of Job*, 259.

Prosperity of the Wicked: Job 21

Job repeatedly brings up the prosperity of the wicked in his argument with the friends. On this point, Job and the friends talk past each other. The friends insist that the wicked perish. Job depicts the wicked as living in peace and prosperity (Job 21:7–13). Several of the images that Job uses to depict this prosperity are productive images in Deuteronomy.¹⁷ A distinctive image concerns the reproductive abilities of cattle. שׁוֹרוֹ וְעֵשְׂתָרֶת צֹאנָהּ עַל הָאֲדָמָה אֲשֶׁר־נִשְׁבַּע לְאַבְתָּיִךְ לְתֵת לְךָ: בְּרוּיֹה תִהְיֶה מִכָּל־הָעַמִּים לֹא־יִהְיֶה בְּךָ עָקָר וְעִקְרָה וּבְבָהֶמְתֶּךָ: [Yhwh] will love you, bless you, and multiply you. He will bless the fruit of your womb, your land, your grain, your new wine, *the offspring of your cattle*, and the increase of your flock upon the land which he swore to your ancestors to give to you. You will be blessed more than all the peoples, and there will *not be barrenness among you or your livestock*. (Deut 7:13–14)¹⁸ and twice negatively (Deut 28:18, 51). The strongest connection is to Deut 7:13–14.

וְאַהֲבֶנּוּ וּבִרְכּוּ וְהִרְבּוּ וּבִרְכּוּ פְרִי־בִטְנֶנּוּ וּפְרִי־אֲדָמָתֶךָ דִּגְנֶנּוּ וְתִירְשֶׁנּוּ וְיִצְהָרְךָ שְׂגַר־אֶלְפֵיֶיךָ
וְעֵשְׂתָרֶת צֹאנָהּ עַל הָאֲדָמָה אֲשֶׁר־נִשְׁבַּע לְאַבְתָּיִךְ לְתֵת לְךָ:
בְּרוּיֹה תִהְיֶה מִכָּל־הָעַמִּים לֹא־יִהְיֶה בְּךָ עָקָר וְעִקְרָה וּבְבָהֶמְתֶּךָ:
[Yhwh] will love you, bless you, and multiply you. He will bless the fruit of your
womb, your land, your grain, your new wine, *the offspring of your cattle*, and the
increase of your flock upon the land which he swore to your ancestors to give to
you. You will be blessed more than all the peoples, and there will *not be*
barrenness among you or your livestock. (Deut 7:13–14)

Job connects the state of the wicked to the blessings of Yhwh in Deuteronomy. The passages bear further similarity in discussing the establishment of children (Job 21:8, 10, cf. Deut 7:13–14).

This case of intertextual connection qualifies as an allusion. However, it is an allusion to a Deuteronomic theme more than a specific passage. Within the Hebrew

17. Seow, *Job 1–21*, 870.

18. Clines and Habel note the similarity to Deut 28:4, but not 7:13–14, which is the stronger connection. See Clines, *Job 21–37*, 526; Norman Habel, *The Book of Job*, OTL 7 (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1985), 327.

Bible, this blessing on the prevention of cattle barrenness/miscarriage is nearly unique to Deuteronomy.¹⁹ The correlation is strong enough to conclude that Deuteronomy influenced Job in this passage, but the lack of specific lexical connections prevents it from being a direct connection to a particular passage.²⁰ It is not clear whether Job wishes to deride Deuteronomy's vision of prosperity by applying it to the wicked or if Job laments the loss of Deuteronomy's ideals. In either case, Job is despondent that the blessings Deuteronomy prescribed for the righteous have come to the wicked. Without Deuteronomy, the general prosperity of the wicked may be an injustice, but not these Deuteronomic images of blessing that comes on the wicked.

Storing Up Calamity for Children?

Job contests the concept of transgenerational retribution.²¹ אֱלֹהִים יִצְפֹּן-לְבָנָיו אֲוִנוֹ ("God stores up his [the wicked person's] calamity for his [the wicked person's] children. Let him [God] repay [it] to him [the wicked person], and he [the wicked person] will know" [Job 21:19]). While not quoting from Deuteronomy, this text bears similarity to Yhwh's self-revelation formula used in the Decalogue.

לֹא-תִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה לָהֶם וְלֹא תַעֲבֹדֵם כִּי אֲנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ אֵל קַנָּא פֹקֵד עֵוֹן אָבוֹת עַל-בָּנִים
וְעַל-שְׁלֹשִׁים וְעַל-רְבָעִים לְשִׁנָּאִי:

You shall not bow down to them and you shall not serve them. For I, Yhwh your God, am a jealous God, *visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children* and upon the third and fourth generation of those who hate me. (Deut 5:9; cf. Exod 20:5–6; 34:7; Num 14:18)

19. Ps 107:38 contains a similar phrase about cattle not diminishing. Ps 144:13–14 also contains similar language. Other texts use the multiplication of flocks and herds to show divine favor (Gen 30:25–43). The key connection is in the concept that cattle never miscarry and are never barren.

20. Job uses different words for bull (שׁוֹר) and heifer (פָּרָה) than Deuteronomy (אֵלֶּיךָ, בְּהֵמָה).

21. Seow, *Job 1–21*, 873.

Newsom believes that Job brings up this concept to address a potential objection to his argument.²² The friends have not claimed that God punishes the children of the wicked instead of the wicked, as Job seems to imply, but that punishment for the children of the wicked is an extension of their punishment.²³ However, Job contests such a possibility as not being punishment at all (Job 21:21), and therefore unjust.

The concept of transgenerational retribution is common in the Hebrew Bible.²⁴ However, it is uncommon in the ancient Near East,²⁵ thus strengthening the case that Job and his friends refer to the Hebrew concept.²⁶ One possible example of this concept from a non-Israelite source is the account of a plague that oppressed the Hittites during the reign of Mursilis II.²⁷ Mursilis II makes several prayers asking the various deities to have mercy. After much supplication to the storm deities and other protection deities, Mursilis II claims he found two ancient tablets that describe the neglect of sacrifices to the deity of the Mala river, and the second describes the transgression of a treaty between the Hittites and the Egyptians, which the storm deity had ratified (CTH 378.II.3–4).²⁸ Mursilis II in a later prayer claims that he and his reign are innocent from the transgressions that seem to be causing the plague (CTH 379.8), claiming that he did not change the treaty, and that

22. Carol Newsom, “The Book of Job,” *NIB* 4:493. See also Clines, *Job 21–37*, 529.

23. Newsom, “The Book of Job,” 493.

24. *Ibid.*

25. Moshe Weinfeld discusses the appearance of this phenomenon in Greek literature. See Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1–11*, 298.

26. This gives credibility to Edouard Dhorme’s case that the friends actually posit Israelite wisdom despite having non-Israelite nationalities. Dhorme, *A Commentary on the Book of Job*, cxiv.

27. Robin C. Cover, “Sin, Sinners (OT),” *ABD* 6:31–40.

28. For an English translation and introduction to these texts, see Itamar Singer, *Hittite Prayers*, ed. Harry A. Hoffner (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2002), 57–61, 66–69.

he was only a child when his father attacked some Egyptian outposts (CTH 379.12). For Mursilis II, the concept of transgenerational retribution is unjust; however, he does not make accusation against the deities, as Job does, but only argues for his innocence.

In the case of the Hittite plague, transgenerational retribution appears to be an anomaly, and the Hittites viewed it as unjust. When Job and his friends refer to the concept of transgenerational retribution, their notions fit the concept found in the Hebrew Bible, notably, the self-revelation formula (Deut 5:9). Other sections of the Hebrew Bible, picking up the motif of transgenerational retribution, either claim that this practice shall cease (e.g. Jer 31:27–30, Ezek 18:1–32) or seem to refer to Deuteronomy (2 Kgs 14:6). In this case, it is highly likely that the book of Job refers to Deuteronomy or related texts also using Deuteronomy.²⁹

In the Hebrew Bible, only Job contests transgenerational retribution as being unjust (Job 21:20–21).³⁰ However, Deuteronomy only uses the principle of transgenerational retribution to describe the nature of God;³¹ it strictly prohibits humans from punishing children for the sin of their parents or vice-versa (Deut 24:16).³² Yet it is God's justice that Job decries as unjust. If Job is contesting the words of the divine self-revelation formula, it is a startling rhetorical move. It demonstrates that Job's sufferings

29. See Exod 20:5; 34:7. Both texts likely post-date Deuteronomy.

30. Two prophetic texts raise the issue of the transgenerational retribution outside of the Torah (Jer 31:27–30; Ezek 18:1–32) but neither challenges its justice. Both depict God's declaring the ending of this principle for divine retribution. Other texts raise the issue, but do not challenge its legitimacy.

31. The emphasis in the self-revelation formula is the extension of Yhwh's mercy far beyond his punishment. His mercy extends to a thousand generations, while his judgment only to three or four generations. See William Propp, *Exodus 19–40*, ABC:2a (New York: Doubleday, 2006), 611.

32. Pope, *Job*, 145.

have moved him to a place where he is willing to challenge the justice of Decalogue and the divine self-revelation formula. Perhaps the rhetorical advantage of this challenge is the shock that readers would feel by Job's boldness. However, even with this rhetorical move, Job is not categorically rejecting the words of Deuteronomy.

Deuteronomy is conflicted concerning transgenerational retribution, and even contradicts the words of the self-revelation formula concerning Yhwh's actions.

וּמְשַׁלֵּם לְשׂוֹנְאָיו אֶל-פָּנָיו לְהַאֲבִידוֹ לֹא יִאָּחַר לְשׂוֹנְאוֹ אֶל-פָּנָיו יִשְׁלַם-לוֹ:
[Yhwh] repays the ones hating him to his person to put him to death. He does not delay. He repays directly to the person of the one hating him. (Deut 7:10)³³

Job is aware of both traditions within Deuteronomy concerning Yhwh's execution of transgenerational retribution, and clearly prefers the claims of Deut 7:9–10 over Deut 5:9.³⁴ Examining the connection through Fishbane's model implies that Job comments on the internal conversation of Deuteronomy on this matter and chooses a side of the argument, bolstering Deut 7:9–10. He did not reject the words or authority of Deuteronomy itself.

Job's stance reflects greater alignment with Deuteronomy than with other books of the Torah commenting on transgenerational retribution. Exodus 34:7 and Num 14:18 each claim that Yhwh does visit the sins of the ancestors on the children. Leviticus 26:39–40 holds a middle ground and claims that Yhwh will forgive the descendants if they repent. However, these descendants must confess the sins of their ancestors to attain forgiveness, thus they are still culpable for the sins of their ancestors. Deuteronomy 7:10

33. Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, 436–37.

34. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, 311.

makes the strongest claim among books of the Torah that Yhwh punishes only individuals for their sins³⁵—a position that Job views as the most just.

Job Refers to God's Commandment?

The most compelling evidence that Job respects Deuteronomy might be that he claims to respect it.

בְּאִשְׁרוֹ אֶתְּוָה רַגְלִי דָרְכּוֹ שְׁמֵרְתִי וְלֹא־אָטָּ:
מִצְוֹת שְׁפָתָיו וְלֹא אֶמְיֵשׁ מִחֻקֵּי צִפְנֹתַי אִמְרֵי־פִיו:

My foot has clung to his steps, I have kept his path, I have not wandered. I have not departed from the commandment of his lips. I have treasured the words of his mouth in my bosom. (Job 23:11–12)

Job's adoration of the divine mandates is most similar to Psalm 119, which also has connections to Deuteronomy. The most striking connection is the use of the word commandment (מִצְוָה).³⁶ While commandment (מִצְוָה) is prevalent in much of the Hebrew Bible, it appears with greatest frequency in Deuteronomy and is typical of Deuteronomic language.³⁷ Deuteronomy usually uses the term to refer to its own material (Deut 4:40; 7:11; 8:1; 10:13; 11:8, 13, 27–28; 13:18; 15:5; 19:9; 26:17; 27:10; 28:1; 30:8 et al.). Also striking as a potential connection is Job's reassurance of being committed to the way of God, which is also a strong motif in Deuteronomy (Deut 8:6, 11:22, 13:5, 19:9, 26:17, 28:9, 30:16). While this motif is present elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible, the distinctions between the two ways of life and death is essential to Deuteronomy (Deut 30:19).

35. Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, 436–37.

36. Witte, "Does the Torah Keep Its Promise?" 61.

37. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, 337.

Since the Joban dialogue contains an essentially Israelite religious perspective,³⁸ the presence of a Deuteronomic catchword in the Joban text implies connection to Deuteronomy. The reference is subtle, as this is the only mention of commandment (צִוִּיּוֹת) in the book of Job. Job does not elaborate on his thoughts about the commandments of God as the author(s) of Psalm 119 do/does. However, even in his agitated state, Job has some time to mention the value of God's commandments. The way he does this presents a connection to Deuteronomy.

Job, Justice, and Pledges: Job 24

Job's concept of justice bears similarity to laws from Deuteronomy. In Job 24:1–25, Job complains about the lack of justice from God because the guilty go unpunished. Job's first specific example of injustice is that some³⁹ move boundary stones (Job 24:2). The reference is to the practice of moving boundary markers, thus indicating that one owns some of his or her neighbor's land,⁴⁰ thus increasing one's own economic prospects and decreasing the economic prospects of a neighbor and possible competitor. Deuteronomy strictly prohibits this practice (Deut 19:14), as it is akin to stealing, which is one of the prohibitions from the Decalogue (Deut 5:19). Additionally, boundary stones demarcate the ancient tribal lands, and to move these stones is encroaching on another tribe's territory. However, not moving boundary stones is part of colloquial wisdom

38. I discussed and argued this beginning on page 65. See also Greenstein, "The Problem of Evil in the Book of Job," 336.

39. The subject of verse 2 is simply "they" in the Hebrew text. Since verse 2 contains no external subject, but only the conjugation of the verbs as third person plural, one must infer the subject from the context. The previous verse does not supply an acceptable subject. The actions of the subjects in verses 2–4 are crimes; thus NRSV supplies "the wicked," and other translators (ESV, NASB, NIV, et al.) provide "some," as the subject.

40. Clines, *Job 21–37*, 602.

about how to live a holy life (Prov 22:28, Hos 5:10), thus not providing firm evidence that Job refers to Deuteronomy. However, further examination of Job's illustrations of injustice demonstrates extensive alignment with Deuteronomy, thus showing it is a reference to Deuteronomy.

Job twice takes up the issue of taking a pledge (Job 24:3, 9). This refers to the practice of taking an object as collateral for a debt to ensure that the debtor will return the loaned money or item.⁴¹ Job claims: *יִתְקַבְּלוּ שׂוֹר אֶלְמָנָה* (“[The wicked] take the widow's ox as a pledge” [Job 24:3]). Deuteronomy does not prohibit the taking of an ox from a widow as a pledge. However, Deuteronomy prohibits the taking of a widow's garment as a pledge (Deut 24:17), and it makes some general commands about the care of widows and orphans in the surrounding verses. Deuteronomy does not give a reason for its prohibition against the taking of a garment from a widow as a pledge, but it gives a similar prohibition against keeping the garment of a poor person past sunset (Deut 24:3). Presumably, the poor person has no other garment to sleep in, and the text may assume that the same applies to the widow. Additionally, Deut 24:6 prohibits taking a mill or millstone in pledge because it would obstruct a person's livelihood. The same reasoning may apply to the ox of the widow.

Job assumes that taking an ox from a widow as pledge is an evil action.⁴²

Although Deuteronomy does not specifically prohibit this practice, it is oppressive to

41. H. A. Hoffner, “*חַבְּהַל* chābhal II,” *TDOT* 4: 181.

42. In the immediately preceding speech, Eliphaz accuses Job of taking pledges (Job 22:6) and oppressing widows and orphans (Job 22:9). Job does not seem to acknowledge that accusation in this passage, but he takes up similar themes of wickedness. However, Job claims to have remained righteous earlier in the speech (Job 23:11–12). See Clines, *Job 21–37*, 603. For a possible alternative explanation of Eliphaz's accusations, see 69n32.

vulnerable people within the society, and the law regarding pledges and widows is supposed to protect widows from such behavior. Deuteronomy 27:19 proclaims a curse on anyone depriving widows of justice. However, the Hebrew Bible does not take up the issue of taking pledges from a widow outside of Deuteronomy and Job. The wisdom material of the Hebrew Bible makes no prohibitions of requiring pledges and even encourages it in the case of foreigners (Prov 20:16; 27:13). Care of widows and the prohibition of oppressing widows are common motifs in the Hebrew Bible (Isa 1:17, Jer 7:6 Ezek 22:6 et al.), and many ancient Near Eastern cultures had laws prohibiting the oppression of widows.⁴³ However, the specific protection for widows from oppressive pledge practices is unique to Deuteronomy; not just in the Hebrew Bible, but ostensibly in the ancient Near East in general. I have found no evidence of similar laws concerning the protection of widows in regard to pledges in ancient Egypt,⁴⁴ and Babylonians in the late sixth-century BCE clearly took pledges from wealthy widows.⁴⁵ Therefore, it is likely that the Joban text refers to the laws of Deuteronomy. Job's specific example assumes that the widow is wealthy enough to own an ox, which means he finds this practice unacceptable for any socio-economic level, not just destitute widows. This grievance is not only about violating the proverbial calling not to oppress weak members of the society, but for Job, it is an infraction of his social ethic derived from Deuteronomy.

43. Lundbom, *Deuteronomy*, 695.

44. Pnina Galpaz-Feller, "The Widow in the Bible and in Ancient Egypt," *ZAW* 120 (2008) 231–58.

45. Martha T. Roth, "The Neo-Babylonian Widow," *JCS* 43–45 (1991–1993): 1–26.

The second time that Job raises the issue of taking pledges in this speech is a more horrific example. Job claims *וְעַל-עֲנֵי יִקְבְּלוּ* (“[The wicked] take children⁴⁶ of the afflicted as pledge” [Job 24:9]). This is rather explicit language concerning the wicked. A child as collateral is both an effective and cruel way to ensure debt repayment. Nowhere else in the Hebrew Bible does it specifically raise this issue; however, the practice is clearly oppressive. The vivid imagery from the first half of the verse illustrates the precise nature of their crimes. The language of “snatching” recalls in Deut 24:10 the prohibition of entering a house to take a pledge. Traditionally, the term orphan (*יָתוֹם*) in the Hebrew Bible designates the fatherless.⁴⁷ The text depicts the wicked as snatching orphan infants from breasts (Job 24:9a), indicating that these infants have mothers. Women with orphan children are usually widows in ancient Israelite culture, as divorce was permissible (Deut 24:1), but uncommon;⁴⁸ thus this is another example of people oppressing widows while also oppressing orphans, and Deuteronomy forbids both (Deut 27:19).

Job’s lament over the evil in the world continues by taking up the issue of the poor and needy lying naked at night (Job 24:7). With the context of people taking pledges from the vulnerable members of society, it is likely that Job is lamenting more than the poor’s lack of clothing. The wicked who continue to harm the vulnerable are not returning the pledged garments of the poor men and women before sunset as

46. This reading aligns with the emendation that the BHS editors suggest for Job 24:9. The emendation changes only vowel pointings and makes better sense of the parallelism.

47. Koehler and Baumgartner, “*יָתוֹם*,” *HALOT* 2:451.

48. Deut 23:17 prohibits Israelites from becoming cultic prostitutes and Exod 22:17 requires men to marry any virgin they seduce, thus ideally preventing children from being born out of wedlock and not having fathers. While practice likely differed from the laws of Deuteronomy and Exodus, bastard children are not the likely victims here.

Deuteronomy indicates they should do (Deut 24:3). Job laments for the social condition of the poor based on a similar vision of social justice that Deuteronomy upholds for the poor.

Another attribute of the oppressed in this lament of Job is that they are hungry even though they work in the fields, winepresses, and olive presses (Job 24:10–11). The wicked have broken two of Deuteronomy's laws regarding the poor. The workers should receive enough compensation for their labor in order to satisfy their most basic needs. It appears that the landowners are withholding the wages of their poor workers for either a later date or entirely. Deuteronomy specifically forbids this.

לֹא־תַעֲשֶׂק שֹׁכֵיר עֲנִי וְאֶבְיֹן מֵאַחֶיךָ אוֹ מִגֵּרְךָ אֲשֶׁר בְּאַרְצְךָ בְּשַׁעֲרֶיךָ:
 בְּיוֹמוֹ תִתֵּן שֹׁכְרוֹ וְלֹא־תִבּוֹא עָלָיו הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ כִּי עֲנִי הוּא וְאֵלָיו הוּא נֹשֵׂא אֶת־נַפְשׁוֹ וְלֹא־
 יִקְרָא עָלֶיךָ אֱלֹהֵי־הַיָּהוָה וְהָיָה כִּי תִטָּא:

Do not withhold wages from the afflicted or poor whether they are from your brothers or foreigners to you, who are in your land and in your gates. You shall give to each wages daily, and the sun shall not set [before you pay wages]. For he is afflicted and that is his way he is supporting his life. Then he would not cry out against you to Yhwh, and you would [not] be guilty. (Deut 24:14–15)

The close association of the two texts becomes even clearer when one examines the act of crying out. Job claims: “From the city the dying groan, the life of the wounded cries out, but God does not assign guilt” [Job 24:12]). Deuteronomy promises positive results for the poor and needy when they cry out against wealthy oppressors, but Job sees no evidence of this. Applying Fishbane's model, it appears that Job is casting Deuteronomy in a slightly negative light.⁴⁹ However, the charge is more direct towards God than towards Deuteronomy. Job wishes that Deuteronomy were right, but God does not appear to be living up to that standard.

49. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*, 281.

The landowners are breaking a second law found in Deuteronomy 24 by stripping their fields bare (Deut 24:19–21). The poor are clearly close enough to fields that they should be able to glean the remainder of the produce of the fields, but the landowners are preventing them from doing this; thus the poor are going hungry even though they are working in the fields of the wealthy landowners. Similar to the case of the garments, Job laments the lack of social justice that Deuteronomy depicts as appropriate for the poor.

The close connection between Job 24 and Deuteronomy 24 is striking.⁵⁰ The number of references and allusions in Job 24 to Deuteronomy 24 demonstrates a very high degree of likelihood that the Joban author(s) used this specific text. I find it unlikely that the number of close connections result from either chance or shared source traditions. Georg Braulik wrote about the connection between the texts and argued that Job 24 is aware of a developed Deuteronomy 24.⁵¹ I agree with Braulik. The strong connection to a specific section of text in Deuteronomy illustrates direct literary dependence. Job laments far more than the transgressions of proverbial social ethics; he also laments the loss of Deuteronomy's social ethic.

The Song of Moses (Deuteronomy 32)

Job 24 bears a possible allusion to the *Song of Moses* (Deut 32:1–43). When discussing the plight of the poor, Job claims: וְיִמְבְּלִי מִתְּהֵה חֲבָקוּ-צִוִּיר: (“Lacking shelter they cling to the rock” [Job 24:8b]). The motif of the rock (צִוִּיר), representing the deity in whom the people trust, is prevalent in the *Song of Moses* (Deut 32:4, 15, 18, 30, 31, 37).

50. See Appendix B, page 146 for a table that shows the concentration references and allusions in Job 24 to Deuteronomy 24.

51. Braulik, “Das Deuteronomium und die Bücher Ijob, Sprichwörter, Rut,” 61–138.

Job 24 uses the same root (הסה) to describe taking shelter as the *Song of Moses* uses to describe taking refuge in the rock (Deut 32:37), which symbolically means to trust. Job claims that regardless of the poor's trust in the rock (צור), that is God, which according to the *Song of Moses* is an essential pious action, the poor do not receive the protection of God. However, the motif of taking refuge in the rock as representing God is common in the Hebrew Bible, especially the Psalms (2 Sam 22:3; Isa 17:10; Ps 18:3 [18:2 English]; 62:8 [62:7 English]; 71:3; 94:22).

Job alludes to the *Song of Moses* (Deut 32:1–43) in Job 29. Job begins this speech by reminiscing about the previous days before the great calamity came upon him (Job 29:1–25). The author uses distinct language about the way of Job being washed in curds⁵² and a rock pouring forth streams of oil (Job 29:6). This text is strikingly similar to Deuteronomy 32:13b, which speaks of oil coming from a flinty rock. Both texts use the Hebrew word צור for rock and שמן for oil. The connection is strong enough that Edward Greenstein claims that the intertextual connection is clear.⁵³ Deuteronomy 32:14 also mentions curds, thus making the connection stronger. The texts use the imagery in similar rhetorical ways, as they are both descriptions of God's provision. These are the only two texts in the Hebrew Bible that describe oil as coming from a rock. The distinct nature of this imagery, combined with its lack of appearance in other texts of the Hebrew Bible, implies direct literary connection.

The rhetorical advantage that the speaker gains by invoking the *Song of Moses* is connection to the favor of God. The *Song of Moses* uses strong language to describe

52. This is the variant, but clearly superior reading that the BHS editors note for Job 29:6a.

53. Edward Greenstein, "Parody as a Challenge to Tradition," 72.

God's provision for the people of Israel, and Job 29 uses similar language to describe God's provision for Job. The *Song of Moses* continues with Yhwh's rejecting the people of Israel (Deut 32:17), which is analogous with Job's own situation of rejection. However, Job wishes to contrast himself with Israel because Yhwh rejected Israel due to their rejection of him. Job, on the other hand, put on righteousness as his clothes and justice as his turban, and he helped the poor, orphaned, and oppressed (Job 29:14–17). Job claims that he succeeded in upholding the social ethic that Deuteronomy posits for orphans, widows, and oppressed members of society, which I discuss in more detail below. This is something that Israel famously failed to do;⁵⁴ thus in Job's view, God's rejection of him is unjust.

Greenstein argues that the relationship of Job 29:6 to Deuteronomy 32:13 is parody. However, Greenstein's definition of parody does not necessitate degradation of the prior text, but only use of the prior text.⁵⁵ Job does not undermine, criticize, or distort the *Song of Moses*. Although it is difficult to make strong claims based on Job's use of the *Song of Moses*, this is an example of Job's tying his rhetoric to the authority of the tradition of Deuteronomy, which indicates that Job recognizes the authority of the *Song of Moses* and, therefore, Deuteronomy. This plays into Fishbane's theory concerning new traditions' building of authority from older traditions.⁵⁶

54. Amos, Isaiah, and Ezekiel claim Israel failed to observe a social ethic that protects the poor and vulnerable members of society. See Isa 1:16–17; 10:1–4; Ezek 22:6–7; 25; Amos 2:7; 4:1; 5:11; 8:4–6.

55. Greenstein, "Parody as a Challenge to Tradition," 71.

56. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*, 435–36.

The Social Ethics of the Wealthy Job: Job 29

Job makes strong affirmations of his actions regarding disenfranchised demographics in Job 29. In quick succession, Job addresses several categories that Deuteronomy frequently addresses.

כִּי־אֲמַלֵּט עֲנִי מְשׁוּעַ יָתוֹם וְלֹא־עֲזָר לִּי:
 בְּרַפְתָּ אֲבָד עָלַי תְּבֵא וְלֵב אֶלְמִנָּה אֲרָנוּ:
 צָדֵק לְבָשָׁתִי וַיִּלְבַּשְׁנִי כַּמַּעֲיֵל וְצִנּוּרִי מִשְׁפָּטִי:
 עֵינַיִם הָיִיתִי לְעֹנֵר וְרַגְלָיִם לַפֶּסֶס אָנִי:
 אָב אָנֹכִי לְאַבְיוֹנִים וְרַב לֹא־יָדַעְתִּי אַחֲקָרְהוּ:

For I delivered the afflicted who cry out and the orphan who does not have a helper. The blessing of the perishing came upon me. I caused the heart of the widow to be jubilant. I was clothed with righteousness, and justice was my mantle and turban. I was eyes to the blind, and I was feet to the lame. I was a father to the poor and advocated the case of the one I did not know. (Job 29:12–16)

As discussed beginning on page 38, Deuteronomy calls specific protection for widows, orphans, the poor, and strangers/foreigners. The person whom Job “did not know” is analogous to the stranger/foreigner in Deuteronomy.⁵⁷ While Deuteronomy’s discussion of proper conduct towards the blind is brief, it also calls curses on those who mislead the blind (Deut 27:18). Job is demonstrating his affirmation of a social ethic that is Deuteronomic. Considering the reference to Deuteronomy 32 earlier in Job 29, I find it highly likely that these categories are allusions to the Deuteronomic social ethic.

Job places himself under the social expectations of Deuteronomy—something that will become increasingly clear in Job 31. This is also a significant piece of understanding the relationship between the books. While the author(s) of Job inevitably used multiple sources to construct the character Job, Deuteronomy appears to be the strongest influence when considering the creation of his social ethic.

57. The NRSV renders the text as “stranger.”

The Innocence of Job: Job 31

In Job's final speech (Job 31), Job asserts his innocence most strongly. As Michael Brennan Dick has shown, Job 31 fits into a recognizable genre of the "declaration of innocence."⁵⁸ However, Job 31 is significantly longer than typical declarations of innocence. Dick argues that the material in Job 31 connects better to the wisdom traditions rather than the legal traditions.⁵⁹ Weinfeld has noted the affinities between the Deuteronomic school and the wisdom tradition.⁶⁰ Thus the similarity makes the distinction between a primarily legal source and wisdom sources difficult in the case of Deuteronomy. I disagree with Dick, as I argue Job 31 shows direct connection to specific texts in Deuteronomy, and the wisdom material cannot explain all of the sins in Job 31. One cannot explain all of Job 31 without connections to wisdom traditions, but I argue the connections to Deuteronomy are stronger. The presence of the legal metaphor, which dominates Job 31,⁶¹ and the sapiential formulae⁶² lead me to conclude that a legal text with connections to wisdom traditions is the most likely candidate for a central influence. Deuteronomy fits this description well.

The categories that Job uses to proclaim his innocence align with Deuteronomy.⁶³ Many of the examples correspond to the Decalogue. Other laws appear to connect with

58. Michael Brennan Dick, "Job 31, the Oath of Innocence, and the Sage," *ZAW* 95 (1983): 36.

59. *Ibid.*, 48–53.

60. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, 260–74.

61. Dick, "The Legal Metaphor in Job 31," 38.

62. Dick, "Job 31, the Oath of Innocence, and the Sage," 50.

63. Witte, "Does the Torah Keep Its Promise?" 57. See also, Philippe Nemo, *Job and the Excess of Evil*, trans. Michael Kigel (Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1998), 75–76.

unique legal material from Deuteronomy. While not everything in Job 31 has a precise parallel with laws in Deuteronomy, nearly all of the material has approximate parallels in Deuteronomy. Job 31 represents the greatest concentration of references to Deuteronomy in the speeches of Job.

Job opens this section of his speech with affirming a high standard of sexual purity. Job claims that he has made a covenant with his eyes that prohibits him from even looking upon a virgin (Job 31:1). Dick claims that the motif of eyes as the source of sin is unique to the wisdom tradition.⁶⁴ While Dick is correct in the precision of his argument, eyes also play a significant role in the actions of people in Deuteronomy (Deut 4:9; 6:22; 7:19; 11:7 et al.). The motif of cutting (כָּרַת), or making, a covenant is strong in Deuteronomy (Deut 4:23, 31; 5:2, 3; 9:9; 28:69 [29:1 English]; 29:11 [29:12 English], 13 [14 English], 24 [25 English]; 31:16). The motif is common in much of the Hebrew Bible. However, making covenants is not a common motif in the wisdom traditions of the Hebrew Bible.⁶⁵ This further illustrates the connection with Deuteronomy, which has an emphasis on the role of eyes in causality and the creation of covenants.

The laws protecting virgins in the Torah are not robust (Exod 22:16–17; Deut 22:23–29).⁶⁶ Exodus 22:16–17 hardly condemns seducing or even raping an unengaged virgin. Deuteronomy 22:29 offers slightly better protection for the unengaged virgin whom a man seduces or rapes by prohibiting the perpetrator from divorcing the woman.

64. Dick, “Job 31, the Oath of Innocence, and the Sage,” 46.

65. The exception to this would be in Sirach. However, Sirach usually refers to the covenant established in the Torah.

66. Pressler, *The View of Women*, 32–36.

Job subtly acknowledges that violating a virgin is among the least condemnable crimes in Deuteronomy or the Torah, but claims complete innocence in this matter. The vagueness of the claim prevents strong connections from forming between Job and Deuteronomy at this point. However, among the wisdom literature of the Hebrew Bible, there is not an admonition against avoiding virgins. Sirach does have such a warning (Sir 9:5), but it is unlikely that Job pulls from Sirach. The warnings concerning women in the wisdom literature center on promiscuous women (Prov 2:16; 5:3; 7:5; 22:14), not virgins. Deuteronomy presents a closer connection in this case.

In tandem with the statement on his sexual purity, Job asks the rhetorical questions *וַיִּגַּהַּ אֵלֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים מִמַּעַל וַיִּנְחַלְתָּ אֹשֶׁי מִמְּרָמִים:* (“And what portion would be from God on high, and what inheritance of Shaddai from the heights?” [Job 31:2]). The motif of Yhwh’s doling out an inheritance is common in Deuteronomy, Numbers, and especially Joshua. While Job uses the same word (*נַחֲלָה*) for inheritance that Deuteronomy frequently uses (Deut 25:19; 26:1 et al.), the motif is too common to make an argument for specific connection to Deuteronomy. However, it demonstrates that the character is working from a similar register of vocabulary. The use of the rhetorical question represents a sapiential formula.⁶⁷ However, the rhetorical question is also a productive literary device in Deuteronomy (Deut 4:7, 8, 32–34; 5:26; 10:12; 20:19; 32:6, 30, 34). Thus the use of rhetorical questions does not create an exclusive connection to sapiential literature, as Dick argued.⁶⁸

67. Dick, “Job 31, the Oath of Innocence, and the Sage,” 50.

68. Ibid.

Job addresses the concept of retributive justice in Job 31:3. Deuteronomy 27 and 28 assert retributive justice strongly. However, Job may be mocking the argument of the friends, which, as I have argued,⁶⁹ does not connect well to Deuteronomy's version of retributive justice. However, the concept raises association with Deuteronomy. The motif of the "way," which Job raises in Job 31:4, is productive in Deuteronomy.⁷⁰ Job brings up this motif more explicitly in Job 31:7, which I cover below.

The conditional self-curse or self-imprecation, which is common in Job 31, begins with language similar to that of the Decalogue.

אִם-הִלַּכְתִּי עִם-שָׁוְא וַתַּחַשׁ עַל-מְרֻמָּה רַגְלִי:
 יִשְׁקָלֵנִי בְּמֵאֻנֵּי-צֶדֶק וַיַּזַּע אֱלֹהִים תְּמִתִּי:

If I have walked with vanity or my foot hastened to deceit, may he weigh me with just scales, and God knows my integrity. (Job 31:5–6)

The term for vanity (שָׁוְא) is the same term in the Decalogue's prohibition of using the name of Yhwh for vanity (Deut 5:11).⁷¹ The language is somewhat vague, but it could mean swearing an oath in the name of Yhwh and not fulfilling it.⁷² Similarly, the Decalogue prohibits deceit (Deut 5:20), which is another matter in which Job claims innocence.

Job continues the conditional self-curse formula with language that is reminiscent of Deuteronomy: אִם תִּטָּה אֲשֶׁרֶי מִנִּי הִגֵּדְךָ וְאַחַר עֵינֵי הַלֵּךְ לִבִּי וּבְכַפִּי דָבַק מְאֹד: ("If my

69. See 50–55 and 81.

70. The motif of the way and walking is also productive in the wisdom and hymnic literature. See Dick, "Job 31, the Oath of Innocence, and the Sage," 48.

71. Witte, "Does the Torah Keep Its Promise?" 57.

72. It is not a prohibition of swearing by the name of Yhwh, which Deuteronomy instructs the Israelites to do in 6:13. Swearing frivolous oaths is an issue in other ANE cultures. See Lundbom, *Deuteronomy*, 282.

steps have strayed from the way and my eyes went after my heart, and a blemish clung to my hands” [Job 31:7]). The implication is that Job believes that he has not turned from the way. The motif of walking in the way recurs throughout Deuteronomy. This could be walking in the ways of Yhwh (Deut 8:6, 11:22, 13:5, 19:9, 26:17, 28:9, 30:16) or the way in which Yhwh commanded (Deut 5:33 9:12, 16, 11:28, 31:29). The conditional curse Job calls down on himself is reminiscent of the curses of Deuteronomy 28: **אֲזַרְעָה וְאָחַר** **יֹאכַל וְצִאָצְאִי יִשְׂרָשׁוּ:** (“Let me sow, but another eat, and my produce be uprooted” [Job 31:8]). Deuteronomy 28 contains lists of curses and blessings. The blessings are for those who keep the commandments of Yhwh and **וְהָלַכְתָּ בְּדַרְכָּיו:** (“walk in his ways” [Deut 28:9]), which is what Job implies that he has done (Job 31:7). Yhwh invokes the curses in the case of rebellion **אִם-לֹא תִשְׁמַע בְּקוֹל יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ לְשָׁמֵר לַעֲשׂוֹת אֶת-כָּל-מִצְוֹתָיו וְהִקְלַתְיוּ:** (“If you do not listen to the voice of Yhwh, your God, to keep doing all his statues and commandments” [Deut 28:15]). Deuteronomy 30b–30c claims, **בֵּית תְּבִנָּה וְלֹא-תֵשֵׁב בּוֹ** **בָּרַם תִּטַּע וְלֹא תִחְלֶנּוּ:** (“You will build a house and you will not live in it, you will plant a vineyard but not enjoy it”).⁷³ This is significant because it is a reversal of the good things that Yhwh did for Israel by bringing them to a land so that they could occupy houses and vineyards for which they were not responsible (Deut 6:11). The curses return to this theme in Deut 28:38.⁷⁴

73. The strongest connection of this motif is to Amos 5:11, but Job’s relationship to the prophets is not the subject of this study.

74. Lev 26:14–33 contains a list of curses similar to those in Deut 28:15–68, and the same language of failing crops and sowing but not eating reappears (Lev 26:16).

Job's list of crimes he claims that he did not commit returns to themes similar to those in the Decalogue in the next section (Job 31:9). Job claims that he has not committed adultery.

אם-נפְתָה לְבִי עַל-אִשָּׁה וְעַל-פֶּתַח רַעֲי אֶרְבָּתִי:
תִּטָּתֵן לְאַחַר אִשְׁתִּי יַעֲלֶיהָ יְכַרְעוּן אַחֲרָיו:

If I have set my heart upon a woman and waited beside the door of my neighbor, may my wife grind for another, and let others kneel over her. (Job 31:9–10)

The Decalogue is not as descriptive as Job or sexually explicit, but it tersely says, “You will not commit adultery” (Deut 5:18). Job’s self-curse is similar to the curse from Deut 28:30, which graphically claims others will come and take betrothed women away from the cursed men. אִשָּׁה תִּאָרְשׁ וְאִישׁ אַחֵר יִשְׁגְּלֶנָה (“You will become engaged to a woman, but another man will violate her” [Deut 28:30a]).

Deuteronomy 22:22 mandates death for those committing adultery as Job has described. Job invokes legal imagery claiming that adultery would be כִּי-הוּא זַמָּה וְהִיא עֲוֹן פְּלִילִים: (“an iniquity for judges”⁷⁵ [Job 31:11]), which means that it would be a criminal offense, or for the sake of argument, an infraction of the laws of Deuteronomy. Job adds to the conditional self-curse by calling for complete incineration of his land and fields, burning down to the underworld: כִּי אֵשׁ הִיא עַד-אַבְדֹן תֹּאכַל וְכָכַל-תִּבְוָאָתִי תִשְׂרַשׁ: (“For, that fire consumes down unto Abaddon and uproots all of my produce” [Job 31:12]). כִּי-אֵשׁ קָדְחָה בְּאַפִּי וַתִּיקַד עַד-שְׁאֹל וַתֹּאכַל אֶרֶץ וְיִבְלָהּ. (“For a fire ignites in my anger and burns unto Sheol underneath and consumes the land and its produce” [Deut 32:22a–b]). Job 13:12 cannot qualify as a direct quotation of Deut 32:22a–b because the

75. The only other appearance of this term for judges (פְּלִילִים) is in Exod 22:22, which refers to a local judge consulted to determine the fine for causing a woman to miscarry. See Witte, “Does Torah Keep Its Promise?” 58.

lexical differences are significant. However, the strong similarity in concepts, the use of synonyms,⁷⁶ and the rhetorical similarity, indicate that is an indirect quotation. This forms a strong connection to Deuteronomy.

Job continues to make conditional statements similar to the conditional curses of the previous sections, but the section dealing with his treatment of slaves contains no curse (Job 31:13–15). The text implies that Job has treated his slaves in an exemplary fashion.

אִם-אֶמְאָס מִשְׁפֹּט עֲבָדַי וְאִמְתִּי בְרָבָם עִמָּדִי:
וּמָה אֲעֲשֶׂה כִּי-יָקוּם אֱלֹהִים וְכִי-יִפְקֹד מֶה אֲשִׁיבָנּוּ:
הֲלֹא-בְרֵטֶן עֲשִׂנִי עָשָׂהוּ וְיִכְנֹנּוּ בְרַחֲם אֶחָד:

If I rejected the justice of my male servants and female servants in their disputes with me. What shall I do when God rises up? When he visits, what shall I return to him? Did not the one who made me in the womb make them? Only one formed us in the womb. (Job 31:13–15)

Job's statement on slaves supports a social ethic that is especially favorable towards slaves and embraces a concept approaching equality.⁷⁷ The closest approximation of Job's statement concerning slavery in the Hebrew Bible appears in Malachi, which affirms that all people come from God (Mal 2:10). However, Malachi does not specifically address slaves. I argue that the implied social ethic concerning slaves resembles the social ethic of Deuteronomy most closely in the Hebrew Bible.

Deuteronomy has a more robust social ethic for slaves than other books from the Torah. Deuteronomy mandates slave owners to release male or female Hebrew slaves after six years of service (Deut 15:12–18), which is a privilege of only male slaves in

76. In Job 26:6, Sheol and Abaddon appear in parallelism, thus demonstrating that they can be synonyms.

77. Richard Neville contests the radical nature of Job's statement concerning slaves. Richard Neville, "A Reassessment of the Radical Nature of Job's Ethic in Job XXXI 13–15," *VT* 53 (2003): 184.

Exodus (Exod 21:7) and not granted at all in Leviticus (Lev 25:49).⁷⁸ Job specifically mentions both male and female slaves (Job 31:13), mirroring the less misogynistic approach of Deuteronomy. As Weinfeld has argued, Deuteronomy emphasizes the position of Hebrew slaves as “your brothers” or siblings (אֶחָיוֹתָיִם).⁷⁹ While it is unlikely that either Job or Deuteronomy would view slaves as equals,⁸⁰ both use equalizing language to describe them. According to Job, God made both slaves and masters, and according to Deuteronomy, slaves are brothers. Thus in each case slaves have exemplary rights. Weinfeld further demonstrates the greater respect of the private lives of slaves in Deuteronomy.⁸¹ The only reasons for a slave to stay with his or her master in Deuteronomy are if the slave loves the master and enjoys life under that master (Deut 15:16). In Exodus, a slave’s family belongs to the master; thus he or she must stay with the master to stay with his or her family (Exod 21:5). Deuteronomy does not mention this possibility because masters do not own the families of their slaves in Deuteronomic law.⁸² Job claims that he has not infringed on the social rights of his slaves, and the social ethic concerning slaves appears to emerge from Deuteronomy.

The example of correct treatment of slaves is another case where Job 31 connects better with the legal corpus of Deuteronomy than with the wisdom literature of the Hebrew Bible. The wisdom literature of the Hebrew Bible lacks discussion concerning

78. Matitiah Tsevat, “The Hebrew Slave according to Deuteronomy 15:12–18: His Lot and the Value of His Work, with Special Attention to the Meaning of אֶחָיוֹתָיִם,” *JBL* 113 (1994): 594.

79. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, 282–83.

80. Neville, “A Reassessment of the Radical Nature of Job’s Ethic,” 184–88.

81. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, 283.

82. *Ibid.*

positive treatment of slaves and occasionally encourages harsh treatment of them (Prov 29:19). This is further evidence that Dick's suggestion that Job 31 belongs primarily in the context of sapiential literature is insufficient.⁸³ Deuteronomy is the better source for the discussion on slaves.

Job defends his humanitarian acts by returning to the conditional curse formula (Job 31:16–23). He laments the lack of justice for the poor in an earlier speech (Job 24:1–25).⁸⁴ Eliphaz accuses Job of abusing the widow, orphan, naked, hungry, and even his own family (Job 22:5–11),⁸⁵ but Job does not defend his character against these accusations until Job 29. With this conditional self-curse, Job asserts that he has helped the poor, widows, and orphans, which corresponds to laws from Deuteronomy (Deut 15:7–11, 24:19). Deuteronomy 27:19 declares אָרוּר מַטֵּה מִשְׁפַּט גֵּר-יְתוֹם וְאַלְמָנָה (“Cursed is the one who withholds justice from the foreigner, the orphan, and the widow”). Job's curse is quite graphic with his shoulder falling out of its socket, and it does not have a precise parallel in the Hebrew Bible, but it is of similar severity to the curses found in Deuteronomy 28. This section demonstrates the alignment of the social ethics of Deuteronomy and the speeches of Job.

In Job 31:24–28, Job defends his orthodoxy, demonstrating that he has trusted only in God. He has not trusted in any quantity or quality of gold (Job 31:24), which Deut 17:17 prohibits for potential kings of Israel. Although Job was wealthy, he did not rejoice in the wealth that God gave him, which is a theme Job addressed earlier (Job 29:1–20),

83. Dick, “Job 31, the Oath of Innocence, and the Sage,” 48–53.

84. For discussion of Job 24, see 105.

85. For a possible alternative explanation of Eliphaz's accusations, see 69n32.

picking up themes similar to the *Song of Moses*.⁸⁶ This is another example of Job's commitment to fulfilling Deuteronomy perfectly. Even though the requirement of not trusting in gold is only for monarchs, Job embraces this restriction as well. Dick claims that not trusting in wealth is "exclusively the concern of sapiential circles."⁸⁷ However, he has overlooked the regal restrictions of Deuteronomy 17. These restrictions provide a legal source of Job's claim of innocence.

Job immediately (Job 31:26–28) makes another connection to Deuteronomy 17. The association may be circumstantial, as the pericopes (Deut 17:3–7; cf. 17:17) are not adjacent. However, their proximity is worth noting. Job uses much source material from Deuteronomy 24 in close proximity in Job 24;⁸⁸ thus there is precedent for this type of association. Job claims that he has not worshipped any of the astral deities (Job 31:26), which were common objects of worship in the ancient Near East.⁸⁹ Deuteronomy forbids this practice with language similar to Job's (Deut 4:19; 17:3), and the Decalogue prohibits worship of anything other than Yhwh (Deut 5:9). Jeffery Cohen argues that the cryptic phrase *לִפִּי יָדִי לָשְׁקָה* ("My hand kissed my mouth" [Job 31:27b]) indicates a type of silent devotion⁹⁰ that would only be appropriate for Yhwh; thus Job is expanding on his claim that he has not worshipped or given devotion to any of the astral deities.⁹¹ At

86. See 110.

87. Dick, "Job 31, the Oath of Innocence, and the Sage," 52.

88. See 105.

89. See 2 Kgs 17:16; Jer 8:2; 19:13; 2 Chron 33:3, 5.

90. Jeffery Cohen, "An Unrecognized Connotation of NŠQ PEH with Reference to Three Biblical Occurrences," *VT* 32 (1982): 416–24.

91. Moshe Weinfeld notes the similarities between Job 31:27 and Deut 27:15–16. See Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*, 276–77.

the end of this section, he makes a claim similar to his claim in Job 31:11, saying that the aforementioned grievance *גַּם־הוּא עֲוֹן פְּלִילִי* (“Would be an iniquity for my judge” [Job 31:28a]). This again invokes the legal imagery replete in Job 31, likely referring to the law requiring two or three witnesses to execute worshippers of the astral deities (Deut 17:2–7). The wisdom traditions of the Hebrew Bible do not prohibit sun and moon worship, and only Deuteronomy prohibits it among books of the Torah.⁹² The most logical connection is Deuteronomy.

Job builds upon his commitment to the social ethic of Deuteronomy. In Job 31:32, Job claims that the stranger has not resided in the streets. One of the categories of vulnerable people that Deuteronomy calls the community to protect is the stranger, or foreigner (*גֵּר*). Several times Deuteronomy lists foreigners, or strangers, alongside orphans and widows as people who need special provision (Deut 14:29; 24:17, 19, 20, 21; 26:11, 12, 13; 27:19). Dick argues that the stranger (*גֵּר*) in Deuteronomy is not analogous to the stranger in Job 31:32.⁹³ Dick claims that the stranger in Job is only a traveler, not a resident foreigner because of the parallelism with the traveler. Dick has a fair critique. Deuteronomy identifies foreigners as “within your gates” (Deut 5:14). However, I do not find Dick’s argument that there is a disconnect entirely convincing. Stranger (*גֵּר*) has the connotation of displaced individual.⁹⁴ Deuteronomy 16:13 depicts the foreigner as a landless demographic, which creates a transient population.

92. Among the prophets, Jeremiah derides and condemns sun and moon worship, but likely relies on Deuteronomy in this case. See Jer 8:2; 19:13.

93. Dick, “Job 31, the Oath of Innocence, and the Sage,” 51.

94. Koehler and Baumgartner, “*גֵּר*,” *HALOT* 1:201.

Deuteronomy is surely concerned with more than the stable populations.⁹⁵ Since it is probable that the author(s) of Job was/were aware of Deuteronomy, it would be strange to describe the care of a demographic with the same terminology that Deuteronomy uses to describe the care of a different demographic. As with orphans and widows, Job implies that he has fulfilled the social ethic of Deuteronomy by assuring that strangers and travelers have had safe places to stay. While prohibition of oppressing foreigners appears in other texts, Deuteronomy's special concern for the foreigner or stranger is strong.⁹⁶

Job begins another conditional self-curse in Job 31:33. However, he does not provide the curse—only the condition. Job does not decry a specific sin, but only the concealment of sins. Deuteronomy takes up the matter of secret, or hidden, sins (Deut 27:15–26).⁹⁷ God is to act in the case of secret sins. Dick claims that internalization of sin is more sapiential than legal.⁹⁸ However, Deut 29:19 identifies sins of the heart as sins, not only the internal motivation for an external crime.

Markus Witte has argued that the written indictment (סִפָּר כְּתָב) that Job longs for in Job 31:35c is analogous to the Torah and perhaps Deuteronomy.⁹⁹ Witte conflates Job's signature, or sign (אֶתְּ), in Job 31:35b with the indictment.¹⁰⁰ Although I do not find Witte's logic completely sound, his thesis is intriguing. Job would then be observing the

95. Dick, "Job 31, the Oath of Innocence, and the Sage," 51.

96. For more on foreigners in Deuteronomy, see van Houten, *The Alien in Israelite Law*, 68–106.

97. Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, 253.

98. Dick, "Job 31, the Oath of Innocence, and the Sage," 49.

99. Markus Witte, "Hiobs 'Zeichen' (Hiob 31,35–37)," in *Gott und Mensch im Dialog. II : Festschrift für Otto Kaiser zum 80 Geburtstag*, ed. Markus Witte (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2004), 725; Witte, "Does the Torah Keep Its Promise?" 58.

100. Witte, "Hiobs 'Zeichen,'" 730.

Deuteronomic commands to bind the words of the law to one's forehead (Deut 6:8) by fastening the indictment as a crown (Job 31:36). I find it more likely that the indictment is based simply on Deuteronomy rather than a copy of Deuteronomy or the Torah. As Job 31 illustrates, Job employs a legal standard that is most similar to Deuteronomy. Thus I find it logical to assume that the indictment is based on Deuteronomy, but not the equivalent of the book Deuteronomy.

Job's final conditional self-curse bears strong relationship to the Torah. His curse is that his land would become unproductive if he has abused either it or anyone working it.

אִם-עָלִי אֲדַמְתִּי תִזְעַק וְיִחַד תִּלְמִיָּהּ יִבְכְּוּן:
 אִם-פָּחַה אֲכַלְתִּי בְּלִי-כֶסֶף וְנִפְּשׁ בְּעַלְיָהּ הַפְּחָתִי:
 תִּחַת הַטֹּהוּ יֵצֵא חֹמֶם וְתַחַת-שְׁעֵרָה בָּאֲשָׁה:

If my land cries out against me, and her furrows weep together
 If I have eaten her produce without [paying] silver, or exhausted her owners
 In place of wheat may thorns come forth, and in place of barley, stinking weeds.
 (Job 31:38–40a)

Job claims he has never withheld the wages of the people who work the land for him.

This is in accordance with the laws of Deuteronomy concerning paying workers (Deut 24:14–15). Job's self-curse is similar to the curse that God put on Cain after he killed his brother (Gen 4:12), which is a story that Job referred to before (Job 16:18). The previous time Job alluded to that story, he associated himself with Abel; but if Job is guilty of breaking one of Deuteronomy's laws, he shall be like Cain.

The most significant weakness in Dick's assertion concerning Job 31 and the wisdom traditions is the connection to the indictment.¹⁰¹ Job calls for the indictment, or

101. Dick, "Job 31, the Oath of Innocence, and the Sage," 48.

the written account (Job 31:35), against him. In order to be innocent of the allegations, there must be a legal standard. Although it may be an implied legal standard based on wisdom, Deuteronomy provides a more compelling backdrop for Job 31, and I argue it is of greater significance than the wisdom traditions of the Hebrew Bible.

The numerous allusions to Deuteronomy in Job 31 illustrate Job's high view of the book. Job 31 illustrates that Job does not attempt to refute Deuteronomy, as he believes that the presence of an indictment based on Deuteronomy would vindicate him (Job 31:35). For Job, Deuteronomy is the standard by which a person is righteous or wicked. Job understands justice regarding those who infract these laws similarly to that in Deuteronomy 28. Job 31 may illustrate better than any other references or allusions to Deuteronomy that Job respects the authority of Deuteronomy. Job fits within the scope of Israelite orthodoxy, especially Deuteronomic orthodoxy.

Intertextual Partners: Job and Deuteronomy

Considering the large number of intertextual connections between Deuteronomy and Job, it is tempting to cast Deuteronomy as Job's main intertextual partner.¹⁰² However, as I have shown,¹⁰³ the book of Job contains many intertextual connections to other works from the Hebrew Bible and beyond. Making a claim about the most prominent intertextual partner of Job would require further intense study. References to the Psalms are plentiful,¹⁰⁴ as are references to Jeremiah.¹⁰⁵ The author(s) of the book of

102. See Appendix B on page 146 for a visual representation of connections between the speeches of Job and Deuteronomy.

103. See 8–12.

104. Frevel, "Telling the Secrets of Wisdom," 157–68.

Job demonstrated literary mastery by the plentiful allusions and references to abundant literature from much of the ancient Near East. Scholarship needs to investigate further the intertextual connections between the book of Job and other literature from the ancient Near East.

From the books of the Torah, only Genesis approaches the level of connection to the speeches of Job that Deuteronomy enjoys.¹⁰⁶ Although there is repeated material from Deuteronomy in Exodus and Leviticus with which Job interacts, the way Job refers to the material demonstrates a closer association with Deuteronomy than with Exodus or Leviticus. Considering the extended conversation regarding retributive justice and the significant number of intertextual connections, it is most logical to place Deuteronomy as the most significant conversation partner from the books of the Torah with the speeches of Job.

105. Greenstein, "Jeremiah as an Inspiration to the Poet of Job," 98–110; Dell, "'Cursed Be the Day I Was Born!': Job and Jeremiah Revisited," 106–17.

106. For a brief discussion of Job and Genesis, see 8.

CONCLUSIONS

Three strong conclusions emerge concerning the relationship between the speeches of Job and Deuteronomy after this study. If one assumes that Deuteronomy preceded Job¹ it is logical to discuss Job's uses of Deuteronomy. (1) Job respects and applies a social ethic based primarily on Deuteronomy. (2) Job assumes some version of retributive justice that is not identical to the retributive justice in Deuteronomy, but neither is it diametrically opposed to it. For example, Deuteronomy's understanding of retributive justice is more complex than the understanding posited by Job's three friends and it allows for exceptions, as they do not. (3) Job alludes to Deuteronomy extensively and does so positively in the majority of cases. I will explain these three points at greater length.

First, while the social ethic that Deuteronomy posits becomes programmatic for much of the Hebrew Bible, it is especially strong concerning its protection of vulnerable members of society. Deuteronomy focuses on the plight of orphan and widow as a hendiadys for suffering and vulnerable members of society. This concern is stronger in Deuteronomy than in any other book of the Torah. Only Job, Isaiah, and Jeremiah consistently maintain the orphan and widow pairing as a group in need of special assistance within the rest of the Hebrew Bible.² While Job has connections to Isaiah and

1. For a discussion on the relative dating of Job and Deuteronomy, see 5–19.

2. There are several occurrences in the Psalms that use the pairing. However, the Psalms do not even self-identify as a unified corpus.

Jeremiah, Job surpasses both in concern for these categories. The connection to Deuteronomy becomes clearer when one examines the special protection Deuteronomy and Job each call for the stranger/foreigner—something that neither Jeremiah nor Isaiah emphasizes.³ Protection for the stranger is not prevalent in the wisdom traditions of the Hebrew Bible, which tend to deal with strangers with suspicion (e.g. Prov 11:15). Job's social ethic also calls for people of means to assist the poor and needy, which is an emphasis in Deuteronomy and many of the prophets. Job's social ethic is most similar to the social ethic of Deuteronomy, and I claim that it relies on Deuteronomy.

While the speeches of Job and Deuteronomy agree most in the area of social ethics, Job and Deuteronomy are not opposed to each other in their systems of orthopraxy and theology. Both books hope for or expect a world devoted to a singular deity. A significantly different *Sitz im Leben* for the two books explains the different emphases in their understandings of orthopraxy, but they do not contradict each other. Job and Deuteronomy speak the same religious language.

Second, Job never completely eschews retributive justice. Retributive justice is at the core of Job's final speech (Job 31), which is an address to God rather than to the friends. While the book strongly protests a rigid universal retributive justice system, retributive justice is present all through the book. Retributive justice does not fully explain Job's world, but it is part of Job's world. Deuteronomy maintains a stronger sense of retributive justice than the book of Job, but it does not present a universal or rigid retributive justice system. The retributive justice of Deuteronomy is inextricable from

3. Concern for the stranger also appears in two Psalms (Ps 94:6; 146:9).

covenant, and the covenant is not present in the book of Job. Deuteronomy acknowledges the suffering of several innocent categories, such as orphans, widows, and victims of accidents. The story of liberation from Egyptian slavery is integral to the argument of Deuteronomy, which would be impossible in a system of rigid retributive justice. When retributive justice applies rigidly, there should never be need for liberation. Deuteronomy presents a complex picture of retributive justice, which relies primarily on the community to maintain justice within its borders. God's role in retributive justice is primarily on the national level. Job does not seek to undo the argument of Deuteronomy or its retributive justice, but it does oppose facile versions of retributive justice that are overzealous in their application of common wisdom.

Third, the speeches of Job make plentiful references and allusions to the text of Deuteronomy. Of the references, only a few depict Deuteronomy in a negative light. However, many of the references depict Deuteronomy positively. The largest concentration of references and allusions to Deuteronomy appears in Job 31. In Job 31, Deuteronomy provides the legal standards in which Job can claim innocence. Job embraces the legal world of Deuteronomy. In Job 24:1–12, 21 and 29:12–17, the social ethics of Deuteronomy emerge specifically. Job affirms and supports those standards in Job 29:12–17 and laments the violation of those standards in Job 24:1–12, 21. Both of these texts depict a respect for Deuteronomy. The most significant negative allusion to a text in Deuteronomy (Deut 5:9) occurs in Job 21:19. However, this allusion simultaneously connects positively to Deut 7:9–10 and in slight opposition to other texts from the Torah (Exod 34:7; Num 14:18). Job 29:6 and Job 21:7–13 each rely on Deuteronomy's metaphors and imagination in depicting the providence of God. Job 21:7–

13 depicts this providence as coming to the wicked, and Job 29:6 depicts God's providence for Job. Both represent affirmations of Deuteronomy's vision of providence, and one represents a lament that the wrong people receive that providence.

It would be strange to assume that Job has a negative view of Deuteronomy when the majority of allusions depict Deuteronomy positively. Considering the evidence presented here, I argue that Deuteronomy has the strongest and most positive connection to the speeches of Job of all of the books of the Torah. I do not argue that Deuteronomy and Job are in complete agreement. However, reading the book of Job and Deuteronomy creates a healthy discourse. This discourse asks some important questions. While the discourse is productive, it is not conclusive. Questions remain unanswered. But the discourse has explored a nearly universal problem—the problem of God and how God operates in the world. This discourse with Deuteronomy is one of the many pieces that make Job a literary masterpiece and worthy of continued study and investigation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Balentine, Samuel. *Job*. SHBC 10. Macon, GA: Smyth and Helwys, 2006.
- Botterweck, Johannes, Heinz-Josef Fabry, and Helmer Ringgren, eds. *The Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. 15 vols. Translated by Douglas Stott. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975-2004.
- Braulik, Georg. "Das Deuteronomium and die Bücher Ijob, Sprichwörter, Rut." Pages 61–138 in *Die Tora Als Kanon für Juden und Christen*. Edited by Erich Zenger, Freiburg: Herder, 1996.
- _____. *The Theology of Deuteronomy: Collected Essays of Georg Braulik O.S.B.* Translated by Ulrika Lindblad. North Richland Hills, TX: Bibal Press, 1994.
- Brenner, Athalya. "Job the Pious?: The Characterization of Job in the Narrative Framework of the Book." *JSOT* 43 (1989): 37–52.
- Brueggemann, Walter. *Theology of the Old Testament: Testimony, Dispute, Advocacy*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1997.
- Ceresko, Anthony. *Job 29–31 in the Light of Northwest Semitic*. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1980.
- Chin, Catherine. "Job and the Injustice of God: Implicit Arguments in Job 13.17–14.12." *JSOT* 64 (1994): 91–101.
- Clines, David. *Job 1–20*. WBC 18. Dallas: Word Book, 1989.
- _____. *Job 21–37*. WBC 18a. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2006.
- _____. *Job 38–42*. WBC 18b. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2011.
- _____. "Job 5, 1–8: A New Exegesis." *Bib*. 62 (1981): 185–94.
- _____. "Job's Fifth Friend: An Ethical Critique of the Book of Job." *BibInt* 12 (2004): 233–250.
- Cohen, Jeffery. "An Unrecognized Connotation of NŠQ PEH with Reference to Three Biblical Occurrences." *VT* 32 (1982): 416–24.

- Cook, Stephan. "A Reading of Job as a Theatrical Work: Challenging a Retributive Deuteronomistic Theology." *LA* 24 (2014): 39–62.
- Cover, Robin C. "Sin, Sinners (OT)." Pages 31–40 in vol. 6 of *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freeman. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Crenshaw, James. "Job, the Book of." Pages 858–68 in vol. 3 of *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freeman. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Crouch, C. L. *Israel and the Assyrians: Deuteronomy, the Succession Treaty of Esarhaddon and the Nature of Subversion*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2014.
- Dalley, Stephanie. *Myths from Mesopotamia: Creation, the Flood, Gilgamesh, and Others*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- De Wette, Wilhelm M. L. *Dissertatio critico-exegetica qua Deuteronomium a prioribus Pentateuchi Libris diversum*. Jena: Etzdorf, 1805.
- Dell, Katharine. "'Cursed be the Day I Was Born!': Job and Jeremiah Revisited." Pages 106–17 in *Reading Job Intertextually*. Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 574. Edited by Katharine Dell and Will Kynes. New York: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2013.
- Dell, Katherine, and Will Kynes. Introduction to *Reading Job Intertextually*. Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 574. Edited by Katharine Dell and Will Kynes. New York: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2013.
- Dhorme, Edouard. *A Commentary on the Book of Job*. Translated by Harold Knight. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1967.
- Dick, Michael Brennan. "Job 31, the Oath of Innocence, and the Sage." *ZAW* 95 (1983): 31–53.
- _____. "The Legal Metaphor in Job 31." *CBQ* 41 (1979): 37–50.
- Erickson, Amy. "'Without My Flesh I Will See God': Job's Rhetoric of the Body." *JBL* 132 (2013): 295–313.
- Eslinger, Lyle. "Inner-Biblical Exegesis and Allusion." *VT* 42 (1992): 47–58.
- Fishbane, Michael. *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.
- _____. "The Book of Job and Inner-Biblical Discourse." Pages 86–98 in *The Voice from the Whirlwind: Interpreting the Book of Job*. Edited by Leo Perdue and Clark Gilpin. Nashville: Abingdon, 1994.

- Fisher, Loren. *Who Hears the Cries of the Innocent?* Willits, CA: Fisher, 2002.
- Frevel, Christian. "Telling the Secrets of Wisdom: The Use of Psalm 104 in the Book of Job." Pages 157–68 in *Reading Job Intertextually*. Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 574. Edited by Katharine Dell and Will Kynes. New York: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2013.
- Frost, Robert. "A Masque of Reason." Pages 473–90 in *The Poetry of Robert Frost*. Edited by Edward Connery. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1969.
- Galpaz-Feller, Pnina. "The Widow in the Bible and in Ancient Egypt." *ZAW* 120 (2008): 231–58.
- Gray, John. *The Book of Job*. Edited by David Clines. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2010.
- Green, William Scott. "Stretching the Covenant: Job and Judaism." *RE* 99 (2002): 569–77.
- Greenstein, Edward. "A Forensic Understanding of the Speech from the Whirlwind." Pages 241–59 in *Texts, Temples, and Traditions: A Tribute to Menahem Haran*. Edited by M. Fox, V. Hurowitz, A. Hurvitz, M. Klein, B. Schwartz, and N. Shupak. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1996.
- _____. "In Job's Face/Facing Job." Pages 301–17 in *The Labour of Reading: Desire, Alienation, and Biblical Interpretation*. Edited by Fiona Black, Roland Boer, and Eric Runions. Atlanta: SBL Press, 1999.
- _____. "The Invention of Language in the Poetry of Job." Pages 331–46 in *Interested Readers: Essays in Honor of David J. A. Clines*. Edited by James K. Aitken, Jeremy M. S. Clines, and Christl M. Maier. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013.
- _____. "Jeremiah as an Inspiration to the Poet of Job," Pages 98–110 in *Inspired Speech*. Edited by J. Kaltner and L. Stulman. New York: T & T Clark International, 2004.
- _____. "The Language of Job and Its Poetic Function." *JBL* 122 (2003): 651–66.
- _____. "Parody as a Challenge to Tradition: The Use of Deuteronomy 32 in the Book of Job." Pages 66–78 in *Reading Job Intertextually*. Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 574. Edited by Katharine Dell and Will Kynes. New York: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2013.
- _____. "The Problem of Evil in the Book of Job." Pages 333–62 in *Mishneh Todah: Studies in Deuteronomy and its Cultural Environment in Honor of Jeffery Tigay*. Edited By Nili Sacher, David A. Glatt-Gilad, and Michael Williams. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2009.

- _____. "Some Metaphors in the Poetry of Job." Pages 179–95 in *Built by Wisdom, Established by Understanding: Essays in Honor of Adele Berlin*. Edited by Maxine L. Grossman. Bethesda, MD: University of Maryland Press, 2013.
- _____. "Truth or Theodicy: Speaking Truth to Power in the Book of Job." *PSB* 27 (2006): 238–58.
- _____. "When Job Sued God." *BAR* 38 (2012): 55–57.
- Habel, Norman. *The Book of Job*. OTL 7. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1985.
- Hamilton, Mark. "Elite Lives: Job 29–31 and Traditional Authority." *JSOT* 32 (2007): 69–89.
- _____. "The Past as Destiny: Historical Visions in Sam'al and Judah under Assyrian Hegemony." *HTR* 91 (1998): 215–50.
- Heller, Roy L. "The Widow in Deuteronomy: Beneficiary of Compassion and Co-option." Pages 1–11 in *The Impartial God: Essays in Biblical Studies in Honor of Jouette M. Bassler*. Edited by Calvin J. Roetzel and Robert L. Foster. New Testament Monographs 22. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2007.
- Houten, Christiana van. *The Alien in Israelite Law*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 107. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1991.
- Houtman, C. "The Urim and Thummim: A New Suggestion." *VT* 40 (1990): 229–32.
- Hurvitz, Avi. "The Date of the Prose Tale of Job Linguistically Reconsidered." *HTR* 67 (1974): 17–34.
- Janzen, Gerald. *Job*. Int. 14. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1985.
- Joyce, Paul M. "'Even if Noah, Daniel, and Job Were in It...' (Ezekiel 14:14): The Case of Job and Ezekiel." Pages 118–28 in *Reading Job Intertextually*. Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 574. Edited by Katharine Dell and Will Kynes. New York: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2013.
- Koehler, Ludwig, and Walter Baumgartner. *Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Translated by M. E. J. Richardson, 5 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Kristeva, Julia. *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*. Edited by Leon S. Roudiez. Translated by Thomas Gora, Alice Jardine, and Leon S. Roudiez. New York: Columbia University Press, 1980.
- Larsen, Mogens Trolle. "Individual and Family in Old Assyrian Society." *JCS* 59 (2007): 93–106.
- Lundbom, Jack R. *Deuteronomy: A Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013.

- Lyons, Michael A. "‘I Also Could Talk as You Do’ (Job 16:4): The Function of Intertextual Quotation and Allusion in Job." 169–77 in *Reading Job Intertextually*. Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 574. Edited by Katharine Dell and Will Kynes. New York: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2013.
- MacDonald, Nathan. *Deuteronomy and the Meaning of Monotheism*, Forschungen zum Alten Testament 2/1. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.
- McKenzie, Steven L. "Deuteronomistic History." Pages 161–68 in vol. 2 of *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freeman. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Nemo, Philippe. *Job and the Excess of Evil*. Translated by Michael Kigel, Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1998.
- Neville, Richard. "A Reassessment of the Radical Nature of Job’s Ethic in Job XXXI 13–15." *VT* 53 (2003): 182–200.
- Newsom, Carol. "The Book of Job." Pages 319–637 in vol. 4 of *New Interpreter’s Bible*. Edited by Leander Keck et al. 12 vols. Nashville: Abingdon, 1996.
- _____. *The Book of Job: A Contest of Moral Imaginations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- _____. "Job and Ecclesiastes." Pages 177–93 in *Old Testament Interpretation: Past Present and Future, Essays in Honor of Gene M. Tucker*. Edited by James Luther Mays, David L. Petersen, and Kent Harold Richards, Nashville: Abingdon, 1995.
- _____. "Job and His Friends: A Conflict of Moral Imaginations." *Int.* 53 (1999): 239–53.
- Oeming, Manfred. "Hiob 31 und der Dekalog." Pages 362–68 in *The Book of Job*. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 114. Edited by W. A. M. Beuken. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1994.
- Patrick, Dale. "The Rhetoric of Collective Responsibility in Deuteronomic Law." Pages 421–36 in *Pomegranates and Golden Bells: Studies in Biblical, Jewish, and Near Eastern Ritual, Law, and Literature in Honor of Jacob Milgrom*. Edited By David P. Wright, David Noel Freedman, and Avi Hurvitz. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1995.
- Pinker, Aron. "Satanic Verses—Part II." *JBQ* 25 (1997): 225–33.
- Pope, Martin. *Job*. ABC 15. New York: Doubleday, 1965.
- Pressler, Carolyn. *The View of Women Found in the Deuteronomic Family Laws*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 216. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1993.

- Propp, William H. *Exodus 19–40*. ABC 2a. New York: Doubleday, 2006.
- Reed, Annette Yoshiko. “Job as Jobab: The Interpretation of Job in LXX Job 42:17b–e.” *JBL* 120 (2001): 31–55.
- Reyburn, William D. *A Handbook on the Book of Job*. New York: United Bible Society, 1992.
- Roberts, J. J. M. “Job and the Israelite Religious Tradition.” *ZAW* 89 (1977): 107–14.
- Römer, Thomas. “The Book of Deuteronomy.” Pages 178–212 in *The History of Israel’s Traditions: The Heritage of Martin Noth*. Edited by Steven L. McKenzie and Patrick Graham. Sheffield, IL: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.
- Roth, Martha T. “The Neo-Babylonian Widow.” *JCS* 43–45 (1991–1993): 1–26.
- Scholnick, Sylvia Huberman. “The Meaning of Mišpāt (Justice) in the Book of Job.” Pages 349–58 in *Sitting with Job: Selected Studies on the Book of Job*. Edited by Roy B. Zuck. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 1992.
- Schultz, Richard. “Job and Ecclesiastes.” Pages 190–203 in *Reading Job Intertextually*. Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 574. Edited by Katharine Dell and Will Kynes. New York: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2013.
- Schweitzer, Steven. “Deuteronomy 32 & 33 as Proto-Deuteronomic Texts.” *PEGLMBS* 22 (2002): 79–98.
- Seow, Choon Leong. *Job 1–21: Interpretations and Commentary*. Illum. 14. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013.
- Simundson, Daniel. “Suffering.” Pages 219–25 in vol. 6 of *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. 6 vols. Edited by David Noel Freedman. New York: Double Day, 1992.
- Singer, Itamar. *Hittite Prayers*. Edited by Harry A. Hoffner. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2002.
- Smith, David L. “The Concept of Death in Job and Ecclesiastes.” *Did.* 4 (1992): 2–14.
- Tigay, Jeffery. *Deuteronomy*. JPSTC 5. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1996.
- Tsevat, Matitياهو. “The Hebrew Slave according to Deuteronomy 15:12–18: His Lot and the Value of His Work, with Special Attention to the Meaning of מְשֻׁבָּה.” *JBL* 113 (1994): 587–95.
- _____. “The Meaning of the Book of Job.” *HUCA* 37 (1966): 73–106.
- Waltke, Bruce and M. O’Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990.

- Weinfeld, Moshe. *Deuteronomy 1–11*. ABC 5. New York: Doubleday, 1991.
- _____. *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972.
- Weisman, Ze'ev., "The Place of People in Making Law and Judgement." Pages 407–20 in *Pomegranates and Golden Bells, Studies in Biblical, Jewish, and Near Eastern Ritual, Law, and Literature in Honor of Jacob Milgrom*. Edited By David P. Wright, David Noel Freedman, and Avi Hurvitz. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1995.
- Westermann, Claus. *The Structure of the Book of Job*. Translated by Charles Muenchow. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1981.
- Wiseman, D. J. "A New Text of the Babylonian Poem of the Righteous Sufferer." *AntS* 30 (1980): 101–7.
- _____. "The Vassal-Treaties of Esarhaddon." *Ir*. 20 (1958): 1–99.
- Witte, Markus. "Does the Torah Keep Its Promise? Job's Critical Intertextual Dialogue with Deuteronomy." Pages 54–65 in *Reading Job Intertextually*. Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 574. Edited by Katharine Dell and Will Kynes. New York: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2013.
- _____. "Hiobs 'Zeichen' (Hiob 31,35–37)." Pages 723–42 in *Gott und Mensch im Dialog. II : Festschrift für Otto Kaiser zum 80 Geburtstag*. Edited by Markus Witte. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2004.
- Wolfers, David. *Deep Things Out of Darkness: The Book of Job, Essays and a New English Translation*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.
- _____. "Job: A Universal Drama." *CBQ* 21 (1993): 13–23.
- Young, Ian. "Is the Prose Tale of Job in Late Biblical Hebrew?" *VT* 59 (2009): 606–29.
- Zuckerman, Bruce. *Job the Silent: A Study in Historical Counterpoint*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.

APPENDIX A

TRANSLATION OF SELECT JOBAN SPEECHES

Job 3

¹After this Job opened his mouth and cursed his day

²Job answered and he said:

³May the day in which I was born perish! And the night that it was said ‘a man is conceived!’

⁴May that day be darkness! Let God (אֱלֹהִים) not seek it from above! Let not light shine on it!

⁵Let darkness and the shroud of death claim it! May cloud rest upon it! May the darkenings of day terrify it!

⁶May intense darkness seize that night! Let it not rejoice among the days of the year! Let it not be numbered with the months!

⁷See here! May that night become barren! And let no shout of joy enter it!

⁸Let those cursing the day curse it—those skilled at provoking Leviathan!

⁹May the stars of its twilight darken! May it hope for light and there be none! Let it not see the rays of the dawn!

¹⁰Why were not the doors of my [mother’s] belly shut, and trouble hidden from my eyes?

¹¹Why did I not die from the womb or coming out from the belly and expire?

¹²Why were there knees before me and breasts so that I nursed?

¹³For now I would lie down and I would have quiet, I would be asleep and there would be rest for me

¹⁴With kings and counselors of the land, the ones building up desolated places for themselves

¹⁵Or with princes who have gold for themselves, the ones filling their houses with silver

¹⁶Or why was I not hidden as a stillborn child, as infants who never see the light?

¹⁷There the wicked cease their raging, and the weary of strength rest

¹⁸Together prisoners rest, they do not hear the sound of their oppressors

¹⁹Small and great are in that place, and slaves are free of their masters

²⁰Why is light given to the troubled, and vitality to those bitter of life?

²¹The ones waiting for death, and it is not for them

²²Those who rejoice and are glad when they find the grave

²³To the man whose way is hidden, and God (אֱלֹהִים) shuts himself off behind

²⁴My sigh comes before my bread, my groans pour out like water

²⁵I am terrified and it comes to me, that which I fear enters into me

²⁶I will not be quiet, I will not be still, I will not rest, but troubles comes

Job 6

¹Job answered and said:

²If only my vexation were surely weighed, and my calamity laid together on scales

³For now they would be heavier than the sand of the seas, therefore my words were brazen

⁴For the arrows of Shaddai (שֵׁטֶף) are in me, from which my spirit has drunk of their poison, the horrors of God (אֱלֹהִים) form battle lines against me

⁵Does the wild ass brays over grass? If the bull lows over its fodder

⁶Does one eat tasteless food without salt? If there is taste in the slime of the bugloss?

⁷My life refuses to touch them, they are my detestable food

⁸Who will grant that what I request may come? And will God (אֱלֹהִים) give me my wish?

⁹God (אֱלֹהִים) is intent and he crushes me, and he withdraws his hand and cuts me off

¹⁰And if it were again, I would take comfort, I would revel in pain that does not show pity, for I did not cover up the words to the holy one

¹¹What is my strength that I should hope? What is my end that I should prolong my life?

¹²Is my strength the strength of stones? Is my flesh bronze?

¹³Surely I am unable to help myself, and success is driven from me

¹⁴To reject faithfulness from a friend is to forsake fear of Shaddai (שֵׁטֶף)

¹⁵My brothers are treacherous as a wadi, like the channels of a wadi they disappear

¹⁶They darken with frost, concealing snow upon it

¹⁷In time, they dry up and disappear, in heat, they vanish from their place

¹⁸Caravans grope along their way, they ascend into the darkness and perish

¹⁹The Caravans of Tema gaze after it, the travelers of Sheba take hope in it

²⁰They are ashamed for they trusted, they arrive there and are rueful

²¹For now you are not, you see terror and are afraid

²²Have I said, "Give to me!" or, "From your power offer me a bribe!"?

²³Or, "Deliver me from the hand of my enemy!" and, "Ransom me from the hand of terrorizers!"

²⁴Teach me and I will be silent, Make me understand what I have erred

²⁵How pleasant are the words of the upright, but what does your correction correct?

²⁶Do you consider correcting words? And the speech of the despairing as wind?

²⁷Also you would cast [lots] over an orphan, and strike a deal over a friend

²⁸And now be willing to turn towards me... Would I lie to your face?

²⁹Relent please, and let no wrong be done, relent, my acquittal is still possible

³⁰Is there any wrong on my tongue? Cannot my pallet discern calamity?

Job 21

¹And Job answered and said:

²Listen to my words! This is your consolation

³Raise me up, and I will speak, after I speak you will mock

⁴Am I [bringing] my complaint to a human? Why should not my spirit (patience) be short?

⁵Turn towards me and be appalled, place [your] hand over [your] mouth

⁶If I remembered, I was dismayed, shuddering seized my flesh

⁷Why do the wicked live? They advance in life and become very powerful

⁸Their descendants are established in their presence, their offspring before their eyes

- ⁹Their houses are at peace from terror, and no rod of God (אֱלֹהִים) is upon them
¹⁰His bull mates and does not fail, his heifer delivers and never miscarries
¹¹They send out their little boys as a flock, their children skip about
¹²They lift up tambourine and lyre, they rejoice to the sound of the pipe
¹³They complete their days with good things, they descend to Sheol in rest
¹⁴They say to God (אֱלֹהִים), “Turn away from us! We do not desire knowledge of your ways
¹⁵What is Shaddai (שַׁדַּי) that we should serve him? How will we profit if we meet him?”
¹⁶See! Is not their prosperity in their hand? The council of the wicked has been distant from me
¹⁷How often is the lamp of the wicked extinguished? Or their calamities come upon them? Or [God] portions out destruction in his anger?
¹⁸Or are they ever like straw before the wind, or like chaff that a storm snatches away?
¹⁹[Does] God (אֱלֹהִים) store up his calamity for his children? Let him (God) repay [it] to him, and he will know
²⁰Let the eyes of each see his calamity and drink from the wrath of Shaddai (שַׁדַּי)
²¹For what delight does he have in his house after his [life] or when the number of its months are cut off?
²²Will they teach knowledge to God (אֱלֹהִים)? He judges the exalted
²³This one dies with strength in his bones, completely at rest and at ease
²⁴His pails are full of milk, and the marrow of his bones is moist
²⁵That one dies with a bitter life, and has not eaten good [food]
²⁶They lie down together in the dust, and the worm covers them
²⁷See! I know your plans and schemes to do violence to me
²⁸For you say, “Where is the house of the nobleman?” and, “Where is the tent in which the wicked dwell?”
²⁹Did you not ask the one who journeys on roads? And you did acknowledge them?
³⁰For the day of calamity is withheld from the evil one, and they allude the day of fury
³¹Who declares his ways to his face? Who repays him for what he has done?
³²He is brought to his grave, and someone keeps vigil over his tomb
³³They find the clods of the wadi sweet, every person will continue after him, there is no number for those who were before him
³⁴How you have comforted me with emptiness, only deceit is in your replies

Job 24

- ¹Why are not times stored up by Shaddai (שַׁדַּי)? And those who know him do not see his days?
²They overtake boundary markers, they steal herds and shepherd them
³They drive away the donkey of the orphan, they take the ox of the widow in pledge
⁴They thrust the poor from the road, together the afflicted of the earth are hidden
⁵See! They are wild donkeys in the wilderness, they go forth in their labor [Looking] for the leftovers of prey in the dessert as food for their young
⁶They harvest food in the field, and they glean in the vineyard of the wicked
⁷They spend the night naked without clothing, and there is no covering for them in the cold
⁸From the torrents of the mountains, they are soaked, and lacking shelter they cling to the rock

⁹They seize the orphan from the breast, they take the child of the afflicted in pledge

¹⁰They walk about naked without clothing, they are starving while carrying grain

¹¹Between the rows of the olive grove they press for oil, they tread in the winepress but they thirst

¹²From the city the dying groan, the life of the wounded cries out, but God does not assign guilt

¹³They are the ones who rebel against the light, they do not acknowledge its ways, they do not dwell in its paths

¹⁴The murderer raises the light so that he may kill the afflicted and poor, and in the night he is as a thief

¹⁵The eye of the adulterer keeps watch at twilight saying, "No eye will regard me." And he puts a concealment on his face

¹⁶In the dark, they dig through houses, daily they seal him up, they do not know the light

¹⁷For together, morning is the shadow of death to each, for he acknowledges the terrors of the shadow of death

¹⁸He is light on the face of the water, their portion of the land is cursed, no road turns towards the vineyards

¹⁹Drought also heat seize the waters of snow, they sinned unto Sheol

²⁰The womb forgets him, the worm finds him sweet, he is remembered no longer, wickedness is broken like a tree

²¹He is doing evil to the barren women that has not born children, and he does no good to the widow

²²He extends the mighty by his power, he raises up and he does not trust in life

²³He gives to him security, and he is supported, his eyes are upon their road

²⁴They are exalted, and then he is not, they have been struck like the bugloss, they are cut off like the ears of grain

²⁵If it is not so, who will make me a liar and will establish that my words are not [true]

Job 29

¹Job continued lifting up his words, saying:

²Who will give to me according to earlier months, according to the days when God (אלהים) kept watch over me?

³When his lamp shone upon my head, I walked by his light through darkness

⁴When I was in the days of my autumn harvest, with the council of God (אלהים) over my tent

⁵Shaddai (שדי) was still with me, my children surrounded me

⁶When my steps were washed with curds, and a rock poured forth streams of oil for me

⁷When I went out of the gates of the city, when I established my seat in the plaza

⁸Young men saw me and withdrew, old men rose and stood

⁹Princes refrained from speaking, they placed a hand upon their mouths

¹⁰The sound of rulers was quieted, and their tongues clung to their jaws

¹¹For the ear that heard me, blessed me, and the eye that saw me vouched for me

¹²For, I delivered the afflicted who cry out and the orphan who does not have a helper

¹³The blessing of the perishing came upon me, I caused the heart of the widow to be jubilant

¹⁴I was clothed with righteousness, and justice was my mantle and turban

¹⁵I was eyes to the blind, and I was feet to the lame

¹⁶I was a father to the poor and advocated the case of the one I did not know
¹⁷I shattered the fangs of iniquity, and I caused his teeth to release the prey
¹⁸And I said, “I shall expire with my nest, and I will multiply my days like the sand”
¹⁹My roots are spread to the waters, and dew settles on my branches
²⁰My honor was new with me, it restrings my bow in my hand
²¹They listened to me and waited, they kept silent for my counsel
²²After I spoke, they did not [speak] again, my words dripped over them
²³They waited for me like rain, and they open their mouths wide for the spring rain
²⁴I laughed at them and they had no confidence, They did not diminish the light of my face
²⁵I chose their way and sat as a headman, as a king I lived among the troop
 As one who comforts those lamenting

Job 31

¹I have made a covenant with my eyes, how could I consider a virgin?
²And what portion would be from God (אֱלֹהִים) on high, and what inheritance of Shaddai (שָׁדַי) from the heights?
³Does not disaster come upon iniquity? And misfortune on those doing injustice?
⁴Does he not see my ways? And number all of my steps?
⁵If I walked with vanity, if my foot hastened to deceit
⁶May he weigh me in just scales, God (אֱלֹהִים) knows my integrity
⁷If my steps have strayed from the way, and my eyes went after my heart, and a blemish clung to my hands
⁸May I sow, but another eat and my produce be uprooted
⁹If my heart was seduced over a woman and I laid in wait by the door of my friend,
¹⁰May my wife grind for another, and may others kneel over her
¹¹That would be a crooked plan, and that would be a transgression for judges
¹²For, that fire consumes down unto Abaddon and uproots all of my produce
¹³If I rejected the justice of my male servants and female servants in their contentions with me
¹⁴What shall I do when God (אֱלֹהִים) rises up? When he visits, what shall I return to him?
¹⁵Did not the one who made me in the womb make them? Only one formed us in the womb
¹⁶If I have withheld the desire of poor people, and caused the eyes of the widow to fail
¹⁷And eaten my morsel alone, and the orphan did not eat from it
¹⁸From my youth, I raised him [the orphan] up as a father would, and from the womb of my mother I led her [the widow]
¹⁹If I saw one perishing without clothing and there was no covering for the poor,
²⁰If his loins [offspring] did not bless me, and he did not draw warmth from the fleece of my lambs
²¹If I waved my hand over the poor, because I saw my supporters in the gate
²²May my shoulder fall from its socket, May my arm be broken from its end
²³For terror was mine—the calamity of God (אֱלֹהִים), I am not able to comprehend his majesty
²⁴If I have set gold as my confidence, and said to fine gold, “[You] are my trust,”
²⁵If I rejoiced in the multiplication of my wealth, or that my hand found power

²⁶If I looked at the sun when it shined, or the moon moving in honor

²⁷If my heart was enticed in secret, or my hand kissed my mouth

²⁸Also, that would be a iniquity for my judge, for I would have been untruthful to God

(^לא) above

²⁹If I rejoiced in the calamity of those hating me, and was stirred up when harm found him

³⁰I did not set my mouth to sin by asking a curse on his life

³¹Surely the men of my tent have never said, "Who will give his flesh?—And we will not be satisfied?"

³²The foreigner has not resided in the streets, I opened my doors to the journeyer

³³If I concealed my transgressions as human does, hiding my iniquity in my pocket

³⁴If I were terrified of the great masses, and contempt of families frightened me, and I was silent and did not go out of my doors

³⁵Oh that he would grant me someone to listen to me. See, my signature! Let Shaddai (^שדד) answer me! And, the indictment written by the man opposing me

³⁶Surely I would carry it upon my shoulder—I would fasten it as my crown

³⁷I would report to him an account of my steps—Like a prince I would draw near to him

³⁸If the land cries out against me, and her furrows weep together

³⁹If I have eaten her produce without [paying] silver, or exhausted her owners

⁴⁰In place of wheat may thorns come forth, and in place of barley, stinking weeds

The words of Job are complete

APPENDIX B

TABLE OF POSSIBLE INTERTEXTUAL CONNECTIONS

The following is a table of possible intertextual connections between the speeches of Job and Deuteronomy. I will categorize each of the connection according to the methodology I described beginning on page 92. I have bolded connections that appear in clusters of connections to specific texts in Deuteronomy.

Job 6

- | | |
|----------------------------------|----------|
| a. 4 – Deut 32:42 | Allusion |
| b. 22 – Deut 10:17; 16:19; 27:29 | Allusion |

Job 9

- | | |
|-------------------|----------|
| a. 5 – Deut 32:22 | Allusion |
|-------------------|----------|

Job 16

- | | |
|--------------------|----------|
| b. 9 – Deut 32:24 | Allusion |
| c. 13 – Deut 32:23 | Allusion |

Job 17

- | | |
|---------------------------------|----------|
| a. 5 – Deut 28:65 ; 32:5 | Allusion |
| b. 6 – Deut 28:37 | Allusion |

Job 21

- | | |
|---------------------------------|----------|
| a. 8 – Deut 28:18; 7:13–15 | Allusion |
| b. 10 – Deut 28:18 | Allusion |
| c. 19 – Deut 5:9; 7:9–10; 24:16 | Allusion |

Job 23

- | | |
|---------------------------|----------|
| a. 11 – Deut 28:14 | Allusion |
| b. 12 – Deut 5:32; et al. | Allusion |

Job 24

- | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|
| a. 2a – Deut 19:14, 27:17 | Reference |
| b. 2b – Deut 5:19 | Thematic Similarity |
| c. 3 – Deut 24:17, cf. 24:6 | Reference |

<i>d.</i> 4 – Deut 24:14	Reference
<i>e.</i> 7 – Deut 24:12	Reference
<i>f.</i> 8 – Deut 32:37	Allusion
<i>g.</i> 9 – Deut 24:10	Allusion
<i>h.</i> 10a – Deut 24:19–21	Allusion
<i>i.</i> 10b – Deut 24:15	Allusion
<i>j.</i> 11 – Deut 24: 14–15, 20	Reference
<i>k.</i> 12 – Deut 24:14–15	Reference
<i>l.</i> 15 – Deut 22:22	Allusion
<i>m.</i> 21 – Deut 27:19	Allusion

Job 27

<i>a.</i> 4 – Deut 5:20	Thematic Similarity
<i>b.</i> 15 – Deut 28:21	Allusion
<i>c.</i> Whole chapter – Deut 27, 28	Thematic Similarity

Job 29

<i>a.</i> 6 – Deut 32:14; 8:15	Allusion
<i>b.</i> 15 – Deut 27:18	Reference
<i>c.</i> 14–17 – Deut 32:15	Allusion
<i>d.</i> 15 – Deut 27:18	Allusion

Job 31

<i>a.</i> 1 – Deut 22:17–28	Allusion
<i>b.</i> 3 – Deut 28:15ff	Allusion
<i>c.</i> 5–6 – Deut 5:11, 5:20	Reference
<i>d.</i> 7 – Deut 8:6, 11:22, 13:5, 19:9, 26:17, 28:9, 30:16	Allusion
<i>e.</i> 8 – Deut 28:30b–30c, Deut 6:11	Allusion
<i>f.</i> 9–10 – Deut 5:18	Allusion
<i>g.</i> 12 – Deut 32:22	Indirect Quote
<i>h.</i> 13 – Deut 15:12–14	Reference
<i>i.</i> 16 – Deut 24:17–21	Allusion
<i>j.</i> 18 – Deut 27:19	Allusion
<i>k.</i> 19 – Deut 10:18; 15:11	Allusion
<i>l.</i> 20 – Deut 18:4	Allusion
<i>m.</i> 21 – Deut 24:17–21	Reference
<i>n.</i> 24–25 – Deut 17:17	Reference
<i>o.</i> 26–27 – Deut 17:2–6	Allusion
<i>p.</i> 28 – Deut 17:6	Allusion
<i>q.</i> 32 – Deut 14:29 et al.	Reference
<i>r.</i> 33 – Deut 27:15, 24	Allusion
<i>s.</i> 36 – Deut 6:8	Allusion
<i>t.</i> 39 – Deut 24:14	Allusion