

THE EXEGETICAL FUNCTION OF THE ADDITIONS TO OLD GREEK JOB (42,17a-e)

In the Masoretic Text (MT), the book of Job ends with a clear-cut — one might even say natural — closure: Job's death¹. Notwithstanding this sharp ending, the Old Greek (OG) version adds two short notes: Job 42,17a foretells Job's future resurrection, while v. 17b-e provides details on Job's genealogic and geographic provenance². Both additions are introduced by references to written sources. The aim of this article is to show that the placement of the additions after the end of the narrative and their introduction by references to other texts give evidence of their particular function in the late phase of canonization³. Secondly, I want to demonstrate that the additions aim to resolve ambiguities in the book they conclude. And thirdly, I will try to outline the method of authoritative interpretation that is observable in the two OG additions. As we will see, these three aspects — the position at the borderline between the canonical text and its reception; the tendency towards disambiguation; and the authoritative interpretative method — together make up the unique exegetical function of Job 42,17a-e, by which they are distinguished from other additions at the ends of books in the Hebrew Bible and the Septuagint.

Before going into the text, a brief reflection on the close relationship between canonization and interpretation is in order (I). Then I will analyze the function of the two introductory phrases by comparing them to citation formulae in the Hebrew Bible and the Septuagint (II); afterwards, I will sketch the textual parallels of both additions and evaluate their interpretative effect with respect to ambiguities in the book of Job (III and IV); finally, I will draw some conclusions regarding the distinctive function of

¹ This study is part of a research project funded by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF), project number M 2395-G24.

² Besides these additions, OG Job omits the final remarks on Job's seeing his offspring until the fourth generation and on his death (42,16b-17 MT), and adds instead a brief record on Job's total lifetime (42,16b OG); the only manuscripts which testify both the omissions and additions of OG are written in Sahidic; cf. A. CIASCA, *Sacrorum Bibliorum fragmenta copto-sahidica Musei Borgiani iussu et sumptibus S. Congreg. de propaganda fide*, volume II (Rome 1889) 1-68.

³ The limited scope of this study does not allow us to deepen the complex question of dating OG Job 42,17a-e; however, with A.Y. REED, "Job as Jobab: The Interpretation of Job in LXX Job 42:17b-e", *JBL* 120 (2001) 31-55, here 40, we may assume that the additions were composed after the OG translation, but before the fragment of Aristeas the Exegete, and therefore presumably between 150 and 60 B.C.E.

the two additions at the boundaries between interpretative textual growth and reception history (V).

I. CANONIZATION AND INTERPRETATION

Canonization confers enduring authority to a given text in changing circumstances. From this it follows that canonization and interpretation are intrinsically connected, given that the canonical status of a text requires its interpretative adaption to a shifted setting. Therefore, canonization can be termed as the “process of choosing the texts that will become the object of interpretation”⁴. But at the same time, interpretation, “as all transcription and reading of texts, creates a difference”⁵, or a “liminal space”⁶. In other words, interpretation is an “attempt to narrow the very space it has produced”⁷.

On the one hand, by narrowing the gap which it discloses, the interpreting text partakes in the authority of the canonical text it explains. M. Halbertal pointedly remarks: “[T]he sealing of the text [i.e. canonization, T.H.] engenders both the bestowal and the removal of authority [...]. The moment the text was sealed, authority was removed from the writers of the text and transferred to its interpreters”⁸. But on the other hand, authority also tends to be returned to the origin of the canonical writings. This becomes evident in early Jewish interpretation of the Tora, as M. Fishbane observes: “Pharisaic Judaism tried to minimize the gap between the divine Torah and ongoing human interpretation by projecting the origins of authoritative exegesis to Sinai itself”⁹.

In my view, the two short OG additions at the end of the book of Job are the kind of authoritative exegesis described by Fishbane. On the one hand, the additions refer to other texts, and in this way “project” their interpretation of the book of Job to writings that were considered authoritative. On the other hand, they implicitly claim authority for themselves by aiming to give a final interpretation of the whole book.

⁴ W. ISER, *The Range of Interpretation* (The Wellek Library Lecture Series at the University of California, Irvine; New York 2000) 13.

⁵ W. BARNSTONE, *The Poetics of Translation. History, Theory, Practice* (New Haven, CT 1993) 18.

⁶ ISER, *Range*, passim.

⁷ ISER, *Range*, 6.

⁸ M. HALBERTAL, *People of the Book. Canon, Meaning, and Authority* (Cambridge, MA 1997) 19.

⁹ M. FISHBANE, “Inner Biblical Exegesis. Types and Strategies of Interpretation in Ancient Israel”, *Midrash and Literature* (eds. G.H. HARTMAN – S. BUDICK) (New Haven, CT 1986) 19-37, here 19-20.

II. THE INTRODUCTORY PHRASES IN JOB 42,17A AND B

In order to analyze the function of the references to written sources in the two additions, I will first compare the phrase *γεγραπται δε* (Job 42,17a) to the citation formulae in the Old and New Testament and in the Qumran texts¹⁰. Secondly, I will briefly examine the second introductory phrase (*ουτος ερμηνευεται εκ της Συριακης βιβλου ν. 17b*). Finally, I will compare both with the demarcation signals in the epilogue of Ecclesiastes (Eccl 12,9-14).

The phrase *γεγραπται δε* is marked by two distinct aspects: the reference to a written source using the verb *γράφω* and the omission of the indication of that source. Concerning the first aspect, Job 42,17a is in accordance with the citation formulae in the historical books of the Old Testament, as the indicative or the perfect passive participle of *γράφω* (or the passive participle of *כתב*, resp.) is used more than 80 times in such formulae. With K. Spawn, two types of these formulae can be distinguished in terms of the source to which they refer: non-legal or legal writings¹¹. Concerning the first type that appears frequently in the books of Kings and Chronicles, K. Stott points out that the formulae are not primarily aimed at indicating the source that is used, but rather have a confirmatory and authenticating function¹². Regarding the second type, we can observe that in some cases the indication of the source is omitted¹³. This tendency to leave out the source indication increases in both the New Testament and the Qumran documents, which, as J. Fitzmyer shows, frequently use citation formulae with *כתב / γράφω* and *אמר / λέγω*¹⁴. Also, as M. Bernstein points out, the verb *כתב* (in the formula *כאשר / ואשר כתוב*) is used in non-continuous Qumran pesharim to introduce previously unquoted texts,

¹⁰ I leave out of the comparison other LXX additions at the end of books (Josh 24,33a-b; Est 10,3a-l; Psalm 151; Daniel 13-14), as — differing from Job 42,17a-e — they do not open with a reference to a written source or any other introductory element.

¹¹ See K.L. SPAWN, “As It Is Written” and Other Citation Formulae in the Old Testament. Their Use, Development, Syntax, and Significance (BZAW 311; Berlin 2002) 21-123. References to non-legal sources are found, e.g., in 1 Kgs 11,41; 14,19,29; 1 Chr 29,29; 2 Chr 9,29; 12,15; references to legal sources are made, e.g., in Josh 8,31 (Josh 9,2b LXX); 1 Kgs 2,3; 2 Kgs 14,6; 23,21.

¹² See K.M. STOTT, *Why Did They Write This Way? Reflections on References to Written Documents in the Hebrew Bible and Ancient Literature* (LHB 492; New York 2008) 1-73, 139-141.

¹³ No source is indicated in 2 Chr 30,5,18; Esr 3,4; Neh 8,15. The LXX translation of *ככתוב* in the four passages slightly varies: in 2 Chr 30,5 we find *κατα την γραφην*; in 2 Chr 30,18 *παρα την γραφην*; Esr 3,4 and Neh 8,15 translate *κατα το γεγραμμενον*. For a detailed analysis of the passages, see SPAWN, *As It Is Written*, 86-87, 97-104, 111-112.

¹⁴ See J.A. FITZMYER, “The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament”, *NTS* 7 (1961) 297-333.

whereas in continuous pesharim we usually find the formula **וְאִשֶּׁר אָמַר**¹⁵. Therefore, from an historical perspective, the omission in Job 42,17a and the use of **כְּתָב** fit with this development. With regard to the function of the introductory phrase, besides the confirmatory and authenticating uses mentioned before, the comparison with the citation formulae in the historical books brings to the fore another specific aspect of the introductory phrases in 42,17a and b. Whereas those formulae often leave open what is written in the sources, in the additions to OG Job the introductory phrases clearly separate the cited passages from the foregoing text¹⁶. This delimiting function also comes into evidence when we compare the two additions with the epilogue of Ecclesiastes (Eccl 12,9-14).

Before making the comparison to Ecclesiastes, let us first look at the introductory phrase in Job 42,17b. It differs from v. 17a in two regards: Firstly, instead of **γράφω**, the verb **ἐρμηνεύω** is used, which does not appear in citation formulae. Instead, the only uses in LXX are Esr 4,7 and Est 10,31, where the verb shows up in the same context as in OG Job, since it indicates in both cases a translation of a letter (**γραφή**) — i.e. a written source — from another language into Greek. Therefore, apart from the additional aspect of translation, **ἐρμηνεύω** — the same as **γράφω** — mainly brings out the reference to another text. Secondly, the indication of the source is not omitted as in the first introductory phrase, but it is indicated as **ἐκ τῆς Συριακῆς βίβλου**. Concerning the form of the source, the noun **βίβλος** hints at its textuality, yet the expression as a whole is interpreted variously in research:

- M. Kepper and M. Witte suggest that an oral source, known also by Aristeas the Exegete, might be referred to¹⁷.
- P.J. Gentry instead proposes that a lost Aramaic targum might have been the source of the addition¹⁸.

¹⁵ See M. BERNSTEIN, “Introductory Formulas for Citation and Re-Citation of Biblical Verses in the Qumran Pesharim. Observations on a Peshar Technique”, *Reading and Re-Reading Scripture at Qumran* (StTDJ 107; Leiden 2013) 635-673.

¹⁶ According to M. Leuchter, in the books of Kings, the source citations are “blurring the lines between tradition and innovation, source and product”: M. LEUCHTER, “The Sociolinguistic and Rhetorical Implications of the Source Citations in Kings”, *Soundings in Kings. Perspectives and Methods in Contemporary Scholarship* (eds. M. LEUCHTER – K.-P. ADAM) (Minneapolis, MN 2010) 119-134, here 132. In contrast, in Job 42,17a-e these lines are clearly indicated by the introductory phrases.

¹⁷ M. KEPPEL – M. WITTE, “Job. Das Buch Ijob/Hiob”, *Septuaginta Deutsch. Erläuterungen und Kommentare zum griechischen Alten Testament* (ed. M. KARRER) (Stuttgart 2011) 2041-2126, here 2049.

¹⁸ See P.J. GENTRY, *The Asterisked Materials in the Greek Job* (SCSt 38; Atlanta, GA 1995) 536; however, the very literal Aramaic rendering of the book of Job in 11 Q Tg Job

- Finally, according to some scholars, the source indication might be fictitious: A.Y. Reed deems it likely that the passage “was not translated from Aramaic, but rather composed in Greek”¹⁹; J. Cook assumes that the reference might have “propagandistic and legitimizing intentions”²⁰.

Concerning the term *συριακός* by itself, the Aramaic (cf. 2 Macc 15,36) as well as the Hebrew language come into view²¹.

In view of the indications on Job that follow in Job 42,17b-e, it seems not unlikely that LXX Genesis 36,31-39 or possibly its parallel in *Jub* 38,15-24 might have been the source of the addition, as we will see below (section IV). For now, we can state that the introductory phrase in v. 17b, similarly to v. 17a, suggests a reference to an authoritative written source.

As mentioned above, unlike the citation formulae of the historical books, the introductory phrases in Job 42,17a and b clearly delimit the cited text. The only parallel in this regard at the end of a book in MT and LXX is found in Eccl 12,9.12, where *ויתר* / *και περισσω* twice marks the beginning of an addition to the book²². This parallel helps us to grasp a further aspect of the specific function of the two introductory phrases in the OG additions: whereas the function of *ויתר* / *και περισσω* is limited to demarcating the two supplements, the introductory phrases in Job 42,17a and b additionally claim authority derived from the sources to which they refer.

In sum, we can conclude that the introductory phrases in Job 42,17a and b, similarly to references to non-legal sources in historical books,

does not support this assumption; see M. GOREA, *Job repensé ou trahi? Omissions et raccourcis de la Septante* (EtB NS 56; Paris 2007) 219.

¹⁹ REED, “Job as Jobab”, 38.

²⁰ J. COOK, “The Septuagint of Job”, *Law, Prophets, and Wisdom. On the Provenance of Translators and their Books in the Septuagint Version* (CBET 68; Leuven 2012) 175-221, here 211. As Gorea remarks, the transcription of the names into Greek in 42,17d is the same as in Gen 36,31-35 LXX, from which one might deduce that the source of the addition might rather be LXX Genesis; see GOREA, *Job repensé*, 220-221.

²¹ See REED, “Job as Jobab”, 36; M. WITTE, “Jobs Sohn. Eine textgeschichtliche Notiz zu Job 42:17 (LXX)”, *Septuagint, Sages, and Scripture. Studies in Honour of Johann Cook* (eds. R.X. GAUTHIER – G.R. KOTZÉ – G.J. STEYN) (VT.S 172; Leiden 2016) 172-179, here 175-177.

²² According to N. Lohfink, the introductory *ויתר* in Eccl 12,9.12, which — the same as its translation (*και περισσω*) in LXX — is unique in HB, allows for two interpretations: technically, it may demarcate 12,9-11 and vv. 12-14 as supplements to the book; syntactically, it might underscore the main clause in 12,9ba or the imperative *הזהר* in 12,12a; see N. LOHFINK, “Zu einigen Satzeröffnungen im Epilog des Koheletbuches”, “*Jedes Ding hat seine Zeit ...*”. Studien zur israelitischen und altorientalischen Weisheit (eds. A.A. DIESEL – R.G. LEHMANN – E. OTTO – A. WAGNER) (BZAW 241; Berlin 1996) 131-147.

have a confirmatory function; but beyond that they mark, like וַיִּתֵּן / και περισσόν in Eccl 12,9.12, the delimitation between the book text and the supplements. Finally, and more specifically, they attribute an authority to the cited text that is derived from other writings.

III. JOB 42,17A AND THE AMBIGUOUS ISSUE OF RESURRECTION

<i>Job 42,17a OG</i>	<i>Job 42,17a NETS</i>
γεγραπται δε αυτον παλιν αναστη- σεσθαι μεθ'ων ο κυριος ανιστησιν	And it is written that he will rise again with those the Lord raises up.

Let us now turn to the parts of the additions that are (allegedly) based on other texts, beginning with the prediction of Job's resurrection in Job 42,17a. Two questions arise in this regard: On which texts is the affirmation based, and to what extent does this statement on Job give a final interpretation of the whole book?

The fact that the citation formula in Job 42,17a does not indicate the quoted source implies that the reader will know which authoritative text(s) confirm(s) the prediction of Job's future resurrection. Yet, explicit affirmations of the resurrection of the righteous are found in not more than four passages, namely 2 Macc 7,14; 12,43-45; Dan 12,2.13. A comparison of these short paragraphs with Job 42,17a does not yield a clear result. On the one hand, all four passages differ in some regard from Job 42,17a. Unlike the two examples given in 2 Maccabees, Job only suffers but is not killed for his faith; and whereas Dan 12,2 foresees the eschatological resurrection of all the dead, in Job 42,17a the prediction of life after death is limited to the righteous²³. On the other hand, Job 42,17a corresponds to all four passages concerning the use of the root ἀνάστασις / ἀνίστημι. In conclusion, we can assume that 42,17a vaguely refers to all four passages simultaneously²⁴.

²³ The difference of context between 2 Maccabees 7 and 12 and Daniel 12, on the one hand, and Job 42,17a, on the other, is pointed out by Schnocks, who therefore argues that γεγραπται rather refers to passages in OG Job itself; see J. SCHNOCKS, "The Hope for Resurrection in the Book of Job", *The Septuagint and Messianism* (ed. M.A. KNIBB) (BETL 195; Leuven 2006) 291-299, here 291-292; also H. Swete, N. Peters and C. Seow argue that Job 42,17a refers back to one or several passages in OG Job itself; see H.B. SWETE, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* (Cambridge 1914) 256-257; N. PETERS, *Das Buch Job* (EHAT 21; Münster 1928) 502; C.L. SEOW, *Job 1-21*. Interpretation and Commentary (Illuminations; Grand Rapids, MI 2013) 114.

²⁴ Based on the assumption that Job 42,17a (and b-e) was added to OG Job by a later hand, chronologically the reference to 2 Maccabees 7 and 12 does not seem impossible.

As a final affirmation that claims to be based on authoritative writings, Job 42,17a encourages the reader to interpret the book from the standpoint of the prediction of Job's resurrection. In the following, I will first briefly examine some paragraphs in OG Job that, according to some scholars, affirm the belief in the resurrection of the dead. Secondly, I will evaluate the impact of the final assertion of 42,17a on the reading of these passages.

The most frequently quoted passages in Job that might imply the belief in resurrection are Job 14,13-17; 19,25-27; and 29,18-20. Concerning 14,13-17 (and in particular v. 14), scholarly opinion is divided. Whereas G. Gerleman concludes that "the belief in a resurrection flashes through this passage"²⁵, D. Mangin insists that *παλιν γενωμαι* in v. 14b by no means refers to a new life after death, but to a physical recovery within the lifespan before death²⁶. With J. Ausloos, my impression is that scholarship has been "influenced too much by a 'yes – no' mentality"²⁷. The contrasting interpretations underscore the ambiguity of the passage, which militates against taking a position on either side but instead signals an openness to either meaning.

This holds true also for 19,25-27. According to H. Tremblay, the OG translator interpolated the belief in resurrection; A. van der Kooij and J. Cook instead maintain that *αναστησαι το δερμα μου* (19,26) refers to Job's hope for the future healing of his skin but does not hint at a hope in resurrection²⁸. Again, we are inclined to conclude that the passage should be read as deliberately ambiguous.

²⁵ G. GERLEMAN, *Studies in the Septuagint I. The Book of Job* (AUL.T 43,2; Lund 1946) 61; cf. H.S. GEHMAN, "The Theological Approach of the Greek Translator of Job 1-15", *JBL* 68 (1949) 231-240, here 238-239.

²⁶ See D. MANGIN, "L'arbre et l'homme (gJob 14:7-17). Les prétendues allusions à l'après-vie dans la version grecque du livre de Job (1)", *RB* 115 (2008) 26-48; see also N. FERNÁNDEZ MARCOS, "The Septuagint Reading of the Book of Job", *The Book of Job* (ed. W.A.M. BEUKEN) (BETL 114; Leuven 1994) 251-266, here 265 (note 52); J. COOK, "The Profile and Some Theological Aspects of the Old Greek of Job — Resurrection and Life after Death as Points in Case", *OTEs* 24 (2011) 324-345, here 331-337; A. VAN DER KOOIJ, "Ideas about Afterlife in the Septuagint", *Lebendige Hoffnung — ewiger Tod?! Jenseitsvorstellungen im Hellenismus, Judentum und Christentum* (eds. M. LABAHN – M. LANG) (ABIG 24; Leipzig 2007) 87-102, here 92-95.

²⁷ H. AUSLOOS, "'A Man Shall Not Rise Again ...'. Job 14:12 in Hebrew and Greek", *Septuagint, Sages, and Scripture. Studies in Honour of Johann Cook* (eds. R.X. GAUTHIER – G.R. KOTZÉ – G.J. STEYN) (VT.S 172; Leiden 2016) 159-171, here 165.

²⁸ See H. TREMBLAY, *Job 19,25-27 dans la Septante et chez les pères grecs. Unanimité d'une tradition* (EtB NS 47; Paris 2002) 459-460; VAN DER KOOIJ, "Ideas about Afterlife", 95; COOK, "Profile", 337-339; on the historical and theological context of OG Job, see also C.E. COX, "The Historical, Social, and Literary Context of Old Greek Job", *XII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Leiden, 2004* (ed. M.K.H. PETERS) (SCSt 54; Atlanta, GA 2006) 105-116.

An interesting case is Job 29,18-20. Although the OG rendering differs considerably from MT, both texts, albeit in different ways, are ambiguous regarding the belief in resurrection. Concerning the Hebrew text, it is most of all the noun **חול** that effects ambiguity, as both meanings suggested in research — “sand” and “phoenix” — claim equal plausibility²⁹. Regarding v. 18b alone, the meaning “sand” is more obvious (“like sand I shall multiply my days”), whereas in the context of v. 18a (“I shall die in my nest [...]”), an oblique allusion to the phoenix myth becomes plausible (“and like a phoenix I shall multiply my days”)³⁰. If we look now at the OG rendering of v. 18, it seems that the translator has grasped the ambiguity of the noun **חול**, as he in turn also uses an ambiguous locution, **στειλεχος φοινικος** (“trunk of a palm tree” / “body of a phoenix”)³¹. Usually the noun **φοῖνιξ** is used in LXX as the translation of **תמר** / **תמרה** “palm tree”, and in Exod 15,27 and Num 33,9, **תמרים** (plur.) is rendered as **στελεχη φοινικων**³². However, in Job 29,18 MT and its immediate context, there is no mention of a “palm tree” (**תמר** / **תמרה**), wherefore we might conclude that the translator attributed to **חול** the meaning of “phoenix” and translated it with an equally ambiguous term³³.

In sum, the three most important paragraphs regarding resurrection in OG Job display a considerable degree of ambiguity. Now, reading these sections in the light of 42,17a, the ambiguities are not eliminated, but tend toward resolution. We can therefore conclude that the first addition at the end of the book probably originates from the perception of these ambiguities and is aimed at resolving them. Yet, this effort at disambiguation not only regards the issue of resurrection, but also Job’s piety, since by predicting his resurrection Job 42,17a also implicitly counts him among the “just” (**μεθ’ ων ο κυριος ανιστησιν**). The addition thereby underscores a tendency that is perceivable in several passages of OG in contrast to MT:

²⁹ On the ambiguity in Job 29,18 MT, see R. EGGER-WENZEL, “Ein Phönix in Ijob 29,18”, *Wisdom for Life* (eds. N. CALDUCH-BENAGES – M. GILBERT) (BZAW 445; Berlin 2014) 96-104.

³⁰ Regarding the possible origins of the phoenix myth and **חול** in the meaning of “phoenix”, see H. HERAS, “The Standard of Job’s Immortality”, *CBQ* 11 (1949) 263-279.

³¹ On the OG rendering of Job 29,18, see H. HEATER, *A Septuagint Translation Technique in the Book of Job* (CBQMS 11; Washington, DC 1982) 89-91; S.B. NOEGEL, “Word-play and Translation Technique in the Septuagint of Job”, *AuOr* 14 (1995) 33-44, here 41-42.

³² The noun **φοῖνιξ** is used 37 times in LXX, translating **תמר** / **תמרה** in MT, except in 2 Sam 16,1-2 (**קִיץ**); in Job 40,30, **כנענים** is rendered by **φοινικων γενη** “Phoenician races” (cf. Acts 27,12).

³³ The motif of the old age in Job 29,18 OG, which is also absent in MT, might be taken up from Ps 92,13-15, where the palm tree (92,13 MT: **תמר** / 91,13 LXX: **φοῖνιξ**) symbolizes the vigor of the just in old age.

- In 1,1, the adjective *δικαιος* is added as a fifth quality in the initial characterization of the protagonist.
- At the end of the prologue, OG Job appends “at all” (*ουδεν*) and “before God” (*εναντιον του θεου*) to the declaration that Job “did not sin with his lips” (2,10) and thus underscores the fact that he remained blameless.
- In the introduction to Elihu’s speeches (32,1), OG Job states that Job was “just *before them*” (*δικαιος εναντιον αυτων*) — not “*in his eyes*” (*צדִיק בְּעֵינָיו*).
- In Job’s answers to the divine speeches (cf. 40,3-5; 42,1-6), small additions underscore Job’s humility and repentance.
- Finally, according to OG Job 42,8, it is Job himself — not his friends as in MT — who carries out the offerings, which reinforces his role as an intercessor³⁴.

These observations suggest that OG tends “to present the character of Job in a more favorable light than does M”³⁵. Turning back to 42,17a, we can conclude that the addition emphasizes this tendency to disambiguate the image of Job concerning his piety and invites a rereading of the book from this perspective.

We can draw now some conclusions regarding the function of the OG addition in 42,17a. First, the position at the end of book and its separation from the foregoing text by a citation formula present the short note as a final interpretation of the book and at the same time indicate that this interpretation is based on scriptural authority. The reader therefore is encouraged to reconsider the book of Job in keeping with this ultimate authoritative statement. Secondly, the interpretative effort in this term may be recognized as disambiguation: the issues of resurrection and Job’s piety that remain rather equivocal in the book are disambiguated by the prediction of Job’s rising from the dead. Thirdly, we observe an exegetical method by which ambiguous passages in the book are interpreted in the light of authoritative texts.

³⁴ On the differences of OG Job to MT in the epilogue, see C.E. COX, “Old Greek Job 42 — A Surprise at the End of the Road. Intertextual Connections Between the Epilogue and the Prologue Introduced by the Translator”, *Septuagint, Sages, and Scripture*. Studies in Honour of Johann Cook (eds. R.X. GAUTHIER – G.R. KOTZÉ – G.J. STEYN) (VT.S 172; Leiden 2016) 180-189.

³⁵ D.H. GARD, “The Concept of Job’s Character According to the Greek Translator of the Hebrew Text”, *JBL* 72 (1953) 182-186, here 186. According to GERLEMAN, *Studies in the Septuagint*, 56, OG Job has a “tendency to represent him [i.e. Job, T.H.] as a blameless martyr”; for FERNÁNDEZ MARCOS, “Septuagint Reading”, 264, Job in OG is “above all the righteous (*δίκαιος*) of the Wisdom tradition”; COOK, “Profile”, 330, states that Job in OG “is depicted as an astute saint”; Seow, finally, remarks that, compared to MT, OG draws “a more positive portrayal of Job as a patient sufferer and even a prayerful man” (SEOW, *Job 1–21*, 113).

IV. JOB 42,17B-E AND JOB'S ABRAHAMITIC DESCENT

	Job 42,17b-e OG	Job 42,17b-e (based on NETS)
b	ουτος ερμηνευεται εκ της Συριακης βιβλου εν μεν γη κατοικων τη Αυσιτιδι επι τοις οριοις της Ιδουμιας και Αραβιας προπηρχεν δε αυτω ονομα Ιωβαβ	This is translated from the Syriac (?) book: Living in the land of Ausitis, on the borders of Idumea and Arabia, previously his name was Iobab;
c	λαβων δε γυναικα Αραβισσαν γεννα υιον ω ονομα Εννων ην δε αυτος πατρος μεν Ζαρε των Ησαυ υιων υιος μητρος δε Βοσορας ωστε ειναι αυτον πεμπτον απο Αβρααμ	taking an Arabian wife, he fathered a son, whose name was Ennon, and he in turn had as father Zare, a son of the sons of Esau, and as mother Bosorra, so that he was the fifth from Abraam.
d	και ουτοι οι βασιλεις οι βασιλευσαντες εν Εδωμ ης και αυτος ηρξεν χωρας πρωτος Βαλακ ο του Βεωρ και ονομα τη πολει αυτου Δενναβα μετα δε Βαλακ Ιωβαβ ο καλουμενος Ιωβ μετα δε τουτον Ασομ ο υπαρχων ηγεμων εκ της Θαιμανιτιδος χωρας μετα δε τουτον Αδαδ υιος Βαραδ ο εκκοψας Μαδιαμ εν τω πεδιω Μωαβ και ονομα τη πολει αυτου Γεθθαιμ	And these are the kings who reigned in Edom, which country he too ruled: first Balak the son of Beor, and the name of his city was Dennaba, and after Balak, Iobab, who is called Iob, and after him Hasom, who was a leader from the Thaimanite country, and after him Hadad son of Barad, who cut down Madiam in the plain of Moab, and the name of his city was Geththaim.
e	οι δε ελθοντες προς αυτον φιλοι Ελιφας των Ησαυ υιων Θαιμανων βασιλευς Βαλδαδ ο Σαυχαιων τυραννος Σωφαρ ο Μιναιων βασιλευς	Now the friends who came to him were: Eliphaz, of the sons of Esau, king of the Thaimanites, Baldad, the tyrant of the Sauchites, Sophar, the king of the Minites.

As before regarding Job 42,17a, in the following I will examine to what extent the details about Job's origin provided in vv. 17b-e are based on other textual passages that were considered authoritative, and the way in which the second addition gives a final interpretation of the whole book. In contrast to the first addition, the introductory phrase to vv. 17b-e indicates a source, the "Syriac book" (i.e. a Hebrew or Aramaic source). It remains speculative what may have been intended by this term. However, just as with v. 17a, we can identify textual passages that were considered authoritative as the source from which the elements of the second addition are drawn. In fact, as A. Reed has shown, the main source text of vv. 17b-e is the list of Edomite kings in Genesis 36 LXX, which has been combined with the information on the name and origin of Job and

his friends in the prologue (Job 1,1; 2,11)³⁶. We may remark that also *Jub* 38,15-24 provides the same list of Edomite kings as Gen 36,31-39, and therefore might have served as source as well, since the *Book of Jubilees* seems to have obtained authoritative status at least among some groups in first-century BCE Judaism, as the considerable number of fragments in Qumran shows. However, as there is no clear marker that *Jubilees* 38 might have been the source for the OG Job 42 reference, we may conclude it is unlikely to be the book to which the Greek text refers³⁷.

According to Reed, only three elements (besides the mention of the “Syriac book”) do not derive from either Genesis 36 LXX or the book of Job itself: the location of “the land of Ausitis” on the borders of Idumea and Arabia (Job 42,17b); the Arabian origin of Job’s wife; and the name of his son, Ennon (v. 17c). However, as I will try to show, these elements may also be traced back to textual sources.

Regarding the name of Job’s son (Εννων) in Job 42,17c, M. Witte argues that it also derives from the list of Edomite kings in Genesis 36³⁸. According to his thesis, the name is extracted from Βαλαεννων in Gen 36,38-39 LXX by the subtraction of the theophoric element (Βαλα / בעל)³⁹. Yet, in Genesis 36 the name of the father of Βαλαεννων is Αχοβωρ, not Ιωβαβ, who is mentioned earlier in vv. 33-34. To understand why it might nonetheless be plausible that the name of Job’s son stems from this text, we must analyze briefly the structure of Job 42,17b-e. On the

³⁶ Cf. REED, “Job as Jobab”, 37-38; Reed gives an overview of the parallels between Genesis 36 LXX and Job 42,17b-e in the appended synopsis (REED, “Job as Jobab”, 53-54). Also Swete (*Introduction*, 257) remarks that only three elements in Job 42,17b-e have no parallels in Gen 36,32-35 LXX and Job 2,11 LXX.

³⁷ Also the mention of the “Syriac book” in 42,17b, which, as noted above (section II), might refer to a Hebrew or Aramaic source, would fit with the *Book of Jubilees*, since the latter was most probably composed in Hebrew; see J. VANDERKAM, “Recent Scholarship on the Book of Jubilees”, *CBR* 6 (2008) 405-431; unfortunately, no Hebrew (or Greek) fragments of *Jub* 38,15-24 have been preserved; see J. STÖKL, “A List of the Extant Hebrew Text of the Book of Jubilees, their Relation to the Hebrew Bible and some Preliminary Comments”, *Hen* 28 (2006) 97-124; J.C. VANDERKAM, *The Book of Jubilees* (CSCO.Ae 88; Leuven 1989) vi-xiv. That a Syriac version of *Jubilees*, to which the “Syriac book” (Job 42,17b) might refer, existed at the time Job 42,17b-e was composed, is rather improbable, as “it is not certain that there was a full Syriac translation” (VANDERKAM, *Book of Jubilees*, vi) at all. Many thanks to Prof. VanderKam for the advice in this regard.

³⁸ See M. WITTE, “Jobs Sohn”, 172-179.

³⁹ According to Witte, the omission of the theophoric element בעל is explicable in the context of Job’s fidelity to YHWH; he also argues that this tradition — and possibly 42,17b-e as a whole — is of Hebrew (or Aramaic) origin, as only in the original Semitic form of the name the detachment of חן from בעל is plausible, while at the same time the meaning of the name, “(God) is merciful”, fits well with the end of the Joban narrative; see WITTE, “Jobs Sohn”, 175-179.

one hand, the four verses, besides giving further information on Job, are connected among each other by references to Edom/Esau⁴⁰; on the other hand, the remark on Job's descent from Abraham concludes the details on Job's origin in vv. 17b-c, so that Abraham's name, which is the most renowned in this list, stands in the center of the whole addition. Based on the central importance of Job's relationship to Abraham, we can recognize the significance of the name of Job's son:

- In parallel to Job being fifth after Abraham (v. 17c), Βαλαεννων is the fifth after Ιωβαβ according to Gen 36,33-39 LXX⁴¹.
- As with the alteration of the name of Abram to Abraham and of Jobab to Job, the name of Βαλαεννων becomes Εννων.

The centrality of Job's descent from Abraham sheds light also on the other two elements in Job 42,17b-e, which, following Reed, are not taken from Genesis 36:

- According to Gen 25,1-6 and *Jub* 19,11, Abraham, after being tested by God (Genesis 22), takes another wife, Keturah, whose descent is associated with Arabia⁴². The note about Job's Arabian wife in Job 42,17c might therefore be aimed at underlining the parallels between Job and Abraham.
- Finally, given that Job — if we identify him with Jobab in Genesis 36 — is of Edomite origin, and his wife — paralleled to Keturah — is Arabian, the borders between these two territories become Job's logical homeland, as mentioned in Job 42,17b⁴³.

⁴⁰ In Job 42,17b, Job's Edomite origin is signaled by the localization of his homeland *ἐπι τοῖς ὄρεισις τῆς Ἰδομμαίας καὶ Ἀραβίας*, in v. 17c and e by the affiliation of Job's father Zare or his friend Eliphaz to τῶν Ἡσαυ υἱῶν, and in v. 17d in the introductory note about the following list of kings ruling *ἐν Ἐδῶμ*. Against REED, "Job as Jobab", 47, the term *Ἰδομμαία* in v. 17b (instead of *Ἐδῶμ* as in v. 17d) does not need to be understood as anachronistic, but more likely agrees with Gen 36,16 LXX, where the clans of Eliphaz are localized *ἐν γῆ Ἰδομμαία*. In addition, such variability is typical for the linguistic style of OG; see C.E. COX, "Job", *The T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint* (ed. J.K. AITKEN) (London 2015) 385-400, here 389-391.

⁴¹ The sequence of Edomite kings according to Gen 36,35-38 LXX is: Jobab, Hasom, Hadad, Samala, Saoul, Balaennon.

⁴² The names of Keturah's sons and further descendants are used for Arabian cities and tribes; see E.A. KNAUF, *Midian*. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte Palästinas und Nordarabiens am Ende des 2. Jahrtausends v. Chr. (ADPV 10; Wiesbaden 1988) 28-31, 77-86, 168-169.

⁴³ According to Reed ("Job as Jobab", 42-48) the localization of Uz in Job 42,17b is based on its identification with the stronghold Ḥorvat 'Uza (עִיזָה), situated at the border of Idumea and Nabatea; but Cook convincingly objects that, in the book of Job, Uz is not depicted as a city or stronghold but as a land or region; see J. COOK, "Contextuality in Wisdom Literature: The Provenance of LXX Proverbs and Job as Case Studies", *Texts*,

In sum, we can conclude that the additional information on Job in 42,17b-e is taken from other texts that were considered authoritative. Although the introductory phrase does not mention Genesis 36, but an unspecified “Syriac book”, we may assume that the list of Edomite kings in its Greek version is the main source for the second addition. Therefore, the same exegetical method as in Job 42,17a is discernable: authoritative texts are taken up in order to add some further information on Job, giving the book in this way a final interpretation.

As we have seen, the main theme in the second addendum is the link between Job and Abraham. According to J. Cook, by making this connection the translator or supplementor wanted to “demonstrate that the book of Job is an important writing that should be taken seriously, even though the central figure, Job himself, is not a son of Israel”⁴⁴. Yet, from the reader’s perspective, we observe a similar disambiguating effect as in the first addition. By identifying Job as a descendant of Abraham, ambiguities in the prologue concerning Job’s origin are resolved. At the same time, rereading the book in the light of 42,17b-e, the parallels between Job and Abraham in the prologue are emphasized⁴⁵. Moreover, the close relationship to Abraham underscores Job’s exemplary piety. Therefore, by stressing Job’s Abrahamic traits, similar to v. 17a, the second addition highlights his status as δίκαιος.

V. AT THE BOUNDARIES OF INTERPRETATIVE REDACTION AND RECEPTION HISTORY

In our analysis of Job 42,17a-e, we captured an interpretative method that is aimed at explaining (parts of) the foregoing book based on texts that — in a late phase of the formation of the Old Testament canon — were considered authoritative. This mode of interpretation is not dissimilar to other interpretative additions within the Hebrew Bible. However, in contrast to interpretative passages that date back to an earlier stage of

Contexts and Readings in Postexilic Literature. Explorations into Historiography and Identity Negotiation in Hebrew Bible and Related Texts (ed. L. JONKER) (FAT II 53; Tübingen 2011) 149-168, here 163-164.

⁴⁴ J. COOK, “In Search of the Old Greek of Job”, *JSem* 20 (2011) 213-232, here 229.

⁴⁵ Regarding the parallels between Job and Abraham in Job 1–2, see, e.g., S. JAPHET, “The Trial of Abraham and the Test of Job: How do they differ?”, *Hen* 16 (1994) 153-172; T. VEIJOLA, “Abraham und Hiob. Das literarische und theologische Verhältnis von Gen 22 und der Hiob-Novelle”, *Vergegenwärtigung des Alten Testaments*. Beiträge zur biblischen Hermeneutik (eds. C. BULTMANN – W. DIETRICH – C. LEVIN) (Göttingen 2002) 127-144.

the biblical texts, our two additions are, firstly, appended to the end of the book and, secondly, clearly separated from the foregoing text by the two introductory phrases. This demonstrates that the existing text as such could not be expanded anymore, since it was regarded as stable⁴⁶. From this we can further deduce that the additions date from a late phase of the canonization (of OG Job), when the text was regarded as fixed, but its interpretation could still be added to the book itself and was not preserved in a separate commentary⁴⁷.

Looking ahead to the further development, one might compare the interpretive method of Job 42,17a-e with the explicit and implicit scriptural quotations in the targumim, or with the rabbinic literature on a large scale, where the use of citations abounds⁴⁸. In this perspective, the two additions to OG Job represent an early stage of a development by which, as M. Marmor observes, “the centrality of quotation in Jewish culture is established”⁴⁹.

As an interpretation of the book of Job, 42,17a-e are designed to the actualization, or — in a term coined by J.A. Sanders — the “resignification”⁵⁰ of the biblical text. According to E. Ulrich, resignification means that “the tradition, important in its original setting, and important in itself beyond its importance for that original concrete situation, is found also to be important to me here and now in my present situation. The tradition proves adaptable, capable of having new significance in this new particular situation”⁵¹. The new significance attributed to the book of Job in 42,17a-e comes to the fore in a creative way, in which elements of the book of Job are combined with other authoritative texts. The interest in Job as an exemplary figure and as a witness of the belief in resurrection reflects the religious circumstances in which the two additions emerged.

⁴⁶ Unlike 42,17a-e, the OG addition in 2,9a-d is integrated into the translated text. From this, however, it does not follow that 2,9a-d must have been added earlier than 42,7a-e; rather, it gives evidence of a different attitude towards the interpreted text concerning its stability.

⁴⁷ The Aristeas fragment, which regarding content and date of origin is very close to Job 42,17b-e, might be an example of an early external interpretation; see R. DORAN, “Aristeas The Exegete. A New Translation and Introduction”, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Volume 2 (ed. J.H. CHARLESWORTH) (London 1985) 855-859.

⁴⁸ Regarding explicit and implicit biblical quotations in the targumin, see, e.g., A. HOUTMAN – H. SYSLING, *Alternative Targum Traditions. The Use of Variant Readings for the Study in Origin and History of Targum Jonathan* (SAIS 9; Leiden 2009) 137-152.

⁴⁹ M. MARMUR, “Why Jews Quote”, *Oral Tradition* 29 (2014) 5-46, here 9.

⁵⁰ J.A. SANDERS, *Canon and Community. A Guide to Canonical Criticism* (GBS; Philadelphia, PA 1984) 22.

⁵¹ E. ULRICH, “The Canonical Process, Textual Criticism, and Latter Stages in the Composition of the Bible”, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids, MI 1999) 51-78, here 75.

In view of the reception history of the book of Job, 42,17a-e appear as a starting point of an interpretative trend that was very influential in the Greek-speaking Jewish tradition and even more in the early church, where we can trace Job's exemplary status from Jas 5,10-11 to Gregory the Great's *Moralia in Iob* and beyond⁵². The Aramaic-speaking Jewish tradition instead tended to distance itself from that current, underlining instead the ambiguities in the book of Job⁵³. Therefore, the identification of Job with Jobab, while present in the Aristeas fragment and in the *Testament of Job*, is absent in Rabbinic sources, and sometimes Job's exemplary status is downplayed in comparison to that of Abraham⁵⁴.

VI. CONCLUSION

The two Greek additions at the end of the book of Job, 42,17a.b-e, are situated at the borderline of canonization. By means of the introductory phrases, they are clearly separated from the foregoing text and thus are marked as interpretative additions (similarly to Eccl 12,9-11.12-14). At the same time, the reference to other texts in these introductory notes invest them with the same authority as the sources to which they allude. In fact, the texts on which the additional details on Job are based were identified in our analysis as passages in 2 Maccabees 7 and 12, Daniel 12, or Genesis 25 and 36 (par. *Jubilees* 19 and 38). Therefore, the two additions do not just supplement some details of minor importance about Job but claim to function as an authoritative interpretation of the book, acting as the last word on Job.

Regarding the content of the additions in relation to the book as a whole, we were able to discern an effort to deal with ambiguities about resurrection and Job's piety. Although some passages in OG Job can be identified as deliberately ambiguous about the belief in resurrection, and

⁵² See J.R. BASKIN, *Pharao's Counsellors. Job, Jethro, and Balaam in Rabbinic and Patristic Tradition* (BJSt 47; Chico, CA 1983) 32-43; N.J. ELLIS, "The Reception of the Jobraham Narratives in Jewish Thought", *Authoritative Texts and Reception History. Aspects and Approaches* (eds. D. BATOVICI – K. de TROYER) (BilnS 151; Boston 2017) 124-140, here 135-140; F.T. HARKINS – A.M. CANTY (eds.), *A Companion to Job in the Middle Ages* (Brill's Companions to the Christian Tradition 73; Leiden 2016).

⁵³ See G. OBERHÄNSLI-WIDMER, "Hiobtraditionen im Judentum", *Das Buch Hiob und seine Interpretationen. Beiträge zum Hiob-Symposium auf dem Monte Verità vom 14.–19. August 2005* (eds. T. KRÜGER – M. OEMING – K. SCHMID – C. UEHLINGER) (ATHANT 88; Zürich 2007) 315-328, here 324-326; M.C. LEGASPI, "Job's Wives in the 'Testament of Job'". A Note on the Synthesis of Two Traditions", *JBL* 127 (2008) 71-79.

⁵⁴ See BASKIN, *Pharao's Counsellors*, 8-26; OBERHÄNSLI-WIDMER, "Hiobtraditionen", 318-327; ELLIS, "Reception", 128-131.

even though the OG translation compared to the MT already tends to underline Job's status as a δίκαιος, the two additions encourage a reconsideration of the book that (further) resolves these ambiguities.

Finally, we could observe in the two OG additions an exegetical method that is similar to other interpretative citations in biblical writings but gains a specific function here at the borderline of canonization. On the one hand, Job 42,17a-e became part of the canonical texts in the Greek tradition and its affiliate versions; on the other hand, the two short notes may be regarded as early examples of authoritative interpretation of the given canonical text, paving the way for the emergence of a major current in the reception history of the book of Job.

Faculty of Catholic Theology
Department of Biblical Studies
University of Vienna
Schenkenstraße 8-10
1230 Wien
Austria

Tobias HÄNER

SUMMARY

Attached to the end of the book and separated from the foregoing text by introductory phrases, the additions in Old Greek Job 42,17a.b-e function as a final interpretation of the book, claiming authority by referring to other writings that were considered authoritative (namely, Genesis 36 LXX). By foretelling Job's resurrection from the dead and identifying him as a descendant of Abraham, the supplements help to disambiguate equivocal passages in the book concerning resurrection and Job's piety. Situated at the edge of canonization, 42,17a.b-e constitute a liminal phenomenon between interpretative textual growth and reception history.