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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The book of Job is one of the most difficult books to interpret in the Old Testament. ¹ This is mainly due to the two literary portions of the book—the prose frame (prologue [1:1-2:13] / epilogue [42:7-17]) and the poetic center (3:1-42:6)—that seem to record conflicting messages about Job. ² While most agree that the prose tale describes Job as a patient and righteous man, ³ a difference of opinion exists as to the Job of the poetic dialogue. To some, the Job of the poetry is a rebel who is self-righteous and nearly blasphemous. ⁴ Others hold more favorable views, taking him as either an imperfectly


righteous or even a blameless man, despite his ignorant challenge to divine justice during the debate. As a result, scholars diverge as to whether the book should be read as about a righteous, partially pious, or utterly sinful man.

More commentators—notably Christian interpreters—have accepted the patient Job, guided by his favorable portrayal in the prologue/epilogue and in other biblical accounts (Ezek 14:14, 20; Jas 5:11). The positive reading also prevails in Second Temple Jewish writings (the LXX, Aristeas the Historian, Tobit, Ben Sira, some Qumran fragments, Testament of Job), Rabbinic literature, and patristic and medieval Christian interpretations. In this line, many early Jewish writers regard “Job’s model of arguing with God” in the poetic body as demonstrating a “Scripture-sanctioned virtue of the people of God.”

The positive reading, however, has not gone unchallenged. Many have criticized such an approach as “glossing over” Job’s intemperance and rebellion in the poetic section for the sake of outshining the hero of the frame narrative. Consequently,

---


another stream of interpretation has arisen—particularly with the rise of critical study—that is more attentive to the darker side of Job.\footnote{Dell, \textit{The Book of Job as Sceptical Literature}, 5–56.}


[Zuckerman] The book of Job therefore appears to be at odds with itself; and however one may attempt to resolve its contradictory picture, the result never seems to be quite successful. Like oil and water, the Prose Frame Story and the Poem naturally tend to disengage from one another despite all efforts to homogenize them.\footnote{Zuckerman, \textit{Job the Silent}, 14.}

[Curtis] A consideration of the contrasting presentations of the figure of Job is, however, so disconcerting as to show that the poetry must not be interpreted in terms of the prose.\footnote{John B. Curtis, “On Job’s Response to Yahweh: (Job 40:4-5; 42:2-6),” \textit{JBL} 98, no. 4 (1979): 510.}

The present study finds the negative interpretation problematic. As opposed to
the critical appraisal of Job as a book of disunity and dissonance, the prose and the poetry organically connect, creating literary unity and conveying a coherent message about Job. Against the negative assessment of Job’s personality, the book consistently portrays Job as an innocent, righteous sufferer.

The thrust of this unifying understanding comes from Eliphaz’s vision (4:12-21) and the role of Satan in the book. In contrast to the common belief that Satan vanishes for good after the prologue,17 this monograph finds that Satan, disguised, appears again as the spirit (רוּחַ [4:15]) in Eliphaz’s vision (4:12-21) and exerts a vast amount of influence on the speeches of the friends and Elihu. Although the importance of Eliphaz’s vision in the development of the friends’ and Elihu’s speeches (chs. 4-37) has been noted by some,18 commentators in general neglect or lack consensus concerning the identity of the רוּחַ (4:15). While many fail to specify it,19 others consider the רוּחַ (4:15) to

be either God/God’s angel,20 Satan,21 a spirit of deception,22 or even some nighttime spirit.23 In addition, few monographs or commentaries discuss the importance of the רוח (4:15) and its role in the development of the theological debate of the friends and Elihu.24 As E. J. Hamori notes, serious commentary on the רוח (4:15) is rare because commentators tend to focus more on the “theological content” of the vision than on the


K. Brown’s 2015 monograph, *The Vision in Job 4 and Its Role in the Book*, marks the first extensive treatment of the topic. He correctly notes the centrality of the visionary account (4:12-21) in the theological development of the book and the subversiveness of the spirit and its message. However, he fails to see the רוח (4:15) as Satan, taking it as a spirit of deception (e.g., 1 Kgs 22) that brings divine condemnation (to Job). Moreover, he intermingles synchronic and diachronic-redactional approaches to the text, with the result that he attributes the vision to Job—not Eliphaz—by relocating the visionary account (4:12-21) to the end of Job’s opening lament in chapter 3. His interpretation, therefore, departs not only from the intended meaning of the received text but also from the traditional ascription of the vision to Eliphaz.

Rejecting such a reconstruction of the text, this monograph intends to contribute to the ongoing debate on the meaning of Job by proposing the centrality of Eliphaz’s vision (4:12-21) for understanding the book.

**Thesis**

The present study argues that the most plausible candidate for the unidentified spiritual visitor (רוח [4:15]) in Eliphaz’s vision (4:12-21) is the Satan of the prologue. Perhaps on one of the nights when the friends are visiting Job (2:11-13), Satan, disguised, approaches Eliphaz and whispers a dark message of human untrustworthiness that echoes his accusation against Job in the prologue (1:9-11; 2:4-5).
Job 4:17-19 Can a man be righteous before God? Can a man be pure before his Maker? Even in his servants he puts no trust, and his angels he charges with error. How much more those who dwell in houses of clay, whose foundation is in the dust, who are crushed like the moth.

Eliphaz, perceiving the message as divine revelation, believes that the affliction that has befallen Job is due to his sin. Following Job’s opening lament (ch. 3), Eliphaz therefore responds first by introducing the vision’s message and suggesting that Job should repent (chs. 4-5).

Not only does Eliphaz reiterate the vision’s message as a key premise for his subsequent speeches (e.g., 15:14-16), but Zophar (20:2-8), Bildad (25:4-6), and Elihu (33:15-17, 19-21, 23-28; 33:4; 36:10, 15) also continually rely on the vision’s message and authority to condemn Job and support their doctrine of retribution.30

Table 1. Major citations/allusions to Eliphaz’s vision (4:12-21)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eliphaz’s 2nd speech: 15:14-16</th>
<th>What is man, that he can be pure? Or he who is born of a woman, that he can be righteous? See, God puts no trust in his holy ones, and the heavens are not pure in his sight. How much less one who is abominable and corrupt, a man who drinks injustice like water!</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zophar’s 2nd speech: 20:3</td>
<td>The spirit beyond my understanding answers me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bildad’s 3rd speech: 25:4-6</td>
<td>How then can man be in the right before God? How can he who is born of woman be pure? See, even the moon is not bright, and the stars are not pure in his eyes. How much less man, who is a maggot, and the son of man, who is a worm!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elihu’s speech: 33:15-16</td>
<td>In a dream, in a vision of the night, when deep sleep falls on men, while they slumber on their beds, then he opens the ears of men and seals them with instructions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>He opens their ears to instruction and commands that they return from iniquity. . . . He delivers the afflicted by their affliction and opens their ear by adversity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30For the full list of citations and allusions to Eliphaz’s vision (4:12-21), see Table A1 in Appendix 1.
The major citations/allusions to the vision particularly occur at the beginning and the ending of each cycle unit, framing each of the speech cycles of the friends and Elihu.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The original vision</th>
<th>The vision</th>
<th>The vision</th>
<th>The vision</th>
<th>The vision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Cycle</td>
<td>Second Cycle</td>
<td>Third Cycle</td>
<td>Elihu Speech 1</td>
<td>Elihu Speech 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Chs.4-14)</td>
<td>(Ch.15-21)</td>
<td>(Chs.22-25)</td>
<td>(Chs.32-33)</td>
<td>(Ch.34)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. The vision’s influence in the book

Satan’s subversive influence, then, is not confined to the prologue but extends to the whole of the speech cycles (chs. 4-25; 32-37), serving as the basis for the friends’ and Elihu’s counsel to Job.

This study’s interpretation thus suggests that the friends and Elihu are misled by the demonic teaching to falsely accuse Job as a sinner. Job, meanwhile, remains innocent as he honestly responds to the friends’ accusations by defending his integrity. Unaware of the satanic origin of his affliction and of the vision’s message, Job—using language similar to that of the lament and imprecatory psalms—questions divine justice concerning his undeserved suffering and the false condemnation of the vision’s message (e.g., 7:11-21).³¹

Two different paths of the debate further highlight Job’s innocence, as D. A. Garrett explains. The friends, who begin with a “tactful rebuke of Job” (chs. 4-5),

---
progress to a “veiled denunciation of him,” and finally—fully embracing Satan’s teaching
(4:17-21)—to an “open, bitter, and altogether false assault on his character” (chs. 22,
25).32 Job, on the other hand, pursues a different “spiritual journey.” From his nadir of
despair in cursing his birth (ch. 3; cf. Jer 20:14-18), he advances to offer many prayers
(cf. “the three friends never pray”) with an eschatological hope for a meditator/redeemer
(16:19, 21; 19:25-27), to explore the meaning of “his suffering” and “the injustice of the
world” (chs. 21, 24), and finally to reject the vision’s false message (26:4; 27:3-4) with a
confession of faith in “the justice of God” (chs. 26-27) and in God’s vindication (ch.
31).33 In the final verdict of the epilogue, Job is indeed vindicated, whereas the friends
are proved wrong.34

In addition, the theme of the righteous sufferer—together with the
pervasiveness of Satan’s influence in the book—refines the quest to identify the principal
genre of Job. While no consensus has been reached concerning the genre of the book
(e.g., tragic drama, comedy, parody, heroic epic, lament, lawsuit, or even sui generis),35
Garrett has pioneered the reading of Job as apocalyptic wisdom literature.36 In his
forthcoming book *The Problem of the Old Testament* (particularly in the chapter on Job),
Garrett highlights eleven features that Job shares with the two other biblical examples of


33Ibid., 20–29. See also Fuller, “The Book of Job and Suffering,” 53–54. Against this reading,
see Gault, “Job’s Hope,” 147–65.

34For a diverse interpretive suggestions for 42:7-8, see David D. Frankel, “The Speech about
Other related interpretive issues such as 38:2 מִִ֤יַזְּוַּמְּמִלְּיַיְקָבִּ֖יַד מְלַלְמִיִּ֑וַּה (“Who is this that darkens
counsel by words without knowledge?”), 40:8 מְלַלְמִיִּ֑וַּה מְמִלְּיַיְקָבִּ֖יַד מְלַלְלִּ֑וַּה (“Will you indeed annul my
justice? Will you declare me guilty so that you might be right?”), 42:3 מְמִלְּיַיְקָבִּ֖יַד מְמִלְּלִּ֑וַּה (“Who is this
that hides counsel without knowledge?”), and 42:6 מְמִלְּלִּ֑וַּה מְמִלְּיַיְקָבִּ֖יַד מְמַלְּלִּ֑וַּה (“Therefore I despise
myself, and repent in dust and ashes” [ESV]) will be discussed in ch. 5 to support the reading of Job as
about an innocent sufferer.


by Johnson, *Now My Eye Sees You*. 
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apocalyptic literature—Daniel and Revelation. He particularly notes that Job, Daniel and Revelation all describe the “severe suffering” of believers (i.e., Job himself [Job]; the chosen people [Daniel]; Christians [Revelation]), which “ultimately comes from Satan.” These books thus invite the believer to endure the suffering and wait for the “divine intervention” (Job 38-41; Dan 2:44-45; 7:9-14; Rev 19:11-21) that will terminate the domination of Satan and bring bliss to the patient believer (Job 42:7-17; Dan 12, Rev 21-22).

Following this apocalyptic reading, one would then expect an “apocalyptic climax” in which the Satan of Job is brought to justice. While the identity of Leviathan (40:25-41:26 [41:1-34]) in God’s second speech has been debated, the present study, following the studies of Garrett and others, maintains that the serpent Leviathan (40:25-41:26 [41:1-34]) represents Satan, upon whom God pronounces his ultimate punishment.

A brief survey of the arguments of this monograph then suggests that Job is not a book of incongruities but a literary whole with the overarching themes of the reality of evil (which ultimately comes from Satan), the suffering of the righteous, and the apocalyptic resolution of the problem of evil. Through this thematic progress, the book effectively answers the issue of divine justice/theodicy, declaring that God’s

---

37 For detail, see ch. 5, 188-91.
41 R. E. Murphy writes, “The setting of the book must be placed in the wisdom movement. . . . The work is a product of the sages who found the optimism of Proverbs to be an oversimplification. The doctrine of divine retribution, which Proverbs shares with the Deuteronomic theology and the general biblical tradition, needed to be confronted with the ‘difficult case,’ and this is Job.” Roland E. Murphy, Wisdom Literature, FOTL, vol. 13 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983), 20.
administration of the world (and more specifically, his dealings with the problem of evil/suffering) is beyond human comprehension (chs. 38-41), and that man’s proper response is to fear God, and trust in God’s sovereign and righteous rule (28:28).  

**Methodology**

Since the rise of historical criticism, the literary integrity of Job has been severely challenged. Particularly due to its seeming inconsistencies, critics have questioned the authenticity of many parts of the book. Most regard the prose and the poetry sections as disparate pieces, taking either the poetry as later development or the prologue-epilogue as added later. Within the prose, some reject the prologue (or the heavenly scene in particular) as non-original, while others consider the epilogue to be a later addition. As for the poetic body, chapter(s) 24,

---


45 E.g., Tur-Sinai, *The Book of Job*; Zuckerman, *Job the Silent*.

46 E.g., Eduard König, *Das Buch Hiob* (Gütersloh, Germany: C. Bertelsmann, 1929).


51 E.g., Jastrow, *Book of Job*; W. A. Irwin, “The Elihu Speeches in the Criticism of the Book of
(32-37),\textsuperscript{52} and/or God’s speech\textsuperscript{53} (or more limitedly, God’s first speech\textsuperscript{54} or second speech\textsuperscript{55}) have been taken as secondar.

In addition, rearrangement of the text is not uncommon. For instance, some who are not content with the present form of the third speech cycle (chs. 22-27; particularly due to the brevity of Bildad’s speech [ch. 25] and the lost speech of Zophar) suggest numerous relocations of the text.\textsuperscript{56} Some also insist that the Elihu speeches fit better before chapter 28.\textsuperscript{57} Besides these major rearrangements, the cases of minor reconstruction or deletion of a verse/verses are too numerous to be introduced here.\textsuperscript{58}

In recent years, however, more scholars have approached the book as it stands, seeking to find the book’s meaning in its final, received form.\textsuperscript{59} The following arguments

---


\textsuperscript{52}E.g., Fohrer, Das Buch Hiob; Pope, Job; Steinmann, Le livre de Job; Horst, Hiob; Rowley, Job; John C. L. Gibson, Job, Daily Study Bible (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1985); Newsom, “The Book of Job as Polyphonic Text,” 200–33.


\textsuperscript{54}E.g., Steinmann, Le livre de Job, takes 39:13-18 as secondary.


\textsuperscript{56}H. H. Rowley, “The Book of Job and Its Meaning,” 188n2, in his survey, comments that the proposals for the reconstruction of the third speech cycle are “innumerable.”


\textsuperscript{58}The textual note sections in D. J. A. Clines’s Job commentary series often provide a helpful survey of the minor alterations suggested by commentators. Clines, Job 1-20; Clines, Job 38-42, WBC, vol. 18B (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2011).

\textsuperscript{59}Newsom, “Re-Considering Job,” 155–82. Y. Pyeon outlines the recent trend in Joban scholarship: “Biblical scholarship has been changing over the past few decades as scholars have come to question past historical, or diachronic, methods and to adopt newer literary, or synchronic, models of interpretation. Scholars are finding that reconstructions of the compositional history of a book do not always provide a full understanding of the book, and that in many cases such models cannot be proven decisively. Instead, or in addition, they are increasingly looking to synchronic models that ask about the final form of the biblical text, its plot, or the means by which it presents ideas, etc. This is especially so in the case of Job.” Yohan Pyeon, You Have Not Spoken What Is Right about Me: Intertextuality and the Book of Job, Studies in Biblical Literature 45 (New York: Peter Lang, 2003), 3. According to Seow, Job 1-21, 228–29, contemporary European scholarship tends to embrace the historical-critical method, whereas many
have been advanced against the critical reconstruction of the text: (1) Neither the prose nor the poetry makes sense on its own. The prologue and the epilogue, notes R. S. Fyall, are merely the “opening and closing” of a larger narrative and they themselves “do not constitute a full story.” The poetry dialogue, likewise, cannot stand in isolation. Without the prologue, maintains P. P. Zerafa, the reader would “miss the necessary information about the persons involved” and the whole story “would be deprived of its natural setting.” Without the epilogue, the book “would unwarrantedly be turned into a tragedy and the masterful composition would be thrown out of balance.” (2) The three-part literary pattern of Job (prose-poetry-prose) is also attested in other ancient Near East compositions. Job’s mixture of prose and poetry, then, might reflect a common literary convention of the ancient Near East, and hence affirm the book’s independent stance as a literary whole. (3) While numerous proposals for reconstructing the book have been recent Anglophone scholars are skeptical of such an approach. See also Newsom, “Re-Considering Job,” 160–61.


63 C. H. Gordon and G. A. Rendsburg warn against hasty reconstruction of the book: “Hammurapi’s Code has a comprehensive literary form. The prologue and epilogue are in poetry, whose form is parallelistic and whose language is archaic. The law in the middle, however, are in prose, so that the whole composition has a pattern, which we call ABA; A being poetry, B being prose. This has an important bearing upon other oriental compositions including the Bible. Thus the Book of Job starts out with a prose prologue; but the main body of the book is poetry with parallelism and archaic language; and the epilogue is in prose. Some scholars are inclined to detach the prologue and epilogue because they are in prose, whereas the rest of the book is in poetry. Such an argument fails to reckon with the literary composition as a whole, which, like Hammurapi’s Code, has the architectural form ABA. Although in the Book of Job the prose and poetry are reversed, the architectural balance remains the same. Similarly the biblical Book of Daniel begins and ends in Hebrew, though the middle is in Aramaic. The possibility of an intentional ABA
offered, there is little agreement. For instance, most commentators differ as to which part(s) of the book should be considered secondary. Moreover, if one accepted all the critical suggestions (as surveyed above), virtually nothing would remain as the original kernel of the book. Another example is the third speech cycle (chs. 22-27) in which critics have produced “a bewildering variety” of proposals. L. Wilson’s statement is noteworthy:

A number of scholars add 26:5–14 to Bildad’s otherwise short speech (e.g., Rowley, Gordis, Pope, Terrien, Habel); but Clines adds all of chapter 26; John Hartley instead adds 27:13–23; while Peter Zerafa ascribes 24:18–25:6 to Bildad. Many have assigned 27:13–23 to Zophar, but others add 24:18–24 and sometimes 27:7–10 (or 27:7–12). We might conclude with E. J. Kissane that “the text has suffered much more at the hands of some modern critics than it had suffered throughout the ages of its history.” The end result is that the attempts to “restore the original text” have failed to come to any compelling conclusion.

To add to this, there is “no manuscript evidence” to support such views. Every effort to reconstruct or relocate the text, therefore, is inherently speculative and subjective. (4) A growing number of recent studies reveal that on literary grounds, all the parts of the book are integral to the flow and structure of the book. For example, Y. Pyeon summarizes,

Recent study of Job has uncovered a variety of evidence that builds support for the literary connection of the various parts of the book of Job: quotations and citations, verbal ironies, repetition of key terms, images, motifs, ideas and themes not only between the prologue-epilogue (1:1-2:13 and 42:7-17) and poetic sections (3:1-42:6), but also among the poetic dialogues themselves. . . . [T]ogether they suggest


E.g., S. Terrien considers only the Elihu speeches to be secondary, while G. Fohrer takes ch. 24, the Elihu speeches, and God’s second speech (40:6–41:34) to be later additions. M. Pope, on the other hand, holds ch. 28, the Elihu speeches, and God’s second speech to be secondary, and J. Lévéque views ch. 28 and Elihu speeches to be non-original. See the survey in Williams, “Current Trends in the Study of the Book of Job,” 2–7.


Lindsay Wilson, Job, THOTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015), 24.


that the book of Job shows a kind of literary unity in that the various parts interact with one another in ways heretofore not noticed.\textsuperscript{69}

The weight of the evidence, then, suggests that the historical/redactional approach to the book is an inadequate model for interpreting Job.\textsuperscript{70} The present study, therefore, approaches the book in its original design.

The Hebrew Text and Versions

In regard to the text of Job, the Masoretic text (MT) is given priority and provides the basis for this study.\textsuperscript{71} The MT, however, presents many challenges to exegetes with its unique syntax and morphology.\textsuperscript{72} It also contains a number of abstruse and rare words, including 170 \textit{hapax legomena}.\textsuperscript{73} These difficulties have led some to

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{69}Pyeon, \textit{You Have Not Spoken What Is Right about Me}, 1–2.


\textsuperscript{71}The two most important Masoretic manuscripts are the Aleppo Codex (925 AD) and the Leningrad Codex (1,009 AD). According to Seow, \textit{Job 1-21}, 4, when the Leningrad Codex presents “a dubious reading,” the Aleppo Codex often provides “the correct form” (e.g., “1:21; 4:9, 17; 7:21; 8:1; 9:35; 10:1, 2; 11:3, 6, 7; 15:8; 16:5; 22:21”). See also Moshe H. Goshen-Gottstein, “The Aleppo Codex and the Rise of the Massoretic Bible Text,” \textit{The Biblical Archaeologist} 42, no. 3 (1979): 145–63; Goshen-Gottstein, “The Authenticity of the Aleppo Codex,” \textit{Textus} 1 (1960): 17–58.


\textsuperscript{73}August H. Konkel, \textit{Job}, vol. 6 (Carol Stream, IL: Tyndale House Publishers, 2005), 12. Hooks, \textit{Job}, 21, notes that there are “more \textit{hapax legomena}” in Job “than in any other book of the Old Testament.”
\end{footnotesize}
even speculate that the MT was translated into Hebrew from another language such as Arabic,\textsuperscript{74} Aramaic,\textsuperscript{75} or Edomite,\textsuperscript{76} though few currently adhere to such views.\textsuperscript{77} Still, many resort to emendations\textsuperscript{78} and/or to comparative Semitics (e.g., Arabic, Akkadian, Aramaic, Sumerian, Ugaritic, Phoenician, Eblaite) to handle the obscurities of the MT.\textsuperscript{79} The present study, however, attempts to read the MT in its own right by minimizing or resisting most suggestions for emendation. Moreover, T. Longman and others seem to be right in warning against the uncontrolled use of comparative Semitics in Joban studies (e.g., M. J. Dahood’s excessive use of Ugaritic).\textsuperscript{80} The Semitic languages, therefore, will be consulted with discretion when necessary.

In addition, the Hebrew MSS and the ancient versions—the LXX (Old Greek), revisions of the LXX (Aquila, Theodotion, Symmachus, and Origen), the Peshitta, Vulgate, Targum, and DSS (4QJob\textsuperscript{a}, 4QJob\textsuperscript{b}, 2QJob, 4QpalaeoJob\textsuperscript{b}, 4QtgJob,

\textsuperscript{74}E.g., Frank H. Foster, “Is the Book of Job a Translation from an Arabic Original?,” \textit{AJSLL} 49, no. 1 (1932): 21–45.

\textsuperscript{75}E.g., Tur-Sinai, \textit{The Book of Job}, xxx–xl.


\textsuperscript{77}See the survey in Williams, “Current Trends in the Study of the Book of Job,” 9–11.

\textsuperscript{78}See the survey in the textual note sections of Clines, \textit{Job 1–20}; Clines, \textit{Job 21–37}; Clines, \textit{Job 38–42}.


—will be consulted to clarify the meaning of the Hebrew text. A word of caution is in order, however, as ancient translators, like modern interpreters, undoubtedly all also struggled with the difficulties of the Hebrew text laid before them.

The following few remarks on the LXX and other selected versions will help to inform this study’s approach. (1) LXX Job presents some difficulties. Not only is it one-sixth shorter than the MT, but its omissions are also unevenly distributed (4 percent shorter in chs. 1-15; 16 percent in chs. 15-21; 25 percent in chs. 22-31; 35 percent in chs. 32-37; and 16 percent in chs. 38-42). While the translator’s faithfulness to his source text should not be underestimated, commentators also suspect that the LXX translator deliberately abridged parts that seemed difficult, unnecessary, repetitive, or long.

For fragments of the texts preserved in the DSS manuscripts, see Table A2 in Appendix 1.


Frequently LXX Job drops “lines and verses” and at times, even “six or seven verses in length” (e.g., 21:28–33; 26:5–11; 28:14–19; 34:28–33; 39:13–18). Konkel, Job, 13.

Dhorme, A Commentary on the Book of Job, ccii–cciii; S. R. Driver and G. B. Gray, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Job, ICC (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1921), lxxiv–lxxv. Note that the first six chapters of the LXX are virtually identical to the MT, but the Elihu speeches (chs. 32–37) in the LXX are 35 percent shorter than the MT. E. Dhorme attributes such an extensive omission to the translator’s carelessness (e.g., increased fatigue), whereas C. L. Seow is more positive in that the translator “may have been concerned with the wearying of the reader” and hence was “not merely rendering the Hebrew original word for word but conveying the general sense of the composition.” Dhorme, A Commentary on the Book of Job, ccxi–cciii; Seow, Job 1-21, 7, italics original.


Dhorme, A Commentary on the Book of Job, ccii; Seow, Job 1-21, 7; Robert Gordis, The Book of God and Man: A Study of Job (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978), 122; Gillis Gerleman,
addition, the translator, more often than not, exercised freedom in creating a free, paraphrastic, and even midrashic translation (e.g., 2:9; 42:17)\textsuperscript{88} such that C. E. Cox, the NETS Job translator, even describes the LXX translator’s stance as “an epitomiser, commentator, interpreter.”\textsuperscript{89} To add to this, a number of mistranslations\textsuperscript{90} and possible theologically motivated alterations\textsuperscript{91} have been attested. It is more likely, then, that most divergences are due to translational factors\textsuperscript{92} rather than to a different Hebrew Vorlage underlying the LXX.\textsuperscript{93} While in some cases LXX Job does help to resolve textual issues, this study approaches the LXX cautiously. (2) Peshitta Job has received a mixed review. Some, taking Peshitta Job primarily as a daughter translation of the LXX, discount its text-critical value.\textsuperscript{94} Many, however, hold it to be a direct translation from the Hebrew text close to the MT and find it helpful in solving textual problems,\textsuperscript{95} despite its

\textsuperscript{88} For numerous examples, see Dhorme, A Commentary on the Book of Job, cxcvi–cxcix.


\textsuperscript{90} For many examples, see Dhorme, A Commentary on the Book of Job, cxxvii–cxcviii.


\textsuperscript{93} This position is held by Edwin Hatch, Essays in Biblical Greek (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1889), 215–45, and H. M. Orlinsky (see n85 of this chapter).


occasional departure from the MT.\textsuperscript{96} (3) Jerome’s Vulgate is inconsistent. Despite Jerome’s intention to render a faithful translation of the Hebrew text, in many cases the influence of the LXX and Origen’s Hexaplaric versions (Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus) is still apparent.\textsuperscript{97} As a result, his translation occasionally deviates from the MT, sometimes being literal and other times rather free.\textsuperscript{98} At times, Jerome simply does not seem to have understood the Hebrew correctly.\textsuperscript{99} Therefore, like the LXX, the Vulgate is used with discretion here.\textsuperscript{100} (4) Finally, the Rabbinic Targum is generally a faithful rendition of the MT,\textsuperscript{101} except for its midrashic expansion\textsuperscript{102} and its sporadic departure from the MT “primarily on theological grounds.”\textsuperscript{103} The Targum, however, translates Job in prose, even the poetic part, resulting in the loss of “much of the force of the poetry.”\textsuperscript{104}


\textsuperscript{98}Pope, \textit{Job}, xlvi; Seow, \textit{Job 1-21}, 12–13.


\textsuperscript{100}Pope, \textit{Job}, xlvi.

\textsuperscript{101}See the discussion in Mangan, \textit{The Targum of Job}, 13–15.

\textsuperscript{102}C. Mangan notes that “the Midrash it contains is not as extensive as in some of the other Targums.” Céline Mangan, “The Interpretation of Job in the Targums,” in \textit{The Book of Job}, ed. W. A. M. Beukens, BETL 114 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1994), 268.

\textsuperscript{103}Hooks, \textit{Job}, 22.

\textsuperscript{104}Mangan, \textit{The Targum of Job}, 13–14.
Outline of the Monograph

The outline of this monograph is as follows: Chapter 2 begins by investigating the identity of the spirit (רוּח) in Eliphaz’s vision (4:12-21). I will first discuss problems with seeing the spirit as God or an angel by critically examining six proposals raised to support this view. I will then demonstrate why taking the spirit as Satan is exegetically preferred, carefully examining the Hebrew text of Job 4:12-21 and the immediate literary context. Chapter 3 progresses to explore the pervasiveness of the vision’s influence in the friends’ dialogues (chs. 4-25). I will demonstrate that the demonic message (4:17-21) not only frames the whole of the speech cycles of the friends but also functions as the foundation for the friends’ accusations against Job. The discussion then extends to the Elihu speeches (chs. 32-37) in Chapter 4. Against some scholars’ assertion that Elihu’s theological contribution is different from that of the friends, I will suggest that Elihu’s stance is virtually identical to theirs, with the same emphasis on the vision’s message and on the doctrine of retribution. In Chapter 5, I will then sum up the previous discussions by presenting two implications for the book. Based on the pervasiveness of Satan’s influence in the speech cycles, I will first reaffirm the traditional reading of Job as an innocent, righteous sufferer. I will then support D. A. Garrett’s understanding of the book as apocalyptic wisdom literature and propose that Leviathan in God’s second speech (40:25-41:26 [41:1-34]) refers to Satan, who will face an apocalyptic end. Finally, Chapter 6 summarizes the entire discussion by concluding that the book as it stands conveys a coherent, unified message about the suffering of the righteous and God’s sovereign handling of the problem of evil.
CHAPTER 2

THE ORIGIN OF THE UNIDENTIFIED SPIRIT
IN ELIPHAZ’S VISION (JOB 4:12-21)

This chapter aims to unveil the origin of the spirit, which may bring a crucial hermeneutical key for interpreting Eliphaz’s vision (4:12-21) as well as the theological argument of the friends and Elihu. Three sections will be devoted to the discussion: (1) a description of the visionary experience (4:12-16), (2) the spirit’s message (4:17-21), and (3) the literary context.¹ I will conclude that the most plausible candidate for the spiritual visitant is Satan, who not only afflicts Job in the prologue (1:1-2:13), but who also, disguised, delivers a subversive message that will function as the key premise of the speeches of the friends and Elihu.

Description of the Visionary Experience (4:12-16)

Job 4:12-16 recounts Eliphaz’s personal revelation received in the dead of night:²

¹I divide the text into 4:12-16 and 4:17-21 based on Roland E. Murphy, Wisdom Literature, FOTL, vol. 13 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983), 23–24. While most take 4:17-21 as the spirit’s message, some (e.g., Moses Buttenweiser, The Book of Job [New York: Macmillan, 1922], 163, and David J. A. Clines, Job 1-20, WBC, vol. 17 [Dallas: Word Books, 1989], 133–34) limit it to 4:17 and consider 4:18-21 to be Eliphaz’s exposition on 4:17. I, however, agree with the former view that assigns 4:17-21 to the spirit’s message.

A word came stealing to me, and my ear caught a whisper of it. Amid disquieting thoughts from visions of the night, when deep sleep falls on people, a spirit passed by my face, the hair of my flesh stood up. It stood still, but I could not recognize its appearance and form before my eyes; silence and a voice, I heard.

Unlike other visionary accounts in the OT, the description of Eliphaz’s experience (4:12-16) is overwhelmingly elusive. Not only is there no mention of the spirit’s origin, but the unknown spirit also brings a terrifying experience (4:14-15) that is difficult to comprehend. The passage is also filled with “rare and technical words” that only heighten the difficulty. J. E. Harding even concludes that “a single meaning for Job 4:12-21 is impossible, and the search for such a meaning futile.”

At first glance, Eliphaz’s spiritual encounter sounds like a typical prophetic experience: (1) receiving a “word (ד ב ר)" (4:12), (2) having “visions (ח זְיֹנוֹת)” of the night (4:13), and (3) accompanying experiences that are both auditory (e.g., רֵץ “word” [4:12]; קֹล “voice” [4:16]) and visionary (e.g., physical sensation [4:15]; seeing something [4:16]) all resemble common prophetic descriptions.

---

3Marvin H. Pope, Job, AB, vol. 15 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1985), 36, notes 4:12-21 as “one of the most uncanny in the OT.”


The text, however, also carries a furtive and spooky tone which is uncommon in the ordinary prophetic experience. Traditionally, prophets received oracles openly for public proclamation (e.g., Jer 1:4-9; Ezek 2:1-3:11) and even were graced to stand in the heavenly council to hear God’s words (e.g., Jer 23:18, Isa 6:1-8). But for Eliphaz, not only does a “word (ד ב ר)” come “stealthily (גֻּנ ב)” to him (4:12a), but he also can barely grasp “the whisper (שֵמ ץ) of it” (4:12b).

Eliphaz’s vision is also replete with horrifying expressions that are quite unusual. While fear is a common physical reaction for the recipient of divine revelation (e.g., Gen 28:17, Judg 6:22-23, Dan 10:7-8), Eliphaz’s account employs excessively eerie language, such as “fear (פ ח ד)” (4:14), “trembling (רְע ד ה)” (4:14), “made the mass (ר) of my bones to shake (ךָסֹמְר צְמוֹת יַהִפְחִיד)” (4:14), and “the hair stood up (סְמֵרַש עֲר ת)” (4:15), which increases the deviant undertone for his vision.10 Not only are most of these words elusive terms that can be rendered with radically different nuances,11 but expressions like “made my bones to shake (פ ח ד)” and “the hair stood up (סְמֵרַש עֲר ת)” are quite unusual. While fear is a common physical reaction for the recipient of divine revelation (e.g., Gen 28:17, Judg 6:22-23, Dan 10:7-8), Eliphaz’s account employs excessively eerie language, such as “fear (פ ח ד)” (4:14), “trembling (רְע ד ה)” (4:14), “made the mass (ר) of my bones to shake (ךָסֹמְר צְמוֹת יַהִפְחִיד)” (4:14), and “the hair stood up (סְמֵרַש עֲר ת)” (4:15), which increases the deviant undertone for his vision.10

Eliphaz’s vision is also replete with horrifying expressions that are quite unusual. While fear is a common physical reaction for the recipient of divine revelation (e.g., Gen 28:17, Judg 6:22-23, Dan 10:7-8), Eliphaz’s account employs excessively eerie language, such as “fear (פ ח ד)” (4:14), “trembling (רְע ד ה)” (4:14), “made the mass (ר) of my bones to shake (ךָסֹמְר צְמוֹת יַהִפְחִיד)” (4:14), and “the hair stood up (סְמֵרַש עֲר ת)” (4:15), which increases the deviant undertone for his vision.10 Not only are most of these words elusive terms that can be rendered with radically different nuances,11 but expressions like “made my bones to shake (פ ח ד)” and “the hair stood up (סְמֵרַש עֲר ת)” are quite unusual. While fear is a common physical reaction for the recipient of divine revelation (e.g., Gen 28:17, Judg 6:22-23, Dan 10:7-8), Eliphaz’s account employs excessively eerie language, such as “fear (פ ח ד)” (4:14), “trembling (רְע ד ה)” (4:14), “made the mass (ר) of my bones to shake (ךָסֹמְר צְמוֹת יַהִפְחִיד)” (4:14), and “the hair stood up (סְמֵרַש עֲר ת)” (4:15), which increases the deviant undertone for his vision.10

Eliphaz’s vision is also replete with horrifying expressions that are quite unusual. While fear is a common physical reaction for the recipient of divine revelation (e.g., Gen 28:17, Judg 6:22-23, Dan 10:7-8), Eliphaz’s account employs excessively eerie language, such as “fear (פ ח ד)” (4:14), “trembling (רְע ד ה)” (4:14), “made the mass (ר) of my bones to shake (ךָסֹמְר צְמוֹת יַהִפְחִיד)” (4:14), and “the hair stood up (סְמֵרַש עֲר ת)” (4:15), which increases the deviant undertone for his vision.10 Not only are most of these words elusive terms that can be rendered with radically different nuances,11 but expressions like “made my bones to shake (פ ח ד)” and “the hair stood up (סְמֵרַש עֲר ת)” are quite unusual. While fear is a common physical reaction for the recipient of divine revelation (e.g., Gen 28:17, Judg 6:22-23, Dan 10:7-8), Eliphaz’s account employs excessively eerie language, such as “fear (פ ח ד)” (4:14), “trembling (רְע ד ה)” (4:14), “made the mass (ר) of my bones to shake (ךָסֹמְר צְמוֹת יַהִפְחִיד)” (4:14), and “the hair stood up (סְמֵרַש עֲר ת)” (4:15), which increases the deviant undertone for his vision.10 Not only are most of these words elusive terms that can be rendered with radically different nuances,11 but expressions like “made my bones to shake (פ ח ד)” and “the hair stood up (סְמֵרַש עֲר ת)” are quite unusual. While fear is a common physical reaction for the recipient of divine revelation (e.g., Gen 28:17, Judg 6:22-23, Dan 10:7-8), Eliphaz’s account employs excessively eerie language, such as “fear (פ ח ד)” (4:14), “trembling (רְע ד ה)” (4:14), “made the mass (ר) of my bones to shake (ךָסֹמְר צְמוֹת יַהִפְחִיד)” (4:14), and “the hair stood up (סְמֵרַש עֲר ת)” (4:15), which increases the deviant undertone for his vision.10 Not only are most of these words elusive terms that can be rendered with radically different nuances,11 but expressions like “made my bones to shake (פ ח ד)” and “the hair stood up (סְמֵרַש עֲר ת)” are quite unusual. While fear is a common physical reaction for the recipient of divine revelation (e.g., Gen 28:17, Judg 6:22-23, Dan 10:7-8), Eliphaz’s account employs excessively eerie language, such as “fear (פ ח ד)” (4:14), “trembling (רְע ד ה)” (4:14), “made the mass (ר) of my bones to shake (ךָסֹמְר צְמוֹת يַהִפְחִיד)” (4:14), and “the hair stood up (סְמֵרַש עֲר ת)” (4:15), which increases the deviant undertone for his vision.10 Not only are most of these words elusive terms that can be rendered with radically different nuances,11 but expressions like “made my bones to shake (פ ח ד)” and “the hair stood up (סְמֵרַש עֲר ת)” are quite unusual.


“are also rare constructions that occur only once in the OT.” Moreover, his experience lacks the comforting statement that often accompanies a fearful encounter with the Lord or angel: “Do not fear!” (e.g., Gen 15:1, Dan 10:12).

**A Gentile Prophet?**

Despite the inherent difficulty of 4:12-16, Jewish commentator Rashi, followed by V. E. Reichert, R. Gordis, and S. B. Freehof, maintains that the vision is from God. For them, the vision carries such a furtive tone because Eliphaz was a Gentile prophet. Unlike the prophets of Israel to whom God spoke manifestly (e.g., Num 12:8 “With him [Moses] I speak mouth to mouth, clearly, and not in riddles”), to non-Israelite seers like Abimelech, Laban, Balaam, and Eliphaz, God took a channel that was rather surreptitious such as a dream or vision of the night. Gordis further supports this view, noting a verbal connection between Job 4:14 (“fear came [קר] upon me”) and Balaam’s account in Numbers 23:3 (“the Lord will come [קר] to meet [קר] me”). He thinks the use of the same verb קר indicates that Eliphaz’s vision closely resembles Gentile prophets’ experience.

---

12 HALOT, "סמר,” פחד” "שער ת”.


14 E.g., Abimelech: חלום ליהל “dream by night” (Gen 20:3), Laban: חלום להלך “dream by night” (Gen 31:24), Balaam: חזון לאלים אלברעבץ ליהל “God came to Balaam in the night” (Num 22:20), and Eliphaz: חזון ליהל “visions of night” (Job 4:13). Rashi, Job, 4:13; Reichert, Job, 16; Gordis, The Book of Job, 48; Freehof, Book of Job, 65–66.

15 Gordis, The Book of Job, 49. Milgrom, noting the construction אֱלֹהִים/יְהוָה + niphal of קר in Num 23:3, 4, 15, 16 and Exod 3:18, 5:3, suggests that such a construction is particularly common in the context of God addressing to “a foreigner whose encounter with God cannot be counted on” (e.g., Balaam speaks to Balak: Num 23:3 נורא הקרויה אתני לברעבץ ליהל “The Lord will come to meet me”; 23:4 נורא הקרויה אתני לברעבץ “God met Balaam”; 23:15 נורא הקרויה אתני לברעבץ “I meet [the Lord] over there”; and 23:16 נורא הקרויה אתני לברעבץ “The Lord met Balaam” / Moses and elders of Israel address to Pharaoh: Exod 3:18 נורא הקרויה אתני לברעבץ ליהל "The Lord, the God of the Hebrews, has met with us”; and 5:3 נורא הקרויה אתני לברעבץ ליהל “The God of the Hebrews has met with us”). Jacob Milgrom, Numbers, JPS Tanakh Commentary (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1990), 320n12. Note, however, that while Num 23:3, 4, 15, 16 and Exod 3:18, 5:3 all
The following evidence, however, contradicts this view: (1) Daniel was an Israelite but received a revelation through a “vision of night” (חֶלְוָיָה לְיָלְיָא) [Dan 2:19], cf. Job 4:13). The Lord’s announcement to Miriam and Aaron (Num 12:6-8) also illustrates that the lesser prophets of Israel—in contrast to Moses the greater prophet—received words through “visions (מִרְאוֹת) and “dreams (חֲלֹם).” (2) Moreover, whereas the stories of Abimelech, Laban and Balaam all specify that God granted them visions,16 Eliphaz’s account lacks such an identification. (3) The verb קָרָא is also used in an unusual context in Job 4:14. While קָרָא in Numbers 23:3 has יהוה (“Lord”) as its subject, קָרָא in Job 4:14 has פחד (“fear”) instead. In other words, Job 4:14 is not describing God’s manifestation but the fear that seized Eliphaz.

A Patriarch’s Experience?

Second, some interpreters relate Eliphaz’s experience to the patriarchs’ model. S. Lee and H. Ewald, for example, suggest that Eliphaz’s “visions of night (חֶלְוָיָה לְיָלְיָא)” (4:13) fit best with the patriarchs’ experience since the night vision/dream oracle was a common method through which God revealed his words to patriarchs (e.g., Abraham’s vision in the night [Gen 15:17], Jacob’s night dream [Gen 28:11-12], Abimelech’s dream [Gen 20:6]), and Laban’s night dream [Gen 31:24]).17 W. D. Reyburn also finds Eliphaz’s vision more akin to Abraham’s experience. Not only are both revelations associate with the falling (תַפָל) of “deep sleep (תַּרְדֵּמָה)” (Job 4:13; Gen 15:12), but they

have the niphal of קָרָא, Job 4:14a has the qal of קָרָא instead. Moreover, whereas קָרָא in the former verses always has יהוה/אלהים ("Lord/God") as its subject or object, קָרָא in Job 4:14a has פחד ("fear") for its subject, hence making it unfitting for the construction suggested by Milgrom.

16Gen 20:3 וַיֵּלֶךְ אֲלֹהִיםַא ל־אֲבִימְלךָ; Gen 31:24 וַיֵּלֶךְ אֲלֹהִיםַא לְלַבְנָא; Num 22:20 נָעַשׂ אֲלֹהִיםַא אֲלֵי בִלְעָם.

also are accompanied by “fear (חרד) / trembling (חרדיה)” (Job 4:14) and “dread (פחד) / great darkness (ח減少)” (Gen 15:12), which sound quite similar.\textsuperscript{18}

The view of Lee, Ewald, and Reyburn, however, is not conclusive: (1) Although the book of Genesis often recounts nighttime visions/dreams, a similar type of revelation also abounds in later books (e.g., Num 12:6 [visions and dreams of lesser prophets]; 1 Sam 3:4ff. [Samuel’s night vision]; 2 Sam 7:17 [Natan’s vision]; 1 Kgs 3:5 [Solomon’s night dream]; Dan 2:19, 7:2 [Daniel’s night vision]; and Dan 2:28 [Nebuchadnezzar’s dream and visions]). (2) The experience of Eliphaz’s vision also differs from that of the patriarchs. Whereas Abimelech, Jacob, and Laban received visions in their nocturnal dreams (e.g., Gen 20:6, 28:12, 31:24) and Abraham fell into a deep sleep before hearing God (Gen 15:12), Eliphaz may have been awake when the vision came. The term תרדמה (“deep sleep”) can either mean a natural sleep (e.g., Prov 19:15; Jon 1:5-6) or a supernatural sleep (e.g., as God caused Adam into a deep sleep [Gen 2:21]), and D. J. A. Clines rightly notes that the former meaning is intended in Job 4:13 (“when deep sleep falls on men [אישים]”). Job 4:13, then, indicates “the ordinary sleep” of all men (אישים) that excludes Eliphaz.\textsuperscript{19} (3) Eliphaz’s vision has no mention of its origin, whereas the patriarchs’ accounts unanimously specify God as the source of the revelation. (4) The patriarchs’ revelation eventually turns out to be true (e.g., Abraham’s vision of four hundred years of slavery, the exodus, and the return to the promised land [Gen 15:13-21]), but Eliphaz’s vision in the end is condemned by God as false (Job 42:7).


The Fear of Isaac?

Third, A. Pinker, M. Dahood and W. L. Michel focus on Job 4:14a (פָּחֲדַקְרִי נִיַּוְרְעַדְה "Fear and trembling fell upon me"). A. Pinker suggests that "פָּחֲד (fear, dread)" in Job 4:14a is a metonymy for God’s name, arguing that Isaac in Genesis 31:42 (אֱלֹהֵיַאֱבְרֹהַם וּפָחֲדַיִצְחְק "God of Abraham and Fear of Isaac") and 31:53 (וַיִּשְׁבַּע לְפָחֲד יִשְׁבַע לְפָחֲד "So Jacob swore by Fear of his father Isaac") uses the same term פָּחֲד to refer to God. The author of Job, who hoped to add “an archaic tenor” of “the Patriarchal period” to the book, deliberately borrowed the term פָּחֲד from Genesis 31:42, 53—along with other archaic terms such as רְעַדְה, שֶׁיָּאָבְרֹהַם אֱלֹהַי, אֱלֹהִים—and applied them to his composition. Hence Pinker renders Job 4:14a as “God (פָּחֲד) called me, and a trembling.”

Similarly, Dahood and Michel claim that רְעַדְה ("Fear") and רְעַדְה ("Trembling") (and perhaps even רֹב ("Greatness")) in Job 4:14a indicate God. These terms, originally used as epithets for the Canaanite god Mot, were borrowed by the Joban poet as substitutes for God’s name.

This view of Pinker, Dahood, and Michel, however, is problematic on several accounts. (1) The meaning of פָּחֲד in Genesis 31:42, 53 is disputed. In the context of Genesis, the word can mean either “fear,” “Fear,” “kinsman,” or “thigh.”

(2) The biblical evidence for taking פָּחֲד and רְעַדְה as metonymies for God’s name is weak. Other meanings for פָּחֲד ("fear," “dread,” “trembling”) and רְעַדְה ("trembling," “quaking”) are far more common in the OT. For instance, compare Psalm 55:6a[5a] with Job 4:14a.

---


24The connection has been noted by Édouard Dhorme, A Commentary on the Book of Job,
Ps 55:6a[5a]  יִרְא הַוֹר עֲדַי בֹּאַבִּי  “Fear and trembling come upon me”  
Job 4:14a  פָחֲדַקְר אֵנִי וּרְעָדְה  “Fear and trembling befell upon me”

The two texts are almost identical in meaning except that they use synonym terms (יִרְא ה > פחָד, רְעָד > רְעָדְה, יִבֹא > קְרַאָנֵי) with slightly different word orders (i.e., S + S + V + O [Ps 55:6a[5a]], S + V + O + S [Job 4:14a]). Both texts also have one masculine and one feminine noun followed by a third masculine verb (Ps 55:6a[5a]: יִרְא ה [f] + רְעָד [m] + יִבֹא [3ms verb]; Job 4:14a: פחָד [m] + רְעָדְה [f] + קְרַאָנֵי [3ms verb]). Psalm 55 is an individual lament psalm describing the psalmist’s agony over his enemies’ animosity. In this background, virtually no commentator takes the terms “fear (יִרְא ה)”/“trembling (רְעָדְה)” in Psalm 55:6a[5a] as referring to God; the terms are generally interpreted as the psalmist’s expression of distress coming from the threat of enemies. Likewise, the context of Job 4:12-16 suggests that “fear (פָחֲד)” and “trembling (רְעָדְה)” (Job 4:14a) naturally read as the emotional anxiety associated with the spiritual encounter. (3) In the same vein, the expression “fear / dread” from Ludlul bel nemeqi (“I will praise the lord of wisdom”), a Babylonian sufferer text from the second millennium B.C., requires further attention. The text reads,

Heavy was his hand upon me, I could not bear it! Dread of him was oppressive . . . .


A remarkable young man of extraordinary physique, magnificent in body, clothed in new garments, because I was only half awake, his features lacked form. He was clad in splendor, robed in "dread" — He came in upon me, he stood over me.28

This text is quite analogous to Job 4:12-16. Not only is the sufferer visited by a spiritual being ("a remarkable young man . . . . came upon me"), but expressions like "dread" (cf. "fear" [Job 4:14]), "his features lacked form" (cf. "I could not recognize its appearance" [Job 4:15]), "he came in upon me" (cf. "a spirit passed by my face" [Job 4:15]), and "he stood over me" (cf. "it stood still" [Job 4:15]) all resemble those of Job 4:12-16. In particular, the term "dread" occurs twice in Ludlul bel nemeqi ("dread of him was oppressive," "robed in dread"),29 and in neither of the cases does the word refer to a god (e.g., Marduk) or a spiritual visitor. Instead, as in Psalm 55:6a[5a], the term denotes the internal fear that the sufferer had within the encounter. This Babylonian counterpart then further undermines the reading proffered by Pinker, Dahood and Michel.

An Encounter Like that of Moses?

Fourth, D. J. A. Clines compares Eliphaz’s experience with that of Moses. In Numbers 12:8 (“With him I speak face to face—clearly [וְיָרָא], not in riddles; and he sees the form [תְמוּנָה] of the Lord”), Moses is described as beholding the form (תְמוּנָה) of God in his encounter with God. Strikingly, the same juxtaposition—וְיָרָא and תְמוּנָה—appears in Job 4:16 (“It stood still, but I could not discern its appearance [וְיָרָא]. A form [תְמוּנָה] was before my eyes” [NRSV]), and following the NRSV rendition, the text seems to imply that although Eliphaz saw a form (תְמוּנָה), he could not discern what it was. Clines thus interpret Job 4:16 as Eliphaz’s claim of having seen God, just as Moses saw the form of God.30 Clines argues that the term תְמוּנָה “always refers to God” (e.g., Num 12:8; Deut

28COS, 1.153

29Cf. ANET, 596–600, which translates as “my dread of him was alarming” and “robed in dread.”

30Clines, Job 1-20, 131.
31 Clines, Job 1-20, 131.


33 Tur-Sinai, The Book of Job, 83.
form (μορφή/חזatron) before his eyes. (2) If one regards the MT as superior and resists the emendation,34 the MT still reads very differently from most English translations. First, the verb אכיר (“I could not recognize”) seems to have been gapped in 4:16b to avoid unnecessary repetition.35

Job 4:16a I could not recognize its appearance

4:16b [I could not recognize] a form before my eyes

4:16 then translates, “I could not recognize its appearance and form before my eyes,”36 a meaning virtually identical to the LXX and Peshitta. Second, תמנוְהַלְנֶגֶדַע can be read as an “explanatory gloss” of וְרְאֵה: “I could not recognize its appearance, (that is) a form before my eyes” (4:16). This rendition has been favored by some old commentators,37 and the MT accentuation38 and the Vulgate39 also support this reading. These two

34So Seow, Job 1-21, 402–3; Dhorme, A Commentary on the Book of Job, 51. Note that H. M. Szpek compares 4:15-16 from both the MT and Peshitta and concludes, “The ‘heightening effect’ produced by the rapid juxtaposition of clauses in the MT is lost [in the Peshitta]. . . the translator has added an overabundance of ‘waw (א)’ seasoning that has destroyed the literary piquancy of this eerie recipe.” Heidi M. Szpek, Translation Technique in the Peshitta to Job: A Model for Evaluating a Text with Documentation from the Peshitta to Job, SBLDS 137 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 125–26.

35On the “verb gapping,” see Michael P. O’Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1980), 124–29. O’Connor notes that this verb gapping is common in Hebrew poetry. For instance, Psalm 78:47י הֲרֹגַב ב ר דַג פְנֵם שִׁקְמוֹת שֶׁב חֲנֵמַל (“He destroyed their vines with hail, and their sycamores with frost”) can be restructured as follows:

Ps 78:47a י הֲרֹגַב ב ר דַג פְנֵֽם He destroyed their vines with hail,

78:47b וְשִׁקְמוֹת שֶׁב חֲנֵמַל And [he destroyed] their sycamores with frost.

The first line verb לֹא אכיר has been gapped in the second line for the sake of conciseness. For more examples (e.g., Ps 78:51; 106:16), see ibid., 128–29.

36Thanks to D. A. Garrett for this observation.


38Rebia above מָרָא ובָּהוּ תְמוּנ הַלְנ ג דַעֵינ י, which is governed under dechi-athnach. The author follows the accent system suggested in Russell T. Fuller and Kyoungwon Choi, Invitation to Biblical Hebrew Syntax: An Intermediate Grammar (Grand Rapids: Kregel Academic, 2017), 351–98.

39Stetit quidam cuius non agnoscebam vultum imago coram oculis meis (“There stood one whose appearance I did not recognize, an image before my eyes”).
approaches then reaffirm the general meaning conveyed in the LXX and Peshitta: Eliphaz’s inability to recognize the appearance/form before his eyes. (3) In addition, Clines’ definition of תְמוּנ ה needs to be revisited. Clines asserts that תְמוּנ ה “always refers to God” (e.g., Num 12:8; Deut 4:12, 15; Ps 17:15) or “to some representation of God” (e.g., Exod 20:4; Deut 4:16, 23, 25; 5:8). If Clines were right, the occurrence of תְמוּנ ה in Job 4:16 would be enough to indicate that God’s manifestation was there. In other words, even though Clines’ claim—that Eliphaz saw the form of God like Moses did—can no longer be sustained, the use of תְמוּנ ה would still imply that Eliphaz had some type of theophany (e.g., like the Israelites who “saw no form” but were in the presence of God [Deut 4:12, 15]). Clines again seems to be wrong here, however. The precise meaning of תְמוּנ ה, then, may have to be determined contextually, and Job 4:16 gives no clue that תְמוּנ ה refers to God or God’s manifestation. תְמוּנ ה in 4:16 then better reads as an unrecognizable form of a spiritual visitor that cannot be discerned.

---

40 Clines, Job 1-20, 131.
41 Exod 20:4; Num 12:8; Deut 4:12, 15, 16, 23, 25, 5:8; Ps 17:15; Job 4:16.
A Storm Theophany?

Fifth, some exegetes interpret Job 4:15-16 with a theophanic backdrop. (1) M. Dahood, N. H. Tur-Sinai, and R. Gordis, for example, render Job 4:15 as “A wind [רוּחַ] passed by my face; a storm [שְעַרְתָּ] made my body bristle” (cf. most English versions translate, “A spirit [רוּחַ] passed by my face; the hair [שְעַרְתָּ] of my flesh bristled”). Their support comes from the Targum which reads, “A strong wind [זִיקָא] passes by my face; the hair [שְעַרְתָּ] of my flesh bristled.” Like the Targum’s זִיקָא (“wind, storm”), they take רוּחַ as “wind”; like the Targum’s שְעַרְתָּ (“storm”), they alter שְעַרְתָּ––a construct form of שְעַרְתָּ (“hair”)—to שְעַרְתָּ (“storm”), a form not found in the OT, but they suppose it to be an absolute form with an old feminine ending ת (cf. נָחִלָּ [Job 27:13]). In their opinion, this rendition not only allows a well-formed parallelism between “wind” and “storm” but also better fits the stormy scene of God’s coming that is attested elsewhere in the OT (e.g., Exod 19:16, 18; Judg 5:4-5; 2 Sam 22:8-16; Pss 18:7-15; Job 38:1; 40:6). 43

(2) D. J. A. Clines, following J. Lust’s study, translates Job 4:16b (דְמִמ הֵוָו קָוָא שְמַע) in a radically different sense. Whereas a common translation for 4:16b is “there was silence (דְמִמ), and I heard a voice”—a rendition stressing a moment of tranquility—Clines applies another root meaning to דְמִמ (i.e., דִּמְמָא “[wail, moan]” from the Akkadian root damāmu) and renders 4:16b “I heard a thunderous (דִּמְמָא) voice.”44 Did Eliphaz then have a storm theophany similar to Elijah on Mount Horeb (1 Kgs 19) or Ezekiel on the river Chebar (Ezek 1)?45


45 As claimed in Seow, Job 1–21, 388. Similarly, Clines, Job 1–20, 120, 131.
Though that suggestion is stimulating, the following evidence undermines the theophany view: (1) As for השעַרְת ("hair") in Job 4:15, the MT’s שְׁעַרְת ("storm") preserves a superior reading over השעַרְת ("storm"). First, while the Targum supports the reading of השעַרְת as השעַרְת ("storm"), other versions—the LXX (τρίχας), Peshitta (אשָר), and Vulgate (pili)—all support the MT’s שְׁעַרְת ("hair"). Second, taking השעַרְת ("storm") as an absolute noun is also unwarranted. Dahood and others justify it by taking ה at the end of השעַרְת as an old feminine ending ה, but no such absolute form is attested in the OT. Rather, the OT already has an absolute noun השעַרְת ("storm") with the ה ending (Job 9:17; Nah 1:3). In particular, the occurrence of the absolute form השעַרְת in Job 9:17 suggests that the Joban poet would be unlikely to employ two different absolute forms in his composition. Third, the evidence of Akkadian documents affirms that the MT’s שְׁעַרְת ("hair") is original. The expression תְסַמֵּר שֶׁעֱרַת בְּשֵׁרִי ("the hair of my flesh stood up" [4:15]), which appears only once in the OT, has been an interpretive challenge for exegetes. S. M. Paul’s study on “Mesopotamian medical and literary texts” has been an eye-opener in this regard: he finds that the expression “the hair of my flesh stood up” (4:15) reflects a common literary convention of the ancient Near East.

If the hair of his head stands on edge like (that of) a . . . (CAD, Z, 53, e, 2’)

[If a patient’s] hair, on his head and body, stands on end . . . [etmnu-ghost] who makes the hair on my head stand up. (CAD, Z, 54, 3, 2’)

The hair will remain standing . . . it (the evil demon) causes the hair of his body to stand up. (KAR 202 17)

Whose hair on his body the evil rābiṣu demon has made stand on end (variant: has made fall out). (KAR 202 17)46

Most strikingly, the expression (“the hair of my flesh stood up”) often is related to an encounter with a spiritual being, particularly with demonic spirits ("etmnu-ghost" [CAD, Z, 54, 3, 2’]; “the evil demon,” “the evil rābiṣu demon” [KAR 202 17]). If so, is Elihu

unknowingly and ironically testifying that he had an encounter with a demonic spirit? (2) Clines’s translation of Job 4:16b (“I heard a thunderous [דְמ מ ה granite] voice.”) is also unwarranted. Unlike Clines’s choice of the root דמם (“to wail, moan”), I believe that the root ḏem (“to quiet, stand still” from Arabic damdama and Ethiopia tadamama) better suits the context. Clines’s reading implies that the spirit’s message (vv. 17-21) was given in a loud roaring sound. But this blaring tone is never attested in other revelatory accounts of the OT. Moreover, such a tone contradicts Job 4:12 where Eliphaz states that he could hear only a “whisper (שֵמַע)” of the word.

Like the Prophet Elijah or Jeremiah?

Sixth, some commentators compare Eliphaz’s experience with that of Elijah or Jeremiah. (1) A. van Selms, C. S. Rodd and S. E. Balentine note that Job 4:16b (גנבת וروح ודְמ מ ה, “silence and a voice I heard”) is reminiscent of Elijah’s encounter where he heard “a sound of sheer silence (גנבת וַדְמ מ ה)” in the midst of a stormy theophany (1 Kgs 19:12). Not only are the two passages juxtaposed with the same words דמ מ ה (“silence, whisper”) and קול (voice, sound”), but they also describe a similar yet unusual prophetic experience where a moment of stillness just precedes a word being spoken to their ears. (2) Several others also connect דבֶּר in Job 4:12 (דבֶּר אֶל יִדְבָּן “a word came stealing to me”) with Jeremiah’s famous prophetic phrase “the word [דבֶּר] of the Lord came to me” (Jer 1:4, 11, 13; 2:1).

The Elijah-Jeremiah model, however, is not without error. (1) Some

47 HALOT, “דְמ מ ה.”


commentators, following 1 Kings 19:12 ([“a sound of sheer silence”]), read Job 4:16b’s קִוֹלַדְמ מ as a hendiadys (hence, “a silent voice I heard”). But that rendition seems to violate the combination of the MT accentuation and a pausal vocalization. Job 4:16b (דְמ מ הַו קוֹלַא שְמ ְּֽע׃) follows the poetry accent system in which the munach under קִוֹלַא becomes a transformed rebia mugrash that separates קִוֹלַא from שְמ ְּֽע (I heard). In addition, the pausal vocalization qame under the ו of ו קוֹל separates קִוֹלַא from שְמ ְּֽע (“silence”) and ו קוֹל (“and voice”), preventing a hendiadic reading. Thus Job 4:16b better reads “Silence and then voice, I heard.” If this is correct, the meaning of קִוֹלַה / וְּֽע in Job 4:16b is not the same as that of 1 Kings 19:12. While 1 Kings 19:12 describes a one-time hearing of a “sound of silence,” Job 4:16b expresses two events, that is, hearing first the silence and then the voice of the spirit. More specifically, קִוֹל in 1 Kings 19:12 is a “sound of silence,” whereas that of Job 4:16b is “the voice of the spirit.” The difference, then, undermines associating Eliphaz’s vision with Elijah’s experience at Mount Horeb. (2) The term רֶבוֹ (”word”) in Job 4:12 does not fit with Jeremiah’s prophetic model either. Instead, the juxtaposition of רֶבוֹ and גֶּנֶב in Job 4:12 (“A word


[51] R. Fuller comments, “Frequently, when a disjunctive accent has more than one conjunctive accent, the first conjunctive (or sometimes the second conjunctive) accent before the disjunctive accent functions syntactically as a disjunctive. This conjunctive accent, therefore, is called a transformed disjunctive accent. Transformed disjunctives are musically conjunctive, chanted as a conjunctive accent, but syntactically disjunctive.” As for the transformed rebia mugrash, he remarks, “When a Rebia Mugrash does not occur in a verse and less than two syllables occur between the syllable with Silluq and the first word before a Silluq, which has a conjunctive accent, the conjunctive accent [usually Munach] is a transformed Rebia Mugrash.” Fuller and Choi, Invitation to Biblical Hebrew Syntax, 359–60, emphasis original.


[54] So ESV; NASB; NRSV; Gordis, The Book of Job, 49–50; Michel, Job in the Light of Northwest Semitic, 1:94.
[גַּנֵּב] came *stealing* [בָּדַבְּלָנְל] to me” conveys a pejorative nuance of false prophecy, as R. J. Z. Werblowsky explains. The ד ב ר + גַּנֵּב combination appears only twice in the OT (Job 4:12; Jer 23:30), and in both cases, גַּנֵּב comes with intensive conjugations (pual in Job 4:12 and piel in Jer 23:30). Jeremiah 23:9-40 describes false prophets as liars who “prophesy the deceit of their own heart” (v. 26) and “*steal* (בָּדַבְּלָנְל) [the Lord’s] words (דָּבַר) from one another” (v. 30). Since Eliphaz was after all “solemnly disavowed by Yahweh himself” (Job 42:7), Werblowsky thinks that the derogatory undertone of Jeremiah 23:30 (as expressed in ד ב ר + גַּנֵּב) is also intended in Job 4:12 with the same construction ד ב ר + גַּנֵּב. Hence he concludes that as in the case of Jeremiah’s false prophets, Eliphaz’s vision may not have been from God or an angel. Following Werblowsky, the use ד ב ר + גַּנֵּב in Job 4:12—together with the expression “the hair of my flesh stood up” (4:15) — heightens the suspicious nature of Eliphaz’s encounter. If the spirit (4:15) is not God nor an angel, where did the spirit come from?

**Is רוח in Job 4:15 Satan?**

Since the previous six proposals all have problems, is there any other clue in Job 4:12-16 that could further help identify the spirit? The term רוח in 4:15a (ד ב ר + גַּנֵּב “a spirit passed by my face”) may provide a solution to this conundrum. The nature


of the רוּח (4:15a), which can mean either “wind,” “breath,” or “spirit/Spirit,” has been disputed.\(^{57}\) N. H. Tur-Sinai and others, for example, take רוּח (4:15a) as “wind” and translate 4:15a as “A wind passed by my face.”\(^{58}\) By contrast, Rashi and others consider it a “spirit” and suggest “A spirit passed by my face.”\(^{59}\)

The reasons for the former opinion are as follows: (1) D. J. A. Clines argues that when רוּח is masculine—as in 4:15a—it “always refers to a wind or breath.”\(^{60}\) (2) The “wind” view is particularly favored by those who vocalize市の (4:15b) as市の (“storm”), since the “wind” and “storm” then form a balancing parallelism (“A wind [רֵיחַ] passed by my face; a storm [שְׁעוֹר] made my body bristle”).\(^{61}\) (3) C. L. Seow suggests that the expression “the destructive wind of God” in 4:9 (from the wind of his anger they are consumed”) seems to parallel with “a storm-wind” (רוּח) in 4:15a.\(^{62}\) (4) The manifestations of God/Holy Spirit in Elijah’s theophany (1 Kgs 19:11) and Pentecost (Acts 2:2) are also preceded by a literal wind tempest.\(^{63}\)

This “wind” approach, however, has a serious drawback. While the “wind” translation fits smoothly with 4:15 (e.g., “A wind passed by my face”), it no longer works

---

\(^{57}\)J. E. Harding comments that “the most problematic term of all” is probably רוּח in 4:15a.


\(^{60}\)Clines, Job 1–20, 111.


\(^{62}\)Seow, Job 1–21, 388.

in 4:16. For example, יעמד ("he/it stood" [4:16]) and ומראה ("his/its appearance" [4:16]) are left with no clear antecedent, resulting in an awkward reading of 4:16. In response, the proponents of the "wind" view have proposed several solutions. E. Dhorme, for instance, conjectures that a subject, such as אלהים, has disappeared after יעמד (4:16). W. L. Michel, who takes פחד ("Fear") and רעיה ("Trembling") in 4:14 as metonymies for God’s name, suggests פחד and רעיה as the subject of יעמד (4:16). D. J. A. Clines, on the other hand, regards תמונה ("form" [4:16]) in following text to be the subject.

These suggestions, however, still do not adequately answer the problem: Why would the Joban poet devise such an unusual construction, one that distances or delays the subject in relation to the verb יעמד (4:16)?

The "spirit" view, however, resolves the difficulty. With this reading, 4:15-16 translates clearly and consistently: “A spirit passed by my face (4:15) . . . . It [the spirit] stood still (עמד), but I could not recognize its [the spirit’s] appearance (מראה) (4:16).” As S. Lee notes, the term פחד (4:15) therefore “can be taken of nothing but of a spirit,” allowing it to serve as well as an antecedent of יעמד and ומראה.

How does one then respond to Clines’s statement that since פחד (4:15) is masculine, it must be taken as “a wind or breath”? As J. E. Harding notes, Clines’s point is nullified by 1 Kings 22:21-22 where a masculine פחד refers to a spirit (1 Kgs 22:21 פחד י_Ent הלפנ ויהי "A spirit came forward and stood before the Lord" [ере护肤品].

---


65Dhorme, A Commentary on the Book of Job, 51.

66Michel, Job in the Light of Northwest Semitic, 1:93.

67Clines, Job 1-20, 111; Edgar C. S. Gibson, The Book of Job (London: Methuen, 1899), 22.


69Clines, Job 1-20, 111, states, “Though usually fem, רוח when masc. always refers to a wind or breath (1:19; 41:8 [16]; Exod 10:13; Num 5:14; Eccl 1:6; 3:19; etc. see KB, 877b; Terrien). It is therefore not likely to mean a ‘spirit’.”
Another masculine רוּח appears in Job 20:3 and further counters Clines’ view. Job 20:3 is debated, and three suggestions have been proffered for understanding רוּח in the verse: (1) as referring to Zophar himself (“My spirit of understanding impels me to reply” [Gordis], “My discerning spirit leads me to answer” [Habel]); (2) רוּח as “wind” (“A wind from my intellect answers me” [Good]) or “impulse” (“An impulse of my understanding prompts me to reply” [Dhorme]), or (3) רוּח as a “higher spirit” (“A spirit beyond my understanding gives me a reply” [Longman]). Among these, the third option is preferable, for it faithfully reflects the original Hebrew (literally, “And a spirit from [or beyond] my understanding answers me”). The higher spirit (רוּח) that Zophar refers to in 20:3 is, as D. A. Garrett observes, the spirit (רוּח) of Eliphaz’s vision (4:15) (the extensive verbal connection between Eliphaz’s vision and Job 20 will be discussed in Chapter 3). The masculine רוּח in 20:3 then evidences that the masculine רוּח in 4:15 refers to a spirit.

---

70 Harding, “A Spirit of Deception in Job 4:15?,” 146–47. See also Bernhard Duhm, Das Buch Hiob, KHAT, vol. 16 (Freiburg, Germany: J. C. B. Mohr, 1897), 28.


73 Edwin M. Good, In Turns of Tempest: A Reading of Job (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1990), 103. See also Barton, Commentary on the Book of Job, 179.

74 Dhorme, A Commentary on the Book of Job, 290. So Clines, Job 1-20, 473.

75 Longman, Job, 119, 266. See also Rodd, The Book of Job, 42; Driver and Gray, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Job, 135; Rashi, Rashi’s Commentary on Job, 20:3.

76 Taking מִן as comparative (e.g., NRSV, REB).


78 Zophar does not claim in Job 20:3 that he also received a vision from God, for the book never mentions Zophar’s encounter of a supernatural revelation. Cf. Clines, Job 1-20, 473. As we shall see in the next chapter, Zophar in ch. 20 points to the spirit of Eliphaz’s vision (4:15) to buttress the teaching of the vision’s message and his condemnation of Job.
What is the identity of רוח (4:15) then? Is it God, an angel, or Satan? Classifying the usage of רוח based on its gender may help clarify the issue. In the OT, רוח is generally feminine and seldom is it masculine.79 The meaning “spirit / Spirit” in particular can come with both genders. For example, in 1 Kings 22:21-22, a masculine רוח is used for a “spirit” (רוּחַ שָׁעָד “A lying spirit” [רַעִית: n. m.]), but in Judges 9:23, a feminine רוח denotes a “spirit” (רוּחַ שַׂעָד God sent an evil spirit between Abimelech . . .” [רַעִית: adj. f.]). Likewise, the feminine often refer to the “Spirit of God” (e.g., Gen 1:2), but in a rare case the masculine is also attested (e.g., How did the Spirit of the Lord go from me to speak to you” [רוּחַ: 3ms]). Some, therefore, after studying the gender of רוח, conclude that they are “not able to find a reason for this shift in gender.”80

If one, however, assumes that the Joban poet was at least consistent in using the gender of רוח in his composition, one could trace the following pattern. רוח with the meaning “spirit / Spirit” occurs thirteen times in Job,81 and among these, the gender can be distinguished in eight cases (4:15, 6:4, 17:1, 20:3, 21:4, 32:8, 32:18, 33:4).82 Table 2 below summarizes the usage of רוח in Job based on the gender. Six passages (6:4, 17:1, 21:4, 32:8, 32:18, 33:4) have a feminine רוח that denotes either the Spirit of God (32:8, 32:18, 33:4) or the spirit of a man (6:4, 17:1, 21:4). Two passages (4:15, 20:3), on the other hand, have a masculine רוח, and both refer to the spirit of Eliphaz’s vision. Who then is this masculine רוח in 4:15 and 20:3 who is neither the Spirit of God nor the spirit

79HALOT, “רוח.”


82These are five cases where the gender cannot be determined: 7:11 (אֲדֹנָי רֹעֲשָׁה יָדֶךָ “I will speak in the anguish of my spirit”), 10:12 (יִגּוֹד בְּעַרְיֶךָ ת֖וֹ וּתְכַגְּשֶׂךָ לְךָ “your care has preserved my spirit”), 15:13 (יִמְרְאֵה בִּרְאתֶךָ בִּירֵאתֶךָ לְךָ “you turn your spirit against God”), 27:3 (רוֹעֲשָׁה לְךָ לְהוֹיֵא לְךָ “the Spirit of God is in my nostrils”), and 34:14 ([ע]ה גָּאָר תִּצְבָּאֵת לְךָ אֱלֹהִי הָאָדָם “[He] he gather to himself his spirit and his breath”).
of a human being? Only two options remain: an angel or an evil spirit/Satan.

Table 2. The meaning of רוּח based on the gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fem.</td>
<td>The Spirit</td>
<td>32:8</td>
<td>רוּח־הִיא אֵנֹשׁ (3fs)</td>
<td>&quot;The Spirit is in a man&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32:18</td>
<td>רוּחִית (3fs)</td>
<td>&quot;The Spirit within me...&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33:4</td>
<td>רוּחִית (3fs)</td>
<td>&quot;The Spirit of God has...&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The spirit of a man</td>
<td>6:4</td>
<td>רוּחִית (ptc fs)</td>
<td>&quot;My spirit drinks poison&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17:1</td>
<td>רוּחִית (3fs)</td>
<td>&quot;My spirit is broken&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21:4</td>
<td>רוּחִית (3fs)</td>
<td>&quot;My spirit is short&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masc.</td>
<td>A spirit of?</td>
<td>4:15</td>
<td>רוּחַ (3ms)</td>
<td>&quot;A spirit passed by my face&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20:3</td>
<td>רוּחַ (3ms)</td>
<td>&quot;A spirit beyond my understanding answers me&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In no case in the OT does רוּח refer to an angel. Angels are often designated as רוּח and לְא כ יו וּ רוּח ("angel" [Gen 16:7]), קְדוֹשִים ("holy ones" [Job 5:1]), בְנֵיַה אֱלֹהִים ("sons of God" [Job 1:6]), קְנָה ("host" [Josh 5:14]), or מְשָרֵת ("minister" [Ps 103:21]). By contrast, when רוּח indicates a non-corporeal being, it commonly points to an agent of falsehood or disaster. In Judges 9:23, for example, an "evil spirit (רוּח רע)" is sent out by God to Abimelech and the lords of Shechem. In 1 Samuel 16:14-16, 23, 18:10, 19:9, an "evil

---

83So Gordis, The Book of Job, 367, who takes רוּח in 32:8 (“Surely, the Spirit is in a man, the breath of Shaddai gives them understanding”) as the “Spirit of God,” equating רוּח with נשיעת ד רה (“breath of Shaddai”). This point will be further elaborated in ch. 4. D. J. A. Clines and J. H. Walton, on the other hand, read רוּח as a human spirit breathed into man. David J. A. Clines, Job 21-37, WBC, vol. 18A (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2006), 685; Walton, Job, 352–53.

84The meaning of רוּח in 21:4 is unclear. Dhorme, A Commentary on the Book of Job, 309, suggests that both meanings—“breath” and “spirit”—are possible.

85HALOT, "רוּח," Cf. Ps 104:4 (“He makes his messengers [מְשָרֵת] winds [היו], his ministers a burning fire”) is the only verse in the OT that relates angels to רוּח. But רוּח here is “wind,” not “spirit.”

spirit from the Lord (רוּח ־ר ע הַמֵאֵתְיָהוֹ ה) torments Saul. In 1 Kings 22:19-22 (2 Chr 18:18-21), a figure identified as רְוָא רִאשָׁנָיָהוֹ ה (“the spirit”) is commissioned by God to be a “lying spirit (רוּח)" in the mouth of the prophets. In 2 Kings 19:7 (Isa 37:7), a “spirit (רוּח)" influences the Assyrian king Sennacherib to hear a rumor, return to his land, and eventually die there.\(^87\)

Who then are these spirits that are sent by God yet deceitful and even destructive? E. J. Hamori takes all of them, together with רוּח in Job 4:15, as a “spirit of falsehood."\(^88\) For her, the common ground of all these accounts is that (1) רוּח is linked to falsehood (e.g., “Abimelech and the Shechemites act deceitfully,” “Saul is rendered delusional,” “Ahab’s prophets are deceived,” “Sennacherib is deceived through a rumor,” and “Eliphaz’s misperception is confirmed by the spirit”);\(^89\) (2) רוּח is sent by God;\(^90\) (3) רוּח influences those who are “already in the wrong” (e.g., “Abimelech and the Shechemites are blatantly wicked,” “Saul is king but not the chosen one,” “Ahab’s prophets are already giving false prophecy,” “Sennacherib is making war against Israel and claiming arrogantly,” and “Eliphaz hears what he already believes and in the context

\(^{87}\)There are other usages of רוּח such as “spirit of wisdom” (You shall speak to all the skillful, whom I have filled with a spirit of wisdom [Exod 28:3]), “spirit of jealousy” (If the spirit of jealousy [תִּשְׁעָה וַתַּעֲשֵׂה] comes over him and he is jealous of his wife [Num 5:14]), “spirit of confusion” (The Lord has poured into them a spirit of confusion [אר שִׁתַּא] and they have made Egypt stagger [Isa 19:13-14]), “spirit of deep sleep” (The Lord has poured out upon you a spirit of deep sleep [אֵן אֶחְלוֹד וְאֶשֶׁר] and they have made Egypt stagger [Isa 29:10]), “spirit of destroyer” (Thus says the Lord, ‘Behold, I will stir up the spirit of a destroyer [ָאֶשֹּד הָבֵית] against Babylon’ [Jer 51:1]), “spirit of whoredom” (A spirit of whoredom [אֵין אָשֶׁר וָיָּה] has led them astray [Hos 4:12]), “spirit of grace” (I will pour out on the house of David . . . a spirit of grace [רִחְמָה] and pleas for mercy [[Zech 12:10]), and “spirit of uncleanness” (I will remove from the land the prophets and the spirit of uncleanness [אֵין אָשֶׁר הָכַנְנֶה] [Zech 13:2]). רוּח in these texts, however, does not seem to refer to incorporeal supernatural beings. See discussions in Gary V. Smith, Isaiah 1-39, NAC, vol. 15A (Nashville: B&H Publishing Group, 2007), 358–59, 499; Geoffrey W. Grogan, Isaiah, in vol. 6 of EBC, eds. Frank E. Gaebelein et al. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986), 127, 188; F. B. Huey, Jeremiah, Lamentations, NAC, vol. 16 (Nashville: B&H Publishing Group, 1993), 419; Duane A. Garrett, Hosea, Joel, NAC, vol. 19A (Nashville: B&H Publishers, 1997), 123; David J. Clark and Howard A. Hatton, A Handbook on Zechariah, UBS Handbook Series (New York: United Bible Societies, 2002), 320–21, 328–29. See also Block, “Empowered by the Spirit of God,” 48–52.


\(^{89}\)Ibid., 28.

\(^{90}\)According to Hamori, “The Spirit of Falsehood,” 28, the fact that Eliphaz has a vision indicates that the spirit is also sent by God.
of the book is inaccurate and arrogant”);\(^91\) and (4) unlike the Spirit of God and angels who are identified by their recipients, the spirit of falsehood acts “surreptitiously,” as would fit God’s plan in sending it (since “overt deception is unlikely to be effective”).\(^92\) She therefore takes רוח in these passages—together with רוח in Job 4:15—as a “subversive messenger” whom God sends “in place of the divine spirit” so that “destructive justice” can be brought “through deception to those who are already in the wrong.”\(^93\)

Her explanation, however, is not fully satisfying. Against Hamori, I argue that Micaiah’s account of his throne vision in 1 Kings 22:19-22 (2 Chr 18:18-21) should be treated differently from the other passages mentioned above. Three court vision accounts occur in the OT (Job 1-2, 1 Kgs 22, Zech 3), and they all introduce a figure called רוח (“Satan”).\(^94\) Although the term רוח does not appear in 1 Kings 22, it has רוח, whose function is analogous to רוח (“Satan”).\(^95\) S. W. T. Hyun’s comparison between רוח (1 Kgs 22:19-22) and רוח (Job 1:6-12, 2:1-7) supports this conclusion: In both texts, (1) the Lord is “surrounded by the host of heaven” (1 Kgs 22:19; Job 1:6, 2:1), (2) the Lord dialogues with both רוח and רוח (1 Kgs 22:21-22; Job 1:7-12, 2:2-6), (3) both רוח and רוח make a suggestion to the Lord (1 Kgs 22:21; Job 1:9-11, 2:4-5), (4) both רוח and רוח go out/come in ( יצא) from the presence of the Lord (1 Kgs 22:21-22; Job 1:12, 2:7), and (5) “the suggestion of” רוח “causes the fall (נפל) of Ahab at Ramoth-\(^96\)


\(^92\)Ibid., 27–30.

\(^93\)Ibid., 29.

\(^94\)The term רוח (“Satan”) occurs exclusively in Job 1-2 and Zech 3 in the OT. First Chr 21 has רוח, without an article רוח (“Satan [רוּחַ] stood against Israel and incited David to number Israel” [1 Chr 21:1]).

gilead” (1 Kgs 22:20), while “the suggestion of” מָשֵׁה “causes the fall (שָׁנָה) of the fire” from heaven (Job 1:16), “the fall (שָׁנָה) of the houses on Job’s children” (Job 1:19), and “the fall (שָׁנָה) of Job himself onto the ground” (Job 1:20).  

Unlike the spirit (רוּחַ) in 1 Kings 22:19-22 whose identity can be traced to Satan (שָׁנָה), the identity of the spirit that influences Abimelech, Saul, and Sennacherib remains ambiguous, for the OT provides little information on it.  

The latter spirit, however, seems to be distinguished from the spirit (רוּחַ) of 1 Kings 22:19-22. While the gender of the latter spirit (רוּחַ) is all feminine, the gender of רוּחַ in 1 Kings 22:19-22 is masculine (in addition, רְשֵׁעַ רוּחַ [“a lying spirit”; 1 Kgs 22:21] is masculine; the gender of שָׁנָה [“Satan”] in Job 1-2 and Zech 3 is also masculine; even שָׁנָה [“Satan”] in 1 Chr 21:1 is masculine).  

Strikingly, the gender of רוּחַ in Job 4:15 is also masculine. Moreover, the description of רוּחַ here (Job 4:15) is more closely related to רוּחַ (1 Kgs 22) / שָׁנָה (Job 1-2; Zech 3) rather than to the spirit that affects Abimelech, Saul, and Sennacherib. Both רוּחַ in Job 4:15 and שָׁנָה / רְשֵׁעַ רוּחַ (Job 1-2; 1 Kgs 22; Zech 3) are embodied beings (רוּחַ) (Job 4:15] physically appearing to Eliphaz and שָׁנָה / רְשֵׁעַ רוּחַ [Job 1-2; 1 Kgs 22; Zech 3] standing embodied in the heavenly assembly), whereas the spirit of the Abimelech, Saul, and Sennacherib accounts is disembodied in nature.

96 Seong W. T. Hyun, *Job the Unfinalizable: A Bakhtinian Reading of Job 1-11*, BIS 124 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 139–40; R. L. Mayhue, “False Prophets and the Deceiving Spirit,” 135–63, also examines six proposals raised for רוּחַ (1 Kgs 22:19-22) (i.e., the aetiological, self-deluded, angelic, personified spirit of prophecy, a demon, and Satan) and concludes that Satan is the most plausible candidate for רוּחַ.

97 Not surprisingly, therefore, commentators often disagree on the identity of the evil spirit. For instance, R. D. Bergen suggests that it is an “angel of judgment (cf. 2 Kgs 19:35),” while R. F. Youngblood takes it as a “demon.” D. I. Block, on the other hand, asserts that “the identity of the spirit remains vague.” Robert D. Bergen, *1, 2 Samuel*, NAC, vol. 7 (Nashville: B&H Publishing Group, 1996), 182; Ronald F. Youngblood, *1 & 2 Samuel*, in vol. 3 of *EBC*, eds. Frank E. Gaebelein et al. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992), 688; Block, *Judges, Ruth*, 324.

98 As for the account of Sennacherib (2 Kgs 19:7 [Isa 37:7]), however, the gender of רוּחַ cannot be determined.

99 Job 1:7: שָׁנָה ("And Satan answered"); Zech 3:1: שָׁנָה ("And Satan standing"); 1 Chr 21:1: שָׁנָה ("Satan stood").
But besides these patterns, if one searches within the book of Job for an evil spirit or Satan, there is only one possible candidate: The Satan of the prologue. In Job 1:7, 2:2, God asks Satan, “Where have you come from?” and Satan answers, “From going to and fro on the earth, and from walking up and down on it.” S. W. T. Hyun takes Satan’s statement as indicating Satan’s descent from heaven to earth to afflict Job and to appear in Eliphaz’s vision. If this is correct, Satan reappears in Eliphaz’s vision as the unidentified spirit. Just as רוח (“the spirit”) comes down to earth to deceive prophets as a lying spirit (רוּח שקר) in 1 Kgs 22:22-23, Satan, disguised, visits Eliphaz, continuing to exert his influence beyond Job’s prologue.

In sum, the first section dealt with six proposals that see the spirit (4:15) as God or his angel. Against these suggestions, this section finds that Satan is a more probable candidate for the spiritual visitor (4:15). The next section investigates the message of the spirit (4:17-21) and the literary context to see whether this Satanic understanding can be further validated.

**Message of Eliphaz’s Vision (Job 4:17-21)**

The spirit whispers to Eliphaz the following words in 4:17-21.

4:17 “Can a man be righteous before (מֵאֱלוֹה) God? Can a man be pure before his Maker (וּמֵעֹשֵה)?

4:18 Even in his servants he puts no trust, and his angels he charges with error.

4:19 How much more those who dwell in houses of clay, whose foundation is in the dust; they are crushed like a moth.

4:20 Between morning and evening, they are beaten to pieces; without anyone noticing, they perish forever.

4:21 Is not their tent-cord pulled up within them? They die, yet without wisdom.”

Although English versions differ slightly on Job 4:17 due to the ambiguity associated with the preposition מִן, the thrust of 4:17 is clear: “No one is righteous nor pure before

References:

100 Hyun, Job the Unfinalizable, 139–41.

101 The old approach is to take מִן as a comparative מִן (“more than”) (as in NIV, KJV: “Can a man be more righteous than God?”). While most modern interpreters reject this rendition since it is impossible for a man to be more righteous than God, R. Whitekettle recently advocates this reading, suggesting that the old reading better suits Eliphaz’s rhetoric goal of persuading Job through a “hyperbolic question.” Richard Whitekettle, “When More Leads to Less: Overstatement, Incrementum, and the Question in Job 4:17a,” *JBL* 129, no. 3 (2010): 445–48. Other suggestions for מִן are “in relation to” (e.g., Newsom, Job, 378: “Can a man be righteous in relation to God?”) or “before” (e.g., Habel, The Book of
The similarity with Job 4:17 has disappointed some because, despite the tremendous encounter described in 4:12-16, the message does not seem to convey anything new. G. L. Mattingly, for example, argues that 4:17 is a “dictum that Eliphaz cites” based on the “tradition axiom that he has verified through his own experience.” Such a skeptical view, however, is unnecessary since the subsequent verses (4:18-21) shape the spirit’s message to make it distinctive from that of ANE sufferer texts.

Job 4:18-19 intensifies the meaning of 4:17: “Even in his servants (עבד) he puts no trust, and his angels (ךְָּמִלְא) he charges with error; How much more those who dwell in houses of clay . . .” His “servants (עבד)” and “angels (ךְָּמִלְא),” which refer to God’s messengers (cf. 15:15 “holy ones [קדש]”), have been diversely interpreted. These
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102 Eliphaz and Bildad quote 4:17 in their later discourses: “What is man, that he can be pure? Or he who is born of a woman, that he can be righteous? (Eliphaz, 15:14), “How then can man be in the right before God? How can he who is born of woman be pure?” (Bildad, 25:4). As we shall in the next chapter, Eliphaz and Bildad do not present new ideas here, but reiterate the spirit’s message in 4:17.

103 J. Klein, “Man and His god (1.179),” in COS (Leiden: Brill Academic, 2003), 1:573, n.2.

104 J. Klein’s translation. Cf. S. N. Kramer renders “Never has a sinless child been born to its mother … a sinless workman has not existed from of old” (ANET, 589-91).

105 E.g., Roland E. Murphy, The Book of Job: A Short Reading (New York: Paulist Press, 1999), 22; Whybray, Job, 43; Clines, Job 1-20, 128, 132–33; Robert L. Alden, Job, NAC, vol. 11 (Nashville: B&H Publishing Group, 1994), 88; Buttenweiser, The Book of Job, 163.


untrustworthy servants/angels have been linked with either (1) Genesis 6:1-4 where “sons of God (םֵא רְאוֹיָה יִתָּם)” had a union with daughters of men,109 (2) Psalm 82:1-2, 6-7 where “sons of Most High (יִתָּם לְיוֹן)” were condemned in a divine council,110 (3) fallen angels,111 or (4) Satan in the prologue (Job 1:6-12, 2:1-7).112 Though stimulating, these connections seem unnecessary.113 As H. H. Rowley notes, the point of 4:18 is “even the purest angels are still impure in the presence of God.”114 4:18-19, then, conveys the following message: If God’s angels—heavenly beings—are filthy, how much more are humans—earthly beings—who are made of the dust and crushed like a moth?

The murky description of humans’ frailty continues in 4:20-21. Here humans’ temporal life is compared to “morning and evening.”115 Once they die, they are remembered no more. Humans’ vulnerability is also described with the term “tent-cord (י ת ר).”116 Once the tent-cord is pulled out of the ground, men collapse. They die devoid of wisdom, that is, without being able to manage their life “intelligently and successfully.”117

But why such a dark message? Job 4:17 at least seems orthodox since the concept of universal sin/total depravity is also attested elsewhere in the OT (e.g., Gen

109 Clines, Job 1-20, 134.
110 Gibson, Job, 39.
111 Pope, Job, 37, 110.
112 Buttenweiser, The Book of Job, 163–64; Reichert, Job, 16; Barton, Commentary on the Book of Job, 81–82.
113 Longman, Job, 120.
115 Gordis, The Book of Job, 50; Davidson, The Book of Job, 34; Barton, Commentary on the Book of Job, 82.
116 Estes, Job, 29; Van Selms, Job, 34; Barton, Commentary on the Book of Job, 83.
117 Whybray, Job, 44. Cf. Bergant, Job, Ecclesiastes, 49, interprets 4:21b differently: “Physical imperfections and the fleeting nature of life prevent people from attaining wisdom.” So Gibson, The Book of Job, 23. Van Selms, Job, 34, on the other hand, reads, “People never come to understand the meaning of his existence.”
6:5–7, 8:21; Ps 51:7[51:5]; Jer 17:9). But the subsequent verses begin to sound more nihilistic than convincing and even like Gnosticism, which sees body as “totally corrupt, a prison for the soul, a dirty shell to be discarded.”118 Moreover, it presents an erroneous view of angels that finds hardly any biblical support.119 First, Psalm 103:20-21 reads,

Bless the Lord, O His angels, mighty ones who are doers of His word, to obey the voice of His word. Bless the Lord, all his hosts, his ministers who are doers of His will.

The psalmist describes God’s angels as loyal celestial beings who always carry out and obey the word of God.120 Second, the message also contradicts other biblical portrayals of mankind. For instance, it does not fit with “God’s affirmation of humans in Psalm 8” or “God’s commendation of biblical figures such as Job and Enoch” (Job 1-2, Gen 5:22, 24).121 It also contrasts with Genesis 1:26-28, where humans are created in God’s image “to rule creation as His earthly surrogate (Gen 1:26-28),”122 and with God’s declaration in Genesis 1:31 that everything he had made was “very good” (Gen 1:31).123 Third, as R.Y. Fyall observes, the message does not conform to the traditional prophetic tone either. While the ordinary prophetic judgement is accompanied by a proclamation of remedy and hope, the spirit’s message lacks such a statement. It only “legalistically condemns the whole human race” and then “slams shut the door of hope.”124 Last but not least, while this “negative description” of universal sinfulness might provide a “justification for
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118Habel, Job, 39.
119Longman, Job, 120; Murphy, The Book of Job, 22; Barton, Commentary on the Book of Job, 82.
121Estes, Job, 30; Habel, Job, 39.
123Bergant, Job, Ecclesiastes, 49.
God’s punishment on Job,”125 the message then falsifies itself by betraying the prologue that portrays Job as righteous (1:8, 2:3).126

To conclude, the discussion on 4:17-21 suggests that the spirit’s message can hardly be taken as from God. The message may seem orthodox at first, but it progresses into a dark and nihilistic message of condemnation that contradicts the prologue as well as other biblical accounts. The message then heightens the possibility that the spirit of the vision (4:15) is the Satan of the prologue.

**Literary Context**

The literary context further discloses the Satanic origin of the vision. Not only does the prologue describe Job’s integrity, but the epilogue (42:7-17) also affirms Job’s innocence through God’s verdict that the friends, not Job, have been wrong (42:7).127 The message of the book’s frame then contradicts the vision’s thesis—everyone, and so Job, is foul before God—raising suspicion as to the vision’s origin. If Job were to accept the spirit’s message and confess his guilt, the thrust of the book would be subverted. This acceptance would “disprove” God’s confirmation of Job in the prologue/epilogue and instead declare that Satan and the friends “had been right.”128

S. W. T. Hyun’s observation on the allusive link between the prologue (1:1-2:13) and Eliphaz’s first speech (chs. 4-5) is also remarkable: (1) Satan’s suggestion to God to “stretch out your hand and touch his bone (וֹעֲצָמ)` and his flesh (וֹבְשָׁר)` (2:5) is

---


126 Pyeon, *You Have Not Spoken What Is Right about Me*, 101, 116, captures the point of 4:17-21: “Job has brought about his current plight” and “it is he who is to blame.”


echoed in 4:14-15 “Fear . . . filled the mass of my bones (ךְצְמוֹת יִצְוָי) with fear. . . . the hair of my flesh (בְּשֵׂרִי) stood up.”129 (2) Satan killed Job’s children by a great wind (רוּחַ) (1:19), and this event is resounded by הרוח in Eliphaz’s voice (“By the breath of God they perish, and by the blast [תָּרֶשֶׁ] of his anger they are consumed” [4:9]) and carried through הרוח in his encounter (“A spirit [תּוֹרֶשֶׁ] passed by my face” [4:15]).130 (3) Satan’s “rhetorical question and challenge to God” (1:10-11, 2:4-5) are also alluded to in the spirit’s message (4:17-21). As opposed to God who holds to Job’s integrity “before Him” (1:8; 2:3), Satan predicates that Job will abandon his faithfulness “before God” (1:11, 2:5). This sneering challenge continues in the vision’s message that humans are “neither righteous nor pure before God” and are prone to fail.131 D. A. Garrett further elaborates,

The spirit proclaims to Eliphaz a message that closely echoes Satan’s complaint in Job 1. Satan approaches God with profound cynicism about human beings. They are innately foul, and if someone like Job does right, it is only for the sake of material reward. Job’s righteousness is a sham: he pretends to be righteous . . . . This is beyond cynicism; it is nihilism. Nothing God created is good, and “goodness” itself is a meaningless concept. . . . Eliphaz’s nighttime spirit whispers a message wholly congruous with this nihilistic paradigm.

The Satanic revelation contrasts powerfully with God’s attitude. In his lengthy discourse on how he watches over all of creation, and specifically over the wild beasts (38:4-39:30), God never suggests that he finds them foul and repulsive, even though many of them are red in tooth and claw (39:30). . . . Satan claims that Job will blaspheme God, but God believes in Job! He has faith that Job’s loyalty will survive the most stringent test. This is not the attitude of a deity who considers all humans to be repugnant, despicable, and treacherous. YHWH believes that godliness and virtue can exist in a human; Satan and the spirit of Job 4 do not.132

The thematic and linguistic links between the prologue (chs. 1-2) and chapter 4 then reaffirm that Satan is the spirit of Eliphaz’s vision (4:12-21).

J. E. Miller’s comparative study on Eliphaz’s vision and Job’s theophany also corroborates this view. Miller observes that the two revelatory experiences recorded in
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130 Ibid., 139.
131 Ibid., 140–41.
132 Garrett, “Job,” 32, emphasis original.
Job—Eliphaz’s vision (4:12-21) and Job’s theophany (38:1-42:6)—form an *inclusio*, enclosing the poetic body (3:1-42:6) as the first and last reply to Job’s words. His comparison of these two revelatory accounts is as follows:  
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Table 3. Eliphaz’s vision (4:12-21) versus Job’s theophany (38:1-42:6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character of experience</th>
<th>Eliphaz’s Vision</th>
<th>Job’s Theophany</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Hidden</td>
<td>- &quot;Public and personal”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “Takes place in a fearful stillness”</td>
<td>- Takes place “in a storm”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Occurs “in the dead of night”</td>
<td>- “Seems to occur in the daylight”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Privately received</td>
<td>- Received “in the presence of his friends,” and Eliphaz is “also addressed (42:7-8)”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Eliphaz is “merely a spectator trying to catch” the message</td>
<td>- Job is “challenged to respond”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The visitor is unknown and “does not seem to be God”</td>
<td>- Job receives the presence of God Himself</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revealed message</th>
<th>Eliphaz’s Vision</th>
<th>Job’s Theophany</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- “The spirit does not address Eliphaz directly as a person”</td>
<td>- “Job is continuously addressed and recognized”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “Speaks of humanity in general”</td>
<td>- “Speaks concerning Job himself”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Creates “distance between God and man” by “denigrating man”</td>
<td>- Creates “distance between God and man” by emphasizing “the transcendence of God”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The spirit informs Eliphaz that “a human is naturally less than righteous” and “cannot stand clean before his maker (4:17/15:14-16)” “Even the members of God’s court are less than effective (4:18/15:15), and the heavens which God created are unclean (15:15)”</td>
<td>- God “never touches on uncleanness or unrighteousness as part of Job’s problem, or anyone else’s problem” “God has respect for his creation, even for Eliphaz”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “Tries to answer the problem of theodicy (by pointing out man’s corrupt nature)”</td>
<td>- “Does not try to answer the problem,” only affirms that “God is in control after all”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Table 3. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revealer and Receiver</th>
<th>“Almost no relationship between Eliphaz and the revealer”</th>
<th>“Strong relationship between God and Job”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- “No conversation” and “Eliphaz is not directly addressed”</td>
<td>“Job has called on God and God answers Job”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The spirit visitor is “as uncaring as Job thought God was”</td>
<td>“God is portrayed as caring and personal to Job”</td>
<td>“Even Eliphaz receives more personal attention in Job’s theophany than he did in his own vision”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Miller’s observations reveal a sharp distinction between Eliphaz’s vision and Job’s theophany. The quality of the experiences is different, and a great gap exists in the content as well as in the relational aspect. As Miller notes, the spirit in Eliphaz’s vision is a far lesser being that has “a limited outlook and limited power.”\(^\text{134}\) The crafty spirit pretends to deliver a heavenly message, but he is only impotent, distorted, and subversive.

**Conclusion**

This chapter demonstrates that Satan is the most plausible candidate for Eliphaz’s spirit visitor. Eliphaz believes that the vision is from God, but the careful reader recognizes the unidentified spirit as a guise of the Satan of the prologue. This chapter finds the six proposals that consider the spirit (4:15) as God or an angel to be inconclusive at best. Instead, my exegetical observation on some expressions (“a word came stealing to me” [4:12]; “the hair of my flesh stood up” [4:15]), the gender of רוח (4:15), the message of the vision itself (4:17-21), and the literary context suggests that Satan returns as the spirit of the vision. Contrary to the common belief that Satan

vanishes after the prologue, he comes back with the same message of mistrust with which he challenged God in the prologue. Satan therefore exerts his influence beyond the prologue, triggering another affliction on Job (through the friends’ false condemnation and verbal assault on Job) and setting the whole theological debate into motion.
CHAPTER 3
ELIPHAZ’S VISION IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF
THE THREE FRIENDS’ SPEECH CYCLES

If Satan is the spiritual visitor of Eliphaz’s vision (4:12–21), how does Satan’s subversive message affect the development of the debate between the three friends and Job? More specifically, how do Eliphaz, Bildad, Zophar, and Job perceive the message and utilize it in their arguments?

Commentators identify Eliphaz’s vision (4:12-21) as being cited or alluded to in all of the speech cycles (e.g., first cycle: 4:7, 9, 11; 5:2, 4, 6 [by Eliphaz], 7:14, 17; 9:2 [by Job] / second cycle: 15:14–16 [by Eliphaz], 20:2-8 [by Zophar] / third cycle: 25:4–6 [by Bildad]).¹ Scholars also note that the visionary message brackets the speech cycles as a whole, serving as the beginning (4:17–21) and the ending (25:4–6) of the friends’ discourses.² If Eliphaz’s vision frames the speech cycles and is constantly referred to by the friends and Job, what role does it play in the friends’ polemic against Job?

This chapter aims to demonstrate that the demonic message of Eliphaz’s vision lies at the heart of the debate between the friends and Job. For this purpose, the present chapter examines every reference to the spirit’s message by the friends and by Job to see how this message contributes to the surrounding literary context. Each speech cycle (first cycle: 4–14; second cycle: 15–21; third cycle: 22–27) will be discussed in order below to explore the way the friends and Job use Eliphaz’s vision to support their arguments.


First Cycle (Job 4-14)

In the first round of speeches, the demonic message is found in (1) Eliphaz’s first speech (chs. 4–5) where his vision originally occurs (4:17–21), and it is alluded to in the surrounding context (e.g., 4:7, 9, 11; 5:2, 4, 6), and in (2) Job’s subsequent speeches where he occasionally refers to Eliphaz’s vision and its message in his responses to the friends (7:14, 17; 9:2).

Eliphaz’s First Speech (Chs. 4–5)

Much ink has been spilled concerning the segmentation of each unit of Job and of Job 4-5 in particular. In his study on Job 4-5, D. W. Cotter summarizes various divisions that commentators have proposed for Job 4–5 (for detail, see Table A3 in Appendix 2). Within the proposals, no consensus is readily apparent, except that scholars mainly agree on divisions after 4:11 (i.e., 4:1-11, 12-21) and 5:7 (i.e., 5:1-7, 8-16) and/or 5:16 (i.e., 5:8-16, 17-26). Of particular interest for our discussion is the segmentation and structure suggested by F. I. Andersen. He divides chapters 4-5 into 4:2, 3-6, 7-11, 12-21 and 5:1-16, 17-26, 27, assigning 4:12-21 as the center of the structure (see below). His division not only fits well within the spectrum of the scholarly consensus (i.e., divisions after 4:11 and 5:16) but also forms a “symmetrical introverted

---


structure” (i.e., a chiasmus structure) with a discernable structural center.⁶

A Opening remark (4:2)

B Exhortation (4:3-6)
- Begins with הִנֵה clause (v. 3 “Behold [הִנֵה], you have instructed many …”)

C God’s dealings with men (4:7-11)
- Imperative (v. 7 זָכַר־אֱנֶה [“Remember!”]) + two interrogatives (מִי + אֵיפֹה)
- A didactic anecdote introduced by רָאִיתִי (“I have seen”; v. 8)
- Retributive principle expressed through agricultural metaphors (v. 8)

D The revelation of truth (4:12-21)

C′ God’s dealings with men (5:1-16)
- Imperative (v. 1 קָרֵא־אֱנֶה [“Call now!”]) + two interrogatives (הֲ + אָל־מִי)
- A didactic anecdote introduced by רָאִיתִי (“I have seen”; v. 3)
- Retributive principle expressed through agricultural metaphors (vv. 2-7)

B′ Exhortation (5:17-26)
- Begins with הִנֵה clause (v. 17 “Behold [הִנֵה], blessed is the one whom …”)

A′ Closing remark (5:27)

According to Andersen, the center D—4:12-21 (Eliphaz’s vision)—serves as “the basis” for Eliphaz’s discourse in chapters 4-5. What surrounds D is the doctrinal argument (i.e., the doctrine of retribution) in C and C′ that Eliphaz develops from the vision’s message. Out of this doctrine, then, emerges Eliphaz’s exhortative advice as reflected in B and B′. Finally, the opening (A) and closing remarks (A′) encircle the whole block of Eliphaz’s speech.⁷

The following evidence corroborates Andersen’s structure. To begin with, as Andersen and others point out, a straight linear development of chapters 4-5 seems logically less likely.⁸ Moreover, the distributive pattern of direct and indirect address

⁶I have added details (lines under B, C, C′, and B′) to Andersen’s original structure found in Francis I. Andersen, Job, TOTC, vol. 14 (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1976), 118–19.
⁷Ibid.
⁸For instance, 4:2-6 and 5:17-27 carry a similar genre element that sets them apart from the genre element of 4:7-11 and 5:1-7 (or 5:1-16). See ibid., 118; Brown, The Vision in Job 4 and Its Role in the Book, 17; J. Gerald Janzen, Job, Interpretation (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1985), 116; Elmer B. Smick, Job, in vol. 4 of EBC, eds. Frank E. Gaebelein et al. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1988), 897.
within Eliphaz’s speech supports Andersen’s symmetric structure. For example, B (4:3-6) and B’ (5:17-26), which together constitute Eliphaz’s “exhortation,” are marked by a higher number of “direct address,” that is, a frequent use of “second person” verbs, pronominal suffixes, and independent pronouns directed to Job.

Table 4. Verbs, pronominal suffixes, and independent pronouns in B/B’ and C/C’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>1st person (%)</th>
<th>2nd person (%)</th>
<th>3rd person (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B (4:3-6)</td>
<td>Exhortation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B’ (5:17-26)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (4:7-11)</td>
<td>God’s dealings</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C’ (5:1-16)</td>
<td>with men</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>77.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In contrast, C (4:7-11) and C’ (5:1-16), which together embody Eliphaz’s doctrinal argument, contain a higher concentration of “indirect address,” that is, a frequent use of generalized statements by using “third person” verbs, pronominal suffixes, and independent pronouns (for detail, see Table A4/A5 in Appendix 2).9

Andersen’s structure is further substantiated by the parallelism found in B-B’ and C-C’. As for B (4:3-6) and B’ (5:17-26), (1) both have the הִנֵה clause at the outset (4:3 “Behold [הִנֵה], you have instructed many”; 5:17 “Behold [הִנֵה], blessed is the one”)10 and

9Some scholars further divide C’ (5:1-16) into 5:1-7 and 5:8-16, and treat the two sections as separate units (i.e., 5:1-7, 8-16, 17-26[27]; e.g., Schlottmann [1851], Hitzig [1874], Peters [1928], Konig [1929], Kroze [1961], Weiser [1968], Habel [1985], Hartley [1988], Cotter [1992]). Others separate 5:1-7 from 5:8-16, and group 5:8-16 with 5:17-26(27) as one unit (i.e., 5:1-7, 8-26[27]; e.g., Ewald [1854], Dillmann [1891], Vetter [1897], Möller [1955], Terrien [1963]). While these divisions are not impossible, I think there are valid reasons to divide ch. 5 as Andersen does (i.e., 5:1-16, 17-26[27]; so Schlögl [1916], Kissane [1939], Bezuidenhout [1968]). First, whereas both 5:1-7 and 5:8-16 contain a higher number of third person “indirect address” (5:1-7: 1st person [13 percent]; 2nd person [13 percent]; 3rd person [73.9 percent] / 5:8-16: 1st person [19 percent]; 2nd person [0 percent]; 3rd person [81 percent]), 5:17-26 has more second person “direct address” (1st person [0 percent]; 2nd person [57.6 percent]; 3rd person [42.4 percent]). Second, 5:1 and 5:8 are connected thematically. In 5:1, Eliphaz challenges Job by asking, “Call now, is there anyone who will answer you? And to which of the holy ones will you turn?” In 5:8, Eliphaz provides a solution to his challenge in 5:1: “But as for me, I would seek God, and to God I would commit my cause.” Third, both 5:1-7 and 5:8-16 expound the doctrine of retribution whereas 5:17-26(27) mainly includes exhortatory remarks.

10The other occurrence of the הִנֵה clause in chs. 4-5 is in 5:27.
(2) both, from a thematic point of view, distinguish themselves from other units as “exhortation.”\textsuperscript{11}

C (4:7-11) and C’ (5:1-16) also mirror each other in many respects: (1) Both begin with an imperative followed by two interrogatives (כִּי אָדָם אֵלֵיהוּ [4:7]; כִּי אָדָם אֵלֵיהוּ [5:1]). (2) Both continue Eliphaz’s counsel in the form of a didactic anecdote (יָדֵיהוּ “I have seen . . .”; 4:8; 5:3).\textsuperscript{12} (3) Both stress the fate of wicked/fool expressed in the retributive principle (4:8-11; 5:2-7, 11-16). In doing so, both employ the terms כְּנֶסֶת (“trouble”; 4:8; 5:6) and שֶׁפֶל (“misery”; 4:8; 5:6, 7),\textsuperscript{13} and moreover, both repeatedly use agricultural metaphors such as חֵרְשָׁה (“to plow”; 4:8), זֵרֶע (“to sow”; 4:8), שֶׁפֶל (“toil”\textsuperscript{[?]}, misery”; 4:8; 5:6, 7), חֵרֶב (“to reap”; 4:8), שְׁרוּשׁ (hiphil: “to put out roots”; 5:3), קְרֵס (“harvest”; 5:5), מִשְׂרָה (“dust”; 5:6), הַכְּרֵס (“ground”; 5:6), and צֶמֶת (“to sprout”; 5:6). C. L. Seow comments,

To illustrate the common-sense principle of cause and effect, Eliphaz has used an agricultural metaphor (of cultivation, sowing, and harvesting) characterized as something that he has “seen” (4:8). Now he returns to what he has “seen,” namely, the case of a plant that has taken root, and he continues that metaphor in the first stanza of the second movement (5:2-7).\textsuperscript{14}

(4) Both echo the language used in Eliphaz’s vision (D) (for detail, see Table A6 in Appendix 2). Terms echoing the vision’s message (4:17-21) such as אָדָם (“to perish”; 4:20 => 4:7, 9, 11), מָכָּר (“without”; paired with אָדָם; 4:20 => 4:11), מָתָּה (“to die”; 4:21 => 5:2), אָדָם (“to crush”; 4:19 => 5:4), שֶׁפֶל (“dust”; 4:19 => 5:6), and מָכָּר (“angel”; 4:18.

\textsuperscript{11}K. Brown, \textit{The Vision in Job 4 and Its Role in the Book}, 17, summarizes the movement of Eliphaz’s first speech as follows: “[It] opens by appealing to Job to maintain his piety (4:2-6), and closes with assurances that those who do so are inevitably blessed and preserved (5:17-27).” Against this popular reading, J. D. W. Burnight, “Does Eliphaz Really Begin ‘Gently’? An Intertextual Reading of Job 4,2-11,” \textit{Biblica} 95 (2014): 347–70, interprets 4:2-6 as an accusatory rebuke that aligns with the tone of 4:7-11.


\textsuperscript{13}Ibid., 413–18; Brown, \textit{The Vision in Job 4 and Its Role in the Book}, 119-20.

\textsuperscript{14}Seow, \textit{Job 1-21}, 413.
5:1 has קְדֹשִים ("holy ones")¹⁵ are scattered throughout C-C'.¹⁶ In contrast, such a concentration of the visionary language is not attested in B-B’ nor A-A’¹⁷

The evidence, then, suggests that Andersen is correct to place Eliphaz’s vision (4:12-21) as the center of Eliphaz’s first speech (chs. 4-5). I have to disagree with him, however, in one major point, that Eliphaz did not receive a divine revelation (i.e., “the revelation of truth,” as Andersen terms it)¹⁸ but a Satanic message. If Eliphaz’s vision is of vital importance in the literary structure of chapters 4-5, how does it affect and relate to the surrounding discourse blocks such as C-C’, B-B’, and A-A’? The discussion now—following Andersen’s structure—turns to the relationship between the vision and its immediate context.

**Eliphaz’s vision (D) and C-C’.** As discussed, Eliphaz in his discourse in C-C’ (4:7-11; 5:1-16) possibly alludes to the key terms of the spirit’s message in 4:17-21. Despite the verbal connection, there is a sharp division of opinion within scholarship in relating Eliphaz’s vision (D) to C-C’ (4:7-11; 5:1-16). Central to the issue is how the dark message of the vision—everyone is sinful (4:17-18) and doomed to destruction (4:19-21)—can be reconciled with the theme of C-C’ (4:7-11; 5:1-16) where Eliphaz, based on that retributive doctrine, asserts that it is only the wicked and the fool—not the innocent—that perish. For example, concerning the seeming contradiction between Eliphaz’s vision (D) and C-C’, K. Brown comments,


¹⁶For other possible correspondences, see Brown, *The Vision in Job 4 and Its Role in the Book*, 116–22.

¹⁷The only possible occurrences are השם (“man”; 4:17 => 5:17) and משמש (“to die”; 4:21 => but 5:20 has מות “death,” the noun form), but they seem to be insignificant.

¹⁸Andersen, *Job*, 119.
[The vision’s message] first challenges human righteousness before or compared to God, then asks: If God does not even trust his own servants, how much less lowly human beings? Most significantly, it concludes that anyone can suddenly perish. In a series of violent images, 4:19-21 declares that mortals without distinction are crushed, destroyed, perish, pulled up and die. The problem is that Eliphaz directly repudiates this conclusion in the passage immediately preceding the vision, insisting that the righteous do not perish, while the wicked cannot escape (4:7-8). He then reaffirms the same contrast at length in ch. 5, cursing the “fool,” but promising that God saves the lowly. The other friends argue similarly throughout the first two speech cycles, insisting again and again on the same dichotomy between the righteous and the wicked that the vision directly challenges.19

Brown, then, surveys four different ways commentators have dealt with this logical inconsistency:20 (1) Those who take the vision to be Eliphaz’s and assume that the vision’s message is nevertheless fully compatible with “the views of Eliphaz,”21 (2) those who ascribe the vision to Eliphaz yet find “some degree of ambiguity or subversion in the vision,”22 (3) those who “question whether the vision was an original part of the book at all,”23 and (4) those who claim that “the vision was originally attributed to Job, not Eliphaz.”24

Dissatisfied with the first three approaches, Brown embraces the fourth option. Thus he reframes 4:12-21 as a part of Job’s speech, originally belonging to the end of Job’s lament in chapter three. From this premise, he develops an extensive discussion on the vision’s significance and its role in the book.25

19 Brown, *The Vision in Job 4 and Its Role in the Book*, 298, emphasis original. Similarly, David J. A. Clines, “Verb Modality and the Interpretation of Job 4:20-21,” *VT* 30, no. 3 (1980): 356, remarks, “If [4:21] is to be taken seriously as a general statement about man-kind, Eliphaz has, half-way through his first speech, destroyed the premise from which he began, and on the basis of which alone he can offer consolation to Job: namely that mankind is divided into two camps, the righteous and the wicked (iv 7-8), that each camp receives its proper reward (iv 8) and that Job unquestionably belongs to the former camp (iv 3-4, 6).”

20 For a full discussion, see Brown, *The Vision in Job 4 and Its Role in the Book*, 11–53.

21 For a detailed survey and bibliography information, see *ibid.*, 12–19.

22 Ibid., 19–31.

23 Ibid., 31–39.

24 Ibid., 39–51.

While he rightly sees the centrality of 4:12-21 in the development of the friends’ speech cycles, Brown is misled at major points. To begin with, I find Brown’s critique against the first and third approaches valid: (1) The first approach too readily harmonizes Eliphaz’s vision (D) and C-C’ by minimizing any explanation or leaving the tension unresolved, particularly because the commentators of the first approach generally hold that the vision originates from God. (2) The third approach is likewise problematic since—as Brown points out—it hastily dismisses the tension by treating the vision as secondary.

Nonetheless, I find Brown’s endorsement of the fourth approach also unconvincing. He makes use of the unproven assumption that for the vision to be regarded as Eliphaz’s, the vision’s message (D) must be consistent with the retributive principle laid out in C-C’. He fails to see that Eliphaz and the spirit represent two different voices. Why would the crafty spirit bring a message that is a mere repetition or banal affirmation of Eliphaz’s view of retribution (C-C’)?

D. A. Garrett explains the author’s intention behind the seeming dissonance between D and C-C’:

1. Eliphaz holds to the doctrine of retribution, but initially gives it a fairly optimistic slant, that it is possible for one to merit God’s favor by righteous behavior.
2. Satan’s vision effectively poisons the dialogue from the outset, suggesting that the very notion that a creature could be “good” is abhorrent.
3. Thus, as the dialogue progresses, the friends will be progressively darker, hostile

---


27Ibid.

28Ibid.

29As an analogy, God in Job’s theophany (38:1-42:6) brings a message that Job and the friends (and even the reader) have never anticipated. Contrary to the expectation that God would provide a “profound explanation” for Job’s sufferings, God speaks about nature (38:1-40:5), Behemoth (40:6-24), and Leviathan (40:25-41:26; 41:1-34) to teach Job that the “conventional understanding of wisdom” has limits and that God, who is in control of chaos, will ultimately subdue evil. Garrett, “Job,” 49–63. If Eliphaz’s vision (4:12-21) parallels the theophany (38:1-42:6) as the frame of the whole speech cycles (4:1-42:6), one could likewise expect that the spirit would deliver a cryptical message that is far beyond expectation. James E. Miller, “The Vision of Eliphaz as Foreshadowing in the Book of Job,” *Proceedings* 9 (1989): 102–11; Garrett, “Job,” 2–3.
to humanity in general and Job in particular.

4. The tension between D and the rest of the argument brings out an inherent flaw in the doctrine of retribution, that it is easy to see how a man could merit God’s condemnation but impossible to see how a man could ever merit God’s favor. By itself, the doctrine of retribution can lead only to universal condemnation.

5. It appears that Eliphaz has introduced the vision as justification for his claim that no one, including Job, is sinless, and therefore God is justified in punishing Job. But he does not see that the vision is actually nihilistic.30

As discussed, the spirit’s message (4:17-21) is thematically connected with Satan’s challenge in the prologue (chs. 1-2). Satan in the prologue cynically argues that Job’s disinterested piety cannot be true. Once his initial challenge has failed, Satan, disguised, reappears in Eliphaz’s vision (4:12-21) with the same nihilistic message of mistrust.31

The religious foundation for both the friends and Job is the doctrine of retribution.32 All of them believe the problem of evil and suffering can be adequately explained from this doctrinal paradigm, namely, the righteous must prosper and the wicked must suffer hardship.33 This righteous-wicked dichotomy, therefore, casts both Job and Eliphaz into insoluble perplexity. For Job, his undeserved suffering means a blunt contradiction of the retributive justice (e.g., ch. 3). For Eliphaz, there is no other possible explanation but that Job must have sinned to deserve his misery. In this juncture the spirit steps in, delivering the false message that helps Eliphaz to resolve his dilemma by believing that Job had sinned at some point.34

The demonic message, which in early chapters is introduced alongside of the account on the retributive doctrine, is in later chapters fully blended with the doctrine and

30Thanks to Garrett for the suggestion.


34Esther J. Hamori, “The Spirit of Falsehood,” CBQ 72, no. 1 (2010): 25, notes that the spirit—just like the lying spirit of 1 Kgs 22—brings to Eliphaz what he already wants to hear.
dominates the entire speeches of the friends. A stark contrast can be seen between chapters 4 (the first words of the three, spoken by Eliphaz) and 25 (the last words of the three, spoken by Bildad), in both of which the spirit’s message occurs (4:17-21; 25:4-6). In chapter 4, Eliphaz speaks on both the positive and negative sides of the retributive doctrine (e.g., the wicked perish [4:8-11; 5:2-7, 12-14], but God protects the righteous [4:6-7] and restores the repentant [5:11, 15-16, 18-27]). What one finds in Chapter 25, however, is the dark side of the doctrine that only condemns Job and humanity (as worms and maggots). As Garrett notes, the friends “have moved beyond a simple doctrine that ‘all have sinned’ to a denial of the significance of human virtue, or even of its possibility.”

L. Wilson’s summary on the shift of the friends’ speech tone further buttresses this understanding:

There is, for example, a significant change from Eliphaz’s optimism in 5:17-26 to his strong condemnation of Job in 22:5-11. . . . [I]n the first round of speeches the focus is on the positive aspect of the retribution idea—that God rewards the righteous—at least in the first two speeches (4:6–7; 5:18–27; 8:5–7). There is only a brief statement of the flip side—that God punishes the wicked—by Zophar (11:11), and Bildad applies this to Job’s children rather than to Job himself (8:4). In the second round, the balance shifts almost totally to emphasize the outcome for the wicked (15:20–35; 18:5–21; 20:4–29), and this is also the focus of the third round (22:15–20).

If so, the theological tension between Eliphaz’s vision (D) and C-C′ is as the author intended it. The spirit’s message, which denies any human merit, effectively sets Job as a sinner and allows Eliphaz’s defense of the doctrine of retribution. As the debate progresses, however, the nihilistic premise of the vision will dominate the friends’

theology, turning the retribution principle into a dark condemnation of man.

**Eliphaz’s vision (D) and B-B’, A-A’.** Whereas C-C’ (4:7-11; 5:1-16) is marked by the use of indirect address to expound on the generalized doctrinal statement, B-B’ (4:3-6; 5:17-26) and A-A’ (4:2; 5:27) frequently employ second person verbs, pronominal suffixes, and independent pronouns to directly address and exhort the doctrinal principle to Job.

While it is commonly accepted that the literary purpose of A-B (4:2-6) and B’-A’ (5:17-27) is to urge Job to submit to God, scholars are debating whether the tenor of A-B (4:2-6) is accusatory or conciliatory. The different understandings of 4:2-6, for example, are well illustrated in two different translations proposed by the NRSV and Rashi’s commentary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NRSV</th>
<th>Rashi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4:2</td>
<td>If one <em>ventures</em> (הֲנִס ה) a word (ד ב ר) with you, will you <em>be offended</em> (תִלְא ה)? But who can keep from speaking?</td>
<td>4:2 Because He <em>tested</em> (הֲנִס ה) you with [one] <em>thing</em> (ד ב ר), should you <em>be weary</em> (תִלְא ה)? Who can withhold words?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


41 While NRSV takes נַעַשְׂנָה as a reference to “an emotional state” (hence “be offended”); similarly ESV/NIV “be impatient”), Rashi considers נַעַשְׂנָה as pointing to “physical exhaustion” (hence “be weary”; similarly Targum נַעַשְׂנָה “be weary” and Syriac לֶאַא “be weary”). Burnight, “Does Eliphaz Really Begin ‘Gently’?,” 349–50.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5. Continued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4:3 See, you have instructed (כזרמה) many; you have strengthened the weak hands (子どיו דקה).  
4:4 Your words have supported those who were stumbling (מדלי), and you have made firm the feeble knees (קריסך דורה).  
4:5 But now it has come to you, and you are impatient; it touches you, and you are dismayed.  
4:6 Is not your fear (of God) (רואת תהל), your confidence (כפל), and the integrity of your ways: your hope (חכמה הוה וכרות)? |
| 4:3 Behold, you have chastised (כזרמה) many, and you have strengthened weak hands (子どיו דקה).  
4:4 Your words would pick up the stumbler (כזרמה), and you would strengthen buckling knees (ברכיך פורת).  
4:5 Now when it comes to you, you weary; it touches you and you are frightened.  
4:6 Surely, your fear (רואת נואז) was your foolishness (סמה), your hope and the sincerity of your ways (חכמה אתה וכרות). |

---

42Whereas NRSV follows כזרמה “to strengthen” (and hence “instructed”; so ESV/NIV), Rashi takes כזרמה to instruct, chastise.” Y. Hoffman remarks on the equivocalness of this word: “The difference between these two possibilities must not be underestimated. If Eliphaz is saying that Job used to strengthen suffering people, then he actually praises and encourages Job . . . . On the other hand, if כזרמה is interpreted here as chastisement, then Eliphaz blames Job for hypocrisy: you dared to chastise other people, but now, when you share their misfortune, you blaspheme God!” Yair Hoffman, “The Use of Equivocal Words in the First Speech of Eliphaz (Job 4-5),” _VT_ 30, no. 1 (1980): 114.

43In the positive reading, the metaphors such as כזרמה (weak hands”; v. 3), מכסיל (the stumbler”; v. 4), and קריסך פורת (buckling/feeble knees”; v. 4) have been understood as Eliphaz’s compliments of Job’s support for the discouraged and dismayed. On the contrary, J. Burnight holds to a negative reading in that he takes (1) מכסיל (“the stumbler”) as a metaphor for “sinners facing divine punishment” often found in the prophetic literature, and (2) כזרמה (“weak hands”) and קריסך פורת (“buckling/feeble knees”) as referring to “terror felt by those who have experienced God’s wrath” (2 Sam 4:1; Ezra 4:4; Neh 6:9; Isa 13:7, 35:3; Jer 6:24, 38:4, 47:3, 50:43; Ezek 7:17, 21:7; Zeph 3:16; Cf. The expression “strengthen the weak hands” is used in the context of encouraging exhortation as in 1 Sam 23:16; Ezra 6:22; Isa 41:13; Ezek 13:22). Following this negative reading, Burnight takes the meaning of v. 5 (“But it has come to you . . . .”) to be that Job has also encountered “divine punishment.” Burnight, “Does Eliphaz Really Begin ‘Gently’?,” 352.

44The MT reads רואת ("your fear"). The NRSV and many standard English translations assume רואת as an ellipsis for רואת נואז ("fear of God"). Rashi and others, however, take רואת as referring to "one’s general fearfulness." So Seow, _Job 1–21_, 395; Burnight, “Does Eliphaz Really Begin ‘Gently’?,” 354.

45The term כזרמה has two meaning: (1) confidence (e.g., Ps 78:7; as adopted by the NRSV and standard English translations, and supported by the Vulgate [fortitudo tua] and Targum [סמי], and (2) stupidity/foolishness (e.g., Eccl 7:25; as taken by Rashi and supported by the LXX [αφοσιωσθην] and Peshitta [חמלת "your blame"]). For details, see Burnight, “Does Eliphaz Really Begin ‘Gently’?,” 354–63; W. A. M. Beuk, “Job’s Imprecation,” in _The Book of Job_, ed. W. A. M. Beuk, BETL 114 (Leuven, Belgium: Leuven University Press, 1994), 58–59.

46NRSV assumes a parallelism between רואת נואז ("your fear") and כזרמה את והכרות ("the integrity of your ways") (and hence "Is not your fear of God your confidence, and the integrity of your ways your hope?"); while Rashi supposes that רואת נואז ("your fear"), חכמה את ("your hope"), and הכרות את ("the sincerity of your ways") form “sequential parallelism” and serve as subjects for the predicate nominative רואת נואז ("your foolishness") (and hence "Surely, your fear was your foolishness, your hope and the sincerity of your ways"). Burnight, “Does Eliphaz Really Begin ‘Gently’?,” 359; Hoffman, “The Use of Equivocal Words in the First Speech of Eliphaz (Job 4-5),” 115–16.
If one follows the NRSV’s reading, Eliphaz’s speech begins in a kindly and conciliatory manner by commending Job’s piety and expressing comfort. In this line of interpretation, 4:2 is generally understood as a polite note of apology for speaking, 4:3-4 as praising Job’s past good deeds (cf. ch. 29), 4:5 either as an expression of sympathy or sarcasm, and 4:6 as an acknowledgement of Job’s piety to offer him either future reassurance or a mild rebuke.

Some commentators, however, find this positive reading of 4:2-6 (A-B) unfit as it seems to create tension over 4:7-11 (C). J. Burnight summarizes this sentiment:

It is difficult, however, to reconcile this positive reading with some of the other verses in Eliphaz’s speech. His emphasis on the fate of the wicked in 4,8-11, for example, would be peculiar if he believed Job to be guiltless; in some of the older commentaries (e.g., those of Duhm, Peake, Strahan, Ball), in fact, this presumed shift in tone has led scholars to go so far as to delete vv. 8-11 in whole or in part and/or to propose that they are later interpolations. Among more recent interpreters, Terrien, Driver-Gray, Clines, Newsom, and many others have noted the inappropriateness or clumsiness of various statements in 4,7-11 if Eliphaz’s aim is to comfort Job.

Hence Burnight, following Rashi and others, argues for a rendition of 4:2-6 (A-B) that is accusatory in tone. In this line of opinion, 4:2 is often taken as an expression of surprise at Job’s despair in chapter 3, 4:3-5 as an expression of disappointment in Job, for he who once instructed others to accept the divine retribution

---

50 E.g., Pope, Job, 36.
53 Ibid., 351–63.
54 This is the view of Rashi. J. Burnight goes even further, arguing that v. 2 is an expression of “indignation” as Eliphaz responds to Job’s complaints in ch. 3. He translates v. 2 as “May one try a word with you, since you are so exhausted? But who can hold back words?” Ibid.
that came upon them now fails to apply it to himself at the touch of calamity, and 4:6 as containing a sharp tone of rebuke. When read this way, Eliphaz’s accusation in 4:2-6 (A-B) sounds more consistent with the pointed words of the fate of wicked in 4:7-11 (C).

Since the use of “double entendre” or “equivocal words” is a feature often noted by commentators particularly in Eliphaz’s first speech (chs. 4-5), it is difficult to exclude either reading with certainty. I nevertheless find the positive reading more valid for 4:2-6 (A-B). Eliphaz does not simply claim in 4:2-6 that Job is “guiltless.” Rather, he tactfully commends Job’s past behavior in 4:3-6 in order to set the stage for a critique in 4:7-11. As L. Wilson points out, the early laudatory comment seems to serve as “a prelude to what Eliphaz really wants to say” in the following verses. Many commentators who hold to the positive reading of 4:2-6 also note that 4:5 and/or 4:6 cease to be unilateral praise of Job but turn into sarcasm or mild reproof of Job’s error, preparing for more accusatory statements in 4:7-11. Therefore, contrary to the view of Burnight and others, the positive reading of 4:2-6 (A-B) does connect naturally with 4:7-11 (C).

Whether one reads 4:2-6 (A-B) gently or harshly, the underlying message of

---


56Longman, Job, 115–16.

57Wilson, Job, 47.

58E.g., Hartley, The Book of Job, 106–7; Hooks, Job, 95; Wilson, Job, 47; Longman, Job, 116–17. For instance, Longman, Job, 117, finds irony in v. 6: “It is possible that Eliphaz is already goading Job on, thinking that really he neither fears God nor is innocent. In other words, his point is that if Job were really a God-fearing man and an innocent one, then he would not be in this predicament in the first place. That he is now panicking is just a further indication that he is not a wise, godly man, but a fool.”

59Moreover, Eliphaz, just before reiterating the vision’s message in 15:14-16, speaks, “Are the comforts of God too small for you, or the word (ד ב ר) that deals gently with you?” (15:11 ESV). Many scholars suggest that the expressions “the comforts of God” and “the word” specifically point to the vision’s message (Janzen, Job, 116–17; Hartley, The Book of Job, 246; Norman C. Habel, The Book of Job: A Commentary, OTL [Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1985], 254; Édouard Dhorme, A Commentary on the Book of Job, trans. Harold Knight [Nashville: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1967], 212; Seow, Job 1-21, 701). It is more likely then that Eliphaz, the messenger of God’s comfort and the word of gentleness (בג; cf. 2 Sam 18:5), begins his discourse in a conciliatory manner.
Eliphaz’s exhortation in 4:2-6 seems to be the same: Job has erred. It is also true for 5:17-27 (B’-A’). In this latter exhortation, Eliphaz offers a counsel of hope, telling Job not to despise God’s instruction and to return to him. Despite its conciliatory tone, the underlying assumption of 5:17-27 (B’-A’) is the same as 4:2-6 (A-B): Job has sinned. The influence of the spirit’s message is then readily seen in these exhortations of Eliphaz.

One more discussion to advance is the connection between Eliphaz’s opening words in 4:2 (A) and Eliphaz vision in 4:12-21 (D). J. P. Fokkelman’s structural analysis of Job 4 shows that Job 4 is composed in a “highly symmetrical structure,” with an accurate balancing of halves in each side (i.e., 4:2-11 contains 10 verses with 175 syllables; 4:12-21 has 10 verses with 175 syllables) (for detail, see Table A7 in Appendix 2). Fokkelman and others further note a “linear parallelism” between 4:2-11 (A-B-C), and 4:12-21 (D). For example, (1) both Ia (vv. 2-6) and IIb (vv. 17-21) contain two questions that frame each unit (Ia: v. 2, v. 6 / IIb: v. 17, v. 21), and Ia and IIb together form an inclusio for 4:2-21 as a whole; (2) both the earlier stanzas (Ia and IIa) serve as “preparatory” units for the messages contained in the later stanzas (Ib and IIb); (3) both the messages in Ib and IIb correspond as they carry “harsh images of destruction”; (4) both Ib and IIb repeatedly use words such as ṣāḵā (“to perish”; Ib: vv. 7, 9, 11 / IIb: v. 20) and ʿīḇēṯ (“from without”; Ib: v. 11/ IIb: v. 20); and (5) both Ia and IIa begin with the term דבַר (“word”; Ia: v. 2/ IIa:v. 12).

Concerning this linear parallelism between 4:2-11 and 4:12-21, van der Lugt

---

61Ibid., 327.  
and others particularly call for “due attention” to the term דבּר (“word”) used in the beginning of 4:2-11 and 4:12-21. Accordingly, דבּר in 4:2 and 4:12 serves as a linking word, coordinating 4:2-11 with 4:12-21. Concerning this van der Lugt remarks, “Eliphaz dares a word’ to Job (v. 2a), ‘because’ he himself received a ‘word’ (v. 12a).” Some commentators have already noted that the visionary message Eliphaz received may have compelled Eliphaz into speech (cf. v. 2b “Who can withhold from speaking?”), and this parallel use of דבּר further corroborates this understanding. It is then his visionary experience that prompted Eliphaz to speak up.

**Job’s Allusion to Eliphaz’s Vision**

Eliphaz’s first speech (chs. 4-5) has neither convinced nor comforted Job at all, for Job knows of no sin that he has committed. The other friends (Bildad [ch. 8], Zophar [ch.11]) also essentially repeat Eliphaz’s thesis. Fueled by the friends’ accusations, Job responds, and he does so particularly by alluding to Eliphaz’s vision as in 7:14, 7:17 and 9:2.

**Allusion to the vision in Job’s first response (ch. 7).** While commentators have reached no consensus concerning the structure of Job’s first response (chs. 6-7), it

---


68E.g., Habel, *The Book of Job*, 124, comments, “The impulse of the prophet to deliver his message was sometimes derived from a burning internal word from Yahweh (Jer. 15:16-17; 20:9). The initial compulsion for Eliphaz was apparently derived from the condition of Job and a message he too had received by revelation (4:12-16).” So Hooks, *Job*, 95.

is often agreed that Job in his first response (ch. 6) attempts to refute Eliphaz’s claims in chapters 4–5, particularly twisting Eliphaz’s earlier doctrinal arguments. Unlike in chapter 6, commentators generally do not find any significant connection between chapter 7 and Eliphaz’s speech (chs. 4–5), for chapter 7 contains Job’s direct address to God. In fact, however, chapter 7 does closely interact with Eliphaz’s speech (chs. 4–5) and particularly with Eliphaz’s vision.

The first allusion to Eliphaz’s vision appears in 7:14 where Job says, “You scare me with dreams (🧬) and terrify me with visions (돌궐).”


For example, (1) in 5:2a (“Surely vexation [ /[feyня]/ ] kills the fool”), Eliphaz employs the term וְלָהֵנָה ("vexation") to characterize Job’s attitude in ch. 3 and indirectly identifies him as a fool. In response, Job argues in 6:2 (“O that my vexation [ /[feyня]/ ] were weighed, and all my calamity laid in the balances!”) that his “vexation” is understandable considering the undeserved predicament that has fallen upon him (Beuken, “Job’s Imprecation,” 60–61; Habel, *The Book of Job*, 144–45; Hooks, *Job*, 114). (2) In 5:16 (“So the poor have hope, and injustice [ /[יִרְא ה]/ ] shuts its mouth”), Eliphaz lays out the retributive principle by using the word יִרְא ["injustice"] and implicitly implies that Job’s current plight fits such a fate of injustice. In return, in 6:29–30 Job reverses Eliphaz’s claim.

Please turn; let no injustice (יִרְא ה) be done. Turn now; my vindication is at stake.

6-29 Is there any injustice (יִרְא ה) on my tongue? Cannot my palate discern the cause of calamity? In 6:29, Job indicts the friends for falsely judging him guilty and warns them to turn away from such an injustice, while in 6:30, he “pleads his own innocence” by denying any injustice in his speech (Beuken, “Job’s Imprecation,” 61). (3) In 4:7a (“Remember: who that was innocent ever perished [ /[אבד]/ ]?”), 4:9a (“By the breath of God they perish [ /[אבד]/ ]”), and 4:11a (“The lion perishes [ /[אבד]/ ] for lack of prey”), Eliphaz again presents the retributive doctrine by using the term אבד (“to perish”), and in doing so he implies the evil fate that has befallen Job. In reply, Job, using a metaphor of caravans who find no water source, argues that he will “perish” because the friends fail to provide due care and advice for his suffering (6:18 “The caravans turn aside from their course; they go up into the waste, and perish [ /[אבד]/ ]”) (Ibid., 64–65). On a related note, Eliphaz in 4:6 exhorts Job to let his fear of God be his confidence (“Is not your fear [ /[יִרְא ה]/ ] of God your confidence, and the integrity of your ways your hope?”). Job turns that around in 6:14 (“Those who withhold kindness from a friend forsake the fear [ /[יִרְא ה]/ ] of the Almighty”) by saying that “the way Eliphaz has spoken” disqualifies him to be a feeder of God (Wilson, *Job*, 57; Beuken, “Job’s Imprecation,” 58–60). (4) What strikes at the heart of Eliphaz’s claim of retributive justice is Job’s words in 6:21 which reads, “For now you have become nothing; You look upon [my] calamity and are afraid” (Following the kethīv יָד over the qere [Garrett, “Job,” 20]). Here Job poignantly discloses the friends’ deep-seated fear that their view of retribution is “at risk” (Wilson, *Job*, 58; Garrett, “Job,” 20). For different interpretations of this verse, see Longman, *Job*, 141; Newsom, *Job*, 389; Seow, *Job* 1–21, 463–64; Solomon B. Freehof, *Book of Job: A Commentary* (New York: Union of American Hebrew Congregations, 1985), 78. For further semantic connections between chs. 4–5 and ch. 6, see Habel, *The Book of Job*, 141–44; Beuken, “Job’s Imprecation,” 58–67.

For instance, compare N. C. Habel’s commentary on ch. 6 and ch. 7. Habel, *The Book of Job*, 141–44, 153–56. See also W. A. M. Beuken’s observation on the semantic correspondence between Eliphaz’s speech (chs. 4–5) and Job’s response (chs. 6–7) in which more connections are noted between chs. 4–5 and ch. 6. Beuken, “Job’s Imprecation,” 58–67.
Table 6. Job 7:14’s allusion to Eliphaz’s vision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job 7:11-14 (Job)</th>
<th>Job 4:13 (Eliphaz)</th>
<th>Job 33:15 (Elihu)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>7:11</strong> Therefore I will not restrain my mouth; I will speak in the anguish of my spirit . . .</td>
<td>Amid thoughts from <em>visions of the night</em> (חֲלֹמוֹת,ְיֹנוֹת <em>לֶאָל</em>), when <em>deep sleep</em> falls on men (ַלֶאָל כַּמַּלְפַּל פָּרְשֵׁהָ של אָנָשִים) . . .</td>
<td>In a <em>dream</em> (רַל), in a <em>vision of the night</em> (חֲלֹמוֹת,ְיֹנוֹת לֶאָל), when <em>deep sleep</em> falls on men (כַּמַּלְפַּל פָּרְשֵׁהָ של אָנָשִים), while they slumber on their beds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7:13</strong> When I say, ‘My bed will comfort me, my couch will ease my complaint,’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7:14</strong> then you scare me with <em>dreams</em> (חֲלֹמוֹת) and terrify me with <em>visions</em> (ְיֹנוֹת) . . .</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many commentators take the “dreams/visions” (7:14) as indicating Job’s own nightmare, while some minor views consider it to refer to Eliphaz’s vision (4:12-21). I find the latter view more convincing. (1) As Elihu quotes 4:13 “almost verbatim” in 33:15, he deliberately replaces 4:13’s “visions (תְיֹנוֹת)” with the parallel word-pair “dream/vision (חלום/יֹנוֹת).” The parallel “dream/vision” also appears in Ugaritic. These cases then suggest that 7:14’s “dreams/visions (חֲלֹמוֹת/ְיֹנוֹת)” could be pointing to “visions (תְיֹנוֹת)” in 4:13. (2) Taking 7:14’s “dreams/visions” as a generic term for “nightmare” is problematic. While החלום can mean either an “natural dream” (e.g., Ps 126:1) or “revelatory dream” (Gen 20:3), is a technical term restrictedly denoting

---


“a form of revelation.” When חֲלֹם and חָזָה are used together, therefore, they must carry a revelatory tone. (3) Moreover, it is impossible that God would torment Job with such a traumatic nighttime experience. It would contradict God’s attitude toward Job as depicted in the prologue and Job’s theophany.

(4) In light of the immediate context, it is more natural to see חֲלֹמוֹת / חָזָיוֹת (7:14) as pointing to Eliphaz’s visions (ch. 4). Job has just heard the cold condemnation of the vision that contradicts his innocence. He must respond, and it would be strange for him to bypass any comment on the vision and simply talk about his nightmares.

As for the meaning of 7:14, its surrounding context first deserves attention. Most scholars discern two main sections in chapter 7, namely, 7:1-10 and 7:11-21. D. A. Diewert, in his article on Job 7, further lays out the substructure of 7:11-21 as follows.

Table 7. Structure of 7:11-21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preface (v. 11)</th>
<th>I will not keep silent but express my complaints.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part I (vv. 12-16)</td>
<td>Job’s protest against God’s constant surveillance by alluding to chaotic powers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part II (vv. 17-21)</td>
<td>Job’s protest against God’s constant surveillance by parodying Psalm 8:5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

78 A. Jepsen, “חָזָה,” in TDOT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), 4:290, comments, “It is more important to note that chāzāh, etc., refers to a special type of divine revelation, probably during the night but distinct from a dream.” See also J. A. Naudé, “חָזָה,” in NIDOTTE (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1997), 2:59.

79 See Miller, “The Vision of Eliphaz as Foreshadowing in the Book of Job,” 98–112; Garrett, “Job,” 32. Following the ancient thought that generally sees nightmares as “coming from a demonic or malevolent divine agent” (J. H. Walton, V. H. Matthews, and M. W. Chavalas, The IVP Bible Background Commentary: Old Testament [Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2000], 498–99), some even ascribe Job’s nightmares to demonic activities (e.g., Longman, Job, 147). As stated above, however, it is unlikely that God would send out such a pernicious agent to Job.

80 For a survey, Van der Lugt, Rhetorical Criticism and the Poetry of the Book of Job, 95–97.

In Diewert’s analysis, 7:11-21 express Job’s unrestrained wish to address his complaints to God. Its two subsections, 7:12-16 and 7:17-21, exhibit an analogous theme of Job’s protest against God’s unceasing scrutiny. This thematic correspondence is particularly evidenced by the similarities between 7:12 and 7:17: (1) Both 7:12 and 7:17 “stand at the head of their respective subsections,” (2) both contain “interrogative statements couched in a very similar grammatical and rhetorical dress” (v. 12: כִּי ... אִם ... וְכִי ... וְכִי ... מַחְסִי, / v. 17: כִּי ... אִם ... וְכִי ... כִּי ... מַחְסִי),82 and (3) both refer to “events linked with the origins of the world”: 7:12 alludes “to the subduing of the force of chaos in the primeval struggle” (ב יָם, תֶּנְיָה [“sea”, “sea monster”]), and 7:17, by parodying Psalm 8, “to the creation of the cosmos, and humanity in particular.”83

Following Diewert’s outline, I now discuss the first subunit (7:12-16). In 7:12 (“Am I the sea, or a sea monster, that you set a guard over me?”), Job asks God whether he, like the chaotic powers of the יָם ("sea")84 and תֶּנְיָה ("sea monster"),85 has exhibited a rebellious attitude in order that God should keep strict watch on him. This complaint is further explicated in 7:13-14:

When I say, ‘My bed will comfort me, my couch will ease my complaint,’ then you scare me with dreams and terrify me with visions.

---


83Ibid., 215n34. Diewert attributes this insight to P. E. Dion.

84The word יָם in v. 12 has often been understood in light of Job 38:8-11, where God claims to have set the boundaries for the surging primeval seas (ב יָם): “Thus far shall you come, and no farther, and here shall your proud waves be stopped” (v. 11; NRSV). Some commentators, however, hold to the mythological understanding of the term יָם. For a survey of the issue, see ibid., 203–10. Michael A. Fishbane, “Jeremiah 4:23-6 and Job 3:3-13: A Recovered Use of the Creation Pattern,” VT 21, no. 2 (1971): 151–67.

Job asserts that when he hoped for respite and solace, God plagued him with terrifying dreams and visions. The point made here is not some disturbing nightmare, as many assume. Employing bed-couch imagery, Job specifically refers to the condemnation of Eliphaz’s vision (4:17-21), which betrays his hope for answers and comfort for his undeserved plight. The thrust of 7:13-14 is then Job’s inability to find relief and comfort. No wonder he even desires death (7:15-16), unaware that it is not God but Satan that strikes his heart. Many find Job’s complaints to God here defiant, but the Satanic backdrop of his complaint must not be neglected.

The second allusion to Eliphaz’s vision appears in the subsequent subunit (7:17-21).

Table 8. Job 7:17’s allusion to Eliphaz’s vision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job 7:17-21 (Job)</th>
<th>Job 4:17 (Eliphaz)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:17 <em>What is man that</em> (מִן אֱנוֹשֵׁכִי) you make so much of him, and that you set (נָשְׁת) your heart on him, <strong>visit</strong> (פקד) him every morning and test him every moment?</td>
<td><em>Can a man</em> (אֱנוֹש) be in the right before God? <em>Can a man</em> be pure before his Maker?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:18 <em>What is man</em> (מִן אֱנוֹשֵׁכִי) you are mindful of him, and the son of man that you care for (פקד) him? You have given him dominion over the works of your hands; you have put (נָשְׁת) all things under his feet.</td>
<td><em>What is man</em> (מִן אֱנוֹשֵׁכִי) he can be pure? Or he who is born of a woman, that he can be righteous?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psalm 8:5-7[4-6]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 7:17-21, Job repeats the theme of 7:12-16—God’s misplaced surveillance upon him. Whereas Job employed the imagery of chaotic powers in 7:12-16 to support his case, he

---

now alludes to both Psalm 8 and the vision’s message (4:17-21) in 7:17-21.

Job 4:17a *Can a man (אֶנֶוֶשׁ) be righteous before God?*
Psalm 8:5a[4a] *What is man that (גֶּדֶר) you are mindful of him.*
Job 7:17a *What is man that (מִזָּהָכַי) you make so much of him.*
Job 15:14a *What is man that (נָאָבָה) he can be pure?*

While many consider Job 7:17-18 as an ironic play on Psalm 8:5-7[4-6] (cf. Ps 144:3),²⁷ they often ignore or bypass the rhetorical link between Job 7:17a and 4:17a. The connection between 7:17a and 4:17a is demonstrated by Job 15:14-16.²⁸ In 15:14-16, Eliphaz reiterates the spirit’s message (4:17-19), and in doing so he particularly reformulates הָאֱנֶוֶשׁ (“Can a man . . .”) from 4:17a into מַזָּהָכַי (“What is man that . . .”) in 15:14a by directly quoting Job’s own words מִזָּהָכַי (“What is man that . . .”) in 7:17a.²⁹ This verbal linkage, then, suggests that Job’s use of הָאֱנֶוֶשׁ in 7:17a is meant as a direct response to the vision’s message (4:17-21) which begins with הָאֱנֶוֶשׁ (“Can a man . . .”; 4:17a).

²⁷E.g., W. Kynes helpfully observes, “The lexical similarities between these two passages are too numerous to be coincidence. First, the question ‘what are human beings?’ (כִּי יְהֹוָה) is repeated. Second, the extended forms of both questions have a similar structure ([verb] + כִי + [verb] + כִי), with the addition of כִּי. Third, Job’s use of the verb מָזָּהָכַי (‘to make great’) recalls the exalted status of humanity in Ps 8:6-9, though in its context it has a negative connotation, ironically contrasting with the verb מָזָּהָכַי (‘to make less’), which is used positively in Ps 8:6. Fourth, מִזָּהָכַי (‘you set your mind/heart’) in Job recalls מָזָּהָכַי (‘to be mindful of’) in the psalm. Fifth, the same verb מָזָּהָכַי is set in a context which reverses its meaning from condescending care in the psalm to overbearing observation in Job. Six, both verbs in the psalm and three of the four verbs in Job have suffixes with an energic nun, and these are the only two passages in the HB where the verb מָזָּהָכַי has an energetic nun.” William L. Kynes, *My Psalm Has Turned into Weeping: Job’s Dialogue with the Psalms,* BZAW 437 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2012), 64. Cf. A considerable literature exists on the literary link between Job 7 and Ps 8. For positive appraisals of the connection between Job 7 and Ps 8, see ibid., 63–79; Michael A. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), 285–86; Fishbane, “The Book of Job and Inner-Biblical Discourse,” in *The Voice from the Whirlwind: Interpreting the Book of Job,* ed. Leo G. Perdue and W. Clark Gilpin (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1992), 87–90; Paul-Eugène Dion, “Formulaic Language in the Book of Job: International Background and Ironical Distortions,” *Studies in Religion* 16, no. 2 (1987): 187–93. For cautionary assessments, see Raymond C. Van Leeuwen, “Psalm 8.5 and Job 7.17-18: A Mistaken Scholarly Commonplace?,” in *The World of the Aramaeans I: Biblical Studies in Honour of Paul-Eugène Dion,* ed. P. M. Michèle Daviau, John W. Wevers, and Michael Weigl, JSOT 324 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 205–15; Helmut Schnieringer, *Psalm 8: Text, Gestalt, Bedeutung,* Ägypten und Altes Testament 59 (Wiesbaden, Germany: Harrassowitz in Kommission, 2004), 432–33, 503. Commentators are also debating which of the two—Job 7 or Ps 8—came first. See surveys in Kynes, *My Psalm Has Turned into Weeping,* 67–68; Hartley, *The Book of Job,* 11–13.

²⁸Note that the expression מַזָּהָכַי appears only in Job 7:17a, 15:14a, and Ps 8:5 in the Hebrew Bible.

²⁹This connection has been also noted by Alden, *Job,* 175; Janzen, *Job,* 117; John H. Walton, *Job,* NIVAC (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2012), 212.
Job’s reflection on the vision’s message begins with the same question that the psalmist raises (“What is man that . . .?”). In Psalm 8:5-7[4-6], the psalmist finds that God has endowed lowly mankind with an exalted status and benevolent care. Hence he marvels and praises God. In Job 7:17-18, however, Job only finds despair. For Job, God seems to delight in “incessant surveillance and unforgiving scrutiny” upon him.\(^90\) What would be a praise to the psalmist becomes a “doxology of sarcasm” to Job.\(^91\) S. E. Balentine comments,

Virtually every assertion [of Psalm 8] is turned inside out. The interrogative (מְלוֹא) that introduces the psalmist’s wonderment evokes from Job a cry of despair instead. When he considers the special attention that God devotes to human beings, he discerns a sinister intent. God ‘exalts’ (מָלָא; lit., ‘makes great’) human beings in order to humiliate them. God’s ‘mind’ (לֵב; lit., ‘heart’) is fixed on harassing and terrifying. God’s ‘visit’ (פקד) is for Job a daily reminder that he has been singled out for punishment (cf. Jer 6:15; Hos 1:4; Amos 3:2), not compassion (cf. Gen 21:1; Pss 65:9 [MT 65:10]; Jer 27:22; 29:10). God’s ‘testing’ (בחן) is not for the purpose of proving his innocence (cf. Jer 12:3; Pss 17:3; 26:2; 139:23) but of declaring him guilty, regardless of the evidence that would acquit him. God’s relentless scrutiny, morning by morning, moment by moment, serves not to build him up but to break him down.\(^92\)

Job prays in chapter 7, but not knowing the Satanic origin of the vision’s message, is left as a bitter lamenter before God.

**Allusion to the vision in Job’s second response (ch. 9).** After hearing Job’s response and prayer (chs. 6-7), Bildad enters the discussion (ch. 8). Bildad condemns

---

\(^90\)Alden, *Job*, 112.


\(^92\)Balentine, *Job*, 139. M. Fishbane’s observation is also noteworthy: “Clearly the image of God here is not that of a majestic providence who delegates authority to a human overlord (as in Ps. 8). It is rather that of a dark divinity that hounds and horrifies the dreams of mortals (v. 14). Indeed, the inverted perspective of our Joban passage assumes added irony when specific topics are compared. For example, in the hierarchical structure of Psalm 8 (which mirrors Gen. 1) even the creatures of the watery deep are under human dominion. This orderly perspective clashes with Job 7:12, where rhetorical questions exaggerate God’s misplaced attention. ‘Am I the Sea or the Dragon, that You muzzle me so?’ (v. 12). . . . The royal God of Psalm 8, who sets (šāṭṭâ) all creatures under human dominion, is presented here as a divinity inappropriately obsessed (יָשָׁל) with human sin.” Fishbane, “The Book of Job and Inner-Biblical Discourse,” 88–89.
Job’s previous words as “blustering wind (כ בִיר רוּח ַ)" (8:2) and argues that Job’s assertion that “God is unjustly persecuting him” is “simply unthinkable” (8:3). To affirm that God cannot pervert justice and that the principle of retributive justice still holds, Bildad maintains—with ignorant cruelty—that Job’s children faced a violent death because their sinfulness deserved it (8:4) and claims that Job did not stand right with God (8:5-7).

In chapter 9, Job returns an answer to Bildad, and in doing so, he particularly quotes Eliphaz’s vision in 4:17.

[Job] 9:2 Truly I know that it is so: But how can a man be in the right before God? (וּמ ה־יִצְד קַאֱנוֹשַעִם־אֵל)

[Eliphaz] 4:17 Can a man be in the right before God? (כ אֱנוֹשַמֵאֱלוֹה יִצְד ק)

Can a man be pure before his Maker?

In the opening words, Job seems to concede Bildad’s thesis: “Truly I know that it is so” (9:2a). But what follows is an apparent echo of Eliphaz’s vision in 4:17 (and also a

93Clines, Job 1-20, 202.

94Hooks, Job, 134.

95Bildad assumes that Job is “not pure or upright” in v. 6, and according to R. B. Zuck, this understanding stems from the vision’s message in 4:17 (“Can a man be pure before his Maker?”). Roy B. Zuck, Job, Everyman’s Bible Commentary (Chicago: Moody Publishers, 1978), 44.

96The conjunction ג can be either adversative (so ESV, NRSV, NIV, NASB) or epexegetical (“Truly I know that it is so, that is, . . .”; cf. NJPS). Cf. Vulgate: vere scio quod ita sit et quod non iustificetur homo compositus Deo (“Truly I know that it is so, and that man cannot be justified, compared with God”); Peshitta: (_TOGGLE) (“Truly I know that it is so, and a man is not innocent before God”). For a full discussion on the translation options, see Seow, Job 1-21, 543, 554. See also S. R. Driver and G. B. Gray, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Job, ICC (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1921), 84.

97As Job quotes 4:17a in 9:2b, he changes מינ (i.e., מִן־אֵל “before God”) for מִן (i.e., מִן “with God”). Following the use of מִן in 9:3a (יִהְיוּ מִן אֱלֹהִים לְרָקִיב שָׁם) (“If anyone wants to dispute with him”), many argue that Job is substituting the “moral sense” of 4:17a with a “legal/forensic sense” in 9:2b (e.g., N. C. Habel translates 9:2b as “A mortal cannot win a suit against EL”). Habel, The Book of Job, 178, 189. Similarly, Seow, Job 1-21, 543; Hartley, The Book of Job, 166; Walton, Job, 166.

98Scholars debate on two issues in this verse: (1) Many consider irony or sarcasm is intended in 9:2a (e.g., "truly [מִן־אֵל]”). So Driver and Gray, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Job, 83–84; Robert Gordis, The Book of Job (New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1978), 102. For a cautionary appraisal, see Seow, Job 1-21, 543, 554; Clines, Job 1-20, 226. (2) Commentators often regard 9:2a (“Truly I know that it is so”) as referring to 8:3 where Bildad defends God’s justice. Contrary to this view, R. B. Zuck, Job, 46, connects 9:2a to 8:8-22 where Bildad talks about the fate of the wicked and innocent.
possible allusion to 8:3 where Bildad defends God’s justice), which Job develops with a radically different sense in chapter 9. Eliphaz’s vision in 4:17 asserts that a human—being morally foul—cannot be accounted right in God’s sight. Job, on the other hand, ironically twists this meaning in chapter 9 to say that it is God’s overwhelming power and arbitrariness that prevents a man—“no matter how innocent” he is—from appealing his case before God and being counted as righteous. Job simply cannot agree with the vision’s message and by quoting 4:17, he directly challenges its thesis.

Job elaborates this idea in the subsequent verses. Against 4:17 and Bildad’s argument in 8:3 that God judges and punishes fairly, Job insists in chapter 9 that God seems to be an arbitrary judge. In doing so, he begins by alluding to Eliphaz’s hymnic doxology (5:9-16) in 9:5-10.

At a cursory glance, Job—like Eliphaz—seems to be praising God’s magnificent power. On closing reading, however, Job’s words have reversed implication. In contrast to “Eliphaz’s glowing description of God’s power (5:9-16),” Job emphasizes “the negative aspects of God’s might” as exemplified in God’s “overturning the mountains (v. 5), shaking the earth (v. 6), and shutting off the light of the sun and the

---

99The fact that Job cites Eliphaz’s vision in the first place often leads commentators to assume that Job is more concerned with things Eliphaz said earlier than with what Bildad spoke in ch. 8. See Terrien, The Book of Job, 975–76; Rowley, Job, 75. Balentine, Job, 164, for example, regards 9:1-13 as a reaction to Eliphaz (4:17-21), and 9:14-24 as a response to Bildad (8:3). For a critique of this view, see Seow, Job 1-21, 543. At any rate, it is clear that for Job as well as the friends, the vision’s message is of central importance in their debate.


Eliphaz employs the doxological hymn (5:9-16) to express his confidence in God, the powerful creator and sustainer, who brings justice to the earth. Job, however, twists the hymn to convey his terror of God, who with his destructive power brings chaos and perhaps, injustice to the creation. In the conclusion of the hymn (9:10), Job directly quotes 5:9 (“Who does great things and unsearchable, marvelous things without number”). But here again, Job draws an opposite conclusion. In 5:9, Eliphaz meant that “all God’s operations have an ethical meaning and subserve one great purpose of goodness.” But to Job in 9:10, “they seem the mere unmoral play of an immeasurable force.”

---


---

**Table 9. Job’s hymnic doxology (9:5-10)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job 9:5-10 (Job)</th>
<th>Job 5:9-16 (Eliphaz)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:5 He who removes mountains, and they know it not, when he overturns them in his anger,</td>
<td>5:9 Who does great things and unsearchable, marvelous things without number (עֹש הַגְדֹלוֹת וְאֵיןַחֵק רַנִפְל אוֹתַע ד־אֵיןַמִסְפ ר).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:6 who shakes the earth out of its place, and its pillars tremble;</td>
<td>5:10 He gives rain on the earth and sends waters on the fields.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:7 who commands the sun, and it does not rise; who seals up the stars;</td>
<td>5:11 He sets on high those who are lowly, and those who mourn are lifted to safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:10 <strong>who does great things beyond searching out, and marvelous things beyond number (עֹש הַגְדֹלוֹת וְאֵיןַחֵק רַנִפְל אוֹתַע ד־אֵיןַמִסְפ ר).</strong></td>
<td>5:12 He frustrates the devices of the crafty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5:16 So the poor have hope, and injustice shuts her mouth.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The immeasurable power of God only frightens Job and distances him from God. The terror of God’s power only deprives him of “any hope” that he might “stand before God and get a fair hearing” (9:14-20). He knows that he is innocent (9:15) and must be vindicated, but he despairs because God will not hear his plea (9:16). What is worse, God is going to wound him and fill him with bitterness (9:17-18). Though he is blameless, God will prove him guilty (9:20-21) and treat him like the wicked. The wicked and innocent alike will be destroyed (9:22-23). Job confirms that the sovereign God is in control of his fate, but he fears that God will refuse to declare him innocent (9:29).

In sum, the discussion of Job’s allusions to the vision in chapters 7, 9 highlights two points: (1) the centrality of the vision in Job’s pain and struggle and (2) his honesty in dealing with the vision’s false condemnation. Wrongly believing that the vision originates from God, Job laments and complains, yet in prayer to seek an answer from God.

Second Cycle (15-21)

In the second round, the demonic message (4:17-21) reappears in (1) the speech of Eliphaz (15:14-16) and (2) the speech of Zophar (20:2-8). The citation/allusion to the spirit’s message particularly frames the second cycle, being placed at the beginning (ch. 15) and the ending (ch. 20) of the friends’ speeches.

Eliphaz’s Second Speech (Ch. 15)

Zophar, in his short speech in chapter 11, delivers more poignant words of the

107 Garrett, Job, 26–27.

108 Newsom, Job, 412. In this insurmountable desperation and anxiety, however, Job maintains his hope in God. He seeks an intercessor who could mediate his case with God and vindicate him (9:33-35). Job’s lengthy prayer (10:2-22) that pleads his case before God also follows (see also other prayers in 7:11-21; 10:2-22; 13:20-14:22) (Garrett, “Job,” 20). Finally, as Job’s speeches develop, his confession of faith will extend significantly (e.g., 13:15-16; 16:18-21; 19:15-27). Ibid., 21–27.
three, bluntly accusing Job of being a sinner (11:6). Zophar then counters Job’s previous speech by asserting that God’s way and power far exceed Job’s abilities to comprehend (11:7-12). Finally, Zophar ends his speech by calling Job to repentance (11:13-20). In a lengthy rejoinder (chs. 12-14), Job again assails the shallow counsel of Zophar and company. He first claims that his wisdom is not at all inferior to that of the friends (12:2-3; 13:1-2). To demonstrate, he recites the traditional wisdom (12:7-12) and—though in a negative cast—hymnic doxology (12:13-25; cf. 5:9-16; 9:5-10). He then tells the friends that this shared understanding of the traditional theology of retribution has utterly failed and that he himself will now bring the case before God (13:1-20). In a prayer that follows (13:20-14:22), Job again pleads his case before God—appealing to the ephemeral and weak nature of human beings—and yearns that his case be heard and that he might find hope in despair.

In response to Job’s massive speech of 560 words in Job 12-14, Eliphaz initiates the second round of dialogue, speaking 560 syllables in Job 15. But Eliphaz is no longer the gentle persuader of the first round. Seeing Job’s unbending claim of innocence and unrelenting questioning of God’s justice, he raises the level of accusation against Job. This is also true for the other friends. S. E. Balentine observes that there are four notable changes made by the friends in the second round: (1) Discussions on the fate of the wicked and the righteous have been reduced only to “the fate of the wicked (15:17-35; 18:5-21; 20:6-29)” ; (2) the friends’ tone is “much sharper” “(e.g., 15:7-9; 18:3; 20:3)” ; (3) they no longer offer a “word of encouragement to Job” “(e.g., 15:5-6; 18:4; 20:13)” ; (4) their counsel is “much more pessimistic” “(e.g., 15:13-15).”

109Just as Job’s earlier doxological hymn in 9:5-10 carried a reversed meaning of Eliphaz’s hymn in 5:9-16, Job’s hymn in 12:13-25 again twists its meaning to convey the subversive aspect of God’s power. S. M. Hooks, following D. J. A. Clines, points out, “While the hymn in 9:5–16 focused on God’s power to disrupt the natural order, this hymn [12:13-25] focuses on God’s power to disrupt the social order.” Hooks, Job, 179, emphasis original; Clines, Job 1–20, 296–97. Of particular note is that Eliphaz’s doxological hymn in 5:9-16 also carries two themes: God’s power in creation (5:9-10) and social justice (5:11-16). Hooks, Job, 106–8.

20:4-11); and (4) “there is considerable repetition in their speeches,” indicating that “they are increasingly mired down in intransigent dogma and theory.”

Of particular interest to our discussion is Job 15:14-16 where Eliphaz reiterates the demonic message of 4:17-19.

Table 10. Eliphaz’s vision in 15:14-16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job 15:14-16 (Eliphaz)</th>
<th>Job 4:17-19 (Eliphaz)</th>
<th>Job 7:17 (Job)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15:14 What is man that (מ ה־אֱנוֹשִׁי) he can be pure (לָצֵר)? Or he who is born of a woman (יְלוּדַאִשׁ), that he can be righteous (רָצִין)?</td>
<td>4:17 Can a man (נָשׁוֹה) be in the right (צֶדֶק) before God? Can a man be pure (לָצֵר) before his Maker?</td>
<td>What is man that (נָשׁוֹה) you make so much (גָּדֲלָה) of him, and that you set your heart on him,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:15 Behold, God puts no trust in his holy ones, and the heavens are not pure in his sight.</td>
<td>4:18 Even in his servants he puts no trust, and his angels he charges with error.</td>
<td>Psalm 8:5[4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:16 How much less one who is abominable and corrupt, a man who drinks injustice like water!</td>
<td>4:19 How much more those who dwell in houses of clay, whose foundation is in the dust, who are crushed like the moth.</td>
<td>What is man that (נָשׁוֹה) you are mindful of (זָכַר) him, and the son of man that you care for him?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While 15:14-16 is virtually identical in the content and structure to 4:17-19, there are also minor differences. For example, Eliphaz slightly modifies 4:17a with Job’s reflections drawn from 7:17a and 14:1a. Hence, 15:14a reads “What is a man that he can be pure?” (cf. 7:17a “What is a man that you make a big deal of him”; 4:17a “What is a man that you make so much of him”; 15:14a “Can a man be in the right before God?”) and 15:14b reads “Or he who is born of a woman, that he can be righteous?” (cf.

---

111Balentine, Job, 229. See also Hooks, Job, 205–6.
14:1a “Man who is born of a woman”; 4:17b “Can a man be pure before his maker?”). Moreover, as we shall see, 15:14-16 alludes to Psalm 8 with lexical correspondences such as אֵ십시오 (Job 15:14a = Ps 8:5a[4a]; cf. Job 4:17a [7:17], כֹּלֶש (Job 15:14a ≈ Ps 8:5a[4a] [7:17]), וּבְרָת (Job 4:18b [8:7b]), and שָׁת (Job 15:16b ≈ Ps 8:7b[6b] [7:17]).

Concerning this modification, N. C. Habel rightly comments that 15:14-16 reflects Eliphaz’s “subtle reformulation of 4:17-19 in terms of Job’s particular situation and preceding provocative statements.”113

It is worthwhile to trace Eliphaz’s intention behind these modifications.

Besides the cases in which Eliphaz, in 15-14-16, develop Job’s earlier statements into derogatory puns,114 major alterations occur where Eliphaz makes allusions to Psalm 8 and Psalms 14, 53. As discussed, Job parodied Psalm 8 in 7:17-18, and as he did that, he also picked up 4:17a in 7:17a. In return, Eliphaz now picks up both 4:17 and 7:17a in 15:14. Based on this verbal connection, commentators commonly interpret Eliphaz’s words in 15:14 as a direct rebuttal to Job’s parodic complaint in 7:17-18. While they are correct, a closer look at the allusions made in 15:14-16 provides a much deeper understanding of Eliphaz’s intent.


114 E.g., In 15:14b (“Or he who is born of a woman [𬙊 יִפְנָּה] that he can be righteous?”), Eliphaz changes רָבָה of 4:17b (“Can a man [นอกจาก] be pure before his Maker?”) into יִפְנָּה, a term drawn from Job’s own words in 14:1 (“Man who is born of a woman [монтаж יִפְנָּה] is few of days and full of trouble”). The effect of this change seems two-fold: (1) יִפְנָּה, which has the connotation of “strong man,” is replaced with a debased term for humanity, “born of woman,” a term emphasizing “human mortality.” Hartley, The Book of Job, 247–48. See also the comparison between יִפְנָּה and יִפְנָּה in Wilson, Job, 88. Some think (e.g., Clines and de Wilde) that the expression “born of woman” indicates “human mortality,” while others (e.g., Dhorme, Rowley, and Peak) relate it with the unclean status associated with child birth. See the discussion in Clines, Job 1-20, 353. (2) When Job employs the term “born of woman” (14:1), he uses it in the context of human frailty and transience. Nevertheless, Job does not lose hope that he himself will be vindicated before God in some day, even in the resurrection after his death (14:13-17). Eliphaz, in contrast, borrows the same expression only to claim that being “born of woman,” everyone is guilty before God. Garrett, “Job,” 21–22; Garrett, Job, 34–35.
### Table 11. Job 15:14-16 and Psalm 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job 15:14-16 (Eliphaz)</th>
<th>Psalm 8:4-7[3-6]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 15:14 *What is man that (מַה כַּאֲנָשִׁים) he can be pure (יְבַשָּׂם)? Or he who is born of a woman, that he can be righteous?*<br>15:15 Behold, God puts no trust in his holy ones, and the *heavens* (שָׁמָיִם) are not pure (זְכָךְ) in his sight.<br>15:16 How much less one who is abominable and corrupt, a man who drinks (שָׂחֵן) injustice like water! | 8:4[3] When I look at your *heavens* (שָׁמַים), the work of your fingers, the *moon* (יָרְחָם) and the *stars* (כֹּכַּבִּים) which you have set in place,<br>8:5[4] *what is man that (מַה כַּאֲנָשִׁים) you are mindful of (זָכַר) him, and the son of man (בֵּן אָדָם) that you care for him?*<br>8:6[5] Yet you have made him a little lower than the heavenly beings and crowned him with glory and honor.  
8:7[6] You have given him dominion over the works of your hands; you have put (שָׂחֵן) all things under his feet. |
| Job 25:4-6 (Bildad) |  |
| 25:4 How then can man be in the right before God? How can he who is born of woman *be pure (יְבַשָּׂם)*?  
25:5 Behold, even the *moon* (יָרְחָם) is not bright, and the *stars* (כֹּכַּבִּים) are not pure in his eyes.  
25:6 How much less man, who is a maggot, and the *son of man* (בֵּן אָדָם), who is a worm! |  |

While the lexical and semantic links between Psalm 8 and Job 15:14-16 (and 25:4-6) have gone largely unnoticed by commentaries, several recent studies find a striking connection between these passages. (1) As Eliphaz quotes 7:17a in 15:14a, he cites מַה כַּאֲנָשִׁים (“what is man that”) verbatim but reformulates 7:17a’s יְבַשָּׂם:  

---


“to make great”) into יִזְכ ה (Qal: "to be pure”; cf. 4:17 has:"to be clean"). Several scholars think that this change is deliberate. In 7:17a, Job replaced זכר ("to remember/be mindful") from Psalm 8:5a[4a] with גדל ("to make great") to turn the meaning upside down. In 15:14a, Eliphaz reverts Job’s alteration by exchanging the verb גדל ("to make great") for זכָה ("to be pure"), an assonant verb that closely matches זכר ("to remember") in Psalm 8:5a[4a] and carries the same meaning as זכר ("to be pure") in 4:17. He does this one more time in 15:15b ("the heavens are not pure [זכָה] in his sight") by rephrasing 4:18b יִשְׂכָה מִלְא כ יִם (“he charges with error”) into יִשּׁי מָלְא כ יִם ("to be pure, bright"; from root זכָה), another assonant verb allusive to זכר ("to remember"; Ps 8:5a[4a]). It may seem, then, that Eliphaz is reestablishing the original sense of Psalm 8 here, but it is more likely that he is twisting the meaning of Psalm 8 again (though in a different sense from Job). Both Psalm 8 and Job 15:14-16 ask a question about the status of mankind ("What is man . . .?"). In answer, Psalm 8:5a[4a] ("What is man that you are mindful [זכָה] him?") expresses wonderment at God’s care and the exalted status of mankind. Job 15:14a ("What is man that he can be pure [זכָה]?"), however, merely repeats the thesis of Eliphaz’s vision (4:17-21) that humans are inherently corrupt and incapable of being pure before God. (2) In 15:15b, Eliphaz alludes to Psalm 8:4[3] ("When I look at your heavens [צדק], the work of your fingers, the moon [pageNum] and the stars [خوف] . . .") by replacing מֵלָא כ יִם ("his angels") of 4:18b with שָׁמַיִם ("heaven"). In 25:4-6, another direct quotation of Eliphaz’s vision (4:17-19; 15:14-16), Bildad also changes both השכיה ("his

117 Fishbane, Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel, 286; Kynes, My Psalm Has Turned into Weeping, 71; Michael Cheney, Dust, Wind and Agony: Character, Speech and Genre in Job, Coniectanea Biblica Old Testament 36 (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1994), 130.

118 The verb זכָה ("to be pure") occurs only two times in Job: 15:14a and 25:4b (Bildad’s quotation of 15:14a).

119 So Fishbane, Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel, 286, who argues that with this stroke, Eliphaz, who felt Job’s inversion of the sense of Ps 8 “so poignant” and “so strident,” “has deflated Job’s contention, inverted it, and even, in some measure, ironically re-established the original traditum.”

servants”; 4:18a) and➲ עלובי (“his angels”; 4:18b) to ירח (“moon”; 25:5a) and➲ כוכבים (“stars” 25:5b) following Psalm 8. The meaning conveyed in the quotations of Eliphaz and Bildad, however, is radically different from that of Psalm 8:4[3]. In Psalm 8, the psalmist, upon contemplating on the vastness of the heavens (שמיים) reflected in stars (כוכבים) and moon (ירח), finds mankind’s insignificance (and even more so as the giant universe is only the work of God’s “fingers”!). Nevertheless, he marvels at the royal status of glory and honor that God has bestowed on such a lowly mankind. In 15:14-16 and 25:4-6, on the other hand, the same termsköy, שמיים, and כוכבים are employed but only to condemn mankind: If the heavens (שמיים), moon (ירח), and stars (כוכבים) are filthy in God’s sight, say Eliphaz and Bildad, how much less are human beings who are the tiniest fragments of the gigantic cosmos? (3) The harsh denigration of the mankind intensifies in the following allusions to Psalm 8 and Psalms 14, 53. In Psalm 8:7[6] (“You have given him dominion over the works of your hands; you have put [שנה; from root שתה] all things under his feet”), the psalmist continues to praise God for crowning humanity with dominion over all things. In 15:16, on the other hand, Eliphaz plays on the consonant שתה of Psalm 8:7[6] with a pejorative sense: “How much less one who is abominable and corrupt, a man who drinks (שיה; from root שתה) injustice like water!” According to 4:19, human beings are morally frail and inferior because they are made from “clay” and “dust.” In 15:16, however, Eliphaz turns 4:19 into a merciless condemnation of humans as feeble because they are inherently “abominable,” “corrupt,” and “ones who drink injustice like water.” Strikingly, the terms “abominable” (גנבת; from root גנב), “corrupt” (희 /^(; from root חל), “drink” (שיה; from root שתי), and “injustice” (ע reinforce all

Many commentators, not recognizing the allusion to Ps 8, have struggled over why Eliphaz and Bildad would reword ַעלובי (4:18a) and ַעלובי (4:18b) as ַעלובי (15:15b), ַירח (25:5a) and ַכוכבים (25:5b). E.g., Pinker, “On the Meaning of Job 4,18,” 500–19.


Kline, Allusive Soundplay in the Hebrew Bible, 49.
reminiscent of the language used in Psalms 14 and 53, twin psalms that are nearly identical in content and form.\(^{125}\)

**Table 12. Job 15:14-16 and Psalms 14, 53**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job 15:15-16</th>
<th>Psalm 14:1-3</th>
<th>Psalm 53:2-4[1-3]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15:15</td>
<td>Behold, God puts no trust in his holy ones, and the heavens (שמים) are not pure in his sight.</td>
<td>14:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:16</td>
<td>How much less one who is abominable (טועב) and corrupt (השחתו) and who drinks (שתה) injustice (שון) like water!</td>
<td>14:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53:2[1]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Job 15:14-16 not only parodies Psalm 8, but also alludes to Psalms 14 and 53, psalms meditating on the godless fool (עוֹל; cf. 1 Sam 25), the wicked, and universal depravity.\(^{126}\)

In describing the fool, Psalms 14 and 53 employ words such as “abominable” (טועב) and “corrupt” (שחת), and Eliphaz in turn quotes the terms to directly charge at Job.\(^{127}\)

---


\(^{127}\)In addition to the function of allusion to Pss 14 and 53, Eliphaz’s use of the word טועב (“abominable”) in 15:16a seems to play double duty here. In the context of the book of Job, the term appears once preceding 15:16, and is in Job’s speech: “Yet you will plunge me into a pit, and my own
Moreover, expressions from the psalms, such as “they are corrupt” (הִשְַחִיתוּ; from root שחת [Pss 14:1, 53:2[1]]) and “iniquity” (עֲלִיל; [Ps 53:2[1]]; cf. Ps 14:1), are intermingled to form “one who drinks injustice” (שֹת הַעֲלִיל) in Job 15:16 with the allusive assonant verb שחת (cf. Pss 14:1, 53:2[1]) and the feminine form of עֲלִיל (cf. Ps 53:2[1]). Finally, the term שֹת הַעֲלִיל (“the heaven”) in Psalms 14:2 and 53:3[2] is echoed in Job 15:15. The reader may have questioned why Eliphaz, as he parodied Psalm 8 in 15:14-16, would choose שֹת הַעֲלִיל over יִרֵיחַ and כֹּכָב יִם (cf. Bildad’s later quotation in 25:4-6, which has little or no allusion to Psalms 14 and 53, employs יִרֵיחַ and כֹּכָב יִם over שֹת הַעֲלִיל). The allusion to both Psalm 8 and Psalms 14 and 53, then, explains the rationale behind Eliphaz’s choice of שֹת הַעֲלִיל over יִרֵיחַ and כֹּכָב יִם in 15:14-16. At any rate, the point of Eliphaz’s allusion to Psalms 14 and 53 (in addition to Psalm 8) is this: Job is a “wicked fool” who cannot escape the domain of universal human corruption. But as Garrett judiciously points out, Eliphaz’s allusion to Psalms 14 and 53 distorts the intended meaning of these psalms. While these psalms “speak of YHWH looking down from heaven and seeing that ‘all are corrupt’” (Pss 14:2-3; 53:3-4[2-3]), the Lord also “speak of those who are ‘my people’” (Pss 14:4; 53:5[4]) and “of the ‘company of the

clothes will abhor (תעב) me” (9:31). Here Job is claiming that no matter how he tries to purify himself (9:30), God will plunge him into a filthy pit, meaning that God has predetermined to declare him guilty. Hence Job declares that his own clothes will “abhor” his undeserved filthiness, and it is this very statement that Eliphaz, in 15:16, flips into an accusation against Job as inherently guilty, an “abhorred one” (or “abominable”).

128 It is also possible that the term הִשְַחִיתוּ (“injustice, iniquity”) has a double function here. In addition to its allusion to Ps 53:2[1], הִשְַחִיתוּ plays on the key points of the previous dialogues between Job and the friends. In closing his doxological discourse in 5:8-16, Eliphaz invited Job to repent by laying out his reflection on the retributive principle: “So the poor have hope, and injustice (עֹל תְּה) shuts her mouth” (5:16; see also Zophar’s statement in 11:14). In response, Job urged two points: (1) He was far from injustice (“Is there any injustice [עֲלִיל] on my tongue?” [6:30a]), and (2) the friends, who falsely judged him guilty, were committing injustice (“Please turn; let no injustice [עֲלִיל] be done” [6:29a; see also 13:7]). In return, Eliphaz condemns Job with full force in 15:16 as the “one who drinks injustice (עֲלִיל) like water!”

129 In 25:4-6, the only possible, yet uncertain, allusions to Ps 14 and 53 would be בְּנֵי אָדָם (“son of man” [25:6]; cf. Ps 14:2, 53:3[2] have בְּנֵי אָדָם “sons of man”), and והָלִישָׁו (“maggot” [25:6]; cf. Ps 53:2[1], which has וּלֵיהֶם “iniquity,” a word that Job 15:16 turns into the feminine form וּלְיהֶם). Kline, Allusive Soundplay in the Hebrew Bible, 51, thinks that והָלִישָׁו is playing on והָלִישָׁו (15:16) by rearranging the letters and adding ב to והָלִישָׁו to signal the end of Bildad’s speech.
Despite its allusive reformulation and intensification, Job 15:14-16 nonetheless carries the same thesis as conveyed in 4:17-21: no man is pure before God. If so, how does the hopeless note of 15:14-16 contribute to the development of Eliphaz’s second speech?

Most scholars agree that chapter 15 is composed of two major sections (vv. 2-16; vv. 17-35). Thematically, the first section further unfolds along three subsections: (1) 15:2-6, (2) 15:7-10, and (3) 15:11-16. In 15:2-6, Eliphaz opens the discourse with a sharper tone of rebuke. He warns that Job’s attitude could subvert piety (15:4) and even directly condemns Job as wicked (15:5-6). In 15:7-10, Eliphaz moves on to chide Job for his arrogance and defective knowledge. In a series of rhetorical question, Eliphaz challenges Job’s right to claim as he does and asserts that the “superior knowledge” of wisdom—by “virtue of seniority”—is “on the side of Eliphaz and his friends” (15:7-10). In doing so, Eliphaz particularly challenges Job with the following question: “Have you listened in the council of God? And do you limit wisdom to yourself?” (15:8).

J. E. Harding, in his detailed discussion of 15:7-8, argues that what Eliphaz means here is that whereas “Job has not been the recipient of divine revelation and thus cannot understand divine justice,” Eliphaz himself possesses the kind of higher knowledge derived from “prophetic inspiration” (cf. Jer 23:18-22), acquired earlier in his nighttime revelation (4:12-21).

Harding’s view is buttressed by the immediate context, 15:11-16, where

---

130 Garrett, “Job,” 35.

131 So J. G. Sticker, P. Vetter, and J. P. Fokkelman. Similarly, F. Delitzsch, N. Peters, A. van Selms, E. C. Webster, and D. J. A. Clines. For other views, see Table A8 in Appendix 2.

132 Pope, Job, 115; Garrett, Job, 37.

Eliphaz is now reintroducing his visionary experience.

15:11 Are the comforts of God too small for you, or the word (דבساهم) that deals gently (סשת) with you? 15:12 Why does your heart carry you away, and why do your eyes flash, 15:13 that you turn your spirit against God and bring such words out of your mouth? 15:14 What is man, that he can be pure? Or he who is born of a woman, that he can be righteous? 15:15 Behold, God puts no trust in his holy ones, and the heavens are not pure in his sight; 15:16 how much less one who is abominable and corrupt, a man who drinks injustice like water!

Many commentators hold that the expressions “the comforts of God” and “the word” refer to the vision’s message in 4:17-21. Claiming the spirit’s message as God’s consolation (15:11), Eliphaz accuses Job of not heeding God’s gentle instruction (15:12-13) and turning his spirit against God. What follows is Eliphaz’s reiteration of the vision’s message (15:14-16), by which Eliphaz reemphasizes the demonic doctrine.

In the second section (15:17-35), Eliphaz then leverages the vision’s thesis to expound on the doctrine of retribution. The dominant theme of this section is that the wicked will not escape God’s impending punishment, a poignant message pointed at Job. Whereas Eliphaz in chapters 4-5 spoke on the fate of both the righteous and wicked, in chapter 15, Eliphaz, dominated by the demonic teaching, only stresses the fate of the wicked (so Bildad in chapter 18 and Zophar in chapter 20).

To conclude, the rhetorical strategy utilized in chapter 15 is virtually identical to that of chapters 4-5. In chapters 4-5, Eliphaz used the vision’s message (4:17-21) as bedrock for the doctrine of retribution and for accusation against Job (4:7-11; 5:1-16). Eliphaz in chapter 15 likewise relies on the vision (15:11-16) to buttress his theology and

---


135Cf. Seow, *Job 1-21*, 697. Job 15:17-35 further carry the following message. In a short introduction (vv. 17-19), Eliphaz asserts that he is going to teach the consensus of wise men, the tradition, a reliable knowledge that contrasts with Job’s inferior one (cf. 8:8–19). What follows is Eliphaz’s lengthy treatise on the fate of the wicked (vv. 20-35), and in it he attempts to rebut Job’s main thesis that “God’s world is morally incoherent” (Newsom, *Job*, 448). Asserting that the wicked get what they deserve as retribution for their sin (vv. 20-35), Eliphaz reaffirms that God’s governance of the moral order is just, and that Job, a sinner, deserves what has befallen him.
condemn Job (15:17-35).

Zophar’s Second Speech (Ch. 20)

Following Eliphaz’s lead (ch. 15), Bildad with increased anger rebukes Job (18:2-4). Wounded by the aggressive and misplaced attacks of the friends, Job bitterly laments (16:15-17; 16:22-17:2; 19:13-22) and offers prayers to God (16:6-14; 17:3-9), yet he does not lose hope of being vindicated by a heavenly intercessor (16:18-21; 19:25-27). Hearing Job’s unbending claim of innocence (19:5-12) and his warning to the friends (19:28-29), Zophar in chapter 20 takes his turn and hurls back a stinging accusation in Job’s face. In doing so, he alludes to Eliphaz’s vision (4:12-21).

While chapter 20 does not directly quote the spirit’s message as do 15:14-16 (Eliphaz) and 25:4-6 (Bildad), it has allusions to Eliphaz’s vision (4:12-17) that are too numerous to be coincidence (see Table 13 below).

The following is a list of verbal correspondences to Eliphaz’s vision: (1) שְעִפִים (“troubled thoughts”) in 4:13 and 20:2 (the word occurs only two times in the Hebrew Bible), (2) חָזִיָּה לַיְלָה (“visions of night”) in 4:13 and חָזֵי לַיְלָה (“vision of night”) in 20:8 (also חָלָם [“dream”] in 20:8; cf. 7:14; 33:15), (3) the masculine form of רוּח in 4:15 and 20:3 (the masculine form appears twice in the book and refers to the spiritual visitant of Eliphaz’s vision), (4) the word-pair אבד / לֵךְ (“perish”) and לֵךְ / אבד (“forever”) in 4:20 and 20:7, (5) though “too common a verb to be significant,” the first person form אַשְׁמֵנָה (“I

136Garrett, Job, 38–41, 43–46.
138J. P. Fokkelman notes that both Job 19 and 20 have 28 verses, 12 strophes, and 59 cola (cf. Job 19 has 210 words and 500 syllables; Job 20 has 204 words and 464 syllables). Fokkelman, The Book of Job in Form, 246; Fokkelman, Major Poems of the Hebrew Bible, vol. 4, Job 15–42, 388–89.
139As discussed, when Job and Eliphaz referred to חָזִיָּה (“visions”) in 4:13, they rephrased the term with the parallel word-pair חֲלֹם / חָזֵי (“dreams/visions”) (7:14; by Job) or חָלָם / חָזֵי (“dream/visions”) (33:15; by Eliphaz).
140See ch. 2; Garrett, “Job,” 34.
141The word-pair appears in Job only in 4:20, 14:19-20 and 20:7. Brown, The Vision in Job 4
“(hearing”) that occurs only in 4:16 and 20:3 within the friends’ dialogues (cf. 33:8), and other minor cases including עֵינָה (“eye”) in 4:16 and 20:9 (cf. 7:8), עֵין (“bone”) in 4:14 and 20:11, and עֵפר (“dust”) in 4:19 and 20:11.

Table 13. Zophar’s allusion to Eliphaz’s vision (ch. 20)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job 20 (Zophar)</th>
<th>Job 4 (Eliphaz)</th>
<th>Job 7:14 (Job)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20:2 And so my troubled thoughts (שָׁעִיפִים) bring me back [into the fray]. And [I speak] on account of the agitation within me.</td>
<td>4:13 Amid thoughts (שָׁעִיפִים) from visions of the night (וְחַלְוֹת עַל יְלָה), when deep sleep falls on men . . . .</td>
<td>Then you scare me with dreams (חֲלֹם) and terrify me with visions (חַלְוֹת).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:3 I keep hearing (שָׁעִיפִים) an insulting reproof (מוּס רַכְלִמ תִי) directed at me. And a spirit (רוּחַ) beyond my understanding gives me an answer.145</td>
<td>4:15 A spirit (רוּחַ) glided past my face; the hair of my flesh stood up . . . .</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:7 He will perish (אָבָד) forever (לֶנֶץ חַלְוֹת) like his own dung . . . .</td>
<td>4:16 It stood still, but I could not discern its appearance, a form before my eyes (עֵינֶת); there was silence, then I heard (שָׁעִיפִים) a voice:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:8 He will fly away like a dream (חֲלֹם) and not be found; he will be chased away like a vision of the night (וְחַלְוֹת עַל יְלָה).</td>
<td>4:20 They perish (אָבָד) forever (לֶנֶץ) without anyone regarding it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:9 The eye (עֵינָה) that saw him will see him no more.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Besides these connections, one indirect allusion to Eliphaz’s vision occurs. In 20:3, Zophar states that he hears “insulting reproof” (מטהר קָלַמִּין; literally, “the instruction

and Its Role in the Book, 130.

142 Brown, The Vision in Job 4 and Its Role in the Book, 111n42. Moreover, the first person form שָׁעִיפִים occurs only three times in 4:16, 20:3, and 53:8.

143 For discussions of the use of עֵינָה in these passages, see ibid., 130; John C. Holbert, “‘The Skies Will Uncover His Iniquity’: Satire in the Second Speech of Zophar (Job 20),” VT 31, no. 2 (1981): 175.

144 Brown, The Vision in Job 4 and Its Role in the Book, 111n42.

of my insult/disgrace”) that agitates him. The term מָוסְרָא (“instruction”; from the root מָסֵר “to instruct” [cf. מָסֶר “to strengthen”]), which occurs five times in Job (5:17, 12:18, 20:3, 33:16, 36:10), is often used in Job in the context of revelatory experience. For example, 33:14-16 and 36:10 read,

[Eliphaz] 33:14 For God speaks in one way, and in two, but man does not perceive it. 33:15 In a dream (חֲלוֹם), in a vision of the night (חֲזֹן יְלָה), when deep sleep falls on men (בִּנְפֹלַת רְדֵמ הַע ל־אֲנ שִים), while they slumber on their beds, 33:16 then he opens the ears (אֹזְן) of men and seals their instruction (בְּמֹס ר). 33:17 He opens their ears (אֹזְן) to instruction (לָמֹס ר) and commands that they return from wickedness.

Elihu in 33:14-16 borrows several terms directly from 4:12-21 (e.g., חֲזֹן יְלָה [4:13; 33:15]; בִּנְפֹלַת רְדֵמ הַע ל־אֲנ שִים [4:13; 33:15]; אֹזְן [4:12; 33:16]), and he seems to have Eliphaz’s vision in mind in his speech here. Concerning how God communicates with men, says Elihu, God “opens the ears (אֹזְן) of men” (cf. 4:12: “A word was brought to me . . . my ear (אֹזְן) received the whisper of it”) and “seals their instruction (בְּמֹס ר; i.e., seals an instruction concerning them).” The expression בְּמֹס ר is difficult and has been intensely debated. A number of commentators, for instance, attempting to connect 33:14-16 with Job’s words in 7:14 (“You scare [חתות] me with dreams and terrify me with visions”), emend יְחִתֵם (חתם) to יְחִתֵם (חתם; i.e., seals an instruction concerning them). However, such an emendation seems unnecessary. What Elihu conveys in this context is the manner God communicates his revelation, that is, the sealing of instruction upon men as modeled in Eliphaz’s visionary experience (4:12-21). Elihu’s statement in 36:10 also carries the same sense: “He opens their ears to instruction (לָמֹס ר). . .” If so, מָסְרָא in 33:16 and 36:10 refers

147 For surveys on the issue, see Clines, Job 21-37, 695–96; Dhorme, A Commentary on the Book of Job, 494–95.  
148 So Davidson, The Book of Job, 229–30; Zuck, Job, 146.
metaphorically to a revelatory message, perhaps 4:17-21\textsuperscript{149} (also compare 5:17: “Behold, blessed is the man whom God reproves; therefore reject not the instruction [מִסְרָה] of the Almighty”).\textsuperscript{150} In this regards, Zophar’s use of the term מִסְרָה in 20:3 should not simply be overlooked.

I keep hearing (א שְׁמ ע) an insulting reproof (מוּס ר) directed at me. And a spirit (רוּח) beyond my understanding gives me an answer.

In this short verse, three terms carry the visionary tone: א שְׁמ ע (4:16; 20:3), the masculine רוּח (4:15; 20:3), and מִסְרָה (5:17; 20:3; 33:16; 36:10). Though מִסְרָה is used in a derogative sense in this verse (i.e., “the instruction of my insult” = “insulting reproof”),\textsuperscript{151} Zophar’s choice of the terms seems deliberate: by mimicking the revelatory language, he signals that he is referring to Eliphaz’s vision.

Zophar, as he alludes to the vision, essentially follows the rhetorical pattern of Eliphaz in chapters 4-5 and 15. Zophar starts with remarks on the vision (20:2-3) and then expounds the fate of the wicked (20:4-29).\textsuperscript{152} The opening words (20:2-3) commence by reflecting on Zophar’s upset inward state. The expressions “troubled thought,” “agitation,” and “insulting reproof” indicate that Zophar is increasingly

\textsuperscript{149} Cf. LXX 33:16 renders מִסְרָה as εἴδοσιν φόβου (“scary vision”). For other ancient translations, see Dhorme, A Commentary on the Book of Job, 494–95.

\textsuperscript{150} By the expression “the instruction of the Almighty” (5:17), is Eliphaz specifically referring to the vision’s message (4:17-21)? Or is he claiming a divine authority upon his own statements in chs. 4-5 as God’s instruction? Most English translations render מִסְרָה in 5:17 as “discipline (of God)” (e.g., ESV, NIV, NRSV) or “chastening (of God)” (e.g., KJV, Rashi, Rashi’s Commentary on Job [Salonica, 1515], 5:17). The last occurrence of מִסְרָה in the book of Job is 12:18: “He looses the instruction (מִסְרָה) of kings and binds a waistcloth on their hips.” Most commentators, however, think that מִסְרָה here should be revocalized, following the Vulgate and Targum, as מוסר (“bond”). Clines, Job 1-20, 280; Dhorme, A Commentary on the Book of Job, 176.

\textsuperscript{151} Though it cannot be proved with certainty, the expression מִסְרָה כָּלְמַי מַיִם may have double entendre here. כָּלְמַי, a term generally used in the Hebrew Bible to mean “insult/disgrace,” appears three times in Job (here, 11:3, and 19:3). In Akkadian, a counterpart term kullumu has the meaning of “cause to see, show” (Siegfried Wagner, “כָּלְמַי, “ in TDOT, 7:185-86), and if this is the case, 20:3a can be also rendered as “I keep hearing the instruction of my seeing (i.e., Eliphaz’s vision?)” At any rate, the result is the same: Zophar is pointing to Eliphaz’s vision here.

\textsuperscript{152} A number of scholars hold to the twofold division of ch. 20 (i.e., vv. 2-3; vv. 4-29) (so D. A. Garrett, D. J. A. Clines, T. Longman III, R. E. Murphy, B. Duhm, J. E. Hartley; Similarly, F. Hitzig, G. Fohrer). For detail, see Van der Lught, Rhetorical Criticism and the Poetry of the Book of Job, 235–36; Garrett, Job, 47; Longman, Job, 266; Murphy, Wisdom Literature, 33. For other divisions of ch. 20, see Van der Lught, Rhetorical Criticism and the Poetry of the Book of Job, 230–36.
distressed and is ready to enter a combat with Job. Moreover, he claims divine authority, that is, the spirit of the vision on which he and the friends rely (20:3b: “But a spirit beyond my understanding gives me an answer”).\textsuperscript{153} He now feels justified and ready to blast out a more pointed and directed accusation against Job.

Zophar then presents his version of the treatise on the fate of the wicked (20:4-29). His account about the wicked, however, is slightly different from those of the friends. We have just observed that Zophar molded his speech with key terms drawn from Eliphaz’s vision such that, in some sense, his speech sounds like a miniature of 4:12-21 (e.g., שְׁעִפִים “trouble thoughts” [4:13; 20:2]; תַּנֵי נַחַל “vision of night” [4:13; 20:8]; the masculine דִּבְרֵי רָעָה “spirit” [4:15; 20:3], אֲשֶׁר נַפְלֵת “I hear” [4:16; 20:3], אֲשֶׁר נַפְלֵת “perish forever” [4:20; 20:7]). Likewise, unlike the usual approach of the friends that “explicitly” respond to what Job said in the immediate context (e.g., Eliphaz [ch. 15] and Bildad [ch. 18]), Zophar interacts with the broader context of the previous dialogues, echoing many of “earlier phrases of various speakers.”\textsuperscript{154} Does this rhetorical strategy, then, suggest that Zophar, who speaks no more after chapter 20, gives “his last bolt”\textsuperscript{155} in this chapter by recapitulating the essence of the previous dialogues? The so called “lost speech of Zophar” in the third cycle of speeches has been the subject of immense scholarly debate,\textsuperscript{156} and many critical scholars even rearrange the third-round speeches in an

\textsuperscript{153}The translation of 20:3b (וְרוּחַ מִבִּינָי עֲנֵנִי) is difficult and has been discussed in ch. 2. To summarize, three different translations have been proposed for v. 3b: (1) Taking רוּחַ as pointing to Zophar himself (e.g., “My discerning spirit leads me to answer” [Habel]), (2) reading רוּחַ as “wind” (e.g., “a wind from my intellect answers me” [Good]) or “impulse” (e.g., “an impulse of my understanding prompts me to reply” [Dhorme]), or (3) taking רוּחַ as a higher spirit (“a spirit beyond my understanding gives me a reply” [Longman]). I have argued that the third option should be preferred since it faithfully follows the Hebrew (literally, “a spirit from [or beyond] my understanding answers me”). Unlike in Longman, however, רוּחַ should be taken as Satan, not the “Spirit of God.” See ch. 2.

\textsuperscript{154}Clines, Job 1-20, 482. See also Habel, The Book of Job, 314–15; Holbert, “‘The Skies Will Uncover His Iniquity’,” 171–79.

\textsuperscript{155}Fokkelman, The Book of Job in Form, 259.

\textsuperscript{156}For surveys of the issue, see Dariusz Iwanski, The Dynamics of Job’s Intercession, AnBib 161 (Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2006), 6–16; Katharine J. Dell, The Book of Job as Sceptical Literature, BZAW 197 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1991), 52n161.
attempt to rediscover a possible speech of Zophar.\textsuperscript{157} The issue is difficult, but the speech strategy adopted by Zophar suggests that he is giving his best shot in chapter 20.

Zophar particularly borrows from the larger context Job’s own descriptions of his plight and offers reverse meanings to those statements. In this regard, in a number of his portrayals of the fate of the wicked in 20:4-29, Zophar “mirrors Job’s plight and thereby indicts him, indirectly, as one with the wicked.”\textsuperscript{158} Among examples pointed out by commentators (e.g., 3:10, 20 [cf. 5:6-7] => 20:22; 6:4 => 20:12-16; 7:8 and 14:10 => 20:7, 9; 7:21, 10:8-9 and 19:25 => 20:11; 16:13 => 20:24-25; 16:18-19 => 20:27),\textsuperscript{159} this section limits the discussion to cases that relate to Eliphaz’s vision.

### Table 14. Zophar’s play on Eliphaz’s vision (20:7-8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job 20 (Zophar)</th>
<th>Job 4 (Eliphaz)</th>
<th>Job 5:7 (Eliphaz)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20:7 He will <em>perish</em> (אבד) forever (ל נ צ ח) like his own dung; those who have seen him will say, ‘Where is he?’</td>
<td>Amid thoughts from <em>visions of the night</em> (ח זְיוֹנוֹת ל יְל ה), when deep sleep falls on men . . . .</td>
<td>But man is born to trouble as the sparks <em>fly upward</em> (עֵפוּ).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:8 He will <em>fly away</em> (עָפָר) like a <em>dream</em> (חֲלֹם) and not be found; he will be chased away like a <em>vision of the night</em> (ח זְיוֹנוֹת ל יְל ה).</td>
<td><em>Between morning and evening they are beaten to pieces; they perish</em> (אבד) <em>forever</em> (ל נ צ ח) without anyone regarding it.</td>
<td>Then you scare me with <em>dreams</em> (חֲלֹמוֹת) and terrify me with <em>visions</em> (ח זְיוֹנוֹת).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job 7:14 (Job)</th>
<th>Job 33:15 (Elihu)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Then you scare me with dreams</em> (חֲלֹמוֹת) and terrify me with <em>visions</em> (ח זְיוֹנוֹת).</td>
<td>In a <em>dream</em> (חֲלֹם), in a <em>vision of the night</em> (ח זְיוֹנוֹת ל יְל ה), when deep sleep falls on men . . . .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Job 20:7-8 has several terms reminiscent of Eliphaz’s vision and its immediate


\textsuperscript{158}Habel, *The Book of Job*, 314.

\textsuperscript{159}For detailed discussions, see ibid., 314–15; Garrett, “Job,” 19; Holbert, “’The Skies Will Uncover His Iniquity’,” 171–79.
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context (chs. 4-5). In 20:7, Zophar, alluding to 4:20 (יִּבְדַּד כָּלְבֵּךְ "perish forever"), maintains that the wicked will “perish forever” like his own dung, a result being that no one will be able to find him and asks, “Where is he (וֹאִי)?” This question reverses the meaning of וֹאִי in 14:10, the only other occurrence of the same expression in the book. There, Job in his lament and prayer used the term וֹאִי to appeal to God in order that humans, who quickly pass away, should have their “anguish resolved” before it is too late (“Where is he?”). For Job, this obviously means his vindication.\(^{160}\)

In 20:8, Zophar again uses the word-pair חֲלֹם (“dream”) and חֲלֹמָה לַיְלָה (“vision of night”) to point to Eliphaz’s vision (cf. 4:13 חֲלֹמָה לַיְלָה; 7:14 חֲלֹמָה / חַלְמֹת; 33:15 חֲלֹמִים / חַלְמִים). In 7:13-14, Job, alluding to Eliphaz’s vision and metaphorically employing bed-couch imagery, complained that God, from whom he expected comfort and vindication, terrified him with the vision’s brutal message. In other words, he was surprised that God would treat him as a sinner when he was innocent. Zophar inverts this meaning in 20:8. To do so, he adds the term עָפָא (“to fly”; cf. עָפָא “to be dark”), a verb that occurs only here and in 5:7 and recalls Eliphaz’s provocative statement in 5:7 (“But man is born to trouble as the sparks fly [עָפָא] upward”).\(^{162}\) Though 5:7 is notoriously difficult,\(^{163}\) the sense conveyed seems to be that a person’s sin engenders punishment.\(^{164}\) Alluding to this sin-punishment imagery, then, Zophar asserts that Job, a sinner, deserves the terror that befell him through the vision’s message (7:13-14) and that with the terrifying vision, he will vanish quickly (cf. Isa 29:7; Ps 73:20).\(^{165}\)

\(^{160}\) Wilson, *Job*, 88.

\(^{162}\) 11:17 also has the same verb form עָפָא but uses עָפָא II (“to be dark”). Clines, *Job* 1-20, 141–42, considers 5:7 as the “climax” of Eliphaz’s discourse in 5:1-7 which delivers “an astounding and provocative generalization.”


In sum, despite the intensity of the accusation, Zophar’s basic claim is nonetheless the same as that of the other friends: God’s management of the moral universe is just. To defend his conviction, he fiercely attacks Job by directly accusing him as a sinner awaiting God’s punishment. The reader again finds that it is the demonic teaching that prompts and guides Zophar.

**Third Cycle (22-27)**

In the third cycle of speeches, Satan’s message is reintroduced in Bildad’s last speech (25:4-6), which also marks the final speech for the three friends. The vision’s message, therefore, brackets all of the speech cycles, serving as both the beginning (4:17-21) and the ending (25:4-6).

**Bildad’s Third Speech (Ch. 25)**

Against Zophar’s bold defense of the doctrine of retribution (ch. 20), Job in chapter 21 forcefully presents counter-evidence. Job turns from the problem of his own suffering and invites the friends to gaze upon the real world that is filled with apparent moral anomalies (e.g., wicked people prosper and live long). Offended, Eliphaz in chapter 22 radically shifts the stance he held in chapters 4-5 and 15 and harshly condemns Job as a great sinner. He accuses Job with a list of false charges (22:2-10) and calls him to repent (22:21-30). In a rejoinder (chs. 23-24), Job again desires to present his case before God and get a fair hearing (23:1-7), yet he also feels that God is inaccessible (23:8-17). He then, as in chapter 21, honestly examines the reality world and—seeing the wicked do not receive the retribution they deserve—questions why God’s rule of the moral world is inconsistent (ch. 24).

In chapter 25, Bildad steps in to respond to Job, speaking only five verses. The

---

166 Moreover, just like the rhetorical strategy of Zophar in ch. 20, Job makes frequent allusions to the previous speeches of the friends (e.g., “Eliphaz, 15:20ff.; Bildad, 18:5ff.; Zophar, 20:5ff.”). Hooks, *Job*, 265.
brevity of his speech, coupled with the absence of Zophar’s last speech and the interpretive challenge of the surrounding chapters (e.g., 24, 25-27), has brought about an intense debate among commentators in delineating Bildad’s third speech (for a representative sampling of the diverse opinions, see Table A9 in Appendix 2). While scholars of previous generation often reconstructed Bildad’s last speech, more recent commentators tend to resist such a rearrangement for the following reasons: (1) There is little agreement among critical commentators about how the text can be relocated. (2) There is no ancient witness that supports the rearrangement. As S. E. Balentine puts it, 

None of the proposed reconstructions is fully convincing. Moreover . . . there is no evidence that this is so. The earliest translations of the book (the Aramaic Targum of Job from Qumran [11QtgJob] and the LXX) show the same sequence of speeches as the Masoretic Text. A better approach is to wrestle with the text that we have instead of rebuilding a text that conforms to a pattern that may never have existed.

(3) The interpretive difficulty of chapters 26-27, a portion in which Job seems to defend the doctrine of retribution just like the three, can be also adequately explained otherwise. Job, in earlier chapters, rightly saw the problem of justice in his own suffering and the absurd reality of the people around him. Yet, in chapters 26-27, he has not abandoned the hope, notes D. A. Garrett, that retributive justice still holds true. Rather than renouncing his faith in God, he desires to bring this confidence in justice as he presents his case before God. (4) From a literary and theological perspective, the brevity of Bildad’s

---

167 Wilson, Job, 24, succinctly summarizes the issue: “In the third cycle of speeches, a number of difficulties have been proposed: Bildad’s speech is much shorter than his previous speeches (25:1–6), lacks both introduction and conclusion, and would be suitably finished by 26:5–14; a third speech from Zophar is missing; there are not enough poetic lines to make a full cycle; Job’s last response is very long (chs. 26–31); Job’s words in 24:18–24 seem to counter his complaint in 24:1–17; and 27:13–23 seems out of place in Job’s mouth.”

168 For a survey of a wide variety of proposals, see Iwanski, The Dynamics of Job’s Intercession, 6–16; Markus Witte, Vom Leiden zur Lehre: der dritte Redegang (Hiob 21-27) und die Redaktionsgeschichte der Hiobbuches, BZAW 230 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1994); Rowley, Job, 169.

169 Balentine, Job, 381–82. See also Chase, Job, 185–87. Note that the MT as well as all ancient versions (the LXX, Peshitta, Vulgate, and Targum) supply the introductory formula: 22:1 (to Eliphaz), 23:1 (to Job), 25:1 (to Bildad), 26:1 (to Job), and 27:1 (to Job). The relocations imposed by critical scholars, however, lack such an introductory marker.

170 Garrett, “Job,” 28. Against this view, others hold that an irony or parody is intended in chs.
speech and the absence of Zophar’s speech seem intentional. They stress “the bankruptcy of the friends’ arguments.”¹⁷¹ (5) Finally, since the friends’ entire speech begins with the vision’s message (4:17-21), it is more natural to assume that the whole speech also ends with the spirit’s message (25:4-6)¹⁷² (Also note that Eliphaz’s vision [4:12-21] parallels with Job’s theophany [38:1-42:6] as the frame of the poetic section of the book).¹⁷³

If one takes Bildad’s third speech as it appears, how does the final reappearance of the vision’s message (25:4-6) contribute to Bildad’s short speech? To begin with, Bildad’s speech is comprised of two sections: (1) A hymn on God’s power (25:2-3) and a (2) reiteration of Eliphaz’s vision (25:4-6). Unlike the usual pattern of the friends’ speeches, Bildad’s opening statement (25:2-3) skips any rebuttal of Job’s previous statements and jumps right into a hymnic praise of God’s power.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job 25:2-3 (Bildad)</th>
<th>Job 5:8-16 (Eliphaz)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25:2 Dominion and fear are with God; he makes (עֹשֵׁה), peace in his high heaven.</td>
<td>5:9 He who does (עֹשֵׁה) great things (גָּדוֹל) and unsearchable, marvelous things without number (מִסְפָּר).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25:3 Is there any number (מִסְפָּר) to his armies (גְדוּד)? Upon whom does his light not arise?</td>
<td>5:11 He sets on high those who are lowly, and those who mourn are lifted to safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5:12 He frustrates the devices of the crafty . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5:15 But he saves the needy from the sword of their mouth and from the hand of the mighty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5:16 So the poor have hope, and injustice shuts her mouth.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

²⁶-²⁷. E.g., Seow, Job 1-21, 67–68; Wilson, Job, 127–33.

¹⁷¹Wilson, Job, 24. Similarly, Fokkelman, The Book of Job in Form, 259–60; Longman, Job, 309; Garrett, “Job,” 35. Hooks, Job, 301–2, comments, “[T]he general pattern of the speeches exhibits a progressive shortening of the discourses of the friends leading up to and including the so-called “broken” third cycle. Job’s speeches, by contrast, get progressively longer. This could be the author’s way of suggesting that the friends have run out of arguments and that Job has won the debate.”

¹⁷²Garrett, “Job,” 35, further notes, “If Job’s speech in 25:5-14 (a description of God’s majesty) were appended to Bildad’s speech, the symmetry of the bracketing structure would be lost.”

A closer look at the hymn in 25:2-3, however, reveals that Bildad is attacking Job with another piece of the account on the doctrine of retribution. Eliphaz in 5:8-16 also presented a similar hymnic doxology on the doctrine but with a different emphasis. He praised God who punishes the wicked (“crafty” [5:12], “wily” [5:13]) yet lifts the needy and poor (5:11; 15-16). Here, the emphasis was on both God’s “destructive acts” (5:12-14) and “saving acts” (5:10-11, 15) with more effect on the hope for the poor (5:16). In this regard, said Eliphaz, God is the one who does (הتظים) great things (רובה) without number (מ américain) (5:11).

Bildad, on the other hand, adopts a similar language (e.g., הتظים, מ américain, and an assonant word גְדוּד), but stresses God’s destructive acts only. Against Job who bluntly claimed the divine justice as incoherent (ch. 24), Bildad, referring to God’s supreme dominion and power (25:2a) and his establishment of a “celestial order” (i.e., his making of [שלום] peace in high heaven; 25:2b), confronts Job’s right to make such a challenge (v. 2). He then employs two rhetorical questions in 25:3: “Is there any number (מון) to his armies (צבא)? Upon whom does his light not arise?” The implication is that God, whose armies are numberless, relentlessly scrutinizes mankind only to find that humans are inherently impure and hence “will crush them by the power of his countless troops.”

The retributive doctrine that Bildad portrays in 25:2-3 not only differs from that of Eliphaz in 5:8-16, but, more surprisingly, also reflects Satan’s voice itself (4:17-

---


176 Garrett, “Job,” 35. Similarly, Hooks, Job, 303. In the preceding context, the term צב (“army”) occurs once in 19:12 “His troops (צב) come on together; they have cast up their siege ramp against me . . . .” Job metaphorically claims in this verse that God treats him as an enemy that needs to be subdued. Other commentators take the expressions “armies” and “God’s light” as depicting God’s sovereign rule of all creatures. E.g., Longman, Job, 309; Rowley, Job, 170. Hartley, The Book of Job, 356–57, considers “God’s light” as indicating the source of “warmth, joy, and life” that “empowers life and sustains all his creatures.”
21). Eliphaz also claimed that the innocent and the upright never perish (4:7). For Bildad here, however, there is no such thing as an innocent or upright person; every human is filthy and doomed to destruction before God. If so, the friends’ doctrine of retribution, which was more optimistic than the “satanic doctrine of moral nihilism” in earlier stage of the debate, has been twisted and fully blended with it as one message in this later speech development. In other words, the spirit’s message, which in its initial stage only triggered the friends’ debate, now dominates the later portion of the friends’ dialogues. As Garrett puts it, “the three have moved beyond a simple doctrine that ‘all have sinned’” to teach “an orthodoxy that has been transformed into a hatred of the created world,” that is, that “God regards everything as corrupt.”

Following this sinister hymnic note of Bildad (25:2-3), Bildad now reiterates Eliphaz’s vision in 25:4-6 (see Table 16 below). In his quotation of 15:14-16 (and 4:17-21), Bildad modifies 15:14’s (מה ינRecyclerViewません כי לעז אמן תאם “What is man that”) to מינRecyclerViewי הני (“How can man be in the right before God”) in 25:4 by directly quoting Job’s own words from 9:2 (“Truly I know that it is so: But how can a man be in the right before God [מה ינRecyclerViewי הני]) (see the table below). As discussed, Job in 9:2 questioned the validity the vision’s thesis (4:17) by asserting that it is God’s power and arbitrariness—not a man’s impureness—that prevents man from appealing to God and being vindicated.

Bildad, on the other hand, flips that argument in 25:4. In 25:2-3, Bildad has already depicted God as the one who always find humanity impure and crushes them with his powerful troops. Bildad then carries this imagery of God in 25:4: Sinful being that he is, a man deserves his own punishment and has no right to challenge God.

---


178Ibid., 35.

179As for the meaning of “born of woman” (אִשָּׁה יִלְדָּה) in the context of the vision’s message, see n114 of this chapter.
Table 16. Eliphaz’s vision in 25:4-6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job 25:4-6 (Bildad)</th>
<th>Job 15:14-16 (Eliphaz)</th>
<th>Job 4:17-19 (Eliphaz)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25:4 <em>How then can man be in the right before God</em> (מְדָהֵי צִדְקָא אֵל יִצְדַּקַּע אֵל)? How can he who is <em>born of woman</em> (יְלוּד אִש ה), be <em>pure</em> (זָכַר)?</td>
<td>15:14 <em>What is man that he can be pure</em> (זָכַר)? Or he who is <em>born of a woman</em> (יְלוּד אִש ה), that he can be <em>righteous</em> (צדק)?</td>
<td>4:17 <em>Can a man</em> (כַּפַּר נָשׁ) <em>be in the right</em> (צדק) before God? Can a man be <em>pure</em> (זָכַר) before his Maker?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25:5 Behold, even the <em>moon</em> (יְרֵח) is not bright, and the <em>stars</em> (כֹּכְבֵי) are not pure in his eyes.</td>
<td>15:15 Behold, God puts no trust in his holy ones, and the <em>heavens</em> (שַׁמְיֵה) are not pure in his sight.</td>
<td>4:18 Even in his servants he puts no trust, and his angels he charges with error.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25:6 How much less man, who is a <em>worm</em> (רִמ), and the <em>son of man</em> (בָּן־אֲדֹן), who is a <em>maggot</em> (תֹלֵע).</td>
<td>15:16 How much less one who is abominable and corrupt, a man who drinks <em>injustice</em> (עַלְוָה) like water!</td>
<td>4:19 How much more those who dwell in houses of clay, whose foundation is in the dust, who are crushed like the moth!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, Bildad makes a slight change to 25:5-6 with regards to the Psalm allusions. We have observed that 15:14-16 (Eliphaz) makes a number of sarcastic allusions to both Psalms 8 and 14, 53. While Bildad retains the parodical allusion to Psalm 8 (e.g., the use of מְדָה in 25:4 [so 15:14, Ps 8:5[4]; cf. Job 4:17 has an interrogative why?]; the assonant verb זָכַר in 25:4 [so 15:14; cf. Ps 8:5[4] has זוּחֶר]; and the participle כָּלֶבֶם in 25:5 [cf. 15:15 has כָּלֶבֶם; Ps 8:4[3] has כָּלָאָם; כָּלָאָם in 25:6 [So Ps 8:5[4]]], he no longer seems to play on Psalms 14 and 53.180

In 15:14-16, Eliphaz rephrased 15:16 (“How much less one who is abominable [תעב] and corrupt [אלח], a man who drinks injustice [שָׂלֹם] like water!”) based on Psalms 14 and 53 to claim that Job, who belongs to the realm of universal depravity, is a wicked

---

180See n129 of this chapter for a detailed discussion.
sinner. In contrast, Bildad, in chapter 25, brings this dismal view of mankind to its climax by reformulating 15:16 in 25:6: “How much less man, who is a worm (רִמּה), and the son of man (בָּנֵי אֲדֹם), who is a maggot (יוֹלֵע ה)!” Two points deserve our attention with regards to this change: (1) Bildad calls mankind “maggot” and “worm,” terms symbolizing “death and decay” (7:5; 17:14; 21:26; 24:20). Bildad, then, reinforces this sense by further alluding the expression בָּנֵי אֲדֹם in Psalm 8:5: “What is man . . . and the son of man (בָּנֵי אֲדֹם) that you care for him?” The term בָּנֵי אֲדֹם, which connotes the “earthbound” lowliness of human nature, carries different senses in Psalm 8:5 and Job 25:6 respectively. In Psalm 8:5, the emphasis is on God’s exaltation of the “son of man.” Despite human mortality and minuteness, declares Psalm 8:6, God has made people’s status a little lower than the angels (NIV, KJV) or God (NRSV, NASB). In Job 25:6, on the other hand, the term intends to completely denigrate any “human worth and dignity.” It depicts the “son of man” as “the bottom of the order of creation,” that is, not as “a little less than the angels or God” but as the maggot and worm itself. (2) J. G. Kline finds the significance of the word יוֹלֵע ה (“maggot”). יִוְלֶע ה, which occurs only here in the book, is the last word of Bildad as well as the three friends. By rearranging “the letters of Eliphaz’s utterance יִוְל ה [15:16]” and adding the last letter of the Hebrew alphabet ה to the rearranged word יִוְל ה (hence יוֹל ה as in 25:6), Bildad signals to the

---


182 Cf. Pss 14:2 and 53:3[2] have בָּנֵי אֲדֹם “sons of man.”


184 Alden, Job, 256–57.

185 Habel, The Book of Job, 370. Note how the emphasis has been shifted in the series of quotations: In 4:17-21, humans are impure because they are made of “clay” and “dust.” In 15:14-16, every human is filthy because of the universal depravity. In 25:4-6, human beings are hopeless because they are disgusting creatures like worms and maggots.
reader that the friends’ speech officially ends here.\textsuperscript{186}

Despite the minor alterations and heightened denigration of humanity, the essential message of Bildad’s quotation is the same as 4:17-21 and 15:14-16: that every man is inherently foul. If so, why does Bildad, in his brief yet final speech, end by reciting Eliphaz’s vision, which might sound trite and even intractable? A number of commentators ascribe it to the “bankruptcy” of Bildad’s argument.\textsuperscript{187} While this is true, it is not an adequate explanation of Bildad’s abrupt conclusion. Just as Zophar (ch. 20) counted on the vision’s authority to make his final claim, Bildad creates an inclusion, placing the demonic vision at the beginning and end of the friends’ speeches. As J. G. Kline notes, the final occurrence of the vision’s message in the friends’ speeches reflects its “centrality to the dialogue between Job and his friends.”\textsuperscript{188}

\section*{Conclusion}

The discussion of the role of the vision’s message (4:17-21) in the friends’ speech cycles suggests that at the heart of the debate is the demonic message of Eliphaz’s vision (4:12-21). The vision’s message, which is frequently quoted or alluded to by the friends, not only brackets the whole of the speech cycles as the beginning (4:12-21) and the ending (25:4-6), but also frames each individual cycle (first cycle: the beginning [4:12-21]/ second cycle: the beginning [15:14-16] and the ending [20:2-3]/ third cycle: the ending [25:4-6]) as the backbone for all the debate cycles of the friends (See Figure 2 below).

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{186}Kline, \textit{Allusive Soundplay in the Hebrew Bible}, 51.}


\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{188}Kline, \textit{Allusive Soundplay in the Hebrew Bible}, 50. Garrett, “Job,” 35, also remarks, “Expressions of the demonic doctrine, found at 4:12-21 and 25:2-6, bracket the speeches of the friends. Thus, the layout of the text is as the author intended it. . . . Functionally, demonic doctrine colors everything the three say, since the bracketing indicates that their discourses begin and end with the spirit’s teaching.”}
Figure 2. Eliphaz’s vision in the friends’ speech cycles

Triggered by the vision (4:12-21), the friends falsely accuse Job as a sinner, buttressing the doctrine of retribution. As the debate progresses, the friends’ message turns profoundly dark, fully blending their theology with Eliphaz’s vision. Job, on the other hand, recoils from the false accusations launched against him and seeks an answer from God.
CHAPTER 4
ELIPHAZ’S VISION IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE ELIHU SPEECHES

An extensive body of literature exists concerning the origin, placement, and meaning of the Elihu speeches in chapters 32-37, but little consensus has been reached among scholars. Because of the enigmatic nature of the Elihu speeches, critics often consider the Elihu episode to be a later, secondary interpolation, while others hold it to be original to the flow and design of the book. Some are dissatisfied with the present


2D. J. A. Clines summarizes issues often raised by commentators: “(1) Unlike the other speakers in the book, Elihu has not been referred to in the narrative prologue, and will not be mentioned in the epilogue. (2) The speeches of Elihu could be omitted without loss to the book, and it can even be said that ‘the dramatic power of the book is heightened by the omission of his speeches’ (Strahan). (3) The style of the Elihu speeches and narrative differs from that of the book elsewhere: it is ‘prolix, laboured and tautological; the power and brilliancy which are so conspicuous in the poem generally are sensibly wanting’ (Driver-Gray).” David J. A. Clines, Job 21-37, WBC, vol. 18A (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2006), 708–9. For other issues raised on the nature of Elihu speeches, see J. Vermeylen, Job, ses amis et son Dieu: La légende de Job et ses relectures postexiliques, Studia Biblica 2 (Leiden: Brill, 1986), 23–24; Édouard Dhorme, A Commentary on the Book of Job, trans. Harold Knight (Nashville: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1967), xviii–cv.


location of Elihu texts and even relocate them in other part(s) of the book’s structure. What is more, Elihu’s character and contribution in the cycle have been disputed. Concerning his character, some hold a more positive view (e.g., “divinely inspired intermediary” [C. L. Seow], “arbiter” [R. V. McCabe], “proto-charismatic” [J. W. McKay], “covenant mediator” [H. D. Beeby]), while others take him more negatively (e.g., “opinionated fool” [N. C. Habel], “pompous, insensitive bore” [E. M. Good], “fanatic and bigot” [J. B. Curtis], “person assumed or adopted by Satan” [D. N. Freedman]). As for Elihu’s contribution to the book, Elihu is seen either as mostly


7Habel, “The Role of Elihu in the Design of the Book of Job,” 91–98; Edwin M. Good, In Turns of Tempest: A Reading of Job (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1990), 321; Curtis, “Why Were the Elihu Speeches Added to the Book of Job?,” 93. David N. Freedman, “Is It Possible to Understand the Book of Job,” Bible Review 4, no. 2 (1988): 26–33, following The Testament of Job (41:5; cf. 42:2), remarks, “I believe that Elihu—who comes from nowhere and disappears from the scene as soon as he is done with his speech—is not a real person at all. . . . He is the person assumed or adopted by Satan to press his case for the last time. His speeches are Job’s fourth test.” Newsom, The Book of Job, 200, comments, “Although Elihu has had a few defenders (more so in the nineteenth than in the twentieth century), the majority of critics are hostile to him, often treating him as an object of ridicule.” For more opinions of scholars, see Gore, “The Unifying Force of the Identity and Role of Elihu Within the Book of Job,” 48–67; Theresia Mende, Durch Leiden zur Vollendung. Die Elihureden im Buch Ijob (Ijob 32-37), Trier Theologische Studien 49 (Trier, Germany: Paulinus, 1990), 1–14.
rehashing the traditional theology of the three friends⁸ or as making a unique contribution by presenting a theological outlook that is different from that of the friends.⁹

This chapter aims to contribute to the ongoing debate about the Elihu cycle by examining the role of Eliphaz’s vision in the development of Elihu’s discourse. The Elihu chapters comprise a brief introductory prose section (32:1-5), followed by four separate speeches that begin with an introductory formula וַיֹּאמֶר אֵלִיפַזְאֶלִיהוּ[10] (“Eliphaz answered . . . and said” [32:6; 34:1; 35:1; 36:1]).¹⁰ Major references to Eliphaz’s vision appear in the first (33:15-17, 19-21, 23-28) and the fourth speeches (36:10, 15), and just as the friends’ dialogues, these references enclose the whole of Elihu’s discourse. Implicit or minor allusions to the vision also occur in 32:8, 18, 33:4, and 34:7. To demonstrate the centrality of these quotations and allusions in the Elihu’s speeches, this chapter will examine the first (chs. 32-33), second (ch. 34), and fourth (chs. 36-37) speeches. I will conclude that Elihu virtually reduplicates the role and argument of the friends, with the same stance as theirs on Eliphaz’s vision and the doctrine of retribution. The present study, following the ancient textual witnesses (the LXX, Peshitta, Targum, Vulgate, and DSS [4QJob⁸, 2QJob, 11QTargJob]) and recent scholarly discussion,¹¹ assumes the authenticity of the Elihu speeches in the original design of the book.

---


¹⁰The fourth speech begins slightly differently: וַיֹּאמֶר אֵלִיפַזְאֶלִיהוּ (“Elihu continued and said”).

¹¹See n4 of this chapter.
Eliphaz’s Vision in Elihu’s First Speech (Chs. 32-33)


**Introductory Statement (32:6-33:1-7)**

At the completion of the third speech cycle (chs. 22-27), the three friends are rendered speechless. What follows is Job’s final plea, solemnly pleading for his vindication (chs. 29-31). In this “climatic moment” where the reader anticipates God’s appearance and resolution to Job’s dilemma,\footnote{McCabe, “Elihu’s Contribution to the Thought of the Book of Job,” 50. Cf. Clines, *Job 21-37*, 705.} an angry young Elihu intrudes into the dialogue (32:1-5), delivering an unprecedentedly lengthy introduction of twenty-four verses validating his intrusion.

negative view, however, may not be correct. As we shall see below, Elihu, like Eliphaz in
his opening discourse in chapter 4, begins moderately and even deferentially.

To approach the issue, I will begin by discussing the literary framework of
32:6-22. A number of proposals have been suggested on the structure of 32:6-22 (for
detail, see Table A10 in Appendix 3). Despite the diversity, one may nevertheless find
two notable patterns. Commentators of previous generations (and some modern scholars
such as D. J. A. Clines) tend to divide the text into 6-10|11-14|15-22 or similar.\(^\text{16}\)
Recently, more scholars delineate the structure as 6-10|11-16|17-22 or similar, taking
32:11-16, not 32:11-14, as one unit.\(^\text{17}\) For instance, in his article on the structure of 32:6-22, P. W. Skehan proposes the 6-10|11-16|17-22 pattern type. He divides 32:6-22 as 6|7-10|11-16|17-20|21-22 by further segmenting 32:6-10 into 32:6/7-10 and 32:17-22 into
32:17-20/21-22, yet holding 32:11-16 to be one unit. He finds verbal repetitions (vv. 7-10
[אמר/אמר]; vv. 11-16 [יחל/יחל]; vv. 17-20 [ענה/ענה]; vv. 21-22 [.mozilla/.mozilla]) and
recurrent catch phrase “(I will) declare my opinion” (אֲח וּ הַדֵעִי [vv. 10, 17]; cf. מֵח וֹּתַדֵעִי
[v. 6]) as key components to the frame of 32:6-22.\(^\text{18}\)

A 32:6 I was timid and afraid to declare my opinion ( camino) to you.

B 32:7 I said (พรีเมียร์), ‘Let days speak . . .’
32:10 Therefore I say (אמר) . . . let me also declare my opinion ('],[').

C 32:11 Behold, I waited (יחל) for your words . . .
32:16 And shall I wait (יחל), because they do not speak . . .?

93–97.

\(^\text{16}\)Some would further split vv. 6-10 and/or vv. 15-22 into smaller units, but they all regard vv.
11-14 as one unit.

\(^\text{17}\)E.g., Habel, The Book of Job, 446; David A. Diewert, “The Composition of the Elihu
Speeches: A Poetic and Structural Analysis” (PhD diss., University of Toronto, 1991), 576–79; Balentine,
J. P. Fokkelman, The Book of Job in Form: A Literary Translation with Commentary, SSN 58 (Leiden:

\(^\text{18}\)Patrick W. Skehan, “I Will Speak Up: Job 32,” CBO 31, no. 3 (1969): 381–82; Skehan,
Studies in Israelite Poetry and Wisdom, CBQMS 1 (Washington D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of
I also will answer ( Heb. ענה). . . I also will declare my opinion ( Heb. אֲח וּ הַדֵעִי).

I must open my lips and answer ( Heb. ענה).

I will not show ( Heb. נשא) . . . or use flattery ( Heb. כנה) toward any person. For I do not know . . . flatter ( Heb.), else my Maker . . . take me away ( Heb).

Job 32:6-22 is composed of five strophic units. Except for the first (v. 6), each unit has verbal repetition that forms an inclusio. The catch phrase, “[I will] declare my opinion,” also runs throughout the first, second, and fourth unit as a unifying thrust for the entire speech. Lastly, the five units are in concentric structure, and the inclusio of each unit sets “the essence of what is being said” in the unit. Hence Skehan summarizes the structure as follows:

A  I feared to tell you my opinion (v. 6)
B  I thought ( אמר; I said to myself) (vv. 7-10)
C  I waited (יחל) (vv. 11-16)
B’ I will speak up ( Heb) (vv. 17-20)
A’ Without flattery or favor ( Heb: כנה+нести) (vv. 21-22)

Skehan’s framework has followers (e.g., R. E. Murphy in his FOTL commentary; R. V. McCabe), but his model contains one critical problem. The occurrence of verbal repetitions and the catch phrase is unsymmetrical. Not only does the verbal repetition not exist in the first unit, but the catch phrase, “[I will] declare my opinion,” also does not appear in the third and fifth units.

As an alternative, this study suggests that 32:6-22 better divides into 6-9|10-16|17-22, a threefold symmetrical structure in which every unit begins with the catch phrase (“[I will] declare my opinion”; vv. 6, 10, 17) followed by a series of word repetition in the form of inclusio (vv. 7-9 [ח המק ואנ/כמב+וח/אני]; vv. 11-16 [יחל/יחל]; vv. 18-20).

19Skehan, “I Will Speak Up,” 381–82.
20Ibid.
21Murphy, Wisdom Literature, 40–42; McCabe, “The Significance of the Elihu Speeches in the Context of the Book of Job,” 47–49.
A  Thesis 1:  
32:6 I am young in years, and you are aged; therefore I was timid and afraid to declare my opinion (מֵח וֹתַדֵעִי) to you.

Supporting Ideas:  
32:7 I said, ‘Let days speak, and many (רֹב) years teach wisdom (חכָמִי).’
32:9 It is not many (רֹב) who are wise (חכם), but the aged who understand what is right.

B  Thesis 2:  
32:10 Therefore I say, ‘Listen to me; let me also declare my opinion (אֲח וּ הַדֵעִי).’

Supporting Ideas:  
32:11 Behold, I waited (יחל) for your words, I listened for your wise sayings . . .
32:16 And shall I wait (יחל), because they do not speak . . .?

A’ Thesis 3:  
32:17 I also will answer with my share; I also will declare my opinion (אֲח וּ הַדֵעִי).

Supporting Ideas:  
32:18 For (כִי) I am full of words; the Spirit within me constrains me.
32:22 For (כִי) I do not know how to flatter, else my Maker would soon take me away.

In this framework, 32:6, 10, 17 have the catch phrase “[I will] declare my opinion” and function as thesis statements for each unit, and the ensuing inclusio structures (vv. 7-9; vv. 11-16; vv. 18-22) provide supporting ideas. In the first unit, for example, 32:6 sets the thesis of the first unit: “Out of the respect for the friends’ age and knowledge, I [=Elihu] feared to declare my opinion.” Job 32:7-9, forming a concentric structure, provide supporting ideas for 32:6.

Following my translation (see Table 17 below), Elihu gives two rationales for his hesitance to speak before the friends. They are older and wiser than he (A [v. 7] and A’ [v. 9]), but more importantly, they are inspired by God (B [v. 8]). As we shall see, Elihu means Eliphaz’s vision when refers to divine inspiration. Elihu, then, is not arrogant or pompous here; rather, he is polite and respectful (cf. Eliphaz in 4:2-6).

---

22 Although no scholar that I know of has presented an argument for this framework, Alden, *Job*, 318–21, divides 32:6-22 based on the same structure. His translation and interpretation, however, are quite different from the author’s.
Table 17. Job 32:7-9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>My Translation</th>
<th>NRSV</th>
<th>MT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>32:7 I said, ‘Let days speak, and many (יְרֹב) years teach wisdom (חֲכָמִים).’</td>
<td>32:7 I said, ‘Let days speak, and many (יְרֹב) years teach wisdom (חֲכָמִים).’</td>
<td>32:7 אֵשֶׁר־חֲכָמִים יִנְתַּמְּךָ, יַחֲרָרְךָ לְשׁוֹם יֵשַׁעְתָּךָ. ַלְחָכִים יִנְתַּמְּךָ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>32:8 Truly, the Spirit is in a man, the breath of the Almighty gives them understanding.</td>
<td>32:8 But truly it is the spirit in a mortal, the breath of the Almighty, that makes for understanding.</td>
<td>32:7 את־רוּחַ־הָאִישׁוֹנִי, וַהֲנַשֵּׁתָּם שְׁבַעְּנֵם יֵדְוֶהָוָּוֹנָּים. 32:8 את־רוּחַ־הָאִישׁוֹנִי, וַהֲנַשֵּׁתָּם שְׁבַעְּנֵם יֵדְוֶהָוָּוֹנָּים. 32:7 את־רוּחַ־הָאִישׁוֹנִי, וַהֲנַשֵּׁתָּם שְׁבַעְּנֵם יֵדְוֶהָוָּוֹנָּים. 32:8 את־רוּחַ־הָאִישׁוֹנִי, וַהֲנַשֵּׁתָּם שְׁבַעְּנֵם יֵדְוֶהָוָּוֹנָּים. 32:7 את־רוּחַ־הָאִישׁוֹנִי, וַהֲנַשֵּׁתָּם שְׁבַעְּנֵם יֵדְוֶהָוָּוֹנָּים.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A'</td>
<td>32:9 It is not many (יְרֹב) who are wise (חכם), but the aged that understand what is right.</td>
<td>32:9 It is not the old (רֹב) that are wise (חכם), nor the aged that understand what is right.</td>
<td>32:9 לא־רְבִים יְהִי חָכָם, אֲבָל הָאֵדָד שָׁמֵיר וַיַּעַל וֹמִשְׁפְּט׃ 32:9 לא־רְבִים יְהִי חָכָם, אֲבָל הָאֵדָד שָׁמֵיר וַיַּעַל וֹמִשְׁפְּט׃ 32:9 לא־רְבִים יְהִי חָכָם, אֲבָל הָאֵדָד שָׁמֵיר וַיַּעַל וֹמִשְׁפְּט׃</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most commentators and translations render 32:8-9 with a radically different sense, as NRSV translation illustrates above. In this line of reading, Elihu speaks positively on seniority in 32:7, but his attitude bluntly changes in 32:8-9 to totally deny it’s importance, claiming in particular that special inspiration sets him far above the aged.

---

23 אכף can carry either an assertive (“surely,” “truly,” “indeed”) or an adversative meaning (“but/however,” “nevertheless”) (HALOT, “אכף”). A number of commentators and English translations render אכף in v. 8 as adversative, a rendition supported by the LXX/Origen (ἀλλὰ) and Vulgate (sed). In contrast, the Targum (בַּקושטא) “in truth”), Peshitta (ܫܵܪܝܵܪܝܬ), Frederick Field (profecto “surely”), Saadiah Gaon (“for”), and Rashi (“indeed”) render it as assertive. NRSV and other English translations regard אכף to be assertive but also add adversative force to it (e.g., NJPS [“but truly”]). This study finds that reading אכף as purely assertive (hence “truly”) better fits to the overall context. A rationale will be provided below. Frederick Field, ed., Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt: sive Veterum interpretum graecorum in totum Vetus Testamentum fragmenta (Oxonii: Oxonii Typographeo Clarendoniano, 1875), 57; Rashi, Rashi’s Commentary on Job (Salonica, 1515), 32:8; Ben Joseph Saadia, The Book of Theodicy: Translation and Commentary on the Book of Job, trans. L. E. Goodman, Yale Judaica Series 25 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988), 348.

24 The parallelism between רוּחַ־הָאִישׁוֹנִי (“the Spirit—it is in man”) and נשֵׁתָם שְׁבַעְּנֵם (“the breath of Almighty”) makes the רוּחַ in man the Spirit of God. For a detailed discussion, see below.

25 Following the MT תְבִינֵם (between + 3mp suffix). The only possible reference to the plural pronominal suffix is the three friends. NRSV, in contrast, does not reflect the suffix in its translation. ESV translates the 3mp suffix as “him” to point to Elihu.

26 The translation of v. 8 is from D. A. Garrett.

27 Following the MT. A default meaning of רֹב (רֹב + 3mp suffix). The only possible reference to the plural pronominal suffix is the three friends. NRSV, in contrast, does not reflect the suffix in its translation. ESV translates the 3mp suffix as “him” to point to Elihu.
three.\textsuperscript{28}

This reading, however, carries several problems: (1) It would be nonsensical for Elihu, just after deferring to the three elders (vv. 6-7), to suddenly burst into completely denigrating them (vv. 8-9).\textsuperscript{29} (2) This reading would contradict Elihu’s statements in chapter 34, where he calls the three friends “wise men” (חכמים) / “those who know” (34:2) and “men of sense” (ঢাকাব) (34:10, 34).\textsuperscript{30} (3) In the earlier dialogues, the friends firmly believed that they were inspired (4:12-21; 15:14-16; 20:2-3; 25:4-6). It would be odd, then, for Elihu to claim another divine inspiration as a basis for condemning them as unwise.\textsuperscript{31} (4) The presence of the third masculine plural pronominal suffix in תבין of 32:8 (“Truly, the Spirit is in a man, the breath of the Almighty gives them understanding [תבין]”) would make it difficult for 32:8 to refer to an experience of Elihu.\textsuperscript{32} The only possible plural antecedent for the pronominal suffix in the immediate

\textsuperscript{28}Not all scholars, however, agree that Elihu refers to God’s inspiration in v. 8. E.g., Habel, \textit{The Book of Job}, 451; Whybray, \textit{Job}, 139.

\textsuperscript{29}Clines, \textit{Job 21-37}, 718-19; Andersen, \textit{Job}, 266; Longman, \textit{Job}, 382.

\textsuperscript{30}Commentators find it difficult to harmonize the favorable titles given to the friends in 34:2, 10, 36 with the negative assessment of the three in 32:9 (“It is not the old that are wise, nor the aged that understand what is right”). S. Terrien and S. B. Freehof, for example, attempt to resolve the problem by taking the appellations in 34:2 as sarcastic addresses toward the friends (and perhaps even Job). Samuel Terrien, \textit{The Book of Job: Introduction and Exegesis}, in vol. 3 of IB, ed. George A. Buttrick (New York: Abingdon, 1951), 1140-41; Solomon B. Freehof, \textit{Book of Job: A Commentary} (New York: Union of American Hebrew Congregations, 1985), 215. H. H. Rowley, S. E. Baletine, and S. M. Hooks, on the other hand, regard the appellations in 34:2 as referring to a circle of spectators other than the three. Rowley, \textit{Job}, 217; Baletine, \textit{Job}, 506; Hooks, \textit{Job}, 382. D. J. A. Clines, however, rightly points out that the titles—“wise men” and “those who know”—in 34:2 must be pointing to the three friends since they are “very definitely in view at the opening of the Elihu episode (32:3, 5) and “there is no hint of audience of bystanders.” Moreover, Elihu’s words directed to Job in 34:16 (אמרו ויאמרו ל货源 “[If you have understanding, hear this”) clarify that Elihu is not considering Job as a part of “wise men”/“men of sense.” Clines, \textit{Job 21-37}, 768. So J. P. Fokkelman, \textit{Major Poems of the Hebrew Bible: At the Interface of Prosody and Structural Analysis}, vol. 4, \textit{Job 15-42}, SSN 47 (Assen, Netherlands: Van Gorcum, 2004), 234. Clines’ solution is that Elihu has the character of a “trimmer” who at first sounds harsh to the friends (ch. 32) but suddenly changes his attitude in 34:2 with flattering words to call the friends “wise men” and “those who know.” Clines, \textit{Job 21-37}, 768. I find Clines’ explanation, though stimulating, also misses the point. If one follows my translation of 32:8-9, Elihu considers the friends “wise men” and “knowers” from the outset of his speech.


\textsuperscript{32}MT’s תבין is supported by the Peshitta, Targum, Aquila, and Theodotion. The LXX, Origen, Vulgate, however, omit the 3mp pronominal suffix.
context is the aged friends in 32:9.\footnote{33}

Also central to the issue is how to render 32:9:

[My translation] It is not \(\text{many} \) who are wise, but \text{the aged} \text{that understand what is right.}

[NRSV] It is not \(\text{the old} \) that are wise, nor \text{the aged} \text{that understand what is right.}

Many scholars, taking \(\text{the old} \) \text{as parallel with} \text{the aged} (hence “old” [ESV, NRSV], “aged” [NJPS], “senior” [M. H. Pope]).\footnote{34} In this reading, \(\text{the old} \) is considered to govern both 32:9a and 32:9b.\footnote{35} But as D. J. A. Clines points out, the term \(\text{the old} \) \text{itself can hardly mean ‘aged’},\footnote{36} for its default meaning is “many, numerous, great.”\footnote{37} Hence many even emend \(\text{the old} \) to make sense of it such as \(\text{the gray-haired} \) \text{[Budde and Beer]}, \(\text{multitude of days} \) \text{[Duhm, Hölscher, Fohrer]; cf. the Peshitta} \text{[“multitude of days”]; [“many years”; cf. 32:7]}, and \(\text{the great/multitude of days} \) \text{[Gerleman].}\footnote{38}

Rashi and T. Longman, on the other hand, attempt to read the MT in its own right and render 32:9, “Neither do \text{great men} gain wisdom, nor do \text{elders understand judgment}” \text{(Rashi)} and \text{“The many are not wise; the elders do not understand justice”} \text{(Longman).}\footnote{39} My translation goes one step further and argues that 32:9a and 32:9b

\begin{footnotesize}
\footnote{33}{Cf. Dhorme, A Commentary on the Book of Job, 476.}
\footnote{34}{Pope, Job, 242–43; Dhorme, A Commentary on the Book of Job, 476–77.}
\footnote{35}{So the LXX \(\text{οὐχὶ εἰσίν σοφοὶ οἱ ἐλαττωμένοι} \) \text{find support for rendering \(\text{the old} \) as “aged.” E.g., John Gray, The Book of Job, THB 1 (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2010), 396; C. J. Ball, The Book of Job: A Revised Text and Version (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1922), 369. Against this view, Clines, Job 21–37, 685, rightly argues that Genesis 25:23 may be rendered, “‘the greater will serve the lesser’ rather than ‘the older will serve the younger.’” So the LXX \(\text{οἱ μείζονες δοῦλοι τῷ ἐκλάσασθαι} \) \text{“the greater will serve the lesser”}.}
\footnote{36}{HALOT.\footnote{37}Rb 25:23 \(\text{the elder shall serve the younger} \) [NRSV], find support for rendering \(\text{the old} \) as “aged.” E.g., John Gray, The Book of Job, THB 1 (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2010), 396; C. J. Ball, The Book of Job: A Revised Text and Version (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1922), 369. Against this view, Clines, Job 21–37, 685, rightly argues that Genesis 25:23 may be rendered, “‘the greater will serve the lesser’ rather than ‘the older will serve the younger.’” So the LXX \(\text{οἱ μείζονες δοῦλοι τῷ ἐκλάσασθαι} \) \text{“the greater will serve the lesser”}.}
\footnote{37}{HALOT. \footnote{38}Some commentators, however, referring to Genesis 25:23 \(\text{the elder shall serve the younger} \) [NRSV], find support for rendering \(\text{the old} \) as “aged.” E.g., John Gray, The Book of Job, THB 1 (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2010), 396; C. J. Ball, The Book of Job: A Revised Text and Version (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1922), 369. Against this view, Clines, Job 21–37, 685, rightly argues that Genesis 25:23 may be rendered, “‘the greater will serve the lesser’ rather than ‘the older will serve the younger.’” So the LXX \(\text{οἱ μείζονες δοῦλοι τῷ ἐκλάσασθαι} \) \text{“the greater will serve the lesser”}.}
\footnote{38}{See the survey in Clines, Job 21–37, 685.}
\footnote{39}{Longman, Job, 371, emphasis added; Rashi, Rashi’s Commentary on Job, 32.9, emphasis}
\end{footnotesize}
should not be taken as a synonymous parallelism (with לֹא affecting both v. 9a and v. 9b) but as an antithetic (with v. 9a and v. 9b conveying contrasting perspectives, and לֹא affecting only 32:9a; hence, “The many are not wise; but the aged understand what is right”) or perhaps even synthetic parallelism (with v. 9b completing the thought of v. 9a; hence, “It is not many who are wise, but the aged that understand what is right”). The fact that רֹבֵים cannot be equivalent with זְקֵנִים creates a strong case against reading 32:9a and 32:9b synonymously.  

One discussion remains in regard to 32:7-9. When Elihu speaks highly of the wisdom and knowledge of the friends in 32:7, 9, why does he particularly add in 32:8 that the friends possess the spirit/Spirit (רוּחַ), the breath of the Almighty?

[Garrett’s translation] 32:8 Truly, the Spirit (רוּחַ) is in a man, the breath of the Almighty (נִשְׁמַת שְׁדֵי) gives them understanding.

[NRSV] 32:8 But truly it is the spirit (רוּחַ) in a mortal, the breath of the Almighty (נִשְׁמַת שְׁדֵי), that makes for understanding.

Two issues affect 32:8. First, does the feminine רוּחַ (cf. Eliphaz’s vision has the masculine רוּחַ [4:15; 20:3]) refer to the Spirit of God or to a human spirit breathed into man? Second, what is meant by the רוּחַ as the source for the friends’ knowledge? F. A. Andersen captures the difficulty of 32:8:

Where this knowledge comes from is not clear. Verse 8 suggests that it is the breath of the Almighty that gives understanding. But if this is in men by creation, why are so few wise? While not claiming special inspiration, Elihu does refer in 33:14f. to a

---


40 It is not difficult to find constructions within Job and other poetical books where לֹא governs only the first half line of a stich and not the other (see Table A11 in Appendix 3). Moreover, the Joban poet often provides לֹא to the second half line of a stich to clarify that the whole line is negated (see Table A12 in Appendix 3).


dream revelation rather similar to Eliphaz’s (4:12ff.), where the same word spirit is used. But here it is feminine.43

J. G. Janzen finds a compelling reason for Elihu to use the feminine רוּח ("spirit/Spirit") and נשימה ("breath") pair in 32:8, which I will here elaborate further.44 In 25:4-6, Bildad gave his last verbal attack to Job by reiterating the demonic message. In return, Job responds in 26:4,

With whose help have you uttered words, and whose breath ( נשימה) has come out from you?

Though he once held the vision to be divine revelation, Job no longer tolerates this false assumption and challenges the vision’s divine authority.45 Here he asks “whose breath,” that is, which spiritual source have they drawn the words from. The unidentified spirit (i.e., the masculine רוּח in 4:15), which has not been under suspicion until chapter 25, is now challenged by Job in 26:4. Job continues in 27:2-6,

27:2 As God lives, who has taken away my right, and the Almighty, who has made my soul bitter, 27:3 as long as my breath ( נשימה) is in me, and the Spirit of God (רוּחַ אֱלֹהִים) is in my nostrils, 27:4 my lips will not speak falsehood, and my tongue will not utter deceit. 27:5 Far be it from me to say that you are right; till I die I will not put away my integrity from me. 27:6 I hold fast my righteousness and will not let it go.

In his first usage of an oath formula (27:2-6), Job plays on the very term, נשימה (27:3), that he used in 26:4 (cf. נשימה occurs only six times in the book: 4:9 [by Eliphaz]/ 26:4, 27:3 [by Job]/ 32:8, 33:4, 34:14, 37:10 [by Elihu]). In doing so, he adds רוּחַ אֱלֹהִים ("the Spirit of God") as parallel to נשימה, clarifying that unlike the friends’ false words that stem from a suspicious source, his statement of integrity reflects the truth, for it comes from the divine spirit within him.46

43Andersen, Job, 266, emphasis original.
44Janzen, Job, 177, 219.
46Janzen, Job, 179–85, 219. Concerning the oath formula in 27:2-6, see Alison Lo, Job 28 As Rhetoric: An Analysis of Job 28 in the Context of Job 22-31, VTSup 97 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 168, 188. One finds Job’s astonishing confession of faith in 27:2-6. Janzen, Job, 182–85, comments, “What is so striking about Job’s oath here is that, deeper than the fact of his alienation from God by God’s injustice toward him, there is the fact of the existential bond between God and himself, a bond signaled textually by the progression, “the life of God … my breath … the spirit of God in my nostrils. . . . He repudiates
Provoked, Elihu in 32:8 returns a full rebuttal to Job’s assertion: “Truly, the Spirit is in a man, the breath of the Almighty gives them understanding.” Here Elihu is not calling on his own inspiration, as most assume. Instead, he fervently defends the friends, asserting that the friends’ wisdom and knowledge stems from the breath of the Almighty, the Spirit of God.\(^{47}\) In saying this, he makes a subtle change to the term he uses. Against Job’s provocative statement in 26:4 and 27:3, Elihu no longer uses the implicit masculine רוּח (4:15; 20:3). Instead, he now explicitly declares that it is the breath of God that is the source of the spirit’s teaching (4:17-21). As we shall see, he uses the pair terms “the Spirit/spirit” (the feminine רוּח) and “breath” repeatedly to emphasize this point in his following speeches (32:8, 33:4, 34:14; cf. 37:10).

Elihu’s use of אֱנוֹש (man) in 32:8 particularly requires scrutiny. Garrett observes that אֱנוֹש in 5:17a refers to Job, a specific individual, suggests that אֱנוֹש in 32:8 might also point to Eliphaz. In response to Job’s provocative statement in 27:3b (“the Spirit of God [רוּחַ אֱלוֹה] is my nostrils”), Elihu thus claims two points in 32:8: (1) the spirit that has brought forth the vision to Eliphaz (4:12-21) is the Spirit of God (“the Spirit is in man [=Eliphaz]” [32:8a]), and (2) the three friends who adhere to the spirit’s teaching are also inspired (“the breath of the Almighty gives them [=the three friends] understanding.”

\[^{47}\text{Janzen, Job, 219.}\]

---

Bildad’s latest words as so much misguided claim to inspiration (nešama, 26:4). When Job, however, makes his oath by the use of this same word nešama (“breath,” 27:3\(^a\)) as the presence of God’s life within him, we may identify a divine light which shines within his clear conscience. . . . [T]he divine light of revelation, and the divine spirit of inspiration, is to be seen in Job’s conscience.”

---
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Although some consider רוּח הַיָּבֵא אֱנוֹשׁ in 32:8 a human spirit in the inner man (cf. Gen 2:7), the following evidence further corroborates my argument: (1) In addition to the parallelism in 32:8 (לְשׁוֹנֵת שָׁהְיִיתְהוּ אֱנוֹשׁ [“the Spirit—it is in man”] / רוּחַ הַיָּבֵא אֱנוֹשׁ [“the breath of Almighty”]), 33:4—an immediate context to 32:8—parallels רוּחַ אֱלֹהִים (“Spirit of God”) with נִשְׁמַת שָׁהְיִיתְהוּ (“breath of Almighty”), indicating that Elihu means divine inspiration in this particular context. (2) 32:8 (Truly the Spirit [רוּחַ] . . . the breath of the Almighty, that gives them understanding [בִּינֵי]) resembles 20:3b (But the spirit [רוּחַ] beyond my understanding [בִּינֵי] gives me an answer), a passage on Zophar’s claim to inspiration, with the use of similar terms רוּחַ and בִּינֵי. (3) Major ancient versions (e.g., LXX, Symmachus, Vulgate, Peshitta, Targum) unanimously read 32:8 as special inspiration (see Table A13 in Appendix 3).

After defending the friends’ inspiration (32:6-9), Elihu opens the second unit (32:10-16) with the following thesis statement: “Therefore I say, ‘Listen to me; let me also declare my opinion (אֲחֵי וְהַדֵעִי)” (32:10). Here Elihu provides his reasons for intrusion despite the fact that the friends are wiser and inspired. The supporting ideas are laid out in 32:11-16.

A  I have waited (יחל) for the friends to speak (v. 11)
B  But the friends no longer refute Job (v. 12)
   C  The friends gave up and say, “Let God strike Job and not man” (v. 13)
   C’ But I will not respond to Job with what you just said (v. 14)
B’ Exhausted, the friends no longer refute Job (v. 15)
A’ Shall I wait (יחל) for the friends’ stopped speaking? (v. 16)

---

48 Thanks to D. A. Garrett for this observation.
49 See n42 of this chapter.
50 Compare also Gen 41:38 (“And Pharaoh said to his servants, ‘Can we find a man like this, in whom is the Spirit of God [רוּחַ אֱלֹהִים]?’”). See also Exod 31:3; Num 27:18; Isa 11:2; Dan 4:8, 9, 18, 5:11.
Again, many think that Elihu accuses the friends here of incompetency in their argument.¹¹ N. Whybray, for example, states that Elihu “contemptuously taunts the friends” by asserting “their arguments [as] totally inadequate to answer Job.”¹² This interpretation, however, is wrong. Elihu does not denigrate the friends’ earlier speeches. The thrust here is that he patiently waited (יחל) for the friends’ refutation to go well, but seeing them exhausted and backing off, he is now justified in continuing their role. The key issue to 32:11-16 is how to interpret 32:12, 14.

As the ESV translation implies (see Table 18 below), 32:12, 14 have often been read as Elihu’s blunt denial of the friends’ arguments. In the ESV, Elihu claims that the friends did not refute or answer Job (v. 12b), and that he will not answer Job with their futile speeches/arguments (v. 14b).¹³ There are, however, several problems with the ESV reading: (1) T. Longman and others point out (and my discussion below will show) the irony that “the vast majority of Elihu’s comments do not advance beyond the argument of the three friends”;¹⁴ (2) to claim that the friends did not refute or answer Job fully contradicts what the friends have done all along in chapters 4-25; and (3) it also contradicts 32:15-16 where Elihu asserts that it is the friends’ discouragement (חתת) and their unwillingness to speak that prompt him into the debate. If Elihu found the friends’ argument useless (v. 14b), why would he say such things?

My translation resolves these difficulties.


¹⁴Longman, Job, 383, 409; Andersen, Job, 266; Pope, Job, xxvii–xxviii; Driver and Gray, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Job, xli; Rowley, Job, 209.
Using a series of the preposition יד ("until, as far as"), Elihu states in 32:11-12a that he has attentively watched over the friends’ wise counsel ( להבין והבנה) “And so far to you, I gave my understanding” [v. 12a]). In 32:12b, he then shifts the focus to the present

---

55The hiphil of יכח can denote (1) “to rebuke/reprove” (e.g., Job 5:17; 6:25, 26; 13:10; 33:19), (2) “to decide/mediate” (e.g., Job 9:33 מוכיח arbiter; 16:21), and (3) “to assign” (HALOT, יכח). Some scholars, following מוכיח arbiter in 9:33, render מוכיח in 32:12 “arbiter” as well. E.g., Sylvia H. Scholnick, “Lawsuit Drama in the Book of Job” (PhD diss., Brandeis University, 1976), 227–37; McCabe, “Elihu’s Contribution to the Thought of the Book of Job,” 50–51; Habel, “The Role of Elihu in the Design of the Book of Job,” 82; August H. Konkel, Job, CBC, vol. 6 (Carol Stream, IL: Tyndale House Publishers, 2005), 192–93. Against this approach, Clines, Job 21-37, 686. 719–20, rightly argues that (1) the concern of Elihu is not the lack of an arbiter, but the failure of the friends to keep reproving Job, and (2) “It is not the formal legal language that is being spoken here, but the language of debate and disputation.” Terrien, The Book of Job, 1132, also notes that the parallelism between the participial forms מוכיח and עון hardly validates taking מוכיח as “arbiter.”

56Cf., Clines, Job 21-37, 686; Dhorme, A Commentary on the Book of Job, 478.
situation. Using "behold" followed by two participles "rebuker" and "answerer" that particularly emphasize "linear aspect"/"continuous action," Elihu complains that the friends have ceased to reprove or answer Job's speeches given in chapters 26-27, 29-31. Elihu's use of "answer" in 32:15-16 particularly buttresses this understanding.

[Elihu] 32:12b Behold, there is none among you who is rebuking Job or who is answering his sayings.

[Elihu] 32:15-16 They are dismayed; they answer no more; they removed from them words. And shall I wait, because they do not speak, because they stand there, and answer no more?

The point of "answer" in 32:15-16 is that the friends no longer want to answer Job. Since 32:12 (B) parallels with 32:15 (B') (see my structure above), the thematic link further demonstrates that Elihu in 32:12b simply describes the friends' reluctance to engage with Job anymore.

This idea is now carried on in 32:13 where Elihu hypothetically captures the friends' sentiment: "So do not say, 'We have found wisdom; God may strike him, not a man.'" Elihu argues that the friends were ready to declare themselves the victors in the debate with Job, walk away, and let God deal with Job. Elihu is distressed because, although he thinks they are in the right, he does not think that they have sufficiently rebutted Job.

Elihu then declares in 32:14b that he will not respond to Job with the friends' attitude described in 32:13.


58 The default meaning of נדף is “to destroy, scatter, blow away” (HALOT, “נדף”). One Hebrew manuscript has רדפ (“to pursue”), and another has הדפ (“to thrust”). Cf. Targum יושב (“to thrust”), Peshitta כרס (“to strike”), Vulgate proicio (“to cast way”), and 11QtgJob בוחר (“to condemn”).

59 Thanks to Garrett for the suggestion.
Many take 32:14b (“I will not answer him with your sayings”) as Elihu’s disapproval of the friends’ argument in chapters 4-25. Against this, I contend that the antecedent of “your sayings (אֵמ ר)” in 32:14b is 32:13b (“We have found wisdom; God may strike him, not a man”). To prove this point, Elihu’s use of אֵמ ר/אמר in 32:12-13 needs to be examined. As discussed, what Elihu portrays in 32:12-13 is the friends’ renouncement of engaging with Job. In this regard, “his [Job’s] sayings” (אֵמ ר) in 32:12 specifically refers to Job’s speeches in chapters 26-27, 29-31. Against the friends’ defeatist attitude in 32:13, Elihu now asserts in 32:14b that he will not answer Job like “your [the friends’] sayings (אֵמ ר).” In the context of 32:12-13, the friends did not speak at all after chapter 25, and if this is the case, what does “your sayings (אֵמ ר)” in 32:14b points to?

The only possible precursor in the context is 32:13b where Elihu summarizes what the friends implicitly said (אֵמ ר): “We have found wisdom; God may strike him, not a man.” One must also note that 32:13 (C) parallels 32:14 (C’). Whereas the friends have given up speaking in 32:13 (C), Elihu now proclaims that he, unlike the three, will speak up (C’). It would, then, be more reasonable to read 32:14b in light of 32:13b rather than claiming that Elihu rejects all the speeches of the friends.

---

60E.g., Wilson, Job, 159; Crenshaw, Reading Job, 136; Victor E. Reichert, Job (Hindhead, UK: Soncino Press, 1946), 168; Freehof, Book of Job, 207, 209; Balentine, Job, 523; Whybray, Job, 139; Alden, Job, 320.
Providing the reason for his intrusion (32:10-16), Elihu progresses to the third unit (32:17-22). As in the earlier units, Elihu begins with a new thesis statement in 32:17: “I also will answer with my share; I also will declare my opinion (אֲח וּ הַדֵעִי).” In 32:18-22, he then provides supporting ideas (note the two כִּי clauses enclosing vv. 18-22). Just as he claimed the inspiration of the friends in the first unit (32:6-9), he now appeals to God’s Spirit as the source of his utterance.

32:18 For (׃) I am full of words; the Spirit in my belly constrains me.
32:19 Behold, my belly is like wine that has no vent; like new wineskins ready to burst.
32:20 I must speak, that I may find relief; I must open my lips and answer.
32:21 I will not show partiality to any man or use flattery toward any person.
32:22 For (׃) I do not know how to flatter, else my Maker would soon take me away.

Elihu declares that the Spirit in his belly compels him to speak (v. 18). Like wineskins ready to burst, he must find relief by speaking to Job (vv. 19-20). In doing so, he cannot flatter for he holds inspired words that must be spoken with truth (vv. 21-22). 32:18b sounds particularly analogous to other inspirational passages by Zophar (20:3b) and by Elihu himself (32:8).

[Zophar] 20:3b But the spirit (רוּח) beyond my understanding (בִּינַי) gives me an answer.

[Elihu] 32:8 Truly the Spirit (רוּח) . . . the breath of the Almighty, that gives them understanding (יה). 32:18b The Spirit (רוּח) in my belly constrains (צוּק) me.

Most commentators, however, do not agree with my reading of 32:18-22.61 Although some note the resemblance of 32:18-22 to the prophetic description of Jeremiah 20:9b (“There is in my heart as it were a burning fire shut up in my bones, and I am weary with holding it in, and I cannot”), they do not recognize 32:18b as a claim to special revelation.62 The primary reason is that unlike 20:3b and 32:8, 32:18b adds the

61Although few, the following commentators support my reading: Janzen, Job, 218, 221; Whybray, Job, 139–40. Cf. Bernhard Duhm, Das Buch Hiob, KHAT, vol. 16 (Freiburg, Germany: J. C. B. Mohr, 1897), 32:18.

62E.g., Terrien, The Book of Job, 1133–34; Walton, Job, 353; Balentine, Job, 524; Robert
term “my belly” (ב טן), and this has led many to regard the feminine רוּח in 32:18 as Elihu’s own spirit,63 breath,64 or wind.65 N. C. Habel and others, for example, connecting 32:18b with Eliphaz’s speech in 15:2 (“Should a wise man answer with windy [רוּח] knowledge, and fill his belly [ב טן] with the east wind?”), even reads the combination of רוּח and ב טן in 32:18b as ironically implying a “windbag.”66

However, there is a compelling reason to read 32:18b as referring to inspiration. In the discussion of 32:8, we noted that Elihu specifically responded to Job’s provocative words in 26:4 and 27:3, and that in doing so, he deliberately replaced the masculine רוּח (4:15; 20:3) with the feminine רוּח to explicitly refer to the “Spirit of God” as the source of Eliphaz’s vision and the friends’ subsequent arguments. In 32:18b, Elihu now interacts with Job’s statements in both 27:3-4 and 31:15a.

Table 20. Elihu’s response to 27:3-4, 31:15a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job 32:18-22 (Elihu)</th>
<th>Job 27:3-4 (Job)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32:18 For I am full of words; the Spirit (רוּח) in my belly (ב טן) constrains me.</td>
<td>27:3 As long as my breath is in me, and the Spirit of God (רוּח אֱלוֹה) is in my nostrils,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32:19 Behold, my belly (ב טן) is like wine that has no vent . . .</td>
<td>27:4 My lips (שְפ ת י) will not speak (דבר) falsehood, and my tongue will not utter deceit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32:20 I must speak (דבר), that I may find relief (רוּח); I must open my lips (שְפ ת י) and answer. . .</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32:22 For I do not know how to flatter, else my Maker (עֹשֵנִי) would soon take me away.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


64Clines, Job 21-37, 681, 688.


The verbal connection seems evident. Against Job’s first oath statement of innocence in 27:2-6, Elihu quotes the terms רוח (“Spirit”; 27:3 ⇒ 32:18; cf. the verb רוח [“to be wide, feel relieved”] in 32:20[?]), דיבור (“to speak”; 27:4 ⇒ 32:20), and שופתי (“my lips”; 27:4 ⇒ 32:20). Against Job’s other oath statement of innocence in chapter 31, Elihu cites בטן (“belly”; 31:15 ⇒ 32:18-19 [x2]), and עונתי (“my Maker”; 31:15 ⇒ 32:22). In 31:13-15 in particular, Job asserts that he has not mistreated his male and female servants (31:13), for they are, like Job himself, God’s creatures created in the image of God (31:15א והלא לא negocio העשין בטן עונתי “Did not my Maker [عضן] in the belly [בטן] make them?”).67 Elihu is particularly incited by Job’s expression “my Maker in the belly” (31:15א), which like 27:3-4 (“the Spirit of God [רוּח אֱלֹהִים] is in my nostrils” [27:3ב]), claims that Job rather than the friends possesses the divine spirit. Elihu hurls back the assertions that he does have God’s Spirit (“the Spirit [רוּח] in my belly [בטן] constrains me” [32:18ב]) and that his Maker is on his side (“my Maker [עשֵן] would soon take him away” [32:22ב]).68 The essence of the debate here is who owns the true divine spirit (and hence true words), and Elihu justifies his intrusion by maintaining that he does so.

Completing his long introductory statement to the friends (32:6-22), Elihu begins another introductory address to Job in 33:1-7. After summoning Job to hear (v. 1), Elihu declares that he is going to speak with uprightness of heart and sincerity of lips (vv. 2-3). What follows is another inspiration statement (v. 4):

*The Spirit of God* (רוּח אֱלֹהִים) has made (עשֵן) me, and *the breath of the Almighty* (נִשְמַת הַשִּׁדְיָם) gives me life (חָיָה).

Many find difficulty here due to the terms עשֵן (“to make”) and חָיָה (“to give life”). Why does Elihu, after the grandiose opening, suddenly state that God has made him and gives him life, a trite statement rather unfitting to the context? To resolve the clumsiness,

67 Or as NRSV renders, “Did not he who made me [עשֵן] in the womb [בטן] make (עשֵן) them?”

68 Note that Elihu has already defended the friends in 32:6-9.
ancient versions twist either השם or הלחם, \(^{69}\) and some critics even delete or relocate the verse. \(^{70}\) Many commentators read the verse as either about “the divine life” breathed into “all humans” (Gen 2:7) \(^{71}\) or as referring to divine inspiration. \(^{72}\)

The following comparison suggests that 33:4, like 32:18-22, centers on Elihu’s claim to inspiration as he responds to Job’s provocative statements in 26:4, 27:3-6, and 31:15a.

Table 21. Elihu’s response to 26:4, 27:3-6, 31:15a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job 33:2-4 (Elihu)</th>
<th>Job 31:15a (Job)</th>
<th>Job 27:3-6 (Job)</th>
<th>Job 26:4 (Job)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behold, I open my mouth; the tongue (לְשׁון) in my mouth speaks (דבר). My words declare the uprightness of my heart (לְבֵית), and what my lips (שְפֵתֵי) know they speak sincerely. The Spirit of God (רוּח ּאֵל) has made (עשה) me, and the breath of the Almighty (נִשמוֹת אֲלֹהִים) gives me life.</td>
<td>Did not my Maker (עשֵנִי) in the belly make (עשה) him? / (Or) Did not he who made me (עשֵנִי) in the belly make (עשה) him?</td>
<td>As long as my breath (נְש מ ה) is in me, and the Spirit of God (רוּח ּאֱלוֹה ַ) is in my nostrils, my lips (שְפ ת י) will not speak (דבר) falsehood, and my tongue (לְשׁון) will not utter deceit.</td>
<td>With whose help have you uttered words, and whose breath (נְש מ ה) has come out from you?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{69}\)E.g., LXX πνεύμα θείον τό ποιήσαν με πνοή δὲ παντοκράτωρος ἡ διδάσκουσά με (“It is the divine spirit that has made me and the breath of Almighty that teaches me”). Peshitta צְאַלֵת אֲפַלְפַלְפָלָה (“The Spirit of God has awakened me, and the breath of God has enlivened me”). Targumוָכַיְם נִישְמַת אָדֶנְקָם (“The Spirit of God has made me, and the word of the Almighty sustains me”).

\(^{70}\)Clines, Job 21-37, 691, summarizes, “Budde, Duhm, Beer (BH), Hölscher delete the verse as inappropriate here, and as a gloss based on v 6 and 32:8. Dhorme, more persuasively, removes it to follow v 5 (following Budde), Strahan, Peake, and de Wilde to follow v 6, and Kissane to follow 32:13.”

\(^{71}\)E.g., Ibid., 726. Also Habel, The Book of Job, 464; Reichert, Job, 170; Good, In Turns of Tempest, 324; Walton, Job, 354.

\(^{72}\)E.g., Crenshaw, Reading Job, 136; Rowley, Job, 221; Estes, Job, 201; Pope, Job, 247; Steven Chase, Job, Belief (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2013), 238; Alter, The Wisdom Books, 137.
Just as Elihu dealt with 31:15a (Did not my Maker [עֹשֵנִי; or “he who made me”] in the belly make [עשה] him?) in 32:18-22, Elihu again alludes to 31:15a in 33:4 (“The Spirit of God has made [עשה] me . . . gives me life [חיה]). As discussed, the thrust of Elihu’s citation of 31:15a is to assert against Job’s skepticism that the divine spirit is with Elihu. In addition, Elihu borrows other expressions from Job in 27:3-6 and 26:4 such as לִשְׁנָה (“tongue”; 27:4 => 33:2), דבר (“to speak”; 27:3 => 33:2), לַעֲבָר (“my heart”; 27:6 [לב] => 33:3), שְׁפַתְיָה (“my lips”’ 27:4 => 33:3), רֹוח ־אֵל (“Spirit of God”; 27:3 [רוּח ַאֱלוֹה ַ] => 33:4), and נְשִׁים (“breath”; 26:4, 27:3 => 33:4). Elihu then plays on these terms as specific rebuttals to Job’s challenges in 26:4, 27:3-6, and 31:15a, and at the same time, as validation for his ensuing speeches as divinely authorized.73

Since Elihu already defended the friends’ inspiration in 32:6-9, why does he react to Job’s passages again and again (as in 32:18-22 and here) and reapply them to justify himself? Is Elihu saying that he will continue the role of the friends by leveraging the same spiritual source, that is, the spirit of Eliphaz’s vision? As we shall see below, Elihu starts off the next section by introducing the vision (33:15-17, 19-21, 23-28).

In sum, the examination of Elihu’s introductory address (32:6-33:7) suggests that Elihu, like the friends, stands on Eliphaz’s vision. Against Job’s skepticism concerning the divine origin of the vision (26:4, 27:3-4, 31:15a), Elihu contends that the friends hold the true revelation and that with the same inspiration he will resume the debate where the friends have left off. Elihu does not claim that the three made bad arguments; rather he criticizes them for giving up too soon.

**Refutation of Job’s Thesis (33:8-33)**

After validating his right to speak, Elihu lays out his first argument in the second section of the first speech (33:8-33). Elihu begins by citing key statements from

---

73Elihu summarizes his introductory address as follows: “Behold, I am toward God as you are; I too was pinched off from a piece of clay” (33:6).
Job’s earlier speeches. R. V. McCabe observes that Elihu’s citation falls into three themes.74

Table 22. Elihu’s summary of Job’s argument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Elihu’s Citation</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job’s defense of innocence</td>
<td>33:9 You say, “I am pure, without transgression; I am clean, and there is no iniquity in me.”</td>
<td>9:20-21; 13:23; 27:5-6; 31:1-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job’s challenge to God’s justice</td>
<td>33:10 “Behold, he finds occasions against me, he counts me as his enemy, 33:11 He puts my feet in the stocks and watches all my paths.”</td>
<td>10:6-7; 13:23-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job’s claim that God is silent</td>
<td>33:13 Why do you contend against him, saying, “He will answer none of man’s words”?</td>
<td>9:2, 14-19, 32-35; 13:22; 19:7; 23:2-7; 30:20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Elihu’s quotation in 33:9-11 capsulizes Job’s dilemma in chapters 3-31. Job knows that he is innocent (v. 9), but he cannot comprehend the divine justice that treats him as God’s enemy (vv. 10-11).75 To find an answer to the tension between his integrity and God’s justice, Job hopes to directly appeal to God. But what he finds is God’s silence, as captured in Elihu’s summary of Job’s complaints: “He will answer none of man’s words” (v. 13b).76

In rejoinder, Elihu asserts two points: (1) “God’s greatness over man negates the possibility of man having a legitimate claim against God” (v. 12), and (2) God did respond to Job in one way, and in two, though he did not perceive it (v. 14).77 To prove

74I have created the table above based on McCabe’s discussion in McCabe, “Elihu’s Contribution to the Thought of the Book of Job,” 51–54.

75Ibid., 51–53.

76Ibid., 54.

77Ibid. For other interpretive possibilities for v. 12b (“For God is greater than man”), see
the second point, Elihu argues that God communicated with Job through (1) Eliphaz’s vision (vv. 15-18) and (2) Job’s pain (19-22).78

Table 23. Eliphaz’s vision in 33:15-18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job 33:15-18 (Elihu)</th>
<th>Job 4:13 (Eliphaz)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33:15 In a dream (חֲלֹם), in a vision of the night (חזקַיָּלֵל), when deep sleep falls on men (נֶפֶלֶת רְדֵמ הַע ל־אֲנ שִים), while they slumber on their beds (מִשְכ ב), 33:16 then he opens the ears of men and seals with their instruction, 33:17 that he may turn man aside from his deed and conceal pride from a man. 33:18 He keeps back his soul from the pit, his life from perishing by the sword.</td>
<td>Amid thoughts from visions of the night (חזקַיָּלֵל), when deep sleep falls on men (נֶפֶלֶת רְדֵמ הַע ל־אֲנ שִים).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job 7:13-14 (Job)</td>
<td>7:13 When I say, ‘My couch will comfort me, my bed (מִשְכ ב) will ease my complaint,’ 7:14 then you scare me with dreams (חזקַיָּלֵל) and terrify me with visions (חזקַיָּלֵל).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Elihu quotes 4:13 almost verbatim to signal that the visionary message in 4:17-21 is the answer from God that Job has eagerly waited for. In quoting 4:13, Elihu also alludes to Job’s statement in 7:13-14 with the terms מִשְכ ב (“bed”) and חזַיָּלֵל/.Observable (“dreams/visions”). As discussed, the point of 7:13-14 is not Job’s nightmare experiences but his “inability to find relief and comfort.” Using bed-couch imagery, Job responds to the vision, expressing his astonishment for its harsh condemnation, which betrays his expectation that God will comfort him for his undeserved suffering (7:13-14).79

Clines, Job 21-37, 729–30.

78 Scholars often see God’s two modes of communication being addressed here, a point that I will refute later. E.g., Freehof, Book of Job, 212; Crenshaw, Reading Job, 138; Roland E. Murphy, The Book of Job: A Short Reading (New York: Paulist Press, 1999), 80; Hartley, The Book of Job, 443.

79 As discussed in the previous chapter, 7:13-14 is Job’s first response to Eliphaz’s vision after Eliphaz introduced it in chs 4-5. It would be odd for Job to simply bypass any comment to the vision’s subversive message and talk about some other unrelated nightmare experience. Moreover, the term חזַיָּלֵל (“vision”) is a technical term restricted to “a form of revelation,” and hence the word pair חזַיָּלֵל/.Observable (“dreams/visions”) in 7:14 makes it unlikely that the word here refers to a dream or nightmare. For detailed discussion, see ch. 3.
What, then, is Elihu doing in 33:15-18? By alluding both Eliphaz’s vision (4:12-21) and—though pejoratively—Job’s response to it (7:13-14), he reaffirms the vision and calls Job to submit to its message. In other words, Elihu, like the friends, requests Job to give up all his futile challenges (e.g., 7:13-14) and efforts for vindication (e.g., ch. 31) and to turn to God by confessing his sin.

Many, however, fail to see this connection. Although the verbal link between 33:15 and Eliphaz’s vision (4:12-21, especially 4:13) is universally recognized, scholars often do not read 33:15-18 as Elihu’s emphasis on the vision. They instead interpret 33:15-18 without reference to Eliphaz’s vision, arguing that God can use any mode of dream or vision to warn people to turn away from their sin and pride. Some read 33:15-18 in light of 7:13-14 (by taking 7:13-14 as Job’s nightmare experiences and as a sign of God’s warning), but they too fail to recognize the connection to the vision’s message.

Against this view, I must ask this: Why does Elihu allot such a long opening address in 32:6-33:7 to proving that his and the friends’ spiritual source is God? If Elihu’s intention was not to reintroduce Eliphaz’s vision, but to talk about anonymous dreams and visions as God’s channels of warning, what would be the point of tenaciously claiming the divine origin of Eliphaz’s vision? Moreover, why would Elihu quote 4:13 word for word in 33:15 if his focus was elsewhere? (cf. 15:14-16; 20:2-3, 7-9; 25:4-6).

The next avenue of communication that God used to answer Job, suggests Elihu, is Job’s affliction (33:19-22) (see Table 24 below). As often noted, the language of 33:19-22 reflects Job’s own portrayal of his pain (e.g., 6:7, 19:20).

---


81E.g., Newsom, Job, 569; Hartley, The Book of Job, 443; Murphy, The Book of Job, 80; Wilson, Job, 163; Hooks, Job, 379; Andersen, Job, 268–69. Cf. Balentine, Job, 543–44.

82Estes, Job, 202; Reichert, Job, 172; Andersen, Job, 269; Alden, Job, 328; Roy B. Zuck, Job, Everyman’s Bible Commentary (Chicago: Moody Publishers, 1978), 146–47. L. Wilson’s observation is noteworthy: “This section is largely a progressive description of suffering from pain when lying down (v. 19a) and aching in his bones (v. 19b), which result in a loss of appetite, even for desirable food (v. 20).
Table 24. Job 33:19-22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job 33:19-22 (Elihu)</th>
<th>Job 6:7 (Job) (cf. 3:24)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33:19 Man is also reproved with pain on his bed and with continual affliction in</td>
<td>My soul refuses to touch them; they are as bread that is loathsome to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>multitude of his bones.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33:20 So that his life loathes bread, and his soul the choicest food.</td>
<td>Job 19:20 (Job) (cf. 16:8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33:21 His flesh is so wasted away that it cannot be seen, and his bones that were</td>
<td>My bones stick to my skin and to my flesh, and I have escaped by the skin of my teeth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not seen stick out.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33:22 His soul draws near the pit, and his life to those who bring death.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Elihu, however, quotes Job’s expressions to interpret them in a different light, that is, in line with 33:15-18. To do so, he particularly alludes to two key passages. First, citing “to reprove” from 5:17a (“Blessed is the one whom God reproves”; Eliphaz) in 33:19a (“Man is also reproved with pain . . .”), Elihu asserts that Job’s current pain is God’s reproof, a warning sign, to bring the sinful Job back to God. Second, in a similar vein, he again quotes the term “bed” from 7:13-14 (the term occurs only three times in the book [7:13; 33:15, 19]) and sarcastically relates it to Job’s affliction (“Man is also reproved with pain on his bed . . .” [33:19]). Elihu’s use of the term indicates that he rejects Job’s challenge of the vision in 7:13-14, while holding Job to be a sinner whose agony is deserved. As some commentators note, however, Elihu is wrong, for his view contradicts “the reason for Job’s suffering as set out in the prologue.”


Stunningly, Elihu in 33:19-22 makes another set of allusions to Eliphaz’s vision, and in doing so, ironically undermines his own claim.

Table 25. Eliphaz’s vision in Job 33:19-22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job 33:19-22 (Elihu)</th>
<th>Job 2:5 (Satan)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job 33:19</strong></td>
<td>But stretch out your hand and touch his bone (עָצָם) and his flesh (בִּשְׂרָה), and he will curse you to your face.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job 2:5 (Satan)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job 4:13-15 (Eliphaz’s vision)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job 7:13 (Job)</strong></td>
<td>When I say, ‘My couch will comfort me, my bed (מִשְכ בּ) will ease my complaint . . .’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We have noted that Elihu directly quoted 4:13 in 33:15. Elihu now resumes his citation of 4:14-15 in 33:19-21. Eliphaz describes in 4:14-15 that the spiritual encounter made the “multitude of (רֹב) his bones (עָצָם) shake” and “the hair of his flesh (בִּשְׂרָה) stand up.” Elihu, taking the same terms, states that man is reproved with continual affliction in the multitude of (רֹב; Qere: רָב, “multitude”) his bones (עָצָם) that were not seen stick out. His flesh (בִּשְׂרָה) is so wasted away that it cannot be seen, and his bones (עָצָם) that stick out. As discussed in Chapter 2, the word pair עָצָם / בִּשְׂרָה is used by Satan in 2:5 (“Stretch out your hand and touch his bone [עָצָם] and his flesh [בִּשְׂרָה], and he will curse you to your face”) and reappears in the description of Satan’s disguised appearance in Eliphaz vision (4:14-15). Since the pair term is rarely used in the book\textsuperscript{84} and often occurs in the context of Satan, it is striking that

\textsuperscript{84}Other occurrences of the pair עָצָם / בִּשְׂרָה besides 2:5, 4:14-15, and 33:19-21 are 10:11 (“You
Elihu’s statement in 33:19-2 echoes the terms verbatim. In addition, Elihu’s quotation of מִשְכ ("bed"; 7:13-14) in 33:19 suggests that Elihu again has Eliphaz’s vision in mind here.

If so, what is the point of the second allusion in 33:19-22? First, it indicates that Elihu holds up Eliphaz’s vision just as he did in 33:15-18. But there is one more aspect. In his first speech (chs. 4-5), Eliphaz leveraged the vision’s authority to condemn Job and invite him to respond to God’s reproof (5:17). Elihu now follows the same pattern in 33:19-22 by combining the allusion to Eliphaz’s vision and the theme of divine reproof. In his quotation of the visionary language, however, Elihu unintentionally subverts his argument. The reader knows that it was Satan who struck Job’s “bones” (עַצְמֵי) and “flesh” (בֵּשָׁר) (2:7). By asserting that Job’s pain, reflected in his bones and flesh, came from divine censure, Elihu not only proves himself wrong, but at the same time, he unknowingly associates himself with Satan’s voice and activity in earlier chapters.

After maintaining that God did speak to Job (33:15-18; 19-22), Elihu progresses to address a heavenly intercessor (33:23-28).

33:23 If there is an angel (ךְָּמְלָא) over him, a mocker/interpreter (מֵלִיץ)—one out of a thousand, to tell a man what he must do.

33:24 And [if] he is kind to him and says [to God], “Let him loose from going down to the pit. I have found a ransom.”

The identity of the מֵלִיץ (33:23) has long baffled scholars. The term מֵלִיץ can either denote “interpreter” (Gen 42:23; 2 Chr 32:31) or “mocker” (16:20), and together with the ambiguity of the parallel wordךְָּמְלָא (either “heavenly messenger” [4:18] or “human

clothed me with skin and flesh [בֵּשָׁר], and knit me together with bones [עַצְמֵי] and sinews”; [spoken by Job]) and 19:20 (“My bones [עַצְמֵי] stick to my skin and to my flesh [בֵּשָׁר], and I have escaped by the skin of my teeth” [spoken by Job]).


86 Ibid., 47n87.
messenger” [1:14]), מֵלִיץ has been interpreted in a variety of ways. The difficulty has even led the LXX, Peshitta, and Vulgate to delete the term in their rendition (cf. The Targum). Is מֵלִיץ a heavenly being or an earthly being (e.g., Elihu himself), and moreover, is he supportive (an “interpreter/meditator”) or subversive (a “mocker”)?

The weight of evidence suggests that the primary reference of מֵלִיץ is the spirit in Eliphaz’s vision (4:12-21). (1) As often noted, Elihu responds to Job’s hope for a heavenly intercessor (9:33; 16:19; 19:25) by introducing a counter figure מֵלִיץ in 33:23. Elihu’s intention is clearly seen in the comparison of 16:19-21 (Job) and 33:23 (Elihu).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job 33:23 (Elihu)</th>
<th>Job 16:19-21 (Job)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If there is an angel (ךְֹּלָלֶה) over him, a mocker/interpreter (ןֵלִיץ)—one out of a thousand (ךְֹּלָלֶה), to tell a man what he must do.</td>
<td>16:19 Even now, behold, my witness (תַּמָּדֶה) is in heaven, and my advocate (תַּמָּדֶה) is on high.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16:20 My friends are my mockers/interpreter (ןֵלִיץ); my eye pours out tears to God,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16:21 that he would argue the case of a man with God . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job 9:3 (Job)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If one wished to contend with him, one could not answer him once in a thousand times (ךְֹּלָלֶה).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

87 J. E. Hartley, *The Book of Job*, 446. For instance, lists six proposals: “(1) another human being, e.g., a covenant friend, a prophet, or a teacher; (2) the sufferer’s own conscience; (3) one of the angelic host; (4) the heavenly witness mentioned in 16:19; (5) the special angel or messenger of Yahweh (malʾaḵ Yhwh; e.g., Gen. 21:17; 22:11, 15; Judg. 6:11–22; 13:2–23); (6) the concealed Christ.”


Against the friends who act as his *mockers/interpreters* (מֵלִיץ) (16:20), Job desires a heavenly witness, an advocate, who can fairly argue his case before God (16:19, 21). In return, Elihu (33:23)—using the same term מֵלִיץ which occurs only in 16:20 and 32:23 in the book—claims a different heavenly intercessor, a *mocker/interpreter* (מֵלִיץ) who, like the friends, tells man (בְּמָצָא) what he must do (i.e., to repent [33:26-27]). Elihu, also playing on Job’s statement in 9:3b, states that the מֵלִיץ is “one out of a thousand” (א ח דַ מִנִי־א ל ף), indicating a rare angel out of hosts of angels.\(^94\) (2) The מֵלִיץ reverses the function of the heavenly advocate that Job has envisaged. Whereas Job’s advocate appeals to God for Job’s vindication, Elihu’s מֵלִיץ comes to man to tell him to confess sin (33:26-27).

Who, then, is this spirit that condemns Job as sinner? There is only one candidate in the book, and it is the spirit in Eliphaz’s vision. (3) This interpretation is corroborated by the immediate context of 33:23, that is, 33:15-22 where Elihu reintroduces Eliphaz’s vision. If Elihu’s point in 33:15-22 is that God did answer Job through the vision, would it not be more natural to see the מֵלִיץ in 33:23 as Eliphaz’s spirit visitor, the protagonist of the vision? (4) Elihu’s strategy in quoting Eliphaz’s vision further supports this view (see Table 27 below). Elihu’s quotation of Eliphaz’s vision has a corresponding thematic progression. For example, 4:13 (theme: “the vision is given to me”) is quoted in 33:15-18 with the theme, “God speaks to Job through Eliphaz’s vision.” 4:14-15 (theme: “the vision is frightening”) is then quoted in 33:19-22 with the theme “Job’s pain is God’s reproof/punishment.” Now the reader expects that 4:15-16 (theme: “there is a spirit”) would be alluded to in 33:23 with a corresponding theme, and, rightly so 33:23 introduces מֵלִיץ with a theme, “there is a mocker/interpreter.”

---

\(^{94}\) 9:3b can be rendered two different ways: (1) “A man could not answer God one question in a thousand” (so Duhm, Hölscher, Pope), or (2) “God would not answer man one question in a thousand” (so Dhorne, Gordis). See the survey in David J. A. Clines, *Job 1-20*, WBC, vol. 17 (Dallas: Word Books, 1989), 228.

\(^{95}\) Garrett, “Job,” 48.
Table 27. Elihu’s strategy in citing the vision (33:15-23)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eliphaz’s theme</th>
<th>Job 4:13-16 (Eliphaz)</th>
<th>Elihu’s quotation</th>
<th>Elihu’s theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The vision is given to me.</td>
<td>4:13 Amid thoughts from visions of the night (תַּכּוֹנָה לַלֻּלְכָּה), when deep sleep falls on men</td>
<td>Job 33:15-18</td>
<td>God speaks to Job through Eliphaz’s vision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The vision is frightening.</td>
<td>4:14 Dread came upon me, and trembling, which made multitude of (רְבָּעָים) my bones (עֵצְמִים) tremble. 4:15 The hair of my flesh (בְּשָׁר) stood up.</td>
<td>Job 33:19-22</td>
<td>Job’s pain is God’s reproof/punishment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a spirit.</td>
<td>4:15 A spirit (רוּחַ) glided past my face; 4:16 It stood still, but I could not discern its appearance . . .</td>
<td>Job 33:23(?)</td>
<td>There is a mocker/interpreter.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that one more theme is developed in 33:24-28 by, once again, alluding to 4:14-18 (see Table 28 below). The theme that Elihu advances from Eliphaz’s vision is that “if Job accepts the מֵלִיק’s counsel of repentance (33:26-27), he will be restored.” The prominent allusive link appears between 4:17a and 33:26. In 4:17a, the demonic spirit asks a rhetorical question, “Can man (שָׁוָא) be in the right (צדק) before God (אֱלֹהִים)?,” a key statement that the friends use to condemn Job and call him to repentance (e.g., 15:14; 25:4). In 33:26, Elihu asserts that if a man—following the מֵלִיק’s teaching—prays to God (אֱלֹהִים) in repentance, God will accept him and restore to the man (שָׁוָא) his righteousness (צְדָקָה). Other allusions also develop the same theme. In 4:14, Eliphaz experiences dread (פחד) and trembling ((frר) of bones. In 33:24, 28, Elihu, using the assonant verbs פֶּדֶד (meaning uncertain/to redeem), declares that if Job repents, he will not tremble like Eliphaz but be redeemed (פֶּדֶד). Against Eliphaz’s inability to discern

---

96There are a number of verbal connections between 4:14-18 and 33:23-28: שָׁוָא (“angel”; only appears three times in Job; 4:18 => 33:23; cf. 1:14), רְבָּעָים (“before/in front of”; 4:16 => 33:23), רְדֵמ (“to tell”)], 4:14 => 33:22 רְפַּד (“dread”/”to tremble”); 4:14 => 33:24 רְפַּד/רְפַּד (meaning uncertain/to redeem”, assonant verb?], 33:28 רְפַּד (“to redeem”; assonant verb?), רְפַּד (“flesh”; 4:15 => 33:25), and שָׁוָא/צְדָקָה (man)”/”to be righteous”/”God”; 4:17 => 33:26 שָׁוָא/צְדָקָה/אֱלֹהִים).
the appearance (מְדֹא) of the spirit (4:16), Elihu claims that if Job confesses his sin, he will see (ראַה) God’s face with a shout of joy (33:26) and his life shall see (ראה) upon the light (33:28). Again, Elihu promises that Job’s flesh (בָּשָר) will become fresh with youth if he accepts the מֵלִיץ’s teaching and turns to God (33:25; cf. 2:5,7; 4:15).

Table 28. Elihu’s strategy in citing the vision (33:24-28)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job 33:24-28 (Elihu)</th>
<th>Job 4:16-18 (Eliphaz)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theme: If Job accepts the counsel of the מֵלִיץ and confesses his sin, he will be restored.</td>
<td>Theme: Man is inherently foul and hence Job is sinful.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| (33:23 If there is an angel [ךְמַה] over him, a mocker/interpreter . . . to tell [צָבָא] a man what he must do.)  
33:24 And [if] he is kind to him, and says [to God], ‘Let him be redeemed (MT: פָּדָיָה) [? / הָפָדָי [“to redeem”; cf. 33:28]) . . .  
33:25 Let his flesh (בָּשָר) become fresh with youth . . .  
33:26 Then man prays to God (אֱלֹהֵי), and he accepts him; he sees (ראַה) his face with a shout of joy, and he restores to man (שָׁם) his righteousness (צדק).  
27 He sings before men and says: ‘I sinned and perverted what was right . . .  
28 He has redeemed (פָּדָי) my soul . . . my life shall see (ראה) upon the light.’ | (4:14 Dread [פָּחַד] came . . . my bones tremble [פָּחַד . . . ]  
4:15 . . . the hair of my flesh [ךְמַה] stood up.)  
4:16 . . . I could not discern its appearance (מְדֹא . . . ) and the form before (זָהָב) my eyes . . .  
4:17 Can man (שָׁם) be in the right (צדק) before God (אֱלֹהֵי) ? . . .  
4:18 His angels (ךְמַה) he charges with error. |

The מֵלִיץ, however, is not confined to the spirit in Eliphaz’s vision. The second reference of the מֵלִיץ seems to be both Elihu and the friends. J. L. Crenshaw’s observation on Elihu’s word play in 33:33 suggests that Elihu describes himself to be the “one out a thousand.”

[33:23] If there is an angel over him, a mocker/interpreter (ךְמַה) — one out of a thousand (ךְמַה-ךְמַה), to tell a man what he must do.

---

97 Cf. two MSS have יַעֲנָה (“to loose”). See the discussion in Clines, Job 21-37, 701.

98 Crenshaw, Reading Job, 139.
[Elihu] 33:33 If not, listen to me; be silent, and I will teach you (ךָאֲלָל פְּ) wisdom.

[Job] 16:20 My friends are my mockers/interpreter (מֵלִיץ); my eye pours out tears to God,

In his closing statement of the first speech, Elihu boldly declares, “Be silent, I will teach you (ךָאֲל פְּ) wisdom” (33:33). The first four letter of�אֲל פְּ, which echoes “the one out of a thousand” (ךָא ח דַמִנִי) in 33:23, insinuates that Elihu considers himself to be taking the role of theךָא ח. As we shall see, Elihu’s second speech (ch. 34) begins with the demonic message (34:7-8) followed by a discourse on the retributive doctrine (34:10-30[33]), reduplicating the typical rhetoric pattern of the friends.

If Elihu can be regarded as theךָא ח, why not the friends, whose theological stance has inspired Elihu? There are two points to support this view. First, as discussed, the only other occurrence of the termךָא ח in the book is 16:20 where Job calls the friends my “mockers/interpreters” (ךָא ח). The fact that Elihu deliberately uses the same term indicates that he identifies himself with the friends.

Second, Elihu’s discourse in 33:14-30 is framed by two refrains in 33:14 and 33:29-30 that set the topic of 33:14-30.99

[Job] 33:14 For God speaks in one way, and in two, though man does not perceive it.

[Job] 33:29 Behold, God does all these things, twice, three times, with a man.


100E.g., Freehof, Book of Job, 212; Crenshaw, Reading Job, 138; Murphy, The Book of Job, 80; Hartley, The Book of Job, 443; Alden, Job, 326–30.

101E.g., Balentine, Job, 543–56.

As I have argued, however, these classifications fail to see Eliphaz’s vision as the central thrust of 33:14-30. The message of 33:14-30 is one: submit to the vision’s authority and confess sin. Elihu’s statement that God spoke to Job multiple times, then, probably refers to the vision’s message. It was first delivered by the spirit and then reiterated by the friends and finally by Elihu himself (33:33). Is this the reason why Elihu calls the friends and himself to be inspired (32:8, 18; 33:4)?

To conclude, Elihu’s discourse in the second section of the first speech (33:8-33) also centers on Eliphaz’s vision. Heavily relying on visionary language (cf. ch. 20 [Zophar]) and identifying himself as the \(\text{מֵלִיץ} \), Elihu, like the three, firmly holds the vision to be God’s message and invites Job to submit to its authority in repentance of his sin.

**Eliphaz’s Vision in Elihu’s Second Speech (Ch. 34)**

Elihu’s second speech (34:1-37) can be divided into four major thematic sections: (1) a summons to the friends to hear (vv. 2-4), (2) a summary of Job’s arguments with a condemnation of Job (vv. 5-9), (3) a defense of the doctrine of retribution (vv. 10-30[33]), and (4) a closing statement (vv. 34-37).\textsuperscript{103} The vision’s message appears in the second section (vv. 7-8) and prepares for Elihu’s defense of the doctrine of retribution in the third section (vv. 10-30[33]). Elihu, then, duplicates the friends’ rhetoric pattern by leveraging Eliphaz’s vision to present the doctrine of retribution (for detail, see Table A14 in Appendix 3).

The structure of the second section (34:5-9) is as follows:

\textsuperscript{102}E.g., Good, *In Turns of Tempest*, 324.

\textsuperscript{103}So Murphy, *Wisdom Literature*, 40; McCabe, “The Significance of the Elihu Speeches in the Context of the Book of Job,” 131. Cf. Hartley, *The Book of Job*, 450. segments into three thematic units: (1) “a summons to listen” (vv. 1-4), (2) “a disputation” (vv. 5-33), and (3) “a judgment” (vv. 34-37). For five divisions, see Alden, *Job*, 332–42. For six segmentations, see Habel, *The Book of Job*, 479–80.
For Job has said (כִּי־א מ רַאִיוֹב)

34:5 *For Job has said,* ‘I am in the right, and God has taken away my right;

34:6 In spite of my right I am counted a liar; my wound is incurable, though I am without transgression.’

B The vision’s message: everyone is wicked, including Job

34:7 What man is like Job, who drinks up scoffing like water,

34:8 Who travels in company with evildoers and walks with wicked men?

A’ For Job has said (כִּי־א מ רַאִיוֹב)

34:9 *For he has said,* ‘It profits a man nothing that he should take delight in God.’

Elihu, like he did in 33:8-11, summarizes Job’s position in 34:5-6. In 33:8-11, Elihu presented Job’s core arguments as (1) Job’s claim of innocence and (2) his challenge against divine justice. Elihu restates the same points in 34:5-6, 9.105

Table 29. Elihu’s summary of Job’s position (34:5-6, 9)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Elihu’s citation/summary of Job’s words and its reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>v. 5-6</td>
<td><em>Job’s defense of his innocence</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34:5a For Job has said, ‘I am in the right’ (9:15, 21; 10:15; 13:18; 27:2–6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34:6a ‘In spite of my right . . .’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34:6b ‘Though I am without transgression’ (cf. 33:9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 9</td>
<td><em>Job’s challenge against God’s justice</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34:5b ‘And God has taken away my right’ (27:2a; cf. 14:3; 19:7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34:6b ‘I am counted a liar; my wound is incurable’ (6:4[?], 28[?]; 16:8[?], 10:17[?])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34:9 For he has said, ‘It profits a man nothing that he should take delight in God’ (9:22–24; 21:5–13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


His repetition of these points indicates, as R. V. McCabe suggests, Elihu considers them to be the “key tension that needs to be resolved.”

How then does Elihu attempt to resolve this tension? In contrast to Job who eagerly desires to hear from God (e.g. ch. 31), Elihu, like the three friends, reiterates the demonic message in 34:7-8. While many treat 34:7-8 merely as a parenthetical “ad hominem attack” or a “censure” placed between Elihu’s summary statements, the chiastic structure of 34:5-9 (with A-A’ forming an inclusio [i.e., the repetition of כִּי־א מ רַאִים in vv. 5, 9] and B [vv. 7-8] serving as the center) suggests the centrality of the vision’s message for interpreting 34:5-9.

Table 30. Eliphaz’s vision in 34:7-8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job 34:7-8 (Elihu)</th>
<th>Job 15:16 (Eliphaz)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job, who drinks up like water (שתהכמימים) mocking (לעשת) like water (כמים), who travels in company with evildoers (פועלי עון) and walks (הלך) with men of wicked (רעים)?</td>
<td>How much less one who is abominable and corrupt, a man who drinks (שתה) injustice (ש ServletException) like water (כמים)!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blessed is the man who walks (הלך) not in the counsel of the wicked (רעים), nor stands in the way of sinners, nor sits in the seat of mockers (לבד).</td>
<td>Job 31:3 (Job) (cf. 22:15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is not calamity for the unrighteous, and disaster for the evildoers (פועלי עון)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Elihu quotes 15:16b (“A man who drinks [שתה] injustice like water [כמים]!”) almost verbatim in 34:7 (“What man is like Job, who drinks up [שתה] mocking like water [כמים]). As discussed, 15:16b reflects Eliphaz’s reformulation of 4:18 parodying Psalms

---


Ibid. Similarly, Wilson, Job, 166; Davidson, The Book of Job, 234; Clines, Job 21-37, 770-71; Andersen, Job, 272; Alden, Job, 333; Hartley, The Book of Job, 452; Wilson, Job, 384; Whybray, Job, 145; Crenshaw, Reading Job, 139–40.
14 and 53. Nevertheless, the message conveyed in 15:16b and 34:7 is the same: Everyone is wicked, including Job. Using the demonic message then, Elihu answers Job’s theological dilemma (summarized in 34:5-6, 9) and secures, moreover, a way for his own defense of the doctrine of retribution that follows in the next section (34:10-30[33]).

Two points further require scrutiny: (1) Just as Elihu quoted 15:16b in 34:7, he also alludes to Psalm 1 in 34:8 (e.g., רְשֵׁיָם [“wicked”]; Ps 1)/[“to walk”]; רְשֶׁנֶה [“wickedness”; 34:8]).

Elihu thus expands the demonic condemnation of 34:7 into 34:8, identifying Job as the companion of evildoers and of the wicked against whom Psalm 1 warns. (2) In quoting Psalm 1, however, he subtly modifies the psalm’s “wicked” (רְשֵׁיָם)/“sinners” (חָטָאֵי); “mockers” (לְצִים)/“evildoers” (פֹעַלֵי) in 34:8. What is the purpose of this change? First, in alluding to Psalm 1, Elihu responds to Job’s oath statement of innocence in 31:3 (“Is not calamity for the unrighteous, and disaster for the evildoers [פֹעַלֵי]?”).

Against Job’s claim that he shuns to be one of the evildoers (פֹעַלֵי) (31:3), Elihu responds that Job is indeed the companion of the evildoers (פֹעַלֵי) (34:8). Second, Elihu seems to deliberately avoid quoting the word “mockers” (לְצִים) from Psalm 1 because the term shares the same root (לַיץ) with מֵלִיץ (“mocker/interpreter”) (16:20; 33:23). Quoting that word would equate the friends and himself with the wicked and the sinners of Psalm 1. As an alternative, Elihu twists his citation of 15:16b in 34:7 by replacing ע וְל ה (“injustice”; 15:16b) with לְעַג (“mocking”; 34:7), the root of which, לַעע (“to mock”), is a synonym of לְצִים (“to mock”).

Compare the following:

[Job] 21:3 Bear with me, and I will speak, and after I have spoken, you mock on (לעג).

[Elihu] 34:7 What man is like Job, who drinks up mocking (לעג) like water.

---

108 The connection between 34:8 and Ps 1 has been often noted. E.g., Pope, *Job*, 256; Wilson, *Job*, 166; Alden, *Job*, 333; Clines, *Job 21-37*, 770.

109 Clines, *Job 21-37*, 770. The expression פֹעַלֵי occurs three times in Job. Once it is used by Job (31:3), and twice by Elihu (34:8, 22). Cf. 34:36 has קֹשֶׂי (“evil men”).
My friends are my mockers (מֵלִיץ).

What then does Elihu’s interchange of לֶעָג and לֵיצִים imply? First, he seems to take לֶעָג and לֵיצִים as synonyms, and “mocker” is thus probably the intended meaning of מֵלִיץ in 33:23 (and 16:20). Second, although Elihu evades the term לֵיצִים (“mockers”; Ps 1) in 34:7-8, the allusion to Psalm 1 coupled with his use of the synonym word לֶעָג (34:7) suggest that Elihu unknowingly signals the reader that he and the friends are actually the “mockers” depicted in Psalm 1.

After equating Job with the wicked (34:7-8), Elihu rebuts Job’s thesis in his presentation of the doctrine of retribution in 34:10-30(33). Job 34:10b-12 particularly encapsulates the gist of Elihu’s argument in 34:10-30(33).¹¹⁰

Far be it from God that he should do wickedness, and from the Almighty that he should do wrong. For according to the work of a man he will repay him, and according to his ways he will make it befall him. Of a truth, God will not do wickedly, and the Almighty will not pervert justice.

Does God pervert justice? Or does the Almighty pervert the right?

Employing an oath formula in 34:10b (“Far be it from . . .”), Elihu emphatically rejects Job’s thesis that God perverts justice.¹¹¹ God, maintains Elihu, treats man according to his work and repays him corresponding to his deeds. God, therefore, is incapable of doing anything wrong to man and so to Job. Elihu simply recapitulates the retributive doctrine expounded by the friends (e.g., 8:3),¹¹² and in doing so, he bluntly claims the impossibility of “a righteous man experiencing adversity.”¹¹³

One more discussion remains to advance. As Elihu develops his discourse, he

---


¹¹¹Clines, Job 21-37, 772–73.


¹¹³Estes, Job, 207. Also note the comparison by N. C. Habel (followed by S. M. Hooks) who finds that Elihu in 34:10-30(33) particularly responds to Job’s reply to Zophar in 12:13-25. Whereas Job in 12:13-25 questions divine justice by portraying God’s power and rule as unsettling, Elihu in 34:10-30(33) refutes Job’s charges by defending God’s just rule as displayed in the punishment of the wicked (e.g., those like Job). For detail, see Table A15 in Appendix 3.
first addresses to the three friends (vv. 2-9; 10-15), then Job (vv. 16-33), and then the three again (v. 34-37), as the following table demonstrates.\textsuperscript{114}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Key words and refrain</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Audience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vv. 2-9</td>
<td>v. 2: “Hear (שָמַע) my words, you wise men (חֲכֹמוֹנִים) and listen (הָשָׁאַרְתִּי) to me, you who know (יֹדְעִים).”</td>
<td>Summary of Job’s position / Accusation against Job as a sinner</td>
<td>The three friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vv. 10-15</td>
<td>v. 10 “Therefore, hear (שָמַע) me, you men of understanding (אֶנַשְׁתֵּי לְבָבוֹ)”</td>
<td>Defense of the retributive doctrine</td>
<td>The three friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vv. 16-33</td>
<td>v. 16 “If you have understanding, hear (שָמַע) this; listen (הָשָׁאַרְתִּי) to what I say.”</td>
<td>Defense of the retributive doctrine</td>
<td>Job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vv. 34-37</td>
<td>v. 34 “Men of understanding (אֶנַשְׁתֵּי לְבָבוֹ) will say to me, and the wise man (גְבֵרָה גֶּבֶר) who hears me will say.”</td>
<td>Condemnation of Job</td>
<td>The three friends</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 31. Elihu’s target audience in chapter 34.

Commentators, however, often find difficulty associating the audience of 34:2-15 and 34:34-37 with the three. J. E. Hartley, for example, comments,

The wise men (ḥāḵāmīm), namely, those who know (yōḏeʿīm), may be identified as either the three friends or the bystanders in general. Given Elihu’s attitude toward the comforters in his first speech (32:3, 11-16), it is doubtful that he is using these titles for them. More likely he is addressing the elders of the community.\textsuperscript{115}

As I have argued, however, Elihu’s attitude in chapter 32 is not discourteous but deferential. Moreover, the only people mentioned in the opening narrative (32:1-5) are

\textsuperscript{114}So Murphy, \textit{The Book of Job}, 80; Wilson, \textit{Job}, 381–94. Similarly, Carteret P. Carey, \textit{The Book of Job} (London: Wertheim, Macintosh, and Hunt, 1858), 359, 364; James Strahan, \textit{The Book of Job}, 2nd ed. (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1914), 285, 291. Cf. Clines, \textit{Job} 21-37, 764, 768, 783–84, takes vv. 2-15 as an address to the friends, but considers v. 34-37 as spoken to “right-thinking persons in general, beyond the intimate circle that is represented in the dialogues of the book.”

\textsuperscript{115}Hartley, \textit{The Book of Job}, 450, emphasis original. Similarly, Davidson, \textit{The Book of Job}, 233; Wilson, \textit{Job}, 165; Crenshaw, \textit{Reading Job}, 139, 141; Hooks, \textit{Job}, 382; Balentine, \textit{Job}, 566. Cf. Newsom, \textit{Job}, 575, holds the “wise men” and “men of understanding” as referring to “an imagery audience.”
Job and the three (e.g., 32:3, 5), and nowhere does Elihu claim someone to be wise except the three (32:9; cf. 34:34). If so, the addressees in 34:2-15 and 34:34-37 are evidently the friends.

Why then does Elihu, in contrast with chapters 32-33, start with an address to the friends? As G. H. Wilson rightly notes, Elihu seeks “to establish a common front against Job.” As discussed, Elihu in chapters 32-33 identifies himself with the friends’ spiritual ground (32:6-33:7) and their reliance of Eliphaz’s vision (33:8-33). Setting the stage, Elihu invites the friends to join the full attack, that is, a joint assault where the friends have left off. F. I. Andersen notes the harsher tone of chapter 34.

[Elihu] is no longer reasoning with Job with a view to helping him; he is attacking Job in order to score a point. For all their lucidity, his words are devoid of pastoral concern... Elihu’s theological axioms are pronounced with less adornment than any other speeches in the book. This gives them a cold, detached quality.

Andersen’s view is supported by the opening (vv. 2-9) and the closing unit (vv. 34-37) where the friends are invited to mock Job.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job 34:2-9 (Elihu)</th>
<th>Job 34:34-37 (Elihu)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>34:4</strong> Let us choose what is right; let us know among ourselves what is good.</td>
<td><strong>34:34</strong> Men of understanding will say to me, and the wise man who hears me will say:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>34:7</strong> “What man is like Job, who drinks up mocking (נעי) like water, who travels in company with evildoers (נשים ונשא) and walks with men of wicked (נשים)?”</td>
<td><strong>34:36</strong> “Would that Job were tried to the end, because he answers like evil men (נשים ונשא).”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>34:37</strong> For he adds rebellion (פשע) to his sin.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

117 Wilson, *Job*, 381.
Elihu, then, is not alone. Standing on the same demonic teaching and theology as they, Elihu continues the exhausted friends’ debate.

In sum, this discussion suggests that Elihu’s second speech (34:1-37) also hinges on Eliphaz’s vision. Against Job’s dilemma of his integrity versus divine justice, Elihu, like the three, applies the demonic teaching to brand Job as a sinner and to enshrine the doctrine of retribution. Elihu then says nothing different from the friends.

**Eliphaz’s Vision in Elihu’s Fourth Speech (Chs. 36-37)**

In his final speech, Elihu again alludes to Eliphaz’s vision in 36:10, 15 and uses it as a central premise in the development of his last argument. We noted that the vision appeared in the first speech (chs. 32-33), and this parallel occurrence in the first and the last speeches suggests the centrality of the vision in the Elihu episode.

Many understand chapters 36-37 as the conclusion of the Elihu speeches with a greater emphasis on the positive side of Elihu’s argument. Whereas chapters 33-35 “constitute the negative part or refutation of Job’s self-defense,” chapters 36-37—with no explicit quotation or refutation of Job’s earlier statement—contain “the positive part of [Elihu’s] persuasion on God’s behalf.”

More aspects apply, however. Elihu virtually reiterates his earlier argument on the vision’s message (as in 33:14-30) and the doctrine of retribution. Moreover, he deliberately imitates the content and structure of Eliphaz’s first speech in chapters 4-5. Major components of chapters 4-5 include (1) Eliphaz’s vision (4:12-21), (2) the fate of

---


both the righteous and the wicked (4:7-11; 5:1-16), (3) an exhortation to repent (5:17-26), and (4) a hymnic doxology (5:7-16). Strikingly, chapters 36-37 mark the only other occurrence among the speeches of the friends and Elihu that contains the same elements: (1) reference to the vision (36:10, 15), (2) the doctrine of the fate of the righteous and the wicked (36:5-9, 11-14), (3) an exhortation to repent (36:16-21), and (4) a hymnic doxology (36:22-37:22). Particularly, three times in the book the friends and Elihu introduce the hymnic doxology (5:8-16 [by Eliphaz]; 25:2-4 [by Bildad]; 36:22-37:22 [by Elihu]), and the doxology appears at the beginning and the ending of the friends’ dialogues (chs. 4-25) and in the ending of the Elihu speeches (chs. 36-37). Hence the three doxologies frame the speech cycles of the friends and Elihu, and Eliphaz’s (5:8-16) and Elihu’s doxologies (36:22-37:22) in particular bracket the whole of the speech cycles (chs. 4-27).

Figure 3. The structure of Job

Elihu’s final speech falls into two major sections: (1) reaffirmation of the

---

121 Besides the three doxologies by the friends and Elihu, all other doxologies are sung by Job (e.g., 9:5-10; 26:5-14).

The doctrine of retribution (36:1-21), and (2) hymnic doxology exalting God’s power and anticipating God’s appearance (36:22-37:24). The first main section (36:1-21) further divides into (1) introduction (vv. 2-4), (2) the doctrine of retribution (vv. 5-7), (3) Eliphaz’s vision (vv. 8-15), and (4) exhortation to repent (vv. 16-21).

Elihu begins his introductory words (vv. 2-4) by claiming special inspiration.

36:2 I have yet something to say on God’s behalf.
36:3 I get my knowledge from afar and ascribe righteousness to my Maker.
36:4 For truly my words are not false; one who is perfect in knowledge (תְּמִיםַדֵעוֹת) is with you.

The expression “perfect in knowledge (תְּמִיםַדֵעוֹת)” (36:4b), which also appears in 37:16b to describe God (“the wondrous works of him who is perfect in knowledge [תְּמִיםַדֵעִים]”), has created two different impressions for commentators. For many, the statement indicates that “Elihu’s presumption reached an apex”, for others, his message is directly from God. I think both views are valid and should be considered together.

Elihu here follows his earlier rhetoric pattern of first claiming inspiration (32:18; 33:4; 36:2-4) followed by introducing the vision (33:15-17, 19-21, 23-28; 36:10, 15).

Expressions such as “say on God’s behalf,” “get knowledge from afar,” “ascribe righteousness to Maker,” and “perfect in knowledge” (cf. 36:4b) signify that Elihu attributes his utterance to an inspirational source. On the other hand, by identifying his

123While a little agreement has been reached concerning the structure of chs. 36-37, I find that the two-fold structure by R. V. McCabe and others captures the main components of chs. 36-37. E.g., McCabe, “Elihu’s Contribution to the Thought of the Book of Job,” 60; McCabe, “The Significance of the Elihu Speeches in the Context of the Book of Job,” 175–224; Wilson, Job, 172; Garrett, Job, 74–75; Andersen, Job, 277–78; Newsom, Job, 583. For other suggested divisions, see Van der Lugt, Rhetorical Criticism and the Poetry of the Book of Job, 444–55; Clines, Job 21-37, 851–52; Fokkelman, Major Poems of the Hebrew Bible, vol. 4, Job 15-42, 252–70, 427–29; Murphy, Wisdom Literature, 40.


125Alden, Job, 348. Similarly, Strahan, The Book of Job, 299; Good, In Turns of Tempest, 331; McCabe, “Elihu’s Contribution to the Thought of the Book of Job,” 60; Whybray, Job, 151, even comments, “[The expression] is not only ludicrous, underlining Elihu’s egregious self-conceit, but also close to blasphemy.”

knowledge (36:4b) with the perfect knowledge of God (37:16b), he ironically subverts himself as a fool who stands as a theological foil to the wisdom lesson of chapter 28.\textsuperscript{127}

What follows is Elihu’s presentation of the doctrine of retribution in 36:5-7 which is analogous to that of Eliphaz in 4:6-11, 5:1-16. Although the Hebrew text of 36:5 is obscure, the point of 36:5-7 seems clear: “God judges the wicked and blesses the righteous.”\textsuperscript{128}

Table 33. Job 4:7, 5:11-15 and 36:5-7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job 36:5-7 (Elihu)</th>
<th>Job 4:7, 5:11-15 (Eliphaz)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36:5 Behold, God is mighty, and does not despise any;\textsuperscript{129} he is mighty in strength of understanding.</td>
<td>4:7 Who that was innocent ever perished? Or where were the upright cut off?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36:6 He does not keep the wicked alive, but gives the afflicted their right.</td>
<td>5:11 He sets on high those who are lowly, and those who mourn are lifted to safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36:7 He does not withdraw his eyes from the righteous . . .</td>
<td>5:12 He frustrates the devices of the crafty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5:15 But he saves the needy from the sword of their mouth.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


A: Job’s affliction (1–2)
B: Job curses the day of his birth (3)
C: The three cycles of debate (4–27)
D: The inaccessibility of wisdom (28)
C’: The three major speeches (29:1–42:6)
B’: Job intercedes for the three friends (42:7–9)
A’: Job’s prosperity (42:10–17)

\textsuperscript{128}McCabe, “Elihu’s Contribution to the Thought of the Book of Job,” 60; Longman, Job, 62–63; Newsom, Job, 585.

\textsuperscript{129}The MT יָשָׁר ("And he does not despise/reject") lacks an object and has been extensively debated. Cf. LXX ὁ κύριος оὐ μὴ ἀποκαταθητήσῃ τὸν ἁκακον ("The Lord will not reject the innocent"); Targum יָשָׁר לֹא יִפְשָׁט עָקָקָה ("He does not reject the righteous"); Peshitta יָשָׁר לֹא יִפְשָׁט עָקָק ("[He] does not reject the one who is pure as milk"); Vulgate Deus potentes non abicit ("God do not cast away the mighty"). For more discussions, see Clines, Job 21-37, 810–11; David A. Diewert, “Job 36:5 And the Root Mu’S II,” VT 39, no. 1 (1989): 71–77; Dhorme, A Commentary on the Book of Job, 539–40.
As often noted, the harsher tone of Elihu’s previous speeches (e.g., chs. 34-35) is softened here.\(^\text{130}\) The change is readily seen in 36:5-7 where Elihu, like Eliphaz in chapters 4-5, speaks on the fate of both the righteous (v. 7) and the wicked (v. 6).\(^\text{131}\) As discussed, Eliphaz’s first speech introduces both the positive and negative aspects of the retributive doctrine (positive: 4:6-7, 5:11,15-16, cf. 8:5-7; negative: 4:8-11, 5:2-7, 12-14), whereas in the second and the third speech cycles, the focus almost entirely shifts to the fate of the wicked (15:20-35; 18:5-21; 20:4-29, 22:15-20).\(^\text{132}\) Elihu, then, regresses to Eliphaz’s earlier tone, and by doing so he also assimilates the content of his argument to that of Eliphaz in chapters 4-5.

In 36:8-15, Elihu then reintroduces Eliphaz’s vision in a similar fashion as in the first speech (33:14-30). Though in 36:8-15 he uses a “kings (מְלֶכֶים)” imagery unattested in 33:14-30, the central thrust is the same: submit to the vision’s message and live (see Table 34 below)!

As in 33:15-16, Elihu in 36:10, 15b claims that God speaks to Job through Eliphaz’s vision (e.g., “He opens their ears to instruction”). As in 33:17, Elihu in 36:9, 10b states that the vision’s purpose is to allow Job to turn away from his arrogance and sin (e.g., “He commands that they return from iniquity”). As in 33:19, Elihu in 36:8, 15 asserts that Job’s affliction is God’s warning sign (e.g., “He delivers the afflicted by their affliction”). As in 33:25, 26b, 27, Elihu in 36:11 promises that Elihu will be fully restored if he submits to the vision’s authority and confesses his sin (e.g., “If they listen . . . their days in prosperity”). Finally, as in 33:18b, 22, Elihu in 36:12, 14 warns that Job will perish and die if he refuses to listen to the vision’s message (e.g., “If they do not listen . . .

\(^{\text{130}}\)E.g., Andersen, Job, 278; Clines, Job 21-37, 766.

\(^{\text{131}}\)J. L. Crenshaw, Reading Job, 143, notes that Elihu’s statement in vv. 5-7 contradicts his own words in earlier chapters: “For example, [God] does not despise (maʿas) [v. 5], although he has been described as clapping hands, in the sense of jeering, at the wicked (34:26), and he established kings permanently [v. 7], when elsewhere they are said to be overthrown at midnight (34:20).”

. they perish by the sword”).

Table 34. Eliphaz’s vision in 36:8-15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Job 33:14-30 (Elihu)</th>
<th>Job 36:8-15 (Elihu)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>God speaks to Job through Eliphaz’s vision</td>
<td>33:15 In a dream, in a vision of the night . . .</td>
<td>36:10 He opens their ears (אוזן) to instruction (מָשְׂרָה) and commands that they return from iniquity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33:16 He opens ( hatırl) the ears (אוזן) of men and seals them with instructions (מָשְׂרָה).</td>
<td>36:15b He opens (&gt;:&lt;/&gt;) their ear (אוזן) . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The vision’s purpose</td>
<td>33:17 That he may turn (ס(vc)) man aside from his deed and conceal pride from a man (מִינְשׂ).</td>
<td>36:9 Then he declares to them their work and their transgressions, that they are behaving arrogantly (זרז)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33:19 Man is also rebuked with pain on his bed and with continual strife in his bones.</td>
<td>36:10b He commands that they return (שוב) from iniquity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job’s pain is God’s warning sign</td>
<td></td>
<td>36:8 And if [kings] are bound in chains and caught in the cords of affliction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33:25 Let his flesh become fresh with youth; let him return to the days of his youthful vigor.</td>
<td>36:15 He delivers the afflicted by their affliction . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33:26b He sees [God’s] face with a shout of joy . . .</td>
<td>36:11 If they listen and serve him, they complete their days in prosperity, and their years in pleasantness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33:27 He sings before men . . .</td>
<td>36:12 But if they do not listen, they perish (ишיב) by the sword (shivat) and die without knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If Job submits to the vision . .</td>
<td>33:18b His life (חי) from perishing (שֵׁרָה) by the sword (shivat).</td>
<td>36:14 Their soul (נפש) die (מות) in youth, and their life (חי) ends among the cult prostitutes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33:22 His soul (נפש) . . . near the pit, and his life (חי) to those who bring death (מות).</td>
<td>36:13 If they do not listen, they perish (ishiv) by the sword (shivat) and die without knowledge.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A question, however, remains. In view of the identical themes, why does Elihu particularly employ a “kings (מלכים)” imagery in 36:8-15? Elihu in 33:14-30 uses the veiled term נָעַם (“man”; 33:17) to refer to Job, but 36:7b-15 has מלכים (“kings”).
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Table 35. “Kings imagery” in 36:8-15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job 36:7b-10 (Elihu)</th>
<th>Job 12:18 (Job)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36:7b With kings (מלך) on the throne he sets them forever, and they are exalted.</td>
<td>He looses the instruction/bond (מעורר) of kings (מלך) and binds (אסר) a waistcloth on their hips.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36:8 And if they are bound (ספט) in chains and caught in the cords of affliction,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36:10 He opens their ears to instruction (&gt;Show) and commands that they return from iniquity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job 29:25b (Job)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And I lived like a king (מלך) among his troops, like one who comforts mourners.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job 34:18-20 (Elihu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34:18 Who says to a king (מלך), ‘Worthless one,’ and to nobles, ‘Wicked man,’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34:20 In a moment they die . . . and the mighty are taken away by no human hand.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While מלכים in 36:7b is grammatically the antecedent of 36:8-15, an obscure reference to מלכים (36:7b) has baffled many commentators in connecting מלכים (36:7b) to 36:8-15. While some take מלכים literally as referring to anonymous kings, many others read it metaphorically as referring to general people who suffer.

I myself find that Elihu in 36:7b-15 sarcastically plays on Job’s statement in 12:8: (1) The three terms מורים ("instruction/bond"), מלכים ("kings"), and אסר ("to bind") all occur both in 12:18 and 36:7b-10. (2) Elihu in chapter 34 makes a number of counter arguments against Job’s words in chapter 12. In 12:18, Job challenges divine justice with the idea that God creates social disorder by undeservedly vanquishing kings (מלך). In 34:18-20, Elihu replies that God justly governs the kings (מלך) by properly

---

133E.g., Balentine, Job, 601; Dhorme, A Commentary on the Book of Job, 540–41.


135See n113 of this chapter.

136Garrett, Job, 32–33; Clines, Job 21-37, 300; Hooks, Job, 181–82.
punishing them for their guilt. Elihu seems to carry this refutation of 12:18 into 36:7b-15 by declaring that the kings are rightly overthrown and bound in chains because of their sin. Elihu’s “kings” imagery, then, is a metaphor that Elihu borrows from Job (12:18) to directly rebut Job’s claim of innocence.

After reiterating Eliphaz’s vision (36:8-15) and exhorting Job to repent (36:16-21), Elihu utters a long hymnic doxology in 36:22-37:24. Commentators often note a radical shift of tone here. Unlike the previous context where Elihu condemned Job and defended the doctrine of retribution, Elihu seems to focus here on extolling God’s greatness and splendor, and he even invites Job to do the same. L. Wilson comments on 36:22-37:24,

[Elihu] does not confine himself to the concept of retributive justice, but also explores how God orders and governs the universe. What is presupposed in these nature passages is a theological principle that will be crucial for understanding the Yahweh speeches: that observations from the natural world can lead to conclusions about God’s moral order. As in the natural world, God’s governing of the moral world is broadened far beyond a narrow understanding of retributive justice. Wilson’s positive reading, however, seems to misrepresent 36:22-37:24. More likely, Elihu’s doxology replicates Eliphaz’s doxology from 5:9-16, which expounds the doctrine of retribution. The similarities between the two doxologies are striking (see Table 36 below). Within the book, the concentration of the terms עֹש ה (“to do”), גְדֹלוֹת (“great things”), חֵק ר (“searching”), נִפְל אוֹת (“marvelous things”) and מִסְפ ר (“number”) is exclusive to 5:9 (Eliphaz’s doxology), 9:10 (Job’s doxology), and 36:26, 37:5, 14, 16 (Elihu’s doxology).

---

137 Habel, The Book of Job, 478.


140 Wilson, *Job*, 176.
Table 36. Comparison of doxologies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job 36:26, 37:5, 14, 16 (Elihu)</th>
<th>Job 5:9 (Eliphaz)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behold, God is great, and we know him not; the number (מִסְפְּר) of his years is unsearchable (חֵק ר).</td>
<td>Who does (湎ָשֶׂר) great things (מלָדוּת) and not searchable (חֵק ר), marvelous things (מלָדוּות) without number (מסֵפְר).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God thunders wondrously (נִפְל אוֹת) with his voice; he does (湎ָשֶׂר) great things (מלָדוּת) that we cannot comprehend.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hear this, O Job; stop and consider the wondrous works (מלָדוּות) of God.</td>
<td>Who does (湎ָשֶׂר) great things (מלָדוּת) beyond searching out (חֵק ר), and marvelous things (מלָדוּות) beyond number (מסֵפְר).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you know the balancings of the clouds, the wondrous works (מלָדוּות) of him . . .</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The doxologies of Eliphaz (5:9-16) and Elihu (36:22-37:24) are further distinguished from that of Job (9:5-10) with their shared weather terminology such as מִסְפְּר ("rain") and מִים ("water").

[Eliphaz] 5:10 He gives rain (רְנָן) on the earth and sends waters (מִים) on the fields.

[Elihu] 36:27 For he draws up the drops of water (מִים;) they distill his mist in rain (רְנָן), which the skies pour down and drop on mankind abundantly.

Moreover, the form and themes of 5:9-16 and 36:22-37:24 are almost identical (see Table 37 below). Both doxologies begin with an opening statement praising God’s incomprehensible greatness (5:9; 36:26) and his provision of rain (5:10; 36:27). What follows is the doctrine of retribution formed in a chiastic structure (A-B-A’) in 5:10-16 and in 36:29-33. While both structures convey the same message (God punishes and blesses), the emphasis is slightly different. Whereas 5:10-16 stresses the positive side of the doctrine (positive: vv. 11, 15-16a; negative: vv. 12-14, 16b), 36:29-33 emphasizes the negative side (positive: v. 31b, negative: vv. 29-31a, 32-33). As we shall see, Elihu deliberately employs the destructive image of thunder and lightning in 36:29-30, 32-33 to emphasize God’s judgement on the wicked. Elihu, then, mimics the theme and structure of Eliphaz’s doxology in 5:9-16 with a greater focus on the fate of the wicked.
### Table 37. Job 5:9-16 and 36:26-33

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Job 5:9-16 (Eliphaz)</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Job 36:26-33 (Elihu)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opening</td>
<td>5:9 Who does great things and unsearchable, marvelous things without number.</td>
<td>Opening</td>
<td>36:26 God is great, and we know him not; the number of his years is unsearchable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God sends rain</td>
<td>5:10 He gives rain on the earth and sends waters on the fields.</td>
<td>God sends rain</td>
<td>36:27 For he draws up the drops of water . . . in rain, 36:28 which the skies pour down . . . on mankind abundantly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A (God blesses)</td>
<td>5:11 He sets on high those who are lowly, and those who mourn are lifted to safety.</td>
<td>A (God punishes)</td>
<td>36:29 Can anyone understand . . . the thunderings of his pavilion? 36:30 He scatters his lightning about him . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (God punishes)</td>
<td>5:12 He frustrates the devices of the crafty. 5:13 He catches the wise in their own craftiness. 5:14 They meet with darkness in the daytime.</td>
<td>B (God punishes +blesses)</td>
<td>36:31 For by these he judges peoples; he gives food in abundance.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A’ (God blesses)</td>
<td>5:15 He saves the needy from the sword . . . from the hand of the mighty. 5:16 The poor have hope, and injustice shuts her mouth.</td>
<td>A’ (God punishes)</td>
<td>36:32 He covers his hands with the lightning and commands it to strike the mark. 36:33 Its crashing declares his presence; he is jealous with anger against iniquity (NRSV).142</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Elihu expands his retribution theology by alluding to Psalm 18.143

---

141For interpretive issues in 36:31b, see Clines, Job 21-37, 828–29.

142MT reads נ הַא ףַע ל־עוֹל ה מִקְַ (”the cattle also [declare] that he rises”; ESV). NRSV, on the other hand, renders, “he is jealous (מ קְנִיא) with anger against iniquity (ע וְל ה”). On the textual issue of 36:33b, see ibid., 833–35.

143In a passing comment, C. Frevel notes the connection between Ps 18 and Job 36-37. Christian Frevel, “Telling the Secrets of Wisdom: The Use of Psalm 104 in the Book of Job,” in Reading Job Intertextually, ed. K. J. Dell and W. L. Kynes, LHBOTS 574 (New York: Bloomsbury, 2013), 163n21.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job 36:22-37:24 (Elihu)</th>
<th>Psalm 18:7[6], 14[13], 15[14]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36:19 Will your <em>cry for help</em> (שוע) avail to keep you from <em>distress</em> (צר), or all the force of your <em>strength</em>?</td>
<td>18:7[6] In my <em>distress</em> (צור) I called upon the Lord; to my God I <em>cried for help</em> (שוע), . . . He <em>heard</em> (שמע), and my <em>cry for help</em> (שוע) upon him reached his ears.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36:32 He covers his hands with the <em>lightning</em> (אור) and commands it to strike the mark.</td>
<td>18:14[13] The Lord also <em>thundered</em> (רעם) in the heavens, and the Most High uttered his <em>voice</em> (קול), hailstones and coals of fire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37:2 Keep <em>listening</em> (שמע + שמע) to the <em>thunder</em> of his <em>voice</em> (קול כה) and the rumbing that comes from his mouth.</td>
<td>18:15[14] And he sent out his <em>arrows</em> (חץ) and scattered them; he flashed forth <em>lightnings</em> (בְּרָק) . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37:3 Under the whole heaven he lets it go, and his <em>lightning</em> (אור) to the corners of the earth.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37:4 After it his <em>voice</em> (קול) roars; he <em>thunders</em> (רעם) with his majestic <em>voice</em> (קול כה), and he does not restrain them when his <em>voice</em> (קול) is <em>heard</em> (שמע).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Psalm 18, the psalmist, in his distress (צור) against his enemies, calls upon God for help (שוע). In response, God hears (שמע) his voice (קול) from heaven and comes with saving action. God executes judgement upon his enemies (vv. 8-16[7-15]), accompanied by thunder (רעם; “representing the divine voice”; v. 14[13])\(^\text{144}\) and lightening (ורה, בּּרָק; v. 15[14]). Exalting God’s deliverance and judgment, the psalmist confesses his integrity, which allowed God’s favor (vv. 21-22[20-21]).

\(^{18:21}[20]\) The Lord dealt with me according to my righteousness; according to the *cleanness* of my hands he rewarded me.\(^{18:22}[21]\) For I have kept the ways of the Lord, and have not wickedly departed from my God.\(^{145}\)

---


\(^{145}\)W. A. VanGemeren, *Psalms*, in vol. 5 of *EBC*, eds. Frank E. Gaebelein et al. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1991), 168, notes the structure of Ps 18 as follows. The psalmist’s confession of his faithfulness (vv. 21-30[20-29]) centers the psalm.

A. Yahweh, the Rock of Israel (vv. 1-4[1-3])

B. Affliction (vv. 5-7[4-6])

C. The Lord’s Coming to Help (vv. 8-16[7-15])

D. The Lord’s Deliverance (vv. 17-20[16-19])

E. God’s Faithfulness to the Faithful (vv. 21-30[20-29])

D’. The Divine Perfections (vv. 31-37[30-36])
In contrast, Elihu tells Job that his cry for help (שוע) to God is of no avail (36:19).

Borrowing the judgment imagery of Psalm 18, Elihu asserts that God’s response to Job is only thunder (רעם; 37:2-4) and lightning (אור; 36:32, 37:3), meaning that God regards him as an enemy/sinner. Whereas God heard (שמע) the voice (קול) of the psalmist (Ps 18:21[20]), Job is only told to hear (שמע) God’s thunderous voice (קול) (37:2-4), God’s warning that requires Job to repent of his unrighteousness (37:2). 146

After his intense discussion of God’s control of inclement weather forces like thunder and lightning (37:1-12), 147 Elihu in 37:13 recapitulates his point by quoting the term חסד (“faithful”) from Psalm 18:26[25], 51[50]. 148

Job 37:13 Whether for punishment or for his land or for hesed (חסד), he causes it to happen.

Psalm 18:25[24] With the faithful (חסד) you show yourself faithful (חסד); with the blameless man you show yourself blameless.

Psalm 18:51[50] Great salvation he brings to his king, and is faithful (חסד) to his anointed, to David and his offspring forever.

Elihu claims here that God’s use of thunder and lightning is either for punishment (ש وسلم; cf. 21:9)149 or for his land (36:28, 36:31b) or for hesed. The implied meaning is clear. For

146 The judgmental imagery of Ps 18:8-16[7-15] is also found in many other parts of Elihu’s doxology. E.g., מים (“water”; Job 36:27; 37:10 / Ps 18:12[11], 16[15], 17[16]), ענן (“cloud”; Job 36:28; 37:18, 21 / Ps 18:12[11]), צור (“cloud”; Job 36:29; 37:11, 16 / Ps 18:12[11], 13[12]), סוכת (“pavilion”; Job 36:29 / Ps 18:12[11]), בר (“lightning”; Job 36:30, 32; 37:3, 11, 15, 21[?] / Ps 18:15[14] “He sent out his arrows [יחים] and scattered them; he flashed forth lightnings [ברקע] and routed them”), יצ (“raging”; Job 37:2 / Ps 18:8[7] בחר), קול (“voice”; Job 37:2, 4, 5 / Ps 18:7[6], 14[13]),ccion (“his mouth”; Job 37:2 / Ps 18:9[8]), שמש (“heaven”; Job 37:3 / Ps 18:10[9], 14[13]), ברקע (“to thunder”; Job 37:4, 5 / Ps 18:14[13]), ברקע (“to hear”; Job 37:2, 4 / Ps 18:7[6]), ברקע (“breath”; Job 37:10 / Ps 18:16[15]), and Job 36:30b “He covers the roots of the sea (ים) / Ps 18:16a[15a] “Then the channels of the water (מים) were seen, and the foundations of the world were laid bare at your rebuke.” For detail, see Table A16 in Appendix 3.


148 The word יאָד also occurs in Job 6:14 (“He who withholds hesed [חסד] from a friend forsakes the fear of the Almighty [spoken by Job"]”) and 10:12 (“You have granted me life and hesed [חסד], and your care has preserved my spirit” [spoken by Job]).

149 Hooks, Job, 413–14.
the righteous like the psalmist of Psalm 18, they are for deliverance; for the wicked like Job, they are for judgement and warning. The allusion to Psalm 18, therefore, effectively sets Job as a sinner and bolsters Elihu’s defense of the doctrine of retribution.

Elihu’s concluding statement further confirms this understanding.

Table 39. Elihu’s last statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job 37:23 (Elihu)</th>
<th>Job 8:3 (Bildad)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Almighty (שֶׁבַע) — we cannot find him (נמציא) he is great (גדול) in power (قدرة) and abundant righteousness (צדק) he will not violate (יָכַר).</td>
<td>Does God pervert (עתה) justice (צדק)? Or does the Almighty (שֶׁבַע) pervert (עתה) the right (צדקה)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job 34:12 (Elihu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Of a truth . . . the Almighty (שֶׁבַע) will not pervert (עתה) justice (צדק).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job 23:3-7 (Job)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23:3 Oh, that I knew where I might find him (נמציא). . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23:4 I would lay my case before him and fill my mouth with arguments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23:6 Would he contend with me in the greatness (רֹב) of his power (قدرة)? No; he would pay attention to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23:7 There an upright man could argue with him, and I would be acquitted forever by my judge.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In his final statement (37:23-24), Elihu alludes to 8:3 (Bildad), 34:12 (himself), and 23:3-7 (Job). Elihu first refutes Job’s desire to face God (23:3-7) by asserting that God, who is great in power, is beyond Job’s reach (37:23). He then reaffirms his and the friends’ theology of retribution claiming that God can never violate justice. This summary statement, then, suggests that the goal of his doxology is to defend the retributive model of divine justice, again reflecting his limited knowledge of God’s

---

150 J. L. Crenshaw, Reading Job, 144–45, remarks, “32:26-37:13, focuses almost entirely on El’s greatness, particularly his splendor as manifest in storms. Against this terrifying display of power, Job’s desire to confront El at the count of justice is shown to be ludicrous. That is the brunt of Elihu’s description of El’s activity in nature.” Similarly, Hooks, Job, 407.
governance of the world. Elihu is thus nothing but a theological foil to chapter 28.\textsuperscript{151} With all of Elihu’s arrogance and folly, one cannot but wait for God to intervene and rebuke him. And rightly so—God speaks to Elihu in 38:2: “Who is this that darkens counsel by words without knowledge?”\textsuperscript{152}

Conclusion

The discussion of the Elihu speeches suggests the centrality of Eliphaz’s vision in the development of Elihu’s arguments. Elihu begins his discourse by refuting Job’s skepticism about the origin of the vision’s message (26:4, 27:3-4), asserting that the friends and he possess the true message that originates from divine inspiration (32:6-9, 32:18-22, 33:2-4). He then progresses to reintroduce Eliphaz’s vision in his first and last speeches (33:15-17, 19-21, 23-28; 36:10, 15), and this parallel occurrence not only encloses the speeches as a whole but also functions as the foundational premise for Elihu’s counsel to Job. Like the friends in the dialogues, Elihu leverages Eliphaz’s vision to condemn Job as a sinner (e.g., 34:7) and to bolster the doctrine of retribution. While some claim that Elihu presents a unique theological outlook that is different from that of the friends, this study demonstrates that Elihu’s argument is virtually a resurgence of that of the friends. He, like the three, serves as a foil to the wisdom teaching of chapter 28.

\textsuperscript{151}Garrett, “Job,” 49, comments, “Read in the light of Job 28, Elihu’s speech is the last attempt to discover a wisdom that no human enquiry can obtain. Like the three, Elihu’s fundamental flaw is that instead of fearing God and turning from evil—that is, instead of a simple trust in God in the face of a theological conundrum—he trusts in his theology and in his ability to reason it all out. He is confident that he can resolve satisfactorily the problem of evil and so avoid a cataclysmic undoing of traditional wisdom. But he cannot do it, and he only gives us a rambling rehash of the polemics of the three.”

CHAPTER 5
IMPLICATIONS FOR UNDERSTANDING
THE BOOK OF JOB

Satan’s prominent role in the book as the one who stirred up the crisis and the accusations against Job contributes to further defining Job’s personality and the book’s genre. This chapter focuses on two issues: Job’s character and the governing genre of the book. In the first section, I will challenge the prevailing interpretation that sees two incompatible Jobs in the book, namely the patient Job of the prose tale and the rebellious Job of the poetry, and suggest that the patient Job dominates the whole book.¹ In the second section, I will propose—following recent studies on Job’s genre by D. A. Garrett and T. J. Johnson—a reading of Job as apocalyptic wisdom literature.² To support my case, I will argue that God’s speech on Leviathan (40:25-41:26 [41:1-34]) is best read as God’s announcement of judgement on Satan.³ The chapter concludes that the book of Job is about a righteous sufferer whose apocalyptic ending meets God’s intervention and restoration.


Job as a Righteous Sufferer

As surveyed in Chapter 1, many find difficulty in reconciling the portrayal of the Job of the prose (chs. 1-2 and 42:7-17) with that of the poetry (3:1-42:6). J. Allen’s statement in his article on the history of Job’s interpretation captures well the struggle of most modern commentators:

The interpreter of the biblical text must decide which Job trumps the other. Either the claims concerning Job’s righteousness found in the narrative structure of the book are emphasized and Job’s apparent blasphemies are explained away or Job’s impious self-defense found in the poetic body of the text bears interpretive weight so that, in spite of what the frame narrative appears to say, Job has been a sinner all along. . . . Although the more pious Job ignited the interpretive imagination more often than not, examples abound, especially among those who interpreted the original Hebrew, that portray the darker side of Job.4

The early interpreters, however, understood the book differently. “A more positive view” of Job—Job the “patient and steadfast”—predominates in biblical accounts (Ezek 14:14, 20; Jas 5:11),5 Second Temple Jewish writings, Rabbinic literature, and patristic and medieval Christian interpretations.6 On the other hand, a negative appraisal of Job began to proliferate with the rise of historical criticism and still pervades many recent works on Job.7 How then should the poetry of Job be interpreted? Obviously the Job of the poetry is no longer the submissive, passive Job of the prologue (1:12, 2:10). Does Job then

---


7Dell, The Book of Job as Sceptical Literature, 5–56.
depart from his earlier piety?

Some hold that Job renounces his integrity by cursing his day of birth (ch. 3).8 D. A. Robertson goes even further, insisting that Job curses God in chapter 3, as predicted by Satan (1:11; 2:15).9 Such views, however, miss the point. Job does not curse God nor border on blasphemy here. Instead, he expresses his immense grief and despair by cursing the day of his birth.10 Comparative studies reveal that the language of cursing one’s birth might reflect a common literary convention of the ancient Near East,11 as also witnessed in Jeremiah 20:14-18.12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Job 3:1-13</th>
<th>Jeremiah 20:14-18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cursing the day of birth</td>
<td>3:3a Let the day perish on which I was born.</td>
<td>20:14a Cursed be the day on which I was born!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3:8a Let those curse it who curse the day.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Announcing a child’s birth</td>
<td>3:3b And the night that said, “A man is conceived.”</td>
<td>20:15 Cursed be the man who brought the news . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“A son is born to you”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blocking of the womb</td>
<td>3:10a Because it did not shut the doors of my mother’s womb.</td>
<td>20:17 Because he did not kill me in the womb; so</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3:11 Why did I not die at birth, come out from the womb and expire?</td>
<td>my mother would have been my grave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born to see “trouble”</td>
<td>3:10b It did not hide trouble (ע מ ל) from my eyes.</td>
<td>20:18 Why did I come out from the womb to see trouble (ע מ ל)?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In the immediate context of Jeremiah 20:14-18, Pashhur, a priest, publicly humiliates Jeremiah by flogging and incarcerating him (20:2) for sounding God’s warning of impending judgment (ch. 19). Facing unprecedented violence and the burden of standing as a solitary voice against Judah’s false priests and prophets (cf. the prophet Micaiah [1 Kgs 22]), Jeremiah, like Job, plummets into complete despair and curses his birth (20:14-18).

Although many agree that 20:14-18 reflects the “lowest point in the suffering of Jeremiah,” the passage has occasioned many different comments (e.g., the passage is a reflection of “the divine pathos,” a legitimate lament, “a blast of unreasoned anger,” a blasphemy, or nearly a profaning). The latter views, however, seem incorrect, for such a negative reading often stems from failing to see the larger literary context, particularly the A-B-A’ chiastic structure of 20:7-18. Many regard Jeremiah 20:7-18 as comprising either two (vv. 7-13, 14-18 [e.g., Clements, Holladay]) or three units (vv. 7-9, 10-13, 14-18 [e.g., McKane] or vv. 7-10, 11-13, 14-18 [e.g., Lundbom]),
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17 Charles L. Feinberg, Jeremiah, in vol.6 of EBC, eds. Frank E. Gaebelein et al. (Zondervan, 1986), 504.
and 20:14-18 in particular have been taken as a disparate self-contained unit. The common denial of 20:14-18 as “the direct continuation of the preceding verses” is that “such an outburst of despair could not follow the expression of confidence” in 20:11-13. Some critics, therefore, even consider Jeremiah’s confession of trust (vv. 11-13) misplaced and treat all or a part of 20:11-13 as secondary (e.g., v. 12 [Hyatt, Rudolph], v. 13 [Lewin, Holladay], vv. 12-13 [Duhm], or vv. 11-13 [Cornill]).

More recent studies, however, attempt to read 20:7-18 in its entirety. Coupled with the passage’s resemblance to the content and form of lament psalms, I further propose a chiasmus structure for 20:7-18 (A [vv. 7-10]–B [vv. 11-13]–Aʹ [vv. 14-18]) which has B (vv. 11-13; Jeremiah’s confession of faith/trust) as the center of the structure.

21See the survey in Craigie, Jeremiah 1-25, 270.


23Craigie, Jeremiah 1-25, 270.


25E.g., (1) Address to God (v. 7), (2) lament (vv. 7-10), (3) confession of trust (vv. 11-12), (4) petition (v. 12), and (5) praise (v. 13). Clines and Gunn, “Form, Occasion and Redaction in Jeremiah 20,” 392–93. See also Janzen, “Jeremiah 20:7-18,” 178–79.

Table 41. A chiastic structure of Jeremiah 20:7-18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Jeremiah 20:7-18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Lament (vv. 7-10)</td>
<td>20:7 O Lord, you have persuaded (פתה) me, and I was persuaded (פתה). I have become a laughing stock all (כֹל) the day (יוֹם); everyone (כֹל) mocks me. 20:8 For the word of the Lord has become for me a reproach and derision all (כֹל) day (יוֹם) long . . . . 20:10 For I hear many whispering. Terror is on every side! “Denounce him! Let us denounce him!” say all (כֹל) my close friends, watching for my fall. “Perhaps he will be persuaded (פתה); then we can prevail (יכל) him and take our revenge on him.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Confession of faith/trust (vv. 11-13)</td>
<td>20:11 But the Lord (יהוה) is with me as a dread warrior; therefore my persecutors will stumble; they will not overcome me . . . 20:12 O Lord (יהוה) of hosts . . . let me see your vengeance upon them, for to you have I committed my cause. 20:13 Sing to the Lord (יהוה); praise the Lord (יהוה)! For he has delivered the life of the needy from the hand of evildoers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A’</td>
<td>Lament/curse (vv. 14-18)</td>
<td>20:14 Cursed be the day (יוֹם) on which I was born! The day (יוֹם) when my mother bore me, let it not be blessed! . . . 20:18 Why did I come out from the womb to see toil and sorrow, and spend my days (יוֹם) in shame?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first unit (vv. 7-10 [A])—enclosed by the repetition פָתַה (“to persuade”), פִּלַּל (“to prevail”), and כֹּל (“all”) (vv. 7, 10)—depicts Jeremiah’s inner pain. Although God’s prevailing (יכל) call persuaded (פתה) him into the prophetic office (v. 7), he is now ridiculed and harassed by all (כֹּל) people of the land who only attempt to persuade (פתה) and prevail (יכל) against him (v. 10). His deepest agony is again carried to the parallel

---
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lament of the third unit (vv. 14-18 [A']).

Surrounded by the key term יָום ("day"), the third unit (vv. 14-18) expresses Jeremiah’s wish that the day יָום of his birth did not exist (v. 14), for his current days יָום are filled with shame (v. 18). The term יָום, which only occurs in vv. 7, 8, 14, 18 in chapter 20, not only brackets the third unit (vv. 14-18) as an inclusio, but also encloses all of the units of chapter 20 (vv. 7-18), setting the theme of vv. 7-18 to say that mocking (v. 7), derision (v. 8), and shame (v. 18) characterize Jeremiah’s present days יָום.

Jeremiah, however, does not end as a bitter lamenter, as many assume. Just like in the lament psalms, Jeremiah’s trust in God glimmers in the depth of his cry (vv. 11-13). With the repetition of יהוה ("the Lord"), the second unit (vv. 11-13 [B]) emphasizes Jeremiah’s faith in God’s vengeance and deliverance. In this literary frame (vv. 7-18), Jeremiah’s cursing of his day (vv. 14-18) then is not an accusation against God, but an expression of despair conveyed in the language of the psalmist.

Though Job’s confession of faith/trust in God does not immediately follow after his cursing of his birth (ch. 3), examples abound in his later speeches (e.g., 13:15a, “Though he slay me, I will hope in him”;

32 Following the qere (??) rather than the kethiv (ָד). Some, however, reject to see 13:15a as Job’s statement of faith. E.g., NRSV ("See, he will kill me; I have no hope"); Whybray, Job, 75; Gault, “Job’s Hope: Redeemer or Retribution?,” 151–53; Seow, Job 1-21, 646.
behold God . . . not [as] a stranger”;\textsuperscript{33} and 23:3-7, “I would lay my case before him and fill my mouth with arguments. . . . he would pay attention to me. . . . and I would be acquitted forever by my judge”). Even in his dark lament found in 16:1-17:16, Job never loses his faith in God, as the following chiastic structure by D. A. Garrett demonstrates:

A Speech of the three and speech of Job (16:1-6)
B God and men against Job; people mock him (16:7-14)
   C Job in lamentation (16:15-17)
   D Confession of faith (16:18-21)
   C’ Job ready to die (16:22-17:1)
B’ Mockers; God and men against Job; righteous men appalled (17:2-9)
A’ Speech of the three and speech of Job (17:10-16)\textsuperscript{34}

The reader must remember “the fundamental issue of the book”: “if Job can be broken” and “driven to repudiate God,” then Satan wins the wager (1:8-12; 2:3-6).\textsuperscript{35} Job, however, never renounces his faithfulness during the debate. As Garrett explains, Job begins with deep despair (ch. 3), yet progresses onto the pilgrim’s journey of faith. On this path, he offers many prayers and constantly hopes in an eschatological vindication (16:19, 21; 19:25-27). He also “fearlessly” searches for the meaning of his suffering and for a solution to the problem of evil (chs. 21, 24), and finally rejects the vision’s false message (26:4; 27:3-4), yearning to be met by God for a fair hearing (ch. 31).\textsuperscript{36}

The crescendo of Job’s fidelity is seen in his oath statements (27:2-6; ch. 31) where Job, after challenging the vision’s authority (26:4), makes a final appeal to God. 27:2-6 reads,

\textsuperscript{27}2 As God lives, who has taken away my right, and the Almighty, who has made


\textsuperscript{34}Garrett, “Job,” 22.

\textsuperscript{35}Ibid., 10–11.

\textsuperscript{36}The friends, on the other hand, start with a gentle rebuke of Job (chs. 4-5), but, consumed by Satan’s doctrine of mistrust, end with a bitter condemnation and assault of Job (chs. 22, 25). Ibid., 20–29, 35–36.
my soul bitter, as long as my breath is in me, and the Spirit of God is in my nostrils, my lips will not speak falsehood, and my tongue will not utter deceit. . . . I hold fast my righteousness and will not let it go; my heart does not reproach me for any of my days.

The reader recognizes that Job’s words are true. He states that God made his soul bitter, not knowing that his struggles are crises of Satan’s making. He honestly claims that he will not utter any falsehood, which also reminds the reader of his virtue described in 1:1, 8 and 2:3 (“blameless,” “upright,” “shunning evil”; cf. 28:28; ch. 31). Moreover, he professes that God’s Spirit is within him (27:3), a confession of “the existential bond between” God and himself that allows the reader to even see “a divine light which shines within his clear conscience.”

Thematic and verbal connections to Psalms 22 and 23 further corroborate this favorable reading. As discussed, a number of allusive links exist between the Psalms (e.g., Pss 1, 8, 14, 18, 53) and the speeches of the friends, Elihu, and Job. Several studies indicate that the language and the themes of Psalms 22 and 23 are also attested in Job. A. Wharton, for example, comments on Psalm 22 and Job:

The Hebrew text of Psalm 22 offers a striking instance of an innocent, Joblike sufferer for whom God’s answer constitutes a complete vindication of the sufferer’s cause. Like Job, the psalmist has been unaccountably abandoned by God, subjected to torment not only by physical suffering but by mockery and accusation of “evildoers” (v. 16; see vv. 6-8; 12-18). Like Job, the psalmist has cried out repeatedly to God, receiving no answer (v. 2). Like Job, the psalmist finds this state of affairs incomprehensible, since he remembers times past in which those who trusted God were not “put to shame” (vv. 3-5; see Job 29). Like Job, the psalmist is also puzzled by the mystery that this suffering should happen to one whose birth and nurture have indicated God’s intention for his well-being (Psalm 22:9-10; see Job


W. Kynes notes many intertextual links between Psalm 22 and Job: 40 (1) The psalmist “wonders how God could forsake him when he has been cast upon God ‘from birth’ (מֵר חֵם) and ‘from the womb’ (מִבֵּטְן)” (Ps 22:11[10]). Job, in cursing his birth, “rejects the life God has given him altogether” (“Why did I not die from birth [מֵר חֵם], come out from the womb [מִבֵּטְן] and expire?” [Job 3:11]). 41 (2) Both the psalmist and Job “describe their suffering with similar corporal hyperbole” (“I am poured out [שָפֶך] like water, and all my bones [שָפֶךְ] are out of joint” [Ps 22:15[14]; “And now my [=Job] soul is poured out [שָפֶךְ] within me . . . the night racks my bones [שָפֶךְ]” [Job 30:16-17]). 42 (3) The advice of the psalmist’s enemies (“Commit your cause to the Lord; let him rescue––let him deliver [נְצָל] the one in whom he delights!” [Ps 22:9[8]) echoes that of Eliphaz (“Despise not the instruction of the Almighty. . . . He will deliver [נְצָל] you from six troubles” [Job 5:17-19]). 43 (4) The psalmist’s enemies mock him and shake their heads (“All who see me mock [לעג] me; they make mouths at me; they shake their heads [לעג]” [Ps 22:8[7]). Job’s friends likewise mock him (“Bear with me, and I [=Job] will speak, and . . . you mock on [לעג]” [Job 21:3]; “What man is like Job, who drinks up mocking [לעג] like water” [Job 34:7]; cf. פֶּלְצֶּר [“mocker”; 16:20, 33:23]). 44 Job also uses the expression “to shake one’s head” to describe the friends’ mockery (“I [=Job] also could speak as you do,” Ps 22:8[7]).

40 Kynes cites the works of various scholars to support his argument. For all the reference information, see Will Kynes, “Lament Personified: Job in the Bedeutungsnetz of Psalm 22,” in Spiritual Complaint: The Theology and Practice of Lament, ed. Miriam J. Bier and Tim Bulkeley (Cambridge, UK: James Clarke & Co, 2014), 40–46.

41 Ibid., 43.

42 Ibid.

43 Ibid. Kynes points out that such mocking advice is rare “among the individual lament psalms” (cf. Ps 35:21; 42:3, 10 [“Where is your God?”]). Note also that the psalmist “takes up the words יהוה and נקַל from the mockers and repeats them with new meaning” in Ps 22:20-21[19-20]: “But you, O Lord (יהוה) . . . come quickly to my aid! Deliver (נְצָל) my soul from the sword.” Ibid., 44.

44 The observation is my own.
if you were in my place; I could join words together against you and *shake my head at you* [Job 16:4]). The taunt of the psalmist’s enemies continues in Ps 22:14[13] (“They open wide their mouths at me [like a ravening and roaring lion”) in which Job, “in several verses later” says, “They have gaped at me with their mouth” (Job 16:10a). (5) The psalmist uses “lion imagery” to depict the enemies’ mocking (“They open wide their mouths at me, like a ravening [pain] and roaring [roaring] lion [Ps 22:14[13]], and Eliphaz likewise employs the same imagery to implicitly condemn Job (“The roar [of the lion] . . . the teeth of the young lions are broken. The strong lion perishes for lack of prey [Job 4:10-11]). (6) The psalmist calls himself “a worm (נִיע הַעֲלֵיכָם), not a man, a reproach of men, and a despised of the people” (Ps 22:7[6]), and Bildad also accuses Job as a worm (“How much less man, who is a maggot . . . who is a worm [Job 25:6]). (7) Both the psalmist and Job “long for God to ‘answer’ (una) them (Ps 22:3[2]; Job 30:20, 31:35) and when God finally responds (עה), it marks “the turning point” (Ps 22:22c[21c]; Job 38:1).

---

46Ibid.
47Ibid.

I. Lament (vv. 2-22b[1-21b]):
1. Forsaken by God and mankind (vv. 2-11[1-10])
2. Prayer for help (v. 12[11])
3. Surrounded by trouble (vv. 13-19[12-18])
4. Prayer for deliverance (vv. 20-22b[19-21b])
II. Response (v. 22c[21c]): [You answered me!]
III. Thanksgiving (vv. 23-27[22-26]): by the sufferer
IV. Thanksgiving (vv. 28-32[27-31]): by the congregation
Table 42. נֹאות in Psalm 22 and Job 30-31, 38

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Psalm 22</th>
<th>Job</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Longing for God’s answer</td>
<td>22:3[2] O my God, I cry by day, but you do not answer (ענה).</td>
<td>30:20 I cry to you for help and you do not answer (ענה) me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31:35 Oh, that I had one to hear me! . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Let the Almighty answer (ענה) me!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God answers!</td>
<td>22:22c[21c] You have answered (ענה) me!</td>
<td>38:1 Then the Lord answered (ענה) Job out of the whirlwind and said . .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(8) After God answers the prayers, the psalmist eats (אכלה) and is satisfied (שבט) (Ps 22:27[26]). Job likewise eats (אכלה) with all his relatives and neighborhood (Job 42:11), and dies “satisfied (שבט) of days” (Job 42:17).50 (9) God’s wonderful salvation will be told to the psalmist’s next generation (“Posterity shall serve him; it shall be told of the Lord to the coming generation [ד歐]” [Ps 22:30-31]). Job likewise “lives to see four generations [ד歐], presumably passing on his account of what God had done” (“And after this Job lived 140 years, and saw his sons, and his sons’ sons, four generations [ד歐]” [Job 42:16]).51

In addition, D. J. Green observes Psalm 23’s connection with Job. Drawing upon recent studies that particularly emphasize “journey imagery” of Psalm 23 (e.g., “a pilgrimage to the temple in Jerusalem”),52 he delineates Psalm 23 as having a “journey structure” of “spatial and temporal” movement that aligns with “Israel’s geography and its seasonal and agricultural cycle.”


51Ibid.

1a Statement of Theme: (‘Yhwh is my shepherd’)

1b First Consequence (‘I do not lack’ = ‘Life’)
   2 Provision of food and water (Pasturelands/Spring)

3a Second Consequence (‘He restores my soul’ = ‘Resurrection/Restoration’)
   3bc Theological orientation (Yhwh’s faithfulness)

4 From ‘Death’ (Wilderness/Late Summer)

5 To ‘Life-Plus’ (Temple/Early Autumn)

6 Extension of v. 5 (Dwelling in or Return to Temple)\

In three journey stages to the house of God (pasturelands/spring [v. 2] => wilderness/late summer [v. 4] => temple/early autumn [v. 5]), the psalmist’s experience correspondingly changes from “good” (v. 2) => “bad” (v. 4) => “better” (v. 5). In this reading, 23:1a (“Yhwh is my shepherd”) sets the theme for the whole psalm, 23:1b (“I do not lack”) a theme for 23:1b-2, and 23:3a (“He restores my soul”) a theme for 23:3a-6.

Green particularly suggests that the psalmist’s “descent into” the valley of the shadow of death (צ לְמ ו ת) (v. 4) plays “an integral part of the journey mapped by” the shepherd, God. The completion of the journey, however, will be rewarding. It will not merely be a restoration of the former “good,” but “a better good” as depicted in “the near-Edenic imagery of the banquet and lengthened days” of 23:5-6.

Green then notes that the same narrative movement (“good” => “bad” => “better”) characterizes Job. (1) Job 1:1-5 portrays Job’s “good” stage (cf. Ps 23.2). Job’s “blessed life” is introduced with “Job’s seven sons, three daughters, 7,000 sheep, 3,000 camels, 500 yoke of oxen, 500 donkeys and numerous servants” (1:3). (2) The book’s ending (42:7-17; cf. Ps 23:5-6) describes Job’s “better” stage in which a doubling of his

---

53Green, “The Good, the Bad and the Better,” 78, the emphasis added.

54For a detailed exegesis, see ibid., 70-79.

55Ibid., 72. Green states, “It might be argued that the shift in the subject of the verbs from Yhwh (vv. 2-3) to the psalmist ( אלך, v. 4) indicates that the shepherd is not responsible for bringing the sheep into the valley of צלמות. But the close connection between vv. 3 and 4 suggests that the only reason the sheep finds itself in this valley is because the shepherd has led it (ניח) there.” Ibid., 71n12.

56Ibid., 77-78.

57Ibid., 79.
earlier blessings occurs (42:10): “14,000 sheep, 6,000 camels, 1,000 yoke of oxen and 1,000 donkeys (42:12), with each of his original seven sons and three daughters now replaced (42:13).” Moreover, Job “lives for another 140 years” (42:16), “double the ideal age of 70” (Ps 90:10). (3) The central portion of the book marks the “bad” stage, that is, Job’s death-like experience in the valley of darkness (םלמ ות) (cf. Ps 23:4). Job loses every former divine blessing (1:1-5) and plunges into “a time of evil (רעה).”

Psalm 23:4 Even though I walk through the valley of darkness, I will not fear evil (רעה).

Job 2:10 Shall we receive good from God, and shall we not receive evil (רעה)?

Job 2:11 Job’s three friends heard of all this evil (רעה) that had come upon him.

Job 30:26 When I hoped for good, evil (רעה) came, and . . . darkness came.

Job 42:11 Then all his brothers, and all his sisters . . . came to him, and they . . . comforted him for all the evil (רעה) that the Lord had brought on him. Green also notes that רעה ("darkness") “characterizes Job’s existence.”

Psalm 23:4 Even though I walk through the valley of darkness (םלמ ות), I will not fear evil.

Job 3:5 Let gloom and darkness (םלמ ות) claim it [=my birth].

Job 10:20-22 Are not my days few? Leave me alone, before I [=Job] go—and I shall not return—to the land of deep shadow and darkness (םלמ ות) . . .

Job 16:16-17 My face is red with weeping, and on my eyelids is darkness (םלמ ות), although there is no violence in my hands, and my prayer is pure.

Although Psalm 23 does not specify why the psalmist must pass through the valley of רעה, for Job, notes Green, God wanted to break “the rules of ‘the common theology’ of deed and consequence” and thus “brought evil on a righteous man.”

Referring to recent intertextual studies on Job and the Suffering Servant text of

58 Concerning the same number of Job’s children in 1:2 and 42:13 (seven sons and three daughters), Green refers to Édouard Dhorme, A Commentary on the Book of Job, trans. Harold Knight (Nashville: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1967), 651–52, who, based on the Targum, reads 42:13’s שבעה נים ("seven"; cf. 1:2 has שבעה נים) as “a dual form which results in 14 replacement sons.” As for the daughters, the doubling effect “is not found in their number but in their beauty (42:15).” Green, “The Good, the Bad and the Better,” 80n41.

59 Ibid., 80n41.

60 Ibid., 79.

61 Ibid., 79n39.

62 Ibid., 81.
Isaiah.\(^63\) Green further understands the servant narrative in the same light (the “good” => “bad” => “better” pattern). The “righteous servant of Isaiah” is also led into the valley of遭難 and then is “rescued from the grave to ‘see light’ and have his days lengthened” (Isa 53:9-12; cf. Isa 53:10, Ps 23:6).\(^64\) Based on the journey image shared by Psalm 23, Job, and the servant text of Isaiah, Green thus concludes with an intriguing new possibility of reading these texts as about the pilgrimage (and suffering) of the righteous.\(^65\)

One crucial discussion remains. If a case can be made for an innocent Job within the poetic section, and God’s final verdict in the epilogue further confirms this reading (42:7-8),\(^66\) how does the portrayal of Job in God’s speeches (chs. 38-41) fit in?

---

\(^63\)A. Perry, for example, observes the “lexical and thematic links” between Isaiah and Job as follow: (1) Both Job and the Suffering Servant are called “my servant” (my servant Job 1:8, 2:3; Isa 42:1); “God praises the Suffering Servant as he does Job”; (2) “The people consider the Servant to be ‘stricken’ of God” (Job [Isa 53:4]); likewise, “Job is ‘stricken’ of God” (Job 19:21); (3) “Job is considered to be chastised (נכה) by the Almighty” (Job 5:17); “the same ‘chastisement’ is predicated of the Servant” (nurse Isa 53:5); (4) both Job and the servant are despised (נבק [Job 19:18]; מנה [Isa 53:3]) “by compatriots”; (5) “Job’s friends ‘forget’ (נפק) him and his brethren ‘stay away’ (נפק) from him (Job 19:13-14); the Suffering Servant’s compatriots ‘hide their faces’ (Isa 53:3); (6) both Job and the servant ‘are smitten’ on the ‘cheeks’” (Job 16:10 “They have struck [נפק] on my cheek [רגע]”); Isa 50:6 “I gave my back to those who strike [נפק], and my cheeks [רגע] to those who pull out the beard”; see also Isa 53:4; (7) “The servant does not hide his face from ‘spitting’ [רגע]” (Isa 53:6), “using a rare word (3x) that only occurs in Job (2x) and Isaiah” (Job 30:10 “[They abhor me, they flee far from me, and spare not to spit [רגע] in my face”; see also Job 17:6); (8) “Job claims that what has befallen him was ‘not for any violence’ in his hands” (Isa 16:17), and “this phrase occurs once elsewhere in Isaiah 53:9” (nurse יאש [Job 16:17]); (9) “Job asserts that his prayer was pure” (נפק [Job 16:17]); “this corresponds to their being no guile found in the Suffering Servant’s mouth” (nurse יאש [Isa 53:9, cf. Job 31:5]); (10) Job states that “upright men are appalled or astonished [ Респ] at what has happened to him” (Job 17:8); “this is an aspect of the Suffering Servant” (“Many were appalled [レス] at you” [Isa 52:14]); (11) “Job says that the mockers will not be exalted” (נפק [Job 17:4]); “but this is what will happen to the Suffering Servant” (נפק [Isa 52:13]); (12) “Job wants someone to ‘contend’ with him” (נפק [Job 13:19]); “the same question is posed by the Suffering Servant” “Who will contend [묭] with me?” [Isa 50:8]); (13) “Job complains that he is being eaten by the moth [אש]” (Job 13:28); “whereas the adversaries of the Suffering Servant would be eaten by the moth [אש]” (Isa 50:9); and (14) “Job rests his case with God, as does the Suffering Servant (Isa 49:4, Job 16:19).” Andrew Perry, “The Suffering Servant of Isaiah and the Suffering of Job,” Unpublished (2017): 5–6, emphasis added. See also J. C. Bastaens, “The Language of Suffering in Job 16-19 and in the Suffering Servant Passages in Deutero-Isaiah,” in Studies in the Book of Isaiah: Festschrift Willem A. M. Beuken, ed. J. van Ruiten and M. Vervenne, BETL 132 (Louvain, Belgium: Leuven University Press: Uitgeverij Peeters, 1997), 421–32; John E. Hartley, The Book of Job, NICOT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), 14–15; Dhorme, A Commentary on the Book of Job, clv; Ulrich Berges, “Der Ijobrahmen (Ijob 1,1–28, 42,7–17): Theologische Versuche angesichts unschuldigen Leidens,” Biblische Zeitschrift 39, no. 2 (1995): 225–45; Wharton, Job, 10–11.

\(^64\)Green, “The Good, the Bad and the Better,” 82–83.

\(^65\)Ibid.

\(^66\)The interpretation of 42:7-8, however, is disputed. For a survey of the issue, see David D.
Job’s longings are finally met (chs. 38-41) and the book’s climax has been reached, but there is little consensus among scholars concerning the tone and the meaning of God’s speech (chs. 38-41). Regarding the tonality, suggestions range from the speech being gentle (“playful/relaxing” [F. I. Andersen], “courteous and wistful” [S. Terrien], “respectful” [P. Lockwood]), or sharp (“infinitely keen yet kind” [J. Strahan], “severe, yet not offensive” [D. J. A. Clines]), to even harsh (“remote, unfeeling” [J. B. Curtis], “blustering” [D. Penchansky], “cruel” [M. B. Crook]). As for the meaning, some consider God’s speech largely irrelevant to the issue Job has raised, while others find God offering a resolution to Job’s dilemma, though details vary significantly.

---


69 L. G. Perdue surveys various views on the meaning of God’s speeches: (1) “Although there is chaos in the world, God acts with free to sustain justice in creation and history” (M. Fox, R. Gordis). (2) “God’s actions in the world are paradoxical” (e.g., God “nurture but limits Yam,” and “feeds the offspring of eagles with the dead flesh of other creatures”). “In a world of paradoxes, Job’s speeches rooted in retribution make no sense and thus are dismissed. Paradox is overcome by community with God” (G. Fohrer). (3) “Reality is amoral, while God transcends human standards of justice. Retribution as a vehicle for the operation of God and creation is rejected. Piety is either unrewarded or does not exist” (J. L. Crenshaw). (4) “While God’s darker side has created evil, he acts to constrain its destructive effects. However, God is limited in power and unable to eradicate evil from the earth” (A. Brenner). (5) “God’s wisdom and justice transcend human comprehension. Efforts to impugn divine justice are sheer folly” (E. Dhorme, H. H. Rowley). (6) “God’s sovereignty as Creator and Lord of history is upheld, leading to the rejection of false questioning and the proper response of confession and praise” (H. D. Preuss, M. Crook). (7) “The blustery attack by God reveals that he is a capricious, chaotic, and even jealous tyrant whose abuse of power leads to Job’s proper renunciation” (D. Robertson, J. Williams). (8) “Creation is nihilistic, possessing no meaning in and of itself. Yet in coming as savior, God offers a new creation” (M. Sekine). Leo G. Perdue, Wisdom in Revolt: Metaphorical Theology in the Book of Job, Bible and Literature Series 29 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991), 197–98.
Moreover, many view God’s speech as aimed to humble Job into repentance, whereas others argue for a more positive purpose such as to correct/educate or vindicate/comfort Job rather than to rebuke him for any wrongdoing.

I agree with P. Lockwood and others who find that God’s speech “treats Job’s concerns with the utmost seriousness” and “responds to them firmly, respectfully, [and] comprehensively.” God’s purpose then is not to humble/overwhelm Job or to ignore Job’s issues, but to answer Job’s dilemma by correcting and broadening his limited knowledge of divine justice, ultimately bringing Job comfort, faith, and trust in God.

Three points—(1) the literary context, (2) the content of God’s speech, and (3) Job’s final response (42:6)—support this reading. First, as N. C. Habel and others note, God’s speech “operates from the assumption that Job is innocent but ignorant.” God not only takes pride in Job’s integrity in the prologue/epilogue but is also keenly aware of Satanic influence behind Job’s struggle in the dialogue. God’s appearance—“elsewhere reserved for the likes of” Moses (Exod 3:1-6), Elijah (2 Kgs 2:11, 12), and Isaiah (Isa 6:1-13)—therefore reaffirms God’s continual honor for his servant Job, as also noted by Habel: “Job’s heroic faith has provoked the deus absconditus into becoming the deus

---


72See the survey in Hooks, Job, 420–22.

73Lockwood, “God’s Speech from the Whirlwind,” 168. For other scholars who share a similar stance with Lockwood, see ibid., 168n1. Fox, “God’s Answer and Job’s Response,” 3, also notes, “God speaks in the tone of a wise teacher, who scolds the pupil for his ignorance but does not rage, shout, or threaten.”

74Habel, The Book of Job, 528; Dumbrell, The Faith of Israel, 258.

75Lockwood, “God’s Speech from the Whirlwind,” 170.
revelatus, even before Sinai.”⁷⁶ In fact, God never condemns Job for any sin during his speech, but he does rebuke Job once for questioning his justice.⁷⁷

⁴⁰:⁸ הַ֭א ףַת פֵֵ֣רַמִשְפ טִִ֑יַת ַּ֜רְשִיעִֵּ֗נִיַלְמ ֵ֣ע ןַתִצְד ְּֽק (“Will you indeed annul my justice? Will you declare me guilty so that you might be right?”)

As D. A. Garrett notes, however, one must realize that “God is rebuking Job’s theological conclusion” here, not “Job’s behavior in the conduct of his life.”⁷⁸ Job’s innocence, then, is not at issue in God’s speech but his ignorance in misrepresenting divine justice. Moreover, if God’s intention was to humble Job into repentance (cf. 42:6), notes P. Lockwood, “the thrust of the whole book is subverted: testing whether a person of complete integrity can stay faithful in the face of extreme suffering.”⁷⁹ The broader literary context, then, evidences that Job’s innocence must be assumed even in God’s speech.

Second, the content of God’s speech also buttresses this interpretation. Here I summarize D. A. Garrett’s observation on the topic. In his first speech (38:1-40:5), God specifically replies to Job’s challenge that “the world is in chaos.”⁸⁰ In chapter 3, Job expressed his belief in the failure of the doctrine of retribution by reversing the creation image (Gen 1-2).⁸¹ Against this, God reveals his management of creation presented in both the “inanimate” (38:4-30; e.g., boundaries of the sea, position of the stars, sources of water, thunderstorms) and the “animate nature” (39:1-30; e.g., lions/ravens, wild

---


⁷⁷Pope, *Job*, lxxx. Pope also comments, “The absence of any charge of guilt must be considered tantamount to vindication.” Ibid.

⁷⁸Garrett, “Job,” 50, emphasis original.

⁷⁹Lockwood, “God’s Speech from the Whirlwind,” 179.


⁸¹Ibid., 16–17.
donkey/ox, ostrich, horse), a governance that is far beyond Job’s grasp. By declaring that even the dangerous forces of nature are under his control (and moreover, that what appears “to be chaos” in nature “is not chaos at all” in God’s sight), God effectively teaches Job that it is “wrong to suppose”—based on Job’s limited knowledge of the doctrine of retribution—“that God has left the world” “in chaos.” Garrett particularly notes how God’s first speech refutes the vision’s thesis (4:17-21). Satan’s message claims that “the universe and all it contains are abhorrent to God,” but this message is contradicted by God’s own words:

[D]espite the savage power God ascribes to nature, the tone of God’s discourse has no contempt and loathing. In Job 38–39, the cosmos is awesome and the sea is mighty. The lions, mountain goats, wild donkeys, ostriches, and falcons are impressive in their strength and gloriously free. The power of nature and its bias towards chaos only demonstrates God’s glory, for he does not let it get out of hand. Its violent features do not offend God. As God’s creation, nature is “very good” (Gen 1:31) and he is not willing to destroy it. Instead, he does what only God could do: he manages all of it.

God’s benevolent care for creation confirms that Job’s suspicion about the vision’s message is correct (26:4), but his dilemma remains unanswered. Why does Job, the innocent, face evil, and why has God failed to execute justice in this? In his second speech (40:6–41:26[34]), God therefore discusses the evil reality represented in two composite beasts, Behemoth (40:6–24) and Leviathan (40:25–41:26[41:1-34]). Garrett suggests that Behemoth epitomizes the evil powers of the world (e.g., Dan 7-8; Rev 13), whereas Leviathan refers to Satan, the king of evil (this issue will be dealt with in detail in the following section). Unlike the beasts of the field and the chaotic nature that God “sustains” and “manages,” Behemoth and Leviathan are rebellious, arrogant, and

---

83 Ibid.
84 Ibid., 54.
85 Ibid., 55.
86 Ibid., 57, 62.
untamable forces that God will destroy in due time, though God does not specify “how or when he would subdue” them.\textsuperscript{87} God thus informs Job of the evil reality behind his suffering (and the injustice of the world) and that he must wait until God, at the proper time, puts end to it. Garrett concludes,

[Job] could not understand how God could be just and yet punish the innocent, as He had seemed to do in Job’s case. God’s answer is this: “I am the only one who can manage all the chaotic forces of life and who can bring about the ultimate triumph of righteousness, and I know what I am doing. If this has meant some suffering on your part, you must understand that this does not mean that I am unfair or that you have the right to challenge my justice. I will do what must be done to defeat Leviathan and all the powers of chaos and evil. This may sometimes require suffering on the part of the righteous, but I will bring all things to a just conclusion. Your role is simply to trust in my wisdom and goodness.”\textsuperscript{88}

Third, if Job’s theological dilemma is answered and Job now sees his suffering and God’s administration of the world in a new light, how should Job’s final words (42:6), which have brought so intense a debate, be understood?\textsuperscript{89} While many read 42:6 as a statement of repentance (as in ESV, NRSV, “Therefore I despise myself, and repent in dust and ashes”), recent studies generally agree that such a rendition fails to grasp the Hebrew accurately.\textsuperscript{90} My observation suggests that Job, retracting his earlier claim, expresses his consolation in God in 42:6.

Therefore, I reject [my claim] and I am comforted, upon dust and ashes (שֵׁן אֶפְרָאָם עִנָּיָה יִשָּׁר עִנָּיָה).

The following is my reasoning: (1) The qal of מסתִּית (to reject) usually requires an object,

\textsuperscript{87} Garrett, “Job,” 54–63.

\textsuperscript{88} Duane A. Garrett, \textit{Job}, Shepherd’s Notes (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1998), 92.

\textsuperscript{89} For a comprehensive survey of the issue, see Clines, \textit{Job 38-42}, 1207–211.

but as BDB suggests, 42:6 belongs to five rare cases in the OT in which מָאָס comes without an object (Job 7:16, 34:33, 36:5, 42:6, and Ezek 21:18[13]) and the implicit object must be supplied from the context. 91 What, then, is the hidden object of מָאָס (42:6)? Here I endorse J. A. Cherney’s observation. Cherney argues that Job specifically rejects “the stance he had assumed in the dialogue” (so HALOT, מָאָס, “which proposes the meaning of מָאָס in 42:6, “to reject what one has said previously, revoke”). 92 Cherney, referring to N. Glatzer’s study, notes that “the key words ‘knowledge [דַעֲשׁ],’ ‘wisdom [חָכֵם],’ and ‘understanding [בִּינֵהוּ],’ (and “their verbal forms” דָּעָה, חָכָם, and בִּינָה) run throughout the book in general and the divine speeches in 38-41 in particular.” 93 In the immediate context, Job, who previously has challenged divine justice, hears God’s words and experiences a renewal of his mind. Humbled, Job cites two of God’s earlier statements in 42:3a, 4: “Who is this who, without any knowledge (דַעֲשׁ), conceals good advice?" (42:3a, quoted from 38:2) and “Listen now, it’s my turn to speak; I will question you, and you will inform me [lit. cause me to know [דַעֲשׁ]]” (42:4, quoted from 38:3, 40:7). 94 Cherney explains that these citations, which signify Job’s acknowledgment of the folly of his challenge, “frame Job’s ‘rejection’” (Job also confesses in 42:3b, “Indeed, I had made a declaration, but I didn’t understand [בְּרָא]; these things are too wonderful for me to know [דַעֲשׁ]”). 95 What Job rejects (מאס) in 42:6, then, is his stance in the dialogue

95 Cherney, “Did Job ‘Repent’?,” 134.
where he has claimed “[he] has enough knowledge to dispute about justice with his Creator.”

(2) As for ע פ רַו אֵפ ר (42:6; “dust and ashes”), I propose reading it in light of Job’s lament in 30:19-20:

God has cast me into the mire, and I have become like dust and ashes.

I cry to you for help and you do not answer me; I stand, and you only look at me.

As discussed, Job, the friends, and Elihu frequently quote key statements of earlier speeches in their next round of debate (e.g., Elihu’s quotation of Job’s words [26:4, 27:3-4, 31:15] in 32:8, 18-22, 33:4). This is what seems to be going on here. The expression ע פ רַו אֵפ ר appears only in Genesis 18:27 and Job 30:19, 42:6 in the OT (cf. Sir 10:9, 40:3, 1QH 10:5). In 30:19-20, Job, in his last appeal, cries out to God for casting him down into the mire (and making him like dust and ashes, meaning God has totally ruined him) (30:19) and for not answering (הנה) him (30:20). When he hears God’s answer (הנה) (38:1), however, Job’s view of suffering and injustice are transformed. He still remains in “dust and ashes” (42:6), a state of complete loss, but he is inwardly comforted by learning that the righteous could suffer in the course of God’s dealing with Behemoth and Leviathan. The expression ע פ רַו אֵפ ר (dust and ashes) in 30:19 and 42:6, then, effectively contrasts the Job before the encounter with the one after, highlighting Job’s transformed mind despite the fact that his wretched condition (“dust and ashes”) remains the same. (3) The Masoretic accent system further corroborates this understanding. In 42:6, a major break athnach appears under ע ל־כֵַ֭ןַא מְא ֵ֣סַוְנִח ִ֑מְתִי, separating ע ל־ from ע פ רַו אֵפ ר (“I reject [my claim] and I’m comforted) from ע ל.

---

96 Cherney, “Did Job ‘Repent’?,” 135, the emphasis added.
99 נחם in niphal stem can denote either “change one’s mind” or “to be comforted.” It can hardly mean “to repent” (cf. Jer 8:6). Garrett, “Job,” 65n121; Cherney, “Did Job ‘Repent’?,” 136.
“upon dust and ashes”). Such a division is unique in the OT. As for the idiom של + און (meaning “to change one’s mind about [something]”), the accent system typically joins של and און as a unit (e.g., shall stand for ישה של [Exod 32:12]), rather than detaching them with a heavy break like ישה של (Job 42:6). Moreover, the accent system binds של און as a unit, adding more difficulty to an already unattested construction (typically של should be grouped and separated from און). Because of the unusual accent division, some reject seeing ישתיעל as idiomatic expression, while others—holding און של (“to reject”) and של און (“to change one’s mind”; cf. it could also mean “to be comforted”) to be parallel terms—take של און as a whole to be a subject and און של to be an object (e.g., “I repudiate and repent of dust and ashes” [D. Patrick]). I, however, find that ישתיעל better reads as “I am comforted.” Not only the heavy accent undermines seeing ישתיעל as an idiom, but the use of the term של in the book also supports my view. In Job, the verb של appears seven times (2:11; 7:13; 16:2; 21:34; 29:25; 42:6; 42:11) and its derived noun three times (של און [“comfort”; 6:10], אוןשל [“consolation”; 15:11; 21:2]). Strikingly, besides 42:6, all these occurrences convey the

---


101See, for example, Exod 32:12, 14; 2 Sam 13:39, Jer 18:8, 10, 31:15; Ezek 14:22, 32:31; Amos 7:3; 6: Joel 2:13; Jonah 3:10, 4:2; and 1 Chr 21:15. The only exception to this is where של is followed by a subject and then של, as in Exod 32:14 ישה של ישה silhouette (And the Lord relented from the evil”). Here the athnach separates של ישה from ישה של ישה (so Amos 7:3, 6, Jonah 3:10). For other cases where של is directly followed by של, the accent system joins them as a unit (sometimes a minor break may occur [e.g., in Ezek 14:22 ישה של ישה, a rebiya disjoins של ישה and ישה, but such a division is governed under higher rank breaks [e.g., athnach, silluq, tiphcha, zaqeph, etc.], and hence in a broader syntax, still constitutes a unit). The author follows the accent system suggested in Russell T. Fuller and Kyoungwon Choi, Invitation to Biblical Hebrew Syntax: An Intermediate Grammar (Grand Rapids: Kregel Academic, 2017), 351–98.

102See the examples in n101 of this chapter.


105So Peshitta מלאךzech צלחתועש ("Therefore, I will be silent, and I will be comforted upon dust and upon ash") and Targum מנהמיהם הממעה על בני דון תשריר ("Because of this I have rejected my wealth and I am comforted concerning my sons, who are dust and ashes").
meaning “to comfort” or “consolation.”

Table 43. A comfort theme in the book of Job

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prologue</th>
<th>2:11 [The friends] come to show him sympathy and comfort (נחם) him.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Poetic body | [Job] 6:8-10 Oh . . . God would fulfill my hope . . . This would be my comfort (נחם).  
[Job] 7:13-14 When I say, “My bed will comfort (נחם) me . . . then you scare me with dreams.”  
[Eliphaz] 15:11 Are the comforts (תנחום) of God too small for you?  
[Job] 16:2 I heard many such things; miserable comforters (נחשים) are you all.  
[Job] 21:2 Keep listen . . . and let this the consolation (תנחום) of yours.  
[Job] 21:34 How then will you comfort (נחם) me with empty nothings?  
[Job] 29:25 I chose their way and sat as chief, and I lived like a king among his troops, like one who comforts (נחשים) mourners.  
[Job] 42:6 Therefore I reject, and I am comforted (נחם), upon dust and ashes. |
| Epilogue | 42:11 All his brothers, and all his sisters . . . came to him, and they showed him sympathy and comforted (נחם) him. |

T. Krüger and others note the significance of the comfort/consolation theme in Job.106 The prologue/epilogue begins and ends with the friends and Job’s relatives comforting (נחם) Job (2:11; 42:11). In the poetic section, Job constantly seeks for consolation (נחום) but never finds it (6:8-10; 7:13-14; 16:2; 21:2, 34), though he himself was a comforter (נחם) of others (29:25). In this plot development, then, one would expect a happy climax of the poetic section with Job being comforted (נחם) by hearing God (42:6).107 If so, the Job of 42:6 is not a repentant Job who has been crushed by God for his sin and/or arrogance. Instead, he is a comforted and vindicated Job whose theological dilemma has

---


been resolved. Job in a sense does repent of his folly of questioning God’s justice during the debate as in 42:3, 6 (“I have uttered what I did not understand, things too wonderful for me, which I did not know . . . . therefore I reject [my claim]”). But this is not the kind of repentance that the friends and Elihu urged on him. As L. Wilson notes, Job “does not show a lack of respect for God (fear of God)” during his speeches; his only problem is “a limitation in knowledge of how God orders his world.” The point of 42:3, 6 is then the confession of ignorance, not of “sin, guilt, or pride,” and Job’s “integrity is intact” even to his final statement in 42:2-6. No wonder God in the epilogue makes no charge against Job and only declares him to be right (46:7).

To conclude, this first section demonstrates that the patient Job frames the whole book. Although Job frequently laments and questions God’s justice, at the heart of his cry and struggle is his profound reverence for and faith in God. Job finally hears God and learns about the wonders of God’s sovereign and righteous rule, resulting in his consolation, vindication, and trust in God.

**Job as Apocalyptic Wisdom Literature**

If Job portrays the suffering of the righteous, and the pervasiveness of Satan’s influence also characterizes the book, how can these two core elements be brought together in determining the book’s genre? Scholars have long struggled to identify the governing genre of the book, but little agreement has been reached. Suggestions vary

---


from tragic drama,^112^ comedy,^113^ parody,^114^ heroic epic,^115^ lament,^116^ instruction,^117^
lawsuit,^118^ to even sui generis.\(^119\)

D. A. Garrett’s study marks a significant breakthrough in defining the book’s
genre. Garrett suggests that Job’s genre is both wisdom and apocalypse (more precisely,
“the apocalypse of wisdom”).\(^120\) He particularly compares Job with two other bibilical

---


117E.g., Crook, *The Cruel God*, 5.


examples of apocalyptic literature—Daniel and Revelation—and notes eleven features that these books all share: (1) Daniel and Revelation present events in two perspectives: “the earthly perspective (the apparent triumph of evil)” and “the heavenly perspective (God governing human affairs for his purposes).” Likewise, Job 1-2, 38-41 describe “the heavenly view” of “evil and suffering,” whereas the dialogue portion portrays the earthly view of Job’s suffering.121 (2) “Heavenly messengers reveal profound secrets to the protagonist or to a central character” (e.g., Daniel: angels interpreting “visions for Daniel”; Revelation: the apostle “taken up to heaven and given” visions and interpretation from an angel). In Job 38-41, Job “receives an extended message from God himself.”122 (3) Apocalyptic literature “asserts that behind the conflicts on earth are conflicts between spiritual powers in the heavens” (Dan 10:13; Rev 12, Job 1-2).123 (4) As in Daniel 12:1-3 and Revelation 20:11-21:1, apocalypse “often includes a cataclysmic undoing of creation and the making of a new creation.” Job “calls for himself to be unmade by cursing the day of his birth (Job 3).” “His rhetorical undoing is the prelude to his remaking, a transformation that comes to its climax at his encounter with God.”124 (5) Daniel and Revelation deal in “special numbers, especially three and seven.”125 Likewise, Job is replete with the numbers three and seven.126 (6) Apocalypse “acknowledges how

---


122 Ibid.

123 Ibid.

124 Ibid.

125 E.g., Daniel: “three righteous men” (ch. 3), Daniel’s pray “three times a day” (6:10), the bear’s “three ribs in its mouth” (7:5), “three horns” falling “before the little horn” (7:8), Daniel’s mourning and fasting “for three weeks” (10:2-3), Nebuchadnezzar’s “seven periods of time” (4:16, 23), and “the apocalyptic chronology” of “seventy sevens” periods (9:24). Revelation: “seven churches, seven lampstands, seven stars, seven seals, a lamb with seven horns and seven eyes,” etc., and “three angels with three plagues that kill one-third of humanity (8:13; 9:18), three froglike demons (16:13), the breakup of the “great city” into three parts (16:19)”, etc. Garrett, “Job,” 9–10.

126 E.g., Job “begins and ends with seven sons and three daughters (1:2; 42:13). The Chaldeans
difficult it is to decipher the meaning of heavenly revelations” and invites “the reader to
deepen understanding” (e.g., Rev 13:18 “Here is wisdom. Let him who has understanding
calculate the number of the beast”; Dan 12:10 “the perceptive will understand”). In Job,
Elihu is a countertype example of this who, rather than pouring out his “poorly formed
opinions,” “ought to be quiet and await revelation (as indicated in Job 28).” The reader of
Job, thus, “is called to acknowledge his or her ignorance and be silent.”[127 (7)
Apocalyptic literature employs “fantastic or mythological animals as symbols” (e.g., Dan
7’s four beasts, Dan 8’s ram and goat, Revelation’s “strange beasts”). In Job, God speaks
of wild animals (38:39-39:30) and of “two fantastic and composite beasts: Behemoth and
Leviathan (40:15-41:34).”[128 (8) Apocalypse sometimes inserts “a doxological
intermission both to break the tension of the conflict and as a signal that the divine
intervention is soon to begin” (e.g., “the decree at” Dan 6:26-27 and in Rev 19:1-10). In
Job, chapter 28 “serves as a kind of intermission between the two dialogue
collections.”[129 (9) In Daniel and Revelation, domination of “the imperial powers” or “the
Beast” ends when God intervenes (Dan 2:44-45; 7:9-14; Rev 19:11-21). In Job, divine
intervention brings an end to “the titanic theological debate” and an announcement of the
final doom of Behemoth/Leviathan.[130 (10) Apocalypse “encourage[s] the believer to
endure in the face of severe suffering, which ultimately comes from Satan.” Job 1-2,
likewise, presents “the fundamental issue of the book: if Job can be broken by his

attacked him in three bands (1:17). Three friends come to comfort the suffering hero (2:11) and they sit in
silence for seven days before the dialogue begins (2:13). The ensuing debate has three rounds of dialogue
(Job 3–27). In his final speech, Job lists fourteen sins he has not committed, doubling the number seven
(chapter 31). After God rebukes his three friends, Job intercedes for them with a sacrifice of seven bulls
and seven rams (42:8). In the narrative prologue and epilogue, the thematic verb *barak* . . . is repeated
seven times (1:5, 10, 11, 21; 2:5, 9; 42:12) and the number seven itself appears seven times (1:2, 3; 2:13

[127] Ibid.
[128] Ibid.
[129] Ibid.
[130] Ibid., 54–63.
suffering and driven to repudiate God, then Satan has won.”  

Apocalyptic literature “concludes with the faithful believer having entered bliss” (e.g., Dan 12; Rev 21-22).

Similarly, Job ends with the hero regaining “his good name, his wealth, and many children.”

Following this apocalyptic reading, one would then expect an “apocalyptic climax” in which the Satan of Job is brought to justice. Many, however, find such a scenario less likely, as A. Brenner’s statement reflects:

> Within the narrative framework itself, it is difficult not to notice that the satan—so prominent in the prologue—is surprisingly absent from the epilogue. Should he not be, at least, referred to at the end of the book, when all meaningful strands are drawn together? It is unreasonable to assume that the author has forgotten all about him, or decided to delete him from the ending for no reason. The other figures of the prologue—God, Job, Job’s friends, Job’s children and, by implication, Job’s wife—return in order to round the story off satisfactorily, or seemingly so . . . . Where is the satan, then?

Recent studies, however, suggest that Satan comes back as the serpent Leviathan in God’s second speech. Identifying Behemoth and Leviathan has been a battle-ground of interpretation. R. A. López, for example, surveys “four major interpretations” proffered concerning these two beasts: they are either (1) “physical animals” (e.g., Behemoth

---

132 Ibid., 11; Garrett, Job, 9–10.
[dinosaur, “rhinoceros, water buffalo, elephant, or hippopotamus”]; Leviathan [dinosaur, “dolphin, whale, a conflation of whale with a dolphin, and crocodile”].

(2) “purely mythological entities” (e.g., “mythical terms” representing enemy nations, or “mythological animals” [Behemoth: “mythical oxlike monster; Leviathan: “mythical dragon-monster”]),

(3) “physical animals described in mythological and/or hyperbolic terms,” or (4) “emblems representing evil or Satan.”

Leviathan in particular is often identified with a real animal—notably a crocodile—or, less commonly, with a supernatural serpent-monster symbolizing an evil entity or Satan. Reasons for the crocodile identification are as follows: (1) Leviathan is based on a real creature, but is “given exaggerated features.” (2) Since the twelve animals in God’s first speech are real, one would expect Leviathan “to be real also.” (3) “Though sometimes” “Leviathan may be mythological” (e.g., Job 3:8; Ps 74:14; Isa 27:1), it is also depicted in Psalm 104:24, 26 “as a created being.” (4) Expressions such as “ferocious teeth” (41:6[14]), “double bridle coat and rows of scales”

135 Many hold to this view. For details, see López, “The Meaning of ‘Behemoth’ and ‘Leviathan’ in Job,” 404–8.


141 See n134 of this chapter.


143 Ibid.

144 Ibid.
“chest hard as a rock” (41:24[16], 30[22]), and “its stirring of the waters” (41:31-32[23-24]) all “fit a crocodile” well.\textsuperscript{145} (5) “The crocodile was the natural creature inhabiting the Nile and would have been known” by Job.\textsuperscript{146} (6) “If Behemoth is the hippopotamus”—as espoused by many—logically Leviathan should be the crocodile, “an inhabitant of the same river and equally amphibious, and even more terrible.”\textsuperscript{147}

The following evidence, however, invalidates the naturalistic interpretation. First, the crocodile (and the hippopotamus) was “killed and captured by Egyptians,” which contradicts 40:31[41:7], 41:18-21[26-29] that describe Leviathan as “invulnerable to all human weapons.”\textsuperscript{148}

Second, the proponents of the crocodile interpretation have “to invoke hyperbole, ignorance and poetic license to sustain their identification.”\textsuperscript{149} They cannot adequately explain other descriptions about Leviathan: “eyes and nose flash with light” (41:18[10]), “fire pours out of mouth” (41:19-21[11-13]), “covered with armor” (41:15-18[7-10]), “dominates all creatures” (41:34[26]), “speaks” (41:3-4 [40:27-28]), and “filled with pride” (41:34[26]).\textsuperscript{150} These aspects contrast with chapter 39, where no hyperbolic language is used to describe natural animals.\textsuperscript{151}

Third, Job “has already withdrawn his complaint of cosmic mismanagement” in 40:4-5. Why then would God repeat the same subject of wild animals in the second

\textsuperscript{146}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{147}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{150}Garrett, “Job,” 57.
speech?¹⁵² Job’s response to God’s second speech is also “strikingly different from his first response.” He “claims he has seen God in a new way (42:5)” and been transformed (42:6). If “Behemoth and Leviathan are not different from the wild beasts” (ch. 39), “what occasions the different response in Job?”¹⁵³

Fourth, God’s second speech comprises three parts (“introduction, Behemoth, and Leviathan”) and “the last receives three times as much space and attention as the other two parts” and “more than any other creature mentioned” in chapter 39. Why should “a mere crocodile” be “given this much attention and elevation?”¹⁵⁴

Fifth, Job “never denied” God’s power, “the supposed point” of God’s speech for those who hold to the crocodile view. If God’s words on Leviathan (and Behemoth) are “meant to highlight” God’s might, then God “is trying to convince Job of something he never denied.”¹⁵⁵

Sixth, if the topic of God’s second speech is no more than two additional wild beasts, as in chapter 39, the issue of the innocent suffering and divine justice remains unresolved, leading to an anticlimactic ending.¹⁵⁶ In contrast, setting Leviathan as “the real cause of Job’s predicament” that God must master allows the book to end with “a fitting climax” of God’s resolution to the problem of evil.¹⁵⁷

Seventh, the naturalistic identification is hardly compatible with the Divine

¹⁵¹Ibid., 26.
¹⁵³Ibid., 26.
¹⁵⁶E.g., D. J. A Clines, who takes Leviathan as a crocodile, concludes his commentary on Leviathan section as follows: “Has our poet set before us, in the magnificent sweep of the cosmic Plan, a deity who is in the end unlovely and not a little chilling? Has this deity perhaps a little too much attachment to crocodiles?” Clines, Job 38-42, 1203.
Warrior imagery of God’s second speech, as E. Ortlund points out:

The divine arm and thunderous voice (40:9) and the splendor and majesty with which he clothes himself (v. 10) are often spoken of as YHWH engages in battle with chaos (e.g., Pss 29:1-3; 89:10-14; 104:1-2; Isa 30:30; Hab 3:3). It is almost as if YHWH appears to Job in the storm in full battle armor. But why would YHWH need the weapons with which he fights chaos and Israel’s enemies when he is fighting a mere animal?  

Eighth, Leviathan (לִוְיָתָן) is mentioned six times in the OT (Job 3:8; 40:25[41:1]; Pss 74:14, 104:26; Isa 27:1 [x2]). While many understand Leviathan in the OT in a figurative sense or as a real animal (e.g., Leviathan in Isa 27:1 as representing kings or human enemies; Leviathan in Ps 74:13-14 as Pharaoh, and God’s victory over Leviathan referring to the Exodus), a growing number of scholars—with support from Ugaritic texts and later Jewish literature—interpret Leviathan in general as a symbolic representation of an evil/chaos entity, though the Leviathan in Psalm 104:26 has been disputed. Some hold that the Leviathan in Psalm 104:26 is “demythologized” into a trivial sea creature such as a whale of some sort. The intertextual link between


160 For instance, compare KTU 1.5.1.1-3 on Baal’s defeating of Lotan (“Although you smote Lotan the fleeing serpent [lm.btn.brh], [though] you annihilated the twisting serpent [btn. qltn] ruler with seven heads [šb t.rašm]”) with Isa 27:1 (“In that day the Lord with his hard and great and strong sword will punish Leviathan the fleeing serpent [רֱֿ֔כֶּרֶמְּנַשׁ לִוְיָתָּן], Leviathan the twisting serpent [חָשַעַק לִוְיָתָּן], and he will slay the serpent [תֶּנֶן] that is in the sea). For more of examples, see E. Lipiński, “לִוְיָתָן,” in TDOT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 7:506–9.

161 John N. Day, “Leviathan,” in ABD (New York: Yale University Press, 1992), 4:296, summarizes, “[I]n 2 Esdr 6:49–52, 2 Bar. 29:4, and I En. 60:7–9, 24, Leviathan, along with Behemoth, is to be devoured at the Messianic banquet. Furthermore, there can be no doubt, in view of Leviathan’s seven heads, that it is this mythological monster which underlies the seven-headed dragon (Satan) in Rev 12:3 and the seven-headed beast (Rome) in Rev 13:1, 17:3.”


Psalm 104 and the Leviathan text of Job has particularly been recognized, and based on this connection, M. V. Fox, for example, identifies the Leviathan in Job 40:25-41:26[41:1-34] as a whale.

### Table 44. Job 40[41] and Psalm 104

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job 40[41] (God)</th>
<th>Psalm 104</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40:10 Adorn yourself with majesty and dignity; <em>clothe yourself</em> (בֵּלַע) with <em>splendor</em> (הוֹד) and <em>majesty</em> (הָדְרָע).</td>
<td>104:1 O Lord my God, you are very great! You are <em>clothed</em> (בֵּלַע) with <em>splendor</em> (הוֹד) and <em>majesty</em> (הָדְרָע).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40:25[41:1] Can you draw out <em>Leviathan</em> (לִוְיָתָן) with a fishhook?</td>
<td>104:26 There go the ships, and <em>Leviathan</em> (לִוְיָתָן), which you formed <em>in order to play with it</em> (וֹלְשַׁחַק בְּ).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40:29[41:5] Will you play with him (וֹלְשַׁחַק בְּ) as with a bird?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As J. N. Day notes, however, “in every other instance in the Old Testament and later Jewish literature” Leviathan “alludes to the mythological sea serpent,” and Psalm 104:26 “would be painfully isolated if this were not the case here too.” Some scholars, therefore, attempt to read Leviathan in Psalm 104:26 in line with the Leviathan elsewhere in the OT. G. Kwakkel’s recent article, for example, persuasively suggests that the

---


Leviathan of Psalm 104 is the evil supernatural being depicted in Job 40:25-41:26[41:1-34]. Here is a summary of his observation: (1) He begins by noting Psalm 104’s affinity to the Egyptian creation hymn, the Hymn to Aten (KTU 1.3.II.40; COS 1.86). This connection is intentional, explains Kwakkel. The psalmist, against “his contemporaries who preferred to venerate other gods,” makes a “firm decision” to serve and praise God forever (Ps 104:1, 33, 35). The “polemical overture” is well carried in “the psalmist’s wish that sinners and the wicked may vanish from the earth” (Ps 104:35a). (2) To warn people not to side with other gods, the psalmist contrasts the magnificent power of God with that of Baal in Psalm 104:7-8 and 104:26b. In the Baal myth, “Baal had to wage a hard fight against Yam.” He “succeeded in defeating his opponent only with the help of special weapons prepared by Kothar-wa-Hasis.” In contrast, Psalm 104:7-8 reveals that God “merely had to rebuke the waters and to let the sound of his thunder be heard”; “as soon as he did so, the waters fled and hurried away, ‘over the mountains,’ ‘down into the valleys.’” “The easy fight,” therefore, testifies to God’s “superiority vis-à-vis Baal.” Likewise, Baal strived to smite Lotan (=Leviathan), who “may have been one of Yam’s helpers.” By contrast, Psalm 104:26b declares that “Leviathan is merely a creature formed by YHWH to be played with in the sea,” and hence Leviathan is “evidently no match for him.” Thus Psalm 104:26b “affirms once more” God’s superiority, “not only over Leviathan, but also over other gods such as Baal, who probably had to struggle much harder to defeat the monster.” The “provocative statement that YHWH has formed Leviathan to play with it,” then, is “full of irony and derision.”


Kwakkel, “The Monster as a Toy,” 86.

Ibid.
reason to praise [God] and no other as the true God, who is very great and clothed with splendor and majesty” (Ps 104:1).

3 There is one more point to note. According to Psalm 104:6-9, God “has set a boundary to the waters of the flood.” This, however, does not change the fact that “their potential destructive power” is gone. God “has made the sea a safe route of transport.” He “even plays there with Leviathan,” but this “does not mean that humans can do the same, nor that the monster is lacking any power to threaten them.”

“The harmony in creation does not imply that all dangers and risks have vanished forever.” Kwakkel, therefore, concludes that Psalm 104:26b warns “all those who feel tempted to side with” foreign gods and invites them to follow the psalmist’s “example of dependence of YHWH and his desire to praise him as the God of creation.”

If Kwakkel’s reading is correct, both Psalm 104 and Job 40:25-41:26 portrays the same Leviathan, the supernatural monster that God alone can handle and defeat.

Ninth, Job 40:32-41:4 hints that Leviathan is the Satan of the prologue. While the Hebrew text of this passage is famously difficult, I elaborate and develop D. A. Garrett’s seminal observation offered in 1997 (see Table 45 below).

Garrett notes that 40:32-41:4 “looks back to” 1:6, 2:1, and 3:8. In 1:6, 2:1, Satan, along with other angels, stands (岑岑) before the Lord. In 41:2[10], God, referring to “the audacity of Satan/Leviathan who presents himself before God,” claims that Satan

---

174 Ibid., 88.
176 Garrett, Job, 91–92.
“has no real right to challenge God,” stating “Who is he that would stand (ディング) before me?”

Table 45. God’s speech in 40:25-41:4[41:1-12]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40:25[41:1] Can you draw out <em>Leviathan</em> (לִוְיָתָן) with a fishhook?</td>
<td>1:6 The sons of God came to <em>stand</em> (ディング) before the Lord, and Satan also came among them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40:32[41:8] Set your hands on him; remember the battle (מלחמה) — you will not do it again!</td>
<td>2:1 Satan also came among them to <em>stand</em> (.dimension) before the Lord.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41:1[9] Behold, his [=Leviathan] hope is turned out to be false; Also, was not one overwhelmed by his [=Leviathan] appearance (מראה)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41:2[10] A deadly man (Armor) should not try to <em>rouse</em> ( العربية) him. Who is he that would <em>stand</em> (entina) before me?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41:3[11] Who would <em>confront</em> me, that I should respond? Whatever is under the whole heaven is mine.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41:4[12] I will <em>not</em> be silent at his blathering words of boasting and at his claims to power and at his high evaluation of [himself].</td>
<td>30:19 God has cast me into the mire, and I have become like dust and ashes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41:8[13] I cry to you for help and you do not answer me. . .</td>
<td>30:20 You have turned <em>cruel/deadly</em> (אמר) to me; with the might of your hand you persecute me.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moreover, Job in 3:8, in expressing his despair, wishes that sorcerers might *rouse up*

---


178 Following Ps 17:13 and NJPS. For other options, see HALLOT, “נפש”; Clines, *Job 38-42*, 1162.

179 Following the kethiv (87) instead of the qere (אֹרֶה).

Leviathan (לִוְיְתַן). Against this, God says that “A deadly man (אכזב) should not try to rouse (עֵר) him” (41:2[10]). Not only are the terms עֵר (“to rouse up”) and לִוְיְתַן (“Leviathan”) from 3:8 echoed here (and 40:25[41:1]), but the word אכזב (“deadly/cruel”), which only occurs here and in 30:21 in the book, also implies that the deadly man refers to Job, who should not have hoped that sorcerers would summon Satan/Leviathan.181 (2) God reveals that the real cause of Job’s suffering is Satan: “Remember the battle (מִלְחָמָה)—you will not do it again!” (40:32[41:8]). The term מִלְחָמָה (“battle, war”) appears here, 5:20, 38:23, and 39:25, and it seems that מִלְחָמָה in 40:32[41:8] specifically alludes to 5:20 where Eliphaz said, “In famine he will redeem you from death, and in battle (מִלְחָמָה) from the power of the sword.” Eliphaz unknowingly described Job’s plight as battle, and God affirms that Job’s affliction indeed comes from Satan’s malicious attack. Moreover, God discloses that Eliphaz’s vision originated from Satan: “Also, was not one overwhelmed by his [=Leviathan] appearance (מִרְאָה)?” (41:1[9]). In Job, מִרְאָה (“appearance”) is only found here and in 4:16 (“It stood still, but I could not discern its appearance [מִרְאָה]” [4:16]). Job particularly expresses his anguish over the vision’s message in 7:11-21, challenging God as to why he treats his servant like a serpent monster (תְּנִין; a synonym for Leviathan as in Isa 27:1). Now God responds to Job that it was Leviathan/Satan, the ferocious monster, who appeared in the vision. (3) God declares that Satan’s challenge in the prologue is found to be false: “Behold, his [=Leviathan] hope is turned out to be false” (41:1[9]). God then charges Satan for arrogantly bringing such a false challenge (i.e., that Job would renounce his faithfulness) before him: “Who would confront me, that I should respond? Whatever is under the whole heaven is mine” (41:3[11]). God therefore pronounces that he will not let Satan’s sneering challenge go unpunished: “I will not be silent at his blathering words of

boasting and at his claims to power and at his high evaluation of [himself]” (41:4[12]).

These nine points, then, establish that Leviathan is not a crocodile, but Satan, the protagonist of all the crises. God does not rebuke Job for sin or arrogance. Nor does God’s second speech only highlight God’s greatness of power in controlling evil/chaotic forces. Rather, God allows a look behind the curtain to show the real cause of Job’s suffering and how God is going to respond to it. E. Ortlund remarks,

If we understand YHWH is referring to an evil supernatural power that YHWH alone can defeat . . . then the implications of the second speech become clear. First, YHWH is showing Job that there is a supernatural evil at work in the world. Job is not suffering because he has sinned, nor is all suffering to be attributed to human wrongdoing—an obvious rebuke to Job’s friends. Second, YHWH is acknowledging how greatly Job has suffered—indeed, YHWH may even be implying that Job has suffered more than Job realized. . . . YHWH broadens Job’s horizon to show him the fearsome power that has attacked him. Third, and most crucially, YHWH is hinting that he will eventually defeat this evil. 182

Hearing this, Job is thus comforted and rejects his previous claim (42:6). And God proclaims that Job has been right before him (42:7).

**Conclusion**

This discussion of Job’s character and the book’s genre suggests that the book portrays the suffering of the righteous whose apocalyptic ending meets God’s intervention and restoration. First, against the view that claims two different Jobs in the book, this chapter demonstrates that the patient Job dominates the book in its entirety. Founded on his veneration and trust in God, Job laments like the psalmist and honestly questions the problem of suffering and evil. God finally answers him, bringing his transformation, vindication, and consolation. Second, the present study, following D. A. Garrett’s observation, reaffirms the reading of Job as apocalyptic wisdom literature. Satan, with his malicious influence throughout the book, is finally brought to justice, as God pronounces judgement on Leviathan.

CHAPTER 6
CONCLUSION

This monograph’s discussion can be summarized as follows. Chapter 1 surveys two different approaches to the book of Job. Most ancient interpreters and Christian writers have highlighted the patient Job, whereas many modern critics, holding that the prose and the poetic section stand opposed to each other, emphasize a darker side to Job. Against this latter reading, this study, based on Satan’s pervasive role in the book as reflected in Eliphaz’s vision (4:12-21) and the speeches of the friends and Elihu, proposes that the book is in literary unity, presenting a coherent message on the suffering of the righteous. Rejecting a historical/redactional method, this study approaches the book in its received form by prioritizing the Masoretic text.

Chapter 2 investigates the identity of the spirit (רוּחַ [4:15]) in Eliphaz’s vision (4:12-21). The chapter first discusses the problem of seeing the spirit as God or an angel by examining six proposals raised to support this view (a Gentile prophet, a patriarch’s experience, the Fear of Isaac, an encounter like that of Moses, a storm theophany, and an experience like the prophet Elijah or Jeremiah). The chapter then explores the meaning of (1) the juxtaposition of יָד בָּשָׁן (“word”) and גָּנַב (“to steal”) (4:12a), (2) the masculine gender of רוח (4:15a), (3) the expression “the hair of my flesh stood up” (4:15b), (4) the message of the vision itself (4:17-21), and (5) the surrounding context. On the basis of these observations, the chapter concludes that the Satan of the prologue is the most plausible candidate for the spiritual visitant (4:15).

Chapter 3 then presents the pervasiveness of the vision’s influence in the friends’ dialogues (chs. 4-25). Satan’s dark message—all humans are filthy in God’s eyes
Chapter 4 highlights the vision’s significance in the Elihu speeches (chs. 32-37). Elihu first attacks Job’s suspicion of the vision’s authority (26:4, 27:3-4), claiming that both the friends and he are inspired by divine revelation (32:6-9, 32:18-22, 33:2-4). On this ground Elihu reintroduces Eliphaz’s vision. As with the friends’ cycles, the vision’s appearance in Elihu’s first and last speeches (33:15-17, 19-21, 23-28; 36:10, 15) encloses the entire Elihu cycle, evidencing the centrality of vision’s message in the Elihu episode. Elihu likewise enshrines Satan’s teaching to accuse Job as a sinner (34:7) and buttress the doctrine of retribution. While some assert that Elihu’s theological
contribution is different from that of the friends, the chapter concludes that Elihu’s stance replicates that of the friends.

Chapter 5 draws two implications for the book of Job based on the previous discussion. First, against some who claim two incompatible Jobs in the book, the chapter affirms that the patient Job predominates throughout the book. Job, unaware of Satan’s evil intent, laments and questions divine justice, yet he never loses his profound reverence for and faith in God. God finally answers him, revealing the real cause behind his undeserved suffering and God’s solution to the problem of evil. Job therefore finds consolation and vindication in God. Second, Satan’s prominence in the book together with the righteous sufferer theme support the reading of the book as apocalyptic wisdom literature, as suggested by D. A. Garrett. Satan’s arrogant challenge in the prologue and his malicious influence throughout the book thus finally meet an apocalyptic climax, as he reappears as the serpent Leviathan to whom God announces his punishment.

The book as it stands then conveys a coherent, unified message about the suffering of the righteous and God’s sovereign handling of the problem of evil. Through its thematic progress, the book effectively answers the issue of divine justice/theodicy, declaring that God’s governance of the world is beyond human comprehension (chs. 28, 38-41). The book therefore teaches that one’s proper response is to fear God, shun evil, and trust in the wonders of God’s sovereign and righteous rule over the world (28:28).
APPENDIX 1

TABLES FOR CHAPTER 1

Table A1. The full list of citations and allusions to Eliphaz’s vision (4:12-21)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech Cycle</th>
<th>Citations and allusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First cycle (chs. 4-14)</td>
<td>Eliphaz 4:7, 9, 11; 5:2, 4, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job 7:14, 17; 9:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second cycle (chs. 15-21)</td>
<td>Eliphaz 15:14–16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zophar 20:2-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third cycle (chs. 22-27)</td>
<td>Bildad 25:4–6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elihu’s cycle (chs. 32-37)</td>
<td>First speech 32:8, 18, 33:4; 33:15-17, 19-21, 23-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second speech 34:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fourth speech 36:10, 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A2. Fragments of the texts preserved in the DSS manuscripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2QJob</td>
<td>33:28-30.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2

TABLES FOR CHAPTER 3

Table A3. Structure of Job 4-5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Chapter 4</th>
<th>Chapter 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H. Möller (1955)</td>
<td>4:2–21</td>
<td>5:1–7, 8–27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Horst (1968)</td>
<td>4:1–11, 12–21</td>
<td>5:1–7, 8–16, 17–27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>van der Lugt (1988)</td>
<td>4:2–11, 12–21</td>
<td>5:1–7, 8–16, 17–26, 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Weiser (1968)</td>
<td>4:1–5, 6–11, 12–21</td>
<td>5:1–7, 8–16, 17–27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Terrien (1963)</td>
<td>4:2–6, 7–11, 12–16, 17–21</td>
<td>5:1–7, 8–17, 18–27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Kissane (1939)</td>
<td>4:2–6, 7–11, 12–16, 17–21</td>
<td>5:1–5, 6–11, 12–16, 17–22, 23–27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Fohrer (1963)</td>
<td>4:2–6, 7–11, 12–16, 17–21</td>
<td>5:1–5, 6–11, 12–16, 17–21, 17–21, [–22], 23–27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Webster (1983)</td>
<td>4:2–6, 7–11, 12–16, 17–21</td>
<td>5:1–5, 6–11, 12–16, 17–21, 22–26, 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Skehan (1961)</td>
<td>4:2–6, 7–11, 12–16, 17–21</td>
<td>5:1–2, 3–7, 8–13, 14–16, 17–21, 22–26, 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Merx (1871)</td>
<td>4:2–5, 6–9, [10–11], 12–15, 16–18, 19–21</td>
<td>5:1–7, 8–11, 12–19, 20–23, 24–27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Michel (1987)</td>
<td>4:1, 2–5, 6–7, 8–9, 10–11, 12–16, 17–21</td>
<td>5:1, 2–3, 4–7, 8–11, 12–14, 15–16, 17–18, 19–21, 22–23, 24–26, 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Dillmann (1869)</td>
<td>4:2–11, 12–5:7, 8–26, 27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Löhr (1918)</td>
<td>4:3–9, 12–5:2, 4–7, 9, 11–16, 17–21, 23, 24, 26, 27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The table is an updated version of D. W. Cotter’s 1992 work that reflects the opinions of more recent scholars.1

---

Table A4. Verbs, pronominal suffixes, and independent pronouns in Job 4-5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; person</th>
<th>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; person</th>
<th>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>verb</td>
<td>suffix</td>
<td>pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4:2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0 (=0%)</td>
<td>2 (=50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>4:3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0 (=0%)</td>
<td>12 (=80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>4:7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1 (=6.3%)</td>
<td>1 (=6.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>4:12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9 (=26.5%)</td>
<td>0 (=0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C’</td>
<td>5:1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Table A4. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>1\textsuperscript{st} person (%)</th>
<th>2\textsuperscript{nd} person (%)</th>
<th>3\textsuperscript{rd} person (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5:9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7 (=15.9%)</td>
<td>3 (=6.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>1\textsuperscript{st} person (%)</th>
<th>2\textsuperscript{nd} person (%)</th>
<th>3\textsuperscript{rd} person (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5:17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0 (=0%)</td>
<td>19 (=57.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>1\textsuperscript{st} person (%)</th>
<th>2\textsuperscript{nd} person (%)</th>
<th>3\textsuperscript{rd} person (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5:27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A5. A summary table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>1\textsuperscript{st} person (%)</th>
<th>2\textsuperscript{nd} person (%)</th>
<th>3\textsuperscript{rd} person (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A (4:2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (4:3-6)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (4:7-11)</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D (4:12-21)</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>73.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C’ (5:1-16)</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>77.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B’ (5:17-26)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A’ (5:27)</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A6. Verbal connection between C-C’ (4:7-11; 5:1-16) and D (4:12-21)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job 4:7-11 (C)</th>
<th>Job 4:12-21 (D)</th>
<th>Job 5:1-16 (C’)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4:7 Remember; who that was innocent <em>perished</em> (אבד) ...</td>
<td>4:18 Even in his servants he puts no trust, and his <em>angels</em> (ךְָּמַל) he charges with error;</td>
<td>5:1 Call now ... to which of the <em>holy ones</em> (ךְָּמַל) will you turn?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:9 By the breath of God they <em>perish</em> (שָׁמַר) ...</td>
<td>4:19 How much more ... whose foundation is in the <em>dust</em> (ַּמָּר) they are <em>crushed</em> (דָּמַר) like a moth.</td>
<td>5:2 Surely vexation <em>kills</em> (מִמָּר) the fool ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:11 The strong lion <em>perishes</em> (שָׁמַר) without (<em>מִבְּלִי</em>) prey ...</td>
<td>4:20 They are beaten to pieces; <em>without</em> (ךְָּמַל) anyone noticing, they <em>perish</em> (שָׁמַר) forever.</td>
<td>5:4 Their children are far from safety, they are <em>crushed</em> (דָּמַר) in the gate ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:21 They <em>die</em> (מות), and that without wisdom.</td>
<td>5:6 For misery does not come from the <em>dust</em> (ַּמָּר) ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A7. J. P. Fokkelman’s structural analysis of Job 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stanza</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ia</td>
<td>Ib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT vv.</td>
<td>2-6</td>
<td>7-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Verses</td>
<td>3 + 2</td>
<td>3 + 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Strophe (Short or Long)</td>
<td>L S</td>
<td>L S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syllables</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: J. P. Fokkelman’s analysis suggests that Job 4 is composed in a “highly symmetrical structure,” with an accurate balancing of halves in each side (i.e., 4:2-11 contains 10 verses with 175 syllables; 4:12-21 has 10 verses with 175 syllables).²

---

Table A8. Division of Job 15:2-35

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Division of Job 15:2-35</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P. Vetter (1897)</td>
<td>2-3.4-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. König (1929)</td>
<td>2-6.7-16.17-24.25-35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The table is my updated version of P. van der Lugt’s 1995 original work.³

Table A9. Commentators on Job 25-27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commentator</th>
<th>Bildad</th>
<th>Job</th>
<th>Zophar</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Terrien</td>
<td>25:1-6; 26:8-13</td>
<td>26:1-7, 14</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1957</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(* = no rearrangement)

Note: The following table is an updated version of S. Chase’s work (2013) in which I have reflected views of more recent commentators.⁴

---

APPENDIX 3

TABLES FOR CHAPTER 4

Table A10. Structure of Job 32:6-22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J. G. Sticker (1842)</td>
<td>6-10.11-14.15-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Delitzsch (1876)</td>
<td>6-7.8-10.11-14.15-17.18-22]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. H. B. Wright (1883)</td>
<td>6-7.8-10.11-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Dillmann (1891)</td>
<td>6-10.11-14.15-22. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Ley (1895)</td>
<td>6-10.11-14.15-18.19-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Schlögl (1916)</td>
<td>6-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. König (1929)</td>
<td>6-10.11-14.15-22; similarly, RSV (1952), TOB (1978)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Möller (1955)</td>
<td>6.7-14 (=7-10.11-14).15-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Fohrer (1963)</td>
<td>6-10.11-14.15-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. L. Terrien (1963)</td>
<td>6-7.8-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. E. Murphy (1981)</td>
<td>6.7-10.11-16.17-20.21-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. A. Diewert (1991)</td>
<td>6-10.11-16.17-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. E. Balentine (2006)</td>
<td>6-10.11-16.17-22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: I have revised and updated P. van der Lugt’s original summary table to reflect views of more recent scholarship.1

---

1Pieter van der Lugt, *Rhetorical Criticism and the Poetry of the Book of Job*, OTS 32 (Leiden: 212
### Table A11. `לֹא` governing only the first half line of a stich and not the other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job 22:7</th>
<th>לֹא־יֵצֵֵ֣אַמֵע פֵ֣רַא ִ֑וַּ</th>
<th>You have not given water to drink to the weary / and you have withheld bread from the hungry.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job 3:26</td>
<td>לֹֹ֤א־הִנִֵ֣יח ַא ד ֵ֣םַלְע שְק ִ֑םַ</td>
<td>I am not at ease / I am not quiet / I do not have rest / but trouble comes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job 4:18</td>
<td>ב ַ֭עֲב ד יוַלֹֹ֣א־יִמְא ס־תִ֑םַ</td>
<td>In his servants he puts no trust / and his angels he charges with error.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prov 1:30</td>
<td>לֹֹ֤א־א בָ֥וַּל עֲצ תִִ֑יַנ ַּ֜אֲצִּ֗וַּכ ל־</td>
<td>They would not accept my counsel / they despised all my reproof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps 105:14</td>
<td>לְֹֽא־הִנִֵ֣יח ַא ד ֵ֣םַלְע שְק ִ֑םַ</td>
<td>He did not permit man to oppress them / and he reproved kings for their sakes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table A12. `לֹא` in the second half line of a stich to indicate that the whole line is negated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job 5:6</th>
<th>לֹֹ֤א־יִמְא ס־תִ֑םַ</th>
<th>Affliction does not come from the dust / and trouble does not sprout from the ground.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job 7:10</td>
<td>לֹֹ֤א־יִמְא ס־תִ֑םַ</td>
<td>He does not return to his house / and his place does not know him anymore.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job 7:19</td>
<td>בָֻּ֥הֲנָה לֹא־רֹֽשִׁיתִֵ֖שְׁשִׁים</td>
<td>How long will you not look away from me / (how long) will you not leave me alone till I swallow my spit?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job 8:20</td>
<td>לֹֹ֤א־יִמְא ס־תִ֑םַ</td>
<td>Behold, God will not reject a blameless man / or he will not take the hand of evildoers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job 15:29</td>
<td>לֹֹ֤א־יִמְא ס־תִ֑םַ</td>
<td>He will not be rich / and his wealth will not endure / and his possessions will not spread over the earth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job 28:7</td>
<td>לֹֹ֤א־יִמְא ס־תִ֑םַ</td>
<td>That path bird of prey does not know / and the falcon’s eye has not seen it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job 28:8</td>
<td>לֹֹ֤א־יִמְא ס־תִ֑םַ</td>
<td>The proud beasts have not trodden it / the lion has not passed over it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps 103:10</td>
<td>לֹֹ֤א־יִמְא ס־תִ֑םַ</td>
<td>He does not deal with us according to our sins, / and he does not repay us according to our iniquities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps 147:10</td>
<td>לֹֹ֤א־יִמְא ס־תִ֑םַ</td>
<td>His delight is not in the strength of the horse / his pleasure is not in the legs of a man.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Table A13. Ancient versions on Job 32:8

| Targum | בקושטא רוח נבאתה היא ובררין וימר שרי halftime | “In truth, it is the Spirit of inspiration (lit. prophecy) in man, and the word of the Almighty, that gives them understanding.” |
| Vulgate | sed ut video spiritus est in hominibus et inspiratio Omnipotentis dat intelligentiam | “But, as I see, there is a spirit in men, and the inspiration of the Almighty gives understanding.” |
| LXX | ἀλλὰ πνεῦμα ἐστὶν ἐν βροτοῖς τὸν τὰ παντοκράτορος ἐστὶν ἡ διδάσκουσα | “But, there is a spirit in mortals, and the breath of the Almighty is the one who teaches.” |
| Symmachus | ὁντος δὲ πνεῦμα θεοῦ ἐστὶν ἐν ἀνθρώποις . . . | “And indeed there is Spirit of God in men . . .” |
| Peshitta | “Truly, there is a spirit in humans, and it is the breath of God that provides them understanding.” |

Table A14. The friends’ and Elihu’s rhetoric strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech</th>
<th>Eliphaz’s vision (Theme: Everyone is a sinner)</th>
<th>The doctrine of retribution (Theme: God punishes sinners)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eliphaz’s first speech (chs. 4-5)</td>
<td>4:12-21</td>
<td>4:7-11; 5:1-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliphaz’s second speech (ch. 15)</td>
<td>15:14-16</td>
<td>15:17-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zophar’s second speech (ch. 20)</td>
<td>20:2-3</td>
<td>20:4-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bildad’s third speech (ch. 25)</td>
<td>25:4-6</td>
<td>25:2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elihu’s second speech (ch. 34)</td>
<td>34:7-8</td>
<td>34:10-30(33)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A15. Job 12 (by Job) versus Job 34 (by Elihu)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Job 12 (Job’s Response to Zophar)</th>
<th>Job 34 (Elihu’s speech)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Both “are introduced with a reference to the absolute dominion of God over all human life.”</td>
<td>12:10 In his hand is the life of every living thing and the spirit (רוּחַ) of flesh of all mankind.</td>
<td>34:13b Who laid on him the whole world? 34:14 If he should … gather to himself his spirit (רוּחַ) … 34:15 all flesh (כָּל ותֶּם) would perish together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both cite “a proverb comparing hearing with taste,” yet their citations convey different senses.</td>
<td>12:11 Does not the ear test words as the palate tastes food?  קסמהוּ ותֶּם והָלַחַשְׁתֵיהָ אִישָּׁה (כָּל ותֶּם)</td>
<td>34:3 For the ear tests words as the palate tastes food (אתּה יִשְׂמָה אֱלָה מְלֵאָה ותֶּם)  קָלָלָל.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job says that God “abuses his sovereign power”; Elihu assumes God “governs the cosmos for good.”</td>
<td>12:14 If he tears down, none can rebuild; if he shuts a man in, none can open. 12:15 If he sends them out, they overwhelm the land (נָבִי).</td>
<td>34:13 Who gave him charge over the earth (נָבִי), and who laid on him the whole world?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job challenges God’s justice; Elihu claims that God is “incapable of perverting justice.”</td>
<td>12:16 With him are strength and sound wisdom; the deceived and the deceiver are his.</td>
<td>34:12 Of a truth, God will not do wickedly, and the Almighty will not pervert justice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job says that God perverts “the entire social order by leading its leaders astray”; Elihu responds that God governs in justice by properly pronouncing them guilty and punishing them.</td>
<td>12:17 He leads counselors away stripped, and judges he makes fools. 12:18 He looses the bonds of kings (מלכים) and binds a waistcloth on their hips. … 12:21 He pours contempt on princes (מלך).</td>
<td>34:18 Who says to a king (מלך), ‘Worthless one,’ and to princes (מלך), ‘Wicked man,’ 34:19 who shows no partiality to nobles . . . 34:20 In a moment they die . . . the mighty are taken away by no human hand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job complains that God exposes “the world of darkness”; Elihu “replies by reasserting [God’s] dominion over all such ‘shadowy realms’” that discover the wicked.</td>
<td>12:22 He uncovers the deeps out of darkness (חֹשֶׁב) and brings deep darkness (צלֶם ותֶּם) to light.</td>
<td>34:21 For his eyes are on the ways of a man . . . 34:22 There is no gloom (חֹשֶׁב) or deep darkness (צלֶם ותֶּם) where evildoers may hide themselves.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table A15. Continued

| Job closes by arguing that God “leaves leaders wandering aimless in obscure places”; Elihu responds that God “may overthrow [them] by night, but his judgements are executed in a ‘public place’ for all to see.” | 12:24 He takes away understanding from the chiefs of the people of the earth and makes them wander in a trackless waste. 12:25 They grope in the dark without light, and he makes them stagger like a drunken man. | 34:23 For God has no need to consider a man further, that he should go before God in judgment. 34:24 He shatters the mighty without investigation and sets others in their place. |

Note: The table is created by the author based on N. C. Habel’s observation.²

---

Table A16. Job 36-37 and Psalm 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36:27 For he draws up the drops of water (ים) . . . which the clouds (שמים) pour down and drop on mankind abundantly.</td>
<td>18:8[7] Then the earth reeled and rocked; the foundations also of the mountains . . . quaked (רמג), because he was angry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36:28 Can anyone understand the spreading of the clouds (ךש), the thunderings of his pavilion (סכ)?</td>
<td>18:9[8] Smoke went up from his nostrils, and devouring fire from his mouth (פפי) . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36:29 Behold, he scatters his lightning (אור) about him and covers the roots of the sea.</td>
<td>18:10[9] He bowed the heavens (שמים) and came down . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36:30 He covers his hands with the lightning (אור) and commands it to strike the mark.</td>
<td>18:12[11] He made darkness his covering, his canopy (סכ) around him, thick clouds (שמים + רת) dark with water (מים).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36:32 Keep listening (שמע) to the thunder (רמג) of his voice (קול) and the rumbling that comes from his mouth (פפי).</td>
<td>18:14[13] The Lord also thundered (רעם) in the heavens (שמים), and the Most High uttered his voice (קול) hailstones and coals of fire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36:33 Under the whole heaven (שמים) he lets it go, and his lightning (אור) to the corners of the earth.</td>
<td>18:15[14] And he sent out his arrows (חץ) and scattered them; he flashed forth lightnings (בירק) and routed them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36:34 After it his voice (קול) roars; he thunders (רעם) with his majestic voice (קול) and he does not restrain the lightnings when his voice (קול) is heard (שמע).</td>
<td>18:16[15] Then the channels of the water (מים) were seen, and the foundations of the world were laid bare at your rebuke, O Lord, at the blast (נשף) of the breath of your nostrils.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36:35 Do you know how God lays his command upon them and causes the lightning (אור) of his cloud to shine?</td>
<td>37:2 Keep listening (שמע) to the thunder (רמג) of his voice (קול) and the rumbling that comes from his mouth (פפי).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37:3 Do you know the balancings of the clouds (ךש) . . .</td>
<td>37:3 Do you know the balancings of the clouds (ךש) . . .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX 4

**TABLES FOR CHAPTER 5**

Table A17. Lament psalms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Psalm 59</th>
<th>Psalm 62</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Prayer to be set on high</td>
<td>A Testimony of trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-8</td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Complaint against the wicked</td>
<td>B Pessimistic complaint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Testimony of trust in God</td>
<td>C Testimony of trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C' Testimony of trust in God</td>
<td>C' Testimony of trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B' Curses on the wicked</td>
<td>B' Pessimistic complaint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-17</td>
<td>11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A' Praise to God, the high tower</td>
<td>A' Testimony of trust</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Structures suggested by R. L. Alden.¹

---
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