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Lament Personified

Job in the Bedeutungsnetz of Psalm 22

WILL KYNES


This chapter will employ the intertextual relationship between Ps 22 and the book of Job to demonstrate the tendency toward the personification of lament in Hebrew literature. First, I will put this connection in a wider hermeneutical context by outlining five similar intertextual connections between the psalm and the wider Hebrew tradition: the life of David, other Old Testament books, the New Testament, the Midrash, and the Dead Sea Scrolls. This brief summary will demonstrate both the wide, powerful influence of Ps 22 in the Hebrew understanding of suffering and the method of relecture with its reciprocal effect on the interpretation of texts and events. Second, I will use the lexical, thematic, and narrative similarities between Ps 22 and the book of Job to argue that its author has likewise interpreted Job's experience through the words of the psalm. Finally, I will consider the reciprocal implications of this Bedeutungsnetz ("meaning network") on our interpretation of these texts caught within its hermeneutical web.

The second step encounters methodological difficulties that are worth acknowledging at the outset. First, though, as I will show, the lexical repetition between Job and Ps 22 is repeated and ranges across both texts, no single intertextual connection has quite the "volume," to use Richard Hays's term, to prove direct dependence. Though parallels in Job to other psalms, such as the "bitter parody" of Ps 8:42 in Job 7:17–18 or the verbatim quotation of Ps 107:40 in Job 12:21a, 24b, may approach that level of certainty, the possibility of a third common source or an oral form informing the parallel language cannot be definitively discounted. For this reason, some scholars are reticent to affirm dependence between Job and any text. However, arguments for allusion are cumulative, and in this case I will propose that the evidence considered in total, including the significant narratival similarities, suggests at least a significant possibility that one text is dependent on the other, and that the repeated verbal similarities are not merely common stock language for lament, but contribute to a sustained dialogue between the texts. The rarity of the shared language elsewhere in the OT contributes to this argument, but it is primarily the way these verbal similarities correspond to the close narrative affinity between the texts that suggests direct dependence may be involved.

Even when the probability of dependence is established, the problem of priority remains. Here again, definitive conclusions are elusive. The exact dates of both Job and Ps 22 are unknown. Scholars tend to date Job between the fifth and third centuries BCE, but few commentators are willing even to hazard a guess at the date of Ps 22 beyond suggesting that

---

2. According to Brevard Childs, relecture is "the process by which a later biblical writer made use of an earlier writing in order to produce a new form with its one individual integrity" (Introduction, 514).
3. In linguistics, the Bedeutungsnetz of an ambiguous word is used to describe its meaning. See Wurtzer, "The Structure of the Linguistic World," 9.
4. For Hays' criteria for identifying intertextual "echoes," see Hays, Echoes of Scripture, 29–32.
5. English verse numbering will be used throughout.
6. E.g., Dion, "Formulaic Language," 192.
7. Sommer, A Prophet Reads Scripture, 35.
PART ONE: Foundations

vv. 27–31 are a later, possibly postexilic, addition. Again, a suggestive cumulative argument is the best available. The author of Job appears to be aware of not only the lament form in general, but also specific psalms, lament and otherwise. These psalmic allusions contribute to the author's broader interaction with texts across the Old Testament. The psalm, on the other hand, as I will demonstrate, has been a particularly attractive source for later texts describing extreme suffering. So, Job shows a propensity to build on earlier texts, especially the Psalms, and Ps 22 to be a brick in later textual superstructures. Whether these tendencies hold true here is, admittedly, beyond definitive proof, but even if the diachronic tension between them is still illuminating, as it demonstrates that the author of Job has taken the lament imagery found in that psalm and a similar narrative and personalized it in his depiction of Job's experience.

RELECTURE OF PSALM 22

Some have suggested an original liturgical Sitz im Leben for Ps 22. Whether or not the psalm actually originated in the temple, through its superscription, the text itself associates its origin with David. Brevard Childs observes that these Davidic superscriptions historicize the Psalms by drawing them into David's person and history, which suggests an initial relecture for the psalm. The superscriptions' "of David," invites the reader both to interpret what follows in light of the Israelite monarch and to understand David through the words of the psalm, drawing Ps 22 into a wider intertextual relationship with the psalms attributed to David and the Davidic narratives in the historical books. Though the superscription of Ps 22 does not refer to any specific detail from David's life, other superscriptions do, and, because those incidents are generally not royal occasions, Childs argues that the Davidic superscriptions encourage readers to interpret the Psalms as testifying to "all the common troubles and joys of ordinary human life in which all persons participate." However, the psalm's hyperbolic imagery militates against either a Davidic or everyman ultimate referent as it transcends them both.

Second, driven by this "extravagance of expression," interpreters look beyond David to some future referent. Even interpreters who continue to attribute the psalm's words to David place its meaning elsewhere. Rashi, for example, writes, "David composed this prayer with reference to the future [exile]." The text of the psalm itself may even testify to this relecture. Several scholars suggest that the eschatological hymn that closes Ps 22 (vv. 27–31) is a postexilic addition when the psalm was applied to the corporate suffering of the nation of Israel by which it mediated between God and the nations. This possible relecture of the psalm would draw it into relationship with the prophetic books, especially Isaiah. Even if these final verses were written by the psalmist himself, they involve a new reading of his experience in which he points beyond himself to the community and the future.

Third, whether the result of a later addition or not, this "prophetic and universalist" conclusion, which is "rare in the Psalter," may explain the New Testament writers' affinity for the psalm. Thus Calvin says: "David here speaks of himself in hyperbolic language, and he does this in order to lead us beyond himself to Christ." Whether the psalm is prophetic or not, the "morphological fit" to Jesus' passion is undeniable, and thus it becomes the boldest hue in the evangelists' scriptural

8. E.g., Gerstenberger, Psalms, 1:112.
10. See Frevel, "Theologie der Menschenwürde," 257, 262; Kynes, My Psalm has Turned into Weeping.
11. See, e.g., Pycon, Intertextuality.
12. This would accord with Gerstenberger's proposal that its original cultic use was for "cases of extreme and prolonged suffering" (Gerstenberger, Psalms, 1:113).
palette as they depict the sufferings of Jesus.\(^{25}\) Jesus' agonized quotation of Ps 22:1 in Aramaic (Matt 27:46; Mark 15:34) is the culmination of a series of allusions in all four gospels to the psalm. The casting of lots for Jesus' clothing appears in each account (Mark 15:24; Matt 27:35; Luke 23:34; John 19:23–24; cf. Ps 22:18). The mocking that pervades the psalm also appears throughout the passion narratives. Matthew's placement of jeers from the psalm in the mouths of the chief priests, scribes, and elders (Matt 27:43; cf. Ps 22:8) contributes to an array of lexical correspondences sewn through the accounts.\(^{26}\) Missing from the gospel accounts but later interpreted as prefiguring the crucifixion is the phrase, "They have pierced my hands and feet" (22:16).\(^{27}\) The evangelists' relecture of the psalm is so complete that some of the church fathers denied that it had any reference to David at all. Thus, Tertullian claimed, "David himself did not suffer this cross, nor did any other king of the Jews."\(^{28}\)

Fourth, however, even if the psalm did not refer to David's experience, Jewish interpreters were unwilling to have this text wrested from their tradition. In addition to Rashi's nationalistic interpretation, the rabbis in the Midrash apply the psalm to Esther.\(^{29}\) The connection begins with the words נָשׁ֣וֹנָה יֹֽצֶר (nashonah yoter) in the superscription. The first word could mean either "hind, doe," or "strength" and the rabbis apply both meanings to Esther, first, because Esther is traditionally likened to a hind,\(^{30}\) and second, because David foresaw, "that 'O my Strength' was the apostrophe wherewith she would call upon the Holy One," and so David wrote the superscription "thinking upon Esther."\(^{31}\) As the commentary progresses, the lament is put on Esther's lips, and various details of the psalm are read in light of her experience.\(^{32}\) For example, the opening cry of verse 1 is understood with regard to the growing urgency of Esther's fast:

On the first day of a fast, one says: "My God;" on the second day, one says: "My God;" only on the third may one say, "Why hast Thou forsaken me?" So it was only after Esther cried in a loud voice, "What hast Thou forsaken me?" that her cry was heard.\(^{33}\)

The comments on verses 9–19 construct another prayer around Esther's confrontation with King Ahasuerus. In this account, verse 16—which is translated, "My hands and my feet they made repulsive"—refers to Esther's statement, "Though Haman's sons practiced sorcery on me so that in the sight of Ahasuerus my hands and feet were repulsive, yet a miracle was wrought for me, and my hands and feet were made to shine like sapphires."\(^{34}\) Further, the casting of lots for the garments of the afflicted in verse 18 is said to refer to the bystanders' desire for Esther's royal cloak as they expect her demise, though the queen is miraculously delivered.\(^{35}\)

A fifth example of the relecture of Ps 22 was found at Qumran. Loren Fisher argues that QH 5:5–19 views an earlier disaster through the interpretive lens of Ps 22.\(^{36}\) He observes that the Qumran psalmist begins, "I willingly thank thee, O Lord, for thou has not forsaken me," echoing the first words of the psalm, even as he transforms what follows from a lament into a thanksgiving psalm.\(^{37}\) This theme continues as in lines 6 and 12 the author repeats the phrase, "Thou hast not forsaken me." Further, the beginning of line 11 ("But they do not open their mouth against me") adds only a negating nîq to the same Hebrew phrase in Ps 22:13. Also, as Sigmund Mowinckel notes, the depiction of enemies as beasts, especially lions, which is "characteristic of Psalm 22," appears in the Qumran text.\(^{38}\)

---

25. See Mays, Psalms, 105. For an overview of various approaches to the intertextual connections between the passion narrative and Ps 22, see Tanner, Lens of Intertextuality, 61–69.

26. These include the "contempt" of Herod and his soldiers for Jesus (Luke 23:11: Ps 22:7), the crowds that "look on" (Luke 23:35; Luke 23:48; Ps 22:7) and "shake their heads" (Mark 15:37; Matt 27:39; Ps 22:7), the leaders that "scorn" (Luke 23:35; Ps 22:7) and the criminals that "laugh" (Mark 15:32; Matt 27:44; Ps 22:6). See Mann, "No Ordinary Lament," 333.

27. The MT here reads, "Like a lion [טָנַךְ], my hands and feet," and translators have evidently struggled to understand the verse. See Craigie, Psalms 1–50, 196.

28. Tertullian, Adversus Marcionem, 158.

29. According to Mann, "The understanding of Psalm 22 as Esther's prayer dominates interpretation of the psalm in the amoraic period (third to fifth centuries CE)" (Mann, "No Ordinary Lament," 317). Jerome was already aware of this interpretation in the fourth century (Jerome and Siegfried Risse, Commentarioli in Psalmo, 120–21).

30. Braude, Midrash, 1:397.

31. Braude, Midrash, 1:305.

32. Mann suggests that the editing of the commentary gives the impression that "the Psalm is principally about Esther" (Mann, "No Ordinary Lament," 319 n. 81).


34. Ibid., 1:320.

35. Ibid., 1:321.


37. In this formal classification, he follows Mowinckel, "Hodayot 39.5–20," 267.

Finally, lines 12 and 13 have parallels to God’s hearing and delivering of the psalmist (Ps 22:20, 24). Mowinckel claims the speaker is “a definite individual,” whom he suggests may be the Teacher of Righteousness. Whoever chose to interpret his experience of disaster and deliverance desire to articulate new praise to God through the mediation of older forms and the role of Ps 22 in that pursuit.

PSALM 22 IN JOB

Given this recurrent interpretation of the suffering of certain important individuals through the words of Ps 22, the personage of Job is a fitting candidate to receive such a treatment. Claus Westermann has argued that Job is a “dramatizing of the lament,” as its author “stands within traditions which so determine his thought and shape his questions that he cannot express himself in other than already formed linguistic structures,” and thus weaves the basic motifs of lamentation together into a dramatic form. By demonstrating the similarities between Job and the lament genre, which includes Ps 22, Westermann invites further reflection on this connection. Westermann’s reliance on form criticism results in two shortcomings for his study, however. First, he is unable to account for the prose sections of Job because they have no formal parallel in the lament psalms. Though he claims the narrative framework “simply must be there” because it demonstrates that “the one lamenting in the poem is a real person,” he largely ignores its content. Second, he reads Job through the generic aspects of the lament, which downplays the textual details of both Job and the Psalms. Therefore, he discourages attempts to discern allusions to specific psalms in Job, instead focusing on “the relationship of the parts to one another.”

43. Westermann, Structure, 12–32.
44. Westermann, Structure, 7, 8. Emphasis original.
45. Ibid., 32.

46. Mullenburg, “Form Criticism and Beyond,” 5. Because Carol Newsom addresses Job’s interaction with certain genres of speech, including the lament, this tendency is also apparent in her insightful work into the dialogical nature of the book (Newsom, Moral Imaginations, esp. 136–38).

47. Vall, “Vox Christi,” 184. He is quoting Craigie, Psalms 1–50, 197 and Mays, Psalms, 108. For more on narrative approaches to biblical interpretation, see Bartholomew and Goheen, “Story.”
which, together with the evidence of other readings of Ps 22, justifies reading Job and the psalm together.\footnote{For “meta-intertextuality,” a sustained interaction with another text that warrants reading an alluding text “against the wider context of the specific passages being alluded to,” see Stead, Intertextuality of Zechariah, 254.}

Comparing the “plots” of Ps 22 and the book of Job has several advantages over Westermann’s form-critical approach. First, it follows the text itself instead of creating generic categories. Second, it requires attention to the whole text as a complete presentation of the narrative. Third, whereas the form-critical approach tends to divide the psalms in a unified fashion, the psalms’ transition from trust to lament appears. In his first words, “My God, my God,” the psalmist, like Job’s friends reflect the psalmist’s complaint, which has already erupted in the first verse, reflects a tangle of afflictions similar to Job’s. While the psalmist wonders how God could forsake him when he has been cast upon God “from birth” (Ps 22:10) and “from the womb” (Ps 22:10), Job rejects the life God has given him altogether, asking, “Why did I not die at birth [Ps 22:9], come out from the womb [Ps 22:10] and expire” (Job 3:11).\footnote{See Craigie, Psalms, 55; Baus, Feinde, 28.}

Both describe their suffering with similar corporal hyperbole. The psalmist says, “I am poured out [Ps 22:11] like water, and all my bones [Ps 22:11] are out of joint” (v. 14). Job takes up these images in his closing lament (30:16–17):

14 And now my soul is poured out [Ps 22:11] within me; days of affliction have taken hold of me.
15 The night racks my bones [Ps 22:11],

and the pain that gnaws me takes no rest.

These two words are nowhere else in the OT so closely connected.\footnote{See Schaefer, Psalms, 55; Baus, Feinde, 28.} Job’s elaboration on the psalmist’s words corresponds with several of his other allusions to the Psalms.\footnote{These terms appear together six other times in the OT, and, among those, Ps 58:3 similarly combines both nouns with ṣāḥ. A slightly different construction appears in Isa 46:3.}

Intermingled with the lament in both texts is a dialogue with the enemies. This dominates much of the book of Job, but in the psalm it appears only in verses 7–8, where the psalmist’s enemies advise, like Job’s friends, “Commit your cause to the Lord; let him deliver—let him rescue

55. Craigie, Psalms 1–50, 202, 185.
56. Baus, Feinde, 109–10, see also 63. See also Craigie, Psalms 1–50, 199.
57. See Schaefer, Psalms, 55; Baus, Feinde, 28.
58. These terms appear together six other times in the OT, and, among those, Ps 58:3 similarly combines both nouns with ṣāḥ. A slightly different construction appears in Isa 46:3.
59. The ending of the word is different, but this need not invalidate the allusion.
60. They only appear in even the same chapter three other times in the OT.
[םור] the one in whom he delights!” (cf. Job 5:17–19 where Eliphaz gives similar advice and uses the same word [םור]). The enemies’ mocking advice here is unique among the individual laments.62 Further, similar to the dialogues in the book of Job, where the earlier words of a disputant are often reused in a different way,63 the psalmist takes up the words היחל from the mockers and repeats them with new meaning in verses 19–20. Job implicitly charges the friends with mocking him like similar advice and uses the same word advice here is unique among the individual laments.

In Job’s dispute with his friends a dialogue is also initiated between the book of Job and Ps 22. When Eliphaz claims, “The roar [חרית] of the lion [חרית], the voice of the fierce lion, and the teeth of the young lions are broken. The strong lion perishes for lack of prey [חרית], and the whoelp of the lioness are scattered” (4:10–11), his use of lion imagery to represent enemies, using three of the same words or roots, counters the threat they present in Ps 22:13 (“they open wide their mouths at me [חרית בְּלַע], recalling Ps 22:13 (“They open wide their mouths at me [חרית בְּלַע]”).65

In Job’s lament (e.g., Job 16:10–13 and 16:17), the psalmist does not provide the content of this response, but the Job poet pens some of the Bible’s most powerful poetry to fill this gap. After Psalms (e.g., Ps 7:11; 35:17), nowhere is the language as close. Psalm 58:7, as Westermann observes, similarly requests that God break the teeth of the lions, employing the same rare word חינה (“break”), used only seven times in the Old Testament, as Job 4:10.66 Eliphaz may be conflating the latter passage with Ps 22:13.

In Ps 22:6, the psalmist says, “But I am a worm [חרית], and not human [חרית]; scorched by others, and despised by the people.” Only in five other passages is the word for “worm” used with that meaning, and of those, only in Isa 41:14 is it used metaphorically, but not in contrast with humanity. However, in Job 25:6, Bildad claims, “If even the moon is not bright and the stars are not pure in his sight, much less a mortal [חרית], who is a maggot [חרית], and a human being [חרית], who is a worm[חרית]!”

The two words for “worm” are almost identical. This form is only used in one other place, Isa 14:11, where it is not applied to humanity. Though different words are used for humans in Job and the psalm, the common contrast and the rare word for “worm” suggest an allusion.69 Hermann Speierkern argues that here the negative anthropological perspective of the friends is fully recognizable, as this phrase is consciously taken in isolation from its context in Ps 22 and made into the essential definition of humanity.70

In verses 19–21, the psalmist turns to petition, but he, like Job, does not explicitly ask to be saved from his affliction.71 Both sufferers long for God to “answer” (חרית) (Ps 22:2; Job 31:35), and when he does finally “answer” (חרית), it is the turning point of both texts (Ps 22:21; Job 38:1).72 The psalmist does not provide the content of this response, but the Job poet pens some of the Bible’s most powerful poetry to fill this gap. After

62. According to Westermann, the other individual laments are 6, 13, 35, 38, 42, 43, 88, 102, and 109 (Westermann, Praise and Lament, 182). The enemies also speak in Ps 35:21, but the address is not explicit and is not advice. The nearest parallel is Ps 42:2–3, 10, where the enemies ask, “Where is your God?”

63. E.g., Job 18:5 and 21:17. For the importance of quotation in Job see Gossis, Book of God and Man, 169–89.

64. Gerald Janzen notes this similarity and claims that later in the same chapter Job conforms his speech to the lament of the innocent when he uses other images which appear in Ps 22 (Job 16:10 and Ps 22:7; Job 16:13 and Ps 22:14). See Janzen, Job, 122–23.

65. See Wright, Job, 21–22. He claims Ps 22 “represents a man whose sufferings were very similar to if not identical with” Job’s.

66. Westermann, Structure, 85–86.
PART ONE: Foundations

God’s response, Job and the psalmist are alike in expressing their faith while their situation remains unchanged (Ps 22:22; Job 42:2–6).73 Eventually both are restored, and for both this restoration is twofold with both God and the community. God’s answer and the sufferers’ faithful responses demonstrate the former; the concluding verses of both texts focus on the latter. God’s scolding of Job’s friends is implicit in the psalm, as they disappear from the narrative. In both accounts, the community gathers and welcomes the outsiders back. They share a meal with the sufferers (Ps 22:26; 29; Job 42:11), commiserate with them (Ps 22:24; Job 42:11), and though Job does not “live forever” (Ps 22:26), he is given twice the normal lifespan (Job 42:16; cf. Ps 90:20). He lives to see four generations, presumably passing on his account of what God had done (cf. Ps 22:30–31).74 Thus, Job, like the psalmist, is among the afflicted who will “eat and be satisfied” (נָאְשָׂתָו בְאֶשׁ-יִרְדָּן, Ps 22:26), as he “eats” (חְסָדִי; Job 42:11) and dies “full” or “satisfied” (נָאְשְׂתִי) of days (Job 42:17).

HERMENEUTICAL CONCLUSIONS

In this intertextual reading of Ps 22 and the book of Job, two conclusions implicit in the other relectures of the text become more explicit. First, the relecture of an earlier work creates an interpretive reciprocity between the two texts, which influences the exegesis of the words, images, and narrative of both works, and, second, the Bedeutungsnetz that repeated relectures create testifies to a Hebrew tendency toward particularity.

The reciprocity of relecture appears as the “original text is seen in a new light from the relecture of the older” and the “newer text is also interpreted from the understanding created from the comparison with the relecture of the older.”75 The former effect is undeniable in the impossibility of a Christian reading of Ps 22 free of the interpretive effect of its Christological relecture.76 But the latter is also called for following the example of the New Testament writers who used the psalm as a hermeneutical context for Jesus’ crucifixion.77 Thus, this intrinsic reciprocity means the question of the ultimate referent of the psalm fundamentally misunderstands the nature of its relation to its later relectures. Further, if each relecture of the psalm affects our interpretation of it, and if its meaning affects our understanding of each relecture, then transitive readings between various relectures are necessary, especially if those relectures are canonically endorsed.78 Thus, if Job is one relecture of the psalm and Jesus’ passion is another, understanding all three fully requires reading them all in dialogue with each other.

This type of Bedeutungsnetz is the natural result of the Hebrew preference for particularity reflected in the way the Bible “usually refuses to postulate generalized doctrines without moving swiftly to personalized particulars.”79 In contrast to the modern predilection for propositions, an interpretative approach R. R. Reno brands “conceptual allegory,”80 the authors of the Old Testament favored persons. Therefore, Ps 22 is not tied to the passion narrative or its other later appropriations by a common experience of “Godforsakenness,”81 “the reality of suffering and faith,”82 or any other abstract “theological reflection as concerning the divine res, not the scriptural signa,”83 which has been extracted from the text and then applied to another personage, dragging traces of the psalm’s language with it. Instead, the later authors use the psalm, the signa itself—its words, images, and narrative—to understand their subjects, not merely the res it represents. Thus, the biblical authors share the “profound personalism” of Dostoevsky, for whom “there are no ideas, no thoughts, no positions which belong to no one, which exist ‘in themselves.’”84 For the biblical authors, there is no such thing as “no-man’s thoughts” which float in a vague conceptuality and may be applied to various people.

73. Fyall, Now My Eyes, 182. Further, McCann suggests the psalmist’s invitation to glorify God in verse 23 “indicates renewed recognition of God’s sovereignty” (McCann, “Psalms,” 764). This parallels Job’s reinvigorated faith in God’s sovereignty in Job 42:2.
74. The last word of the second to last verse of both texts is דָּעִי (“generation”).
75. Kellum, Farewell Discourse, 61.
76. Tostengard, “Psalm 22,” 170.
77. Mays, “Prayer and Christology,” 323.
78. By this I mean that the relecture has been incorporated into a community’s authoritative canon, which, for Christian interpreters, puts the Qumran and Midrash relectures in a different category.
79. Tate, Psalms 51–100, 445.
83. Reno claims that this is the failure of Child’s exegesis (Reno, “Biblical Theology,” 398).
84. Bakhtin and Emerson, Dostoevsky’s Poetics, 31.
Instead, there are scriptural texts, which describe the experience of specific persons—"word-events" as Westermann would say. Therefore, Westermann's comments may apply just as well to the purported redactors of the psalm, the evangelists, the rabbis, or the Qumran community, as they do to the Job poet:

For the poet of the Book of Job there is no such thing as thoughts about suffering, or reflective suffering; for him there is only real, experienced suffering. This real, experienced suffering is to be found not in abstract reflections but only in the reaction of a concrete human being to his own suffering—a cry or in muffled silence or in the personal act of expressing this suffering, which means in a lament.

However, Westermann is still too abstract, because it is not in the "form of the lament" but in the words of actual laments, Ps 22 especially, that the Job poet depicts Job's concrete suffering, and the evangelists follow him in this approach. It is in this and its other particularized interpretations—the irreducibly concrete Bedeutungsnetz of the narrative word-events of David, Israel, and Job—that Ps 22 informs our understanding of the passion, and not in abstract theological propositions extracted from it. And the same could be said for each of those relectures, mutatis mutandis. And, lastly, it could be said of us, as well, to the degree that our experience reflects that of the psalm, even if only through the gut-wrenching and faith-building process of reading it and thereby entering its narrative world ourselves.

85. Westermann, Structure, 33.
86. Westermann, Structure, 32. The emphasis on "the reaction of a concrete human being to his own suffering" supports my attention to narrative in the section above because this makes the character even more concrete, instead of merely disembodied words in an eternal present.
87. See Vanhoozer, Drama of Doctrine, 270.
88. See Anderson, Psalms, 1:192.

The Enemy Lament
A Socio-Cognitive Approach to the Metaphors of Job 16:7–14

Carlos Patrick Jimenez

INTRODUCTION

Chapters 16:1—17:16 of The book of Job contain the fifth speech of Job. Although containing a variety of themes, the main topic in 16:7–14 does not seem to be the suffering of humanity as in the previous four speeches, but the suffering of Job. As in the former laments, Job argues that the main reason for his distress is God himself. However, in 16:7–14, Job pours out his complaints against God in a more intense manner, and gives by far the most merciless and severe depictions of Divine animosity in the whole book. The depiction of God is such that some scholars refer to this personal lament as the "enemy lament." The language of job 16:7–14 raises some issues. Newsom observes expressions in these texts