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This dissertation examines the evidence for a dependent literary relationship between Isaiah 40-55, commonly called 2 Isaiah, and the book of Job. Scholars have long recognized certain similarities between these two works. Both emphasize ideas such as the transcendence of God, the lowliness and ignorance of human beings, and the power of God in relation to the creation. The authors of both works show at times a similarity in style of writing. Further, 2 Isaiah and Job share a number of words, phrases, and word strings that are unique within the Hebrew Bible. Finally, both works treat the idea of innocent suffering. Some scholars have judged that these similarities are more than coincidental and that one work is dependent on the other, although not all agree on which is the dependent work. One of the primary factors behind the difference of opinion is the uncertainty about the date of Job. While 2 Isaiah can be reliably dated based on internal evidence, the book of Job is very elusive in this regard, and scholars have posited historical contexts for Job that span hundreds of years. My project is to take a fresh look at the thematic, stylistic, and verbal similarities between 2 Isaiah and Job, aided by recent
research into the phenomenon of intertextuality, with the goal of ascertaining the probability of a dependent relationship between them, describing the nature of their relationship if such exists, and exploring its implications for interpretation.

Chapter 1 introduces 2 Isaiah and Job, particularly theories about the date and nature of their composition and the scope of the texts to be analyzed. Chapter 2 summarizes previous research on the relationship between 2 Isaiah and Job, including problems related to method. I also describe several recent studies on allusion and quotation in literary and biblical studies, including some relating to 2 Isaiah and Job. I then outline my own procedure for analyzing the similarities between 2 Isaiah and Job. Chapter 3 lists as systematically and comprehensively as possible the specific similarities between 2 Isaiah and Job in categories of thematic, stylistic, and verbal parallels, and similarities related to the idea of an innocent suffering servant. Chapter 4 analyzes the nature and distribution of these similarities in their contexts to determine what conclusions can be reached about the nature of the similarities and the relative chronology of the two works. I conclude that previous research has overstated the evidence for a special relationship between 2 Isaiah and Job, and that the claim that one work was inspired by or developed straightforwardly from the other does not hold in light of the evidence. Nevertheless, I suggest two cases in which it appears as if the author of Job is alluding to the text of 2 Isaiah. These allusions can be characterized as parody, and are similar to other cases in which the author of Job is believed to have parodied forms or specific texts known from elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible. Chapter 5 explores the
implications for interpretation of the divine speeches in the book of Job when they are read in part as a response to the criticisms leveled by Job in these instances of parody.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This study examines the similarities between Isaiah 40-55 and the book of Job. These two works, although very different in many respects, nevertheless resemble each other in several intriguing ways. They have in common a number of ideas, and at times exhibit similar literary styles. They share a number of words and phrases that are found nowhere else in the Hebrew Bible, as well as some more extended parallel strings of words. This has led scholars to posit some kind of relationship between these two works, although the nature of this relationship is disputed. The disagreement concerns, first of all, the question of priority: if similarities between Isaiah 40-55 and Job are in fact strong enough to indicate a dependent relationship, which work, or which part(s) of the work is the dependent one? Second is the question of interpretation: how would this relationship affect one’s understanding of these works, particularly the chronologically later one?

The literature on the relationship between Isaiah 40-55 and the book of Job is not only sparse, but also dated, with the most recent independent treatment of the topic published in 1965.¹ The subject is mentioned from time to time in commentaries and

other literature. In the nineteenth century, the discussion centered around the similarities between the figure of 2 Isaiah’s servant and the character of Job, particularly their innocent suffering. In the twentieth century the focus of inquiry turned to words and phrases unique to or characteristic of these two works, in addition to similarities of theme such as innocent suffering. A small majority of this limited body of literature posits Joban priority over Isaiah 40-55, but the consensus of scholarship on Job has, in the last half century or so, settled on an exilic or post-exilic date for its composition, thereby calling into question the assumption that the author of Isaiah 40-55 could have known the book of Job. However, while the date of the composition of Isaiah 40-55 has been pinpointed with relative certainty based on internal evidence, the same quality of

(Grand Rapids, MI: The Society, 1990), 31-38; Jean-Charles Bastiaens, “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; Louvain: Louven University Press, 1997), 421-432. Bastiaens’ study is on synchronic intertextuality (although he assumes Isaian priority), and Curtis addresses only Job 32-37 in relation to Isaiah 40-55. Terrien’s is the most recent attempt to address the topic independently and with new research.

Interestingly, a connection between 2 Isaiah and Job seems to be raised in commentaries on Job more often than those on 2 Isaiah, and usually with positions taken in relation to the conclusions of Pfeiffer and Terrien (e.g. Marvin H. Pope, Job: Introduction, Translation, and Notes [AB 15; Garden City: Doubleday, 1965], xxxiii; John E. Hartley, The Book of Job [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988], 15; John G. Gammie, “On the Intention and Sources of Daniel I-VI,” VT 31 [1981]: 292).


This characterizes the studies of Pfeiffer, Curtis, and Terrien.

In chronological order, the positions are as follows: Cheyne argues for Joban priority except for the Servant poems, Pfeiffer for Joban priority, Elliott for Isaian priority, Terrien for Joban priority, Curtis for Isaian priority over (at least) the Elihu speeches, and Bastians does not argue for but assumes Isaian priority. Other scholars deal with the issue in passing: J. J. M. Roberts refers to “Pfeiffer’s convincing demonstration of Job’s priority over Deutero-Isaiah” (“Job and the Israelite Religious Tradition,” ZAW 89 [1977]: 107-114); Hartley, for example, affirms Joban priority (The Book of Job, 15), as does Ulrich Berges (“Der Ijobrahmen (Ijob 1,1-2,10; 42,7-17): Theologische Versuche angesichts unschuldigen Leidens,” BZ 39 [1995]: 244-245); while Tull Willey assumes Isaian priority (Remember the Former Things: The Recollection of Previous Texts in Second Isaiah [Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997], 7).

James Crenshaw’s Anchor Bible Dictionary contribution is representative of this consensus (“Job.” ABD 3:858-868). According to this view, the text of Job would not, at this point, have included the Elihu speeches.
evidence does not support the consensus about Job’s date of composition. Given this uncertainty, as well as the recent work on intertextuality within the Hebrew Bible, the time has come to reevaluate the relationship between the two works.

A careful analysis of the verbal, stylistic, and thematic connections between Isaiah 40-55 and Job has the potential to make a valuable contribution to scholarship on both works, but particularly to points of debate in scholarship on the book of Job.

• If the relationship between Isaiah 40-55 and the book of Job is found to be such that one was very likely dependent on the other, delineating that relationship could help to locate the date of Job’s composition with more certainty than is currently the case.

If it becomes apparent that the author of Isaiah 40-55 knew the book of Job or parts of it, Job would have to have been composed, in whole or in part, before 550-539 B. C. E., the period to which 2 Isaiah’s composition is generally dated. Conversely, if it becomes apparent that the author of the book of Job was taking his inspiration from Isaiah 40-55, it would show that he was writing after 550-539 B. C. E., lending more certainty to the rather tenuous case for an exilic or post-exilic date for Job, current in Joban scholarship.

• A relatively more certain date for Job, combined with a better understanding of the relationship between Isaiah 40-55 and the book of Job, has the potential to shed light on the interpretation of the book of Job, a notoriously enigmatic book which, in its constituent parts and in its

---

7 2 Isaiah in particular, with its overt references to previous prophecies, has been scrutinized in this regard. See Patricia Tull Willey’s *Remember the Former Things* and Benjamin D. Sommer’s *A Prophet Reads Scripture: Allusions in Isaiah 40-66* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1998).

whole, has been understood in a remarkably broad range of ways, some mutually incompatible.

It is commonplace to say that texts must be read in their historical contexts if we are to have any hope of gaining a right understanding of them, but we are increasingly aware that this includes their literary contexts as well. Texts do not stand alone as isolated artifacts in their culture, without affecting, or being affected by, one another. Sometimes this influence is explicit and intentional, sometimes implicit or unintentional. If either author in question was consciously or unconsciously interacting with the text of the other, reading the works in dialogue with one another is imperative for a right understanding of them that is missed if these texts are read in isolation.

- Comparing Isaiah 40-55 and the book of Job would elucidate the contrasts between them.

Noting similarities between two texts also brings to light their differences. Perceiving how the same ideas are treated differently would allow us to say something about variations in interpretation or diversity of opinion among different authors who perhaps lived at different times or were members of different subgroups in the same culture.

- Discerning the relationship between Isaiah 40-55 and the book of Job would contribute valuable data regarding the phenomenon of inner-biblical allusion⁹ in general.

---

⁹ As distinguished from “innerbiblical exegesis,” where the exegetical relationship is more explicitly marked (see W. M. Schniedewind, “Innerbiblical Exegesis,” in Dictionary of the Old Testament: Historical Books [ed. Bill T. Arnold and H. G. M. Williamson; Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2005], 502-509). If there should prove to be a literary relationship between 2 Isaiah and Job, it would be more indirect than what is meant by innerbiblical exegesis. See also Michael Fishbane, Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel (Oxford: Clarendon, 1985).
As another instance of a connection between disparate parts of (what came to be) the Hebrew Bible, the characteristics of the relationship could be compared and contrasted with other instances of inner-biblical connections, adding to our understanding of how authoritative texts were received, read, and disseminated in antiquity.

Before laying the methodological groundwork for analyzing the relationship between Isaiah 40-55 and the book of Job, it is necessary to say a few words about each of the works as it stands on its own. My purposes in briefly introducing their structure and content are, first, to outline some of the major proposals regarding the compositional history of both works, that is, theories of when and how they came to exist in the form we now have them; and second, to offer something by way of explanation for having chosen Isaiah 40-55 and the book of Job for this study, rather than a different selection of chapters from Isaiah or a partial selection from Job, as others have done.10

1.1 Isaiah 40-55

Although this study is concerned with the second major section of the book of Isaiah, commonly called Second Isaiah (2 Isaiah), the question of 2 Isaiah’s composition hinges on its relationship to the rest of the book, particularly Isaiah 1-39, or First Isaiah (1 Isaiah). The variety of opinions on the nature of this relationship illustrates the difficulty of describing it definitively. That the book of Isaiah was not the work of one eighth century prophet from Jerusalem was first argued in the eighteenth century by J. C. Elliott, for example, in the only other extended study of this question of which I am aware, disregards several chapters of Job on the basis of his judgment that they are not original to the book. See Elliott, “A Comparative Study of Deutero Isaiah and Job,” 137-148. Sommer (A Prophet Reads Scripture) chooses to include a more extended version of 2 Isaiah (chs. 34-35 and 40-66) in his analysis of allusions in 2 Isaiah.
Döderlein, although the suggestions for the time and manner in which the book of Isaiah came into existence have grown considerably more complicated than the original proposal of a bipartite division of chapters 1-39 and 40-66. A century after Döderlein, Bernhard Duhm perceived another division, between chapters 40-55 and 56-66, making for three (at least) distinct prophetic figures whose work made up the content of the book of Isaiah. However, not everyone is convinced by the theory of a tripartite division, and not all those who are find it fruitful to read the book of Isaiah from the perspective of these divisions.

Even though it is now common to hear scholars talk about “First,” “Second,” or “Third” Isaiah, it is widely recognized that these are misleading designations to the extent that they imply the existence of three distinct historical figures or three self-contained historical texts. 1 Isaiah in particular shows a variety of styles and themes that are not likely to have come from one author or even one lifetime. 3 Isaiah, although less diverse, nevertheless contains material that suggests that rather different historical perspectives are represented. 2 Isaiah is perhaps the most unified section, but its boundaries, too, are disputed. In addition, a clear inclusio between Isaiah 1 and 66 indicates not a thoughtless


13 See below (section 1.1.2).

14 Brevard Childs, although not opposed to the idea of a 2 Isaiah or a 3 Isaiah, argues that the historical figures responsible for them have been more or less effaced by the book’s final redactors, who present the canonical Isaiah 1-66 as one coherent whole, and Childs prefers to read Isaiah as it comes to us in its canonical form (Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979], 325-334).
conglomeration of material but rather an intent to present the book as having some kind of unity despite the diversity of material.15

Isaiah son of Amoz, according to the first thirty-nine chapters of the book that bears his name, prophesied during the reigns of Ahaz and Hezekiah, kings of Judah (734-701 B. C. E.). Isaiah prophesied to Ahaz concerning the attack on Jerusalem by the rulers of Damascus and Samaria (Isaiah 7), and to Hezekiah during the Assyrian siege of Jerusalem (Isaiah 36-39). Throughout these chapters resounds a recurring theme of assurance that God carries out God’s purpose for Israel and Judah, punishing or sustaining them according to their moral condition. They are judged according to their attitude toward the cult, and toward economic and social injustices. To the extent that Israel and Judah worship God appropriately and take care of the most vulnerable members of society, they are successful on the world stage. To the extent that they neglect these obligations, their existence as nations is at risk. Even with the threat of exile looming large, however, the hope of survival for a remnant of the people remains (e.g. Isa 7:3; 35:8-10).16

Beginning with Isaiah 40, the tenor and orientation of the prophetic word change. The section opens with God proclaiming, “Comfort, comfort my people” – a very different message from the largely negative critique that dominated much of 1 Isaiah. The exile is now not in the future, as in the days of Ahaz and Hezekiah, but assumed as a

15 This goes beyond the first and last chapters. Isaiah 40 shows clear connections with the call of Isaiah in Isaiah 6, and themes of blindness and lameness are carried over from 1 Isaiah into 2 Isaiah. The similarities between Isaiah 40-55 and 56-66 are prevalent enough to persuade some that they come from the same author (cf. Sommer, A Prophet Reads Scripture, 187-195).

current reality that was, nevertheless, about to change. The argument from prophecy fulfilled is emphasized in 2 Isaiah; to demonstrate the trustworthiness of what he was proclaiming, the prophet preaching comfort points back to previous prophecies that had been fulfilled, prophecies from Isaiah son of Amoz, from Jeremiah, and others.\(^\text{17}\) The presumption of an audience currently in exile, but with high hopes of Cyrus the Persian swooping in to conquer the Babylonian captors, sets the composition of this second major section of Isaiah squarely in the sixth century, probably between 550 and 539 B. C. E.\(^\text{18}\)

The distinction of yet a third major section in the book of Isaiah has received substantial, though not universal support.\(^\text{19}\) 3 Isaiah (Isaiah 56-66) deals primarily with issues internal to the community of Judah rather than international ones. Here, the optimistic anticipation of consolation and return to Zion is replaced by sharp criticism of social and economic injustices, which proliferate even as the perpetrators observe the outward forms of piety (Isa 58:1-5). The religious leaders are accused of taking more concern for their next glass of wine than the sheep under their care (Isa 56:11-12), while the people engage in syncretistic worship (Isa 57:3-13). The atmosphere seems to be one of warring factions, with one group trying to exclude another in a bid for power (Isa 56:3-

---

\(^{17}\) H. G. M. Williamson (*The Book Called Isaiah: Deutero-Isaiah’s Role in Composition and Redaction* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994]), Tull Willey (*Remember the Former Things*), and Sommers (*A Prophet Reads Scripture*) are particularly concerned with exploring the source(s) of 2 Isaiah’s inspiration.

\(^{18}\) Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 40-55*, 93. James D. Smart also places 2 Isaiah in this era, although he would include Isaiah 35 and Isaiah 56-66 along with Isaiah 40-55 in 2 Isaiah (*History and Theology in Second Isaiah: A Commentary on Isaiah 35, 40-66* [Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1965], 32). Not everyone holds to this date. Charles Cutler Torrey, for example, argued that the Cyrus references are interpolations, and that Isaiah 40-66 is the work of one author writing in the 5th century, after the rebuilding of the temple (*The Second Isaiah: A New Interpretation* [New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1928], 40, 53).

\(^{19}\) Critics are, among others, Torrey (*The Second Isaiah: A New Interpretation*), Smart (*History and Theology in Second Isaiah*), and Sommer (*A Prophet Reads Scripture*).
References to a temple already in existence (Isa 56:5-6) as well as to a future rebuilding project (Isa 60:13) hint at different historical contexts, the former perspective perhaps dating from the half century between the rebuilding of the temple and the time of Ezra (516/515-458), and the latter perspective from even earlier.\textsuperscript{20} Possibly because of the disparate situations the prophecies seem to address, these final chapters of the book of Isaiah do not display the same extent of cohesion and structure as Isaiah 40-55, but are a somewhat loose collection that can be described as “a deposit of reflection and elaboration on existing prophetic teaching regarded as authoritative.”\textsuperscript{21}

This is, of course, a simplified panoramic view of the main content and themes of the three sections of Isaiah. As one zooms in closer to any one section, details become clearer and the picture becomes at once more varied and complicated, leading to a variety of theories designed to answer the questions of how the book came to exist in its final form, and how the overall structure is to be understood. A number of complicating factors must be taken account of, and the multiplicity of ways scholars take account of them have produced a multiplicity of answers to these questions. To begin with, it is certain that the book as a whole underwent significant redaction in the process of the disparate sections being joined into one work. Parallels between the first and last chapters of the book (e.g. Isa 1:2, 28 and 66:23-24; 1:13 and 66:23; 1.29 and 66:17) make for an inclusio, demonstrating an intent to draw the whole book together. Thus, at least some parts of so-called 1 Isaiah were written as late as the latest material in the book, and thus long after

\textsuperscript{20} Joseph Blenkinsopp, Isaiah 56-66: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary (AB 19B; New York: Doubleday, 2003), 86. This does not exclude the possibility that minor additions were made later than this time.

\textsuperscript{21} Blenkinsopp, Isaiah 56-66, 77.
the lifetime of Isaiah son of Amoz. In fact, it seems likely that various parts of Isaiah 1-39 are not original to Isaiah of Jerusalem, but come from other authors or redactors, perhaps from the time of the 2 Isaiah material, or even later.\(^{22}\) Isaiah 24-27, for example, are generally accepted as evidence of a later hand at work on the text of Isaiah, closer to 2 Isaiah than to 1 Isaiah.\(^{23}\) Similarly, although Isaiah 35 is included in 1 Isaiah, it is much more closely connected in wording and theme to 2 Isaiah, particularly Isaiah 40; both speak jubilantly of a homeward road for the exiles, though whether they were written by the same author is disputed. These chapters are separated by the story of Hezekiah’s illness and a prediction of the exile (Isaiah 36-39), imported in large part from 2 Kings 18-19 by an author who also seemed to be acquainted with some of the Isaiah material that preceded these chapters.\(^{24}\) Again, although part of 1 Isaiah, these chapters allude to a future exile and thus set up the context for what follows in 2 Isaiah. Regarding 2 Isaiah, while scholars seem inclined to view Isaiah 40-55 as a relatively unified composition, there is nevertheless some disconnect in theme and focus between Isaiah 40-48 and 49-55, and uncertainty concerning how the poems about the servant of YHWH fit into this section.\(^{25}\) Isaiah 56-66 is less cohesive, and appears to be, like Isaiah 1-39, a collection of prophecies that address rather different historical contexts; the buoyant declarations of

\(^{22}\) Williamson (The Book Called Isaiah) sees evidence of 2 Isaiah’s redactional activity in 1 Isaiah, for example.

\(^{23}\) Blenkinsopp, Isaiah 1-39, 346-348.

\(^{24}\) Blenkinsopp, Isaiah 1-39, 458-461. Blenkinsopp points out the contrast between the prophetic sayings of Isaiah 1-39 and the legends surrounding Isaiah (such as his interactions with Ahaz and Hezekiah), further evidence of the composite nature of Isaiah 1-39.

\(^{25}\) Cyrus figures only in the first section; the focus changes from Jacob/Israel in Isaiah 40-48 to Jerusalem/Zion in 49-55; the “servant” in 40-48 is never an individual figure as seems to be the case in 49-55 (Blenkinsopp, Isaiah 40-55, 59-60).
Isaiah 60-62 do not seem to be directed toward a situation consistent with that of the harsh appraisal of Isa 57:3-13, for example, or the foreboding prediction of Isa 66:24.

However one deals with these complicating factors, it is fair to say that whether the text of the book of Isaiah is composite in nature is no longer an open question among critical scholars. The same certainly cannot be said for how to understand the history of its composition. When once it has been conceded that someone other than Isaiah son of Amoz was responsible for the material starting in Isaiah 40, and also for bits and pieces of Isaiah 1-39, questions multiply. Did the author responsible for the 2 Isaiah material self-consciously compose his prophecies in the tradition of Isaiah of Jerusalem, intending them to be appended to those of the latter? Or did 2 Isaiah prophesy in dialogue not only with Isaiah of Jerusalem but also with Jeremiah and his other forebears, intending that his prophecies would be intelligible standing alone? If the former, did he add his own touch to 1 Isaiah’s prophecies to make the connection more explicit? If the latter, when, why, and by whom were his words joined to those of Isaiah of Jerusalem? Did 2 Isaiah inspire yet another “Isaiah,” responsible for the third major section of the book, or do Isaiah 40-66 represent the long career of one prominent figure? To what extent are any of the two or three major sections the work of individual minds, rather than an ongoing tradition whose adherents revised and supplemented their predecessors’ words? Coming to conclusions about the place and extent of 2 Isaiah’s composition within the book of Isaiah is necessary before this study can proceed, since how these questions are answered directly impacts which material will be presented for analysis.
1.1.1 The Place of 2 Isaiah in Isaiah 1-66

The diversity of opinion in recent scholarship on 2 Isaiah regarding the place of 2 Isaiah in the book as a whole can be organized into 3 basic categories. Those in the first category regard 2 Isaiah as largely independent from 1 Isaiah, those in the second regard 2 Isaiah as dependent on 1 Isaiah, and those in the third consider that no part of Isaiah can be understood in isolation from the context of the whole book.

1.1.1.1 An Independent 2 Isaiah

Although no commentator would argue today for three self-contained sections in the book of Isaiah that were each the work of three separate individuals (or groups of individuals), nevertheless there are many scholars who justify separate treatment of 1, 2, and 3 Isaiah. Few still accept Pfeiffer’s bold statement that Isaiah 40-66 was “accidentally” attached to Isaiah 1-39 by virtue of being an anonymous work on the same scroll, and few commentators today would give such short shrift to the relationship of 1 and 2 Isaiah as Westermann does. That does not necessarily mean, however, that the sections are incomplete or unintelligible apart from one another. Steck, for example, considers that both 1 and 2 Isaiah were independent works which stood on their own before being joined by a later redactor. On his view, Isaiah 35 plays an important role in the structure of the book at it stands now, which a redactor composed in order to act as a

bridge between the first and second sections of the book (1-34 and 40-62, respectively) which were at that time joined together as one whole.\(^{28}\)

In a section entitled “Isaiah 40-55 Is *Canonically* Independent of Isaiah 1-39,” Blenkinsopp argues in his commentary on 2 Isaiah for the value of treating it as a separate entity from 1 and 3 Isaiah, against those who maintain that 2 Isaiah is presented as a prophecy of Isaiah of Jerusalem and is best read from that perspective.\(^{29}\) Donning blinders to the clear change of context between Isaiah 39 and 40 hinders a right understanding of 2 Isaiah. However, even the arguments in favor of seeing a very close redactional connection between 1 and 2 Isaiah are misguided in Blenkinsopp’s view. The similarities in wording and theme are not significant enough to overshadow the clear differences between the two major sections (Isaiah 1-39 and 40-66), and 3 Isaiah addresses a situation altogether different from either 1 or 2 Isaiah. Not least is the difference concerning the servant motif, so central in 2 Isaiah but nowhere to be found in 1 Isaiah, pointing toward Deuteronomic influence on 2 Isaiah more than influence from 1 Isaiah.\(^{30}\) The book as a whole underwent substantial redaction over time, but the author of Isaiah 40-55 was not responsible for this editorial activity, nor, apparently, did he intend that his words were to be attached to, or understood as interpretations of, those of Isaiah of Jerusalem.\(^{31}\)

---


Benjamin Sommer and Patricia Tull Willey have made similar contributions to this perspective of 2 Isaiah. Based on their analysis of 2 Isaiah, they both found a plethora of textual allusions and quotations in 2 Isaiah, the sources of which are not only 1 Isaiah, but also include Lamentations, Jeremiah, and the Psalms. 2 Isaiah’s “former things” are not all from the tradition of 1 Isaiah, but from the prophetic tradition more widely conceived. The implication is that 2 Isaiah was interacting with a number of precursors, 1 Isaiah included, but did not perceive his words as having a special relationship with 1 Isaiah and did not intend that they be joined as a supplement or interpretation of 1 Isaiah.

The work of joining 2 Isaiah’s prophecies to Isaiah 1-39 thus belonged to a figure subsequent to 2 Isaiah. It is not at all clear when or how this happened, but it was not an illogical step to take. Despite clear differences, there are nevertheless similarities in the subjects treated by 1 and 2 Isaiah which may have justified it, and certainly Isaiah 40 continues a story already set in motion in Isaiah 1-39. 3 Isaiah may have been included at this same step, or at a later time, and effort made to present Isaiah 1-66 as a whole, if not completely unified, work.

1.1.1.2 A Dependent 2 Isaiah

Gaining ground in recent decades is the push to read 2 Isaiah in relationship with 1 Isaiah, not simply by virtue of their being placed one after the other, but as a genuine

32 Sommer, A Prophet Reads Scripture; Tull Willey, Remember the Former Things.

33 Blenkinsopp, Isaiah 40-55, 43.
attempt to reflect the original intent and purpose of the authors. There are several variations of this way of reading Isaiah, but they all emphasize the affinities that 2 Isaiah has with both 1 and 3 Isaiah, 1 Isaiah in particular.

Christopher R. Seitz is one of the foremost proponents of the so-called “unity of Isaiah” school of thought. On his view, 2 Isaiah was probably never intended to be read or interpreted apart from the material that precedes it. Rather, the author was self-consciously composing the material in Isaiah 40-55 in order to continue the story started in 1 Isaiah. Diverging from the majority opinion, Seitz argues that Isaiah 36-38, the story of Hezekiah’s illness and the deliverance of Jerusalem from Sennacherib, were original in Isaiah’s context and imported into 2 Kings. Isaiah 39, however, was brought over from 2 Kings 20:12-18, in order to show that, despite Hezekiah’s faithfulness, the royal house proved faithless and the threatened defeat became a reality. The aftereffects of defeat, namely the Babylonian exile with which 2 Isaiah deals, continues the story already started in 1 Isaiah. Thus, unlike other scholars who maintain that Isaiah 36-39 was imported from 2 Kings to transition between the historical context of 1 and 2 Isaiah, Seitz maintains that Isaiah 39 and 2 Isaiah were added to Isaiah 36-38 as the continuation of that story. Isaiah 36-38 both reflect the preceding material of 1 Isaiah and anticipate 2 Isaiah. The call narrative at the beginning of 2 Isaiah is not the call of a brand-new

---


35 Seitz, Zion’s Final Destiny, 186.

36 Seitz, Zion’s Final Destiny, 190.

37 Seitz, Zion’s Final Destiny, 194.
unnamed prophet, but the call of the servant Israel.\textsuperscript{38} The bottom line for Seitz is that 2
Isaiah is so closely connected to the material that came before that it is not possible to
understand the former apart from the latter.

Similarly, Clements asserts that Isaiah 40-55 was, from its beginning, intended by
its composer as a “sequel” and “supplement” to 1 Isaiah.\textsuperscript{39} Noting two key themes in 1
Isaiah, namely the people’s blindness and deafness and the divine election of Israel,
Clements notes how these themes are taken up and developed in 2 Isaiah. Isaiah 35, with
its similarities to 2 Isaiah, would have been composed subsequently to finish off 1 Isaiah
and join it to 2 Isaiah. Unlike Seitz, Clements considers that Isaiah 36-39 was brought
into its present location in Isaiah as a transition between, and effectively splitting up,
Isaiah 1-35 and 40-55.\textsuperscript{40}

H. G. M. Williamson takes the idea of the unity of 1 and 2 Isaiah farther than
perhaps any other proponent of the unity of Isaiah.\textsuperscript{41} Not only was 2 Isaiah, a disciple in
the Isaiah tradition, self-consciously dependent upon 1 Isaiah, but he also extensively
worked over and edited the text of the latter. Williamson notes close verbal connections
between various texts in 1 and 2 Isaiah, most significantly those between Isaiah 6 and
Isaiah 40, to demonstrate the literary influence of 1 Isaiah on 2 Isaiah. He also separates
out a number of 1 Isaiah texts, such as the hymn in Isa 12:1-6 and the oracles against

\textsuperscript{38} Seitz, “The Divine Council,” 246.

\textsuperscript{39} R. E. Clements, “Beyond Tradition-History: Deutero-Isaianic Development of First Isaiah’s

\textsuperscript{40} R. E. Clements, \textit{Isaiah 1-39} (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), 277.

\textsuperscript{41} Williamson, \textit{The Book Called Isaiah}. 
Babylon in Isa 13:1-14:23 that were, in fact, either composed or edited and placed in their present position by 2 Isaiah.42

These theories regarding the dependence of 2 Isaiah on 1 Isaiah presuppose that there was some portion of Isaiah 1-39 that predated the rest of the book and circulated independently, providing something on which 2 Isaiah could build. That presupposition has been called into question, most notably by Ackroyd43 and Rendtorff.44 Ackroyd doubts whether Isaiah 1-39, or significant portions of it, could even have been put together in something like a book to which Isaiah 40-66 were then added.45 Rendtorff concurs, noting that the independent existence of all three parts of Isaiah is difficult to believe,46 and wonders whether Isaiah 1-39, or parts of it, can still be considered as a separate book when so much of it is “secondary.”47 He sees all three parts of Isaiah as being very closely connected, with 1 Isaiah edited in light of 2 Isaiah, and with 3 Isaiah intended to unite the two earlier sections.48

42 Williamson, The Book Called Isaiah, 123, 168.


1.1.1.3 An Interdependent Isaiah

A different approach to Isaiah comes from those who take the final form of the book as a starting point. Childs and Sweeney exemplify this perspective, although with rather different methods and goals.\(^{49}\) Childs approaches Isaiah from the point of view of canonical criticism, taking the final, canonical form of the book as the primary lens through which to read it. He does not reject the compositional history of Isaiah as outlined by the historical critical method, nor does he ignore historical critical concerns in his exegesis of the book. However, he sees fundamental continuity despite the change in historical context. Drawing attention to the intertextual links between 1 and 2 Isaiah, he shows how the message of 2 Isaiah is proclaimed using words from 1 Isaiah’s prophecies. Thus, although the historical figure of 1 Isaiah does not figure into the second part of the book, his authoritative word continues to resonate even after the end of his prophetic career.\(^{50}\) Regarding the “former things” to which 2 Isaiah alludes, whatever might have been their original referent, in the final form of the book the referent has become the prophecies of 1 Isaiah, whose message, 2 Isaiah says, has been confirmed.\(^{51}\) Trying to understand 2 Isaiah apart from 1 Isaiah turns 2 Isaiah into a “confused fragment.”\(^{52}\) The most fruitful way to understand the disparate parts of the book is in their theological context, which is the final, canonical form.


\(^{52}\) Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*, 329.
Sweeney also begins with the final form of the text, but for very different reasons. According to Sweeney, questions about redaction cannot be saved until form-critical or compositional history questions are answered, because the final, redacted form is “the only form in which the prophetic message is presented.”53 Every aspect of form or content has passed through redactional hands, which has shaped the final product; once that is recognized, moving backward through time to discover individual forms or the compositional history can and should be done.54 Thus, Sweeney does not approach the book of Isaiah with questions about how it grew from one Isaiah to three; rather, he seeks to discover the structure of the book as a whole, moving backward to delineate its various redactions. He divides Isaiah into two basic sections, Isaiah 1-33, which recounts the preparation for YHWH’s worldwide sovereignty, and Isaiah 34-66, its realization, with chapters 34-35 serving a transitional function.55 He further distinguishes between Isaiah 34-54, which treats that realization as a current event, and Isaiah 55-66, which treats its full realization as a future event.56 The whole book is not merely a conglomeration of prophecies, but a united call to action.57 As Sweeney sees it, the four stages of composition ended with the final form in the 5th century B. C. E., which was preceded by a 6th century redaction involving Isaiah 2-32, 35-55, and 60-62 and a 7th century redaction involving Isaiah 5-23, 27-32, and 36-37, and began with a series of texts attributable to

53 Sweeney, Isaiah 1-39, 11.
55 Sweeney, Isaiah 1-39, 42-43.
56 Sweeney, Isaiah 1-39, 46-47.
57 Sweeney, Isaiah 1-39, 49.
the 8th century prophet Isaiah scattered throughout Isaiah 1-32.\textsuperscript{58} In large part agreeing with most scholars, Sweeney judges that Isaiah 40-55 is a unit, although as the book currently stands, Isaiah 55 is to be read as an introduction to what follows rather than a conclusion to what precedes.\textsuperscript{59} Clearly, the tripartite division of Isaiah does not hold for Sweeney; the structure of the final form takes precedence over what might have been the structure in an earlier incarnation of the book.

Although I can see the value of both Childs’ and Sweeney’s approaches, they are not adequate for the purposes of the present study. I am deliberately attempting to get behind the final form to the state of the text at a particular time in its composition history, in order to see how it influenced or was influenced by another text at that particular time. It is not necessary here to make a judgment regarding whether 2 Isaiah was originally independent of, or dependent on, 1 Isaiah, provided that, in either case, the parameters of 2 Isaiah remain the same, which is discussed subsequently.

1.1.2 The Extent of 2 Isaiah

There is somewhat more agreement on the material that constitutes 2 Isaiah than on how 2 Isaiah relates to the rest of the book. The clear majority opinion is that 2 Isaiah refers to Isaiah 40-55, with a minority arguing for an extended text of Isaiah 35 (or 34-35) and 40-66. Unlike both 1 and 3 Isaiah, 2 Isaiah gives an impression of being a relatively coherent and unified whole. The primary exceptions to this are the so-called

\textsuperscript{58} Sweeney, \textit{Isaiah 1-39}, 51.

\textsuperscript{59} Sweeney, \textit{Isaiah 1-4}, 88.
“servant songs” (Isa 42:1-4; 49:1-6; 50:4-9; 52:13-53:12), which some suggest were not original to 2 Isaiah.

1.1.2.1 Isaiah 40-55

Duhm’s division between Isaiah 40-55 and 56-66 has largely held sway with most critical scholars. Although there are similarities between these sections and a clear intent to make them fit together, particularly in the latter half of Isaiah 40-55, the differences between them, based on style and content, have convinced most scholars of separate authorship. The references to Cyrus and Babylon and return from exile in the former section, versus the references to the rebuilt temple and the apparent setting of the latter section in Palestine indicate (at least) two prophets at work in very different contexts. In addition, there are structural clues that Isaiah 40-55 are meant to be taken together. Isaiah 40:3-5, 8 and 55:10-13 open and close the unit with reference to a new exodus and return home, and to the theme of the enduring nature of God’s word.\(^{60}\) Within Isaiah 40-55 there is a clear division between 40-48 and 49-55; the former talks about Jacob and Israel, and the latter about Jerusalem and Zion, male and female counterparts. Within Isaiah 40-55 there do appear to be additions to the original text here and there, in some cases deliberate attempts to make 2 and 3 Isaiah mesh, for example, the quote in Isa 48:22 of Isa 57:21. In addition, there are some (mostly brief) sections within 2 Isaiah that seem to interrupt the flow of their context and look as if they have been added by someone other than the original author (e.g. the polemics against idol making in Isa 40:19-20; 41:6-7;

By and large these do not detract from the general impression of Isaiah 40-55 as a unified whole. There is some debate regarding whether Isaiah 55 was originally intended as a conclusion to 2 Isaiah, or written to join Isaiah 40-54 and 56-66; most of the time it is grouped with Isaiah 40-54. Isaiah 56-66 (as well as 35), then, were written by someone familiar with 40-55 and “belong to the same textual and exegetical continuum as Isaiah 40-55.”

1.1.2.2 Isaiah (34-)35, 40-66

The internal evidence for assigning Isaiah 40-55 and 56-66 to different dates and authors is less compelling for a minority of scholars. Torrey finds little genuine evidence for the whole idea of a mass return from Babylonian exile; the return from exile, rather, is a return from the multiple locations to which the people of Judah had been scattered. The references in Isaiah 40-55 to Cyrus and Babylon are brief and cursory and, from his perspective, interpolations. Delete them, he maintains, and the very idea of 3 Isaiah “is gone in a twinkling.” For Torrey, Isaiah 34-66 (except for 36-39, taken from 2 Kings) was composed by one author, living in Palestine in the 5th century, after the rebuilding of the temple. Smart, too, remains unconvinced by arguments for a 3 Isaiah. He sees little evidence for a mass exile to Babylon, much less a mass return, and the contradiction between the role of Cyrus and that of the servant is such that Smart suggests his name

was added as a marginal note that made its way into the text. His version of 2 Isaiah is similar to Torrey’s, consisting of Isaiah 35 and 40-66.\textsuperscript{66}

In addition, arguments based on differences in style between Isaiah 40-55 and 56-66 are not equally persuasive to everyone; a skillful author is more than capable of using different tones or styles to address different situations, and during an extended career might do so. Smart, for instance, distinguishes between the written word of the prophet (Isaiah 40-55), and the spoken word (Isaiah 56-66).\textsuperscript{67} Sommer,\textsuperscript{68} following Yehezkel Kaufmann,\textsuperscript{69} recognizes the evidence for the existence of a 3 Isaiah, but does not find it compelling enough to abandon the idea of the basic unity of Isaiah 40-66. Drawing these chapters together are such things as the tendency to repeat a word, sometimes with two meanings (Isa 40:1; 62:10), or to use different words with similar sounds (48:19; 61:2-3).\textsuperscript{70} Sommer also notes the focus on certain themes, such as a road for the exiles, the servant figures, the Zion songs, and a positive view of the cult, that also point toward unity of authorship.\textsuperscript{71} Since Isaiah 34-35 also display some of the same characteristics as Isaiah 40-66, Sommer considers it possible that these chapters are 2 Isaiah’s work as well.\textsuperscript{72} Accounting for both similarities and differences within Isaiah 40-66, Sommer

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{66} Smart, \textit{History and Theology in Second Isaiah}, 20-25.
  \item \textsuperscript{67} Smart, \textit{History and Theology in Second Isaiah}, 36.
  \item \textsuperscript{68} Sommer, \textit{A Prophet Reads Scripture}, 187-195.
  \item \textsuperscript{70} Sommer, \textit{A Prophet Reads Scripture}, 188-189.
  \item \textsuperscript{71} Sommer, \textit{A Prophet Reads Scripture}, 189-190.
  \item \textsuperscript{72} Sommer, \textit{A Prophet Reads Scripture}, 192.
\end{itemize}
suggests that these chapters might have been written by one author at different points in his career, the first part during exile and the second shortly after return.\footnote{Sommer, \textit{A Prophet Reads Scripture}, 190.}

1.1.2.3 The Servant Poems

The so-called “Servant Poems” (Isa 42:1-4; 49:1-6; 50:4-9; 52:13-53:12\footnote{These are the core parts of the poems; there is not universal agreement about the extent of each poem.}) have been the subject of much discussion since Duhm’s influential commentary detached them from their context as a separate text postdating 2 Isaiah and inserted into that text.\footnote{Duhm, \textit{Das Buch Jesaja}, 14.} In the first poem (Isa 42:1-4), the servant is one who is chosen by God and has the spirit of God; he is a teacher of nations and establishes justice on the earth. The second poem (Isa 49:1-6) explicitly identifies the servant as Israel, formed by God before birth and whose purpose is the restoration of Jacob and Israel. The third poem (Isa 50:4-9) depicts the servant as one who endures persecution but will experience vindication from God. The fourth poem (Isa 52:13-53:12) accentuates even more the persecution the servant undergoes, and states plainly that the servant is innocent of wrongdoing; the servant bears the punishment for the sins of others, and thereby heals them. While all four poems now occupy a significant place within 2 Isaiah, there are some indications that one or more of them were perhaps not original to the place they appear in the final composition. If the same figure (individual or collective) is under discussion in the three poems that fall in Isaiah 49-55, for example, then it would seem at least that the last of the poems was
written about the servant after his (or their) death, rather than by the servant. Blenkinsopp argues that the first servant poem was written by 2 Isaiah about Cyrus, and the other three added by a disciple about the prophet-servant after his death. Even those like Blenksinsopp who are inclined to see at least some of the poems as additions to the text note that the addition probably happened relatively soon after the composition of the rest of 2 Isaiah, in contrast to Duhm’s original description of them as a 5th century composition.

1.1.3 Conclusion

Issues of the unity and the extent of 2 Isaiah are not peripheral, but come to bear on the present study in a very important way. It need hardly be said that the choice of which data to include and which to exclude affects the results of any analysis, and choosing unwisely will skew the results and make for distorted conclusions. Given that there are nearly as many theories about the composition of Isaiah as there are theorists, all of them necessarily speculative to one degree or another, it seems advisable in this study to consider Isaiah 40-55 together. Although Sommer argues cogently for the unity of Isaiah 40-66, I remain persuaded by the majority view that the similarities and differences between Isaiah 40-55 and 56-66 are best explained by continuity of tradition rather than

76 Blenkinsopp, Isaiah 40-55, 77-79. The second and third poems are perhaps in the prophet’s own words. Westermann, too, attributes the first three poems to the servant himself, though suggests all four poems were additions (Isaiah 40-66, 29).

77 The apparent contradictions between faithless Israel and the faithful servant do not pose a problem for Smart, since “[t]he true and faithful Israel is hidden even now within the unfaithful Israel” (History and Theology in Second Isaiah, 26).

78 Duhm, Das Buch Jesaja, 19.
unity of authorship. I am suspicious of any explanation of the history of composition that requires the extraction of every text that would undermine it, as in Torrey’s and Smart’s theories. Thus, although the other parts of Isaiah will remain in view and be incorporated where appropriate, the focus of this study is Isaiah 40-55 in its relationship to the book of Job.

Since Isaiah 40-55 give at least the appearance of being a unified composition, I will not attempt to separate out additions that arguably come from someone other than 2 Isaiah. One goal of this study is to determine where the points of contact between Isaiah 40-55 and the book of Job are located, so as to discover whether there is anything helpful to be learned from their distribution. No conclusions concerning the compositional history of either work can rest on patterns of distribution, of course, but those patterns may serve as corroborating evidence that one or another section was or was not an integral part of the material as it was passed on to the later author.\(^79\) Therefore, although this study will take into account the material from the whole of Isaiah 40-55, I will be alert to differences within these chapters as far as its relationship with the book of Job is concerned, and what those differences might entail for the original scope of both works.

1.1.4 The Message of Isaiah 40-55

Taking Isaiah 40-55 as a literary unit, then, what can be said about its primary themes and message? To dissect such a magnificent work of poetry, full to brimming with powerful images of God’s sovereign rule over the nations and tender care for Israel

\(^79\) Extreme caution is in order here, since this kind of argument from silence has a propensity to demonstrate what the one using it is already persuaded is the case.
and Judah is, to say the least, a challenging undertaking. Within Isaiah 40-55 a further division occurs between Isaiah 40-48 and Isaiah 49-55, distinctive enough that a change in location (if not of author\textsuperscript{80}) of the composition may account for the differences.\textsuperscript{81} Isaiah 40 begins with the proclamation of comfort for the exiles, who have been doubly punished for their sins (Isa 40:1-2), and this theme of comfort for beleaguered Israel and Judah pervades Isaiah 40-48. The prophet repeatedly exhorts the people not to fear because God is on their side (Isa 41:13-14). God has absolute power over both nature and nations (Isa 40:12-26), and is more than able to care for those who trust God (Isa 40:27-31). Idols made by human hands cannot compare to God, as evidenced not least by their inability to foretell events, as God has done (Isa 40:18-20; 41:21-24; 44:6-21; 45:20-25; 46:5-13). God, in fact, incited Cyrus against the Babylonians (Isa 44:2-4, 28; 45:1, 13; 46:11), and the Babylonian gods were powerless to help their nation (Isa 46:1-2), which has now been thoroughly disgraced (Isa 47:1-5). God proved to be the supreme creator, who alone formed the world (Isa 40:21-22; 42:5; 43:10; 44:24; 45:18), and who will now form a fertile path through the desert for the exiles (Isa 41:17-20). Although Israel is stubborn and Judah rebellious, God is patient and forgiving (Isa 48:3-12); God urges the exiles to leave Babylon, and promises that if they will but trust, God will once again make them prosper and multiply in the land (Isa 48:17-21). Throughout these chapters, the prophet repeatedly points to the trustworthiness of God’s word, spoken beforehand and now fulfilled, as reason for Israel and Judah to trust God now (Isa 43:10-15; 44:6-8; 46:9-13; 55:10-11).

\textsuperscript{80} Blenkinsopp, \textit{Isaiah 40-55}, 60.

\textsuperscript{81} Sommer suggests this possibility (\textit{A Prophet Reads Scripture}, 190). Not all structural analyses are the same. See Blenkinsopp (\textit{Isaiah 40-55}, 60-61) for alternative possibilities.
In Isaiah 49-55, Israel and Judah fade into the background, as do Cyrus and the fall of Babylon, while Zion and Jerusalem take center stage. God’s servant Israel, now burdened and weighed down, will be vindicated before kings (Isa 49:1-8). Although present circumstances lead Zion to believe that God has forgotten her, the prophet assures her on God’s behalf that such is not the case; it is even impossible (Isa 49:14-16). Having been sent away for her sins (Isa 50:1), soon she will have more prosperity and offspring in the land than she knows what to do with (Isa 49:17-26). As God multiplied Abraham and Sarah’s family, so will God build up the ruin of Zion’s family (Isa 51:1-3; 54:1-5, 11-13). The prophet pleads to God on behalf of the people, that God will act mightily for them (Isa 51:9-11), and God responds with comfort; the one who created the world and stirs up the waves is the same one who shelters Zion (Isa 51:12-16). Although God has punished, God will now bring relief (Isa 51:17-23). God will comfort Zion and redeem Jerusalem in front of the whole world (Isa 52:7-10). If the people will but listen to God, God will renew covenant with them (Isa 55:3). After all, God’s word has proven effective; once it goes out from God’s mouth, it must be established, and so the exiles can count on a joyous and peaceful return (Isa 55:10-13).

1.2 Job

The book of Job has caused much consternation for critical scholars interested in uncovering its compositional history. It is not quite like any other work known from antiquity, and so resists any attempts to categorize it. It tells the story of Job, a man who is blameless and upright, fears God, and turns from evil (Job 1:1). Job becomes the object of a conversation in heaven between God and the adversary (גָּזַר). The adversary, whose
role appears to be that of an informant who roams to and fro on the earth, on the lookout for disloyalty to the deity,\(^{82}\) insinuates that if Job were not so blessed by God, he might not be so blameless (Job 1:8-11). To test the veracity of the accusation, God, who has vouched for Job’s character to the adversary, grants permission to him to attack first Job’s possessions and family (Job 1:12), and then his very person (Job 2:6). Job’s reaction to the loss of his wealth, his children, and his health is at first notably pious; he does not curse God as the adversary had predicted (Job 2:10). The tone of Job’s response changes, however, as he begins speaking with the three friends who come to mourn with him in his distress, Eliphaz the Temanite, Bildad the Shuhite, and Zophar the Naamathite. Job curses the day he was born (Job 3:3-10), setting off a dialogue with these three friends in which he seems to be anything but pious as he questions God’s character and calls God to account for apparently unfair treatment of him. The friends try to defend God’s justice, console Job, and make sense of his suffering in light of their belief that good people prosper and bad people suffer. The dialogue, which consists of three cycles of speeches by the participants, becomes increasingly heated, with the friends intimating that, since God is just, Job must somehow deserve what he is experiencing. Job maintains his conviction that he has done nothing to deserve such suffering, ending the dialogues with a soliloquy that laments his losses and calls down curses on himself if he has done wrong (Job 29-31). At that point Elihu the Buzite, who claims to have been listening in

---

\(^{82}\) Pope, *Job*, 10. Naphtali H. Tur-Sinaí related the term יִסְתֹּר (to roam around), the activity of the adversary in Job. The original form of יִסְתֹּר, then, would have been יִסְתֹּר. According to Tur-Sinaí, all kings would have had these kinds of figures in their employ, and the adversary was simply doing his duty by reporting to the deity the disloyalty he suspected. It may be reading too much into the text, he says, to assume the adversary is a celestial being or an accusing angel; he may even be merely a human sent to be the deity’s eyes and ears in the world (*The Book of Job: A New Commentary* [Rev. ed.; Jerusalem: Kiryat Sepher, 1967], 41-45).
on the speeches of Job and his friends all along, jumps in with his own thoughts about
Job’s circumstances, in much the same vein as the friends (Job 32-27). At the conclusion
of Elihu’s speeches, God finally responds to Job, in the form of two speeches that contain
no obvious answer to Job’s complaints of unjust treatment (Job 38-41). Job answers,
apparently contrite (Job 40: 4-5; 42:2-6),83 is declared by God to have spoken rightly
about God, and ends up even more blessed than before, with possessions and children
(Job 42:7-17).

1.2.1 The Genre of the Book of Job

This story is recounted in an amalgamation of genres, including a prose narrative
that makes up a prologue and epilogue (Job 1-2, 42:7-17), and a poetic section in the
middle (Job 3:1-42:6), the latter made up of a wisdom dialogue (Job 3-27), a wisdom
poem (Job 28), a kind of “testimony” (Job 29-31),84 a lengthy poetic speech from a
character not mentioned elsewhere in the book (Job 32-37), and a speech from the deity
(Job 38-41) to which the hero briefly responds (Job 40:3-5, 42:1-6). Further, a variety of
smaller genres and forms makes up these sections – laments, hymns, disputation
speeches, rhetorical questioning, legal language, and more.85 The question of the
appropriate generic category in which to place the book of Job as a whole has been much

83 Job’s answer is ambiguous, and open to several interpretations. See, e.g., John Briggs Curtis,

84 These chapters do not seem to fit any genre known from antiquity, although parts of them can
be described as “lament, dialogue-appeal, declaration of innocence, appeal for a trial.” The only certainty is
that these chapters differ in style and content from what has come before (see Carol A. Newsom, The Book

85 See Katharine J. Dell, The Book of Job as Sceptical Literature (BZAW 197; New York: Walter
debated. It typically falls into the category of “wisdom literature,” although that is a slippery term, which, in any case, can contain a number of genres within it. When Job’s unity was taken for granted, the book was viewed as a kind of tragedy or epic poem. Several ancient works have come to light in the last century that show remarkable similarities to the book of Job, but none of these is a very close parallel or provides an easy generic category in which to place the book of Job. A host of suggestions have been made in more recent times, describing Job, among other things, as a drama, a lament, a comedy, a tragedy, and skeptical literature. Others have given up on categorizing Job altogether, putting it in a generic league of its own, or have seen

---

86 See Dell’s discussion of this, and the way wisdom literature developed over time (The Book of Job as Sceptical Literature, 58-72).
87 Newsom, The Book of Job, 4.
93 Dell, The Book of Job as Sceptical Literature.
94 Pope, Job, xxx.
authorial intention in the very juxtaposition of genres in which none is privileged, this being integral to its dialogic nature.\textsuperscript{95}

1.2.2 The Scope of the Text

Unsurprisingly, the fact of what appears to be a hodgepodge of sections has led some, if not most, critics to conclude that the book of Job is the product of multiple minds, roughly spliced into one work that is our canonical book of Job.\textsuperscript{96} The common view has been that the prose tale of the prologue and epilogue is something like a folk tale, which probably first circulated orally in one form or another before being written down.\textsuperscript{97} This folk tale would have been a familiar story, the name of Job sufficient to conjure up the image of a particular kind of character, as the mention of Noah, Job, and Dan(i)el in Ezek 14:12-20 would have brought well-known stories to the minds of Ezekiel’s audience. On this view, the author of Job adapted the old tale for his own use, splitting it down the middle, perhaps deleting some material or adding harmonizing details, and inserting his own contribution, the wisdom dialogues. The author, whether

\textsuperscript{95} Newsom, \textit{The Book of Job}.

\textsuperscript{96} The theories about Job’s composition have left no possibility untried. No section of the book has been immune from the claim of being an addition – prologue, dialogue, wisdom speech, Elihu speeches, divine speeches, and epilogue. Likewise, with the exception of Elihu’s speeches, no section of the book has avoided the claim of primacy – prose tale, dialogue, wisdom speech, and divine speeches.

\textsuperscript{97} Duhm, one of the first to suggest this, labels the prose narrative a \textit{Volksbuch} and gives a host of inconsistencies between the prose and poetry that indicate they had to have originated separately (\textit{Das Buch Hiob} [Freiburg: J.C.B. Mohr, 1897], vii-viii). Karl Budde also viewed the story of Job in the prologue and epilogue as one that was used by the poet as a frame for the dialogue (\textit{Das Buch Hiob: Übersetzt und Erklärt} [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1913]). See also Pope, \textit{Job}, xxii; and Westermann, \textit{The Structure of the Book of Job}, 7. The view that the dialogue preceded the prose section, which was then added as a prologue and epilogue, is less fashionable now, as also seems to be the case with the view that the prose tale is itself composite, a series of accretions added to a core story. Avi Hurvitz argues on linguistic grounds that the prose tale in its written form could not be older than the 6\textsuperscript{th} century, but notes archaic elements that might indicate an earlier origin for an oral tale (“The Date of the Prose-Tale of Job Linguistically Reconsidered,” \textit{HTR} 67 [1974]: 17-34).
intentionally or not, left clues to this process in the form of tensions between the old folk tale and his own words, such that readers can tell where one author left off and another began. Pope is one of those readers who sees an array of “incongruities and inconsistencies” between the two sections that demonstrates the problem of literary integrity.\(^{98}\) Besides the difference between prose and poetry, Job seems to have markedly different attitudes toward his suffering in the prose tale versus the poetic dialogue, accepting his misfortunes resignedly in the former while bitterly lamenting his unwarranted suffering in the latter. Further, the epilogue of the prose tale seems to uphold the very doctrine of retribution that is rejected in the dialogues when Job is restored to his former position. Also, use of divine names diverges according to a very consistent pattern between the two sections; the prose tale employs YHWH and Elohim, while the participants in the dialogue refer to the deity mostly by El, Eloah, Shaddai, and infrequently by Elohim.\(^{99}\) In addition, careful readers have compiled examples of alleged inconsistencies in detail between the prose tale and the dialogue. The character of the adversary is part of the prose tale but not of the poetic dialogue.\(^{100}\) The prose tale recounts the death of Job’s children (Job 1:18-19), whereas Job speaks as if they are still living (Job 19:17).\(^{101}\) Such alleged discrepancies, for some readers, point toward the conclusion that separate minds and hands were at work.

\(^{98}\) Pope, \textit{Job}, xxi-xxv.

\(^{99}\) There are possible exceptions. The name יְהוָה is used in the dialogues in Job 12:9 (a verbal parallel with Isa 41:20), although some manuscripts have הָאָלוֹהִים instead. יְהוָה shows up one time in the dialogues, in the wisdom poem (28.28), but some manuscripts read יְהוָה.

\(^{100}\) E. Dhorme, \textit{A Commentary on the Book of Job} (transl. Harold Knight; Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1967), lxxvi-lxxix. This may be considered only natural, given that Job and his friends are ignorant of the heavenly scene.

\(^{101}\) Dhorme, \textit{A Commentary on the Book of Job}, lxxii.
The body of the book makes for even greater complexity. The speeches of Elihu (Job 32-37) are widely believed to be an addition to the text. Even Dhorme, who staunchly defends the authorial unity of the rest of the book, concedes that these speeches must be secondary.\(^\text{102}\) Elihu is never mentioned before he begins speaking in Job 32, and his presence is completely passed over in YHWH’s evaluation of Job’s friends in the epilogue (Job 42:7-9), as if he never existed in the story. Elihu is introduced by a genealogy and an anomalously lengthy description of his mental state that contrasts markedly with the brief descriptions and introductions of Job’s other interlocutors. Most compellingly, his speeches seem to differ stylistically from those of Job and his three friends. They contain more frequent Aramaisms than other portions of the book, as well as other distinctive vocabulary (sometimes unique within the book), both of which indicate to Dhorme that the speeches might originate from a time after the other parts of the book.\(^\text{103}\) The fact that Elihu is said to be a young man who waited for the elders to speak before contributing his own opinion suggests that the author of these speeches may well be a chronological latecomer,\(^\text{104}\) and he seems to have more up-to-date knowledge of the physical world than Job and his three friends.\(^\text{105}\) The majority opinion seems to be that the intrusive Elihu speeches retard the plot and spoil the climax that was supposed to


\(^{103}\) See Dhorme (*A Commentary on the Book of Job*, civ-cv) for a discussion of Elihu’s distinctive vocabulary. Driver and Gray also provide a protracted argument for the secondary nature of Elihu’s speeches based on vocabulary (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Job Together with a New Translation* [ICC; 2nd ed.; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1964], xl-xlvi).


\(^{105}\) Duhm (*Das Buch Hiob*, xi) argues along these lines, and also sees Elihu’s angelology as betraying the later date of these speeches.
have come in the divine speeches.\textsuperscript{106} In the unsympathetic estimation of Driver and Gray, Elihu’s words are “destructive” and “superfluous” to the rest of the book, diminishing the effect of the divine speeches while not adding anything of substance that is new, and the speeches would not be missed if excised.\textsuperscript{107}

The third cycle of speeches (Job 21-27) gives the appearance of having been altered. Bildad has an abbreviated speech in this cycle, and Zophar is missing altogether. Job’s speech includes a digression into the unfortunate fate of the wicked (Job 27:13-23), apparently contradicting his own earlier assertions and agreeing with his friends. To deal with the confusion, Pope, in his commentary, rearranges the material of the third cycle so that the characters speak what he thinks it is reasonable for them to speak, and he is not the only commentator to resort to this kind of rearrangement.\textsuperscript{108}

Further, the wisdom poem of Job 28 seems not to fit well in its context. In the final form of the book, the words of the wisdom poem are Job’s, yet the poem seems to interrupt the speeches of Job that surround them with a style and even a topic not in keeping with anything that has come before. Pope asserts, “Virtually all critics are agreed that the poem on wisdom, xxviii, is extraneous. It is put into the mouth of Job with no

\textsuperscript{106} Dell, \textit{The Book of Job as Sceptical Literature}, 195-198.

\textsuperscript{107} Driver and Gray, \textit{A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Job}, xli.

\textsuperscript{108} See Pope, \textit{Job}, 158-174. In his introduction (xviii) he summarizes his proposal “to augment Bildad’s abbreviated discourse of xxv with the beautiful paean to God’s power in xxvi 5-14 and to supply the missing speech of Zophar from the incongruous parts of Job’s speech, xxvii 8-23, to which may be added appropriately xxiv 18-20, 22-25.” Westermann, too, shuffles bits of Job 25-26 to place them with Bildad’s first speech, fitting the content of those confusing fragments into his overall schema for the book (\textit{The Structure of the Book of Job}, 77-78). Even Hartley, who is less inclined than most critics to see additions in the book of Job, bases his commentary on a rearrangement of material (adding 27:13-23 to Bildad’s third speech and thus eliminating the passage from Job’s third speech); see \textit{The Book of Job}, 25-26. Tur-Sinai goes even farther and suggests that we do not have the full text of the author’s original work; what we have in the canonical book of Job is an incomplete text arranged by a redactor who did the best he could but did not always put the characters’ speeches in the order intended by the author (\textit{The Book of Job}, liv-lv).
effort being made to correlate or integrate it with the rest of Job’s discourse.” Pope has suggested it might have been more appropriately placed in proximity to the divine speeches of 38-41, with which it has some similarities in style, theme, and vocabulary.

The divine speeches themselves have posed interpretive challenges for readers. The differences between the panoramic tour of the cosmos of Job 38-39 and the detailed descriptions of Behemoth and Leviathan of Job 40-41, as well as the oddity of two short responses on the part of Job (Job 40:3-5 and 42:1-6), have resulted in the argument that the Behemoth and Leviathan speeches, and possibly other parts of the divine speeches as well, are also secondary. Von Rad stated confidently, “It is certain that the divine speech has often been subject to secondary expansion.” Cheyne felt compelled to exclude the speech about Behemoth and Leviathan (Job 40:15-41:26 [41:34]) with the justification that it does not fit with the preceding material, whereas Job’s recantation fits very well just after 40:14, and that its style is inferior to the rest of the divine words. Westermann designates the Behemoth pericope (Job 40:15-24) and a large chunk of the Leviathan pericope (Job 41:12-34), along with 39:9-30, as additions, either by the author

109 Pope, Job, xviii.

110 Pope, Job, xxvii. David J. A. Clines, on the other hand, considers that, whoever might have spoken the poem, it steals the thunder, so to speak, of the divine speeches (Job 1-20 [WBC 17; Dallas: Word Books, 1989], lix).


113 Cheyne, Job and Solomon, 56. He notes the possibility that the Behemoth-Leviathan speech might be the work of the author of the rest of the divine words, but in that case would be “one of those after-thoughts by which poets not unfrequently spoil their best productions.”
of (the rest of) Job or by another author, but in any case, not included in the most original form of the book.\footnote{Westermann, The Structure of the Book of Job, 115-122.}

In contrast to the multitude of options so far given for how the book of Job might have been cut, copied, and pasted into its current form, scholars today seem increasingly reticent to view the book of Job as piecemeal.\footnote{There are exceptions. For example, Leo Perdue argues for an early prose frame, to which the poet of the dialogues responded (chs. 3-27, 29-31, 38-42:6); ch. 28 and the Elihu speeches (chs. 32-37) were interpolated subsequently as two protests against the message of the dialogue. The whole work was over two hundred years in the making (The Sword and the Stylus [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008], 117-118; see also Wisdom Literature: A Theological History [Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2007], 83-84).} Prose and poetry appearing side by side in one work is not unprecedented. Examples of poetry framed by prose come to us from ancient Egypt. Job cannot be said to depend on these much older texts, but the book of Job does show a familiarity with things pertaining to Egypt, and the style of a prose frame around a poetic discourse may well be one example of this.\footnote{E.g. “Dispute Over Suicide,” translated by John A. Wilson (ANET 405-407), and “Onchsheshonqy” (text found in B. Gemser, “The Instructions of Onchsheshonqy and Biblical Wisdom Literature” in Congress Volume [VTSup 7; Leiden: Brill, 1960], 102-145).} Since neither the narrative frame nor the poetic dialogue make sense as independent stories, the view that the author of the dialogue simply inserted his own contribution into a ready-made or adapted prose tale is too facile an explanation for this arrangement of genres. Newsom has argued, on the contrary, that the juxtaposition of monologic and dialogic styles was an intentional rhetorical move by the author, meant to jar the reader by presenting the

same basic set of issues through widely divergent genres.\textsuperscript{118} Clines also takes the position that the author of the prologue, dialogue, and epilogue is probably one and the same person.\textsuperscript{119}

The difficulties of the third cycle of speeches should not be underestimated, but here also the reaction by modern scholarly tailors to excise, rearrange and patch up the material for a better fit may have been too hasty. There is no manuscript evidence for rearranging the problematic material, and the attempt often ends up looking like nothing more than “a desperate gesture in response to an interpretive embarrassment.”\textsuperscript{120} It is possible to understand Job’s surprising declarations on the fate of the wicked as a sarcastic anticipation of the friends’ replies,\textsuperscript{121} or as somehow fitting into his belief system.\textsuperscript{122} Both Gordis and Tur-Sinai have drawn attention to the tendency of the author of Job to employ what Gordis calls “virtual quotations” – unmarked quotations of other participants in the dialogue or of texts external to the book of Job.\textsuperscript{123} Newsom interprets Job’s startling sentiments in terms of wisdom dialogue conventions, reading Job in light of the Babylonian Theodicy in particular.\textsuperscript{124} The Babylonian Theodicy does not end with

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\item Newsom, \textit{The Book of Job}, 70.
\item Clines, \textit{Job 1-20}, lviii.
\item In the words of Newsom (\textit{The Book of Job}, 161).
\item J. Gerald Janzen, \textit{Job} (Interpretation; Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1985), 172-174.
\item Newsom, \textit{The Book of Job}, 164-168. She readily admits the difficulties of having only one other example of the genre.
\end{thebibliography}
agreement among the dialogue participants, but the speakers do at least seem to concede the validity of the others’ arguments. This allows for something like a resolution to the debate, without one participant coming out the “winner.” That Job speaks like the friends makes for jarring dissonance that compels the reader to feel the contradiction that Job himself has been feeling, and also serves to silence the friends, but without resolving the conflict.

Regarding the wisdom poem of Job 28, not all experts are so ready to claim its extraneous character as Pope is. Hartley, for example, after noting its less than smooth connections to its surrounding context, nevertheless points out that the poem fits in its present location better than anywhere else it might appear in the book, coming at a major point of transition and acting as a bridge between the dialogue of the first half of the book and the speeches of the second half. He also argues that the similarities between Job 28 and the divine speeches are not necessarily aimless repetition, but a device of the author to prepare the reader or listener for the divine speeches. He concludes,

Since this hymn enhances the work, coincides with the author’s style, stands at the place of a major transition in the book, and contributes to the theme of wisdom that reverberates throughout the book, it may be accepted as an integral part of the original work.125

Newsom, too, sees the poem as an important part of the book as a whole, contributing its own unique take on the dialogues as they have developed up to that point.126 Interestingly, both Hartley and Newsom maintain the tension between the fittingness and the slight awkwardness of the wisdom poem in its context by imagining something like a

play or performance in which the poem is uttered by someone other than Job, either a chorus (Hartley)\textsuperscript{127} or a disembodied voice (Newsom).\textsuperscript{128}

The approach to the divine speeches has gone through extensive transformation since Westermann’s analysis, though the opinion that these speeches were original to the book has long had support. Writing more than a century ago, Delitzsch said, colorfully, that any doubts about their originality “are put an end to by the consideration that the middle part of the book, without them, is a torso without head and feet.”\textsuperscript{129} So too, Dhorme declares confidently, “Not one verse should be cut out.”\textsuperscript{130} Newsom cites a failure to understand properly the sublime nature of the divine speeches as the reason for mistakenly labeling them as unoriginal, and Tsevat criticizes the decision to excise these speeches as interpretive laziness.\textsuperscript{131}

Only the Elihu speeches have anything like a consensus backing up their secondary nature, but even here there are detractors. Clines has argued, for example, that the Elihu speeches were an original part of Job that found their way into the wrong place, belonging instead just prior to (and originally included with) the stylistically similar

\textsuperscript{127} Hartley, \textit{The Book of Job}, 26.
\textsuperscript{128} Newsom, \textit{The Book of Job}, 259.
\textsuperscript{129} Delitzsch, \textit{Biblical Commentary on the Book of Job}, 1:27.
\textsuperscript{130} Dhorme, \textit{A Commentary on the Book of Job}, xciv.
\textsuperscript{131} Newsom, \textit{The Book of Job}, 243; Tsevat is rather blunt in his discounting of the decision to eliminate the speeches: “Some critics, however, say that the final chapters are not part of the original book. Their argument runs as follows: The logic of literary structure as well as other considerations require that these chapters contain the answer of the book; this is their \textit{raison d'être}. But they do not contain it (by which the critics mean: we have not detected in them an acceptable answer). Ergo, the chapters have no justification for existence; they were added later. Ergo, the book has no answer to its problem. This is lazy man's logic. The sentence "I have not detected the meaning" should signify to the philologist "I have not yet detected it," and this should spur him to further search in place of recourse to the easy alternative of denying the authenticity of the passage (Matitiahu Tsevat, “The Meaning of the Book of Job,” \textit{HUCA} 37 [1966], 80).
wisdom poem of Job 28. Wilcox challenged the idea that the Elihu speeches are not original in their present location based on the opening lines of God’s response to Job, which he argues would not make sense apart from Elihu’s speeches. He maintains that at the very outset of the divine speeches God immediately passes judgment on Elihu as the one without knowledge. Taking a different approach, Lynch argues that the Elihu speeches amount to nothing less than an assault on Job and are the climax of Job’s suffering.

1.2.3 The Date of the Book of Job

Given the foregoing considerations, it comes as no surprise that the date of Job’s composition has so far not been discovered based on the material internal to Job, as is the case with Isaiah 40-55. Indeed, the dates that have been proposed span over a thousand years, and all the proposals can claim to have some basis in the text of Job.

---

132 David J. A. Clines, “Putting Elihu in His Place: A Proposal for the Relocation of Job 32-37,” *JSOT* 29 (2004): 243-253. As for how this might have happened, Clines posits the notion that someone may have incorrectly attached the columns of a scroll containing the book of Job, with the result that the Vorlage of the MT had the chapters out of order, as seems to have happened in the case of texts in Ben Sira (“Putting Elihu in his Place,” 253).


135 Pope, *Job*, xxxvi.
1.2.3.1 Pre-exilic

The characters and plot of the prologue and epilogue of the story hark back to an era like that of the patriarchs, with Job, like Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, having great wealth and many servants (Job 1:3). Religious practice seems simple, with no awareness of the regulations spelled out at Sinai; Job acts as priest on behalf of his family members, making sacrifices for their sin (Job 1:4-5). The existence of other ancient literature with affinities to Job has suggested the possibility that the book of Job may also be comparably old. Egyptian, Sumerian, and Akkadian texts from the third and second millennia B. C. E. have certain similarities with the book of Job, particularly with its theme of righteous suffering.\(^{136}\) Although these texts have just as many differences as similarities with the book of Job, they nonetheless show the same concerns and preoccupations, indicating that the book of Job could be at home in the same era in which they were composed.

Of course, a story need not have been composed in the era which it purports to narrate, and those who would assign Job a pre-exilic date bring its composition down into the seventh or sixth century B. C. E. The absence of any reference to the exile, a watershed in any account of Israelite history, precludes some scholars from considering an exilic or post-exilic date. Pope argues from this point, saying that if the author wrote during or just after the exile, the story of Job would have been a parable of that event. Since the book gives no evidence of the nationalism one would expect if such were the case, he thinks it likely that the dialogues stem from the seventh century B. C. E.,

---

\(^{136}\) See n. 88.
although the prose tale may be much older. Delitzsch gives a similar motivation, as well as the cosmopolitan nature of Job and aspects of its doctrine, for assigning Job to the Solomonic period. Interestingly, both Pfeiffer and Terrien argue for a pre-exilic date from Job’s relationship to Isaiah 40-55, in terms of vocabulary and theme. In both respects, Isaiah 40-55 appears to them as further developed than Job, and in this estimation they are followed by Hartley.

1.2.3.2 Exilic or Post-exilic

On the other hand, there are just as many indications of a date during or after the exile. Tur-Sinai, who maintains that the book of Job has been translated from Aramaic into Hebrew, argues that this particular variety of Aramaic would have been used in Babylon during the 7th-6th centuries. The figure of the adversary in the prologue suggests to some readers a connection with the book of Zechariah and thus a date for the composition of the prologue and epilogue not earlier than the end of the sixth century. The implicit monotheism of the book also might indicate that the author of Job was at

---


138 Delitzsch, *Biblical Commentary on the Book of Job*, 1.18-24. The wide-ranging knowledge of nature on the part of Job’s author indicates to Delitzsch a time of cultural flowering and international awareness that would have marked the time of Solomon. Regarding doctrinal content, Delitzsch asserts, for example, that the concept of a personified Wisdom is less developed in Job than in Proverbs 1-8, placing Job at an earlier point on that trajectory than Proverbs 1-8.

139 See Chapter 2.1.


work at a time later than the exile. Janzen, in contrast to Pope, understands Job to be
dealing with the tension between the disaster of the exile and the religious tradition of
Israel.\textsuperscript{143} Dhorme reads a clear allusion to the exile in Job 12:17-19 and pinpoints the
book’s date, based on the perceived influence of Zechariah on Job and of Job on Malachi,
to between 500 and 450 B. C. E.\textsuperscript{144} Cheyne also sees allusions to the exile, although he
places the writing of Job between the beginning of the exilic period and the writing of
Isaiah 40-55, which he indicates was influenced by the book of Job.\textsuperscript{145} Wolfers takes this
concept even further, reading the book of Job as a sort of allegory for the exile, with Job
representing the innocent Hezekiah, the ten children the ten tribes, Behemoth the animal-
like nature of God’s people, and Leviathan the Assyrians.\textsuperscript{146} Similarly, Westermann
conceives of the Leviathan speech as a proclamation of the sovereignty of God over
historical powers.\textsuperscript{147} Unlike Pfeiffer and Terrien, Driver and Gray argue that Job shows
development, with respect to both vocabulary and doctrine, from the earlier 2 Isaiah; they
conclude that Job was written probably in the 5\textsuperscript{th} century B. C. E.\textsuperscript{148} Based on linguistic
evidence, Newsom thinks it best to date the book of Job (except for the Elihu speeches)

\textsuperscript{143} Janzen, \textit{Job}, 5. Noting the connections between Isaiah 40-55 and Job, he goes on to say that
“Job and Second Isaiah arose as mirror opposites from one emergent Israelite tradition” (12).

\textsuperscript{144} Dhorme, \textit{A Commentary on the Book of Job}, clxvii-clxix. Pope claimed that this “allusion” was
too general to make a claim like Dhorme’s (\textit{Job}, xxxiv).

\textsuperscript{145} Cheyne, \textit{Job and Solomon}, 75.

Wolfers connects Behemoth to Ps 73:22, in which the psalmist says of himself, “I was like a brute beast
(\textit{beheten}) toward you” (85).

\textsuperscript{147} Westermann, \textit{The Structure of the Book of Job}, 121.

\textsuperscript{148} Driver and Gray, \textit{A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Job}, lxix-lxxi.
to the early post-exilic period (6th – 5th c. B. C. E.). Also citing linguistic evidence, Crenshaw does not allow for a date before the 6th century B. C. E. Of the date of Job Clines admits, honestly, “I frankly know nothing,” and says only vaguely that the book comes “several centuries before the Christian era.”

With such an abundance of theories regarding when and how the book of Job came into existence, it is somewhat problematic to speak of a consensus on these questions. Even so, while most commentators forthrightly acknowledge that the book of Job probably comes to us from between the 7th and 2nd centuries B. C. E., most commentators of the last twenty-five years would settle on the 6th or 5th century as the most likely time that the bulk of the book was written. The Elihu speeches are believed to have been affixed some time after this, but in any case before the 2nd century B. C. E. The discovery at Qumran of fragments of a Targum of Job, including portions of Elihu’s speeches, provides the one piece of incontrovertible evidence; a form of the book that included the speeches of Elihu had to have been in circulation before the first century B. C. E.


150 James Crenshaw “Job,” ABD 3:863.

151 Clines, Job 1-20, xxix.

152 Pope, Job, xxxvi. Crenshaw (“Job,” 3:863) says this Targum dates from the 2nd or 3rd century B. C. E.
1.2.4 Conclusion

I am inclined to read the book of Job more or less as a whole (recognizing that there may be small accretions to the text), rather than piecemeal, and that is the perspective from which I analyze Job in subsequent chapters. Although I think it likely that a tale about the character Job who suffers innocently was known before the canonical book of Job was composed, that does not indicate to me that the specific incarnation of the tale in Job 1-2 and 42 was composed in its entirety by someone other than the author of the dialogues. Since there are multiple examples of poetry framed by prose, the mere difference in genre between narrative frame and poetic dialogues does not preclude taking both as the work of one author. The “discrepancies” between the two sections are, in my view, overblown by too-literal reading. Job 28 does seem to fit a bit awkwardly in its context, but I am more sympathetic to the attempt to make sense of its meaning where it stands than to the reaction to exclude it as unoriginal. The original inclusion or exclusion of the speeches of Elihu is a much more complicated issue; there are good arguments for both sides, and I consider this to be an open question as of now. I am not fully convinced by the arguments one way or the other.

For the purposes of this project, no part of the work will be excluded from analysis. My decision to include the book in its entirety springs from more than just a desire to be as comprehensive as possible. Disregarding sections a priori as “additions” might prevent the possibility of making valuable comparisons between sections. For example, if Job 3-31 and 38-41 show distinctive connections to Isaiah 40-55, which are not mirrored in Job 32-37, this is a further datum for concluding that the Elihu speeches derive from a different author than the rest of the dialogue. If, however, the Elihu
speeches demonstrate similar types of connections to Isaiah 40-55 as the rest of the book of Job, this could indicate a closer connection between Elihu’s speeches and the dialogues than at first appearance. Including the whole book of Job in this analysis should allow opportunities for comparing and contrasting its disparate parts in an instructive and illuminating way.

1.3 Prophecy and Wisdom

Given the conspicuous differences between Isaiah 40-55 and the book of Job, not least that they fall into separate divisions of the Hebrew Bible, some justification for juxtaposing them is in order. My purpose is not, as some have done, to try to show the influence of one type of figure or literature on another. Whether prophetic literature had an influence on wisdom literature, or sages left an impression on prophets and other questions of this kind are engaging, but very difficult to answer or even to ask appropriately. When Isaiah 40-55 and the book of Job were written, there was nothing resembling our concept of a “Hebrew Bible,” much less three divisions of Law, Prophets, and Writings, and so asking questions about how the literature in the various divisions

---

relate is a distinctly modern project. The results would be of very limited value in
delineating the relationship of Isaiah 40-55 and the book of Job. Finding wisdom
vocabulary in prophetic texts, for example, might indicate some kind of relationship, or it
might simply show that prophets and sages were employing rather common words to talk
about mutual concerns.\textsuperscript{154}

What the literature demonstrating the permeable partition between “prophecy”
and “wisdom” seems to have accomplished is the demolition of a false distinction. It
seems apparent now that the wisdom tradition in Israel was not the province of an elite
class of sages only, but filtered into the lives of people at every level of society as a way
of approaching reality, even manifesting itself as informally as parental instruction of
children.\textsuperscript{155} In addition, the concept of “wisdom” is regarded as much more multi-faceted
than previously; besides the canonical “wisdom books” of Job, Proverbs, and
Ecclesiastes, the wisdom tradition encompasses mantic and revelatory types of wisdom as
well, such as the type of wisdom found in the book of Daniel;\textsuperscript{156} and some would
emphasize the revelatory nature of Job over its traditional categorization of “wisdom.”\textsuperscript{157}

My presupposition, then, is that Isaiah 40-55 and Job are likely to share certain words and

\textsuperscript{154} See the critiques of R. N. Whybray (“Prophecy and Wisdom” in \textit{Wisdom: The Collected
Articles of Norman Whybray} [ed. Katharine J. Dell and Margaret Barker; Ashgate: Burlington, 2005], 282-
286); and James Crenshaw (“The Influence of the Wise upon Amos,” ZAW 79 [1967]: 42-52).

\textsuperscript{155} The transitions in wisdom scholarship are summarized concisely in Whybray, “Prophecy and
Wisdom,” 271-289.

\textsuperscript{156} In addition to wisdom sayings, theological wisdom, and nature wisdom, of which Israelite
wisdom literature consists. See John J. Collins, \textit{Seers, Sybils and Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism
(JSJSup 54; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 388. Von Rad legitimately wonders whether the term “wisdom” is “more
of a hindrance than a help” (\textit{Wisdom in Israel}, 8).

\textsuperscript{157} See Kaufmann, \textit{The Religion of Israel, from Its Beginnings to the Babylonian Exile} (transl. by
then, religious to its very core. It comes from the realm of revelation, not wisdom; this is the distinctive
Israelite feature of the book.”
general themes that are not of significant value for delineating their relationship; these
would instead make up part of the body of evidence for the nebulous character of
“prophetic literature” and “wisdom literature” as we categorize them today.

My concern, rather, is the direct literary relationship between Isaiah 40-55 and the
book of Job. While it may not be so easy for us to see why a sage might view a prophet’s
words as worthy of reference, or a prophet a sage’s words, there is no a priori reason
against comparing the words of the prophet of 2 Isaiah and the sage of Job as readily as
we would compare the words of 2 Isaiah and Jeremiah. Indeed, given the similarities of
word and content noted by others, and the profitable application of the concept of
intertextuality to the Hebrew Bible in recent years,¹⁵⁸ there is great incentive to probe the
relationship between the words of this prophet and this sage.

In what follows, I will outline a methodology for analyzing the possible
connections between 2 Isaiah and Job, and show similarities and differences between this
method and those of previous studies of the question (Chapter 2). I will examine the
evidence for positing a connection between 2 Isaiah and Job, including similarities of
theme, literary style, and vocabulary (Chapter 3). I will then evaluate the strength of this
evidence as it relates to a specific literary relationship between 2 Isaiah and Job, as well
as note the locations and nature of the similarities and the significance they have for the
relative dating and history of composition of the two works (Chapter 4). Finally, I will

¹⁵⁸ E.g. Sipke Draisma, ed., Intertextuality in Biblical Writings: Essays in Honor of Bas van Iersel
(Kampen: Uitgeversmaatschappij J. H. Kok, 1989); Dana Nolan Fewell, ed., Reading Between Texts:
Intertextuality and the Hebrew Bible (Louisville: John Knox Press, 1992); Craig A. Evans and Shemaryahu
Sanders (Leiden: Brill, 1997). For a helpful clarification of the concept of intertextuality, see especially
Ellen van Wolde, “Trendy Intertextuality?” in Intertextuality in Biblical Writings.
investigate the implications of a relationship between 2 Isaiah and Job for our understanding of the book of Job, particularly the divine speeches (Chapter 5).
CHAPTER 2
METHODOLOGY

In a project such as this one, laying a sound methodological foundation is paramount. Similarities between 2 Isaiah and Job have been observed in regard to the content of the works, the style of writing, and the vocabulary the authors chose to use. Whether similarities such as these result from a relationship of influence and dependence, or from dependence of both on a third source or tradition, or from mere coincidence based on spatial and temporal proximity can be a very difficult judgment to make. The element of subjectivity necessarily involved in making such judgments requires a reliable methodology that provides both guidelines for identifying intentional borrowing when it occurs, and also controls for minimizing the possibility of perceiving it where none exists.

There are three separate bodies of literature that require a survey here. First, I will describe the history of research regarding the relationship between 2 Isaiah and the book of Job. Previous investigations into this topic are useful in many ways, especially for their records of words and phrases common to both 2 Isaiah and Job. Most of these, however, stem from a time when biblical scholars did not generally incorporate the insights of the literary theory of the day into their own work on the biblical text. They also predate the explosion of research into theories of intertextuality of the later twentieth century that revolutionized the way texts and relationships between texts are conceived. As a result, as
helpful as these previous treatments are in some respects, by and large they do not contribute much toward a reliable methodology for the present study, nor do they delve into questions of what impact a literary relationship between 2 Isaiah and Job might have on our interpretation of these works.\(^{159}\) Because of this, second, I will discuss the insights that come from the discipline of literary theory regarding the concepts of intertextuality, quotation and allusion.\(^{160}\) Third, I will describe recent work within the field of biblical studies, including some that deals with 2 Isaiah and Job, which takes account of these insights and which might serve as models for the present project.\(^{161}\) Finally, I will outline the methodology that this dissertation will employ, including the definition of terms, similarities with and differences from analogous studies, potential problems inherent in the project, and the procedure whereby I will compare Isaiah 40-55 and the book of Job.

---

\(^{159}\) Most of this previous research, while initially laying out verbal parallels, falls back on perceived cultural or theological developments to argue for the priority of one or the other (see below, section 2.1).


2.1 Previous Research on the Relationship between Isaiah 40-55 and Job

The suggestion that there is a relationship between Isaiah 40-55 and the book of Job is by no means new. A connection was made between the character of Job and the suffering servant of 2 Isaiah by the sixteenth century rabbi Eliezer Ashkenazi in his discussion of Deuteronomy 32. The Song of Moses, Ashkenazi said, answered questions like those that were asked in the book of Job.\(^\text{162}\) Job’s name appears in Ezekiel 14 after Noah and Daniel, which Ashkenazi took to imply that Job lived after Daniel, between the destruction of the first and second temples, during the time referred to in the servant poem of Isa 52:13-53:12.\(^\text{163}\) Job, said Ashkenazi, is a symbol for Israel, and it is his life that inspired the wording of the servant poem,\(^\text{164}\) which Ashkenazi sought to prove by demonstrating the similarities between eighteen different words or phrases in the servant poem and their parallels in the book of Job.\(^\text{165}\) The events of Job’s life were a sign that Israel would also return to a state of blessedness after the experience of suffering. The impetus for an extended discussion about the connections between Job and the suffering servant, Ashkenazi stated explicitly, is to correct the Christians’ incorrect identification of the latter figure.\(^\text{166}\)


\(^\text{163}\) Cooper, “The Suffering Servant and Job,” 194.

\(^\text{164}\) This appears to have been very much a minority view. In his article on Jewish interpretations of the Isaian suffering servant, Charles E. McLain compared the ancient interpretation of the suffering servant as a messiah figure with the medieval interpretation of the suffering servant as the collective people of Israel. McLain mentioned neither Job nor Ashkenazi in this analysis (“A Comparison of Ancient and Medieval Jewish Interpretations of the Suffering Servant in Isaiah,” CBTJ 6 [1990]: 2-31).

\(^\text{165}\) Cooper, “The Suffering Servant and Job,” 195-196.

\(^\text{166}\) Cooper, “The Suffering Servant and Job,” 198. Elsewhere it seems that Job is compared more often with Abraham in rabbinic thought (see A. T. Hanson, “Job in Early Christianity and Rabbinic
In more recent history, T. K. Cheyne, in his commentary on the book of Isaiah, included a separate essay on the parallels between 2 Isaiah and Job. The character of Job, according to Cheyne, is more than a mere individual; he is a “type of righteous men in affliction.” As both individual and type, Job already bears certain resemblances to 2 Isaiah’s servant of the Lord, whose suffering was representative for the community and whose reward benefited the community. Beyond this, Cheyne lists other points of contact between the figure of Job and that of the servant. Both are called “my servant” by God. Both are described as suffering from leprosy, whose appearances repulse those who see them. Both are mocked and deserted by their friends, but are reinstated in the end and given more blessings than before, including the assurance of life beyond the grave. Although he observed clear differences between the figures as well, Cheyne maintained that “the one beyond question helped the other.” Cheyne discounted the possibility that 2 Isaiah influenced the author of Job, but also does not see direct influence in the opposite direction. Rather, Job “helped” Isaiah by influencing an audience and preparing it to receive the message of 2 Isaiah. The influence was indirect; by teaching that virtue is not always rewarded nor vice punished, the book of Job prepared the Jewish nation for

---


the possibility of a Messiah who, far from attaining outwardly visible victory, suffered and died.\textsuperscript{171} In his later book \textit{Job and Solomon}, Cheyne claimed “at least two clear cases of imitation” (Isa 51:9b, 10a and Job 26:12-13; Isa 53:9 and Job 16:17) besides those parallels which result simply from similar themes.\textsuperscript{172} In the former case, Cheyne asserted Joban priority, but with regard to the latter case suggested that the servant poem found in Isa 52:13 – 53:12 had its origin before the exile, and was known to the author of Job, who composed at least the dialogue during the exile.\textsuperscript{173} In any case, while he saw Job and 2 Isaiah as stemming from roughly the same period, he argued for Joban priority over 2 Isaiah in general, but with more cases of coincidental parallelism based on common theme than cases of direct borrowing.

Other scholars have seen instances of more direct borrowing in 2 Isaiah and Job, and have based a relative chronology on the perceived direction of those parallels, with varying conclusions. Robert H. Pfeiffer was one of the first to attempt an answer to the question of priority based on analysis of verbal connections, in the appendix to a 1927 article entitled “The Dual Origin of Hebrew Monotheism.”\textsuperscript{174} Pfeiffer argued that the “vital and lasting contribution of the children of Israel to the cultural progress of mankind is religious monotheism” which, he said, was a doctrine “clearly formulated for the first time in Is. 40 ff.”\textsuperscript{175} The question he sought to answer was which elements in Israel’s religious thought led to 2 Isaiah’s formulation of that doctrine. Pfeiffer came to the

\textsuperscript{171} Cheyne, \textit{The Prophecies of Isaiah}, 2:252-253.

\textsuperscript{172} Cheyne, \textit{Job and Solomon}, 84.

\textsuperscript{173} Cheyne, \textit{Job and Solomon}, 84-85, 88-89.


conclusion that 2 Isaiah combined two existing conceptions of the deity, namely, the idea of a God of history and a God of the physical world. The first, he maintained, was “strictly Israelitic” while the second was Edomitic and represented by the book of Job.\(^{176}\) Pfeiffer argued that Israel’s deity, up until 2 Isaiah, was exclusively concerned with humanity and human history as opposed to physical nature or animals; on the occasion that the deity acted in the realm of physical nature it was not for nature’s own sake, but for humans’ sake. The deity portrayed in Job, however, is the opposite; this God is not concerned with human affairs and is active only in the realm of nature and living creatures.\(^{177}\) The book of Job is designed to prove that God is “merely powerful, an irresistible, supreme force of nature” who created and sustains the world and is not the least troubled about injustice in the human realm.\(^{178}\) The revolutionary contribution of 2 Isaiah was to keep hold of faith in Israel’s YHWH, who is active in human history, while at the same time incorporating the traits of the Edomitic powerful creator of the physical world, which excluded any notion of polytheism. Thus, Pfeiffer concluded, Israel’s monotheism resulted from 2 Isaiah’s fusion of Israel’s God of history and Edom’s God of nature, portrayed in Job.

Whether Pfeiffer correctly pinpointed the origin of monotheism is worth pondering, but the portion of his argument that concerns us here is the explicit declaration that 2 Isaiah both follows and is impacted significantly by the book of Job. Aware that scholarly consensus would date Job’s composition to after that of 2 Isaiah, Pfeiffer

\(^{176}\) Pfeiffer, “The Dual Origin of Hebrew Monotheism,” 194.

\(^{177}\) “This deity of the Book of Job has nothing in common with the Yahweh of pre-exilic Israel, not even the name” (“The Dual Origin of Hebrew Monotheism,” 198).

included a critical note at the end of his article arguing for the priority of Job to Isaiah 40-55 based on parallels in vocabulary and thought. He listed a total of seventeen words or expressions that occur only in Job, Isaiah 40-55, and postexilic passages; eight idiomatic expressions used by both Job and 2 Isaiah; and seven figures of speech found in both. In addition, he compiled a variety of similarities between Job and 2 Isaiah with respect to conceptions of the deity and of humanity. Pfeiffer concluded that all the similarities are unique to the worldview of Job, whereas Job does not have any of the religious ideas of Israel or the personal views of 2 Isaiah. Pfeiffer considered that the parallel material shows Job to be “far more original, specific, and comprehensive,” and viewing 2 Isaiah as prior to Job would make for a “mountain hanging from a thread.”

Further, 2 Isaiah uses divine names distinctive of Job (אֱלֹהִים, אֱלֹהִים), employs creation terminology from post-exilic literature (קֶסֶם, כָּל, and בָּרָא) that is lacking in Job, and contains the idea of creation by fiat, also lacking in Job. Finally, the doctrine of monotheism that preoccupies the author of 2 Isaiah – indeed, that is for the first time formulated in 2 Isaiah – is not explicit in Job. Thus, Pfeiffer reckoned, the material in 2 Isaiah is a development from the material in Job, but Job could not have known 2 Isaiah.

The most comprehensive treatment of the relationship between Isaiah 40-55 and Job is Ralph H. Elliott’s 1956 dissertation, “A Comparative Study of Deutero Isaiah and

---

Job.”¹⁸² Elliott explored the relationship between Isaiah 40-55 and the portions of Job which he considered authentic or original, concluding that Isaiah 40-55 influenced the chronologically later Job. Disregarding the Elihu speeches (Job 32-37)¹⁸³ as well as the Behemoth and Leviathan pericopes of the divine speeches (Job 40:15-41:26)¹⁸⁴ as not original to the book, Elliott compared the remainder of the two works based on philological aspects (rhythm and meter, vocabulary, syntax, style, and usage of the divine names) and theological aspects (the concepts of God, of man, of Satan and the problem of evil, of suffering, and of the world), concluding that Isaiah 40-55 preceded and influenced (the original portions of) Job. Elliott criticized Pfeiffer for simply having “used his own judgment and evaluation” regarding which of the two works’ shared vocabulary words were early or late, and asserted that very few words are unique to Isaiah 40-55, Job, and post-exilic literature.¹⁸⁵ Elliott came to his conclusion regarding the priority of Isaiah 40-55 based “primarily on the evidence of the narrowing of emphasis from the nation to the individual” – the national emphasis characteristic of Isaiah 40-55 and the individual emphasis of Job.¹⁸⁶ In addition, “the individualistic expression, the diction, the sprinkling of Aramaisms, the idiomatic syntax, and the boldness of expression, coupled with the problem-searching method, the accepted monotheism, and the reach for an afterlife” all led Elliott to believe that the composition

¹⁸² Elliott, “A Comparative Study of Deutero Isaiah and Job.”
¹⁸³ Elliott, “A Comparative Study of Deutero Isaiah and Job,” 143.
of the original text of Job occurred in the fifth century, and “nearer to 400 B.C. than 500 B.C.”

Contrary to Elliott, Samuel Terrien concurred with Pfeiffer regarding the priority of Job, but went further in his analysis of the ways in which 2 Isaiah develops the themes found in Job. Terrien admitted that the scholarly consensus held to a fifth century date for the book of Job, thus placing it after 2 Isaiah. The themes of Job, as well as its humanist and universalist characteristics, suggest to many scholars that the exile had already happened when Job was written, and some even see a dependence on the opening chapters of Proverbs, which are typically considered to be a post-exilic addition to a collection of older proverbs. Along with Pfeiffer, Terrien took a position against this consensus, and proposed that the Joban poem acted as teacher to the author of 2 Isaiah and appeared to be a major source of inspiration for him.

With more than forty verbal parallels, similar rhetorical styles, and common motifs between them, that Job and Isaiah 40-55 do not have some kind of literary relationship was implausible to Terrien. The only question was the nature of this relationship. Terrien described three motifs that Job and Isaiah 40-55 share, including the motifs of divine transcendence, of frail and transitory human existence, and of the Servant of YHWH. These motifs are often described with the same words or expressions


189 Terrien, “Quelques remarques sur les affinités de Job avec le Deutéro-Esaïe,” 298. Terrien (300) places the composition of Isaiah 40-55 between 549 and 545 B. C. E.

190 Terrien, “Quelques remarques sur les affinités de Job avec le Deutéro-Esaïe,” 298-299. Terrien (300) is careful not to insist that Job as we know it today was available to the author of 2 Isaiah in written form; it is enough that the author of 2 Isaiah knew in oral form a fairly stable tripartite dialogue ending with a divine speech from the whirlwind and a two-part response on the part of the story’s main character.
in both works, although according to Terrien’s analysis in rather different contexts. The words and themes that are concentrated in Job (e.g. the idea of a human creature powerless in the face of an almighty God in Job’s speech in Job 9-10) are dispersed throughout Isaiah 40-55. Both works portray God as transcendent over all creation, whose works are incomprehensible to humans, and humans as insignificant beings made of clay, short-lived and powerless compared to God’s greatness. In Job, these portrayals lead to the conclusion that humans ought not to question God, or expect much of anything from God, but rather to accept their place in the creation, lowly though it be. In 2 Isaiah, however, these portrayals lead to the conclusion that humans ought not to question God’s judgment, but rather to trust in God’s tender care for them, who are but clay. Regarding the motif of the servant, in Job the idea is immediate and concrete, with Job, YHWH’s servant, suffering innocently. In Isaiah 40-55, the motif is put to liturgical use, with various ideas of innocent suffering from Job combined in 2 Isaiah, whose author added the element of vicarious suffering.191

Terrien’s evaluation of the data led him to conclude that 2 Isaiah was offering answers to questions posed by Job, questions concerning the agony of human existence, suffering, mortality, and the reality of an all-powerful deity. These themes which occupy the whole book of Job, Terrien believed were concentrated in the opening poem of 2 Isaiah (Isa 40:1-41:4), while some very important Isaian themes (such as vicarious suffering) were not really dealt with in Job. In addition, the all-important term הַמַּעֲנִי in Isaiah 40-55 (used thirteen times) does not make an appearance in Job. Since even those of the majority opinion concede that as far as ideology goes, Job is located between old

191 Terrien, “Quelques remarques sur les affinités de Job avec le Deutéro-Esaïe,” 300-308.
Babylonian wisdom and 2 Isaiah, it seems reasonable to interpret the verbal and thematic connections between Job and Isaiah 40-55 in terms of the author of Isaiah 40-55 taking inspiration from the book of Job, transposing its major theme and applying it to the historical mission of Israel.\(^{192}\)

In his paper “Elihu and Deutero-Isaiah: A Study in Literary Dependence,” J. B. Curtis argued, from similarities in ideas and, to a lesser extent, vocabulary, that the Elihu speeches (Job 32-37) demonstrate knowledge of and dependence on Isaiah 40-55, particularly in regard to the conception of the deity and of the Servant.\(^{193}\) In both works, God is the creator, who has power of life and death over every creature, the savior who delivers from disaster, the judge who rewards or punishes according to deeds, and the transcendent being who is beyond the reach of humans. Elihu, Curtis stated, took over the Servant terminology of 2 Isaiah and related it both to himself and to Job. In addition to these, both works use lawsuit and meteorological terminology, and rhetorical questions along with other similar literary devices. Finally, Curtis listed several words that are unique to Isaiah 40-55 and Job 32-37, or words that are rare but show up in these two texts, as further evidence that there is some literary relationship between them.\(^{194}\) Curtis concluded that the author of the Elihu speeches was very familiar with 2 Isaiah, and wished to reinforce and intensify through the mouth of Elihu those ideas in 2 Isaiah with which he agreed, and to correct or refine those that 2 Isaiah failed to articulate fully.\(^{195}\)


\(^{194}\) Curtis, “Elihu and Deutero-Isaiah,” 37. Curtis mentions similar word usage to back up a case he believes he has already made in other ways, but does not believe it proves anything in and of itself.

\(^{195}\) Curtis, “Elihu and Deutero-Isaiah,” 37.
Taken together, this previous research offers quite a detailed accounting of many of the points of connection between 2 Isaiah and Job, but, as is clear from this survey, the various interpretations of those points contradict one another. The most basic problem is that none of these authors claimed to be attempting to give a complete accounting of all similarities of content and vocabulary, but rather each seemed to choose the data that stand out for him; Curtis, at least, was intentional in dealing only with Job 32-37, and Elliott in omitting Job 32-37 and 40:15-41:26. Without as comprehensive an accounting of the phenomena as possible, any analysis will be incomplete. Interestingly, all the verbal similarities to which Pfeiffer and Terrien pointed to prove Job’s priority were taken from Job 3-31 and 38-41\textsuperscript{196} – that is, they did not draw on the Elihu speeches that Curtis used to show verbal dependence of Job 32-37 on Isaiah 40-55. This may be for the same reason that Elliott disregarded them, namely that the Elihu speeches are generally considered an addition to the text, not integral to the original work and therefore of little value for supporting their hypothesis; or this may be because Pfeiffer and Terrien did not find in the Elihu speeches evidence that supported their hypothesis of verbal dependence of Isaiah 40-55 on Job. In addition, although Pfeiffer, Elliott, and Terrien each began by assessing verbal connections, they ended by making judgments based primarily on historical and cultural developments – for example, the progression from national to individual emphasis (Elliott), or from perception of divine concern for the natural or human world only to a more integrated view (Pfeiffer). These are tricky issues to sort out, especially when the date of Job’s composition might not be a great enough distance apart

\textsuperscript{196} Terrien mentions only one passage from Job 32-37 and not in the context of a parallel with a text from Isaiah 40-55, and Pfeiffer mentions material from the Elihu speeches only in regard to similarity of ideas. All Pfeiffer’s examples of verbal overlap come from Job 3-31 and 38-41.
from that of 2 Isaiah to allow for major cultural developments, and when these issues might be just as well explained by differences of socioeconomic context as differences of historical context.

Whatever their reasons for choosing the examples they do, I find the manner of arguing for their respective conclusions somewhat lacking. Pfeiffer depended too heavily on an argument from silence in his analysis of the fact that Job lacks important themes found in Isaiah 40-55. It may indicate that Job existed before Isaiah 40-55, but there are other explanations as well – the most obvious one being that the author of Job chose not to incorporate those themes in his work. Pfeiffer did not address this possibility, and his argument lacks persuasiveness for this omission. In addition, the idea that the God of Job is not concerned with human affairs is valid only if the prose prologue and epilogue are not considered along with the dialogue, and even if one agrees intentionally to disregard the prose sections for the sake of evaluating Pfeiffer’s argument, that argument still rests on a particular interpretation of the book of Job which is by no means universally held. While it is true that the content of the divine speeches deals almost exclusively with the natural world, it is also a fact that the divine speeches are addressed to a human being, which belies the idea that the deity is not very concerned with human creatures. Without this alleged development (i.e. the idea of the so-called Edomitic creator of the natural world of Job being incorporated into the idea of the Israelitic deity of human history in Isaiah 40-55), Pfeiffer’s argument is severely undermined. Also, it is not so certain that creation by fiat is absent from the book of Job, as Pfeiffer declared. A deity “who says to

---

197 If indeed the shift from communal to individual emphasis can be seen as a historical development, which I am doubtful that it can.
the deep, ‘Be dry-- I will dry up your rivers’” (Isa 44:27) seems to me to operate not so differently from the one who challenges Job (38:34) by asking, “Can you lift up your voice to the clouds, so that a flood of waters may cover you?” or instructs the sea, “Thus far shall you come and no farther, and here shall your proud waves be stopped” (Job 38:11). Finally, that the parallel material demonstrates that Job is “far more original, specific, and comprehensive” is a rather subjective judgment about two pieces of literature that are each impressive in their own right; at the very least, there is room for legitimate disagreement on this point.

Although Elliott’s thesis is more detailed and comprehensive than the others, it nevertheless has a number of problems. First, the omission of Job 32-37 and 40:15-41:26 skews his results somewhat. The only condition under which it seems legitimate to disregard the Elihu speeches from a study such as his is one in which it has already been decided that the Elihu speeches could not have preceded Isaiah 40-55, and Elliott seems to have decided this without ever arguing for it. Even if the Elihu speeches were not original to the work of Job, it does not automatically follow that they could not have preceded or influenced Isaiah 40-55, for example, if they had been added after the composition of the rest of Job but before 2 Isaiah wrote. Thus, it appears that Elliott implicitly assumed his conclusion that Isaiah 40-55 had priority over Job, and therefore felt no need to deal with the (even later) Elihu speeches. The omission of the Behemoth and Leviathan pericopes is even more problematic. Elliott argued that they do not fit the context and are lengthy descriptions of animals, unlike previous short descriptions, and so

---

198 This is one of the texts Pfeiffer lists to show creation by fiat in 2 Isaiah. All English language scripture quotations are taken from the NRSV.
do not belong.\(^{199}\) As Chapter 1 indicated, however, readers today are not nearly so sure of the secondary nature of the Behemoth and Leviathan pericopes. Newsom, for example, acknowledged that at one time critics were perplexed at their function, but “far from being alien to the divine speeches, [they] are simply the crescendo of the sublime terror developed throughout chapters 38-41.”\(^{200}\) Disregarding them calls into question the reliability of Elliott’s conclusions. Finally, Elliott based his conclusions “primarily” on the evidence of what he perceived as a narrowing of emphasis from nation to individual. He did not demonstrate, however, why the emphasis was narrowed rather than widened, or why a national emphasis is necessarily older than an individual emphasis.\(^{201}\) Basing chronological priority on such a perceived development in emphasis is not persuasive when there is no argument for why an opposite direction of development might not just as well have occurred.

Terrien’s analysis, although more in-depth than Pfeiffer’s, gives the impression of his having read a view back into the text rather than having derived a view from the text. On the one hand, Terrien said that 2 Isaiah disseminates words and ideas that are concentrated in particular speeches in Job, and it would be difficult to imagine the Joban author combining such disparate pieces into a single speech. On the other hand, various Joban themes are combined in the opening chapters of 2 Isaiah and in the suffering

\(^{199}\) Elliott, “A Comparative Study of Deutero Isaiah and Job,” 147-148. Elliott considers that these pericopes “[violate] the main theme” of the divine speeches, and finds it unlikely that more verses would be dedicated to the “subordinate theme” found in these pericopes than to the “main theme” found in the fewer verses of what came before. So Elliott simply eliminates the offending majority rather than explain why he thinks the main theme of the speeches is found in the shorter section rather than the longer section.

\(^{200}\) Newsom, The Book of Job, 243.

\(^{201}\) Note Sommer’s view that characteristics of the individual Jeremiah were applied to the nation Israel in 2 Isaiah – making for an opposite direction of development in this area (A Prophet Reads Scripture, 61-66).
servant passages. What Terrien seems to be saying is that the splintering in 2 Isaiah of a theme concentrated in one part of Job shows Job’s priority, and that the concentrating in 2 Isaiah of a theme which is splintered and found in various places throughout Job also shows Job’s priority. Terrien may very well be right that Job inspires 2 Isaiah, but such a line of reasoning does little to prove it.

While Curtis described the similarities between Isaiah 40-55 and the Elihu speeches in a very thorough manner, one also gets the impression that his sequence of events – that Elihu’s inventor had before him both the greater part of the book of Job as well as Isaiah 40-55 which he then transformed in his own way – is decided beforehand rather than argued. Curtis stated that this author applied servant characteristics to both Elihu and Job, though Curtis did not venture into an explanation of why the author would do such a thing. Until Curtis posits a reasonable motive for this, or argues compellingly why the author of Isaiah 40-55 could not just as easily have gathered disparate servant characteristics into his own conception of the servant (as Terrien argued), his analysis is lacking. In addition, Curtis declared that Elihu’s creator portrays Elihu as “reinforcing and making more stringent” some ideas from Isaiah 40-55 and correcting those that were not adequately treated in the earlier work, without addressing the possibility that it was 2 Isaiah who was reinforcing earlier ideas, and tempering those he found too stringent. Curtis may indeed be right in his conclusions, but his argumentation falters from lack of support.

Further, most of the aforementioned scholars treat both Isaiah 40-55 and Job in a somewhat simplistic manner, without sufficient attention paid to the complex (and often obscured) composition history of the two works. Except for Curtis’, the comparisons
made are between the works more or less as wholes, rather than comparisons of which portions of the texts share themes and terms and which seem to have fewer affinities.\textsuperscript{202}

One cannot immediately exclude the possibility, for example, that Pfeiffer and Terrien \textit{as well as} Curtis might be correct, without taking a closer look at the similarities between the various constituent parts of the works. In addition, it has already been observed that preoccupation with the phenomenon of intertextuality in recent years has resulted in better tools for analyzing textual affinities than were available to Pfeiffer, Terrien, and Elliott. These authors dealt primarily with rare vocabulary words and overarching themes, without considering the more subtle rhetorical strategies of allusion and echo, which also may be composed of a piling up of more common words. Thus, although these studies are valuable for their contribution to the relevant data and issues involved in probing the relationship between Isaiah 40-55 and Job, they also demonstrate the confusion and contradiction that can result in the absence of a clear method for doing so.

2.2 Quotation and Allusion in Literature

When one’s goal is to analyze two different texts from the perspective of influence and dependency, such as this dissertation seeks to do, it becomes evident immediately that even phrasing the inquiry this way is problematic in some respects. “Intertextuality,” a broad concept that incorporates all kinds of connections between texts, including quotation and allusion, is a notoriously nebulous term, ill-defined and

\textsuperscript{202} Pfeiffer’s and Terrien’s evidence, for example, relies more on Job’s speeches than the friends’ speeches, even after taking account of the fact that Job’s speeches make up a greater portion of the book than the friends’. It is impossible to know, without a comprehensive study, whether this fact results from an accurate portrayal of the evidence, or simply what Pfeiffer and Terrien happened to notice or choose as their examples.
variously employed. First coined by Julia Kristeva, intertextuality has come to refer to the idea that words and texts can exist and be comprehended only in relationship to other words and texts previously used or known.\textsuperscript{203} “Any text,” wrote Kristeva, “is constructed as a mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and transformation of another.”\textsuperscript{204} Texts are not and cannot be read as isolated units, but always, even if unconsciously, in relationship to other texts, whether written, spoken, seen, or perceived.\textsuperscript{205} Writing shortly after Kristeva, Roland Barthes stated the issue even more emphatically. A text, he famously said, is

woven entirely with citations, references, echoes, cultural languages…, antecedent or contemporary, which cut across it through and through in a vast stereophony. The intertextual in which every text is held, it itself being the text-between of another text, is not to be confused with some origin of the text: to try to find the ‘sources,’ the ‘influences’ of a work, is to fall in with the myth of filiation; the citations which go to make up a text are anonymous, untraceable, and yet already read: they are quotations without inverted commas.\textsuperscript{206}

If this is true, then texts like 2 Isaiah and Job are thoroughly and necessarily made up of a certain kind of quotation of words or phrases known from elsewhere and previously read; to discern them or identify their sources would be impossible, even if one had the inclination to try. Even authors are unconscious of all the sources of their words and

\textsuperscript{203} This common usage is rather different from Kristeva’s original meaning. She defines the term as “the passage from one sign system to another” (\textit{Revolution in Poetic Language} [trans. Margaret Waller; New York: Columbia University Press, 1984], 59).

\textsuperscript{204} Kristeva, \textit{Desire in Language}, 66.

\textsuperscript{205} Even what constitutes a text is uncertain. More narrowly defined, a text is something written; more broadly, a text can include “anything interpretable by cultural knowledge,” for example a religious rite or a painting (Patricia Tull, “Intertextuality and the Hebrew Scriptures,” \textit{CR:BS} 8 [2000]: 60).

\textsuperscript{206} Barthes, \textit{Image, Music, Text}, 160.
ideas, so a mere reader cannot hope to uncover the many underlying layers of the text at hand.

Barthes is, of course, correct to a certain extent. In both speaking and writing, we are limited in our use of words to those we have already read or heard, and we employ them in ways we have already experienced their being employed. Most of the time this reality hovers below a level of awareness; our sources are indeed anonymous and untraceable. There are times, however, when an author or speaker is not only aware of referring to a source, but also quite intentionally referring to this or that particular source and means for others to be aware of it, too. There is a variety of reasons why a writer might consciously rely upon a precursor text for a particular word or series of words instead of employing the anonymous and untraceable quotes that make up the rest of his or her text; whatever the author’s motivation, it behooves the reader to trace what is traceable and, to whatever extent possible, to experience the effect the author was trying to create by that particular manner of expression.

Nevertheless, Barthes’ warning about the “myth of filiation” is well worth taking seriously. Texts are not connected by one straightforward line, one propagating another, as if texts relate to other texts in a hierarchical family tree. Rather, the image of texts or utterances as a web, as Mikhail Bakhtin conceived of them, is instructive here. Each new utterance is launched into the fray of already existing words and meanings through which it must navigate, to which it is responding and from which it inevitably elicits an answer. Rejecting the traditional concept of a word that relates to its object in a straightforward and unhindered relationship, Bakhtin asserts that words cannot relate to their objects in a
singular way because there are other, “alien” words about the same object that interfere.

He wrote,

Indeed, any concrete discourse (utterance) finds the object at which it was directed already as it were overlain with qualifications, open to dispute, charged with value, already enveloped in an obscuring mist – or, on the contrary, by the “light” of alien words that have already been spoken about it. It is entangled, shot through with shared thoughts, points of view, alien value judgments and accents. The word, directed toward its object, enters a dialogically agitated and tension-filled environment of alien words, value judgments and accents, weaves in and out of complex interrelationships, merges with some, recoils from others, intersects with yet a third group: and all this may crucially shape discourse, may leave a trace in all its semantic layers, may complicate its expression and influence its entire stylistic profile.\(^{207}\)

Concretely, this means that discerning those intentional allusions and quotations and identifying their former contexts is only a first step toward being able to describe an intertextual relationship. One has also to be aware of the “tension-filled environment” in which those texts exist, with all the particularities of historical context, culture, language, audience, and other factors that may leave their mark upon meaning.

Despite this complexity, or perhaps because of it, the recognition that all texts are composed of and in relationship to other texts has been an added impetus for readers to search for the precursors of any given text, tracing lines of influence from one author or text to another. The more ancient the text, the more challenging this enterprise can be, since what is “already read” for the original author or audience is often obscured over time. Still, the goal is an important one; if an author’s textual conversation partners can be discovered, it follows that doing so gives the audience an advantage in interpreting his

\(^{207}\) Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination*, 276.
or her words. The value of this goal is illustrated by the proliferation of investigations into the sources of quotation and allusion, especially in English poetry.

As an entry point into this discussion, I would put forward E. E. Kellett’s insightful little book, *Literary Quotation and Allusion*.\(^{208}\) Although he has been criticized for not taking the concepts of quotation and allusion seriously enough,\(^{209}\) in my view he offers a crisp, clear introduction to the benefits a heightened attention to quotation and allusion offers readers of any text, including the biblical text. Publishing in 1933, many years before the idea of “intertextuality” was introduced into common parlance, Kellett recognized the importance of intertextual connections among texts. His words anticipated the work of Kristeva a generation later:

> In one sense *all*, or practically all, our writing is quotation. A thousand years of writing have given us a set of vocabularies, each appropriated to particular uses: and no man can write without employing multitudes of phrases the associations of which have been fixed long since and cannot be *deliberately* altered.\(^{210}\)

Kellett was aware of the inevitable pervasiveness of quotation in all texts, a reality on which subsequent generations of theorists would focus, but his concerns were those allusions and quotations that the author intentionally weaves into his or her work, which cannot be cut away without ruining the fabric, but which are quite clearly patches deliberately borrowed from previous texts.\(^{211}\) His insights into the whys and wherefores

---

\(^{208}\) Kellett, *Literary Quotation and Allusion*.

\(^{209}\) Michael Wheeler censured Kellett for being one of those authors who contribute to misconceptions about quotation and allusion, saying that Kellett “wrote as if spotting allusions in literature were a game designed for educated gentlemen, as quoting the Classics was in the House of Parliament at one time” (*The Art of Allusion in Victorian Fiction*, 1).


of these particular types of intertextual connections were basic yet incisive. Authors allude to give pleasure to their audiences by presenting them with something familiar to recognize, and to establish rapport with the audience by demonstrating common ground.\textsuperscript{212} Quoting and alluding also afford authors the opportunity to shelter themselves under the authority of a respected precursor, and, if need be, at the same time to evade bearing the whole responsibility of having said or written something potentially controversial.\textsuperscript{213} Too, there may be malicious motivations for quoting; parodying another’s words or quoting them out of context opens those words to “piecemeal demolition” without the detractor having to take the trouble to respond to the careful arguments of their context.\textsuperscript{214} Many allusions, on the other hand, are harmless, meant solely for ornamentation by changing the usual style or displaying one’s cleverness.\textsuperscript{215}

Kellett drew special attention to the key role of the audience in the matter of quotation and allusion, since the readers are not passive receivers but rather in some sense are collaborators with the author in making the book.\textsuperscript{216} It is essential, then, that quoting or alluding authors know the readers well, which texts will be familiar to them, and how to mark the quotation or allusion in a way they will recognize, or they will have

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{212} Kellett, \textit{Literary Quotation and Allusion}, 17-19.
  \item \textsuperscript{213} Kellett, \textit{Literary Quotation and Allusion}, 44-46.
  \item \textsuperscript{214} Kellett, \textit{Literary Quotation and Allusion}, 48-50.
  \item \textsuperscript{215} Kellett, \textit{Literary Quotation and Allusion}, 51.
  \item \textsuperscript{216} Kellett, \textit{Literary Quotation and Allusion}, 9. Elsewhere, he states the same point even more forcefully: “It is a truth too often forgotten, and yet obvious on the least consideration, that every book has many authors. There is the so-called writer, and there are the readers, every one of whom contributes his share...it is impossible that the content of the book can impinge in the same way on minds of unequal and unlike content” (65).
\end{itemize}
no way of appreciating the reference, or the cleverness of the author.\textsuperscript{217} By means of quoting or alluding, the author also reveals something of himself or herself, much as the books on one’s bookshelf reveal something of the one to whom they belong: “Thus, then, the range of a writer’s allusions, and the manner in which he makes them, provide us…with clear indications of the character both of himself and of his readers.”\textsuperscript{218} Authors must also have the skill to weave the quotation or allusion, including parody,\textsuperscript{219} into their own creations in a subtle yet perceivable way. The reference must fit precisely in its present place as if it had always belonged there and simultaneously elicit memories of its former context; too indistinct or understated and its significance will be obscured, too obvious and the effect will be ruined and its novelty disregarded.\textsuperscript{220} However the reference is incorporated, to be really successful it must “start a series of undulating suggestions” in the mind of the reader which would have been missing had the author communicated the same idea in his or her own words.\textsuperscript{221} When this is done well, the one who appropriates the words is like the investor who accepts his master’s talent and gives back tenfold when the master returns to collect it.\textsuperscript{222} Kellett concluded,

\begin{quote}
[T]he world of literature is one. Here are no boundaries, no tariff-walls: nay, your purchases, like those of the prophet, are made without money and without price. The work of any great writer is his own property but it is open to us all. Once written, it is a possession for ever and for everybody. You are at liberty to steal, if
\end{quote}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[218] Kellett, \textit{Literary Quotation and Allusion}, 56, 64.
\item[219] Kellett, \textit{Literary Quotation and Allusion}, 25.
\item[220] Kellett, \textit{Literary Quotation and Allusion}, 37, 11.
\item[221] Kellett, \textit{Literary Quotation and Allusion}, 15.
\item[222] Kellett, \textit{Literary Quotation and Allusion}, 40.
\end{footnotes}
you can; if, like Virgil, you can make off with the goods of Homer in the right fashion, and use them in due manner...these are the thefts which, in dividing the ownership between two possessors, do not take away from either, but actually enrich both.²²³

Whether every would-be Virgil would consider himself a thief, or every Homer would agree that he has been enriched, is, of course, another matter. Since Kellett’s intentionally programmatic introduction, others, especially those writing in the shadow of Bakhtin, Kristeva, and Barthes, have refined the concepts of quotation and allusion and exposed some of the complexities inherent in borrowing someone else’s words.

Harold Bloom focused on the negative side of feeling the unwanted influence of another’s words. He argued that “[p]oetic history...is held to be indistinguishable from poetic influence, since strong poets make that history by misreading one another, so as to clear imaginative space for themselves.”²²⁴ Both weak and strong poets cannot help but feel the force of influence of strong poets of previous generations, and this reality inevitably causes anxiety, in so far as it seems to threaten the originality and creativity of the influenced author. Yet, as Bloom pointed out, feeling the influence of another author does not always necessarily entail a diminution of originality, nor preclude the possibility of even greater originality.²²⁵ Even so, the author’s quest to be original and unique seems to be at odds with the inevitability of influence, and Bloom described the resultant struggle in Freudian terms, as a battle between father and son.²²⁶ Bloom made a list of

²²³ Kellett, Literary Quotation and Allusion, 92-93.
²²⁴ Bloom, The Anxiety of Influence, 5.
²²⁵ Bloom, The Anxiety of Influence, 6-7.
“revisionary ratios” by which later poets misinterpret their precursors, and prove the fact of influence. “Poetic influence,” he wrote, “always proceeds by a misreading of the prior poet, an act of creative correction that is actually and necessarily a misinterpretation.” The way to read a poem, it follows, is not in isolation from other poems, but rather as a “deliberate misinterpretation” of a poem or poet that came before it.

John Hollander analyzed poetic echo in less agonistic terms. He distinguished between allusion, which is always intentional, and echo, which is not necessarily so. Echoing can take many forms in addition to verbal similarities; alliteration, for example, involves the echo of a particular vocal pattern, and a particular cadence or rhythm can be echoed as well, even without other kinds of auditory similarities to make the connection. Hollander concurred with Bloom regarding the power of strong poets to reinterpret the poets and poems they are echoing. All echoes are not available to all readers, however:

---

227 Bloom, The Anxiety of Influence, 14-16. These correspond to his chapters and are as follows: Clinamen (Poetic Misprision), Tessera (Completion and Antithesis), Kenosis (Repetition and Discontinuity), Daemonization (The Counter-Sublime), Askesis (Purgation and Solipsism), and Apophrades (Return of the Dead).

228 Bloom, The Anxiety of Influence, 30.

229 Bloom, The Anxiety of Influence, 45.

230 Hollander, The Figure of Echo, 64.

231 Hollander, The Figure of Echo, 31-33.

232 Hollander, The Figure of Echo, 96.

233 Hollander, The Figure of Echo, 73.
The reader of texts, in order to overhear echoes, must have some kind of access to an earlier voice, and to its cave of resonant signification, analogous to that of the author or the later text.\(^{234}\)

This underscores the difficulty of hearing echoes in texts whose authors, or their sources of influence and their “cave[s] of resonant signification,” are unknown. For the author and intended audience, however, even one word can resonate with a multitude of associations.\(^{235}\)

Thomas Greene describes four “imitative strategies,” or ways that authors invoke earlier voices.\(^{236}\) The first he calls reproductive or sacramental. With this strategy, an author imitates an earlier model that has become so fixed that it cannot be changed; the model is held in awe by the author and simply rehearsed without alteration. With the eclectic or exploitative strategy, the author treats traditions alluded to as if they are stockpiles of material, ready to be picked up and used at will. This is done for the author’s own purposes, and allusions from multiple sources appear side by side in whatever way suits the author’s goals. With the heuristic strategy, the author imitates a model intentionally to distance himself or herself from the model, throwing into sharp relief for the audience the difference in language or culture between the model and the imitation. Finally, the most complicated imitative strategy is the dialectical, whereby an author creates a text that “expose[s] the vulnerability of the subtext while exposing itself to the subtext’s potential aggression.”\(^{237}\) This is not just a one-way action, but creates

\(^{234}\) Hollander, *The Figure of Echo*, 65.

\(^{235}\) Hollander, *The Figure of Echo*, 95.


\(^{237}\) Greene, *The Light in Troy*, 45.
opportunity for mutual criticism between the texts. A subset of this category, notes Greene, is parody, when the imitating text treats its model with “affectionate malice.”

The reason that allusions are inherently a complicated business in literature is explicated by Anthony Johnson. Instead of having a simple relationship between a signifier and a signified, allusion creates a situation in which the signifier is pointing to a signified (the evoked text) which is itself a signifier. Thus, the usual relationship between the words we use and the objects we mean by them is made exponentially more complicated, since now the words used have as their objects other words and their objects. The effect is that “[a]llusion allows one literary text to work its way physically into another.” Johnson describes various forms of alluding, including metaphor, simile, irony, *complimento* and *aemulatio*. Of these, simile (or “reflexive allusion”) is quite similar to Greene’s “dialectical” category in that the alluding and the evoked texts are linked and intended to be compared, but one does not supplant the other. The result is that the texts rival and quarrel with one another. One subset of reflexive allusion is ironic allusion, in which the alluding author, often with a language and style similar to the evoked text, will set up a competing value system in an attempt to reverse the evoked text. Whatever the form, the allusion makes it henceforth difficult or even impossible for the two texts to be separated again; the evoked text is forever and always “smeared” by the alluding text, and neither can stand on its own anymore. The author who alludes

---


does not just appropriate content from the evoked text, but actually joins the alluding and
evoked text together, with the result that “[t]he reader is forced to withdraw from the
poet’s own system (and value-system) into a critical position where the two systems
rotate against each other.” 241

Finally, Ben-Porat analyzes the process whereby the reader recognizes in a text
the imitation or resonances of texts already read and draws connections among them. 242
He defines a literary allusion as

a device for the simultaneous activation of two texts. The activation is achieved
through the manipulation of a special signal: a sign (simple or complex) in a given
text is characterized by an additional larger ‘referent.’ This referent is always an
independent text. 243

This “simultaneous activation” of two separate texts, which, he observes, are not
necessarily compatible texts, results in the creation of “intertextual patterns” between the
texts as wholes. The process of reader recognition of a literary allusion begins with the
recognition of a marker – some word or phrase or sound pattern that refers not to a simple
object in the world of the text but to another text. The subsequent step the reader takes is
identifying the evoked text to which the marker refers. Next, the reader will necessarily
modify his or her interpretation of that marker, because he or she now remembers the
marker in a different context where it has a different meaning. This modification in
interpretation can be slight or radical, depending on the marker’s former context.
Sometimes the process stops here, but the reader can go one step further and bring to

242 Ben-Porat, “The Poetics of Literary Allusion,” 105-128.
mind the entire evoked text, as opposed to just the marker, and form intertextual
connections between the texts that are not explicitly marked but which occur to the reader
once the initial allusion is recognized.244

Quotations and allusions, if we are privileged enough to be able to recognize
them, can teach us a great deal about the author who employs them and the audience for
whose benefit he or she did so. Quotations and allusions tell us which were among the
texts the author knew, and which ones he or she expected the audience to know. The
manner of quotation or allusion, whether approving or disapproving, can reveal the
thought of the author in a more powerful way than simple declarative statement could.
Especially pertinent from the survey just undertaken is that kind of allusion, which
Pfeiffer, Curtis, and Terrien never considered, by which a later author deliberately places
his or her text in tension with a previous text, effectively creating rival texts. This goes
far beyond the linear, straightforward, and chronological development of thought these
previous treatments of 2 Isaiah and Job posited. Although “influence” indicates passive
submission to the force of another, as Clayton and Rothstein pointed out, influence is “an
exercise of strength without really trying,” and the alluding author who is influenced by a
precursor is the true active agent as he or she transforms another’s words into a new text
of his or her own making.245 Attention to how this is done is necessary for a fuller
understanding of author, text, and audience.

244 Ben-Porat, “The Poetics of Literary Allusion,” 110-111.

245 Clayton and Rothstein, Influence and Intertextuality in Literary History, 7.
2.3 Quotation and Allusion in Biblical Studies

Heightened sensitivity to the indirect communication about the author and audience offered by a text’s quotations and allusions is desirable in general, but perhaps most of all when access to the author and audience is hindered because of cultural and chronological distance, such as in the case of the biblical text. One of the most significant contributions of literary theory to biblical studies in the last few decades is the push to read texts in dialogic relationship with other texts. There is increasing recognition that the “alien” cultural, theological, political, and social “words” among which the biblical text was created have a tremendous effect on the meaning of that text. The biblical text, like all texts, is part of a tension-filled environment in which none stands alone but each responds to and elicits a reaction from those which share its environment. This makes for links between texts that call for more explanation than direct influence or simple borrowing on the part of one author or text with respect to another.

2.3.1 Biblical Studies in General

Within the corpus of what has become the Hebrew Bible, these links take diverse forms, as texts strengthen, supplement, decenter, and even overturn other texts. The most comprehensive account to date of the phenomenon of “inner-biblical exegesis” is Michael Fishbane’s *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. Fishbane argues that the biblical text as we have it today is filled with individual texts that recall, interpret, or clarify other texts. He distinguishes between *traditum*, the content of the tradition handed
down, and *traditio*, the process of transmitting that content.\(^{246}\) The sage-scribe\(^{247}\) did not always merely copy the text (*traditum*) that came his way, but, when the situation called for it, defined an obscure term, explained a difficult phrase, made a pious correction, interpreted an ambiguous law, or made any of a number of changes to the text that came to be part of the text itself. In addition, new texts were written that incorporated the *traditum* of older texts; these new texts quoted, recalled, reinterpreted, or actualized that *traditum* in new contexts.\(^{248}\) The result is that the Hebrew Bible is a complex web of connections, of references to itself, the layers of which can in some cases be uncovered through careful attention paid to words, phrases, or other less obvious markers that indicate a later comment on or an aggadic interpretation of an older text.\(^{249}\)

This is, of course, a relatively simple and straightforward description of a very complicated and obscure process that spanned centuries. In many cases, the dividing lines between *traditum* and *traditio*, the latter of which was transformed into the next *traditum* which itself called for expansion or explanation, are opaque to modern readers. Nevertheless, Fishbane has shown in a concrete and detailed way the reality of Kristeva’s concept of a text as a “mosaic of quotations,” which has absorbed and transformed other texts. Fishbane’s work has provided a framework in which to view the dynamic process


\(^{247}\) Fishbane suggests that these were part of the wisdom tradition and had significant involvement in the composition of parts of the Torah (*Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*, 32-37).

\(^{248}\) These are characteristic of Fishbane’s category of aggadic exegesis (*Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*, 281-440).

of scriptural interpretation that is demonstrated within those very scriptures, and has laid
the foundation for a wide array of studies on inner-biblical textual relationships, studies
which look for, analyze, and interpret these relationships. They have led to fruitful results
in uncovering the nature of relationships between texts and in exegesis of texts.

What is perhaps the most straightforward accounting of methodology in such a
study is provided by Richard B. Hays in *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. Against
the background of recent work on the concept of intertextuality and also of Fishbane’s work
on inner-biblical exegesis, Hays explores the nature of Paul’s citations
of and allusions to his primary textual inspiration, Israel’s scriptures, in order to see how
they affect the understanding and interpretation of the Pauline texts in which they occur.
He argues for specific resonances in various passages of the Pauline corpus, which help
to elucidate the dialectic relationship between Paul’s words and the scriptures that
informed so much of his thought. Hays notes that some citations and allusions are more
certain than others, and thus establishes at the outset of his book seven tests that help the
reader make a reasonable judgment about whether he or she is hearing an authentic
resonance or a false echo.

1) Availability: Was the proposed source available to the author and original
readers? Meeting this criterion requires that the source be in circulation at
the time of composition, and that the author was likely to have had access
to it.

---

250 Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*.

2) Volume: This has to do with the extent and nature of the relationship between the echo and its source text – how many words or syntactical patterns they share, and what rhetorical role the allusion plays. Several shared uncommon words would indicate an echo; so also would only a few words strategically referencing a well-known, influential precursor.

3) Recurrence: If a particular author is known to refer repeatedly to a specific passage, this indicates that the passage is one of import for him or her and can lend more certainty to dubious cases of echo.

4) Thematic Coherence: An echo is more likely intentional if the content and themes of its original context fit with those of the new context and elucidate the argument of the new context.252

5) Historical Plausibility: This test requires that the author could have intended the echo and the original audience could reasonably be expected to have understood it.

6) History of Interpretation: If previous readers of the text have noticed an echo, this adds weight to any given case; the lack of such discernment can serve as a check against too hasty identifications of echoes.

7) Satisfaction: If recognizing an echo provides a good reading which makes sense in the reader’s experience, it is more likely to be a genuine case than if the reader does not have such an experience.253

---

252 As Tull Willey cautions, this test may not be easily applied in cases where the new text is meaning to overturn or reinterpret the precursor (Remember the Former Things, 82).

253 These last two tests are more subjective than the first five; Hays does not advocate resting a case on the sixth test alone, and he notes that the final test is in large part an individual judgment (Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul, 31-32).
A somewhat skeptical approach to quotation is taken by Richard L. Schultz in *The Search for Quotation: Verbal Parallels in the Prophets*.\textsuperscript{254} Schultz criticizes the current state of research on quotation and allusion in biblical studies, citing a lack of clear methodology – or lack of any methodology – for identifying quotations, assessing their nature, and determining the direction of borrowing.\textsuperscript{255} He observes that many arguments about these issues are convincing only to those who already agree with the conclusions.\textsuperscript{256} Analyzing quotations is useful for many things – dating material, detecting the process of textual transmission, and discovering how texts were interpreted over time, to name a few. However, engaging questions like this involves presupposing that previous oracles were accessible, that the text remained relatively stable, that earlier sayings carried a certain level of authority, and that quotations can really be reliably identified.\textsuperscript{257} Besides these unproved assumptions, there are further obstacles to analyzing quotations: verbal parallels do not necessarily indicate quotation but can result from other causes; it is impossible to prove priority one way or the other simply by analyzing the contexts of quotations; and since most prophetic books are composite, it is very difficult to prove at which stage of the process of textual composition the parallel came into the text.\textsuperscript{258}


\textsuperscript{255} Schultz, *The Search for Quotation*, 58-59.

\textsuperscript{256} Schultz, *The Search for Quotation*, 69.

\textsuperscript{257} Schultz, *The Search for Quotation*, 63-112.

\textsuperscript{258} Schultz, *The Search for Quotation*, 112-113.
To address the problems, Schultz proposes a new model for analyzing quotations that includes “verbal and syntactical correspondence and contextual awareness,” both diachronic and synchronic analysis, and a recognition that quotations have a variety of functions. Verbal and syntactical correspondence entails recognizing an explicit connection between texts, whether complete or loose; contextual awareness requires that knowledge of the quoted context is vital to understanding its new context. Diachronic analysis recognizes that quotation is a historical phenomenon where chronological order is important; synchronic analysis requires that the quotation be analyzed also for its function in its present context. Finally, analysis of quotation must involve questions of function; why did the author choose this rhetorical device, and what part does it play in the composition? Schultz then applies this approach to particular verbal parallels in prophetic literature, not in every case seeing enough evidence to make judgments about priority.

2.3.2 2 Isaiah

In her analysis of allusions in 2 Isaiah, Patricia Tull Willey admits the challenges of analyzing connections between texts when the texts in question are of unknown date, or at best only roughly dateable. She manages this uncertainty by limiting her investigation only to those texts that can with relative certainty be placed chronologically

---

259 Schultz, *The Search for Quotation*, 222-239.

260 See, for example, the difficulties recounted in the diachronic analysis of Isa 2:2-4 and Micah 4:1-3 (Schultz, *The Search for Quotation*, 295-302).

261 *Remember the Former Things*, 84.
prior to the time of 2 Isaiah’s composition.\textsuperscript{262} Comparing her work to Hays’, and applying the insights of Bakhtin on the dialogic nature of texts, Tull Willey concentrates her analysis of 2 Isaiah’s allusions on Isaiah 49-54, the portion of 2 Isaiah that she believes is the most allusive in the work, in which sections dedicated to Daughter Zion and the servant are interspersed with one another. 2 Isaiah is especially ripe for such intertextual analysis, she maintains, because of its penchant for referring to the “former things” – former prophetic and scriptural texts that inspire, inform, and pervade 2 Isaiah’s own prophetic message.

Observing that the concept of intertextuality describes everything from the invisible “mosaic of quotations” that make up every text, to the explicitly marked quotation of one text in another, Tull Willey focuses her investigation of 2 Isaiah between these two poles on the continuum of intertextuality.\textsuperscript{263} Included here are “allusion, response, appropriation, recollection, and echo” that, while not as obvious as quotation, are still very real, and have a significant impact on the understanding of the text that employs them.\textsuperscript{264} These intertextual relationships are sometimes harmonious, sometimes discordant, and sometimes both to a certain degree;\textsuperscript{265} however that may be, recognition of them enhances the reader’s comprehension of the text. Leaving aside the more nebulous thematic and formal connections, as well as less certain verbal echoes, Tull

\textsuperscript{262} Tull Willey, \textit{Remember the Former Things}, 7. Job, among others, is therefore excluded from purview.

\textsuperscript{263} Tull Willey, \textit{Remember the Former Things}, 61.

\textsuperscript{264} Tull Willey, \textit{Remember the Former Things}, 61.

\textsuperscript{265} Tull Willey, \textit{Remember the Former Things}, 63-64.
Willey concentrates on “specific verbal similarities” in order to demonstrate how 2 Isaiah incorporated material from authoritative textual traditions available to him in the composition of his own text. These verbal similarities range from extended parallels, such as the quotation of a seven word string from Ps 98:3 in Isa 52:10, to a mere hint in the form of a similar phrase, such as the recollection of a key phrase from Lam 4:15 in Isa 52:1. The incorporation of material familiar to and authoritative for his audience allowed 2 Isaiah to place himself squarely within Israel’s tradition while at the same time to reinterpret aspects of that tradition in order to make it relevant to his audience and applicable to current concerns.

Given the historical distance between 2 Isaiah and modern readers, the intertextual aspect of his work is not always easy to discern. Because our “already-read” texts (both written and cultural) are vastly different from 2 Isaiah’s, modern readers may miss allusions, see unintended allusions, or misattribute allusions. Still, through careful study of verbal parallels, and held in check by Hays’ seven tests, Tull Willey makes a convincing case for 2 Isaiah’s intentional and selective use of traditional material, including portions of Lamentations, Jeremiah, the Psalms, Pentateuchal texts, and

266 Tull Willey, *Remember the Former Things*, 7.
267 Tull Willey, *Remember the Former Things*, 121-122.
268 Tull Willey, *Remember the Former Things*, 126-127.
269 Tull Willey, *Remember the Former Things*, 70-71.
270 Tull Willey, *Remember the Former Things*, 78-80.
Nahum. The reuse of those texts serves a range of purposes for 2 Isaiah, disputing, for example, the claims of Lamentations, affirming the prophecies of Jeremiah and applying his prophetic call to the nation Israel, and adopting the words of Psalms, Pentateuchal texts, and Nahum for their relevance to his own context and audience.\(^{272}\) This kind of strategic intertextuality, in Tull Willey’s view, was more than a matter of simply responding to these previous texts; 2 Isaiah was rather “negotiating through the maze of other words that may claim authority, in order to assert a new understanding of the divine will in the exilic situation.”\(^{273}\)

Working independently and publishing the year after Tull Willey, Benjamin D. Sommer was similarly concerned with the allusive nature of 2 Isaiah’s composition. Sommer distinguishes between “intertextuality” and “influence and allusion,”\(^{274}\) the former a broad concept of which the latter is one type. Intertextuality approaches texts synchronically, emphasizes texts and readers instead of authors, and is concerned with all manner of connections among texts. Allusion and influence, on the other hand, entail a diachronic approach, hold the author in view, and are concerned with specific kinds of relationships between specific texts.\(^{275}\) Like Tull Willey, Sommer considers 2 Isaiah to be intentionally allusive to specific texts, and so adopts a model of allusion and influence for his analysis of the text (Isaiah 40-66). Sommer adds an eighth test to Hays’ list of seven, that of ascertaining that an apparent parallel is not merely an example of both texts using

\(^{272}\) Tull Willey, *Remember the Former Things*, 265-269.

\(^{273}\) Tull Willey, *Remember the Former Things*, 67.

\(^{274}\) Sommer further distinguishes between allusion and influence: “noting allusion belongs to the project of interpretation and is more focused on a specific text, while studying influence connects to wider, less text- specific issues” (*A Prophet Reads Scripture*, 15).

a common Israelite or ancient Near Eastern literary form. Verbal parallels between 2
Isaiah and another biblical text that “utilize stock vocabulary, exemplify a literary form
such as a lament, or treat a subject that calls for certain words” cannot claim the label
“allusion,” since good reason exists to view such parallels as coincidental similarities.
Sommer’s own approach to the identification and interpretation of allusion is influenced
to a great extent by Ziva Ben-Porat’s four stages of actualizing an allusion.

Sommer lists many of the same reasons for alluding that Kellett catalogued,
including the pleasure it gives to both authors and readers to play with and recognize
familiar words. He further expounds on the reasons for reuse of older material in
Israel’s scriptures specifically.

1) Exegesis: obscure or obsolete texts require an explanation, which a newer
text seeks to provide.

2) Influence: A newer text may feel the influence of an older text, which it
attempts to revise or even oppose.

3) Allusion: A newer text sometimes employs an allusion to an older text in
order to make or undergird its own, not necessarily related, point.

4) Echo: A newer text may borrow familiar words or turns of phrase from an
older text without intending to alter the interpretation of the older text.

---

277 Sommer *A Prophet Reads Scripture*, 32.
278 See above, section 2.2.
Sommer sees a strong connection between 2 Isaiah and Jeremiah in particular, and also cites many of the same sources of 2 Isaiah’s allusions as Tull Willey, including other books of prophecy, Lamentations, Psalms, and Pentateuchal traditions. Not only does 2 Isaiah reuse texts from these sources, he also has his own consistent method of reusing them according to set patterns. Sommer lists five categories into which 2 Isaiah’s allusions typically fall: confirmation of previous prophecies; reprediction of unfulfilled or apparently inaccurate prophecies (with revision if necessary); reversal of fulfilled negative prophecies or laments; historical recontextualization of older material applied to present circumstances; and response to “complaints, accusations, or laments” in source texts.\(^{281}\) 2 Isaiah’s consistency with respect to allusions extends also to the stylistic patterns he employs. His allusions are reliably marked by what Sommer calls the “split-up pattern” (reusing a familiar phrase but splitting it up and placing new words in the rift), sound play (employing different but similar-sounding words), word play (homonyms), and, less frequently, parallel vocabulary used in the same word order as the source text, and more extended exact verbal parallels.\(^{282}\) Sommer further suggests that 2 Isaiah patterns his allusions on the dynamics of biblical poetry, expanding or intensifying the source text, as if source and allusion were two lines of a poem, or supplying in the allusion the second of a common word pair of which only one appears in the source text.\(^{283}\)

\(^{281}\) Sommer, *A Prophet Reads Scripture*, 153-159.

\(^{282}\) Sommer, *A Prophet Reads Scripture*, 159-160.

\(^{283}\) Sommer, *A Prophet Reads Scripture*, 160-165.
Sommer claims that already in Isaiah 40, 2 Isaiah liberally distributes allusions to previous texts, according to nearly all the patterns and methods he will use throughout chapters 40-66, indicating the important place allusion will occupy throughout the entire work. Having shown these patterns and methods, in his conclusion Sommer turns to the more pressing question of why 2 Isaiah used allusion so abundantly. Sommer writes,

The exilic prophet announces: I am a reader, a traditionalist, a recycler. He wants his audience to know that he invests the great labor necessary to inherit a tradition. In so doing, he emphasizes at once his dependence and his originality: he shows that he knows and reveres older texts – and that he differs from them in specific and identifiable ways.

One major reason for openly placing himself under the umbrella of these traditions is the change taking place during and after the exile with respect to prophecy. By the time 2 Isaiah was at work, the credibility of prophecy had begun to wane, brought about in large part by the lack of king, temple, and national existence as it was before the exile. This did not lead to the demise of prophecy altogether, but rather to a change in the form of prophecy. At the same time that prophecy as a living institution began to decline, the mostly dire words of warning from prophets of the past took on greater authority. Not only did these words stem from a time when the deity still spoke directly to humans, they
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284 Sommer A Prophet Reads Scripture, 165.
285 Sommer, A Prophet Reads Scripture, 166.
286 Without a king and a temple, the idea that prophecy could go on unimpeded was questionable, since the institution of prophecy was associated closely with the monarchy, and the temple was the representation of divine-human contact (Sommer, A Prophet Reads Scripture, 174).
also seemed to have proven themselves reliable in light of the disastrous events of the sixth century, and so were remembered, meditated upon, and preserved. The prevalence of allusion in 2 Isaiah’s work, Sommer argues, is evidence of his “in-between” status in this trajectory.²⁸⁸ He does claim to have a direct word from the Lord, but that word came with a generous helping of familiar words and phrases from older prophets and texts, with already established authority. Writing this way helps to augment his authority, create a new but authoritative message for his audience, and even perhaps transform the way his audience would now read those older texts.²⁸⁹ Certainly being aware of 2 Isaiah’s allusions, and therefore reading his prophecies in dialogue with the sources of those allusions, enhances and in some cases changes the reader’s understanding of his prophecies.

Risto Nurmela embarks on an investigation similar to Tull Willey’s and Sommer’s, but with a quite different methodological starting point.²⁹⁰ Like them, he views 2 Isaiah as a patchwork of allusions to previous texts, but he criticizes Sommer in particular for the identification of allusions based on “vague grounds,” including verbal parallels involving rather common words. Nurmela distances himself from Sommer and others by refraining from making a judgment about dating, and therefore about priority and dependence, until after the analysis of verbal parallels has been completed. Following his analyses, Nurmela makes judgments about relative dating based on how smoothly or awkwardly the verbal parallels are integrated into their contexts. He judges the context in

²⁸⁸ Sommer, A Prophet Reads Scripture, 179.
²⁸⁹ Sommer, A Prophet Reads Scripture, 173.
²⁹⁰ Nurmela, The Mouth of the Lord Has Spoken.
which the word or phrase fits more comfortably as the source text, and the context in which the word or phrase seems more awkwardly integrated as the alluding text.\textsuperscript{291} Clues such as unexplained changes in number or person or interruption in a chain of parallels, he says, are evidence that an element is poorly integrated, and indicate an allusion.\textsuperscript{292} Nurmela briefly considers the possibility that two apparently parallel elements might in some cases be reliant upon a third unknown source, but asserts that an analysis of the elements in their contexts would largely eliminate the dangers of misidentifying allusions in these cases.\textsuperscript{293} Based on verbal parallels between 2 Isaiah and the rest of the Hebrew Bible, Nurmela compiles a list of seventy-four allusions in Isaiah 40-55 to source texts, including the Psalms, Pentateuchal literature, other prophetic literature (1 Isaiah especially), the book of Job,\textsuperscript{294} Canticles, Lamentations, and Ruth. Nurmela comes to conclusions regarding the composition history of Isaiah based on the number and distributions of these allusions. For example, he deduces, due to the frequency of allusions to Isaiah 1-39, that 1 Isaiah was a very important text for 2 Isaiah, and that 2 Isaiah was very much preoccupied with relating his own work to that of 1 Isaiah.\textsuperscript{295} The lack of allusions in the Servant Songs suggests to Nurmela that they originated as a separate composition from the rest of 2 Isaiah.\textsuperscript{296}

\textsuperscript{291} Nurmela, \textit{The Mouth of the Lord Has Spoken}, Introduction 2-3.

\textsuperscript{292} Nurmela, \textit{The Mouth of the Lord Has Spoken}, Introduction 2.

\textsuperscript{293} Nurmela, \textit{The Mouth of the Lord Has Spoken}, Introduction 3.

\textsuperscript{294} Nurmela finds three allusions in 2 Isaiah to the book of Job: Job 3:23; 5:9; 9:4, 10 in Isa 40:26-28; Job 12:9 in Isa 41:20; and Job 25:2 in Isa 45:7 (see \textit{The Mouth of the Lord Has Spoken}, 8, 12-13, 42).

\textsuperscript{295} Nurmela, \textit{The Mouth of the Lord Has Spoken}, 81.

\textsuperscript{296} Nurmela, \textit{The Mouth of the Lord Has Spoken}, 82-83. Nurmela recognizes the argument from silence here, and the resultant tentativeness of the conclusion.
2.3.3 Job

A comparatively small amount of similar work has been done with the book of Job. While commentaries have the obligatory section on Job’s relationship to the rest of the Hebrew Bible, relating Job to literature in all three of its divisions, extensive analyses of Job’s intertextual connections with Hebrew Bible texts outside the book of Job are rare. More common are studies dealing with the intertextual connections internal to the book of Job, usually with the goal of showing the literary integrity among disparate parts or of the whole. Two factors, both noted in chapter 1, are behind this dearth of attention to Job’s relationship with other Hebrew Bible texts. First is the uncertainty regarding the date(s) of composition of the book of Job, which complicates any discussions of Job’s diachronic relationship with other Hebrew Bible texts. Tull Willey avoids considering a Joban influence on Isaiah 40-55 altogether, listing it, along with 3 Isaiah and Baruch, as one of the texts that “arguably postdate and recollect 2 Isaiah.” Analyzing allusions and their effects on the meaning of a text is a challenging enterprise even when one knows for certain which text is alluding and which alluded to, and one can never be completely sure about a diachronic relationship when dealing with Job. The second reason for the lack of attention paid to Job’s inner-biblical connections is the fact of Job’s uniqueness within the canon of the Hebrew Bible. There is nothing quite like Job
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297 Including the patriarchal traditions in Genesis, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Zechariah, Amos, Ruth, and Proverbs. See Dhorme, A Commentary on the Book of Job, clii-clxvii; Pope, Job, lxvi-lxvii.


299 Tull Willey, Remember the Former Things, 7.
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that might offer itself as an obvious conversation partner or point of reference with which to compare it, as is the case with 2 Isaiah.

Robert Gordis analyzed the rhetorical use of quotation and allusion in the book of Job in *The Book of God and Man*. He argued that quotation is characteristic of wisdom literature in general, particularly “the use of traditional religious vocabulary to express an unconventional world view” and “the varied use of quotations without any external sign to indicate their character.”

For the most part his examples are hypothetical quotations, which are not found in any extant source text, but which the context indicates are meant to be taken as quoted speech. These citations are of various types: the folk wisdom of the day, proverbs, the speaker’s unexpressed thoughts or previously held beliefs, an opponent’s arguments, and indirect quotations.

The author of Job often quotes hypothetical speech in order to parody it, or immediately to refute it in the next phrase.

Although Gordis’ data are, with only a few exceptions, made up of “virtual quotations” rather than known inner-biblical parallels, his discussion of allusion and analogy is valuable for understanding intentional verbal parallels as well. At the time of Job’s composition, he points out, reading required a lot more effort than it does today. In modern English we have vowels, the separation of paragraphs, and multiple forms of punctuation, all of which help us interpret texts and all of which were lacking in ancient Hebrew texts. Without such aids, the reader is less able to play the role of passive
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300 Gordis, *The Book of God and Man*, 172. According to Gordis, the former is typical of Ecclesiastes, the latter of Job.


recipient of the text, but must actively engage the text in a way that modern readers are not accustomed to doing, by discerning quotations in the absence of markers, for example, or by making distinctions in patterns of thought in the absence of paragraph indentations. Words are symbols, Gordis reminds us, and the corresponding reality must be inferred by the one reading them. Thus,

a symbol operates not merely through the power of analogy inherent in its similarity to the external world, but also through the technique of allusiveness which the human agent must recognize. It therefore follows that the role of the so-called passive partner in all these forms of communication is of fundamental importance. His function is almost as active and creative as that of the initiator of the symbolization. Indeed, if the former is unable or unwilling to play his part, the latter has failed.304

Poetry, Gordis goes on to say, requires more active and creative participation of the reader than other forms of art. By means of allusion and analogy, the poet shows the reader a connection between two things that he or she did not previously perceive. The poet makes room for the active engagement of the reader as he or she understands the connection and thinks about its implications beyond those hinted at in the allusion or analogy.305 The liberal distribution of virtual quotations in Job elicits just this sort of engagement, as the reader thinks about the quotations’ sources and meanings in their present contexts.

Different readers may perceive different quotations, and Gordis was roundly criticized by Michael V. Fox for perceiving quotations in Job and other wisdom literature

---

where Fox was by no means certain they ought to be perceived.\textsuperscript{306} Fox drew attention to the subjective nature of making such judgments, cautioning that it could be used rather arbitrarily to eliminate textual difficulties, and suggested three criteria for identifying so-called “virtual quotations” in a text:

1) The presence of a subject other than the primary speaker to whom the quotation is clearly attributed.

2) A verb or noun that implies speech.

3) A change in grammatical number or person that indicates a change of speaker perspective.\textsuperscript{307}

While virtual quotations may exist apart from these criteria, the case is far less certain. Fox’s perspective is that the author will make it clear that he or she is quoting if it is important that the audience realize it, and that ancient texts as well as modern texts have principles; one of them is that “an utterance not be ambiguous unless the ambiguity is functional in context.”\textsuperscript{308} Thus he essentially cautions Gordis and others not to be overly active and creative readers when it comes to identifying quotations.

Katherine J. Dell’s approach to the book of Job involved the identification of references in Job to various forms found elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible.\textsuperscript{309} Dissatisfied with the lack of a suitable overall genre categorization for the book of Job, Dell analyzed


\textsuperscript{307} Fox, “The Identification of Quotations in Biblical Literature,” 423.

\textsuperscript{308} Fox, “The Identification of Quotations in Biblical Literature,” 427.

\textsuperscript{309} Dell, \textit{Job as Sceptical Literature}. Dell does not refer to them as allusions, but given that the unique use of forms is meant to recall the forms they imitate, allusion would seem to be a proper designation.
smaller segments of the text and found the use of many different forms, not just from the wisdom traditions, but also from psalms, hymns, and legal material as well. What united the use of all these forms, she asserted, was their deliberate misuse of the given form they were meant to recall. Thus, she labeled Job a parody, “a genre which is by its nature parasitic and makes a deliberate improper use of other genres.” The book of Job is, she concluded, a kind of skeptical literature, purposefully contradictory and ironic, which exposes the inadequacy of traditional doctrines by parodying their familiar forms.

Only occasionally have arguments been made for allusion to specific Hebrew Bible texts in the book of Job. A compelling claim was made by Michael Fishbane for seeing a deliberate quotation of Ps 8:4-6 in Job 7:17-18. These texts begin the same way, share certain words, have similar structures, and talk about the exalted status of humans. Further analysis shows other connections between their contexts, but the impression one gets from reading these two passages could not be more different. The psalmist is in awe of the exalted status of the human person, and this

310 Dell, *Job as Sceptical Literature*, 214-215. Even when there is a clear allusion, such as to Psalm 8:4 in Job 7:17-18, Dell focuses on the parody of the hymn form rather than the actual verbal content of the form (126-127).

311 Dell, *Job as Sceptical Literature*, 215.

312 Dell, *Job as Sceptical Literature*, 216.


elicits praise of God. Job, on the other hand, speaks ironically, deriding God’s close
watch over humans’ every move and the divine predilection for spotting human mistakes.
Fishbane concludes, “Indeed, it seems far more likely than not that the fixed form of the
psalmist’s praise preceded and inspired Job’s rhetoric.”

An extended investigation into Job’s intertextual connections was undertaken by
Yohan Pyeon in You Have Not Spoken What Is Right About Me: Intertextuality and the
book of Job. Pyeon distinguishes two levels of intertextuality in the book of Job, the
synchronic intertextuality which is internal to the book and is characterized by “repeated
use of words, phrases and concepts” within the dialogue, and the diachronic
intertextuality which is external to the book and involves repeated use of other biblical
texts. Both levels of intertextuality, in his view, draw the work together and support the
contention that Job in its canonical form is a coherent and unified whole. He proceeds
by analyzing the first cycle of speeches (Job 3-14) according to the two levels of
intertextuality, finding common words and phrases that connect the speeches to each
other and to other biblical texts. Borrowing from James Sanders’ description of the
canonical process as involving the re-signification of traditions as they are applied in

________________________

316 Pyeon, You Have Not Spoken What Is Right about Me.
317 Pyeon, You Have Not Spoken What Is Right about Me, 2. Pyeon criticizes Tull Willey’s
Remember the Former Things for neglecting to make the distinction between the two levels of
intertextuality, and focusing solely on diachronic concerns (65-66). He seems more favorably disposed
toward Sommer’s A Prophet Reads Scripture, because of Sommer’s distinction between intertextuality and
allusion. I do not know how to understand Pyeon’s judgments on the relative merits of each book, however,
since Sommer brackets out intertextuality in favor of allusion, intentionally choosing to address diachronic
rather than synchronic concerns.
ever-changing historical contexts and thus “adaptable for life,” and assuming a date for Job that is no earlier than the fifth century, Pyeon claims that the book of Job is an effort to address the changed needs of the believing community due to “the shift from corporate to individual worth and responsibility.” The emphasis on individual responsibility arose, on Pyeon’s view, because of the exiles’ need to know that they would not continue to pay for the sins of previous generations, and because of the influence of Hellenistic and Roman civilizations on Semitic culture. Job’s friends, according to Pyeon, were trapped in a pre-exilic worldview, failing to adapt the old traditions to Job’s novel circumstances. The point of the book of Job is to present divine righteousness in a new way, relevant to the changing needs of a postexilic community.

2.4 The Present Approach

Since words such as “intertextuality,” “allusion,” and “quotation,” are used differently in different contexts, it is first necessary to define the terms as they will be used in this context. Intertextuality I take to be a broad category, containing within it all manner of connections between all manner of texts, be they synchronic or diachronic. I
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319 Pyeon, You Have Not Spoken What Is Right About Me, 48.

320 Pyeon, You Have Not Spoken What Is Right About Me, 61.


use the term verbal parallel in what follows to refer to the same word or words found in two written texts that I am comparing. Some verbal parallels are single words, others are more extended parallel word strings. Clearly some verbal parallels are insignificant; one of the goals in subsequent chapters is to distinguish which of the many verbal parallels in 2 Isaiah and Job might have significance for defining their literary relationship and which do not. Verbal dependence I use to indicate that the wording of one text is dependent upon the wording of a previous text. Allusion refers to the presence in a text of a marker that refers to a previous text. A quotation is a verbal parallel of one or more words that is meant to be a more or less accurate representation of a portion of a previous text. The terms “intertextuality” and “verbal parallel” carry no judgments of either chronological priority or authorial intention. “Verbal dependence” entails a judgment about chronological priority but not about authorial intention. “Allusion” and “quotation,” however, do indicate some sort of intentionality on the part of the author. Intentionality is a tricky thing to determine in any case, but especially so when the author is an ancient and anonymous one. At best any conclusions about authorial intention have to remain tentative, in the realm of plausibility and likelihood rather than certainty. Nevertheless, language of intentionality is unavoidable in the present case. I am interested in whether and how the ancient and anonymous author(s) in question used the words of a previous text to communicate something to readers and what impact that rhetorical strategy might have on the interpretation of the author’s text. If the author did not intend to communicate in this way, then there is no implication for interpretation
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324 See the discussion of Ben-Porat (above, section 2.2).
based on such a rhetorical strategy, although there might be other implications for interpretation in that case.

The present study resembles those of Hays, Schultz, Tull Willey, Sommer, Nurmela and Pyeon in that it investigates the question of verbal parallels between 2 Isaiah and Job that can arguably be considered quotation and allusion. Unlike Gordis and Dell, it is not concerned with virtual quotations or similarities in form, except in cases where these coincide with verbal parallels, but it does incorporate their valuable observations about the importance of quotation and allusion in the book of Job in general, and the prevalence of parody specifically. Nurmela’s work on 2 and 3 Isaiah is similar to mine in that he does not assume a relative chronology at the outset, but in methodology mine takes its inspiration from Hays, Tull Willey, and Sommer. Their attentiveness both to clear quotations and more subtle allusions, the impact of which is integrated into the interpretation of the texts, is something I hope to replicate in the present study.

Unlike these scholars, however, I have chosen two texts whose relative chronology is uncertain, and so it is necessary to approach the problem somewhat differently. At the same time, I find Nurmela’s method to be lacking in many respects. The relative smoothness or awkwardness of integration in context, the recognition of which is the foundation of his method, is, in my opinion, very problematic. These kinds of judgments can be quite subjective, having their basis in the reader’s perception of how a text “ought” to look. It is true that sometimes change in person or number or interruption of parallelism can indicate that another text has been incorporated into the context, but these can also simply be a mark of the style of a given author, or a textual problem introduced later and thus not the author’s responsibility. In addition, as Kellett
noted, quotations and allusions, when they are used well, fit very smoothly into their context, as if they were always meant to be there. Smooth integration of an element in its context could indicate that a skillful author has done his or her work of alluding very effectively. Further, the verbal parallels that have been posited as evidence of a relationship between 2 Isaiah and Job are so brief and isolated that Nurmela’s strategy is largely unhelpful.

Pyeon, in my judgment, is not selective enough in his identification of quotations and allusions. His evidence for them is often based on shared use of just one or two common words, which casts too wide a net and catches many insignificant or coincidental parallels that ought to be discarded from consideration. At the same time, he does not discuss some of the more obvious cases of quotation, with the result that his data are too exhaustive in some cases and not comprehensive enough in others. His primary goals seem to be to show the unity of the text of Job based on verbal parallels, and the impact on interpretation of the book in light of those parallels. Neither goal is accomplished, since he does not show why verbal parallels could not be the result of successive authors imitating each other, and the impact on interpretation is often based on similarities so slight that they are unable to hold up under the weight of his interpretive conclusions.

There are a number of pitfalls to watch for in a project that investigates the possibility of a relationship between two texts based on similarities of theme, style, and vocabulary. Dependency by one author or text on another is not the only explanation for these kinds of similarities, although it may at times be the most attractive. Since we must assume that only a portion, and perhaps only a very small portion, of ancient texts are
available to us today, it is always a possibility that Hebrew Bible texts displaying verbal parallels knew nothing of each other but rather depended on a third source or tradition of which we are unaware. Michael Fishbane’s caveat is worth repeating here:

For it makes all the difference – all and not some – whether a specific traditum has been reused or annotated; or whether, on the contrary, it either contains independent reflexes of common idioms or comments which are original to the particular composition or teaching.\(^{325}\)

In addition, since this dissertation intentionally focuses on select chapters from Isaiah and the book of Job, the third source or tradition may very well be known but bracketed out of the discussion at the outset. As such, it will be necessary to exclude some parallels between 2 Isaiah and Job on account of the probability that either or both of them were influenced by another Hebrew Bible text. Too, the stock of vocabulary in any language is finite, even if the possibilities for combination of that vocabulary are endless. Thus, mere coincidence may account for some verbal parallels, especially in cases where the subject of the “parallel” texts is the same.\(^{326}\) This is a particular concern when dealing with Isaiah 40-55 and the book of Job; both works incorporate ideas about innocent suffering and the majesty of God on display in the natural world, and are drawing on a limited body of words to do so. One must bear in mind that the very similarities of content which motivate comparison of the texts may have produced coincidental verbal parallels.

\(^{325}\) Fishbane, Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel, 13.

\(^{326}\) A. B. Davidson, for example, considers the possibility that there are similarities in language between 2 Isaiah and Job, but thinks it more likely that they result from the authors being “surrounded by the same atmosphere of thought” (The Book of Job: With Notes, Introduction and Appendix [Cambridge: The University Press, 1960], lxxiv).
The first step to be taken in this project is to lay out as comprehensively as possible all the data, in order to determine its significance for positing a relationship between 2 Isaiah and Job (Chapter 3). One of the problems surrounding previous investigations into the question of a relationship between 2 Isaiah and Job is the absence of a comprehensive and systematic accounting of the data. The data presented for analysis seemed in many cases to be chosen at random, consisting of that which stood out to the author, with the result that Pfeiffer, Elliott and Terrien are basing their conclusions on different, though overlapping, sets of data. I collect all their data, as well as add some from my own independent analysis.\footnote{I categorized as thoroughly as possible a list of similarities of theme, noting where specifically these similarities occurred in each book. I also noted similarities between the literary styles of the authors of 2 Isaiah and Job. I then cross-referenced the vocabulary of 2 Isaiah with Job, taking note of where the text of 2 Isaiah coincided with the text of Job, and paying special attention to those words or phrases which appear only in these two works. I placed these into categories of shared words (words unique to 2 Isaiah and Job, rare, or characteristic of these works, and words used in parallel only in these works), shared phrases (phrases unique to 2 Isaiah and Job, rare, or characteristic of these works), and shared word strings. Finally, I compiled a list of similarities related to the servant of the Lord.}

The next step is to analyze the data so as to determine its significance for positing a relationship, and to come to conclusions regarding the extent and nature of that relationship.
relationship (Chapter 4). Pfeiffer, Elliott, and Terrien move from presenting the data to analyzing the relationship, but I do not assume from the outset that there is a relationship between 2 Isaiah and Job. Whether there is such a relationship must be demonstrated before analyzing its nature. Some of Hays’ tests for identifying allusions are helpful here, but cannot be adopted in their entirety.³²⁸ The tests of volume, recurrence, thematic coherence, and historical plausibility will be of assistance in the examination of the wider contexts of parallels in 2 Isaiah and Job to see how many and where the parallels are, and how they fit into their respective texts. The test of satisfaction, Hays’ most subjective category, will of necessity play a role in this project: does positing verbal dependence in a particular case make for a sensible reading of the text and enhance our understanding of it? This last test, as Hays urged, must be employed with caution, but may well assist in making tentative judgments. It is well worth remembering here that textual interpretation is not an exact science, and one can at least make a cumulative case that points to the likelihood of a conclusion in the absence of solid proof.

The final step is to consider the impact on interpretation of 2 Isaiah and Job in light of the conclusions reached about the existence and nature of the relationship between them (Chapter 5).

³²⁸ The test of availability, for example, can clearly be of no use, since that is one of the points of dispute.
CHAPTER 3

SIMILARITIES OF THEME, STYLE, AND VOCABULARY BETWEEN ISAIAH 40-55 AND JOB

3.1 Introduction

The goal of this chapter is to compile as comprehensive a list as possible of the similarities between 2 Isaiah and the book of Job. These similarities fall into four primary categories: the themes present in the works, their literary style, their vocabulary, and ideas and images related to the servant of the Lord. Many, if not most, of these similarities have been suggested or presented in a partial or scattered form in previous comparisons of 2 Isaiah and Job; here, they have been gathered from their disparate sources and listed in a systematic way.

3.2 Similarities of Theme

On one level, 2 Isaiah and Job appear not to have very much in common at all. 2 Isaiah is wholly concerned with the Israelites at a particular time in their history. The context is the end of the Babylonian exile, and the message is that God has so orchestrated events that the Israelites went into exile for their sins, but now God is leading them back to the promised land, exodus-style. God foretold all these events through the prophets ahead of time, and is now bringing them to pass. In so doing, God is showing total sovereignty over the whole cosmos, from the stars all the way down to the
grasshopper-like Israelites, whom God created, called, and about whom God cares
deeply. The book of Job, on the other hand, except for a handful of references to the
personal deity of the Israelites and one Hebrew character (Elihu, perhaps a relatively late
addition to the text in any case), demonstrates a complete lack of regard for the Israelites
or their history. Instead, the book is concerned with the innocent suffering of the (non-
Israelite) main character, and probes questions about the meaning of suffering, the
character of God, and the divine-human relationship.

Described in this way, the two works really have very little in common, with the
exception that both treat the theme of divine creation of the world at some length, though
this theme plays rather different roles in the two works. What is similar and comparable
about 2 Isaiah and Job is the range of themes or ideas they seem to share about how the
world works. They seem to be in complete agreement about certain beliefs, such as that
God is the all-powerful creator of the cosmos, and humans are tiny, weak creatures who
know nothing in comparison. It is these themes that underlie the two works, rather than
their overt messages, which invite comparison.

Previous research on the literary relationship between 2 Isaiah and Job has relied
most heavily on this category of similarities. After noting similarity of vocabulary which
implied a literary relationship between 2 Isaiah and Job, Pfeiffer, Elliott, and Terrien all
made judgments about the relative chronology based on a perceived development of
thought regarding how similar themes were treated in each work. For Pfeiffer, this
entailed describing 2 Isaiah’s view of God as the offspring resulting from the marriage of
the Israelite notion of a God of history, and the notion of a God of nature as articulated in the book of Job. For Terrien, the questions and problems about the nature of God and humanity that the book of Job posed were answered by 2 Isaiah, who added his own unique touch, such as the idea of vicarious suffering, to what was already present in Job. Elliott, on the other hand, perceived the opposite direction of influence, with similar ideas being treated with a national emphasis in 2 Isaiah and an individualistic emphasis in Job, and this indicated to him that Job dated from a later era than 2 Isaiah.

I see a couple of problems that result from relying so heavily on these kinds of interpretations of “development” in thought between 2 Isaiah and Job. First, one might expect that authors living in relatively close proximity to one another in time and space, as the authors of 2 Isaiah and Job probably did, might be concerned with similar issues or ideas, and write about them in their own style and from their own point of view. Thus, parallel content in two different works might be, not a result of direct contact, but the natural and coincidental result of having lived and thought in a particular culture over a limited span of years. Second, basing conclusions about chronological priority on perceived development in thought regarding similar ideas lends itself to the reduction of a culture or nation to a homogeneous and relatively static unit, changes in which can be traced along a straightforward line of progression from one point to the next. This is hardly an appropriate way to understand cultures, which are multifaceted entities with many kinds of forces, from within and without, pulling this way and that. There is always some amount of diversity within a culture, including diversity in opinions regarding what cultural progress should look like. There are those who lean toward continuity of tradition, and others toward change, with every imaginable combination of the two.
extremes in the middle. What may look to a critic two thousand years hence like progress from point A to point B may be just two different socioeconomic groups looking at the same thing at the same time from different perspectives. Undoubtedly, the critic’s own ideas about what a culture ought to look like or how it ought to progress over time enter into judgments about alleged “development” in other cultures. Thus, conclusions based primarily on comparisons of parallel ideas, like those of Pfeiffer, Terrien, and Elliott, are at great risk of being inappropriately subjective.

Nevertheless, approached with caution, evaluation of parallel themes can demonstrate indirect points of connection, since shared concerns can hint at shared historical contexts. In addition, differences in the way similar ideas are articulated can suggest differences of opinion between subgroups in the larger community. As such, they play an important part in an evaluation of the connections between 2 Isaiah and Job. I have organized these similarities of worldview into four categories: the nature of God, the nature of humankind, the nature of the divine-human relationship, and creation.

3.2.1 The Nature of God

A surface reading of 2 Isaiah and Job shows that they are largely in agreement about various aspects of the divine nature. In both works, God is unquestionably transcendent over the world and (unlike humans) has perfect wisdom and understanding regarding all aspects of reality. As a result, God’s ways are largely hidden from human comprehension. God is holy and pure, and is presumed to exhibit perfect righteousness. God is also solitary in divinity; God has no competition from any other existing deity. This view of God is not unique to 2 Isaiah and Job in the Hebrew Bible, of course; what is remarkably similar is the fact that both works explicitly and repeatedly articulate many
of these perceptions of the divine nature, as opposed to leaving them as unspoken presuppositions understood by inference, as in many other texts.

3.2.1.1 Divine Transcendence

God is so high above the earth that its inhabitants look like grasshoppers (Isa 40:22). Isa 55:9 says, “For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways and my thoughts than your thoughts.” Zophar says that the deep things of God and God’s limits are “higher than heaven” (במה שמים) and “deeper than Sheol” (Job 11:8). Eliphaz, too, asks if God is not “high in the heavens” (Job 22:12).Job also acknowledges God’s loftiness (cf. Job 9:3-4, 30-35), and Elihu is not stingy in his avowal of God’s superiority (Job 35:5-7). In particular, God exerts total control even over the most powerful rulers of the world (Isa 40:23-24; 41:2-4, 25; 45:1-3; 46:11; Job 12:17-25; 34:16-30).

3.2.1.2 Divine Wisdom

The usual words for “wise” and “wisdom (חכמה) are not used positively in 2 Isaiah (cf. Isa 40:20; 44:25; 47:10); they apply to inferior human wisdom. God, however, has understanding beyond the reach of any human (Isa 40:28), and God’s purposes and actions are unfathomable and astonishing to human beings, who are in no position to question the profound skill with which God created the world and continues to manage it (Isa 45:9-12; 55:8-9). Wisdom, a positive word in Job, is attributed to God above all (Job 9:4; 11:6-7; 12:13; 28:23-28). For both 2 Isaiah and Job, no human is in a position to

---

329 Besides these, the only other instance in the Hebrew Bible of a similar phrase is Ps 103:11, which has marked affinities with Isa 55:9.
teach God knowledge (לָמ֖וּד שָׁמַר — Isa 40:14; Job 21:22), but rather God frustrates the cleverness of human beings (Isa 44:25; Job 5:12).

3.2.1.3 Divine Hiddenness

According to the explicit declaration of 2 Isaiah, God hides the divine self (Isa 45:15), and no matter where God goes, Job cannot perceive God’s presence (Job 9:11; 23:8-9). For both 2 Isaiah and Job, God’s ways are also inscrutable to human beings; they are not able to search them out (לֹ֣א תְמַסֵּ֑ס — Isa 40:28; Job 5:9; 9:11). Elihu emphasizes the human incapacity to behold God as well (Job 34:29; 36:26), and ends his speeches with this theme (37:23-24). In contrast, the ways of humans are laid bare before God’s scrutiny (Isa 40:27; 47:10; Job 7:11-21; 23:10; 34:21-22).

3.2.1.4 Divine Holiness

One of 2 Isaiah’s preferred terms for the deity, following 1 Isaiah, is “the Holy One” (הַנִּלְהָ֣ה). It is used to refer to God fourteen times in 2 Isaiah (Isa 40:25; 41:14, 16, 20; 43:3, 14, 15; 45:11; 47:4; 48:17; 49:4; 54:5; 55:5). Although the designation appears only once in Job (6:10), the holiness of God as compared to humans is emphasized in multiple places. Job’s friends point out, unhelpfully, that humans are not more pure than God, or even than the heavens, which are also a step below God in purity (Job 4:17; 15:15).
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330 See section 3.4.2.2 number 5.
331 See section 3.4.1.2, number 2.
332 Curtis, “Elihu and Deutero-Isaiah,” 33-34.
335 See section 3.4.1.4, number 12.
15:14-15; 25:5-6). In his final declaration of his innocence, Job focuses on the purity of his conduct before God (Job 31:1-40).

3.2.1.5 Divine Righteousness

The righteousness of God is of supreme importance in both 2 Isaiah and Job, but in very different respects. In 2 Isaiah, God’s righteousness is almost always related explicitly to God’s salvation (Isa 41:2, 10; 42:6, 21; 45:8, 13; 46:13; 51:5, 6, 8). The two concepts go hand in hand. In the book of Job, belief in God’s righteousness is the foundation on which the problem of the book is built; if Job has acted rightly, and he has, then God’s ill treatment of him throws into question God’s righteousness and justice. Job’s friends firmly believe that God’s righteousness is unquestionable, which is why they question Job’s (Job 8:3; 34:10-12; 37:23). God gets at the heart of the issue with the question of Job 40:8 (“Will you condemn me that you may be justified?”). The divine character trait which is taken for granted and proven by God’s actions in 2 Isaiah is radically questioned by Job.

3.2.1.6 Divine Solitariness

Time after time in 2 Isaiah, the point is driven home that there is no God besides God (e.g. Isa 42:8; 43:10-13; 44:6-8; 45:5-6, 14, 21-22; 48:11). God has no competition, and 2 Isaiah ridicules both the making and the worship of idols ( Isa 40:18-20; 41:21-24; 44:9-20; 46:3-11). Job does not contain such proof-texts for monotheism (or the attempt to propagate it), but the existence of one God without competition from other deities seems to be woven into its very fabric. In the absence of one supreme being with absolute control over the whole world, the problem of innocent suffering which Job treats would
not be a problem; not once do Job or his friends speculate that Job’s suffering might originate or be put to a stop by any other than the one deity under discussion in the dialogues. Indeed, that is the injustice against which Job rebels – God is alone responsible for his ill treatment. The “sons of God” (던י אלהים), who present themselves before God in the prologue (Job 1:6; 2:1), and who shouted for joy at the creation of the world (Job 38:7), clearly are not competition for God. In addition, even the Adversary is limited in his capacity for bringing harm to Job, since God gave him strict instructions regarding what he was and was not permitted to do (Job 1:12; 2:6). Job 31:26-27 indirectly acknowledge the reality of worship of other gods, but denies having ever been “false to God above” in this way (Job 31:28).

3.2.2 The Nature of Human Existence

For both 2 Isaiah and Job, the human person is as lowly as the deity is lofty. Human beings are transitory and impermanent like flowers, and they are incapable of understanding God or God’s ways, or really much of anything important.

336 There are those who see a contrast in Job between the all-powerful deity of the prologue and Job’s personal deity, especially in Job 16:19-21 and 19:25 (see, e.g., William A. Irwin, “Job’s Redeemer,” JBL 81 [1962]: 217-229; and John Briggs Curtis, “On Job’s Witness in Heaven,” JBL 102 [1983]: 549-562). I am not convinced that these do indicate a personal deity, and texts such as Job 9:4-24; 23:13; and 31:26-28 indicate that Job acknowledges the power and authority of one deity. However, even if one accepted the idea of a personal vs. a cosmic deity based on Job 16 and 19, it seems the personal deity does not have much power to do anything other than plead with the supreme deity for an end to Job’s suffering. Certainly, in light of the divine speeches and Job’s final words, if there were such a personal deity, he or she did not come through for Job. Thus, the God of Job is effectively as much without competition as the God of 2 Isaiah.
3.2.2.1 Human Transitoriness

Both 2 Isaiah and Job compare human life to a fading or withering bloom (Isa 40:6-8; Job 14:2), and to a garment that wears out and is eaten by moths (Isa 50:9; Job 13:28). 2 Isaiah speaks of the world passing away, in contrast to God’s salvation, and urges the people not to be afraid of mere humans, who will wear out like a garment – again in contrast to God’s salvation (Isa 51:8, 12). The image of humans as clay in the hands of the divine potter is also present in 2 Isaiah (Isa 45:9-11), and the lowliness of God’s people is emphasized further by referring to them as “worm Jacob” (Isa 41:11). Job seems preoccupied with the idea of the impermanence of human life, with creative comparisons of his days to a weaver’s shuttle (Job 7:6), and a swift runner (Job 9:25-26); he laments that the life span of humans is so short (Job 10:20; 14:21; 16:22). Job’s friends also consider human life to be fleeting (Job 4:19-21; 8:9), but they focus especially on the swift destruction of the wicked (e.g. Job 8:11-19; 22:15-16).

Comparisons have also been made between 2 Isaiah and Job with regard to the idea of an afterlife, since there are certain passages within 2 Isaiah and Job that seem to indicate a sense that human life is perhaps not so impermanent after all. Unfortunately, the two passages marshaled in support of this are notoriously difficult to interpret. In Isa 53:8-12 the servant seems to be dead and buried, but the author claims that the servant would still see his offspring and receive a great reward. Job, too, voices a hope that

337 Cf. Isa 28:1 and Ps 103:15-16.

338 Cheyne, The Prophecies of Isaiah, 2.251; Elliott, “A Comparative Study of Deutero Isaiah and Job,” 244-252. Here, too, Elliott sees development from 2 Isaiah to Job, in that the idea of an afterlife was applied only to the servant in 2 Isaiah, but to the common human in Job (252).

after his skin has been destroyed, in his flesh he will see God (Job 19:25-27). On the other hand, in other places Job considers and then explicitly rejects the idea that he will have existence after death (Job 14:7-22; 16:22). Indeed, the problem of Job’s suffering would not be nearly so troubling if he had an eternal reward to anticipate. Perhaps the most that can be said, in light of the difficulties of interpreting the texts at hand, is that isolated passages in Job indicate that the idea of an afterlife was present in the human imagination, if not universally accepted, at the time it was written; and, depending on one’s understanding of Isa 53:8-12, the idea may also be communicated there. Both contain the idea, present before the development of the concept of bodily resurrection, of the birth of children to replace the ones that have died (Isa 49:19-21; Job 42:13).

3.2.2.2 Human Ignorance

In addition to their frailty, humans, for both 2 Isaiah and Job, are rather ignorant creatures. They misinterpret or fail entirely to understand the ways of God (Isa 40:27-28; 49:14-15; Job 5:9; 8:9; 9:10; 36:26; 37:5). As such, they are in no position to question God’s actions (Isa 45:9-12; 37:23-24). In Job, humans are not able to search out the wisdom with which God created the world (Job 28). The impression left by 2 Isaiah is that God is lovingly condescending to the people; they misunderstand, they think God
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340 For a survey of the options for interpretation, see Clines, Job 1-20, 457-466. Clines’ opinion seems to be the majority one, that this passage cannot be claiming a bodily resurrection in light of the unqualified rejection of it in the rest of the book (464).

341 Like Seth was born to stand in place of Abel, in a certain sense reversing Abel’s death (Jon D. Levenson, The Death and Resurrection of the Beloved Son: The Transformation of Child Sacrifice in Judaism and Christianity [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993], 78).
does not care and all is lost, but God goes to great lengths to demonstrate divine power and concern for their situation. In Job, the rhetorical questions posed by both Elihu and God leave readers with the impression that someone is trying to put humans in their place as mere humans. Either way, there is a vast gulf between God’s knowledge and human perception.

3.2.3 The Divine-Human Relationship

The nature of the relationship between God and humans is characterized in similar ways in 2 Isaiah and Job. Both rely on legal language to describe the relationship. Both accept the ideas that righteousness is rewarded and sin is punished, and that God sometimes sends adversity for testing or refining human beings. In both works also the proper response to God’s action in the world is joyful praise.

3.2.3.1 Legal Language

In 2 Isaiah, it is God who describes the divine relationship with humans (and idols) in legal terms. God calls the nations to draw near for judgment, and Israel as witnesses, in order to determine who foretold and implemented the various recent events on the world stage ( Isa 41:1-2, 21-24; 43:8-13; 45:21). God also invites Israel to make an accusation against the divine self, so that judgment can be passed as to whether God treated Israel fairly; God declares that they were guilty of sin, and for this reason were punished ( Isa 43: 26). In the book of Job it is primarily Job who uses legal language to characterize his relationship with God. He strongly desires a hearing with God, a chance

342 The similarities between 2 Isaiah and Job in this regard are expounded in Gunnel André, “Deuterojesaja och Jobsboken: En jämförande studie” SEÅ 54 (1989): 33-42.
to lay out his case (Job 13:3; 23:3-7; 31:35-37), but despairs of persuading God to meet
with him in this kind of setting for a fair trial (Job 9:2-3, 15-16, 32-35; 31:35). Job’s three
friends largely ignore this aspect of Job’s complaint, but it is picked up by Elihu, who
declares Job guilty in no uncertain terms (Job 34:4-9).\(^{343}\) God responds to Job’s charges
with questions of his own throughout the divine speeches (especially Job 40:2, 8).

3.2.3.2 Punishment and Reward

2 Isaiah takes for granted that God punishes or rewards according to a person’s
wickedness or righteousness. Israel is sent into exile to pay for her sins against God (Isa
40:2; 42:24-25; 43:27-28; 48:17-19; 50:1), and Babylon too will suffer for sins
perpetrated against Israel (Isa 47:5-15). In Job, it is exactly this point that is in dispute;
given outward circumstances, Job’s friends conclude that he has sinned in some way, and
they are unanimous in their belief that the one who suffers has done something to deserve
that plight (Job 4:7-9; 8:11-19; 20:4-29; 36:6-15). Elihu in particular has much in
common with 2 Isaiah; both declare that God rescues the righteous from the pit (Isa
51:14; Job 33:17-30), renews their youthful energy (Isa 40:30-31; Job 33:25), and
delivers them from watery threats (Isa 43:2, 16; 44:27; 50:2; 51:10; Job 33:18).\(^{344}\) Job
persists in believing himself innocent of any sins that might have led to his present
suffering and perceives that the wicked thrive, and so questions whether God cares one

\(^{343}\) Bruce Zuckerman, *Job the Silent: A Study in Historical Counterpoint* (New York: Oxford

\(^{344}\) Curtis, “Elihu and Deutero-Isaiah,” 32-33. In 2 Isaiah, God brings God’s people safely through
water, or dries up the hostile sea. In Job, God prevents the repentant human from crossing the river.
3.2.3.3 Adversity for Testing

In addition to assigning consequences for sin, God also causes or allows adversity in order to test a person and to reveal wickedness and spur humans to repentance (Isa 48:10). This is hinted at in the dialogues of Job (Job 5:17-18; 23:10) and is picked up by Elihu, who treats it at length (33:12-28; 36:8-21). In the case of Isa 48:10 and Job 36:21 the wording is nearly the same (חזרה ממניע וזרה יניע, respectively).

3.2.3.4 Response of Praise

Periodically, 2 Isaiah inserts a call to praise God in response to God’s action in the world (Isa 41:16; 42:10-13; 44:23; 48:20; 49:13; 52:8-9). Creation, both human and non-human, is called on to sing and shout praise to God for divine comfort and salvation. Elihu is very eloquent in calling for praise in response to God’s work, and voicing that praise himself (Job 36:24-37:24). Job, on the other hand, seems to think that fear and terror are a more appropriate response (Job 9:4-12), or even silence (Job 40:4-5).

3.2.4 The Creation

Perhaps the greatest area of thematic overlap between 2 Isaiah and Job pertains to the preoccupation with and manner of talking about the creation. The idea of God’s creation of both the human and non-human world is not a passing reference in either
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346 Curtis, “Elihu and Deutero-Isaiah,” 34.
work, but an important aspect of the development of argument in each. In addition, the words chosen to describe God’s creating work are often similar in each.

In both 2 Isaiah and Job the images the authors use to describe the divine creation of the human person are those of God putting breath into humans (Isa 42:1, 5; 44:3; Job 12:10; 27:3; 32:8; 33:4; 34:14-15), God the divine potter forming humans from clay (Isa 45:9-10; Job 10:8-9; 33:6),\textsuperscript{347} and God creating people in the womb (Isa 44:2, 24; 46:3-4; 49:5; Job 31:15).\textsuperscript{348} Humans live by God’s providence (Isa 46:3-4; Job 10:12; 12:10; 34:14-15)\textsuperscript{349} and perish because of God’s breath (Isa 40:7; Job 4:9). That God is the creator of Israel is reiterated again and again in 2 Isaiah (43:1, 7, 15, 21; 44:12); this is not repeated as an end to itself, but to show that God is also able to bring about the salvation being promised. In the book of Job, it is mostly Job who brings up the fact that he was created by God (Job 10:3, 12; 12:10), but it is to lament the reality that God is now in the process of destroying him.

No less important in 2 Isaiah and Job is the portrayal of God as the creator of the non-human world. God created heaven and earth (Isa 40:28; 42:5; 44:24; 45:12; 48:13; 51:13, 16; Job 26:7-14; 36:27-37:24; 38-41). God’s power is especially visible in the creation and control of the heavenly bodies (Isa 40:26; 45:12; Job 9:8-9; 38:31-33). Again for 2 Isaiah this is part of the argument that God is powerful enough to bring about what God says will happen, and declarations of God’s creative work are often

\textsuperscript{347} See also Isa 29:16; 64:7; Jer. 18:1-6. Isa 45:9-15 shares many words and sounds with Isa 29:14-21, but, according to Sommer’s analysis, it is a kind of echoing that does not change the interpretation of the 2 Isaiah passage (\textit{A Prophet Reads Scripture}, 104).

\textsuperscript{348} Cf. Ps 139:13; Jer 1:5.

\textsuperscript{349} Curtis, “Elihu and Deutero-Isaiah,” 32.
accompanied by the assurances of God’s intimate concern for Israel. Job, on the other hand, seems to find God’s creative work terrifying, and an obstacle to God’s having concern for the average human. A surface reading of the divine speeches would seem to support Job’s view, since the divine speeches talk at great length about the non-human creation, while almost completely ignoring the human creation and Job’s plight. That which is comforting and assuring in 2 Isaiah is threatening in Job.

Of course 2 Isaiah and Job are not the only texts which contain these themes, and in many respects the worldview represented in these texts is not any different from the worldview represented in other Hebrew Bible texts. The commonality between 2 Isaiah and Job with regard to these themes is the emphasis they give to them and, in some cases, the words they use to describe them. While the majesty of God or the lowliness of human beings, for example, might be an unspoken presupposition behind many other texts, 2 Isaiah and Job mention these aspects of the divine and human explicitly and repeatedly. It is the prominent place descriptions like this have in both works that has drawn the attention of readers.

3.3 Similarities of Style

This section lists the similarities of grammatical or writing style that are found in 2 Isaiah and Job. These do not necessarily entail any verbal or thematic parallels, but are manners of expression that take similar form. These stylistic similarities are not always
exclusive to 2 Isaiah and Job; however, they are distinctive enough in both works so as to have drawn the attention of scholars making comparisons between 2 Isaiah and Job.  

1) Cadence. According to Elliott, both 2 Isaiah and Job usually follow a 3/3 or a 3/3/3 pattern of stressed syllables in their meter, occasionally broken up by a 3/2 pattern.

2) Participial clauses. Several scholars note the penchant of the authors of both 2 Isaiah and Job to use phrases introduced with a participle that describe various aspects of God, for example, והנה חכם...יהוה אלהי צדו והארץ לואל אכתי היישו אביו (Isa 40:22) and תשמיש יבשה רבים עלברמה ימ (Job 9:8). Further examples collected by Elliott are Isa 40:23, 26; 42:5; 43:16-17; 44:24-28; 45:7, 18; 46:10-11; 51:13, 15, and Job 5:9-10, 12-13; 9:9-10; 12:17; 26:7-9.

3) Use of a finite verb where an infinitive would be more typical. Cheyne noted this stylistic peculiarity, and lists Isa 42:21 (יוה הפסי למשיزادכו ורידיל) and Job 19:3 and 32:22.
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350 Cheyne and Elliott both list these stylistic similarities.

351 Elliott, “A Comparative Study of Deutero Isaiah and Job,” 171-184. Since Elliott notes that this pattern of poetry is the most typical in the Hebrew Bible, this similarity would not seem to be of particular significance. James L. Kugel says that the typical style of writing in the Hebrew Bible (“terse, parallelistic clauses, usually meted out in pairs, making for sentences of approximately equal length”), exemplified in Job, is more important than any attempt to find metrical rhythm (The Idea of Biblical Poetry: Parallelism and Its History [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981] 299-300).


353 Elliott, following Cheyne, calls this “subordination of infinitive to previous verb” (Cheyne, Introduction to the Book of Isaiah, 256; Elliott, “A Comparative Study of Deutero Isaiah and Job,” 194).
4) Omission of relative conjunction.\textsuperscript{355}

5) Rhetorical questions (Isa 40:12-13, 18, 21, 25-26; 44:7; 46:5; Job 34:13; 36:22-23; 38:4-39:30).\textsuperscript{356} This literary device is characteristic of wisdom writing in general, and is held by some as an indication of wisdom influence on Hebrew Bible texts that employ it.\textsuperscript{357} As Crenshaw rightly pointed out, this is too widespread a device to prove anything simply from its presence;\textsuperscript{358} nevertheless, it is one of the notable similarities between 2 Isaiah and Job, even if not exclusive to them.

6) Exhortation to the audience for close attention (Isa 41:1; 51:1, 4, 21; 55:2-3; Job 13:6, 13, 17; 15:17; 32:10; 33:1, 31, 33; 34:2, 10, 16; 37:14).\textsuperscript{359} The urge to listen fits smoothly into 2 Isaiah, but in the speeches of Elihu the command to listen draws attention to itself by virtue of sheer repetition.\textsuperscript{360} The other characters also, although less often, request close attention to their words, as the above references show.

\textsuperscript{354} Cheyne, \textit{Introduction to the Book of Isaiah}, 256; see also Elliott, “A Comparative Study of Deutero Isaiah and Job,” 194.

\textsuperscript{355} This similarity is noted by both Cheyne (\textit{Introduction to the Book of Isaiah}, 256) and Elliott (“A Comparative Study of Deutero Isaiah and Job,” 194). They claim at least sixty instances of this stylistic feature, which occurs more frequently in poetry than in prose, but neither gives examples.

\textsuperscript{356} Curtis, “Elihu and Deutero-Isaiah,” 34.

\textsuperscript{357} E.g. Wolff, \textit{Amos the Prophet}, 6-16.

\textsuperscript{358} Crenshaw, “The Influence of the Wise Upon Amos,” 46-47.

\textsuperscript{359} Curtis, “Elihu and Deutero-Isaiah,” 37.

\textsuperscript{360} This tendency was noted by Lynch (“Bursting at the Seams,” 354-361), who views the speeches of Elihu as integral to the original form of the book and the climax of Job’s suffering. “Phonetic language,” that is, words about speaking and listening – in particular extended exhortations to listen to his words – bookends Elihu’s speeches.
7) Diaphor. Janzen borrowed this term from Philip Wheelwright, who defines it as the production of new meaning by the juxtaposition of two elements that, separately, each have their own, very different, meaning.\(^{361}\) Janzen applies it to the effect created by the juxtaposition of the images of God as a triumphant warrior raising a battle cry and as a woman in labor crying out and gasping.\(^{362}\) To this one might also add the image of God gently leading the mother sheep in Isa 40:11, followed immediately by a litany of rhetorical questions designed to show God’s supreme power over creation. The same kind of style is present in the divine speeches of Job 38-39, where the image of God as mighty builder of the earth is followed immediately by the image of God as midwife who swaddled the sea at its birth (Job 38:4-11), and where the implication that Job is completely incapable of controlling the heavenly bodies is juxtaposed with the implication that he is unable to provide food for baby animals and ignorant of the intimate details of gestational periods and birthing habits in the animal kingdom (Job 38:31-39:4).

Stylistic comparisons between 2 Isaiah and Job have been made in more general terms as well. Elliott sees a similarity between the two in terms of dramatic note; Job has a dramatic character throughout, but, although it is less obvious, 2 Isaiah is not


completely lacking in this respect either.\textsuperscript{363} As well, both works are characterized by mood variation, juxtaposing soaring hope with debilitating despair.\textsuperscript{364}

3.4 Similarities of Vocabulary

It is the similarities of vocabulary that have persuaded previous scholars that there exists a literary connection between 2 Isaiah and Job, since some of the similarities seem too strong to be coincidental. Not only are there parallel word strings which give the impression of being direct quotations, there are many words which are unique to or distinctive of 2 Isaiah and Job that indicate some kind of connection. Comparisons of vocabulary come with certain risks, however. The existence of these kinds of similarities does not automatically mean there is any kind of relationship between the two, or indicate that one was certainly dependent on the other. Especially since the authors of 2 Isaiah and Job seem to share themes and have a similar worldview, it is always possible that they happen to be using the same words to describe the same things. It is also possible that they were writing at roughly the same time, and so express their ideas according to the norms of their day. Some people avoid relying on verbal parallels for their arguments altogether, because, in the words of one detractor, “it is encumbered with doubt and difficulty, and is apt to resolve itself into a matter of subjective impressions.”\textsuperscript{365}

\textsuperscript{363} In fact, 2 Isaiah has even been labeled a “liturgical drama,” one which would have been performed for an audience (e.g. Klaus Baltzer, \textit{Deutero-Isaiah: A Commentary on Isaiah 40-55} [Hermeneia; transl. Margaret Kohl; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001], 7-25). Elliott (“A Comparative Study of Deutero Isaiah and Job,” 199) lists 40:3ff., 49:1ff., 50:4-9, and 53:1ff. as evidence of 2 Isaiah’s dramatic character.

\textsuperscript{364} Elliott, “A Comparative Study of Deutero Isaiah and Job,” 199.
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This point is well taken, and in the previous chapter I noted some difficulties and subjective impressions which characterized previous investigations into the relationship between 2 Isaiah and Job. Nevertheless, a comparison of vocabulary is still valuable for a number of reasons. First, it is impossible to evaluate the conclusions of previous research on this topic or to formulate any worthwhile impressions without laying out all the data. Previous studies have collected data in a rather haphazard way, with no attempt to be systematic or comprehensive. I would like to correct this deficiency by presenting all kinds of similarities, including verbal similarities, in as thorough a manner as possible. Second, although many of the similarities of vocabulary will not, in the end, be significant in determining the nature of the relationship between 2 Isaiah and Job, it is very difficult to tell which will be important, and which less so; out of the word study, some data rise to the surface for further analysis. Third, comparison of vocabulary will bring to light differences as well as similarities, which can show points of connection as well as divergence, both of which are important for describing a relationship. Finally, locating verbal similarities in the texts can reveal patterns that would otherwise go unnoticed.

Approached with the necessary caution, then, similarities of vocabulary are, along with the other similarities noted in this chapter, a necessary part of evaluating the evidence for a relationship between 2 Isaiah and the book of Job. The data here will be presented in three categories: words shared by 2 Isaiah and Job, shared phrases, and

---

366 “In truth, the intertextual relationship between Second Isaiah and Job does require a fresh examination” (Cooper, “The Suffering Servant and Job,” 199); “Job and Second Isaiah arose as mirror opposites from one emergent Israelite consciousness…The myriad connections between these two flowerings of the exile remain yet to be fully traced” (Janzen, Job, 12-13); “the comparative study of the vocabularies of Job and II. Isaiah would be a real critical and exegetical service” (Cheyne, The Prophecies of Isaiah, 2.241).
shared word strings. I am especially concerned with those elements that are unique to 2 Isaiah and the book of Job.

3.4.1 Shared Words in Isaiah 40-55 and Job

This section is further divided into words that are unique to Isaiah 40-55 and Job, rare words that appear in both, words that are used with a distinct meaning in both, words that are characteristic of the styles of the authors of both Isaiah 40-55 and Job, and words used in parallel in both.

3.4.1.1 Unique Words

This section includes words that appear in 2 Isaiah and Job and nowhere else in the Hebrew Bible. It also includes words that, although they are not unique to 2 Isaiah and Job, appear in a form in those two works that is unique in the Hebrew Bible.

1) הירש – purified, polished, sharpened (Isa 49:2; Job 33:3). This word occurs eighteen times overall, but in this particular form (masculine singular qal passive participle) in only these two instances. In Isa 49:2, the servant of the Lord is declaring that the Lord has made his mouth like a sharp sword and has made him like a polished arrow hidden away in a quiver. In Job 33:3, Elihu uses the description in his claim that he is speaking in a pure and sincere way.

2) ילתפ – barren, hard (Isa 49:21; Job 3:7; 15:34; 30:3). In 2 Isaiah this adjective describes Lady Zion’s self-perception as one without children,

but who, after her restoration, turns out to have so many there is not room enough for all. In Job it is applied to the night of Job’s birth in a curse, to the company of the godless, and to the former hunger of Job’s inferiors who have now become his mockers, respectively.

3) ח.tokenize — to pierce (Isa 51:9; 53:5; Job 26:13). The root itself appears seven times, but Isa 51:9, 53:5, and Job 26:13 are the only occurrences of the po’el form. Isa 51:9 and Job 26:13 are especially similar; both verses are in mythological contexts in which God is piercing the primeval serpent.368

4) ח.tokenize — double (Isa 40:2; Job 11:6; 41:5). In 2 Isaiah, God’s people are assured that their hard service is over because they have paid double for their sins. In Job, the term is used first by Zophar, who tells Job that wisdom is “double” (NRSV “many sided”), and that God exacts less than his guilt deserves. The term is then used by YHWH to describe Leviathan’s “double coat of mail.”

5) ח.tokenize — to give title (Isa 44:5; 45:4; Job 32:21-22).369 In 2 Isaiah, this verb is used in the context of people taking on the name of Israel, and of God naming the people; in Job, Elihu denies showing any partiality, or giving title, to anyone.

6) ח.tokenize (hiphil participle) — to frustrate (Isa 44:25; Job 5:12).370 In 2 Isaiah, God is said to frustrate the omens of diviners, and in Job God frustrates

---

368 in 2 Isaiah, and ח.tokenize in Job. This is one of Cheyne’s “clear cases of imitation,” with 2 Isaiah imitating Job in his view (Job and Solomon, 84).


370 Terrien, “Quelques remarques sur les affinités de Job avec le Deutéro-Esaïe,” 308.
the plans of the crafty. In both cases, this is one in a string of participles that describe the actions of God.

7) נרי – spittle (Isa 50:6; Job 7:19; 30:10). In both Isa 50:6 and Job 30:10 the word is used to refer to a suffering person who must endure being spit upon by enemies. In 7:19, Job asks God why God cannot let him alone so he can swallow his spittle.

3.4.1.2 Rare Words

This section lists words found in 2 Isaiah and Job that appear in the Hebrew Bible five times or fewer. It also includes rare forms of words that are more common. The number of occurrences in the Hebrew Bible is given in each case, followed by a list of the references beginning with those found in 2 Isaiah and Job.

1) נמל – stump, stem (3: Isa 40:24; Job 14:8; also Isa 11:1). In all three contexts the term is a metaphorical description of a human or humanity.

2) נבל – to make a fool of (3: Isa 44:25; Job 12:17; also Eccl 7:7). This root is quite common, but the poel form is rare. In 2 Isaiah and Job, it is God who is making fools of human beings (diviners and judges, respectively). In Ecclesiastes, it is oppression that makes fools of the wise.

3) נף – fetter (5: Isa 45:14; Job 36:8; also Neh 3:10; Ps 149:8; Prov 26:18).

4) נונ – vault, dome, circle (3: Isa 40:22; Job 22:14; also Prov 8:27). In 2 Isaiah God sits above the circle of the earth, and in Job God walks on the circle of heaven. In Proverbs, God drew a circle upon the face of the deep. In Job 26:10 the verb form of the root is used to describe God drawing a circle upon the face of the waters.
5) **חלי** – flint (5: Isa 50:7; Job 28:9; also Deut 8:15; 32:13; Ps 114:8).

Deuteronomy and the psalm talk about God’s bringing forth water (or oil) for the Israelites from the rock. In 2 Isaiah the word is used metaphorically, to describe the determination of the servant, and in Job literally, to describe the process of mining.

6) **משמש** – hidden treasure (5: Isa 45:3; Job 3:21; also Gen 43:23; Prov 2:4; Jer 41:8).

7) **מלוי** – interpreter, mediator, envoy (5: Isa 43:27; Job 16:20; 33:23; also Gen 42:23; 2 Chr 32:31). These are the only five occurrences of the Hiphil participle of **מלוי** (to scorn), all plural except for Gen 42:23 (Joseph’s “interpreter”) and Job 33:23. The meaning of Job 16:20 is not clear, but it seems that in both Isa 43:27 and Job 33:23 (but not in Genesis or 2 Chronicles) the figure(s) in view are divine-human intermediaries.

8) **יאלוס** – youth, youthful vigor (4: Isa 54:4; Job 20:11; 33:25; also Ps 89:46).

9) **ערבה** - poplar (5: Isa 44:4; Job 40:22; also Lev 23:40; Ps 137:2; Isa 15:7).

10) **דה** – to trickle, drip (5: Isa 45:8; Job 36:28; also Ps 65:12-13; Prov 3:20).

---

371 The NRSV translates this as “[they] scorn,” NIV has “my intercessor is my friend,” and JPS has “O my advocates, my fellows.” The Hebrew words translated here are plural rather than singular.

372 Tull Willey makes explicit the intertextual connections between Isaiah 54-55 and Psalm 89, the promises to David in the latter applied to Jerusalem in the former (Remember the Former Things, 250-255).
3.4.1.3 Words with Distinct Meanings

This section contains words that are not rare, but that seem to be used with distinctive meanings by the authors of 2 Isaiah and Job, and in some cases elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible as well. The definition given is the meaning as used in the passages listed.

1) נ kişi – people, referring generally to humankind (Isa 40:7; 42:5-6; Job 12:2; cf. also Gen 11:6).\(^{373}\) When applied to one group of people among others, the singular is typically used, but when applied to humankind in general, the term is usually plural. In these cases, the singular is applied to humankind in general.\(^{374}\)

2) זך – to grind (Isa 47:2; Job 31:10). There are eight occurrences of this term, but only in 2 Isaiah and Job is it used in a clearly sexual context. 2 Isaiah declares to virgin daughter Babylon her humiliation, and orders her to take the millstone and grind meal. In an oath, Job says his wife can grind for another, if he is guilty of adultery.\(^{375}\)

3) עזר – hard service (Isa 40:2; Job 7:1; 14:14). With several hundred occurrences, this word is hardly rare, but only in these three cases\(^{376}\) is it used in the sense of “hard service” for humanity.\(^{377}\)

\(^{373}\) Cheyne, *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah*, 235.


\(^{376}\) Elliott, citing BDB (6635), lists Dan 10:1 as a further example, but says it is “hardly fair to classify the Daniel passage with these other three, for it refers to a vision, not an actuality” (“A Comparative Study of Deutero Isaiah and Job,” 189). Since the vision is about a war-like conflict, it seems
4) הָרְבָּה – many (Isa 42:20; Job 16:2; 23:14; also Ps 40:6; Dan 11:41). This is a very common word, but rarely used in this form with no accompanying noun, as in these five cases.\footnote{378}

5) רֵחַשׁ – stamp, hammer, spread out (Isa 42:5; 44:24; Job 37:18; also Ps 136:6). Four out of eleven times in the Hebrew Bible is this verb used of God’s work in creation; in Job, God spreads out the clouds, and in 2 Isaiah and the psalm, God spreads out the earth.

6) תָּלוּנָה – worm (Isa 41:14; Job 25:6; also Ps 22:7). These are the only three cases in the Hebrew Bible in which a human is described by this term.

3.4.1.4 Characteristic Words

By characteristic words I mean those words that are not necessarily rare, but that are used with enough frequency by an author that they draw attention to themselves and indicate a particular working vocabulary or manner of expression. This category can include words that would be rare except for multiple occurrences in the work of one author, or words that show up sporadically in multiple works, but in a concentrated way in one work. Often there are too many occurrences to list individually; in this section I list the total number of times the word appears in the Hebrew Bible, followed by the number of times it appears in 2 Isaiah and in Job.

\footnote{377} Janzen calls this the “most intriguing” detail that 2 Isaiah and Job share, and suggests that it indicates a change in the way power is understood in 2 Isaiah and Job (“On the Moral Nature of God’s Power,” 469).

\footnote{378} Pfeiffer noted this similarity (“The Dual Origin of Hebrew Monotheism,” 203).
1) אלוהים – god (HB: 58, 2 Isaiah: 1, Job: 41). This designation for the deity, along with שׁוֹעֵד אֶל (Almighty)\(^{379}\) and אֱלֹהִים (God) is very common in the dialogues of Job. In the Hebrew Bible outside of Job, אלוהים is as likely to refer to a foreign or false god as to Israel’s deity. Applied to Israel’s deity, the designation is found mostly in poetry, while every reference to a god other than Israel’s is found in prose. Isa 44:8 asks “Is there any god (אלוהים) besides me?”\(^{380}\)

2) אָדָם – mortal (HB: 42, 2 Isaiah: 2, Job: 18). Otherwise, this term is used once each in Deuteronomy and 2 Chronicles, thirteen times in eleven different psalms, five times in 1 Isaiah, and once each in 3 Isaiah and Jeremiah.

3) אף – also, even (HB: 133, 2 Isaiah: 24, Job: 15). This particle is certainly not rare, but it is found more frequently in 2 Isaiah and Job than any other book of the Hebrew Bible except for Psalms (twenty-three occurrences). Interestingly, all the occurrences in 2 Isaiah are in chapters 40-48. The next most frequent usage is in Proverbs, which has nine occurrences.\(^{381}\)

---

\(^{379}\) This is a name for God in Job that never appears in 2 Isaiah.

\(^{380}\) In Pfeiffer’s view, 2 Isaiah’s use of this designation, along with אף, another of Job’s favorites, is explicable only if 2 Isaiah is dependent on Job rather than the other way around (“The Dual Origin of Hebrew Monotheism,” 205).

\(^{381}\) Elliott, “A Comparative Study of Deutero Isaiah and Job,” 194. Given the different lengths of books, the use of this word in Job does not seem to be any more prevalent than in Proverbs, but does seem to be more concentrated in 2 Isaiah than anywhere else. Elliott, following Pfeiffer, notes the word occurring fourteen times in 2 Isaiah and four times in Job; it seems they are only accounting for the occurrences of אף when it is joined to the word that follows it.
4) **ִּיר – not** (HB: 69, 2 Isaiah: 8, Job: 1). This “comparatively rare” negative particle is found all over the Psalms and 1 and 2 Isaiah (twenty-four times in a total of fourteen verses in 1 and 2 Isaiah) and to some extent in Proverbs. The single occurrence in Job is in the divine speeches (41:15).

5) **יָסַר – in, with, by** (10: 2 Isaiah 3, Job 5). Eight out of ten occurrences in the Hebrew Bible of the poetic form of this preposition are in 2 Isaiah and Job, which some have seen as indication of a stylistic peculiarity shared by the authors.

6) **לֹּא – (divine) redeemer** (HB: 19, 2 Isaiah: 10, Job: 1). **לֹּא** is a common word, but there are only nineteen instances of the participle naming a divine redeemer, spread throughout Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Isaiah, and Jeremiah. It is a favorite designation for 2 Isaiah, which has carried over into 3 Isaiah.

7) **וַיַּרְא – behold** (HB: 100, 2 Isaiah: 16, Job: 32). Almost half the occurrences of this particle in the Hebrew Bible are in 2 Isaiah and Job. Both authors

---

382 According to BDB 1244.


384 Elliott says this similarity is “indicative of a stylistic preference pointing to a certain school of discipleship” (“A Comparative Study of Deutero Isaiah and Job,” 192).

385 Some interpreters take the divine redeemer in Job to be the God whom the characters are discussing (e.g. Jan Holman, “Does My Redeemer Live or Is My Redeemer the Living God? Some Reflections on the Translation of Job 19.25,” in The Book of Job (ed. W. A. M. Beukens; Louvain: Louvain University Press, 1991), 377-381); others take the redeemer to be Job’s personal god – in either case, divine (see n. 335). Clines, in contrast, interprets Job’s redeemer in light of his interpretation of Job’s witness (Job 16:19), which he argues is Job’s “cry” – and thus not a divine being at all (Clines, Job 1-20, 459).
seem to prefer it to the more common בתים, just the opposite of what is
typical elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible. 386

8) שָׁמָּה (hiphil imperative) – to be silent (6, 2 Isaiah: 1, Job: 3). 387 The four
ocurrences of this form in 2 Isaiah and Job are in poetic contexts, unlike
the remaining two, which are in prose. In addition, both 2 Isaiah and Job
employ the term in exhortations that their audience listen carefully to what
they are about to say – which some see as a stylistic device common to
both. 388

9) לַמֵּד – for them (HB: 55, 2 Isaiah: 5, Job: 10). 389 This poetic form of меди 390
occurs frequently in Job and Psalms, but only a handful of times
elsewhere, including eleven times total in 1 and 2 Isaiah. 391

10) פִּיךְ – from (HB: 30, 2 Isaiah: 2, Job: 19). The extended form of פיך is
distinctive to Job; besides 2 Isaiah and Job, it is found only in Psalms and
Judges.

11) נָסַף – offspring, produce (HB: 11; 2 Isaiah: 3; Job: 4). All eleven
occurrences are found in Isaiah and Job. In Job this term usually means
“offspring,” and this is its meaning also in Isa 44:3; 48:19; and 3 Isaiah. In


388 See above, Section 3.3, number 6.

389 Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament, 467.

390 According to BDB 4729 it can also substitute for נב.

391 Three out of six 1 Isaiah occurrences are in Isaiah 24-27 and 35.
Isa 42:5; Job 31:8, and 1 Isaiah it is used to refer to “produce,” or what grows from the earth.

12) קדוש – Holy One (HB: 45, 2 Isaiah: 14, Job: 1). Thirty of the forty-five times that God is referred to as the “Holy One” (either singular or plural) or the “Holy One of Israel” are in the book of Isaiah; clearly, this is a favorite designation for God in the Isaian tradition. Only once does the author of Job use the title, when he has Job assert that he has not “denied the words of the Holy One” (Job 6:10).

13) טהו – nothingness (HB: 20, 2 Isaiah: 7, Job: 3). Eleven of twenty occurrences of this noun are in the book of Isaiah. Besides the fourteen total uses in Isaiah and Job, it shows up once each in Genesis, Deuteronomy, 1 Samuel, Psalm 107, and Jeremiah. Job 12:24b and Ps 107:40b are identical phrases.

3.4.1.5 Words Used in Parallel

There are a couple instances in which the authors of 2 Isaiah and Job place in parallelism with each other two terms which are not paired elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible, and a third instance which would be unique except for a 3 Isaiah occurrence of the word pair.

1) קדוש וטהו (Isa 44:22; Job 26:8; 37:11).  

---

392 I do not include in this count the predicate adjectives describing God, but some cases are ambiguous; in these cases, I followed the NRSV translation.  
393 Williamson, The Book Called Isaiah, 41-45.  
394 These two terms are found in a construct chain in Exod 19:9.
2) נְפִלָּאָה/עַבָּד (Isa 42:19; 44:26; Job 4:18).

3) נָשָׁה/וֹרֵחַ (Isa 42:5; Job 4:9; 27:3; 32:8; 33:4; also Isa 57:16).

3.4.2 Shared Phrases in Isaiah 40-55 and Job

This section is divided into phrases (consisting of two or more words) that appear only in Isaiah 40-55 and Job, phrases that are rare but show up in both Isaiah 40-55 and Job, and phrases that are characteristic of the styles of the authors of Isaiah 40-55 and Job. Generic forms of the phrases are given here, since they are expressed somewhat differently in the different contexts.

3.4.2.1 Unique Phrases

1) בָּשָׂת – child of the womb (Isa 49:15; Job 19:17). In 2 Isaiah, the prophet represents God as asking whether a woman can forget the child of her womb. Job is lamenting his repulsiveness to his wife and to “the children of my womb” – obviously an idiomatic phrase rather than a literal description.

2) חָמֶר אֲדָלָּה/עַשִּׁי – like a garment a moth eats (Isa 50:9; 51:8; Job 13:28). This basic phrase is expressed slightly differently in each passage, but all three have some combination of these words in the forms appropriate to the context. In Isa 50:9, the prophet is declaring that God will vindicate him, and his enemies will wear out like a garment that the moth eats. Isa 51:8 is very similar, but with the declaration made by God. In Job 13:28, Job is describing himself as one who is like a garment eaten by moths as a result of God’s contending with him.
3) way is hidden (Isa 40:27; Job 3:23). In Isaiah the prophet is quoting a complaint made by the people, who are asking why their way is hidden from God; Job is asking why light is given to one whose way is hidden and whom God has fenced in.

4) hewed rock (Isa 51:1; Job 19:24). 2 Isaiah is urging the people to remember their ancestral tradition, metaphorically represented as the rock from which they were hewn. Job is voicing a wish that his words might be inscribed on a rock forever.

5) who will contend? (Isa 50:8; Job 13:19). In both 2 Isaiah and Job this question is asked in the context of the speakers (the Lord’s servant and Job, respectively) declaring confidence in their vindication and asking rhetorically “who will contend with me?”

6) the ends of the earth (Isa 40:28; 41:5, 9; Job 28:24). The singular קְצֵי הָאָרֶץ is much more common in the Hebrew Bible, and is to be found in all three sections of Isaiah, but never in Job.

3.4.2.2 Rare Phrases

This section lists rare phrases which are found in both 2 Isaiah and Job, but also one or more times elsewhere. Many of these similarities of expression have been noted before by Pfeiffer and Elliott.\(^{395}\) Again, I note the total number of occurrences of the phrase in the Hebrew Bible before listing individual references.

1) אין יד – unfathomable, there is no searching out (5: Isa 40:28; Job 5:9; 9:10; also Ps 145:3; Prov 25:3). All except the Proverbs passage are referring to the unfathomable nature of a divine action or attribute.

2) אינש מביצא – there is no deliverer from the hand (4: Isa 43:13; Job 10:7; also Deut 32:39; Dan 8:4). In all cases except Daniel, the one from whose hand there is no deliverance is God’s.

3) איש חציר – man/men of strife (4: Isa 41:11; Job 31:35; also Judg 12:2; Jer 15:10). In 2 Isaiah, God assures Israel that her enemies will perish; Job calls God his “accuser.”

4) הצור – the grass withers (5: Isa 40:7-8; Job 8:12; also Ps 129:6; Isa 15:6). In 2 Isaiah this is a descriptor of all humankind, in Job of the godless. It is the psalmist’s wish for what the haters of Zion would be like, and in 1 Isaiah it appears in a description of the landscape.

5) למם דעת – to teach knowledge (5: Isa 40:14; Job 21:22; also Ps 94:10; 119:66; Eccl 12:9). Only in 2 Isaiah and Job does this phrase take the form of a rhetorical question that asks whether anyone can teach God knowledge. The point of the questions is very different, however. In 2 Isaiah, it is asked in the context of God’s compassion on God’s people and ability to empower them. In Job, the context is Job’s bitter reflections on the prosperity of the wicked.

---

396 For an analysis of this phrase in the contexts in which it appears, see Aaron Chalmers, “There is No Deliverer (from My Hand) – A Formula Analysis,” VT 55 (2005): 287-292.

397 Pfeiffer, “The Dual Origin of Hebrew Monotheism,” 204.
6. for vanity her labor/to labor for vanity (3: Isa 49:4; Job 39:16; also Isa 65:23). Both Isaiah passages use the verb “to labor,” while Job uses the noun “labor.” In 2 Isaiah, the servant is concerned about his own labor; in Job, the ostrich does not care that her labor is in vain.

7. what are you doing? (5: Isa 45:9; Job 9:12; 35:6; also Prov 25:8; Eccl 8:4). Job 35:6, Prov 25:8, and Eccl 8:4 ask the question of a human being, but Isa 45:9 and Job 9:12 are both hypothetical questions directed at God and both contexts show the absurdity of questioning God about God’s actions.

8. who will bring back? (6: Isa 43:13; Job 9:12; 11:10; 23:13; also Isa 14:27; Jer 2:24). All except Jer 2:24 are asserting the impossibility of stopping God from acting as God chooses. Isa 14:27 and 43:13 both ask who will bring ‘it’ back (feminine singular, referring to the hand of God), while the three verses from Job ask who will bring ‘him’ back (masculine singular, referring to God).398

9. to stretch out a line (5: Isa 44:13; Job 38:5; also 2 Kgs 21:13; Isa 34:11; Lam 2:8). In 2 Isaiah, the craftsman stretches out a line to form an idol; in Job, God stretches out a line to form the earth.

10. - barren, who has not borne (4: Isa 54:1; Job 24:21; also Judg 13:2-3). 2 Isaiah exhorts such a woman to rejoice over her many children;

Job claims that the wicked do harm to the barren woman, and yet are blessed with long life and security.

11) – to stop the mouth (3: Isa 52:15; Job 5:16; also Ps 107:42). Isaiah describes the reaction of kings to the Lord’s servant. Job 5:16b and Ps 107:42b are parallel; they declare that injustice shuts its mouth in the face of God’s care for the needy.

12) – to stir up the sea (3: Isa 51:15; Job 26:12; Jer 31:35). Tull Willey, Sommer, and Nurmela all are in agreement that Isa 51:15 is a quotation of Jer. 31:35. Both Isa 51:15 and Job 26:12 mention the primeval monster Rahab in the context of stirring up the sea.

13) – to drink the wrath (5: Isa 51:17, 22; Job 6:4; 21:20; cf. also Jer 25:15). Isa 51:17-23 refers to those of God’s people who have drunk the cup of God’s wrath and suffered all the degradation that accompanied it; the passage ends with an assurance that God has taken away the cup of wrath and a promise that it will be given to their enemies instead. In Job 21, Job is complaining that the wicked do not experience the consequences of their wickedness and says they ought to see their own destruction and...
themselves drink the cup of God’s wrath. In Job 6:4, Job is drinking the poison (חומת) of the arrows of God.

3.4.2.3 Characteristic Phrases

There are two phrases, not noticeably rare, which are used in 2 Isaiah in a more concentrated way than anywhere else in the Hebrew Bible, and are also employed once each in Job.

1) יסִכּוֹר – to establish the earth (9: Isa 48:13; 51:13; 51:16; Job 38:4; also Pss 78:69; 102:26; 104:5; Prov 3:19; Zech 12:1).

2) נצָה שׁמי – to stretch out the heavens (13: Isa 40:22; 42:5; 44:24; 45:12; 51:13; Job 9:8; also 2 Sam 22:10 = Ps 18:19; Ps 104:2; 144:5; Jer 10:12 = 51:15; Zech 12:1). 402

3.4.3 Parallel Word Strings

There are four instances of word strings that are identical (or nearly identical, with minor changes to fit the context) in 2 Isaiah and Job.

1) כָּבוֹד אָמָי – mighty of strength (Isa. 40:26; Job 9:4). אָמָי is not a very common word; three of its six occurrences are in 2 Isaiah and Job and only in these three cases is it applied to God. In both contexts listed here the subject under discussion is God’s power over humankind and nature. 403 In 2 Isaiah this is immediately followed by the assurance for Jacob and Israel

402 For an extended discussion of this phrase, see Norman C. Habel, “He Who Stretches out the Heavens,” *CBQ* 34 (1972): 417-430. Habel concludes that the phrase is meant less to convey the creation of the heavens as the preparation of a domain for divine theophanies (430).

that God is watching over them and sustaining them. In Job, the context is Job’s admission that he and everyone else is powerless to stop God’s sudden and violent action in the world, and Job’s doubt that God would listen to him or care about his plight.

2)  פָּרֵשׁוֹתָה יְהוָה — that the hand of the Lord has done this (Isa. 41:20; Job 12:9). The phrase in 2 Isaiah comes at the end of a divine declaration of reversal of fortune for both Israel, who is currently degraded and defeated, and for the environment. God promises to defeat Israel’s enemies and turn desert and arid land into oases and plant trees in the middle of the wilderness, “so that all may see and know, all may consider and understand, that the hand of the Lord has done this, the Holy One of Israel has created it.” For Job, however, it is the animals who all know that the hand of the Lord (or God) has done “this.” What “this” refers to is not entirely clear. If it refers to what came before, Job is talking about his own innocent suffering while criminals get off scot-free. If it refers to what follows, Job is talking about the reversal of fortunes both for the environment and for humans, but not in a positive sense. God either sends too little water and things dry up, or too much and there is a flood. God takes power away from kings and makes the wise look foolish, makes nations great and then destroys them (Job 12:15-25).

404 There are some Hebrew manuscripts that read אלוהו instead. The use of the tetragrammaton at this point in Job is very strange, since otherwise it is used only in the prologue, epilogue, and narrator’s introduction to the divine speeches. While it may be the case that אלוהו is original and that the textual tradition has been influenced by Isa 41:20 here, still the word strings are identical except for the name of the deity. In that case, one might reasonably believe that the name of the deity was intentionally altered from the usual expression as it is found either in 2 Isaiah or in Job to fit the context better.
3) – who stretched out the heavens alone (Isa. 44:24; Job 9:8).\footnote{Terrien thinks it’s “remarquable” that Job never uses הָאָרֶץ, but Isaiah uses Job’s creation word (שָׁטַן) several times – he lists 43:7; 44:2; and 45:18, among others. (“Quelques remarques sur les affinités de Job avec le Deutéro-Esaïe,” 302-303). Dhorme thinks Job borrows from Isaiah here (A Commentary on the Book of Job, clvii).} Due to the respective contexts, there is a difference of one letter between the otherwise identical participial phrases; in 2 Isaiah, the prophet is quoting God, who stretches out the heavens “by myself” (לְבָנָה), whereas Job is speaking about God, who stretches out the heavens “by himself” (לְבָנָה). is a rather common phrase in the Hebrew Bible,\footnote{See above, section 3.4.2.3, number 2.} but only in these two passages is it emphasized that God acted alone in stretching out the heavens. In 2 Isaiah this is again in the context of God’s promise to act for Israel’s salvation. In Job, the context is the same as (1) above – God acts alone and Job is powerless to do anything about it.

4) – for no wrong (Isa. 53:9; Job 16:17). This is one of Cheyne’s two examples of indisputable dependence.\footnote{Cheyne, Job and Solomon, 84.} In the fourth and final Servant poem, the servant is said to have his grave with the wicked even though he had done no wrong nor been deceitful. Job describes in detail the perceived attack of God against him, even though he had done no wrong, and his prayer is pure.
3.5 The Servant of the Lord

The similarities in the descriptions of 2 Isaiah’s servant of the Lord and Job the servant of the Lord have been the object of a great deal of attention.\(^\text{408}\) The concept of the servant, of course, plays a central role in 2 Isaiah (Isa 41:8-9; 42:1, 19; 43:10; 44:1-2, 21, 26; 45:4; 48:20; 49:3, 5-7; 50:10; 52:13; 53:11; 54:17). In the prologue and epilogue, God calls Job “my servant” (Job 1:8; 2:3; 42:7-8), though this idea is never mentioned in the dialogues. Scholars have noted similarities between the two figures on several levels: besides being called “my servant” by the Lord and their innocent suffering, the experience of their suffering follows similar patterns, and the words used to describe their suffering are at times identical.

In his analysis of the similarities between 2 Isaiah’s suffering servant and the figure of Job, J. C. Bastiaens focuses particularly on Job 16-19 in relation to the final three servant poems (Isa 49:1-6; 50:4-9; 52:13-53:12).\(^\text{409}\) He observes that both figures undergo the same kinds of affliction. Both the suffering servant and Job must face threats from their enemies, even while they maintain their innocence (Isa 50:4-9; 53:7-10; Job 16:7-17). Both figures experience the marring of their physical appearances and the social alienation that results from their suffering and others’ belief that God has been the

---

\(^{408}\) Parallels between 2 Isaiah’s servant and Job, including the ones listed here, have been noted by S. Hoekstra (“Job, ‘de knecht van Jehovah’”), ThT 5 [1871]: 1-56); Reuben Levy (Deutero-Isaiah: A Commentary, Together with a Preliminary Essay on Deutero-Isaiah’s Influence on Jewish Thought [London: Oxford University Press, 1925], 24-26); Terrien (“Quelques remarques sur les affinités de Job avec le Deutéro-Esaîe,” 308), Delitzsch, (The Book of Job, 25), Dhorme (A Commentary on the Book of Job, clv), Bastiaens (“The Language of Suffering in Job 16-19 and in the Suffering Servant Passages in Deutero-Isaiah,” 421-432), Cooper (“The Suffering Servant and Job”), and Cheyne (The Prophecies of Isaiah, 2.244-253).

\(^{409}\) Bastiaens, “The Language of Suffering in Job 16-19 and in the Suffering Servant Passages in Deutero-Isaiah,” 421-432.
one to afflict them (Isa 49:7; 52:14; 53:2-3; 53:4 11; Job 19:7-27).\footnote{Bastiaens, “The Language of Suffering in Job 16-19 and in the Suffering Servant Passages in Deutero-Isaiah,” 428-429.} However, both figures also trust that their ultimate vindication will come from God (Isa 49:4; 50:7-9; Job 16:19-21).\footnote{Bastiaens, “The Language of Suffering in Job 16-19 and in the Suffering Servant Passages in Deutero-Isaiah,” 425. This is true if the figure Job is talking about is divine (see n. 335).}

Aside from these general observations, there are specific details pertaining to both the suffering servant and Job that are similar. The following table is a list of those parallels that have been perceived between these figures. Some of these parallels also involve specific verbal parallels between how each figure describes himself.

### TABLE 3.1
PARALLELS BETWEEN 2 ISAIAH’S SUFFERING SERVANT AND JOB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Isaiah 40-55</th>
<th>Job</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49:7 – The servant is abhorred (ה主办方) by the nations.</td>
<td>19:19 – Job is abhorred (伝え מאש) by his friends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50:4 – The servant has the tongue of a teacher and sustains the weary.</td>
<td>4:3, 29:21 – Job instructed many, strengthened the weak, and counseled others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50:6 – The servant gave the cheek (ধার) to those who would pull out his beard.</td>
<td>16:10 – Job’s tormentors struck him on the cheek (רחה).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50:6 – The servant did not hide his face from insult and spitting (רו).</td>
<td>30:10 – Job is abhorred and spit upon (רוף) by his mockers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50:8-9 – The servant has a vindicator (ומאי) to vouch for him, and he is confident he will be justified.</td>
<td>19:25, 13:18 – Job has a redeemer to help him, and he is confident he will be vindicated (זרם).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52:14 – Many were appalled at (נשחי לעו) the servant, whose appearance was distorted.</td>
<td>17:8 (cf. 21:5), 2:12 – The upright were appalled at (נשחי לעו) Job’s circumstances, and his appearance was almost unrecognizable to his friends.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\footnote{This phrase is not by any means exclusive to 2 Isaiah and Job.}
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Isaiah 40-55</th>
<th>Job</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53:3 – The servant was despised by men.</td>
<td>19:18 – Job was despised even by children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53:3 – The servant was rejected by men.</td>
<td>19:14 – Job was rejected by his loved ones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53:3 – The servant was a man of suffering.</td>
<td>2:13 – Job’s suffering was very great.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53:3-4 – The servant bore the diseases of the people.</td>
<td>2:7, 7:5 – Job was afflicted with disease.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53:4 – The people accounted the servant touched by God.</td>
<td>19:21 – Job said that the hand of God had touched him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53:4 – The people accounted the servant struck by God.</td>
<td>16:10 – Job was struck on the cheek by men.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53:6 – God afflicted the servant.</td>
<td>7:20 – Job felt he was the target of God’s attack.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53:9 – The servant was not guilty of violence</td>
<td>16:17 – Job claims there was no violence in his hands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53:9 – There was no deceit in the mouth of the servant.</td>
<td>27:4, 31:5 – Job declares that his tongue will not utter deceit, and his foot has not hurried to deceit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53:9 – The servant is innocent of wrongdoing.</td>
<td>1:8 – Job is blameless.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53:10 – It was God’s will to crush the servant.</td>
<td>6:9 – Job’s desire is that God would be willing to crush him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53:10 – After God crushed him, the servant would see his offspring and prolong his days.</td>
<td>42:13, 16 – After his suffering came to an end, Job had more children and lived to see four generations of his descendants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53:12 – God reinstated the servant.</td>
<td>42:10 – God restored Job’s fortunes, giving him twice the riches he had before.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53:12 – The servant made intercession for transgressors</td>
<td>42:8, 10 – Job made intercession for his friends.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

413 Which disease in both cases is not specified, but the marring of the appearance suggests leprosy for both the servant and Job (Cheyne, *The Prophecies of Isaiah*, 2.235).

414 This noun form of the three letter root is a hapax legomenon in the Hebrew Bible.

415 Besides these, God crushes only oppressors (Ps 72:4) and Rahab (Ps 89:11).
3.6 Conclusion

In this chapter I have attempted to give as comprehensive a list as possible of the similarities between 2 Isaiah and Job. These involved similarities of theme, similarities of literary style, similarities of vocabulary, and similarities between 2 Isaiah’s suffering servant and the figure of Job. In the following chapter I will evaluate the nature of these similarities, where they can be found within the text of 2 Isaiah and Job, and what they signify for positing a relationship between the two works.
CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF SIMILARITIES OF THEME, STYLE, AND

VOCABULARY BETWEEN 2 ISAIAH AND JOB

4.1 Introduction

The previous chapter listed as comprehensively as possible the thematic, stylistic, and verbal similarities between 2 Isaiah and Job. At this point in previous studies on the relationship between 2 Isaiah and Job, the next step was to outline a theory regarding which of the two works was written first and how the other shows dependence on and development from the first. After listing similarities, particularly thematic and verbal similarities, it was taken for granted that there was a relationship which allowed one to trace a chronological development. This previous research missed a step, in my view. What was lacking was a close, detailed evaluation of these similarities that takes account of where they appear and how they function in each work, so as to determine their significance – if any – for describing a relationship between 2 Isaiah and Job.\(^\text{416}\)

\(^{416}\) Pfeiffer and Elliott in particular were too uncritical in their jump from listing similarities to analyzing the direction of dependence, without taking a sober look at the significance of the similarities. Pfeiffer writes that “parallels in thought and expression between the Book of Job and Is. 40-55 are sufficiently numerous and close to make it reasonably certain that one of the two authors was acquainted...
Therefore, in this chapter, I will analyze the data collected in the previous chapter, taking particular note of where similarities are located and what part they play in 2 Isaiah and Job, as well as noting differences between them.

4.2 Similarities of Theme

4.2.1 Summary

It was seen that 2 Isaiah and Job are concerned with many of the same themes. Both works describe the nature of God as transcendent over the human and non-human world, having perfect wisdom and knowledge; God and God’s ways are inscrutable to humans, and God is portrayed as supremely holy and righteous. God is also solitary in power; no other being compares. In contrast with God’s loftiness, human existence is transitory and impermanent, and humans are woefully ignorant of God and God’s ways. Both 2 Isaiah and Job give evidence of understanding the divine-human relationship in similar ways; it is described using legal terms, with the assumption that humans are rewarded or punished based on their actions. Both acknowledge that God tests human beings, and see praise for God as the appropriate response to God’s action in the world. Finally, both 2 Isaiah and Job are very concerned with God’s role as creator, both of human beings and the non-human world. For Pfeiffer, Elliott, and Terrien, these similarities could not be coincidental, and were a strong indication that one author was dependent on the other when it came to choice of subject matter.

with the other” (“The Dual Origin of Hebrew Monotheism,” 202). Similarly, after listing philological similarities, Elliott declares, “From the philological standpoint there is an unmistakable relationship between the two books” (“A Comparative Study of Deutero Isaiah and Job,” 202).
4.2.2 Analysis

Although 2 Isaiah and Job are indeed concerned with many of the same themes, it is also true that these themes play quite a different role in each work. In addition, although 2 Isaiah speaks with one authoritative voice on these subjects, the book of Job does not. In fact, the different characters have very different views about, for example, the righteousness of God or the idea that God deals out consequences based on behavior. It becomes apparent very quickly that it is too simple to claim that there are thematic similarities and then jump to a demonstration of chronological development.

While it is not possible to pinpoint thematic similarities as precisely as verbal similarities, it is clear from a brief glance at the chapter and verse references for the thematic similarities in 2 Isaiah listed in Chapter 3.2 that most of them – about eighty percent – come from Isaiah 40-48. Chapters 40, 43, and 45 are represented most often. References in Job were more spread out throughout the book, although references from Job’s third speech (Job 9-10) were more prevalent than any other (almost twenty percent of the total). There were also more references to Elihu’s speeches and fewer to the divine speeches than might be expected based on their respective lengths. Besides this, however, each character’s speeches, including Job’s, were represented in the references according to their lengths.

The reality of God’s transcendence over humans is articulated to different ends in 2 Isaiah and Job. In 2 Isaiah, the fact that God’s thoughts are higher than humans’ is given as the reason for seeking God and repenting of wickedness (Isa 55:6-9). Descriptions of God’s loftiness are the prelude to assurances of God’s ability and desire
to watch over Jacob and Israel (Isa 40:21-31). In the book of Job the reality of God’s transcendence elicits different reactions from the various characters. Zophar and Eliphaz are of the opinion that since God can see from such a lofty vantage point, Job should repent of his sin (Job 11:8; 22:12). Job, on the other hand, seems to think that God’s transcendence makes response to God pointless and ineffective, since God will do what God pleases without regard for Job (Job 9:3-35). Elihu concurs with Job that human behavior has no effect on God, but does not accept this as an excuse for bad behavior (Job 35:5-16). In 2 Isaiah God’s total control over world leaders, Cyrus in particular, is a source of comfort and confidence for Jacob and Israel, since it accomplishes the restoration of Judah. In Job’s speeches, however, God’s total control is asserted without any mention of reasons or goals and is just as likely to bring harm as good (Job 12:17-25). Elihu explains that God exerts this control because of humans’ wicked behavior (Job 34:16-30).

The portrayal of God as perfect in wisdom and understanding is also used for different ends in 2 Isaiah and Job. In 2 Isaiah again this idea is meant to instill confidence in the people that God has the perception and ability to bring about salvation. God’s

417 Westermann says of these verses that the questions are “designed to rouse Israel from her torpor.” 2 Isaiah is here bringing praise where there had been lament, in order to pave the way for his message of comfort for Jacob and Israel, which is the aim of this passage (Isaiah 40-66, 56, 60).

418 Apparently, Job’s friends think God’s superior knowledge involves knowledge of Job’s guilt that is unknown to Job (Clines, Job 1-20, 263; Janzen, Job, 162).

419 Westermann, Isaiah 40-66, 57; Blenkinsopp, Isaiah 40-55, 248.

420 Clines, Job 1-20, 296-297.

421 This, and the other attributes of God described in Isaiah 40 are brought up for the purpose of comfort: “All that had been said from v. 12 onwards was intended as preparation for the statement made here, to which Israel can freely listen now that stumbling blocks have been removed” (Westermann, Isaiah 40-66, 60).
perfect wisdom is reason for Job not to question God, according to the friends (Job 11:6-7). Job freely acknowledges God’s perfect wisdom, but it does the opposite of instill confidence; it persuades him that any opposition is futile since God will tear down and destroy, cause to fail or cause to prosper with no rhyme or reason and with no regard for him or any other human (Job 9:4-7; 12:13-14; 21:22-26).422

In both 2 Isaiah and Job, God and God’s ways are hidden from humans, but once again in 2 Isaiah, this is asserted with a sense of wonder and in the context of God’s deliverance and vindication of God’s people (Isa 45:15)423 – and Eliphaz would not disagree (Job 5:9-16). Job voices the same idea but in terror and despair; to him it signifies that no one can stop God from doing whatever God pleases to him (Job 9:11; 23:8-9). Elihu sees divine hiddenness as God’s judgment on the wicked and as the natural consequence of being a mere mortal in comparison with a majestic God (Job 34:29-30; 37:23-24).424 That humans’ ways are not hidden from God is a positive thing for Jacob and Israel (Isa 40:27-31), and a negative thing for Babylon, who will not get away with her wickedness (Isa 47:10). The idea that God watches him closely is a heavy burden for Job (Job 7:17-21).425

In 2 Isaiah, God’s title “the Holy One” is often paired with “Redeemer” and “Savior,” and is almost always used in conjunction with describing God’s salvific action on behalf of the people. Job’s friends compare God’s holiness and Job’s status as impure

422 “God’s wisdom is nothing more than the amoral skill to get one’s way, even to the point of turning the innocent one’s case into a conviction of guilt” (Janzen, Job, 90).

423 This seems to have a positive connotation, even though subsequent translators and readers have apparently found some difficulty with it (Blenkinsopp, Isaiah 40-55, 258).

424 Dhorme, A Commentary on the Book of Job, 572.

425 “An unwelcome intrusion” and “inexplicable cruelty” in Clines’ words (Job 1-20, 192).
human in an attempt to persuade Job that he has no right to question God’s actions, which to them seem perfectly fair (Job 4:17-21; 15:14-15), but Job rests the case for his redemption and vindication on his own purity, not God’s (Job 31:1-40).  

In the context of 2 Isaiah, God’s righteousness is God’s deliverance of Israel and Jacob. God displays and proves divine righteousness by saving the people. In Job, the concept of God’s righteousness has become problematic for Job, if not the friends. The friends base their arguments on the inviolability of God’s righteousness and the necessary corollary of God’s infliction of just consequences for human action – meaning that Job has somehow acted wickedly. Based on his circumstances, Job either has to question the system, or come to a radically different conclusion regarding divine righteousness.

That there exists one all-powerful God without competition plays a part in both 2 Isaiah and Job, but again, to very different effect. One gets the feeling that 2 Isaiah’s audience needed some convincing, but that, once persuaded, they would find it a source of comfort. They would then see that the idols of their captors were powerless, and God’s plan of salvation and redemption would prevail. In Job, on the other hand, God’s solitariness is anything but comforting; for Job it means God is responsible for his suffering, and when disaster strikes or the wicked prosper, God is personally responsible

426 Identifying God’s values with his own, as Newsom points out (The Book of Job, 198, 239-240).

427 The connection between God’s justice and the doctrine of retribution is the primary point of discussion in the dialogues, and the identification of the two is what puts Job in such a difficult spot, creating for him “an awful crisis, when conscience and God seem to be arrayed against each other, of all divided loyalties the most agonizing!” (Kemper Fullerton, “On Job 9 and 10,” JBL 53 [1934]: 329, 338).

428 Westermann sees 2 Isaiah as the prophet who takes most seriously the other gods, going to great lengths to show that these gods are not divine (Isaiah 40-66, 17).
for such atrocities (9:22-24). There is no recourse, because no one is in a position to challenge God.429

2 Isaiah and Job – all characters – are in wholehearted agreement about the nature of human existence – the human person is transitory and exceedingly limited in understanding. This is not much of a problem in 2 Isaiah; when the idea is introduced, it makes for a nice foil for the enduring nature of God’s word and a happy assurance that one’s enemies will not be around for long (Isa 40:6-8; 51:6-8, 12). Job’s friends take similar comfort in the fleeting existence of those they would prefer not to have around, while conveniently ignoring the implications of human impermanence for the righteous (Job 8:11-19; 22:15-16). Job does not shy away from blatantly drawing attention to those implications. From Job’s perspective, there is no hope whatsoever of renewal for the frail blossom of humanity. Even trees, by comparison, have some hope for regrowth, while God completely destroys the hope of human beings, no matter what kind of lives they lived, once they pass away (Job 14:1-22).430 Human ignorance means, for both 2 Isaiah and Job, that humans should not question God. The difference is that God’s actions are for Israel’s benefit in 2 Isaiah, albeit through the surprising figure of Cyrus,431 but God is the instigator of undeserved suffering for Job; thus, the admonition not to question God’s actions has quite a different impact in the former than the latter.

429 Fullerton quotes Isa 45:7 (“I form light and create darkness, I make weal and create woe; I the LORD do all these things”) and notes that this explicit declaration that God causes suffering does not seem to have caused a problem for 2 Isaiah. “The author of Job,” who he thinks postdated 2 Isaiah, “was not so naïve (“On Job 9 and 10,” 342-343).

430 Clines, Job 1-20, 324-337.

The ways 2 Isaiah and Job talk about the divine-human relationship – in terms of legal language, punishment and reward, testing, and the appropriate human response – diverge in similar ways. What is relatively unproblematic and straightforward in 2 Isaiah is a problem in the book of Job. In 2 Isaiah it is God who initiates talk of coming together for judgment, even inviting others to scrutinize divine actions to see whether they are justifiable.\(^{432}\) In Job, it is Job who desires this kind of interaction, but despairs of getting God to participate, or even to write down the accusations against him so he can know what they are (Job 31:35).\(^{433}\) 2 Isaiah takes for granted that God punishes or rewards justly, as do Job’s friends; it is Job who calls into question this aspect of the divine-human relationship. The book of Job as a whole is ambiguous on this point; clearly Job suffers for no guilt on his part, but the story ends with his being vindicated by God and blessed. What is a simple and uncomplicated subject in 2 Isaiah is, in Job, a problem with different solutions tested but in the end not solved definitively. Divine testing, which happens because of God’s mercy for 2 Isaiah and Job’s friends ( Isa 48:10; Job 5:17-18; 33:12-28; 36:8-21), is utterly pointless in Job’s view, since God will do what God pleases in any case (23:10-15). Finally, Job is no less aware of the majesty of God’s works than 2 Isaiah or his friends, but that elicits fear and frustration rather than praise (Job 9:4-12).

That God is the creator of the human person is not an end in itself for 2 Isaiah, but reason to trust that God cares about Jacob and Israel, and that God has the power to

---

\(^{432}\) Paradoxically, God’s having foretold the defeat of God’s people and brought it about is not only justifiable, but also proves God’s divinity (Westermann, Isaiah 40-66, 15).

\(^{433}\) However, see Rowold’s comparison of 2 Isaiah and Job in this regard. God responds with challenge-questions in the divine speeches as God posed challenge questions to the idols in 2 Isaiah (“Yahweh’s Challenge to Rival: The Form and Function of the Yahweh Speech in Job 38-39,” CBQ 47 [1985]: 207-209).
accomplish whatever purpose God has for them as individuals and as a nation.\textsuperscript{434} Once again in the book of Job, this idea brings forth different responses from the characters. Job’s friends do not dwell on this reality; for Job it is all the more reason to despair, since the God who made him is the same God who is now out to get him (Job 10:3). Elihu seems to think he gains authority by claiming divine design for his person (Job 32:8; 33:4). God’s creation also of the non-human world is not an end in itself in 2 Isaiah but evidence supporting the argument that God is acting in contemporary events for Israel’s benefit.\textsuperscript{435} In Job’s speeches the creation of the natural world is a recurring theme as well, particularly in Job 9 and 26, but the idea once again inspires intimidation and fear rather than comfort, as in 2 Isaiah. In the divine speeches, creation and sustaining of the non-human world are front and center – an end in themselves – with what seems to be a self-conscious attempt on the part of the author specifically to exclude humanity from any benefit (Job 38:25-27; 39:5-12). There seems to be an equally self-conscious attempt on the part of Elihu to show how God’s creating and sustaining work in the non-human world is for the benefit of humanity (36:24-37:13).

4.2.3 Conclusion

A survey of how similar themes are treated in 2 Isaiah and Job indicates that it is not adequate to assert, simply, that 2 Isaiah and Job share similar themes. They do treat many of the same topics, but how they treat these topics differs quite a lot. 2 Isaiah speaks with one voice – primarily the divine voice – and makes authoritative statements

\textsuperscript{434} For the close connection between creation and redemption, see Chapter 5.1.1.

about the nature of God and humans that go uncontested and serve as stable building blocks for the overarching message of the book. These declarations are related to and fit perfectly within the course of human events; God is one way, humans another, and the exile and return demonstrate their characteristics and interaction in a concrete and explicable way.

The book of Job, on the other hand, speaks with multiple voices, and the various characters explicitly question, contradict, and disagree with one another. One gets the feeling that if Job’s three friends and Elihu read 2 Isaiah, they would largely be in agreement with it. At any rate, they echo many of the same beliefs that the author of 2 Isaiah clearly held. For Job, however, it seems that hardly a single declaration of 2 Isaiah about God, humans, or their relationship would be without a problem. Since God is so far above and beyond humans, God cannot be questioned about what are clearly questionable actions. If God alone is responsible for the world and no one else is comparable, then God is responsible for Job’s suffering. If God created Job, as Job explicitly acknowledges that he did, then attacking him now is malicious and unfair. God may have the power to summon judge, jury and witnesses to exonerate the divine self and condemn the idols, but lowly human beings cannot hope for the same privilege when their reputation is on the line. The unproblematic declarations meant to bring hope and comfort in 2 Isaiah are radically questioned and bring despair and frustration to Job.

So far, there is nothing that compels one to accept a relationship between 2 Isaiah and Job; these might very well be independent treatments of similar topics. That the same topics are under discussion, and that in many cases the issues are articulated in very similar ways, do indicate, however, that 2 Isaiah and Job were composed in relatively
close proximity in time and space.\textsuperscript{436} This does not automatically imply that one was dependent on the other for choice either of topic or manner of expression. The most one can say at this point is that both 2 Isaiah and Job were dependent on their contexts, free to address the burning issues of their day, but limited to some extent, by their own worldview or the capacity of their audience, to addressing those issues in a manner that was comprehensible and relevant to their time. 2 Isaiah largely accepted the view of God, humans, and their relationship as described above, fitting his own message into the system. The author of Job was a little more rebellious, pointing out the problems and shortcomings of that view of the world in order to communicate his own, very different, message.

While this might lead one to conclude that Job, therefore, is chronologically later than 2 Isaiah, since Job questions what 2 Isaiah accepts, I judge that this is too hasty a conclusion to reach. If the author of Job wanted to question certain accepted ideas of his day, he need not have been dependent on 2 Isaiah to articulate those ideas before critiquing them. However, it is worth saying here that if one were to assume a relationship of dependence at this point, it seems much more likely that the author of Job knew 2 Isaiah, rather than the other way around. The ideas that are straightforward and uncomplicated in 2 Isaiah are problematic and ambiguous in Job. The book of Job raises certain problems, but 2 Isaiah does not address those problems nor show any indication of meaningful interaction with issues raised there.\textsuperscript{437} If 2 Isaiah meant to interact with the

\textsuperscript{436} As others have pointed out. Janzen, for example, writes that “Job and Second Isaiah arose as mirror opposites from one emergent Israelite consciousness” (Job, 12). Cf. Perdue, The Sword and the Stylus, 146; Davidson, The Book of Job, lxxiv.

\textsuperscript{437} Here I disagree with Terrien, who saw 2 Isaiah as offering a response to questions raised by Job (“Quelques remarques sur les affinités de Job avec le Deutéro-Esaïe,” 309).
material in Job, it would seem that he responded just as poorly and ineffectively as Job’s friends. The book of Job, on the other hand, although it does not necessarily rely on 2 Isaiah for knowledge of the themes discussed or a particular worldview, does demonstrate itself to be interacting in a significant and self-conscious way with certain beliefs like some of those that are articulated in 2 Isaiah.

4.3 Similarities of Style

4.3.1 Summary

Previous studies on the similarities between 2 Isaiah and Job, particularly Cheyne and Elliott, noted several ways in which the authors of these two works expressed themselves similarly. Both are composed with the same poetic rhythm. Both have particular grammatical habits, such as the use of participial clauses to describe the deity’s actions, using finite verbs when an infinitive would be more typical, and omitting והיה where it would typically be used. Further, both show a predilection for rhetorical questions, and for the literary device of exhorting the audience’s close attention and of diaphor. Cheyne was circumspect in his conclusions, judging that the composition of the book of Job was prior to that of 2 Isaiah, but that there were very few indications of direct borrowing. Elliott, on the other hand, saw these stylistic similarities, along with other kinds of similarities, as an indication that the author of Job was himself dependent, or was part of a school that was dependent, on 2 Isaiah for what he wrote and how he wrote it.
4.3.2 Analysis

Some of these similarities, such as rhythm, the omission of יָתֹנ, and diaphor can be explained, not by dependence of one author on another, but by both having written in a poetic style. As Elliott himself pointed out, both 2 Isaiah and Job are in this case displaying similarities to Hebrew Bible poetry in general, and so the fact that two works which are themselves mostly poetry display the same characteristics is not terribly significant for demonstrating a relationship. Omitting the relative particle and replacing infinitives with finite verbs tend to be characteristic of poetry as well. The use of rhetorical questions is widespread in the Hebrew Bible (particularly in “wisdom” literature); neither is the exhortation for the audience to listen closely uncommon. Peculiarities like using participial clauses could very well be a reflection of the speaking style or poetic style of a particular time or place, and also does not imply that two works that happen to use this style are related in any way.

4.3.3 Conclusion

Although it is interesting to note these stylistic similarities, as far as making judgments about a specific relationship between 2 Isaiah and Job, they are of relatively little value. In my judgment, Elliott read too much into these kinds of similarities when he included them as evidence of a relationship between 2 Isaiah and Job. However, similar styles may indicate the same general truth as similar thematic and verbal content: that 2 Isaiah and Job at the very least are relatively closely connected in time and space with one another.
4.4 Similarities of Vocabulary

4.4.1 Summary

In order to analyze systematically the verbal similarities between 2 Isaiah and Job, I organized the data into three categories: shared words, shared phrases, and shared word strings. There are a total of seven words or forms of words that are unique to 2 Isaiah and Job, ten rare words\textsuperscript{438} or forms of words that they share, thirteen words characteristic of either or both that they share, and three sets of word pairs that are unique to them. In addition, there are six phrases that are unique to 2 Isaiah and Job, thirteen rare phrases that they share, and two phrases characteristic of 2 Isaiah that are also found in Job. Finally, there are four instances of parallel word strings unique to 2 Isaiah and Job.

One of the goals of collecting these data was to locate verbal parallels between 2 Isaiah and Job in order to see whether they were spread more or less evenly throughout both works, or were concentrated in a particular section or sections of the works. Locating these parallels might bring to light patterns that could contribute to our understanding of a relationship between 2 Isaiah and Job. The total number of scripture references to 2 Isaiah and Job in Chapter 3.4 is one hundred thirty-eight, with sixty-nine in 2 Isaiah and sixty-nine in Job. Forty-four of these involved words, phrases, or word strings unique to 2 Isaiah and Job in the Hebrew Bible; twenty-two are from 2 Isaiah and twenty-two from Job.

\textsuperscript{438} Defined as appearing in the Hebrew Bible five times or fewer.
For 2 Isaiah, I organized the data first according to chapter, then according to section (Isaiah 40-48, 49-55), and finally according to servant poem.\textsuperscript{439} Since chapters and sections vary in length, I also calculated what percentage of the total number of verses each chapter or section represents. I separate out references to unique material (words, phrases, and word strings) before noting the total number of references for all verbal parallels found in Chapter 3.4. Half of the chapters in 2 Isaiah share no unique elements with Job at all – Isaiah 42, 43, 46, 47, 48, 52, 54, and 55. Of the remaining half, Isaiah 50 and 53 have the highest concentration of material unique to 2 Isaiah and Job. Chapters which stand out as having a higher than expected number of total verbal parallels to Job are Isaiah 40, 44, 50, and 51. The total number of all verbal connections is divided more or less evenly between Isaiah 40-48\textsuperscript{440} and 49-55, but there is a higher concentration of unique verbal parallels in Isaiah 49-55. This is attributable to the servant poems which are located in this section of Isaiah; the third and fourth servant poems make up about six percent of total material in 2 Isaiah, but contain almost a quarter of the words, phrases, and word strings unique to 2 Isaiah and Job. There were no references at all to the first servant poem in Chapter 3.4. In other words, taking account of all of 2 Isaiah, the highest concentration of elements unique to 2 Isaiah and Job are found in the final two servant poems, with Isaiah 40, and to a lesser extent Isaiah 44 and 51, also notable for the number of verbal parallels with the book of Job.

\textsuperscript{439} See the Appendix.

\textsuperscript{440} One reference (a rare phrase found in Isa 44:13) comes from a polemic against idols section, all of which can be found in Isaiah 40-48.
For Job, I organized the data first by chapter, then by speech, then by identity of speaker. The references involving material unique to 2 Isaiah and Job are much more spread out in Job than in 2 Isaiah. The prologue and epilogue, not surprisingly, do not contain any of the verbal connections listed in Chapter 3.4. Besides that, no single chapter contains more than one or two instances of unique material; many do not have any unique material at all. Patterns are somewhat easier to see when the data are organized by speech. Job’s 3rd speech (Job 9-10) stands out as having more than the expected number of references in the material in Chapter 3.4. When it comes to identity of the speaker, it is clear that the verbal parallels listed in Chapter 3.4 are more likely to come from Job’s speeches than anyone else’s. Job’s speeches make up just under half the material in the book of Job, but almost seventy percent of references involving unique material are found in Job’s speeches. There were slightly fewer references to Eliphaz’, Bildad’s, and Zophar’s speeches than one might expect based on their length, and slightly more to Elihu’s speeches. Of all the characters in the book, God’s speeches demonstrate the fewest verbal connections to 2 Isaiah. This lack of parallels is curious, since the divine speeches deal almost exclusively with the theme of creation, a prevalent theme in 2 Isaiah as well. God speaks about creation very differently than 2 Isaiah or Job (the character). There seems to be no discernible difference between Job 28 and Elihu’s speeches (widely believed to be additions) and the rest of the (humans’) dialogue portion of the book when it comes to verbal parallels between 2 Isaiah and Job.

---

441 The prologue and epilogue I separated out from the other speeches, as well as Job 28, which comes between Job’s 9th speech (Job 26-27) and his 10th speech (Job 29-31).
4.4.2 Analysis

So far I have summarized the general pattern of parallels in 2 Isaiah and Job; it now remains to look in detail at the specific data laid out in Chapter 3.4. A close look at the individual elements listed in Chapter 3.4 in their contexts indicates that the case for a relationship between 2 Isaiah and Job made by Pfeiffer, Elliott, and Terrien is somewhat exaggerated. While it is true that 2 Isaiah and Job share a number of words and phrases, in most cases these words and phrases are used so differently that the claim of a dependent relationship based on any one of them or on the collective list – let alone a theory about direction of influence – does not hold up under scrutiny.

Elliott, for example, lists the term הָלָּיִם (barren) as one of the similarities that contributes to the claim of a dependent relationship. However, there is nothing in the four contexts in which this word appears that would indicate that one author knew the other. 2 Isaiah uses it in the traditional sense of being without children, but Job uses it metaphorically (to describe a night, the company of the godless, and hunger pangs). The case of מְגַל (double) is similar. 2 Isaiah says the people have paid double for their sins, Zophar describes wisdom as double, and God says Leviathan has a double coat of mail. The same words used in such different contexts indicate similar working vocabularies rather than knowledge of a particular text.

An analogous critique can be made in the case of similar phrases. For example, Elliott lists לְדָעָם (for vanity her labor) as a similarity that indicates a relationship between 2 Isaiah and Job without noting the contexts in which this phrase appears. In 2

---

442 Elliott, “A Comparative Study of Deutero Isaiah and Job,” 186-187. Elliott admits that this word alone is “insufficient proof” of influence but that it is “hardly an accident that the words occur only in two of the Biblical books.”
Isaiah the servant is describing his fears about his labor, and in Job God is describing the lack of care female ostriches have for their offspring. It is difficult to see how the one occurrence of the phrase could possibly be related to the other. In other cases, similarities are open to more than one interpretation. In his list of similar idiomatic expressions, which he prefaces with the words, “It is hardly possible that there could be so much resemblance in idiomatic usage without some kind of dependence,”\footnote{Elliott, “A Comparative Study of Deutero Isaiah and Job,” 196.} Elliott includes יםHip (to shut the mouth). However, he fails to note that the occurrence of this phrase in Job is exactly parallel to Psalm 107:42, with the result that one cannot say for certain whether there is any connection whatsoever here between Job and 2 Isaiah, where the phrase is used in an entirely different context in any case. Similarly, Cheyne calls Isa 51:9 and Job 26:12-13 a clear case of imitation – and they do indeed seem connected in that both speak of piercing the primeval serpent – but Fishbane’s caveat, noted in Chapter 2, is in order here. If the same traditum in two texts is likely to be in each case an independent reflex of a common idiom rather than a reference one to the other, then one cannot claim an allusion or make intertextual judgments based on the common use. There is good reason to think that these two texts are each an echo of the lines of the Creation Epic that describe Marduk’s defeat of Tiamat, including the piercing of her belly and heart.\footnote{“The Creation Epic,” translated by E. A. Speiser (ANET, 67). Cf. Pope, Job, 166.}

The same holds true for most of the words and phrases shared by 2 Isaiah and Job and cited as evidence of a relationship. When each one is examined in its context, it is difficult to see justification for positing a relationship, much less a theory about direction of influence. Compiling a list of such words and phrases, no matter how many there are,
does not make a strong case for a dependent relationship. Instead, similar words and turns of phrase like these contribute to the point already made with regard to thematic similarities: sharing the same basic worldview and having similar working vocabularies, 2 Isaiah and Job were most likely composed in relatively close historical proximity to one another, but the texts do not provide enough evidence to build an airtight case for a relationship of dependence.

Nevertheless, there are certain passages that, when the whole context is taken into account, give a hint that one author, most likely the author of Job, was intentionally interacting with the words of the other. I noted above that with regard both to theme and to wording, Job 9 stands out as having a significant number of similarities to 2 Isaiah. Job 9 marks the beginning of Job’s third speech, in which he introduces the idea of going to court with God, and intersperses talk of the possibility of a legal battle with God with recounting the power of God in the creation of the world and God’s creation of him. Job 9:2-12 contain two word strings unique to 2 Isaiah and Job, אֲנַיָּהוֹלֶת (Isa 40:26 and Job 9:4) and נַעַם יָשָׂבֵל (Isa 44:24 and Job 9:8) and three rare phrases, (Isa 40:28, Job 9:1:10, and (Isa 43:13 and Job 9:12), and (Isa 45:9 and Job 9:12). Job begins his speech with acknowledging that humans cannot take God to court and win; God is too wise and mighty of strength for anyone to challenge God successfully. Job proceeds to list God’s powerful acts within the created world, focusing on God’s destructive actions – overturning mountains, shaking the earth, darkening the sun and

445 Zuckerman, Job the Silent, 106.

446 Tur-Sinai objects to the usual translation of this verse, translating instead, “He spread out the heavens as his press, and treadeth upon the body of the sea” (The Book of Job, 156-157). He sees the verse as an allusion to the Babylonian Creation Epic IV, 137/8. The sky is a press (Ŕ), and God treads on the sea like one treads olives.
stars, trampling the sea – and on creation and control of the constellations. God is so mighty that no one can stop God or question God’s actions. Job concludes with the same theme with which he started; attempting to go to court with God is fruitless. Job then reminds God that God is not a human, that God shaped him like clay, and wonders why God is now destroying him. The speech ends with Job begging God to leave him alone.

Comparing the verbal parallels in the context of this passage with their contexts in 2 Isaiah creates quite a contrast. The context of the parallels in Isaiah 40 is praise of God for creation of the world and for complete control over the rulers of the world; since God is “mighty of strength” none of the constellations is missing. All this forms a prelude to 2 Isaiah’s assurance to Jacob and Israel that God is intimately acquainted with their circumstances and is able to give them the help they need. In Isaiah 44 God declares that there is no other God, no one else who predicted current events, no one else who created the heavens and earth; and God is now declaring that Judah and Jerusalem will be built up again. In Isaiah 43 God promises restoration to Jacob and Israel and again declares that there is no other God, no one else foretold current events, and no one is capable of stopping divine action. Isaiah 45 continues the theme, with emphasis again on the idea that there is no other God; Jacob and Israel as the clay have no right to question the potter who is bringing about their restoration in surprising ways.

What is ironic about the comparison of these passages is how exactly alike they are with regard to worldview but how opposite they are with regard to the effects of that worldview.\(^\text{447}\) In both, God is the all-powerful creator who acts alone and whose action

\(^{447}\) That this passage is meant to be ironic is certainly not a new idea (Fullerton, “On Job 9 and 10,” 329-331: Georg Fohrer, Das Buch Hiob [KAT 16; Gütersloh: G. Mohn, 1963], 203).
cannot be gainsaid; in both, humanity is weak and helpless clay without the wherewithal to understand what God is doing, much less put a stop to it. In 2 Isaiah this incites praise and wonder at the way God cares for Jacob and Israel and brings about their salvation. In Job this produces terror and despair, along with a sense that God cannot be bothered to listen to Job and does not care enough to do anything about his plight.

This kind of subversion of meaning in the face of thematic and verbal agreement puts one in mind of the parody of Ps 8:4-5 in Job 7:17-18. There, the author of Job utilizes the same wording and concept as the psalm (the special place of humanity in creation) to create a radically different effect on the reader. One recalls also Dell’s contention that the author of Job does something similar with forms; he uses familiar forms, but twists them to parody their conventional meaning or intent, a rhetorical device she found primarily in Job’s speeches. It is not implausible, in light of the two parallel word strings and other phrases found in similar contexts in 2 Isaiah, to suggest that the author of Job is doing something similar here, that is to say, intentionally drawing attention to specific words in 2 Isaiah in order to caricature them, or to bring to readers’ attention their disquieting implications.

---

448 For example, the question מָה מֵאַחֲרָיו, although used five times in the Hebrew Bible, is asked of God (or the potter as representing God) only in 2 Isaiah and Job.

449 Clines explicitly rejects the possibility of sarcasm or irony in this passage, and calls it instead a lament (Job 1-20, 228-229). He writes, “While it is hard to disprove the existence of irony in many passages, such comments overlook the fact that similar language to Job’s in these verses occurs in praises in the Psalter where irony cannot be suspected” (229). Clearly, in light of the parody of Psalm 8 in Job 7, simply having similar language does not preclude the presence of irony; parody requires similarity of language, style, or form to the object of the parody if it is to be recognizable as such.

450 Dhorme sees an allusion here as well. He noted that other scholars have excised Job 9:8-10 as an interpolation, since “the verses are a series of citations from other passages in Job or from the prophetic writings. It should be observed, however, that Job began his speech by saying that he knew as much about these high matters as his friends. He in fact describes the attributes of God in terms of current theology…The description he gives is not a mere string of quotations. The texts which inspire him are
There is nothing explicit in the contexts of these parallels in 2 Isaiah or Job to show beyond doubt that if an allusion is being made, it is being made by the author of Job rather than the author of 2 Isaiah. However, it is much more difficult to find a satisfying and plausible explanation for the opposite scenario. The context of Job portrays God rather negatively, almost as abusing divine power, and certainly guilty of lack of consideration for Job, and by extension all humanity. It seems rather unlikely that the author of 2 Isaiah would willingly choose to remind readers of this portrait of God in making his own case about why Jacob and Israel ought to find comfort and confidence in God’s power. If he were attempting to refute it, he did not do so very effectively, since he does not give away any awareness, much less do anything to address, the problems raised in Job 9.

Another word string shared by 2 Isaiah and Job is found in Job’s fourth speech (Job 12-14). Isa 41:20 and Job 12:9 both declare יי יִזְדָּעַת. Since the use of the divine name here is completely unexpected, some contend that this phrase is lifted from Isa 41:20 and inserted here. Clines, on the other hand, thinks the use of the divine name is not accidental but the result of this phrase being a well-known (and thus not easily altered) saying, which also happens to be quoted in Isa 41:20. It is entirely skillfully adapted to a new context” (Dhorme, A Commentary on the Book of Job, 130). Someone might raise Fox’s objection here (see Chapter 2.2.3), that if an author is quoting, he or she will make that clear to the audience, and that this case does not meet the criteria for quotation. I see Fox’s point, but I think it is important to remember that what constitutes clarity for us might be quite different from what constituted clarity twenty-five hundred years ago.

451 But see Chapter 3, n. 403.

452 This is the opinion of Duhm (Hiob, 67) and Gordis (The Book of Job: Commentary, New Translation, and Special Studies [New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1978], 138).

453 Clines, Job 1-20, 294. See also Amos Ḥakham, Job (Jerusalem: Mosad Harav Kook, 2009), xviii.
possible that Clines and others are correct, that both 2 Isaiah and Job are quoting a traditional saying independently, or that this phrase is an addition in Job. However, there are intriguing similarities in the content of the surrounding passage in each case that may suggest the possibility of an intentional allusion.

The context of this phrase in 2 Isaiah is straightforward; God announces a reversal first for Jacob and Israel, in the form of vindication and victory over the enemies who are currently striving against them, and second for the land itself, which, though dry will produce rivers, ponds, and springs so that vegetation can grow in what had been desolate wilderness. This reversal of fortunes is what the hand of the Lord has done that all people will see. The context of this phrase in Job is a little more ambiguous. What Job intends by “this” is not so clear. Zophar has just finished up a speech in which he tells Job (unnecessarily, as Job is already acutely aware) how great God is in comparison with the world and assures Job that everything will turn out all right, provided he repents and turns to God. Job’s sarcastic retort is that he knows everything that Zophar knows, but it is not his reality. He then says,

But ask the animals, and they will teach you; the birds of the air, and they will tell you; ask the plants of the earth, and they will teach you; and the fish of the sea will declare to you. Who among all these does not know that the hand of the LORD has done this?

Clines, in agreement with Gordis, considers that Job 12:7-12 are a virtual quotation of Job’s friends. Clines, in a sense, mocking the friends, insinuating that their wisdom is

\[\text{\textsuperscript{454}}\text{Pope, Job, 88; Clines, Job I-20, 292.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{455}}\text{The that opens the pericope as well as the second person singular address are indications that Job is not here simply addressing the friends (Gordis, “Quotations as a Literary Usage in Biblical, Oriental, and Rabbinic Literature,” HUCA 22 [1949]: 214-217; Clines, Job I-20, 292). Some of the same evidence}\]
so obvious that even the animals know it.\textsuperscript{456} What follows is the description of a reversal, first for the land and then for humanity. Unlike Isaiah 41, however, this time the reversal is not redemptive. God tears down and imprisons; God either holds back the waters to make a desert or sends them and causes a flood. God’s intrusion into the human world is just as destructive:

He leads counselors away stripped, and makes fools of judges. He looses the sash of kings, and binds a waistcloth on their loins. He leads priests away stripped, and overthrows the mighty. He deprives of speech those who are trusted, and takes away the discernment of the elders. He pours contempt on princes, and looses the belt of the strong. He uncovers the deeps out of darkness, and brings deep darkness to light. He makes nations great, then destroys them; he enlarges nations, then leads them away. He strips understanding from the leaders of the earth, and makes them wander in a pathless waste. They grope in the dark without light; he makes them stagger like a drunkard (Job 12:17-25).

Clines notes the interesting parallels between this passage in Job and Psalm 107, and he is surely correct in positing a relationship.\textsuperscript{457} However, intriguingly, there are notable parallels between 2 Isaiah and Psalm 107 as well, including one in the context of the 2 Isaiah passage under consideration. Isa 45:2 has a word string nearly identical to Psalm 107:16 (גִּלָּה יְהוָה נְהַשָּׁה בּוֹרֵי מִדְרֶשׁ וַדִּלְתָּה נְהַשָּׁה אַשֶּׁר בּוֹרֵי מִדְרֶשׁ אָנֻנִּים), has led others to believe that Job 12:7-11 and 12-25 are additions to the text (e.g. Fohrer, \textit{Das Buch Hiob}, 240).

\textsuperscript{456} Clines, \textit{Job 1-20}, 293.

\textsuperscript{457} Clines sees Psalm 107 as a “source” for Job 12 the way Psalm 8 was a “source” for Job 7 (\textit{Job 1-20}, 297). Janzen notes the same connection (\textit{Job}, 103-104).
respectively), and Isa 41:18 echoes the language of Psalm 107:35 (and Isa 41:18 echoes the language of Psalm 107:35, respectively). 459

Regarding Job 12, Clines says, “These verses must rather be seen as a deliberate reworking (perhaps even “parody,”…) of conventional hymnic material, blocking out the positive aspects of reversal of fortune.” 460 Psalm 107 portrays God as engaging in actions of reversal that are both redemptive and destructive, depending on the comportment of humanity:

He turns rivers into a desert, springs of water into thirsty ground, a fruitful land into a salty waste, because of the wickedness of its inhabitants. He turns a desert into pools of water, a parched land into springs of water. And there he lets the hungry live, and they establish a town to live in (Psalm 107: 33-36).

Job selectively borrows from Psalm 107 – specifically, only the divine actions of destructive reversal (Ps 107:15, 21, 22, 24). 461 This is a similar kind of rhetorical move that the author of Job made in relation to Psalm 8, and, it was suggested above, in relation

458 There is a verbal similarity between a line of Isa 45:1 and Job 12:18 as well – ומתרון כל פעם אספה וגדים מתים ומתחמקים and וגדים מתים ומתרון כל снова.

459 Scholars debate the place of vv. 33-43 within Psalm 107. According to Kraus, who noted the connection between Psalm 107 and 2 Isaiah, these verses are a supplementary poem which reflects the situation of the postexilic era, at which time the psalm reached its final form (Psalms 60-150 [transl. Hilton C. Oswald; Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1989], 326-331). Sommer thinks the whole psalm to be postexilic (A Prophet Reads Scripture, 261, n. 9). Dahood, on the other hand, argues that the whole psalm was written by one author, and the final hymn of Ps 107: 33-43 contains allusions to the conquest (Psalms III, 101-150 [AB 17A; New York: Doubleday, 1970], 89). For my part, the situation these verses describe seems too generic to date them to any one period, as Kraus does, nor do I see specific allusions to the conquest of Canaan. Dale Patrick seems to think the psalm predates 2 Isaiah; he lists the reversal motif as found in Psalm 107 as one of the antecedents of 2 Isaiah’s epiphanic imagery surrounding the new exodus (“Epiphanic Imagery in Second Isaiah’s Portrayal of a New Exodus,” HAR 8 [1984]: 125-141). He points out that the reversal in Psalm 107 is for the land to be inhabited, whereas in 2 Isaiah the reversal is for the land to be traveled on the way back to Judah.


461 See Clines’ commentary on these verses and their relationship to Psalm 107 (Job 1-20, 298, 301-304).
to Isaiah 40 and 44. Job says roughly the same thing in roughly the same words, but radically changes the effect on the reader. Moral action that makes sense, as reported in Psalm 107, is reshaped to serve the “perverse sense”\(^{462}\) that Job is expressing.

It will be noted that whether or not 2 Isaiah is quoting Psalm 107,\(^ {463}\) Isaiah 41:17-19 is adopting the language of reversal of fortunes just as selectively as Job, but choosing only the redemptive reversals to report,\(^ {464}\) leading up to Isaiah 41:20, “that all may see and know, all may consider and understand, that the hand of the Lord has done this.” It is, of course, possible that the author of Isaiah 41:17-20 and the author of Job 12:7-25 are both using language of reversal of fortune like that found in Psalm 107 completely independently and for their own ends. On the other hand, the similarities between Isaiah 41 and Psalm 107 on the one hand, and the relationship of Job 12 to Psalm 107 on the other begin to make the parallel word string of Isaiah 41:20 and Job 12:9 appear more than coincidental (Clines) or accidental (Duhrm).\(^ {465}\) If one were to read “Who among all these does not know that the hand of the Lord has done this,” what does one expect to follow? For those who have already read Isaiah 41, the answer is that God reverses fortunes both for people and for the land, bringing victory to the conquered people and prosperity to a barren land. Instead, the reader gets Job’s irreverent answer: God reverses

\(^{462}\) Clines, *Job 1-20*, 301.

\(^{463}\) If Kraus and Sommer are correct, Psalm 107:33-43 were not in existence to quote at the time 2 Isaiah was writing, but if Dahood and Patrick are correct, a quotation is a possibility.

\(^{464}\) Negative reversal of fortune is not completely absent from 2 Isaiah (e.g. 42:15 and 50:2-3), but it is far less prevalent than positive or redemptive reversal of fortune.

\(^{465}\) M. G. Swanepoel is quite confident that Job 12:9 is a deliberate reference to Isa 41:20, although in his view this is a “sign of hope” for Job and “the theological high point,” insofar as it implies that YHWH’s presence will make a positive difference for Job (“Job 12 – An(other) Anticipation of the Voice from the Whirlwind?” *OTE* 4 [1991], 198-199).
fortunes, indeed, but with no rhyme or reason and for no good end. It is not outside the
realm of possibility that our author parodies traditional language as found in Psalm 107,
as Clines suggested, but also at the same time, draws attention to the equally distorted
and selective use of the reversal of fortune motif in Isaiah 41.

Once again it is not possible to point to some objective criterion showing why, if
there is in fact an allusion here, it could not be made by 2 Isaiah.\footnote{Nurmela argues that 2 Isaiah is dependent on Job here, but his reasoning is not very
compelling: the third person (“hand of the Lord”) fits better in Job than in Isaiah, where God has been
speaking about himself in the first person; just because the tetragrammaton is not used elsewhere in the
dialogues of Job does not mean it cannot be used in Job 12; and Isa 41:17-20 is a highly allusive passage
\cite{Mouth of the Lord Has Spoken}, 12-13.)

It is true that the use
of the tetragrammaton is surprising in the dialogues in Job, but if that is a corruption of
the text, it loses its significance. More persuasive is the ambiguity accompanying the
phrase in Job; in 2 Isaiah it is clear what the author means, but not in Job. Knowing the
context in Isaiah, I argued above, sheds some light on what the author of Job meant by
those words. In addition, it seems unlikely that the author of 2 Isaiah would employ a
phrase from what seems likely to be sarcasm or parody in Job. As with the previous case
of Job 9, it would not seem to suit his purpose well to put readers in mind of this passage
from Job. Finally, and this holds true for both Job 9 and 12, this kind of parody on the
part of the author of Job is in line with similar cases, such as allusions to Psalm 8 and
107, and so fits well with the ways we have already seen the author of Job operate in
relationship to texts he knew.

It is instructive here to recall some of the recent research on quotation and
allusion cited in Chapter 2.2. By now it should be clear that, if indeed one accepts that the
author of Job knew and intentionally employed particular words or turns of phrase from 2
Isaiah, the relationship between the texts is not a straightforward one of influence and dependence, as previous research on this topic indicated. It is well to remember Bakhtin’s words, quoted earlier:

The word, directed toward its object, enters a dialogically agitated and tension-filled environment of alien words, value judgments and accents, weaves in and out of complex interrelationships….: and all this may crucially shape discourse, may leave a trace in all its semantic layers, may complicate its expression and influence its entire stylistic profile.\(^{467}\)

If we assume for the moment that the author of Job 9 did in fact allude to 2 Isaiah, it does shape his discourse and necessarily affects our interpretation of it. Although I do not find Bloom’s Freudian analysis of influence to be helpful in this case, since I cannot imagine that the author of Job felt anxious or threatened by 2 Isaiah’s creativity, I think his description of deliberate misreading and creative correction illuminates what the author of Job could be doing with 2 Isaiah, as well as with texts like Psalm 8 and 107. On the surface, the author of Job accepts everything 2 Isaiah claims about the nature of God and divine power, but instead of following in the direction 2 Isaiah is trying to lead the reader, the author of Job stubbornly follows 2 Isaiah’s claims to their logical and alarming end. By doing so, he calls into question 2 Isaiah’s view of the nature of God much more creatively and effectively than he could by outright contradiction of it. In fact, he seems to be employing something like Johnson’s “reflexive allusion,” whereby he alludes with the intention that the texts be compared and thus creates a rivalry between them. Henceforth, the reader who accepts 2 Isaiah’s view (and Job’s ostensible view) of the nature of God has a choice of which path to follow – 2 Isaiah’s path to the tender care

---

\(^{467}\) Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination*, 276.
and involvement of God in bringing about salvation, or Job’s path to the utter
helplessness of humans in the face of God who acts alone and whose destructive action
cannot be challenged. A similar creation of rivalry seems to be going on in Job 12.
Greene’s “dialectical” allusion, of which parody is one type, entails the creation of a text
that exposes the vulnerability of the text to which it alludes. By quoting Psalm 107
liberally but selectively, and also drawing attention to the same reversal of fortune motif
in Isaiah 41, the author of Job exposes 2 Isaiah’s own selective use of the motif. Isaiah
41:17-20 leave half the story untold, and the author of Job is only too ready to fill in the
gaps. The result is the same in both cases: 2 Isaiah’s message has been “smeared” by the
author of Job 9 and 12, with his readers no longer having the option of reading 2 Isaiah’s
half of the story uncritically. This is a two-way street, however, as both Greene and
Johnson point out; 2 Isaiah’s half of the story still stands. The result is that the reader is
forced into a critical position regarding both systems, since they are, in effect, criticizing
one another.

4.4.3 Conclusion

It is my view that the verbal similarities between 2 Isaiah and Job have been
exaggerated. Close analysis of words and phrases in their contexts indicates that in most
cases they are used so differently that it is impossible to show that one author knew the
work of the other, much less deliberately employed a particular word or phrase in
intentional dependence on the other. As with the thematic similarities, there are enough
accompanying differences that it is insufficient simply to list similarities between the two
texts and move into an analysis of who borrowed from whom. The contention that 2
Isaiah and Job share a close relationship in which one author gained some kind of special
inspiration from and developed themes in dependence on the other does not hold in light of the slim evidence marshaled in support of it.

That the claims for evidence of a relationship between 2 Isaiah and Job have been exaggerated does not mean, however, that there was no contact between these texts or that some kind of a relationship did not exist. A close look at some of the parallel word strings in their respective contexts in 2 Isaiah and Job indicates the possibility that the author of Job was familiar with at least some of 2 Isaiah’s words, and made intentional reference to them in the same manner that he made use of forms and in some cases other authors’ actual words that have come down to us as part of the Hebrew Bible. In each of the cases cited above in which the author of Job interacts with the specific words of a previous author, he does not do so in a straightforward way, but uses them for his own end of pointing out the downside or the malignant consequences of accepting those words uncritically. By imitating the previous text he forces a comparison and sets up a rival way of interpreting the same “facts,” effectively inviting the reader to take a step back and examine both sides more critically than would have been possible in the absence of the allusion.

468 Since both Pfeiffer (“The Dual Origin of Hebrew Monotheism,” 205) and Terrien (“Quelques remarques sur les affinités de Job avec le Deutéro-Esaïe,” 309-310) rested part of their case for Joban priority on the absence in Job of the term פַּה, which is used in 2 Isaiah, it is necessary to say a word about this point. First, if Fishbane and Janzen are correct that Job 3 is a curse based on the particular wording of the cosmology found in Genesis 1, this speaks against the author of Job being ignorant of the term, since it shows up several times in that creation account. Similarly, it has been argued that Psalm 8 made use of the Genesis 1 creation account (see Michael Fishbane, “Jeremiah iv 23-26 and Job iii 3-13” VT 21 [1971]: 153) – though Psalm 8, too, lacks the term פַּה – and we have already seen that the author of Job was familiar enough with Psalm 8 to parody it. פַּה is also notably absent from wisdom writings in general, making just one appearance in Eccl 12:1. The authors of both Job and Proverbs seem to have a predilection for פַּה (e.g. Job 4:17; 9:9; Prov 8:26; 17:5), as apparently also do the authors of the Psalms (e.g. Ps 33:6; 95:5). In light of these things it is perfectly plausible that the author of Job was familiar with the word פַּה but chose not to use it.
Even though the verbal connections between 2 Isaiah and Job have been exaggerated, it should be recalled at this point that allusions are not always limited to the few words or “markers” actually cited from a precursor text, but have the potential to bring to mind that entire text. Ben-Porat’s fourth stage of allusion entails that once a reader has recognized an allusion, he or she can form intertextual connections between the texts that are not specifically marked. In the words of Kellett, an allusion can start a “series of undulating suggestions” that goes far beyond the original allusion. Thus, while I do not think it is legitimate to assume a strong, close relationship between 2 Isaiah and Job based on the kind of evidence which Pfeiffer, Elliott, and Terrien cited, I also do not think it is out of place, especially in light of the markers for which I argued in Job 9 and 12, to compare the texts as wholes and think much can be gained by reading 2 Isaiah and Job in dialogue with each other.

4.5 The Servant of the Lord

4.5.1 Summary

Since at least the Middle Ages, readers of 2 Isaiah and Job have drawn connections between the suffering servant of YHWH and the figure of Job. They are both called “my servant” by YHWH and undergo similar experiences of suffering without having done anything to deserve it. Further, their experiences are in some cases described using the same words and phrases. This has led scholars who see these similarities as more than coincidence to the conclusion either that the author of 2 Isaiah was dependent on the figure of Job for images and words regarding innocent suffering (Cheyne, Terrien,
Pfeiffer), or that the author of Job borrowed from the suffering servant in his description of Job’s suffering (Elliott).

4.5.2 Analysis

Once again there are just as many differences as similarities between 2 Isaiah and Job when it comes to the servant of YHWH. It is a much more prevalent concept in 2 Isaiah than in Job. References to the servant are to be found in both major parts of 2 Isaiah, and the four servant poems span both sections as well. At least the final three servant poems demonstrate a keen consciousness on the part of the servant (or the servant’s followers) of being YHWH’s servant. In contrast, YHWH calls Job “my servant” only in the prologue and epilogue; the dialogues give no indication whatsoever that Job or his friends were aware of it or that they thought of Job in those terms. The dialogues, in fact, give the opposite impression: that God is attacking Job unnecessarily or in consequence of some sin he has committed. 2 Isaiah’s servant is silent in the face of his suffering, whereas Job is rather more vocal in his protestations of innocence. 2 Isaiah’s servant figure is called for a particular purpose, having a mission regarding the people of Israel – including vicarious suffering for them. Job, on the other hand, is singled out for his piety in order to prove a point between God and the adversary, and there is no hint that his suffering is somehow vicarious or of any benefit to others.

Nevertheless, it is noteworthy that the experiences of suffering of both 2 Isaiah’s servant and Job take a similar course, and that the descriptions of these experiences are often analogous. In 2 Isaiah the parallels are located almost exclusively in the second two servant poems (Isa 50:4-9; 52:13-53:12). In Job the parallels are more spread out, although all significant overlap of vocabulary is, once again, in Job’s speeches rather than
the friends’, with more in Job’s fourth, fifth, and sixth speeches (particularly Job 13, 16, and 19) than his other speeches. Below is the text of the third and fourth servant poems, and the corresponding text of the verbal parallels in Job which may indicate an intentional connection.
TABLE 4.1
PARALLELS BETWEEN THE 3RD SERVANT POEM AND JOB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Isaiah 50:4-9</th>
<th>Job</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>50:4</strong> The Lord GOD has given me the tongue of a teacher, that I may know how to sustain the weary with a word. Morning by morning he wakens—wakens my ear to listen as those who are taught.</td>
<td><strong>16:10</strong> They have gaped at me with their mouths; they have struck me insolently on the cheek (רֵם); they mass themselves together against me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>50:5</strong> The Lord GOD has opened my ear, and I was not rebellious, I did not turn backward.</td>
<td><strong>30:10</strong> They abhor me, they keep aloof from me; they do not hesitate to spit (רֵם) at the sight of me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>50:6</strong> I gave my back to those who struck me (לֶמֶךְ) and my cheeks (לֶמֶךְ) to those who pulled out the beard; I did not hide my face from insult and spitting (רֵם).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>50:7</strong> The Lord GOD helps me; therefore I have not been disgraced; therefore I have set my face like flint, and I know that I shall not be put to shame;</td>
<td><strong>13:18</strong> I have indeed prepared my case (מְשַׁפָּט); I know that I shall be vindicated (תָּמִיד).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>50:8</strong> He who vindicates me (מְשַׁפָּט) is near. Who will contend with me (מְשַׁפָּט)? Let us stand up together. Who are my adversaries (מְשַׁפָּט)? Let them confront me.</td>
<td><strong>13:19</strong> Who is there that will contend with me (מְשַׁפָּט)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>50:9</strong> It is the Lord GOD who helps me; who will declare me guilty? All of them will wear out like a garment; the moth will eat them up (רֵם).</td>
<td><strong>13:28</strong> One wastes away like a rotten thing, like a garment that is moth-eaten (רֵם).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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TABLE 4.2
PARALLELS BETWEEN THE 4TH SERVANT POEM AND JOB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Isaiah 52:13-53:12</th>
<th>Job</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 See, my servant shall prosper; he shall be exalted and lifted up, and shall be very high.</td>
<td>17:7 My eye has grown dim from grief, and all my members are like a shadow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Just as there were many who were astonished at him (אשתר שמה עליה רעבים) so marred was his appearance, beyond human semblance, and his form beyond that of mortals--</td>
<td>17:8 The upright are appalled at this (אישם), and the innocent stir themselves up against the godless.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 so he shall startle many nations; kings shall shut their mouths because of him; for that which had not been told them they shall see, and that which they had not heard they shall contemplate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Who has believed what we have heard? And to whom has the arm of the LORD been revealed?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 For he grew up before him like a young plant, and like a root out of dry ground; he had no form or majesty that we should look at him, nothing in his appearance that we should desire him.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 He was despised and rejected ( חושל) by others; a man of suffering and acquainted with infirmity; and as one from whom others hide their faces (ךסמהר פנים ממנה) he was despised, and we held him of no account.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Surely he has borne our infirmities and carried our diseases; yet we accounted him stricken (נזר), struck down by God, and afflicted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 But he was wounded for our transgressions, crushed for our iniquities; upon him was the punishment that made us whole, and by his bruises we are healed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 All we like sheep have gone astray; we have all turned to our own way, and the LORD has laid on him the iniquity of us all.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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It seems to me that here, once again, the relationship between 2 Isaiah and Job has been overstated. While the life stories of Isaiah’s suffering servant and Job do follow similar courses, that in itself does not indicate that one figure was patterned on the other.

The number of stories that come down to us from the ancient Near East that involve an innocent sufferer who is afflicted with terrible disease and misfortune, cries out to God, and is rescued ought to make us wary of attributing the figure of Job to any one “source.”

*TABLE 4.2 (Continued)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Isaiah 40-55</th>
<th>Job</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 He was oppressed, and he was afflicted, yet he did not open his mouth; like a lamb that is led to the slaughter, and like a sheep that before its shearers is silent, so he did not open his mouth.</td>
<td>16:16 My face is red with weeping, and deep darkness is on my eyelids,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 By a perversion of justice he was taken away. Who could have imagined his future? For he was cut off from the land of the living, stricken for the transgression of my people.</td>
<td>16:17 though there is no violence in my hands (עלייה תמה), and my prayer is pure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 They made his grave with the wicked and his tomb with the rich, although he had done no violence (עץא תמה), and there was no deceit in his mouth.</td>
<td>6:8 O that I might have my request, and that God would grant my desire;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Yet it was the will of the LORD to crush him (רוצה) with pain. When you make his life an offering for sin, he shall see his offspring, and shall prolong his days; through him the will of the LORD shall prosper.</td>
<td>6:9 that it would please God to crush me (יריסון), that he would let loose his hand and cut me off!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Out of his anguish he shall see light; he shall find satisfaction through his knowledge. The righteous one, my servant, shall make many righteous, and he shall bear their iniquities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Therefore I will allot him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong; because he poured out himself to death, and was numbered with the transgressors; yet he bore the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Isaiah’s servant humbly and silently submitted to abuse and death, suffering on behalf of others and somehow atoning for them.\textsuperscript{469} This figure bears no particular resemblance to Job or the other innocent sufferers, besides the fact that all were innocent, all suffered, and all experienced happy endings. The number of actual verbal parallels, which would be a more reliable indication of dependence in this case, is quite limited, and many of these involve rather common words (e.g. בָּשָׂד, כְּשֵׁר).

However, there are some curious similarities, the most significant being the parallel word string of Isa 53:9 and Job 16:17, which have indicated to some readers a sure connection.\textsuperscript{470} Although it is always possible that the similarities of language listed above are coincidental, merely the result of two authors searching for words to describe a common experience of suffering, in light of the verbal similarities argued for in the previous section, as well as the high concentration of verbal parallels between 2 Isaiah and Job involving the servant poems, I would like to suggest the possibility that the author of Job is here calling to his readers’ minds a description of innocent suffering with which they would have been familiar. Isaiah 53 in particular paints a vivid picture of an innocent sufferer that caught the imagination of subsequent generations. It has been applied to other innocent sufferers, both individuals (e.g. Jesus Christ and Sabbatai Sevi\textsuperscript{471}) and groups (e.g. the Jews\textsuperscript{472}). It would not be surprising at all that it might have

\textsuperscript{469} As Baruch Levine has pointed out, the idea of a scapegoat is absent from the book of Job ("René Girard on Job: The Question of the Scapegoat," \textit{Semeia} 33 [1985]: 125-133).

\textsuperscript{470} Cheyne, \textit{Job and Solomon}, 84.


caught the imagination of the author of Job as well, who chose to use those words for Job’s self-descriptions of his experience of suffering.

Unlike the cases in the previous section, in which the author of Job is using the words of 2 Isaiah to call into question their message, here the author of Job would be simply echoing the language of a precursor text without attempting to misinterpret or change the meaning. Rather, he is depending on the meaning of Isaiah 50 and 53 to communicate his own message. One of the reasons that poetry in general is so allusive (and why most research on allusion and quotation relates to poetry) is because it is designed to communicate so much with so few words. Brief poetic lines do not lend themselves to wordy descriptions, and so must communicate concisely. Alluding allows the author to pack another text’s content into a few well-chosen and familiar words. Thus, when the author of Job searched for words to describe the intense suffering of an innocent character, echoing a few key words from Isaiah 50 and 53 would have communicated his point succinctly yet powerfully.\footnote{Baruch Levine notes the similarities between Isa 50:5-9 and Job, particularly regarding legal language, and says that the “authors of the dialogues of Job may well have taken their cue from this passage” (“René Girard on Job,” 131-132).} If indeed Job’s readers were familiar with the descriptions of the suffering servant, hearing those words would have brought to mind the entirety of the poems, prompting them to interpret the figure of Job in light of them and inspiring contrasts as well as comparisons. Echoing language from Isaiah 50 and 53 would also serve to foreshadow Job’s experience. It indicates that he, like 2 Isaiah’s servant, will be vindicated in the end. It also anticipates the judgment on Job’s friends: they, like the author of Isaiah 53, assume that God is afflicting Job, but in the end will have to acknowledge that Job experienced vindication from God.
It is much more difficult to explain the opposite direction of borrowing, the way Terrien understands the relationship. First, the words that are concentrated in Isaiah 50 and 53 are scattered throughout Job’s speeches; echoing them would not have brought any particular poignant passage of Job to mind to inform the interpretation of Isaiah 50 and 53 the way it brings those passages periodically to mind when reading Job. Second, one significant aspect of both Isaiah 50 and 53 is the servant’s humble and silent response to the suffering; making reference to Job would give a very different flavor to the passages and radically alter our image of 2 Isaiah’s servant, should we have in our minds Job’s vocal protestations to his suffering and his characterization of God as the enemy who is attacking him. In Job we already have different images from the prologue, where Job does humbly accept his lot, and the dialogues, where he decidedly does not. According to one way of reading Job as a whole work, these two responses to suffering seem designed to contrast one another in the final form of the book, and a reference to 2 Isaiah’s suffering servant would highlight that contrast. Thus, it seems more likely that the author of Job would reflect aspects of 2 Isaiah’s suffering servant in a description of one whose innocence he was at pains to show than that the author(s) of Isaiah 50 and 53 would borrow sporadic elements from the self-descriptions of such an ambiguous character as Job.

4.5.3 Conclusion

Given that multiple figures are called “my servant” by God, it is not evident that the author of Job could have meant something significant in relation to 2 Isaiah by having

474 Newsom, The Book of Job, 260; Zuckerman, Job the Silent, 178.
God refers to Job this way in the prologue and epilogue. In addition, the figure of the innocent sufferer was common enough in ancient Near Eastern literature that it would be hard to show that any particular figure was patterned after another. Indeed, it seems to me that Bastiaens and others have exaggerated the number of specific connections between 2 Isaiah’s servant and Job. Nevertheless, certain verbal parallels between the third and fourth servant poems and Job’s self-descriptions, when understood as allusions to the servant poems, enrich the reader’s perception of Job as an innocent sufferer, foreshadow the outcome of his story, and highlight the contrast between the silent Job of the narrative frame and the vocal Job of the dialogues.

4.6 Conclusion

Much of the previous research on the thematic, stylistic, and verbal parallels assumed a relationship between 2 Isaiah and Job because of a relatively large number of similarities, but in my judgment this research was not discriminating enough in its conclusions. Many of the similarities, on closer analysis, proved to have very little significance for demonstrating a relationship. In the case of thematic similarities, a common historical context is an alternative explanation to dependence, and in the case of stylistic similarities, a comparable form of writing. The verbal similarities are indeed remarkable, but often words and phrases were employed in each work so differently that it is impossible to prove a relationship, let alone a direction of influence, based on them. These similarities do give strong indication that 2 Isaiah and Job were likely written in close temporal proximity. Skepticism regarding the conclusions of previous studies does not mean that there is no relationship between 2 Isaiah and Job, but rather that those
studies claimed more than the strength of evidence allows. There were some instances of
verbal similarities which I argued could plausibly be understood as intentional allusions.
In these instances, although which was the allusion and which the source could not be
proven definitively, it made a more likely and satisfying account of the data to posit the
author of Job as the alluding author. This study, then, supports the view that the book of
Job in its original form is an exilic or early postexilic work which followed relatively
closely upon the composition of Isaiah 40-55.
In my analysis of the similarities of theme, style, and vocabulary between 2 Isaiah and the book of Job in the preceding chapter, I argued that previous studies of this topic have, in some respects, made claims beyond those which the evidence can support. The literary relationship between 2 Isaiah and Job is not such that one can be said to be the inspiration for the other (Terrien), or that one developed out of the ideas of the other (Cheyne and Pfeiffer), or that one shows clear historical development from the other (Elliott). Rather, the similar ideas about God, humans, and their relationship, stylistic devices, and manner of expression are an indication that the authors were writing in roughly the same milieu at times not so far removed from one another. The differences in content between 2 Isaiah and Job demonstrate, on the other hand, that they were concerned with very different issues. Nevertheless, I suggested the possibility that the author of Job was familiar with at least some of the material present in the text of 2 Isaiah, and the collective evidence indicates that the author of Job wrote subsequent to 2 Isaiah. It makes a plausible and satisfying account of the data that the author of Job parodied certain texts of 2 Isaiah in much the same way he parodied other texts and forms as a way of communicating his own, very different ideas. In addition, it can be argued
that the author of Job echoed some of the language about 2 Isaiah’s suffering servant in his portrayal of his main character.

If it is the case that the author of Job borrowed certain phrases from 2 Isaiah and Psalm 107 in Job’s third and fourth speeches in order to parody their message, as it seems he did with Psalm 8 in Job’s second speech, an interesting similarity comes to light. In each of these three cases, the author of Job is calling into question some aspect of divine interaction with the creation – divine attention to the human creation (Job 7:17-19), the exertion of divine power over creation (Job 9:2-12), and divine action in relation to the creation, both human and non-human (Job 12:7-25). In each of these three cases the author of Job is giving voice to the problematic aspects of traditional formulations of these issues. In light of this, a natural question to ask is whether the author of Job is articulating his own considered views through the character of Job, intending those views to carry the day, or whether he is raising the issues in order to formulate a response to them.

The logical place to look for an answer to this question is the divine speeches, not only because they come at the end of the book and it is God who is doing the talking, but also because the divine speeches are devoted almost entirely to the issue of creation and God’s interaction with it. In fact, they seem to exclude mention of the many other issues raised previously in the book – much to the vexation of many readers. An answer is not so easy to decipher, however. Coming at the climax of the book of Job seemingly to

---

475 This is the case even apart from the presence of specific references to Psalm 8 or 2 Isaiah in the speeches of Job. Whether or not the author of Job was intentionally referencing these texts, he seems to be voicing the problematic aspects of traditional ways of talking about God and the creation, in whatever form he knew them.

bring some resolution to the issues raised in the preceding parts of the book, the divine speeches are a major key to interpreting the book of Job. However, there is a distinct lack of consensus regarding how to interpret the divine speeches, and it often seems that, Rorschach-like, they show a different picture of God to each set of eyes that examines them. Job’s response is equally ambiguous, and so offers little help in making sense of the divine speeches. The one thing on which all readers can agree is that creation figures prominently in them, but what the extended descriptions of creation communicate about God’s perspective on Job’s circumstances is by no means obvious. To some readers they communicate that God does not care at all about Job’s plight, to others that God cares a great deal, and to yet others that Job’s plight loses its significance when set against the grand scheme of the universe.

In the previous chapter I put forward the concepts of “reflexive” or “dialogical” allusion as a helpful context in which to understand what the author of Job might be doing. If he is, in fact, alluding to Psalm 8 and 107 and 2 Isaiah, he is not doing so straightforwardly, but ironically, effectively exposing the dark side of the message of those texts and inviting readers to take a critical distance from both his main character’s and his precursors’ perspectives. It is my contention in this chapter that, in doing this, the author of Job paves the way for a third perspective, given in the divine speeches, that

477 Williams, “Deciphering the Unspoken,” 60. This is true for those who accept the divine speeches as original to the work; those who see them as secondary would deny their significance or relevance for the message of Job (P. J. Nel, “Cosmos and Chaos: A Reappraisal of the Divine Discourses in the Book of Job,” OTE 4 [1991], 207).


479 The options for understanding the various interpretations of Job’s final words are summed up nicely in Samuel E. Balentine, Job (Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys, 2006), 694.
trumps both the traditional formulations and Job’s critique of them. On this reading, God does respond specifically to Job’s plight, answering the objections he raises, objections regarding divine attention to the human creation, the exertion of divine power over creation, and divine action in creation. Having voiced the complaints in the speeches of Job, the author addresses those complaints in the divine speeches; by appealing to God’s role as creator, he articulates a transformed vision of humanity, divine power, and divine action in the world.

Given that the theme of creation plays such an important role in both 2 Isaiah and Job, I will begin this chapter by summarizing some of the ways scholars have viewed the role of creation in these two works and the manner in which each in its own way can be seen as interacting with creation traditions in the book of Genesis. Then I will give a brief description of the divine speeches and outline some of the ways they have been interpreted. Finally, I will show how the divine speeches can be read as a constructive response to the critiques raised in Job 7:17-18; 9:2-12; and 12:7-25.

5.1 Creation in 2 Isaiah and Job

5.1.1 2 Isaiah

The subject of creation in 2 Isaiah has been treated at length, with a tremendous amount of influence on the interpretation of its role in 2 Isaiah coming from Gerhard von
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480 Both 2 Isaiah and Job interact with Babylonian creation traditions as well, most prominently the defeat of the primeval chaos monster. The way each in its turn does this poses interesting questions, but will remain for the most part outside the scope of this discussion.
Rad’s “The Theological Problem of the Old Testament Doctrine of Creation.” The “problem,” as von Rad saw it, was that Old Testament faith was concerned chiefly with redemption, and so the idea of God as creator had somehow to be made to fit with God as redeemer. Von Rad’s observation regarding 2 Isaiah is that the doctrine of creation does not appear there for its own sake, but is intimately connected with 2 Isaiah’s argument about God’s acts in history. He says,

We are struck by the ease with which two doctrines, which to our way of thinking are of very different kinds, are here brought together. It is as if for Deutero-Isaiah the creation of the world and the redemption of Israel both exemplify the same divine dispensation…

The same sort of bond between redemption and creation can be seen in various psalms as well, particularly Psalm 89 and 74. In von Rad’s view, even in the Priestly account the creation of the world does not have intrinsic value or independent status but is subordinated to divine redemption. Wisdom texts that treat creation independently of redemption might seem to contradict this trend, but von Rad judges that these texts are the result of foreign influence, should not be given much weight regarding Yahwistic faith, and in any case could only be incorporated into that faith as a supplement once the

---


doctrine of redemption was firmly entrenched and under no threat of being removed from pride of place in Israelite religion.  

The subordination of the doctrine of creation was taken further by Carroll Stuhlmueller. He claimed that the idea of creation is not central to 2 Isaiah’s message; rather, it is part of the anticipation or summary of what is his central message – redemption. For 2 Isaiah, the return from exile was a new creation, as evidenced by the creation words he used to describe it, and by allusions to the Babylonian annual festival celebrating the re-creation of fertility. Stuhlmueller tracks the logic of 2 Isaiah from the idea of the redemption of Israel to Israel’s creation, and from Israel’s creation to the creation of the world, and finally to the redemption of the world. He further makes a distinction between “first creation” and the current creating work of God, and concludes that 2 Isaiah does not seem to care very much at all about the creation that began the world. The idea of first creation is not the basis of argument and does not even figure prominently in 2 Isaiah.

---

485 von Rad, “The Theological Problem of the Old Testament Doctrine of Creation,” 185-186. Von Rad seems to think that it is illegitimate to cite wisdom literature as evidence of Yahwistic beliefs about creation; rather, these texts could be accepted into Yahwistic faith only after the doctrine of redemption was given pride of place and preserved. On this point, see Murphy’s critique: the Israelites did not seem to feel the same tension between creation/wisdom and salvation, and included both in their canon, so the development of the doctrine of creation is an authentic part of Israelite faith and not just an importation (Roland E. Murphy, “Wisdom and Creation,” JBL 104 [1985]: 5).


487 Stuhlmueller, Creative Redemption in Deutero-Isaiah, 233.

488 Stuhlmueller, Creative Redemption in Deutero-Isaiah, 233-234.

489 Stuhlmueller, Creative Redemption in Deutero-Isaiah, 237.

490 Stuhlmueller, “‘First and Last’ and ‘Yahweh-Creator’ in Deutero-Isaiah,” 204.
The subsidiary role von Rad and Stuhlmueller assigned to the doctrine of creation has not gone unchallenged. Harner argued that although 2 Isaiah uses language of creation faith to substantiate his claim of approaching salvation, such borrowing of creation language does not provide data for how creation faith functioned in relation to salvation faith, as von Rad presumed. Further, that God created the world is also connected to divine sovereignty (40:12-17, 21-24) and divine uniqueness (Isa 45:18). Thus, Harner contends, the doctrine of creation is not merely a member of the supporting cast for the doctrine of redemption, but an integral part of 2 Isaiah’s whole message for the exiles. Harner goes on to argue that creation plays a vital and even independent role in 2 Isaiah, bridging the gap between his appeal to the Exodus traditions and the new era of salvation that is coming. He concedes that creation is joined to redemption, but takes issue with von Rad’s assertion that this link makes creation ancillary.  

His conclusions were supported by Ludwig, whose analysis of the formulae of establishing the earth demonstrated that they were borrowed from creation traditions not subsumed under the doctrine of election. Westermann also notes that, although God’s work as creator and redeemer are connected, the two are never merged together, since God’s work as redeemer is in the context of God’s work as creator.

However one judges the prominence or nature of the role of creation in 2 Isaiah, scholars have found reason to believe that 2 Isaiah was interacting with specific Israelite


493 Westermann, Isaiah 40-66, 25. Westermann says, “Israel’s redeemer is the God of majesty who created the world and who directs the entire course of its history...God’s saving action upon his chosen people as proclaimed by himself was, as it were, an island within the mighty universe of God’s work as creator.”
traditions of creation. Balentine, drawing attention to creation imagery in 2 Isaiah, suggests that 2 Isaiah was very likely “the first of the biblical writers to appropriate and expand upon the two creation myths in Genesis.” Among his reasons for making this claim is that God recreates the land out of the chaos in which the exiles currently reside, filling it with lush vegetation and trees. In addition, the suffering servant of YHWH, the young plant growing up out of dry land whose appearance had nothing to recommend him, is in sharp contrast to the tree in that other garden with its desirable fruit that brought disaster. Balentine also observed, as many others have as well, the prevalence in 2 Isaiah of verbs of creating that are also employed in the creation stories of Genesis 1 and 2.

2 Isaiah demonstrates, particularly in Isaiah 40, that he was familiar with creation imagery from the wisdom tradition as well.

2 Isaiah even gives indication of correcting or updating the Priestly account of creation. In the context in which 2 Isaiah wrote, there was the potential for misunderstanding various aspects of the Priestly creation account. Fishbane notes three, and 2 Isaiah’s response to them. First, Genesis 1 does not explain the status of the

---


497 Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*, 325-326. He bases this on previous research done by M. Weinfeld (“The Creator God in Genesis 1 and the Prophecies of Deutero-Isaiah,” *Tarbiz* 37 [1968]: 120-126). Many of these same points are made by Arvid S. Kapelrud (“The Date of the Priestly Code (P),” *ASTI* 3 [1964]: 60-61), who concluded that 2 Isaiah very probably “not only knew Gen. 1-2 in the form these chapters have in the Masoretic text, but he also supposed that his audience knew the passages so that he could naturally allude to them in a few words here and there in his speeches” (61).
formless void or the darkness that were in existence before God began the divine creative work, and in 2 Isaiah’s context these might have been understood as rival powers. 2 Isaiah makes clear that God created the darkness and did not create chaos (Isa 45:7, 18).\(^{498}\) Second, Gen 1:26 says, “Let us make humankind in our image, according to our likeness.” In response to misperceptions about divine uniqueness that this might engender, 2 Isaiah declares that there is no one with a likeness that can be compared to God (Isa 40:18,\(^{499}\) 25; 46:5), and that God did the work of creation alone and unaided (Isa 44:24; 40:13-14). Finally, 2 Isaiah combats the potential misunderstanding that God might have needed a day to rest from weariness resulting from the labor of creating by declaring that the creator of the ends of the earth does not grow tired or weary (Isa 40:28). Fishbane’s conclusion is that 2 Isaiah has not said these things by accident, but “exegetically reappropriated” the Priestly creation account, not to undermine it but to preserve it, albeit in a changed way.\(^{500}\)

5.1.2 Job

Creation plays an integral role in wisdom literature in general, and is no less significant in the book of Job.\(^{501}\) Perdue concedes the absence of the idea of salvation

\(^{498}\) Blenkinsopp notes that this interpretation is “tempting,” but does not see 2 Isaiah saying anything that is not in keeping with the Priestly creation account (Isaiah 40-55, 259).

\(^{499}\) This connection was also made by Duhm (Das Buch Jesaja, 296), who noted that in 2 Isaiah’s context, the common human-like images of gods would have come to mind when talking about the “likeness” of God.

\(^{500}\) Fishbane, Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel, 326.

history or election theology from the early writings of the sages,\textsuperscript{502} but does not interpret this lack to indicate that either the sages or their writings were irreligious. Wisdom theology was ordered in such a way as to give a central place to creation. As such, the theology of the sages was universal, since God is God of the whole world, rather than the God of one nation only.\textsuperscript{503} This theology centered on creation embraced both the so-called “first creation” and also God’s ongoing care for both the human and non-human world. God is loving and just in God’s interaction with that world. The world is basically a good place, and humans are nurtured and sustained by God in it.\textsuperscript{504} In the book of Job, however, these basic tenets of creation theology are undermined. Instead of just and loving, the dialogues portray God as a brutal oppressor who purposely wreaks havoc on creation, both human and non-human. Humans are in slavery and have nothing to look forward to except death.\textsuperscript{505} In the world God describes, God is king over a creation where there is an ongoing need to fight the forces of chaos, and where there is a place for wild animals that do not coexist with humans. Humans are certainly not the apex of this creation, since they are incapable of fighting evil and chaos, and have no control over any animal that God mentions.\textsuperscript{506} The general impression left with the reader of Job is that the

\textsuperscript{502} Perdue, \textit{Wisdom and Creation}, 327.

\textsuperscript{503} Perdue, \textit{Wisdom and Creation}, 326.

\textsuperscript{504} Perdue, \textit{Wisdom and Creation}, 327.

\textsuperscript{505} Perdue, \textit{Wisdom and Creation}, 162.

\textsuperscript{506} Perdue, \textit{Wisdom and Creation}, 180.
creation is a marvelous and mysterious place, and only God is capable of understanding its design.507

In her detailed account of the place of creation theology in the book of Job, Kathryn Schifferdecker calls attention to the reality that creation in the book of Job is anything but simple, since the various characters and components of the book have different views about it.508 In the prologue, Job lives in a very ordered world in which he has abundant animals and a large family – signs of God’s blessing of fertility on his life. Evil is held at bay, with even the hint of it stamped out by Job’s sacrifices for the potential sins of his children. Satan describes this world well, claiming that there is a hedge of protection around Job. When this hedge of protection is stripped away, chaos and evil enter Job’s world and he is suddenly deprived of visible signs of blessing.509 When the dialogues begin, it is clear that Job and his friends view the role of creation very differently. The same hedge that Satan claimed protected Job, Job now sees as a kind of trap that he cannot escape. Creation shows God’s incontestable power, which lowly humans have no hope of matching. Job, in fact, rebels against the existence of creation, his curse in Job 3 an attempt to undo it. The friends, on the other hand, see the created world as a source either of blessing or of punishment. Humans are lowly maggots who cannot hope to be pure in God’s sight, but who receive the blessings of creation, provided they have the correct stance toward God. In his final speech, Job describes his previous well-ordered world with himself at the center and no room for the wild or

507 Dhorme, A Commentary on the Book of Job, lviii.


chaotic. Elihu talks a great deal about God’s power in creation, but always in relationship to humans, not animals. The human dialogue participants, despite their differences, all seem to be in agreement that humanity is at the center of creation, an object of special concern for God.\footnote{Schifferdecker, Out of the Whirlwind, 34-61}

God’s speeches present a quite different picture of the world, in that humans are hardly mentioned. The speeches serve to re-create the world that Job had tried to un-create in Job 3. In Schifferdecker’s view, the divine speeches show Job a creation outside himself, challenging the view that humans occupy a special place in creation.\footnote{That the divine speeches serve, among other things, to put humans in their place is articulated by many commentators. In his comment on the divine rhetorical questions, Terrien says, understatedly, “Job is then subtly reminded of his position within the hierarchy of beings, since he did not even exist” at the time God laid the earth’s foundations” (“The Book of Job: Introduction and Exegesis,” New Interpreter’s Bible, 1175). Cf. Delitzsch, Biblical Commentary on the Book of Job, 312. Reed lists the divine speeches as one of the theological critiques of dominion; God affirms the value of predators such as the lion, and the reality is that sometimes humans are under the dominion of certain animals (Stephen A. Reed, “Human Dominion over Animals,” in Reading the Hebrew Bible for a New Millennium: Form: Concept, and Theological Perspective: Theological and Hermeneutical Studies (ed. Kim et al.; Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2000), 344.}

As elsewhere in the book of Job, procreation is a major component of God’s creation blessing, but God speaks about it only in regard to the elements (such as rain and hail) and animals. The message is that creation does not serve humanity’s ends, as the rest of the dialogues had implied. The divine speeches are addressed to Job, indicating he has a position of significance, but it is alongside other creatures and not above them.\footnote{Schifferdecker, Out of the Whirlwind, 67-101.} God’s view of creation is, Schifferdecker concludes, “radically nonanthropocentric.”\footnote{Schifferdecker, Out of the Whirlwind, 84.} God’s power over creation, the importance of procreation, and the place of humanity in creation are themes that recur throughout the whole book of Job, with the different characters
viewing these realities differently.514 In the end, according to Schifferdecker, Job comes around to God’s view of these issues; in the epilogue, he takes up a position in the world once again, realizing it is not a world he can control, but willing to join in its blessings as evidenced by his decision to have more children.515

We have already seen how the author of Job parodies Psalm 8 with regard to the position of humanity in creation. Much like with 2 Isaiah, scholars have also seen the author of Job interacting with the Priestly creation story. Fishbane and many others have argued for a connection between Job 3 and the creation story of Genesis 1.516 According to Fishbane, Job 3:3-13 is designed to reverse the cosmic act of creation in the Priestly account (Gen 1:1-2:4a). Job 3, which has a pattern parallel to that of Genesis 1, is one example among many from ancient Near Eastern literature of prefacing an incantation by referring to a mythic event such as a cosmology.517 The idea is that the power behind that event is invoked for the present action.518 This, says Fishbane, is what Job does with the Priestly cosmology; he invokes the power of that event with the result that his words are


517 Fishbane mentions, among others, the “Cosmological Incantation against a Toothache,” which puts a toothache in the context of Anu’s creation of the world (“Jeremiah iv 23-26 and Job iii 3-13,” 156).

518 Fishbane, , “Jeremiah iv 23-26 and Job iii 3-13,” 158. Job 3 would be an example of sorcery or “black magic” rather than “white magic.”
“nothing less than a counter-cosmic incantation.” Each day except for the third day of creation has a counterpart in word or idea to Job’s speech of Job 3:3-13. For example, in the beginning, God had said, “Let there be light” (אָרְ נָא אָדָם). Job, on the other hand, says, “Let there be darkness” (אָדָם צַלָ ה). The counterpart to the mention of creation of sea monsters (Gen 1:21) is Job’s wish that the ones skilled to rouse Leviathan would curse the day of his birth (Job 3:8). The Priestly cosmology ends with God resting, and Job 3:13 is Job’s wish that he could be at rest. Fishbane concludes that these words of Job are spoken in the context of magic – the “magical dissimilation and dissolution” of the creation.

The inner-biblical connections between the prologue of Job and the creation stories that stand at the head of Genesis are further explicated by Samuel Balentine and Sam Meier. Job is described as the greatest of the people from the East, from the land of Uz. The location of Uz is not known, but conjures up a long ago and distant place. Job is a man of exemplary moral standing, much like the original human, who was innocent of evil. Both Job and his animals have fulfilled the divine command to be fruitful and multiply, evidence of God’s blessing on Job. Job’s family engages in constant celebration, each of his seven sons having his day of the week to host the party. At the end of it, Job would sanctify them, as God sanctified the seventh day at the end of the

---

first week. The reversal of Job’s fortunes apparently begins on the first day of the week, the eldest son’s day to host the feast, and what ensues takes the opposite course as the original week of creation. The movement from having everything to having nothing begins with the loss of animals and ends with the loss of humans. Like the story in Genesis 2-3, the wife of the blameless man comes to him with temptation that would result in death should the man give in. Unlike Genesis 2-3, this time the man does not succumb to the temptation. Balentine further suggests that both the structure and content of the divine speeches correspond to the Priestly account of creation, with the obvious exception of the creation of humankind.

In her essay “God’s Natural Order: Genesis or Job?” Diane Jacobson contends that the book of Job offers a critique, not just of the Priestly creation account, but of the priestly vision as a whole. The Priestly creation account depends on the formation of boundaries, and the ethical counterpart of this cosmology is the Levitical law. Preserving the moral order involves recognizing and maintaining appropriate boundaries between different kinds of animals and observing correct methods of dealing with the unclean. The book of Job, Jacobson says, challenges this worldview in a number of different ways.

---

523 Meier, “Job I-II,” 193. Meier suggests that part of the purpose of Job 1-2 is to fill in the gaps of Genesis 2-3. Where did the serpent come from, and how did he know about the divine command given to humans? Why would the serpent linger at the scene of the crime to receive a punishment, and why would God not give him a chance to explain his action as the humans did? Meier notes that the prologue to Job, when read in light of Genesis 2-3, answers some of these questions (191-192).
ways. In the prologue, Job is presented almost as if he were a parody of a righteous person, making preemptive sacrifices on the chance that one of his offspring has sinned. Not only are the objects of his sacrifice then completely destroyed, he himself is inflicted with a skin disease that would have banished him from the rest of the community.

Job’s opening words after these disasters occurred echo and overturn the Priestly account of creation. Next, Job refers sarcastically to the perception of humanity in Psalm 8 as just a cut below divine, inspired by the place of humanity in the Priestly creation account.

The climax of the book, the divine speeches, are the sharpest critique of all. God takes Job on a tour of the world outside the confines of civilization, boasting about wild animals, many of which would have been considered “unclean.” Regarding the graphic description of birds drinking blood among the dead, Jacobson writes, “No description of a meal and dwelling place could evoke more horror for a follower of the Levitical law than this – to eat blood and to dwell among the dead is the ultimate description of uncleanliness.” The place of Leviathan as king over the beasts topples humanity from its Priestly place at the top of the creation, and God takes delight in and cares for the wild and unclean animals of the earth. Thus, the boundaries so carefully maintained in the priestly vision of the world are blurred. This critique of the worldview presented in the Priestly creation account also invites readers to understand that creation account


528 Jacobson, “God’s Natural Order,” 52-53. Several times throughout the speeches as well, the dialogue participants reiterate the idea that humans are not clean, and that purity and impurity cannot mix (e.g. Job 14:4 and 15:14-16).

529 Jacobson, “God’s Natural Order,” 53-54.
differently, acknowledging that chaos is present even there, in the form of darkness, the sea, and the sea monsters which God created.\footnote{530}

5.1.3 Conclusion

Thus, not only does the doctrine of creation play a large role in both 2 Isaiah and Job, but also, it seems, the authors of the works were familiar and interacted with specific creation traditions that we know from elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible, particularly the Priestly creation story,\footnote{531} and with traditions similar to those we see elsewhere, as in wisdom literature. 2 Isaiah seems quite intent on bringing known creation traditions to the attention of his audience in order to communicate his message of redemption. He also gives the impression of feeling the force of those traditions to the extent that he has to interact with them in a critical way in order to correct misimpressions. This challenges the idea that these traditions are simply supportive evidence and implies that they were a powerful tool for persuading his audience of the authenticity of his message of redemption. The author of Job’s opening speech also uses language and ideas from the Priestly creation account in an apparent attempt to undermine it. That two texts stemming from roughly the same era interact with the same text, albeit in radically different ways, implies that at that time, creation was a hotly contested topic in its own right, not merely a foreign or subsidiary topic permitted to enter Israelite faith at a time when it posed no threat to already entrenched doctrines. That 2 Isaiah could use the idea of creation to authenticate his message, and that the author of Job chose words and images from a

\footnote{530} Jacobson, “God’s Natural Order,” 54-56.

\footnote{531} Some of the connections are more convincing than others; Balentine’s connections between 2 Isaiah and Genesis 1-2, for example, are creative, but seem to me somewhat tenuous.
creation tradition for the opening lines of his dialogues strongly indicate that creation traditions were a force to be reckoned with and a subject of disagreement at this point in time.

5.2 The Divine Speeches

The content of the divine speeches, which is almost entirely centered around the non-human creation, comes as a surprise after reading the first thirty-seven chapters of Job. The reader is ready for God’s appearance, having heard Job time and again beg for a hearing, but not so ready to hear what God has to say. Readers might legitimately expect God to address Job’s complaints, or to explain the situation in some satisfying way, or at least to sympathize with Job. We get none of this. What comes out of the whirlwind is a series of rhetorical questions from God, which apparently aim to communicate to Job that he is a weak and ignorant human being. Not only does this seem like an insensitive response on the part of God, who, the reader knows, has already declared Job innocent yet is ultimately responsible for allowing his suffering; but it also does not seem to tell Job anything he does not already know. Job has readily admitted more than once that he is a helpless human compared to God.

There are two speeches from the whirlwind, each followed by a short response from Job. The first speech from the whirlwind talks about the original creation of the world, the setting of limits for the sea, day and night, and light and darkness. God asks

532 Gordis has quite a different view of God’s response: “The Lord consciously refrains from referring to Job’s suffering, not from callous indifference, but, on the contrary, from exquisite tact and sensibility (The Book of God and Man, 118). No platitude would have been able to help Job; the discussion needed to happen in a different dimension, and that is what God accomplished in the divine speeches, according to Gordis’ interpretation.
questions about Job’s knowledge of meteorological phenomena and the constellations, then surveys the animal kingdom, asking Job if he can provide food for wild animals, or if he knows when they give birth. God inquires about an impressive list of wild animals, demonstrating to Job his inability to control them, and boasting of their magnificent characteristics. Job responds to this onslaught of questions by admitting that he is of small account and will not speak again. God responds by challenging Job to exert power over the proud, but then returns to the subject of the animal kingdom. God gives extended descriptions of Behemoth and Leviathan, apparently taking great pride in their strength and fierceness. Job’s response to this second speech includes the admission that God can do anything, a claim that he has now seen God, and apparently some kind of change in attitude. 533

It is commonplace to observe that these speeches do not really address Job’s plight at all; in fact, in many ways they seem to ignore completely everything that has preceded in the dialogues among Job, his friends, and Elihu. 534 Formerly, scholars were inclined to deal with this fact by denying the original inclusion of some parts or all of these speeches, 535 but the tendency now is to view them as integral to the original form of the book and to try to make sense of them in their context. It is not possible here to give a complete accounting of the many different interpretations of the divine speeches, but

533 Depending on how one reads Job’s final words. See n. 478.

534 “All commentators find the divine speech highly scandalous, in so far as it bypasses completely Job’s particular concerns, and because in it Yahweh in no way condescends to any kind of self-interpretation” (von Rad, Wisdom in Israel, 225).

some representative examples can show the basic categories of thought regarding the
meaning of the divine speeches within the book of Job.

On one end of the spectrum are those interpretations of the divine speeches that
lead to the condemnation of the character of God. John Briggs Curtis offers one of the
blunter and more unsympathetic portrayals of God in his analysis of Job’s two responses
to the divine speeches in Job 40:4-5 and 42:2-6.\textsuperscript{536} Noting the difficulty surrounding the
Hebrew text of the latter passage, Curtis suggests the following for an interpretation of
the final verse: “Therefore I feel loathing contempt and revulsion [toward you, O God];
and I am sorry for frail man.” Curtis understands the former passage to be a sarcastic
pronouncement that he will keep quiet because it is useless to talk to God.\textsuperscript{537} Curtis’
interpretation of the divine speech(es) makes this response on Job’s part intelligible; on
his reading, God tries to crush Job with a blatant display of power. The problem is that
Job has never denied God’s power; Job’s concern is with his innocent suffering, an issue
which God ignores completely. Not only does God declare that there is no such thing as
divine justice, God informed Job of that fact by a contemptuous and arrogant speech from
the whirlwind, much like a bully who refuses to answer the questions of his victim

\begin{quotation}
\textsuperscript{536} Curtis, “On Job’s Response to Yahweh,” 497-511. It should be noted that Curtis is dealing with
a truncated version of the divine speeches; he considers that there was originally only one divine speech
that did not include the Behemoth and Leviathan pericopes or the poem about the ostrich, and one response
on the part of Job that has been split into two (498-499). Others who share Curtis’ general interpretation of
the divine speeches are Greenstein, (“In Job’s Face/Facing Job,” 306-313) and Jack Miles (\textit{God: A
Biography} [New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1995], 315. Greenstein criticizes the subjectivity of those who try
to defend God or draw out implications of God’s goodness from the divine speeches, reading them instead
as God “brow-beating” Job with questions that are supposed to show Job how weak he is – a fact of which
Job is already all too aware. Miles reads the narrative of the book as Satan tricking God into attacking Job,
and, when God finds himself in a bind because of Job’s integrity, responds “with withering sarcasm and
towering bravado…regally changing the subject.”

\textsuperscript{537} Curtis’ paraphrase of Job 40:4 reads, “Although I dealt with matters that to you are trivial when
I spoke earlier, I will now with contemptuous revulsion cease speaking altogether” (“On Job’s Response to
Yahweh,” 507).
\end{quotation}
because he is bigger.\textsuperscript{538} Realizing that justice is not to be found with God, Job utterly rejects the deity.\textsuperscript{539}

A similar image of a protesting Job is evident in Leo Perdue’s interpretation of the divine speeches.\textsuperscript{540} Perdue judges that the divine speeches are a challenge to Job, whom God holds in contempt, and their purpose is to show Job that only God is capable of ruling the cosmos and to bring Job to his knees in humility. In response to God’s mocking questions about Job’s inability to govern the wild areas and animals of the earth, Job declines to answer, given his new insight that humanity is of so little account. Not having succeeded in sufficiently humbling Job, God goes on the attack more vigorously, describing the chaos monsters against whom Job poses no competition for supremacy. This second divine speech implies that God created evil, in the form of the chaos monsters, and the monsters are merely restrained, not eliminated.\textsuperscript{541} For Perdue, Job’s response to God in Job 42:2-6 is a confirmation that Job was right all along – God is unjust and does not rule with compassion, and deviously tries to hide this fact from humanity – and Job protests against this divine abuse.\textsuperscript{542}

On the other end of the spectrum are those who interpret the character of God very charitably. These readers understand God to be communicating something new to Job, which, once he has grasped it, causes a change in his attitude. For Habel, this communication involves the sometimes comic celebration of God’s design in creation,

\textsuperscript{538} Curtis, “On Job’s Response to Yahweh,” 508.
\textsuperscript{539} Curtis, “On Job’s Response to Yahweh,” 510.
\textsuperscript{540} Perdue, \textit{Wisdom Literature}, 117-126.
\textsuperscript{541} Perdue, \textit{Wisdom Literature}, 124-125.
\textsuperscript{542} Perdue, \textit{Wisdom Literature}, 126.
and the declarations that paradox is part of existence in the world.\textsuperscript{543} God does not ignore Job’s situation but challenges him to reorient himself with the perspective of the design of the cosmos.\textsuperscript{544} In this design there is no easy answer for innocent suffering. At the same time, God shows Job the divine care for wild animals, and the implication for Habel is that God cares for humans just as intimately.\textsuperscript{545} The second divine speech demonstrates God’s admission that evil exists, but that evil is controlled and limited. In the extended descriptions of Behemoth and Leviathan, God is inviting Job to compare himself to those fellow creatures, and to recognize that God is as capable of dealing with Job’s protests as with Behemoth and Leviathan.\textsuperscript{546}

Janzen takes a slightly different approach, though is in basic agreement with this positive portrayal of God’s character. He interprets the rhetorical questions of the divine speeches as ironic, with the effect that the true meaning of the divine speeches is quite different from what they appear on the surface to mean. While it would seem that God’s questions are taunts designed to uncover Job’s ignorance and powerlessness, Janzen reads them as positive affirmations of things Job does know and is capable of doing. For example, when God asks Job if he has seen the gates of death, or where the place of darkness is, Janzen thinks Job’s unspoken answer, based on his experience of suffering,


\textsuperscript{544} Habel, \textit{The Book of Job}, 534.

\textsuperscript{545} Habel, \textit{The Book of Job}, 534, 544.

\textsuperscript{546} Habel, \textit{The Book of Job}, 558-561.
can very legitimately be understood as affirmative.\textsuperscript{547} The almost complete absence of humanity from the divine speeches does not imply the decentralization of humanity from creation, but rather a changed understanding of how humans should exert lordship over the creation.\textsuperscript{548} Thus, the author of Job is appearing to tout conventional wisdom about creation but is actually subverting that wisdom to say something about the divine image in human beings. The divine speeches probe “Job’s willingness to enter upon human vocation to royal rule in the image of God, when the implications of that image are intimated in terms of innocent suffering.”\textsuperscript{549} Reading the divine speeches with the background of Psalm 8, Janzen sees all the animals, Behemoth and Leviathan included, as among those things which are placed under humanity’s feet (Ps 8:6). Behind Job’s complaints is the mistaken assumption that God dominates creation with a top-down, coercive kind of rule; this mistaken assumption is challenged as God shows Job a new (and divine) way of ruling.\textsuperscript{550}

Another approach to the divine speeches is to distance oneself from making any kind of moral judgment of God at all, the approach Newsom takes in \textit{The Book of Job}.\textsuperscript{551} She interprets the divine speeches in light of the notion of the sublime. The divine speeches are altogether different from what has preceded them in the book of Job, and are


\textsuperscript{548} Janzen, \textit{Job}, 241.

\textsuperscript{549} Janzen, \textit{Job}, 225.

\textsuperscript{550} Janzen, \textit{Job}, 244-245.

designed to overwhelm Job (and the reader) by something beyond what the mind can comprehend.\textsuperscript{552} Newsom contrasts the final speech of Job (Job 29-31) with the divine speeches, considering them to be connected but divergent in key ways.\textsuperscript{553} Job’s final speech is characterized by his conception of the world as going out from the patriarchal center, as he talks about his family circle, his status as an elder at the gate, and his social obligations to dependents. The wilderness is decidedly outside his comfort zone. God, on the other hand, focuses almost entirely on the periphery of the world, including the wilderness. Thus there is a tension between Job’s words and God’s that is under the surface rather than explicitly discussed.\textsuperscript{554} God’s words describe increasingly unfamiliar and threatening phenomena, ending with chaos personified in the form of Leviathan, whom God describes in a way reminiscent of divinity.\textsuperscript{555} The effect is that, while Job identified God with himself, and interpreted his circumstances accordingly, God portrays the divine self as identified with the chaotic and wild. Newsom concludes that it is Job’s obsession with order that is being critiqued; God has shown that chaos is alive and well in the creation, and so Job has no choice but to abandon the notion of the moral order that he depended upon for his security. This experience of the sublime is at once tragic and exhilarating, causing an existential change in Job.\textsuperscript{556} In all this, the voice of God is not an

\textsuperscript{552} Newsom, \textit{The Book of Job}, 236-237.

\textsuperscript{553} Newsom, \textit{The Book of Job}, 239.

\textsuperscript{554} Newsom, \textit{The Book of Job}, 240-241.

\textsuperscript{555} Newsom, \textit{The Book of Job}, 251.

\textsuperscript{556} Newsom, \textit{The Book of Job}, 252-256. Newsom’s view seems to me to be a more extended and developed version of Tsevat and Daily. Tsevat (“The Meaning of the Book of Job”), although not condemning God, reads the divine speeches as communicating that God is neither just nor unjust, and that the world lacks the kind of morality Job once thought it had. Nevertheless, Job’s relationship with God is maintained in Job’s experience of God’s accessibility (105). Thomas F. Daily takes a similar approach,
authoritative voice, either abusive or caring, that brings resolution, but seems to perpetuate the ambiguity of the rest of the book.  

It is somewhat surprising that such a limited amount of text can elicit such a wide range of responses. The variety of interpretations can be explained in part based on the nature of the text in its context. The above interpretations of the divine speeches depend to a very great extent on the interpreters’ perceptions of how they fit with the rest of the book. If the divine speeches do not respond to Job’s basic complaint, as Curtis and Perdue maintain, the character of God is construed very differently than if the speeches are relevant to Job’s state of mind, as Habel and Janzen believe. The tone of voice in which one imagines God delivering the speeches also plays a significant role in how one perceives them. The truth of Newsom’s cautionary words is demonstrated:

The desire to make the text say what one wants it to say and needs it to say is very powerful. This impulse is as strong among those who wish to discredit the God of the book as it is among those who wish to defend and protect that God.  

saying that Job recognizes the lack of justice in the world, but a mystical experience of God allows him to live with the discomfort (“The Aesthetics of Repentance: Re-Reading the Phenomenon of Job,” *BTB* 23 [1993]: 64-70; “And Yet He Repents – On Job 42.6,” *ZAW* 105 [1993]: 205-209). All three views entail an acknowledgement of the lack of justice (or, at least, justice as humans think of it) in the world combined with an experience of the deity that allows the relationship between divine and human to be preserved.


The tendency seems to be to read God’s questions as combative and meant to diminish Job, but, as Balentine argues, they do not have to be understood in that way. He points to the very similar line of questioning in Isaiah 40 as a counterexample to this tendency; there, the questions are not designed to diminish Israel and Jacob but to give them comfort and assurance (*Job*, 633-634).

Newsom, “Re-considering Job,” 175.
5.3 The Divine Response

The above reactions to the divine speeches all have some merit, but each one seems lacking in some respects. This is perhaps inevitable, because the divine speeches are delivered in poetic and multifaceted language so that it is impossible to boil the meaning down into one simple point or message. Curtis, Perdue, and other readers of Job who judge the character of God severely, and see God as uncaring, powerless, or amoral do have forceful evidence to back up their judgments. Perhaps if we readers knew only what Job knew – that he suffered though innocent, and in the end, God responded with the equivalent of the familiar parental response, “trust me, I know more than you and I have it under control” – we might not take offense at the divine speeches. The fact is, however, that we are privy to information that Job does not have, and God does not emerge from the narrative frame without a blemish. God is the author of Job’s undeserved suffering, even if the adversary is the immediate cause of the suffering. This is bad enough, but when God responds to Job’s heartfelt pleas for a hearing after the fashion of what we read in the divine speeches, “trust me, I know more than you and I have it under control” seems like hollow comfort at best, and unfeeling cruelty at worst. The conclusion that God does not care for Job, cannot defeat evil, or has no moral reason to eliminate suffering is not an unreasonable one to reach. On the other hand, this conclusion disregards certain facets of the divine speeches as well. God’s boasting about divine power involves rather tender and intimate imagery, of swaddling baby sea, finding food for young animals, tipping over heavenly jars of water for rain, and knowing when mother goats and deer give birth. If God meant only to bully Job, God chose rather unconventional word pictures to do so.
On the other side, interpretations like Habel’s and Janzen’s seem to come with blinders as well. They take account of the speeches’ portrayal of divine care for the non-human world, and they are attuned to the nuances and ambiguities of the word pictures God employs. However, they also require extensive reading between the lines, as well as incorporation of previous knowledge of God from other parts of the Hebrew Bible. After all, there is arguably nothing in the book of Job by itself that explicitly communicates that God cares about or loves human beings; this aspect of God’s character is embraced based on texts outside Job. In addition, the book of Job gives no indication that humans occupy a special place in the order of creation; this belief is also imported from texts outside the book of Job. Ignored is the apparently abominable behavior of God, who freely admitted that the divine attack on Job was inflicted for no reason, and the trite (or perhaps ironic) ending in which God capriciously gave back to Job everything that had been taken away, and more – as if this could make up for Job’s suffering.

Because of the ambiguity and open-endedness of the divine speeches and Job’s responses to them, refraining from moral judgment of God, as Newsom does, is a tempting response. If God’s voice is not the authoritative answer to the problems of the book, but one voice in the harmony, the reader does not either have to reject God or massage the speeches to fit with a positive image previously held. That God is associated with the wild and the chaotic is not a problem as long as it is not the definitive response to Job’s (and humans’) suffering touted by the book. However, I am left with the same discomfort that Levenson and Schifferdecker have with Newsom’s polyphonic reading of the text – it is unlikely that the original readers would have understood the text this way,
or that the author would have portrayed the character of Israel’s deity from such a
dispassionate distance.  

It is certainly not my goal here to boil down the meaning of the divine speeches to
some new point or message that is intended to replace previous interpretations, but rather
to explore how it might affect our reading of the speeches to understand them as a
response to the criticisms leveled by Job at various points in his speeches – specifically
his bitter words about divine attention toward humans (as in Job 7:17-18), the exertion of
divine power in creation (as in Job 9:2-12), and the idea of divine action in the human
and non-human world (as in Job 12:7-25). If I am also not exempt from the desire to have
the text say what I want it to say, then my impulse is to interpret the words of God
charitably unless it becomes impossible to do so, and without bracketing out of the
interpretation the character of God established in other texts that would likely have been
known to the earliest readers of Job. My own inclination is to see the divine speeches as
an integral part of the book that communicate something of value, and that are an
intelligible, if somewhat ambiguous and puzzling, response to the dialogues that make up
the first thirty-one (or thirty-seven) chapters of the book.  

Although the divine speeches do seem to disregard the main problem that most
contemporary readers find in the book, that of innocent suffering, they nevertheless
indirectly address much of the content of the earlier parts of the book. I concur with
Habel who sees “repeated allusions, innuendos, and ironic hints at earlier claims and

---

accusations of Job, and he is not the only one to point out the affinities between Job 3-31 (or 37) and Job 38-41. While not discounting the difficulty of the problem of innocent suffering, I would like to pursue the question of how the divine speeches respond to other issues like those raised in the parodies of Job 7:17-19; 9:2-12; and 12:7-25. If indeed we can see these as critiques posed by the author of Job of some of the prevalent ideas of his day, looking to the divine speeches for another perspective has the potential to give insight into how he came to terms with the problems he raised.

5.3.1 Divine Attention to the Human Creation

The book of Job, whatever else it is, seems to be a testing of various perspectives regarding the nature of humankind and its place in the world. On the one hand, Job has bitter things to say about being an object of attention for God; he finds it oppressive and constricting and wants nothing more than to be left alone. On the other hand, he is very cognizant of his status as having been created by God out of dust and clay. The tension inherent in this dual view cannot escape anyone who is taught that he or she is, on the one hand, a divine image bearer and ruler over creation, and on the other hand, made from dust (or a rib, as the case may be). The reality of living with those two identities leads to a crisis situation for Job; he is mere clay and so cannot fight God, but he is also the object of special and unwanted attention from a God with whom he despairs of getting an audience. The story set up by the prologue unmask– deliberately, in my opinion – the

561 See the list in Habel, The Book of Job, 530-532.
dark side of being an object of God’s special attention.\textsuperscript{563} For Job, at any rate, such notice had disastrous effects that he experienced as a mere mortal, subject to sorrow and wasting illness.

I think Fishbane, Balentine, and Jacobson are correct to see a critique of aspects of the Priestly cosmology in Job 7:17-18, and, in a less direct way, in the prologue and Job 3.\textsuperscript{564} It is, of course, much easier to criticize someone else’s view than to articulate a coherent and defensible view of one’s own, but I think that is just what the author of the divine speeches intends to do in response to the ridicule from Job of the incongruity that places frail humanity at the height of the created order. How scholars view that response generally goes in two incompatible directions.

One direction, taken by Janzen and Balentine, leads to the conclusion that the status of humankind is elevated by God. Part of Janzen’s interpretation of the divine speeches involves reading them ironically, as communicating the exact opposite of what they seem to communicate. They seem to communicate that humans are lowly and weak and powerless, but, Janzen says, what they really convey is that humans are, like the Priestly account of creation and Psalm 8 teach, rulers over creation. The divine speeches are an invitation to humans to take on that role.\textsuperscript{565} Balentine’s view of the divine response to the place of humanity in the created order is that it challenges Job rather than

\textsuperscript{563} For any positive evaluation of God’s character, the prologue poses the greatest difficulty. God is caught red-handed, so to speak, and openly confesses to having attacked Job for no reason. I read this narrative, not as a genuine portrayal of the character of God, but as an ironic portrayal of the idea that the author is trying to repudiate – that humans occupy a prominent place in relation to the deity.

\textsuperscript{564} See especially Jacobson, “God’s Natural Order.”

\textsuperscript{565} Janzen, \textit{Job}, 225-227.
condemns him.\textsuperscript{566} God questions Job as a mighty man, and when Job responds to the first round of questions with silence, God, desiring interaction rather than silence, continues with a second round.\textsuperscript{567} Like Janzen, Balentine reads the divine speeches as perpetuating the vision of humanity in Genesis 1 and Psalm 8. Behemoth and Leviathan serve as role models for Job, who is to imitate them in all their power and strength.\textsuperscript{568} On this view, the divine speeches reaffirm the hierarchy that places humanity in a special position in and relationship to the rest of creation.

The other direction, taken by Perdue, leads to the conclusion that humans have a position that is diminished compared to the rest of creation. The absence of humans from the divine speeches, combined with an interpretation of Job’s responses to those speeches that entails Job’s forthright acknowledgement that he is of little account to God, are indications that the Priestly view of humanity has been rejected by the author of Job. Perdue writes,

\begin{quote}
In a striking repudiation of an anthropology in which humans are kings in God’s creation, Yahweh speaks of sustaining a world hostile to human life. The anthropological tradition grounded in the metaphor of humanity as king is shattered.\textsuperscript{569}
\end{quote}

It is both amusing and rather frustrating that the exact same speeches communicate opposite impressions to readers. It seems to me that neither extreme quite captures the divine response. It is hard to accept, as Janzen does, that the divine speeches

\textsuperscript{566} Balentine, “What Are Human Beings, That You Make So Much of Them?” 265.

\textsuperscript{567} Balentine, “What Are Human Beings, That You Make So Much of Them?” 266-267.


\textsuperscript{569} Perdue, \textit{Wisdom and Creation}, 184.
speak so equivocally as to be communicating the exact opposite message from what they appear to be communicating. Given Job’s resentful portrayal of the Priestly view of humankind, as well as the terrifying implications of being an object of God’s special – even positive – attention, communicated by the prologue, I do not think our author meant to build up the exact same structure in the divine speeches that he just finished pulling down in Job’s. On the other hand, Perdue’s interpretation, which is essentially the marginalization of humanity within the creation, does not take account of the fact that God is giving Job four chapters’ worth of personal and undivided attention.\textsuperscript{570} Neither perspective addresses Job’s problem. Job’s problem, it seems to me, is not that he believes he is the royal ruler of creation who has a special relationship with God, nor that he realizes he is fragile clay, but that he is supposed to be a royal ruler made of fragile clay. The tension is the issue, and reading the divine speeches as choosing the former option (Janzen\textsuperscript{571} and Balentine) or the latter (Perdue) does not solve the problem.

It will be noted that all explicit evaluations of the status of humanity are offered by humans, and not by God. There is nothing overt in what God says that either demeans humans or elevates them. The friends have all sorts of perceptions of humans – that they are maggots, impure, lowly – but God does not pass judgment in that way. Neither does God indicate that humans have a special role to play in the creation; in fact, God indicates

\textsuperscript{570} As various commentators have observed (e.g. von Rad, \textit{Wisdom in Israel}, 223; Janzen, \textit{Job}, 241).

\textsuperscript{571} Janzen does attempt to hold on to this tension: “Does not dust itself, without ceasing to be dust, begin to become aware of an unimaginable destiny? And does not royalty, without ceasing to be royalty, begin to become aware of the conditions under which and the modes in which its royal power is to be exercised?” (Job, 13). I appreciate what he is trying to do here; nevertheless, I still judge that he emphasizes the “unimaginable destiny” aspect of being human, without allowing the full weight of the critique of the prologue and Job 7:17-19 to enter into the picture.
the opposite when he implies that Job is unable to exert authority over the animals or other humans. God relates to Job much as God relates to the other creatures: God boasts about Job in front of one of his fellow creatures, and interacts with him in response to his particular circumstances. Unlike the impersonal orders in the Priestly conception of creation (“Let the waters be gathered…”), in the divine speeches God’s word is in direct, second person address (“Thus far shall you come…”), and that is how God addresses Job as well (“I will question you…”). That Job is dust and ashes is not an issue; God interacts in the same way with all creatures, from the ridiculous ostrich and the weakest baby bird to the most powerful sea monster. To borrow a modern word picture, Job has conceptualized the creation as a pyramid, but God redraws it into a web. In that web, God deals with Job the human creature in the same way as the other creatures – personally and according to his capacity, a capacity that does not match that of Leviathan, but also, we might flatter ourselves, is perhaps greater than that of the ostrich. In that web, each creature is the protagonist of its own world, but not of God’s world. Thus, God’s answer to the question, “What are humans…?” is that they are merely one creature among

---

572 As Newsom pointed out, the divine response in Job is unparalleled in similar literature, “something of a tour de force” (Newsom, The Book of Job, 238). This unexpected address further highlights the aspect of personal interaction that is characteristic of the divine speeches.

573 For this understanding of the meaning of the divine speeches, I am indebted to Eleanore Stump’s description of “second person accounts” in the narrative of Job (Wandering in Darkness: Narrative and the Problem of Evil).
many, and therefore, paradoxically, worthy of God’s benevolent and personal attention.

5.3.2 The Exertion of Divine Power over Creation

I argued above that Job criticizes a particular kind of manifestation of divine power in Job 9:2-12. Whereas elsewhere, notably 2 Isaiah, such limitless power over creation is a source of comfort for humans and effects their redemption, for Job that power generates abject terror and despair. He portrays it as destructive for the creation and as something against which mere creatures have no recourse.

For many readers, one of the more offensive aspects of the divine speeches is the overt display of divine power, in light of Job’s painful circumstances as well as the fact that he has freely and repeatedly acknowledged God’s superior strength. Janzen’s way of dealing with this problem is again to turn the overt message on its head and suggest that God is communicating that Job does have the power and the knowledge that the (ironic) rhetorical questions seem to imply he lacks. Again, however, I find Janzen’s ironic reading implausible, as well as the notion that the author of Job might be building up the same image of domineering and coercive divine power that he so unmistakably


575 My understanding of the divine speeches is very similar to Schifferdecker’s given above, but I refrain, as she does not, from extricating some kind of existential comfort for suffering out of this view of creation. If Job, or any reader, finds comfort in the midst of suffering from having gained a wider perspective of the world, that is a side effect and not a cure. This interpretation of the divine speeches is addressed to Job’s question, “Who am I?” rather than, “How do I process my suffering?”


577 Janzen, Job, 236.
attempted to attack in the speeches of Job. Clearly he had some problem with conventional ways of portraying divine power over creation that he had learned elsewhere, and, I argued in Chapter 4, may even have parodied specific texts in 2 Isaiah to point out their deficiencies.

It has been argued that the divine speeches answer specific complaints of Job as he articulated them in his speech of Job 9-10. Job envisions God as shaking the earth from its place so that its pillars tremble (Job 9:6); God, however, claims to have set the earth firmly on its cornerstone (Job 38:6). Job accused God of telling the sun not to rise (Job 9:7), but God commands daybreak to send the wicked scurrying (Job 38:12-13). Job has claimed that God trampled on the back of the sea (Job 9:8). The image of God swaddling the sea could not present a more contrasting image to the violence Job assumed in his assessment of God’s interaction with the sea. It is almost as if Job is offended on behalf of the world for God’s disregard for it, and so it is on that level that God addresses Job.

If I am right that the divine speeches do not simply recreate the picture of divine power that was so odious to Job, then what do they reveal about divine power? In general, they reveal a novel way of exercising power that is completely absent from Job’s mental picture of an all-powerful God. The image of power in the divine speeches includes knowing where light and dark reside in order to walk them home, and knowing


579 D. L. Tönsing, “The Use of Creation Language and the Meaning of Suffering,” *Scriptura* (1996): 444. Tönsing relates God’s response in Job 38 to both Job 3 and Job 9, where Job questions the order of the universe. Tönsing sees God as responding with the claim that there is order in the universe, although there is room for chaos, relating this idea, interestingly, to chaos theory in physics (446-447).

the right time to retrieve precipitation from storage and where to send it. It involves leading the stars out like a puppy on a leash to their place in the sky, and foraging for food on behalf of animals. It means intimate knowledge of the birthing habits of wild animals, and relishing the wild freedom of wilderness creatures. More to the point, it is voluntarily limited power that nurtures and treats the other as an other, delighting in its independent existence, rather than unlimited power that destroys or disregards the other.\textsuperscript{581} God does not act on creation so much as interact with it, cooperating with the various creatures as agents in their own right as they engage in behavior appropriate to their kind.

The section of the divine speeches that might contradict this image of divine power is Job 40:8-14.

Will you even put me in the wrong? Will you condemn me that you may be justified? Have you an arm like God, and can you thunder with a voice like his? Deck yourself with majesty and dignity; clothe yourself with glory and splendor. Pour out the overflowings of your anger, and look on all who are proud, and abase them. Look on all who are proud, and bring them low; tread down the wicked where they stand. Hide them all in the dust together; bind their faces in the world below. Then I will also acknowledge to you that your own right hand can give you victory.

Read in one sense, this does appear to be unconscionable bullying on the part of God, who rubs Job’s face in his inability to govern the world as God can. However, it must be observed that nowhere else in the divine speeches does God portray the divine self as interacting with other creatures, even the most proud and fearsome, in this way. Divine power to this point has been about knowledge and cooperation, not angry outbursts or

\textsuperscript{581} This fact is a further indication to me that the portrayal of God in the prologue is meant to be ironic, and to expose the dark side of the image of God as exerting limitless power to act upon creatures.
humiliation and destruction. This description of the manifestation of power is akin to Job’s descriptions, not God’s. As such, I read it as sarcasm on God’s part; after God’s own unconventional description of the exertion of divine power, God ironically invites Job to exercise power the way he had previously believed a deity would exercise it.

5.3.3 Divine Action in the World

In Job 12:7-25 Job parodies the reversal of fortune motif, an idea found in Psalm 107 and Isa 41:17-20, among other places. It will be remembered that 2 Isaiah has claimed that God reverses fortunes – loosening the loins of kings and treading down nations before Cyrus, for example – all for the sake of the restoration of Israel and Jacob. Job, on the other hand, claimed that God uses the elements of creation for destruction instead of redemption and that God reverses fortunes – loosening the belts of kings and making nations great and destroying them, for example – for no apparent purpose whatsoever. There are those who understand Job’s words here to be a critique of so-called “salvation history.” Perdue even sees in Job 12:7-25 an allusion to the events of the exile:

Indeed, Job uses creation theology to oppose the validity of salvation history and even refers briefly to the exile’s devastation of kingship, political counselors, royal judges, administrative officers, and temple priests. Schifferdecker communicates the same idea, though in slightly different words, proposing that the author of Job chose to address Job’s situation in terms of creation

because the framework of the covenant between God and Israel was not effective for addressing whatever tragedy he was facing, which she suggests may have been the exile.

Interpreting Job 12:7-25 as a reference to – and denigration of – salvation history has led to two different responses, stemming from different interpretations of the book of Job and particularly the divine speeches. Frank Moore Cross judges that the God of salvation history has been rejected based on his evaluation of Job’s critique of the obsolete Priestly and Deuteronomistic theologies that saw God’s handiwork in historical events:

The argument of Job attacked the central theme of Israel’s religion. It repudiated the God of history whose realm is politics, law, and justice, whose delight is to lift up the poor and to free the slave. The God who called Israel out of Egypt, who spoke by prophet, the covenant God of Deuteronomy, did not reveal himself to Job…There is a sense in which Job brought the ancient religion of Israel to an end. History to Job was opaque. Job viewed the flux of history in despair: he detected no pattern of meaning there. History was a riddle beyond man’s fathoming. The Lord of history failed to act.

For Cross, while the book of Job plays a role in the evolution of Israelite religion, it marks a point of sharp divergence from what went before, in its repudiation of the God of the Deuteronomistic History and its revival of the archaic patriarchal God of the ancient

583 Israel Knohl seems to share this perspective. In a brief excursus in his The Sanctuary of Silence, he highlights the dispute between the author of Job and the “Priestly Torah” (PT). After noting the differences between the status of the human person in PT and in the divine speeches of Job, Knohl says, “From the language and style of the book of Job it is clear that the author wished to assume the atmosphere of the Genesis period and the times of the patriarchs. This serves to magnify his argument with PT, since the implication is that the most exalted religious conception had already come into the world, even before the appearance of Moses and the revelation of the Tetragrammaton, outside of Israel! The attainment of exalted faith consciousness is not dependent, then, according to the book of Job, on national belonging; it is not tied to the revelation of a particular divine name, nor to the giving of the teaching and the commandments, nor to the observance of a Temple ritual” (167).

myths who defeated the chaos monster. The ancient Israelite religion that was concerned with God’s action in history was decisively rejected by the author of Job, who turned down another path, which, Cross seems to think, reached something of a dead end. It fell to figures such as 2 Isaiah to create a new version of the old faith.  

Janzen accepts the reality of the critique, but concludes instead that it leads to “an implicit deepening and transformation of Israel’s understanding of creation, covenant, and history.” He argues that the book of Job is more at home in historical Israelite faith than Cross allows. Among other things, it is YHWH, not El or Baal, who speaks from the storm, a tradition also attested in Exodus 19-20, and 2 Isaiah demonstrates that the deity associated with the old creation myths can also be concerned with the events of history (Isa 51:9-11). He relates the book of Job to the creation traditions of Genesis at least as much as those associated with the defeat of chaos. In short, the composition of the book of Job was a sign not that Israel’s ancient religion was at an end, but that it was subject to profound critique from within.

It is tempting to read Job 12:7-25 as a critique of salvation history in the sense that Perdue, Cross, and Janzen read it. Indeed, I agree that Job is voicing a scathing condemnation of something here, but two considerations speak against reading this as a critique of salvation history specifically. First, as Perdue pointed out in another place, the sages did not tend to include the ideas of salvation history or election theology in their

---

585 Cross, Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic, 344-345.
586 Janzen, Job, 13.
587 Janzen, Job, 13.
writings.\textsuperscript{588} Since that is the case, it would be rather surprising if the author of Job did address these issues. In fact, he set his story decidedly outside of salvation history, creating a non-Israelite main character who lived outside the land of Israel before the Israelis existed. Second, a thorough examination of this passage shows it to be addressing not just God’s dealings with humans, but also God’s dealings with the non-human world, which indicates that Job is launching an attack at a larger and more generalized idea than God’s interaction with a specific human community. His critique involves God’s action in the world in general, and it has to do with the apparent meaninglessness and destruction that characterizes God’s interaction with all aspects of the created world, whether human or non-human. The accusation that God acts in a meaningless and destructive way in the world is different than the accusation that God failed to act in salvation history. It may be that the author has in mind the Babylonian exile as a specific manifestation of this meaninglessness, as Perdue claims, or it may be that the author is simply observing the world around him – he certainly gives an apt description of any number of political upheavals that seemed to plague his corner of the world from the time of the Assyrians to the time of the Romans. In any case, once again it is reasonable to believe that our author is, in the divine speeches, building something constructive out of the fragments of what Job has torn apart. If Job disparaged the idea of meaningful divine action in the world, what did the author of Job build up in its place?

Job 12:7-25 is, not implausibly, considered an ironic foreshadowing of the divine speeches. The theme of Job 12:7-12 is creation; Job appeals to the animals, whose

\textsuperscript{588} Perdue, \textit{Wisdom and Creation}, 326-327. See Chapter 5.1.2. The earliest indication of a link between creation theology and salvation history came with Ben Sira.
domain is the land, the birds, whose domain is the air, and the fish, whose domain is the sea – in other words, every level of creation – to give instruction about God’s action in the world.\(^{589}\) In the narrative of the book, Job does not yet realize what the reader has already discovered or will discover – it is these animals that occupy the land, air, and sea that God uses to instruct Job at the climax of the book.\(^{590}\) Similar to the case of Job 9, there are additional ways in which one can understand specific parts of the divine speeches responding to Job’s words in this passage. In Job 12:22 and 25, for example, Job claims that God brings out darkness and makes nations wander about in darkness; in Job 38:2, God accuses Job of bringing darkness.\(^{591}\) God is not in the business of tearing down (Job 12:14), but of building (Job 38:4-7). The only thing God shuts in (Job 12:14) is the sea (Job 38:8-11); otherwise God sets creatures free (Job 39:5-12; 40:24-32). Job sees God as employing the elements of nature for destruction and death (Job 12:15); God builds a canal for the water in order to bring new life to a land even where no humans live (Job 39:25-27).\(^{592}\) Canal-building is typically a human project that involves the intentional manipulation of the natural world for some productive purpose. It is often quite labor-intensive, and so cannot be undertaken arbitrarily or without careful planning and forethought. This image of self-controlled and purposeful divine activity in creation is the polar opposite of Job’s image of the way God brings water in a devastating flood.

\(^{589}\) Swanepoel, “Job 12 – (An)other Anticipation of the Voice from the Whirlwind?” 192-193. Swanepoel agrees with Fohrer and others that these are an insertion into the text, although he attempts to see even these additions in relation to the book as a whole, probing what purpose their composer had for adding them.

\(^{590}\) Swanepoel, “Job 12,” 203; Clines, *Job 1-20*, 293.


\(^{592}\) Habel, *The Book of Job*, 531.
In general, Job has claimed that God’s acts in the human and non-human world are meaningless and bring chaos and destruction; in the divine speeches God acts in a meaningful way in the natural world to promote freedom and life. The absence of humanity from this picture is problematic for some, but the divine speeches have not excluded humans from the overall picture so much as allotted them a place on par with the rest of the world. As such, humans are beneficiaries of God’s actions in the world, but not the exclusive beneficiaries and not in pride of place at the top of God’s priority list. One might even differ with Cross and say that meaningful divine action in the world leaves plenty of room for meaningful divine action in the events of salvation history – though the author of Job does not take his own claims in that specific direction.

In his article “The Loss and Recovery of Creation in Old Testament Theology,” Walter Brueggemann traced the historical changes that accompanied the changes in scholars’ perceptions of the role of creation in Israelite faith. Noting von Rad’s dichotomy between the doctrine of redemption and the doctrine of creation, he suggested that it was framed in terms of the antagonism between “faith” and “natural religion” which reflected the struggle between the “Confessing Church” and the “German Christians,” where faith clearly came out the winner. The idea of an independent doctrine of creation was associated with natural religion and was thus marginalized in Old Testament theology.\footnote{Brueggemann, “The Loss and Recovery of Creation in Old Testament Theology,” 177-178.} Beginning in the 1960’s and 1970’s, this antagonistic model was called into question, particularly by Westermann, who considered that creation and history go hand in hand.\footnote{Brueggemann, “The Loss and Recovery of Creation in Old Testament Theology,” 180.} Westermann drew attention to the fact that the creation figures
in the historical and prophetic books, Psalms, and Wisdom literature, and asserted that it is an essential part of the Israelite understanding of God.\textsuperscript{595} Westermann judged that the action of God as creator is separate from God’s acts in history, the former of which “is not redemptive, not a special work aimed at a special people and a special history, but a universal work.”\textsuperscript{596} Since salvation history is prefaced by primeval history (including creation), it is necessarily in the context of that more universal work of God as creator, which involves all humanity in its scope.\textsuperscript{597}

Brueggemann relates the timing of this shift, and the renewal of interest in wisdom literature in general, to the historical events of the day, such as the Civil Rights movement and the Vietnam conflict, not suggesting a causal connection, but noting that a new historical context made the old way of framing the issues of creation and salvation history obsolete.\textsuperscript{598} As it has been observed, the salvation history model is not very helpful when it comes to addressing the ecological crisis and nuclear war.\textsuperscript{599} I am not suggesting that the shift Brueggemann describes with regard to the place of creation in Old Testament theology is a direct analogue to what was taking place at the time of the author of Job. However, it might be a helpful framework for understanding what the author of Job was doing as a constructive rather than a destructive enterprise, and for avoiding the temptation to analyze the message of Job in terms of an antagonism between


\textsuperscript{596} Westermann, “Creation and History in the Old Testament,” 15.

\textsuperscript{597} Westermann, “Creation and History in the Old Testament,” 17.

\textsuperscript{598} Brueggemann, “The Loss and Recovery of Creation in Old Testament Theology,” 182.

creation and salvation history as do Cross, Perdue, and – it may be recalled – Pfeiffer. Indeed, it is an indication of the hegemony of the salvation history model that Job’s critique of God’s action in the world in Job 12:7-25 is equated with a critique of God’s (in)action in salvation history. If Westermann is correct in his judgment that the idea of God as creator is essential in Israelite religion and that it represents a more universal work of God than salvation history, it is not necessary to conclude that the author of Job is rejecting the covenant God of salvation history any more than the change with respect to the place of creation in Old Testament theology entailed the rejection of a legitimate place for salvation history in Old Testament theology. Rather, I would argue, in consonance with his identity as a sage, the author of Job chose as his framework for making sense of whatever circumstances or events led to the scathing parody of Job 12:7-25 the idea of God as creator, who, by virtue of being the creator had a relationship with all creatures, a relationship that promoted life, well-being and blessing for each creature. He had a sharp critique to offer some aspects of his tradition, and in the process he reconceived the place of humanity in the creation and demonstrated a new way to understand divine power. 2 Isaiah clearly went down a different path; he chose the framework of God as redeemer in history, who created a people in the exodus, carried them through exile, and sustains them through old age. 2 Isaiah saw God’s action in the world in terms of intervention in historical events, which God predicted ahead of time and brought to fulfillment. Cross may indeed be right that it was 2 Isaiah more than Job who directed the course of Israelite faith. Job, however, is not an outsider to that faith who traveled a dead-end road, but an insider whose framework is another – and more universal – way to understand God’s actions in the world. If Brueggemann’s analysis is
maintained, that framework still stands as a complement to and alternative for those times and circumstances when it is harder to accept 2 Isaiah’s confident assessment of what the hand of the Lord has done in history.

5.4 Conclusion

In Chapter 4 I noted that the verbal connections between 2 Isaiah and Job were much more likely to fall in the speeches of Job than anywhere else. It is not a coincidence that the three different critiques listed above are all found in the speeches of Job. The author of the book of Job had a profound critique to lodge against the prevailing worldview, and he borrowed the character of Job to take on that task. One of the surprising results of making a comparison between 2 Isaiah and Job is how they are at the same time so alike – in terms of ideas and words, for example – and yet so different, in terms of purpose and message. One of the primary ways this is illustrated is the different uses they make of the idea of creation. Both 2 Isaiah and Job knew and interacted with the Priestly account of creation, but they did so in widely divergent ways. In 2 Isaiah, that account and the picture it presents of God and humanity are largely allowed to stand, with some strategic correction to make sure readers knew that God’s action in creation was neither challenged nor assisted. In Job, however, the opening words of the dialogue deal blow after blow to that account of creation, and at various points in the book its assumptions are questioned or explicitly discarded. The exercise of power inherent in God’s work of creation goes uncontested in 2 Isaiah, but the book of Job criticizes and recasts the way divine power is conceived. In response to the devastation of the exile, 2 Isaiah connects creation and redemption and connects God’s work as creator firmly to
God’s redemption of Israel. Job, on the other hand, invents a character that is not an Israelite, does not live in the land of Israel, and lives before there were such things as Israelites. The author of Job responds to devastation by emphasizing God as a creator who interacts with the creation in meaningful and life-giving ways, apart from any particular event in salvation history. This is not an admission that the God of history failed to act, but a profession of faith in the ongoing relationship of God with the creation in the face of experiences that shook the foundations of that faith.
I began pursuing the project of comparing the texts of 2 Isaiah and Job because of the number of times scholars suggested the possibility of a connection between them. These two texts are alike in so many ways – sharing themes, style, and vocabulary that have caught the notice of many readers. The texts have very similar perceptions of God, of humanity, and of their relationship, and often enough to generate the attention of readers they articulate these ideas in the same ways with very similar words. In addition, the two texts share a number of words, phrases, and word strings in common that are found nowhere else in the Hebrew Bible. For all these reasons, scholars have posited a connection between the texts, although the nature of this connection has remained in question. The natural explanation is a relationship of dependence, but in which direction the influence traveled was a matter of debate. The similarities are all the more interesting because of the differences between the two texts. 2 Isaiah is chiefly concerned with the current events impacting the lives of the exiles in Babylon – the downfall of Babylon, the imminent possibility of a return to the land of Judah, and the role of God in bringing all these events about. Regarding none of these things does the book of Job give any indication of awareness or interest. The book of Job is solely occupied with the life of one man, Job, and his experience of suffering when he had done nothing to deserve it.

In light of the possible connection between the texts despite the clear differences, I went about comparing 2 Isaiah and Job with regard to theme, style, and vocabulary, in
order to see if the claim of a relationship between them was in fact supported by the evidence. What I found was that the similarities between the texts were not enough to warrant the claim of a special relationship between them, although they give many indications of having been composed in close proximity to one another. The evidence for a dependent relationship had been exaggerated in some cases, and not examined closely enough in others. Nevertheless, it was my conclusion that in certain passages (Job 9:2-12; 12:7-25), it could be argued that the author of Job was interacting with the text of 2 Isaiah (Isa 40:26; 44:24; 41:20) in the form of a parody, as it has been demonstrated he did with other Hebrew Bible texts and forms. The similarities between descriptions of the suffering of 2 Isaiah’s servant and the character of Job indicated that the author of Job may have borrowed wording from the third and fourth servant poems for Job’s self-descriptions.

In the cases where it seemed the author of Job was interacting with the text of 2 Isaiah in the form of sarcasm or parody, I proposed that the concepts of “dialectical” or “reflexive” allusion were the best models for understanding the effect of the allusion. By making an allusion to a previous text, the author of Job was in effect setting up a rivalry between the previous text and his own words that made for mutual criticism between them, causing readers to stand at a critical distance from both. The cases of these allusions were contained in the speeches of Job, which, I suggested, was not coincidental. The author of Job put in the mouth of Job severe critiques of certain aspects of Israelite tradition, namely ideas about divine attention on human beings, the exertion of divine power, and divine action in the world. I interpreted the divine speeches in part as a response to these critiques, with the character of God providing a different understanding
of these issues, namely that humans are not the object of special divine care above the 
rest of creation, that divine power is manifested in knowledge of and personal attention to 
each creature for its own sake without regard for hierarchy, and that God’s action in the 
world, set in the context of God’s role as creator, is meaningful, purposeful, and life-
promoting for each creature. I did not accept the judgment that this interpretation of the 
book of Job entailed a rejection of the so-called God of history. Instead, the idea that God 
is the creator is at home in Israelite religion alongside the idea that God acts in salvation 
history, and still exists as a counterbalance to it.
APPENDIX

The tables that follow list the locations of verbal similarities in 2 Isaiah and Job (see Chapter 3.4). For 2 Isaiah, the references in the first table are listed by chapter, in the second by section (Isaiah 40-48, 49-55), and in the third by the servant poems. For Job, the references in the first table are listed by chapter, in the second by speech, and in the third by identity of speaker. Since chapters vary in length, I have calculated what percentage of the total number of verses each chapter or section represents. I then list the number of scripture references to unique verbal similarities in each chapter or section and the number of total scripture references, along with the corresponding percentage of scripture references that chapter or section contains.

If the verbal similarities between 2 Isaiah and Job were purely coincidental, one would expect the percentage of total references would be roughly comparable to the percentage of total verses in that section. If the verbal similarities were the result of similar content, one would expect that the chapters which share themes would also share the most verbal similarities.
### TABLE A.1

**REFERENCES BY CHAPTER IN ISAIAH**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter:</th>
<th>Percentage of total verses:</th>
<th>Number of references to unique material:</th>
<th>Percentage of references to unique material:</th>
<th>Number of total references:</th>
<th>Percentage of total references:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Isaiah 40</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE A.2

**REFERENCES BY SECTION IN ISAIAH**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Isaiah</th>
<th>Percentage of total verses:</th>
<th>Number of references to unique material:</th>
<th>Percentage of references to unique material:</th>
<th>Number of total references:</th>
<th>Percentage of total references:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40-48</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-55</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## TABLE A.3
REFERENCES BY SERVANT POEM IN ISAIAH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Servant Poem:</th>
<th>Percentage of total verses:</th>
<th>Number of references to unique material:</th>
<th>Percentage of references to unique material:</th>
<th>Number of total references:</th>
<th>Percentage of total references:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (42:1-4)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (49:1-6)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (50:4-9)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (52:13-53:12)</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## TABLE A.4
REFERENCES BY CHAPTER IN JOB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter:</th>
<th>Percentage of total verses:</th>
<th>Number of references to unique material:</th>
<th>Percentage of references to unique material:</th>
<th>Number of total references:</th>
<th>Percentage of total references:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job 1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE A.4 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Percentage of total verses:</th>
<th>Number of references to unique material:</th>
<th>Percentage of references to unique material:</th>
<th>Number of total references:</th>
<th>Percentage of total references:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE A.5

### REFERENCES BY SPEECH IN JOB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech (chapters):</th>
<th>Percentage of total verses:</th>
<th>Number of references to unique material:</th>
<th>Percentage of references to unique material:</th>
<th>Number of total references:</th>
<th>Percentage of total references:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prologue (1-2)</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job’s 1st (3)</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliphaz’ 1st (4-5)</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job’s 2nd (6-7)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bildad’s 1st (8)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job’s 3rd (9-10)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zophar’s 1st (11)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job’s 4th (12-14)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliphaz’ 2nd (15)</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job’s 5th (16-17)</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bildad’s 2nd (18)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job’s 6th (19)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zophar’s 2nd (20)</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job’s 7th (21)</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliphaz’ 3rd (22)</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job’s 8th (23-24)</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech (chapters):</td>
<td>Percentage of total verses:</td>
<td>Number of references to unique material:</td>
<td>Percentage of references to unique material:</td>
<td>Number of total references:</td>
<td>Percentage of total references:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bildad’s 3rd (25)</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job’s 9th (26-27)</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job 28</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job’s 10th (29-31)</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elihu (32-37)</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God’s 1st (38-40:2)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job’s 11th (40:2-5)</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God’s 2nd (40:6-41:34)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job’s 12th (42:1-6)</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epilogue (42:7-17)</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE A.6
REFERENCES BY SPEAKER IN JOB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker:</th>
<th>Percentage of total verses:</th>
<th>Number of references to unique material:</th>
<th>Percentage of references to unique material:</th>
<th>Number of total references:</th>
<th>Percentage of total references:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliphaz</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bildad</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zophar</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elihu</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

That is, Job 1:1 – 2:13 and 42:7-17. Although Job, God, and the adversary all speak in the course of these chapters, I have put the prologue and epilogue in a separate category from the speeches of Job 3-42:6. In addition, for simplicity’s sake, I have not separated out the narrator’s voice in the first verse of each speech from the speech itself.


_____.


_____.


_____.


_____.


_____.
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