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INTRODUCTION

Katharine Dell and Will Kynes

Long before Julia Kristeva coined the term “intertextuality” in the late 1960s, biblical commentators recognized that the book of Job was, in some sense, a “mosaic of quotations.”¹ After listing fifteen pages of parallels between Job and passages across the canon, Samuel Lee (1837, 86) surmised that “either the language and sentiments of this book must have been accessible to the sacred writers ever since the times of Moses, or else the Book of Job must have been written subsequent to them all, and so have borrowed in all this abundance from them.”² Lee thought the latter possibility “an opinion which the wildest of theorists would scarcely adopt,” instead arguing that the fact that “David, Solomon, the prophets generally, and even Moses himself, have cited, or alluded to, this book” proves “it was in existence, and recognised as of canonical authority, prior to the times of them all…that it was looked upon as a sort of treasury of divinity, and worthy of all acceptance at all times, ever since its first publication” (67).³ However, he expressed a wish that “some good Hebrew scholar, who has leisure and judgment sufficient for the task, would thoroughly investigate this question” (86 n. 1).

The present volume is a collective attempt to fulfill Lee’s wish. In the essays that follow the intertextual links between Job and texts from across the Hebrew Bible, from the Law, Prophets, and Writings, are “thoroughly investigated.” However, unlike Lee, and instead following

2. Edward Kissane (1939, xlix) similarly observes a century later that the “enormous number of parallels to passages in other books of the Old Testament” suggest “either the writer of Job showed an intimate knowledge of the rest of Hebrew literature, or that he exerted a deep influence on subsequent writers.”
3. John Mason Good (1812, xlvii) likewise claimed that Job “is occasionally quoted or copied by almost every Hebrew writer who had an opportunity of referring to it, from the age of Moses to that of Malachi; especially by the Psalmist, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel.”
Bateson Wright (1883, 11), the contributors to this volume think it “improbable” that “Job should be the vast storehouse of Hebrew expression on philosophical and theological problems, to which all Hebrew poets and philosophers are indebted.” Because Job is now widely considered the product of the postexilic period, holding this view no longer makes them the “the wildest of theorists.”

A revised understanding of the date of Job is not the only difference between the approach to Job’s intertextual connections practiced in the essays to follow and that of Lee and his nineteenth-century colleagues. First, as Lee’s comments demonstrate, this discussion of parallels between Job and other biblical texts was primarily concerned with determining the date of Job. Lists of parallels like the one he provided, though rarely as extensive, were standard fare in the introductions of Job commentaries into the early twentieth century, but, after contributing to an argument for the book’s date, those parallels rarely reappeared in the exegetical comments which followed. Possible quotations and allusions were considered primarily of historical interest. Firmly under the aegis of “influence,” these scholars rarely investigated the hermeneutical value of the inner-biblical connections criss-crossing the book of Job. In the essays to follow, the historical value of these connections is not ignored (the date of Job relative to some texts in the Hebrew Bible is after all still debated), but, thanks to the influence of the development of intertextuality, the emphasis has shifted from history to hermeneutics.

Second, whereas nineteenth-century interpreters focused their efforts on identifying parallels between Job and other texts in the Hebrew Bible, as well as ancient Near Eastern “Wisdom” texts after their discovery around the turn of the twentieth century, in the service of this historical quest, the investigation of the intertextual significance of Job need not be restricted to canonical, or even ancient Near Eastern, boundaries. Job, like all texts, is part of an infinite intertextual web. Although, to make this study manageable, we have restricted it to later texts that are linked explicitly with Job, even these subsequent texts can offer readers new insight into the meaning of the book.

This points to a third difference between this volume and “intertextual” studies over a century ago. In the intervening years, the reader has emerged as a recognized participant in interpretation, and intertextuality

---

4. For a fuller discussion of the history of intertextual interpretation of Job, with a focus on connections between Job and the Psalms, see Kynes 2012, Chapter 1.
5. This is one reason we prefer “intertextuality” over “inner-biblical exegesis” or “inner-biblical allusion” to describe the approaches taken in this volume.
has contributed to this development. The degree to which the reader, as opposed to the author, is the focus in an intertextual study has become a distinguishing feature between what are commonly characterized as the two major approaches to intertextual method: the “diachronic” and the “synchronic” (see G. D. Miller 2011, 286). The essays in this volume take different approaches to this question, but all, to some degree, incorporate aspects of both, demonstrating that the diametric opposition between them is a false dichotomy (see below).

Intertextuality has also contributed to a difference between the approaches taken in this volume and those common in the bulk of the twentieth century. Concurrent with the rise of form criticism in the early twentieth century, those lists of parallels in Job commentaries disappeared. It seems likely the emphasis on generalized formal comparisons between texts was a contributing cause, as the focus in Job scholarship moved to comparing “forms” evident in Job and other texts. But intertextuality returned interest in connections between specific texts. The term was first explicitly applied to Job’s connections with earlier texts by Tryggve Mettinger (1993), though Michael Fishbane’s Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel (1985) is often credited with introducing an intertextual approach into the study of the Hebrew Bible (despite the fact that he never mentions the term). Mettinger claims Job “draws on literary material from a very wide range of backgrounds: wisdom, law, cult, psalmody, etc.” (75), and a number of studies of intertextual connections between Job and specific texts have followed, demonstrating this to be the case.

These connections with texts across the canon suggest another development of nineteenth- and twentieth-century critical scholarship that may have obscured the type of intertextual insight pursued in this study. It was only in the mid-nineteenth century that Job was placed in the category “Wisdom Literature” (see Bruch 1851; Sheppard 2000, 372). As time has progressed, that categorization has led to the book being isolated in that category, with connections between it and the rest of the canon overlooked. The widespread interaction between Job and texts
across the canon demonstrated in this volume point to the need to reintegrate Job with the rest of the Hebrew Bible.10

Thus, in thoroughly investigating the question of intertextuality in Job, this volume unearths both historical and hermeneutical insight, addresses texts across the canon and beyond, and attends to the roles of both the author and the reader as it examines not merely formal similarities but connections between specific texts, demonstrating how Job breaks the bounds of the “Wisdom Literature” category, its meaning shaped by the diverse texts to which it alludes and illuminated by the intertextual dialogue initiated by texts that refer to or resonate with it.

**Intertextual Approaches**

In the first essay, John Barton provides an incisive overview of the state of intertextual studies in Hebrew Bible scholarship. He describes the widely accepted description of an opposition between “diachronic” and “synchronic” approaches, the former often associated with “author-oriented” and “historical” interpretation and the latter with “reader-oriented” and “literary” reading. He criticizes both the terms and those equivalences, suggesting a distinction instead between relations envisioned in time for the former, and in space for the latter, may be more helpful. We agree with him that “diachronic” and “synchronic” are not ideal terms, but we believe their ubiquity in this discussion makes them unavoidable, and they can still serve as helpful descriptors of different approaches to relations between texts if properly nuanced.

Barton points out, however, that “the absolute polarization of these two approaches is probably exaggerated.” The following essays strongly support this observation. Both “diachronic” and “synchronic” concerns contribute to some degree in every essay.11 For some, this integration of approaches is explicit and central to their approaches. Will Kynes demonstrates how the two approaches can be put into dialogue to push beyond the scholarly impasse on the relative dating of Job and Isa 40–55 and provide new exegetical insight into both texts. Kynes’s argument hinges on recognizing the parodic use of Isa 40–55 in Job’s speeches, and Edward Greenstein similarly focuses on parody in his discussion of allusions to Deut 32 in Job. Greenstein points out that even parody,
which would appear to be undeniably diachronically oriented, depends on “a reader’s interpretation of intertextual relations.” J. Clinton McCann explicitly demonstrates this interaction of diachronic and synchronic intertextual approaches by reading the intertextual links between Marjorie Kemper’s short story “God’s Goodness” and Job first from an author-oriented perspective and then reflecting on what that intersection means for him as a reader. Paul Joyce similarly devotes separate sections of his examination of Job and Ezekiel to considering author- and reader-oriented questions. Though he concludes that a direct literary connection between Job and the only other book in the Hebrew Bible to mention the character is unlikely, he argues this does not preclude readers from employing their imaginations to explore the intertextual network opened up by this link.

Other contributors acknowledge the ways both reading strategies implicitly inform their studies. Michael Lyons observes that even in his comprehensive analysis of the author’s use of intratextual quotation and allusion within Job as part of his “communicational strategy,” a “reader-oriented” feature exists “inasmuch as all texts must be construed by readers.” In her study of Job and the “confessions” of Jeremiah, Katharine Dell “make[s] no apology for a more diachronic intertextual approach that seeks to explore connections between texts within a viable historical and literary biblical world.” However, she claims that even her choice of these two texts, “where some parallels exist though none are strong enough to be obvious on a purely diachronic reading,” adds a synchronic element “of lateral comparison that the diachronic approach alone does not have the flexibility to allow.” Raik Heckl’s essay has a similar lateral element, as he argues that “intended intertextual links” at the beginning of Job to the opening of 1 Samuel serve as “a signal for the reader to read both books as related to each other and to compare the framed book of Job with the books of Samuel and Kings.” Christian Frevel “bridges the (false opposition) between the diametrical concepts of ‘author-centered’ and ‘reader-oriented’ methodologies” in his essay by acknowledging that “the reading processes of the authors are established or (re-)constructed by (modern) readers again.” Through a survey of the “disintegrative textual signals which change the direction of reading for the (model and modern) reader,” he investigates the significance of reading Ps 104 as “one of the hypotexts beneath the book of Job.”

Even contributions that fall more naturally at opposite ends of the diachronic–synchronic spectrum may incorporate aspects of the opposite approach. John Burnight’s approach is mainly diachronic, as he argues that Job’s opening speech (chs. 3–4) involves a series of “rhetorical ‘reversals’” of traditions of Israel’s Heilsgeschichte. Although he argues
that the Job poet makes use of his audience’s familiarity with traditional biblical themes “in the pursuit of his rhetorical ends,” he discovers these reversals predominantly through identifying aspects of the Joban text that are “puzzling” to the reader; these are puzzles that a recognition of earlier intertexts helps to solve.

On the reader-oriented end of the spectrum, J. D. Nogalski reads the dialogue between Bildad and Job in Job 8–10 and Joel together to compare how the verb סָוָה functions differently within the texts, and “this synchronic approach puts into relief the theological claims of these three characters.” Though his analysis of these specific connections “exhibits no interest in the intentions of the author,” his study as a whole does contribute to our understanding of the intended meaning of the texts as it demonstrates “how intricately the characters of the two books are tied to their own competing theologies,” in which Job as protest literature “seeks to make traditional theological paradigms problematic” and Joel “instructs its readers in corporate versions of the very traditions against which Job protests.” When J. Gerald Janzen analyzes Job, Deutero-Isaiah, and several New Testament texts according to what he calls a “hermeneutics of resonance,” engaging in a “thick reading” of the texts that suggests a new understanding of the message of the book of Job, he acknowledges that this “interpretation of texts in synchronic interplay may be attributable to action occurring solely as overtones within the interpreter’s own ‘cave of resonant signification.’” And yet, his argument does not violate diachronic possibility. It could have been what the author of Job intended.

A number of the essays demonstrate how diachronic and synchronic approaches are intertwined while putting an intertextual spin on more traditional approaches to biblical criticism. Two interact in different ways with ancient Near Eastern comparisons. Christopher B. Hays discusses how Job “adapted Egyptianizing mythological imagery in various ways” to create a dialogue about death and the afterlife. The goal of his comparative study is not merely to identify the borrowing of Egyptian motifs, but, following Kristeva’s “transformational/intertextual method,” “to understand a text’s cultural context well enough to appreciate how it functioned within that context,” which, he claims, “reinforces the subfield’s best tendencies.” Manfred Oeming, however, argues that biblical scholars have placed unwarranted emphasis on imaginative connections with ancient Near Eastern mythology in their interpretation of statements about the “Urmensch” in the book of Job. Instead, in his interpretation of בָּשָׂר in Job, he claims a more compelling source for the author’s ideas is Gen 2–3.
James Crenshaw “grafs intertextual concerns with tradition criticism,” as in his analysis of Job 5:17-18 he begins with the close parallel in Prov 3:11-12, but expands his search for lexemes related to the tradition of divine discipline both across Proverbs and throughout the canon, so that they “become threads sewing together disparate texts from Job to 2 Samuel to the epistle to the Hebrews.” The study of the diachronic development of this tradition over time brings all the related texts to bear synchronically on the reading of the Job passage. Markus Witte combines intertextuality with redaction criticism as he traces “references to Deuteronomy in each literary layer in Job in order to show how Deuteronomy is repeatedly alluded to in the multiple redactional layers of Job as the book developed.”

As Samuel Balentine observes, “[i]ntertextual studies do not typically concern themselves with reception history issues,” but several essays in this volume demonstrate the interpretive value of doing so. Thus Balentine incorporates the frequent depiction of Job as a priest in art and iconography into his reading of themes from Priestly literature (and perhaps even Priestly texts) in Job. Anathea Portier-Young argues that the author of Testament of Job, a close relative of the biblical book, offers a “glossotelic” intertextual reading of Job, as he “transposes, transforms, and transvalues” language (glossa) from Old Greek Job with a purpose (telos): “to provide its readers a means for their own mystical transformation.” Susannah Ticcati explores the “unexpected deeper resonances” between Job and Augustine’s anti-Pelagian writings. Though Augustine’s use of Joban texts may at first appear to be proof-texting, she identifies “three successive moments of rapprochement between the worlds of Augustine and Job, the final one leading to the opening up of new meaning within Job.” In a more expanded examination of the history of interpretation, Gabrielle Oberhansli traces the reception of Job in talmudic-rabbinic, modern, and post-modern Jewish literature. This places the texts in this tradition not only in dialogue with Job, but also with each other and reveals a diachronic development in the way the biblical story is represented, with hatred drowning out hope.

Many of the essays involve reevaluations of purported intentional allusions between Job and other texts as posited by earlier scholars. In some cases, the evidence is found wanting, but this does not preclude the hermeneutical potential of intertextual comparison. James Aitken, for example, draws on rabbinic interpretation to demonstrate the “inevitability” of reading Job and Lamentations together. Though, he argues, the case for intentional allusion between the two books is “weak,” pursuing this inevitable connection focuses attention on the often-overlooked theme of mourning in Job, revealing his friends’ failure to provide
appropriate comfort, leaving Job devastated and alone like the besieged city in Lamentations. Employing a strict criteria for identifying verbal parallels, Richard Schultz also claims some of the arguments for verbal dependence between Job and Ecclesiastes are difficult to sustain. Even so, his analysis of these parallels, along with broader conceptual links indicated by shared key words, still yields insight into the “solidarity” of the messages of the two texts, as they together oppose, “overly optimistic views of the benefits of wisdom and wise living.”

All of the essays in this volume demonstrate, therefore, that “the distinction between author-oriented and reader-oriented perspectives is a difficult and slippery one,” as Hilary Marlow observes in her exploration of the intertextual relationship between creation imagery in Job and Amos. Perhaps this explains why the terms, such as “diachronic” and “synchronic,” or even “author-oriented” and “reader-oriented,” used to differentiate these approaches end up being so problematic, as Barton points out. They are helpful heuristic devices for describing different reading emphases, but, ultimately, hermeneutics cannot be hermetically sealed off into one approach or the other. As Ferdinand de Saussure said of the “diachronic” and “synchronic” approaches to semiotics when he coined the terms, they are both autonomous and interdependent.

This brings us to a final point Barton makes in his opening essay. He observes that both diachronic and synchronic versions of intertextuality as commonly practiced by biblical scholars are used as methods to provide insight into texts. Intertextual theory, however, as it was developed by Kristeva and her fellow post-structuralists, is not an interpretive method but more of a mindset, a way to think about texts. He calls this theoretical form of intertextuality the “hard” version, as opposed to the methodological “soft” varieties. According to “hard” intertextuality, Barton remarks, “Studies of intertextuality in Job, as in this volume, will not be important because they tell us anything about Job, but because they illustrate the truth of intertextuality in general.” The essays which follow provide a wealth of new insight into the “soft” intertextuality of Job, as the meaning of this (perhaps deliberately) enigmatic book is illuminated and enhanced by teasing out and analyzing the intertextual threads with which it is woven into a variegated tapestry of texts extending across both the canon and history. Placed in their own intertextual relationship between the covers of this book, these essays also shed light

12. Even the helpful temporal–spatial distinction, he suggests, breaks down if pushed too hard.
on current trends in “intertextual method” in the study of the Hebrew Bible. Finally, from a “hard” intertextual perspective, this volume suggests that “the truth of intertextuality” may be that the intersection of texts is also one of authors and readers.\textsuperscript{14}

\textsuperscript{14} Thus Kristeva (1980b, 86–87) claims, “The one who writes is the same as the one who reads.” She goes on to deny personality to the writer/reader (“he himself is no more than a text rereading itself as it rewrites itself”), but the contributors to the present volume do not take intertextuality to that radical conclusion.
In this essay I will put diachronic and synchronic approaches to intertextuality into dialogue in order to demonstrate how they can together contribute to pushing beyond a scholarly impasse and providing new exegetical insight. At least in biblical studies, the concept of intertextuality, despite the objections of some,¹ has developed into an umbrella term encompassing any connection between texts.² Within this broader understanding, two approaches have developed, one primarily interested in the intentions of authors, and therefore attending to the relative dates of texts, and the other largely unconcerned with these questions since it considers texts part of an infinite web of meaning to be untangled by the reader.³ Whereas diachronic approaches read texts in a historical sequence, synchronic ones enable the reader to interpret texts simultaneously, irrespective of their relative places in history. The two approaches have been set in direct opposition to one another so that, in the words of one scholar, they are “separated by an unbridgeable chasm.”⁴ That may be true of their most extreme forms, but, in fact, synchronic and diachronic concerns have always intertwined in critical reading of the Bible,⁵ and the same can be the case in intertextuality.⁶

¹. E.g. G. D. Miller 2011, 305; Carr 2012.
⁵. Barton 2007a, 188. For example, elsewhere, Barton (2000, 36) observes that the diachronic search for sources underlying biblical texts was motivated by inconsistencies perceived when it was read synchronically.
⁶. For recent studies of intertextuality in the Hebrew Bible that explicitly integrate diachronic and synchronic concerns, see Schultz (1999), Pyeon (2003), and Stead (2009), though none of them present a clear method for how this is to be done.
Using the two approaches together, in this essay I aim to answer three questions: first, are the connections between Job and Isa 40–55 the result of literary dependence? Second, if so, which text is referring to the other? And, third, what is the purpose of those allusions? I believe the answers to these questions are interdependent, each contributing to solving the others. A statement like that, of course, raises the specter of circularity. However, with the answer to the first question as a foundation supported by external evidence, such as the rarity of the shared words and phrases and their recognition by previous scholars, the latter two questions, like sides of an arch, can be built simultaneously to meet at the capstone, which will then offer structural integrity to the entire argument.

There has been thorough though not extensive work done on the first question of possible literary dependence, stretching from the late nineteenth century through two articles arguing for the dependence of Isa 40–55 on Job by Robert Pfeiffer (1927; cf. 1941, 467–76) and Samuel Terrien (1966) to a recent Ph.D. thesis by Christina Brinks-Rea (2010), who has produced a thorough treatment of the thematic, stylistic, and verbal similarities between the texts. Terrien claimed there were more than forty verbal affinities between the texts, which were too numerous and close to allow the hypothesis of independence to be seriously entertained (309), and Brinks-Rea concludes that, though much previous work has exaggerated the evidence for literary dependence (165), in several select passages Job is likely alluding to Isa 40–55: Job 9:2–12 (cf. Isa 40:26; 44:24); 12:7–25 (cf. Isa 41:20); and 16:17 (cf. Isa 53:9) (167–78, 185, 237).

Altogether, more than a century of research has yielded strong indications of some kind of literary dependence between the texts, but the extent and direction of that dependence are still open to debate. This raises the second question: can the direction of dependence be determined? For some, the scholarly consensus on the dates of these two texts is enough to resolve this question, with a sixth-century “Deutero-Isaiah” clearly preceding the postexilic (fifth- to third-century) book of Job.

I have attempted to rectify that in Kynes 2012. The method taken in this essay is an abbreviated form of the one there, which involves eight steps alternating between synchronic and diachronic concerns.

8. See Kuenen 1873, 492–542; Cheyne 1880–81, 2:226, 235–44; 1887, 84–85; Dillmann 1891, xxi; Budde 1896, xlii; Peake 1904, 38–39; Strahan 1913, 19. Cheyne and Dillmann argued Isa 40–55 was dependent on Job. Kuenen, Budde, Peake, and Strahan argued Job was dependent on Isa 40–55.
However, the date of Job is by no means a fixed point, which allows some scholars to continue to dispute this conclusion. As a result, other factors have been incorporated into the discussion, most often a possible chronological development between the respective theological messages of the two texts. However, this has proved inconclusive, open to interpretation in either direction.

Synchronic Approaches to a Diachronic Question

Facing the lack of conclusive diachronic evidence, two scholars have introduced different approaches that may be considered synchronic because they interpret the texts simultaneously, considering the meaning and likelihood of both possible directions of dependence, before suggesting a sequential relationship. In so doing, they are imagining at least one relationship between the texts that could not have historically existed, since both texts cannot be dependent on each other in a single parallel. Terrien (1966), who wrote before the terms “diachronic” and “synchronic” or even “intertextuality” were applied to these questions, devotes most of his article to comparing the respective purposes to which the two authors put the distinctive language they share. This synchronic comparison contributes to his diachronic conclusion that Deutero-Isaiah is attempting to answer the questions raised by Job (309).


10. For example, those who argue for the dependence of Isa 40–55 on Job often point to the lack of explicit mention of vicarious suffering in Job as an answer to the problem of innocent affliction prominent in both texts (see, e.g., Terrien 1966, 309; Hartley 1988, 15), assuming that if the author of Job had known Isa 40–55, he would have incorporated this solution more prominently into his work. In response, however, some have argued that the author of Job has applied the nationalistic view of suffering in Isa 40–55 to the individual (e.g. Gordis 1965, 216). Naish (1925, 41) claims Job omits vicarious suffering because he does not find it comforting. Peake (1904, 38–39) similarly observes, “Israel may suffer for the nations, but what would Job’s vicarious suffering avail?” Discussing Wisdom texts, Dell (1997) questions the entire undertaking of identifying a chronological development of ideas in the Hebrew Bible.

11. Terrien also mentions the absence in Job of the technical term אג for creation common in Isa 40–55 and observes that the parallel phrases addressing the shared theme of divine transcendence are concentrated in Job 9–10 but spread out over the whole of Isa 40–55 (e.g. Job 9:4//Isa 40:26; Job 9:12//Isa 45:9). However, against the latter argument, this phenomenon occurs in the reverse for the themes of the agony and mortality of human existence, which, according to Terrien, are spread
Risto Nurmela’s (2006; cf. 1996, 32–37) synchronic approach to the issue puts the two possible allusions next to one another and asks, primarily, which one fits more naturally into its context. This text, he argues, is more likely the original, with the awkwardness in the later text resulting from the allusion. So, for example, for the connection between Job 12:9 and Isa 41:20, in which both texts share the same phrase “that the hand of the Lord has done this” (םייחלשהמה), he concludes that Isa 41:20 is referring to Job because the expression “links up perfectly with the context in Job, but in Isaiah its function remains somewhat obscure” (13). He also argues, along the lines of lectio difficilior, that the text with the more peculiar vocabulary is more likely original since later allusions are more likely to use more common words. These two criteria are somewhat contradictory, in that the first claims the text that reads more awkwardly is likely later, while the latter claims the more awkward text is likely earlier. If later authors can smooth out vocabulary, then they could also adapt allusions to new contexts.

Given the subjectivity of identifying awkwardness in ancient texts and the demonstrated ability of biblical authors to adapt allusions to their surrounding context, in my view, Terrien’s approach holds more promise. If Nurmela is addressing the internal coherence of the allusion, how the shared language fits in its two respective contexts, Terrien is addressing the external coherence of the allusion, how it relates to the context from which it came. However, Terrien has not taken this across Job, but concentrated in the initial poem of Isa 40–55 (40:1–41:4) (309), and for the parallels between Job and the description of the Suffering Servant in Isa 53 (308). For a detailed study of intertextual connections between Job and the Suffering Servant, see Bastiaens 1997.

12. However, given that this is the only use of םייחלשהמה in the dialogue section of Job, the shared phrase actually seems to fit more awkwardly in Job. See Gordis 1978, 138. The fact that those who do not see this as an allusion to Isa 40–55 have to contrive arguments to attempt to explain this away supports its awkwardness in Job. See Nurmela 2006, 13; cf. Clines 1989, 294.

13. In fact, when Brinks-Rea (2010, 171, 175) addresses the Job 12:9/Isa 41:20 parallel, she argues that the phrase actually is more awkward in Job, where it is ambiguous, than in Isa 40–55, where its meaning in context is “straightforward.”

14. See, e.g., the intratextual allusions within the book of Job (e.g. 21:17//18:5–6).

15. This accords with the helpful principle provided by Richard Schultz, who uses the word “quotation” where many would use “allusion”: “One should seek in quotation such a use of the borrowed phrase that a knowledge of the quoted context is essential in order to properly understand the quoting context” (Schultz 1999, 227; emphasis original).
approach far enough, and I would argue that this leads him to a faulty conclusion on the relationship between Job and Isa 40–55.

Considering the external coherence of the possible allusions between Job and Isa 40–55 brings us to the third question about the purpose of those allusions, which will enable a fresh evaluation of the second question of direction. Terrien claims that Isa 40–55 is responding to the questions of existence posed by Job. This is a possible explanation, but is it really the most probable? Most of these parallels occur, on the one hand, in Isa 40–55, in the midst of praise of God as sovereign creator and sure redeemer of his people, and, on the other, in Job’s complaints that God’s sovereignty has become threatening, as the deity’s comfort has turned to affliction. It is precisely because Job’s redemption is in doubt that he vehemently appeals to God. Thus, instead of answering Job’s questions, allusions to Job’s speeches would undercut the message of Isa 40–55 altogether.

It is, of course, possible that the author of Isa 40–55 is unconcerned with the context of the Joban passages to which he is purportedly alluding, but, given the careful attention to context in his allusions to a wide range of other texts as demonstrated in a number of recent studies, this seems unlikely. My argument here is that there is a more cogent explanation for the antithetical relationship between the respective meanings of the parallels in their contexts: parody. While the negative meaning of Job’s accusations would linger and spoil the confident praise in Isa 40–55 were the author of the latter text alluding to them, it is precisely the contrast between the positive message of Isa 40–55 and Job’s reversal of it that would give his use of the parallel language its bite.

**Parody and Dialogical Interpretation in Job**

Not only does this explanation make better sense of the purposes of the purported allusions, it also agrees with Job’s use of other biblical passages. Consider the parallel between Ps 8:5 and Job 7:17–18, which has earned nearly universal acceptance as Job’s “bitter parody” of the psalm. Job twists the humble adoration of the psalmist’s question, “What are human beings that (יְהֹוָה) you are mindful of them, mortals that you care (יְהֹוָה) for them?,” into accusation: “What are human beings, that (יְהֹוָה) you make so much of them, that you set your mind on them, visit (יְהֹוָה) them every morning, test them every moment?”

16. See Tull Willey 1997; Sommer 1998; Schultz 1999. None of these studies address possible connections with Job, likely because they all consider Job to be later.
Job appears to be employing a similar technique in his allusions to Isa 40–55. For example, Brinks-Rea (2010, 170–75) observes that whereas the shared phrase in Job 12:9 and Isa 41:20 mentioned above contributes to a description of God’s redemption in Isa 40–55, in Job a cynical hymn to God’s destructive power follows, which leads her to conclude that an allusion to Job’s sarcastic parody in Isa 40–55 “seems unlikely,” while Job’s parody of Isa 41:20 would fit the context well and accord with his use of other texts. So, based on the analogy of Job’s “bitter parody” of Ps 8 in Job 7, a synchronic comparison of the external coherence of the possible allusions between Job and Isa 40–55 strongly suggests the diachronic conclusion that Job is the later text. Thus, Job attacks the message of Isa 40–55 in light of his experience, unremitting and unexplained affliction that does not accord with the prophet’s confident proclamations of God’s goodness. Often discussions of allusions in Job, including the discussion of the parody of Ps 8, stop here, but there is more to be said.

First, Job 7:17–18 is not the only allusion to Ps 8 in the book. In fact, Job’s parody initiates a dialogical interpretive debate between the characters in which they return to the psalm several more times, but for the purposes of the present study, I will only attend to Eliphaz’s initial response:

14 What are mortals, that (יְהֹוָה) they can be clean?
Or those born of woman, that they can be righteous?
15 God puts no trust even in his holy ones (יְהֹוָה),
and the heavens (יָסָא) are not clean in his sight;
16 how much less one who is abominable and corrupt,
one who drinks iniquity like water!

Here, he repeats the same opening question and basic structure found in both Job’s allusion and the psalm, and adds allusions to the psalmist’s mentions of the “heavens” (יָסָא) and “heavenly beings” (יָשׁוֹב) in vv. 4 and 6 of the psalm.

Second, considering these repeated allusions to the same text not only strengthens the case for the allusion in the first place,21 it also sheds light on the purpose of the initial allusion in Job 7. Eliphaz responds by taking the ambiguity at the heart of the psalm and emphasizing its negative

18. For a discussion of the use of the psalm across the Job dialogue, including the following allusions in Job 19:9 and 25:5–6, see Kynes 2012.
19. This is the qere. The kethib is יָשׁוֹב.
20. For this translation, see Kraus 1993, 1:183.
21. For the cumulative nature of the case for allusions, see Sommer 1998, 35.
potential, denigrating human value as insignificant and immoral in relation to the heavens. But if Job’s parody was intended to reject the undoubtedly positive message of the psalm as a whole, then how is Eliphaz’s response actually a repudiation of Job’s sentiment? If Job were to reject the psalm, then he would agree with Eliphaz that humanity is unworthy of God’s loving care, and would thereby undercut his case against God by removing the basis for arguing that God should treat him differently. It is more reasonable to argue that, though Job parodies the psalm, he does so not to ridicule or reject it but to appeal more powerfully to the paradigm of divine–human relationship it presents in order to strengthen his appeal against God. If his parody creates a “rivalry” between the view of God he depicts and the one given in the psalm, it is a contest he hopes the psalm will win.

Allusions to Isaiah 40–55 in Job

This same dialogical interpretation occurs in allusions to other psalms in Job, as well as to Isa 40–55, though with this text the technique is not quite as pronounced. Here, briefly, are four examples. These possible allusions are not the strongest between the two texts, and, in fact, it must be admitted that they could be coincidental or even shared references to a common source. However, if one concedes that Job is alluding to Isa 40–55 in the stronger cases (e.g. Job 12:9//Isa 41:20 and the group of parallels concentrated in Job 9:2–12), as does even Brinks-Rea, who believes such claims are often exaggerated, then the Job poet’s evident knowledge of some form of Isa 40–55 legitimates the search for further allusions which may be weaker. As Robert Alter (1996, 118) observes, “allusions often radiate out to contiguous allusions.” The rarity of the shared language in these examples, the thematic interplay between its use

22. Frevel 2004, 261–62. For the possibility that a parody may appeal to an earlier text as a paradigm instead of rejecting or ridiculing it, see Kynes 2011.
23. Brinks-Rea (2010, 176–77), who describes the parody’s effect as a “rivalry,” argues that through Job’s parodies of Isa 40–55, “2 Isaiah’s message has been ‘smeared,’” creating a “dialectical” relationship between the texts in which they criticize one another (see Greene 1982, 45). However, it better fits Job’s argument for him to use Ps 8 to criticize God than to criticize the psalm.
24. See Kynes 2012, where recurrent allusions to Pss 1, 39, 73, 107, and 139 are also discussed, with both Job and the friends alluding to the same psalms in every case but Ps 39.
in the two sources, and its repetition in both the speeches of Job and the friends in line with the dialogical technique demonstrated above all suggest that the author of Job is drawing widely on Isa 40–55 to inform the dialogue between Job and his friends.

Job 9:10; 5:9; and Isaiah 40:28
First, Terrien observes a parallel between Job 9:10 and Isa 40:28, in which both texts describe God’s greatness as “unsearchable” (CBI [J]).

In Job’s speech in 9:2–12, this “praise,” along with several other parallels with Isa 40–55, contributes to his complaint that one cannot contend with the transcendent God (9:3). Terrien (1966, 303) claims that Isa 40–55 is responding by affirming the grace of the creator. But it is more likely that Job, as in his parody of Ps 8, has once again taken praise and turned it into accusation.

Supporting this understanding of the parallel as well as its status as an allusion from Job to Isa 40–55 is the earlier use of the same rare phrase in Eliphaz’s first speech (5:9). However, Eliphaz, like Isa 40–55, uses the phrase to entreat Job to “seek God” (5:8) in his distress.

Job 9:12; 25:2–4; and Isaiah 45:9
Second, Job, continuing to lament God’s transcendent imperviousness to complaint in ch. 9, says, “He snatches away; who can stop him? (J) Who will say (J) to him, ‘What are you doing?’ (J)’” (9:12). The first of Job’s questions appears in Isa 43:13 and the second in Isa 45:9. Terrien (1966, 303) does not address the former parallel, but he notes that Job, by denying the second question (“what are you

27. This phrase only occurs elsewhere in Job 5:9 (see below); Ps 145:3; Prov 25:3.
28. See n. 25.
29. Nurmeila (2006, 8), who claims Isa 40:28 is alluding to Job 9:10, faces the difficulty of distinguishing that allusion from the same shared phrase in 5:9, particularly because the addresses of Job’s friends are rejected in the book (Job 42:7). He claims Isa 40:28 is referring only to 9:10, but having two different characters interpret the same phrase in different ways better explains this repetition.
30. “I am God, and also henceforth I am He; there is no one who can deliver from my hand; I work and who can hinder it (J)?” (Isa 43:13). This verse also has a close parallel in Job 10:7 (“although you know that I am not guilty, and there is no one to deliver out of your hand?”), which further suggests literary dependence.
31. “Woe to you who strive with your Maker, earthen vessels with the potter! Does the clay say (J) to the one who fashions it, ‘What are you making?’ (J) or ‘Your work has no handles?’” (Isa 45:9).
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doing?” evidently considers inquiring into God’s behavior futile, as he here associates God’s transcendence with malevolence. However, in Isa 45:9, Terrien claims, the question is considered legitimate as an inquiry into the highly moral quality of God’s providence with respect to the nations. But if the intent of Isa 45:9 is to inspire trust in God, an allusion to Job’s complaint is an inappropriate resource. Through parodying this verse, however, Job would display the ambiguity of human inability to question God and entreat the deity to turn his oppression to the type of comfort promised to Israel in Isa 40–55.

The ambiguity of this text in Isa 40–55 is reinforced when Bildad alludes to the same passage in his third speech. He declares,

Dominion and fear are with God;
he makes peace (שלום) in his high heaven…
How then can a mortal be righteous (צדק) before God?
How can one born of woman (בת) be pure? (Job 25:2, 4)

The phrase (שלום) appears only here and in Isa 45:7, where God declares absolute sovereignty over all things, including “making weal” (ערום) and “creating woe” (חינתה). God continues in the next verse, commanding the “heavens” (שמים) to shower “righteousness” (צדק) so that “righteousness” (צדק) may sprout on the earth. Additionally, in v. 10, after the verse to which Job alludes, the passage in Isa 40–55 continues, “Woe to anyone who says to a father, ‘What are you begetting (לMalloc)?’ or to a woman (בת), ‘With what are you in labor?’” (cf. Job 25:4, though these words imitate Job 15:14) and, in v. 12 refers to God’s command over the “host” (צבא) of heaven (cf. “his armies,” רגדים, in Job 25:3). Thus, Bildad adds to the repetition of the distinctive phrase (שלום) several more verbal and thematic resonances with the same passage in Isa 45 to which Job alluded. He, like Job, twists its meaning, but his intent is not to accuse God of falling short of the comfort it is meant to provide, but to use its vision of a transcendent unquestionable God to silence Job’s complaint.

32. With (שלום) in the imperfect it also appears in Isa 27:5.

33. Nurmela (2006, 42), who affirms dependence here, argues that (שלום) and (지도) compose “a more or less unique pair of opposites,” whose awkwardness is underscored by a variant in 1QIsa, where the more common parallel term (שלום) replaces (שלום). However, though this may indicate that the MT is the lectio difficilior and therefore earlier than the Qumran variant, it does not support Nurmela’s claim that it is earlier than Job 25:2. In fact, generally in Nurmela’s approach the lectio difficilior is the earlier text, not the later one.
Third, Job uses the first of the questions he shares with Isa 40–55 in 9:12 (“who can hinder it?”) for the same purpose as the second, to present God’s transcendence, as he is currently experiencing it, as threatening. In Isa 40–55, however, it communicates God’s saving intention, as the proclamation of salvation in the previous verse (43:12) indicates.

This type of intervention for good is exactly what Job is denying. It would make little sense for the author of Isa 40–55 to allude to Job. However, Job could be using this phrase from Isa 40–55 to accuse God of not acting in such a way in his life. Zophar’s use of the same phrase in the next speech indicates that this is the case. Zophar says, “If he passes through, and imprisons, and assembles for judgment, who can hinder him (יִכְכָּר אֵלֶּה)?” (11:10). Zophar has taken the promise in Isa 40–55, which Job transformed into a complaint, and turned it into a threat.

Fourth, in the context of his earlier allusion to Isa 40:28 in ch. 5, Eliphaz also appears to allude to Isa 44:25. That text proclaims that God “frustrates (כָּרַת) the omens of liars, and makes fools (דַּרְוַיָּהוּ) of diviners (בָּבַר); who turns back the wise (בִּתְחָנָם), and makes their knowledge foolish.” Eliphaz, similarly declares, “He frustrates (כָּרַת) the devices of the crafty, so that their hands achieve no success. He takes the wise (בִּתְחָנָם) in their own craftiness; and the schemes of the wily are brought to a quick end” (5:12–13). These are the only two places where the verb כָּרַת appears as a hiphil participle. Though previously overlooked in the discussion of this parallel, the recurrence of “the wise” adds to the allusion. For both Eliphaz and Isa 40–55, this image is intended to express God’s power and justice, though Isa 44:25 offers it as comfort, while Eliphaz implicitly threatens Job.

Job, however, returns to the same verse in ch. 12, in which he parodies other aspects of Eliphaz’s speech in ch. 5 (e.g. 12:15//5:10). He says that God “leads counselors away stripped, and makes fools (דַּרְוַיָּהוּ) of judges” (12:17), which repeats the rare polel form of the verb דַּרְוַיָּהוּ found in Isa 44:25, and, along with that verse, uniquely applies it to God, while

34. See Job’s similar use of the same phrase in 23:13.
35. Terrien (1966, 308) claims it also occurs in Ps 33:10, but that the verb כָּרַת is a hiphil perfect of כָּרַת (Delitzsch 1887–89, 1:485).
36. The only other occurrence is Eccl 7:7.
following a similar syntactical structure. However, in contrast to Isa 40–55 and Eliphaz, Job describes God’s power not as just, but as arbitrary, without the indications found in the other passages that those whom God afflicts deserve this fate. This accords with Job’s experience, though it is an experience he hopes will end, which suggests he actually hopes the just God will return to oust the unjust one he is now experiencing.

Conclusion

This study has demonstrated how synchronic and diachronic concerns may be mutually beneficial in the discussion of intertextual connections in the HB. In these four examples, a synchronic comparison, which takes the parallel language and envisions how it would relate to the respective contexts from which it would have come were it an allusion, leads to the diachronic conclusion that Job is much more likely to be the later text. Job’s parody of the praise and promise in Isa 40–55 make more sense than Isa 40–55 incorporating Job’s complaint and accusation into its message. Also, by inserting this shared language into the dispute between Job and the friends, the author of Job unsettles it, giving it to different characters who use it for different purposes in their debate. If Job is the later text, this accords with the dialogical interpretation of other texts in Job, such as the psalms, but complicates matters if Isa 40–55 is later. The most pressing problem would be the passages in Isa 40–55 that would then have to incorporate language from the divergent messages of the speeches of both Job and the friends (Isa 45:9//Job 9:12; 25:2–4; Isa 44:25//Job 5:12–13; 12:17). But even when the same language appears in different speeches in Job (Isa 40:28//Job 5:9; 9:10; Isa 43:13//Job 9:12; 11:10), the reader would face the difficulty of determining to which speech Isa 40–55 was referring.

37. Note also the synonym for “wisdom,” as well as the play on the word הָגָה in Isa 44:25, which could mean “diviner” or “deceiver,” as Job proclaims “With him are strength and wisdom (יָדָע); the deceived and the deceiver are his (יָדָע הָגָה)” (Job 12:16).

38. See n. 29. The only case where a phrase in Job is repeated twice in Isa 40–55 is in Job 13:28//Isa 50:9; 51:8, where the simile of a moth-eaten garment is used. However, unlike the debate between Job and his friends, both times in Isa 40–55 this image has a similar context, so Job could be referring to either or both occurrences. A comparison of the contexts in Isa 40–55 and Job again suggests that Job is the later text, taking the proclamation against enemies in Isa 40–55 and applying it to God’s treatment of humanity in general and himself particularly by implication.
Beyond strongly suggesting the author of Job was familiar with Isa 40–55, exegetically, these examples demonstrate the contrasting ways Job and his friends use earlier texts. While Job parodies passages, using them as a paradigm to accuse God, the friends use them more directly. But their wooden interpretation often either twists the earlier promises into threats or empties them of their force by not taking into account Job’s situation.

This diachronic conclusion then aids the synchronic comparison of the passages, as the allusions reflect back on Isa 40–55, revealing an ambiguity in the presentation of God there. Though each of the affirmations from Isa 40–55 discussed above may offer comfort when placed in the soteriological context of that text, all carry a threatening aspect, which Job experiences and complains of and the friends use to silence his complaints. And yet, if Job does indeed use his parodies to try and convince God to change God’s ways, then the positive side of that imagery must inform his interpretation, as well. He feels the threat but longs for the comfort Isa 40–55 offers, and so this text is an ideal resource to express his frustration.