The Suffering Servant of Isaiah and the Suffering of Job

Andrew Perry

Introduction

Many studies and commentaries highlight intertextuality in Job; the field of comment is extensive. In this paper we want to examine such intertextuality as it pertains to the book of Isaiah, and in particular oracles assigned to Isaiah of Jerusalem and Second-Isaiah. We offer two case studies based in Job 3 and 16.

Most scholars today would date the composition of the book of Job to some point between the seventh and the second centuries BCE, with the probability that a prose folktale of a pious sufferer existed long before the largely poetic book itself was written.[1] Such a consensus about the date does not rule much out, but a later date allows the author of Job to have used more of the Jewish traditions; an earlier date requires us to suppose that later Jewish writings use Job. We will assume a late post-exilic date.

The Hebrew of Job is notoriously difficult. Any intertextual work based on the MT will be susceptible to text-critical objections, where these promote emendation of the text. However, it is still a legitimate exercise to investigate the intertextuality of the MT of Job, as any results contribute to a determination of the text. That is, plausible links between Job and other Jewish traditions may support certain text-critical choices. The scholarly cut and thrust of argument cuts both ways.

Computer tools facilitate intertextual work, but lexical or syntactic co-incidence between Job and other texts does not of itself establish the presence of an allusion. In order to do this, a case has to be made for intentional re-use on the part of the author of common materials. Many scholars would speak of an "author" of Job because of its consistency and coherence, even if they recognise a redactional history. But, the notion of intentional re-use is central to identifying an allusion at whatever redactional layer. We will assume that there is an "author" of the final form of Job and attribute intertextual connections to this fictional person.

In order to make a case for an intentional re-use of language from another text, a larger semantic structure is invoked: an allusion makes sense within a *larger framework* of interpretation in Job. For example, one scholar, V. Hoffer, in a recent paper entitled, "Illusion, Allusion and Literary Artifice in

---

[1] D. J. A. Clines, *Job 1-20* (WBC; Dallas, Texas: Word Publishers, 1989), lvii.

the Frame",[2] notes shared unpointed lexical and syntactic material between Job 1:12 and Gen 22:12 (אל תשלח ידך) as well as other lexical items in the story of Abraham's trial and Job 1 & 2. However, she justifies the presence of allusion on the basis of a shared theme of trial. The "theme" therefore is the more complex semantic structure.

Another example of this type of justification of allusion is a recent paper by J. C. Bastiaens, entitled, "The Language of Suffering in Job 16-19 and in the Suffering Servant Passages of Deutero-Isaiah".[3] This scholar notes various shared lexical items and syntactic structures between Isaiah 50 and 52/53 and Job 16 & 17. The justification of the allusions is the shared *theme* of a suffering individual.

The literary model may change, but the procedure remains the same: if further justification is required in order to agree that there is an allusion within a text, then the allusion is taken as a *component* in larger shared structure, such as a theme, a motif, a plot, a shared character, *and so on*. Essentially, what is going on in this analytical procedure is this: the intentionality of the allusion is based on the presence of a larger shared *design*, and it is the notion of shared design that cascades the intentionality down to the smaller lexical items. Of course, the claim of a sharing of design is as much a claim to an allusion as the claim of shared lexical material. In terms of method, what makes the claim to a sharing of design more impressive, is its larger scope and the involvement of multiple elements. If the presence of multiple elements that go together in a text to make-up a design feature are found in another text within a shared literary environment, then it is more likely that there is allusion and echo.

C. A. Newsom[4] has shown that a reading of Job that "privileges" the narrative envelope is likely to be different from one that "privileges" the dialogues. The narrative envelope offers a context in which Job is conceived as a patriarch and his suffering is local and domestic. The dialogue suggests a different picture of Job: there is a political and a military dimension to the suffering of Job. This extra dimension is suggested by the intertextuality of Job with the Hebrew Prophets. The extent to which the dialogues of Job can be read in conjunction with the Prophets is the extent, perhaps, to which the book needs to be re-classified as a genre (perhaps *sui generis*) other than "wisdom".

---

[2] In S. L. Cook, C. L. Patton & J. W. Watts (eds.), *The Whirlwind* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001). See also J. L. Crenshaw, *Defending God* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 66.

[3] In J. Van Rutien & M. Vervenne (eds.), *Studies in the Book of Isaiah* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1997). Older scholars to note this linkage include S. Terrien, "Quelques remarques sur les affinité de Job avec le Deutéro-Esaie", *VTSup* 15 (1966): 295-310.

[4] C. A. Newsom, "Cultural Politics and the Reading of Job", *Bib. Int.* 2 (1993): 119-134 (124).

The book of Job has allusive links with Jewish scriptural prophetic traditions. The question is whether this allusiveness has a larger frame of reference and is this shared with Job? Do the military and political concerns of the Prophets supply a framework that Job shares? Does the military and political vocabulary of Job apply on a level additional to the patriarchal folktale? If this were to be the case, it would make Job into a *parabolic* figure for Judah, and possibly the king of Judah (and, possibly, *mutatis mutandis* — Israel).

The standard commentaries on Job do not attempt such a reading, even if they variously note links between Job and the Prophets. B. S. Childs observes in his *Introduction* that this view, "that Job is a type of the Hebrew nation in suffering",[5] which he attributes to Ewald, has not received support. However, J. C. McCann, in a recent essay, "Wisdom's Dilemma: The Book of Job, the Final Form of the Book of Psalms and the Entire Bible", notes that "a growing number of scholars in recent years have suggested that the book of Job was an instrumental resource in assisting Israel to respond to the crisis of the exile and perhaps even was composed in response to the exile".[6] J. L. Crenshaw has also noted that "resemblances between Job and certain canonical works, specifically Deutero-Isaiah and the hymnic passages in Amos, attest to a desire to link Job more closely with Israel's religious thought".[7]

There is scope therefore for intertextual work to establish the parameters of such a reading. The main objection that immediately suggests itself for such "corporate" readings is that the book is intensely personal. It may therefore be that any corporate symbology in the book will only work if there is a suffering individual at the heart of Judah's experience. The only systematic parabolic commentary to reflect this approach is that by D. Wolfers, *Deep Things out of Darkness*.[8] Wolfers' view is that "Job is primarily an allegorical figure representing the people of Judah and their king Hezekiah in the time of Assyrian conquests".[9] In their review of recent Joban scholarship, Waltke and Diewert describe Wolfers' book as a "striking anomaly" and comment that "it is unlikely that his views will gain wide acceptance" although they also say that it is "a helpful counterpoint to the conventional lines of

---

[5] B. S. Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture* (London: SCM Press, 1979), 531.

[6] J. C. McCann, "Wisdom's Dilemma: The Book of Job, the Final Form of the Book of Psalms and the Entire Bible in *Wisdom, You are My Sister* (ed. M. L. Barré; CBQ Monographs 29; Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1997), 109.

[7] J. L. Crenshaw, *Old Testament Wisdom: An Introduction* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1979), 122.

[8] D. Wolfers, *Deep Things out of Darkness* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995).

[9] Wolfers, *Deep Things out of Darkness*, 14-15.

understanding".[10] Wolfers attempts to integrate Job into an eighth century context. Our contrary proposal will consider Job in relation to the post-exilic thought of Deutero-Isaiah, as well as Isaiah of Jerusalem, in order to see if a more satisfactory integration of Job with Israelite prophetic traditions can be obtained, other than that offered by Wolfers .

Newsom observes comments that "a new reading should be judged in part by how well it deals with problems left over by other models, though it will inevitably introduce new ones. It should be rigorously answerable to the text in a nonarbitrary fashion. But if a new reading is to be culturally valuable, it should engage the book by means of emerging reading conventions that are part of the cultural project of the interpreter's present".[11] One of the problems with conventional "wisdom" readings of Job is a comparative neglect of prophetic intertextual links. However, such links challenge the scholar to offer a systematic explanation to account for them in the context of the development of Israelite thought.

In order to have some manageable textual material to discuss, we will focus on Job 3 and 16. We will start with the familiar, the comparison of Job with the Suffering Servant, and then consider some unfamiliar links. Although we only make a small number of observations, we have a programmatic objective in showing how the overtly political and military imagery in Job might supply an Israelite application.

Job 16
The book of Isaiah has four oracles of a suffering servant (Isa 42:1-4, 49:1-7, 50:4-9, 52:13-53:12). This servant was commissioned by God to redeem Judah, but endured great suffering. The identity of the Suffering Servant is a vexed question. [12] My assumption for this paper is that it is the Davidic king. While not asserting a one-to-one identity between the Suffering Servant and Hezekiah, I suspect that the Isaianic songs have as one catalyst the emerging idealized picture of Hezekiah. This king provides a suitable typological platform (in the idealized picture of the Chronicler) for the idea that an eschatological Davidic king would suffer and the Suffering Servant passages have this *ideal* quality.

---

[10] B. Waltke & D. Diewert, "Wisdom Literature" in *The Face of Old Testament Studies: A Survey of Contemporary Approaches* (eds., D. W. Baker & B. T. Arnold; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2004), 318-327 (327). This review is restricted and a broader review can be found in R. J. Williams, "Current Trends in the Study of the Book of Job" in *Studies in the Book of Job* (ed., W. E. Aufrecht; Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfred University Press, 1985).
[11] C. A. Newsom, *The Book of Job: A Context of Moral Imaginations* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 16.
[12] Scholars disagree on the identity of the suffering servant — whether it is a corporate group like Israel, or an individual. Our interest is only in those descriptions that focus on an individual.

Scholars have noted intertextual links between the Suffering Servant and Job.[13]

The following lexical and thematic links can be proposed:

- Job is "my servant" (עבדי, Job 1:8, 2:3, Isa 42:1); God praises the Suffering Servant as he does Job.

- The people consider the Servant to be "stricken" of God (נגע — Isa 53:4); likewise, Job is "stricken" of God (נגע — Job 19:21).

- Job is considered to be chastised (מוסר) by the Almighty (Job 5:17); the same "chastisement" is predicated of the Servant (מוסר, Isa 53:5).

- Job is "despised" (מאס, Job 19:18, בזה, Isa 53:3) by compatriots.

- Job's friends "forget" (שׁכח) him and his brethren "stay away" (רחק) from him (Job 19:13-14); the Suffering Servant's compatriots "hide their faces" (Isa 53:3).

- There is an internal group amongst the brethren who are more vociferous; they buffet the Suffering Servant and Job; The Servant and Job are "smitten" on the "cheeks" (נכה, לחי, Job 16:10, Isa 50:6, 53:4).

- The servant does not hide his face from "spitting" (Isa 50:6 — רק), using a rare word (3x) that only occurs in Job (2x) and Isaiah. Job records his experience as "They abhor me, they flee far from me, and spare not to spit (רק) in my face" (Job 30:10, cf. Job 17:6 (R.S.V.)).

- Job claims that what has befallen him was "not for any violence" in his hands (חמס על לא, Job 16:17), and this phrase occurs once elsewhere in Isaiah 53:9, "because he had done no violence".[14]

- Job asserts that his prayer was pure (זך, Job 16:17); this corresponds to their being no guile found in the Suffering Servant's mouth (מרמה, Isa 53:9, cf. Job 31:5).

---

[13] See J. C. Bastiaens, "The Language of Suffering in Job 16-19 and in the Suffering Servant Passages of Deutero-Isaiah" in *Studies in the Book of Isaiah* (eds., J. Van Rutien & M. Vervenne; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1997). J. E. Hartley, *The Book of Job* (NICOT; Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1988), 14-15 and E. H. Dhorme, *Job* (London: Nelson, 1967), clv. J. W. Thirtle makes a strong case for identifying Hezekiah as the catalyst for the Suffering Servant oracles in *Old Testament Problems* (London: Henry Frowde, 1907), ch. 12.
[14] This link is noted by M. H. Pope, *Job: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB; Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1965), 124.

- Job says that upright men are astonished or appalled at what has happened to him (שׁמם, Job 17:8); this is an aspect of the Suffering Servant, "many were appalled (שׁמם) at thee" (Isa 52:14).

- Job says that the mockers will not be "exalted" (רום — Job 17:4); but this is what will happen to the Suffering Servant (רום — Isa 52:13).

- Job wants someone to "contend" with him (ריב — Job 13:19 (R.S.V.)), and the same question is posed by the Suffering Servant (ריב — Isa 50:8), "Who will contend with me?".

- Job complains that he is being eaten by the moth (עשׁ — Job 13:28); whereas the adversaries of the Suffering Servant would be eaten by the moth (עשׁ — Isa 50:9).[15]

- Job rests his case with God, as does the Suffering Servant (Isa 49:4, Job 16:19).

The question arises as to whether Second-Isaiah is dependent on Job or Job is dependent on Second-Isaiah at this point. This question involves taking a view on the date of the material in the book of Isaiah, but we can as a minimum offer the suggestion that Second-Isaiah is here developing the reasons for the necessity of a "Suffering Servant" beyond that picture presented in Job, and that therefore these oracles in the book of Isaiah post-date Job.[16] R. H. Pfeiffer argues this case and concludes that "Job appears to be the source of Second-Isaiah".[17] His essential point is that Second-Isaiah has "found a solution [to the problem of Job's suffering] in the idea of voluntary vicarious suffering".[18] S. Terrien supports this view, and after setting out some lexical links between Second-Isaiah and Job, concludes that "the figure of the servant in Second Isaiah is described in a way that is strongly reminiscent of Job, and shows that Job is not the borrower".[19]

It is not necessary to propose a developmental relationship following Pfeiffer; it is just as possible that the relationship is complimentary. Crenshaw observes that "the epic substratum of the didactic narrative concerns the

---

[15] Pope transposes Job 13:28 to a position after Job 14:2 asserting that the verse is "obviously out of place", *Job*, 106. However, this is not certain, and Pope does not consider the intertextuality of this text. The author positions God as his adversary in Job's lament (v. 21) and Job describes himself "as a rotten" thing (כרקב) being eaten by a "moth" (עשׁ). The same two expressions occur in Hos 5:12, "Therefore *will* I *be* unto Ephraim as a moth (עשׁ), and to the house of Judah as rottenness (כרקב)". Hosea places God in the same structural role of an adversary as the author of Job. There is therefore a reason to retain Job 13:28 in its current position.

[16] See the contrary discussion in Dhorme, Job, clvi.

[17] R. H. Pfeiffer, "The Dual Origin of Hebrew Monotheism", *JBL*, 46 (1927), 203.

[18] Pfeiffer, "The Dual Origin of Hebrew Monotheism", 206.

[19] S. Terrien, *The Book of Job* (IB III; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1954), 889.

search for a single instance of disinterested righteousness" and that "innocent suffering functions as a secondary theme".[20] While some scholars see no particular fit between the narrative envelope and the dialogue, it can be argued that the narrative story moves beyond the declaration that "in all this Job did not sin with his lips" (Job 2:10) to illustrate disinterested service in the *dialogue event*.

We have cited Newsom's view that the narrative envelope is dissonant with the dialogue. Another illustration of this is the fact that disinterested righteousness is *not* a topic of discussion between the dialogue participants. Instead, the discussion has concerned *whether* Job is innocent and suffering undeservedly. The presupposition of this discussion is that suffering as such is not undeserved and that there must be a reason for Job's suffering, i.e. sin. However, this point comments upon the *content* of the dialogue and does not characterize the dialogue event.

Dissonance between the prologue and dialogue can be harmonized, if the author is presenting the dialogue is an *example* of disinterested service; the dialogue shows that Job continues to serve God with nothing as a reward. He continues to serve God because he passionately discusses God; he wants to know the reason for his suffering; he wants to meet God and hear his answer. Job does not curse God, nor does he renounce his beliefs concerning God. Hence, the dialogue illustrates disinterested service, because currently Job sits on an ash-heap — he has nothing.[21] It is conceivable that disinterested service could have been narrated in a different type of story, for example, in ministering to "the poor" without thought for any reward, but the author has eschewed this type of story.

The prologue offers closure to the narrative dynamic set up by the challenge of Satan, insofar as Job affirms that "good and evil" alike come from God (Job 2:10). However, the dialogue event is not inconsistent with this closure. The dialogue extends the test placed upon Job beyond that of his "boil", and his wife's "advice", to a persistent offer by the friends to pursue self-interest. The expectation engendered in the reader by the prologue and the dialogue together is whether Job will admit some infraction and be restored to favour and thus vindicate Satan;[22] or will he maintain his innocence in a state of continuing destitution, and thus vindicate the deity.

---

[20] J. L. Crenshaw, *Introduction to Old Testament Wisdom* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1981), 100-101; see also his *Defending God*, 69, where he says that חננם "encapsulates the gist of the entire story".

[21] The dialogue does show that Job has things, for instance, a household, but the point is that relatively speaking he has been reduced to nothing.

[22] Clines argues that the epilogue "deconstructs" the dialogue insofar as Job is restored to prosperity and his wealth is doubled, and this shows that it is in a person's self-interest to serve God, see "Deconstructing the Book of Job" in his book of essays, *What Does Eve Do To*

The book of Job therefore is not about the problem of innocent suffering, and no answer is needed from God to explain Job's suffering; no justification is needed. The prologue has set up the question of disinterested service, and the book needs to demonstrate this, and it does so insofar as it records no fall from service on the part of Job as a result of his "boil", following the temptation of his wife, and despite the arguments of the friends.

The characteristic of "disinterested righteousness" is a substantial quality to be placed *alongside* that of vicarious suffering. Second-Isaiah and Job both describe an "innocent" servant, but the author of Job focuses on the requirement that such a servant "serve God for nought" (Job 1:9), whereas Second-Isaiah sees a requirement for vicarious suffering. The quality of "disinterested righteousness" makes a vicarious act possible because it excludes self-interest from the motivation for the act. Accordingly, contrary to Pfeiffer, the author of Job may in fact be developing Second-Isaiah because he has seen the theological need to underpin the vicarious act of the Suffering Servant with the quality of disinterested righteousness. Disinterested righteousness is a pre-condition for a vicarious act.

While commentators have noted similarity between Job and the Suffering Servant, the connection is undeveloped. One reason for this is the apparently different contexts: the Suffering Servant has something to do with Judah, or the nation, and Job appears to be a patriarchal tale. However, if a parabolic reading of Job is developed, then Job becomes a figure of the nation and her king, and their suffering. The links between the Suffering Servant and Job can then be given a more systematic basis. Whether this project is achievable depends upon how the rest of Job is read intertextually (with the Prophets).

The success of such a project depends on many factors, for example, how the references of key terms are determined, such as "the Wicked Ones" (Job 3:17 *et al*), "the Wicked One" (Job 18:5-6), "the Hypocrites" (Job 15:31-35), "the Oppressor" (Job 3:17), the "Scourge" (Job 9:20-24), *and so on*. There is sufficient political and military imagery within the speeches of Job and the friends to warrant such a project, and for a case to be made that Job has an Israelite application, but the critical test for such a reading lies in God's speeches. Here it would be necessary to reconfigure the interpretative context for the divine speeches along three lines: i) relate the language of creation to the use of such language to describe the formation of Israel and the position

_____

Help?, (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994). However, it is not clear that Clines essay is an exercise in deconstructive criticism insofar as it does not point up the presence of subtle codes distributed throughout the book that undermine its apparent themes. We would argue that the book illustrates both the possibility of disinterested righteousness and the receipt of good and evil from the hand of the Lord and this is not a deconstructive conjunction.

of Israel among the nations, ii) relate the language of the weather to prophetic figures for describing God's providential dealings with Israel and the nations, and iii) relate the referential terminology for the creatures to comparable terms of reference for the nations surrounding Israel.[23] Discussion of this "critical test" is beyond the scope of this essay, and as second example, we will look at some of the political imagery in Job 3.

Job 3
Job's first speech opens by lamenting the day of his birth (Job 3:3-5), and the night of his conception (Job 3:6-7). It is the narrator that describes his utterances as a curse (Job 3:1). His words are often passed over as a natural response to human suffering, but they convey a special self-understanding — that Job was a "promised seed" in the purpose of God.

> Let the day perish wherein I was born, and the night *in which* it
> was said, there is a strong man (גבר) conceived (הרה[24]). Job 3:2

Job says that the night of his conception was a night in which it was stated that a "strong man" (גבר) was conceived. This is remarkable because it suggests that this knowledge of the sex of the unborn child was the subject of prophecy. A pre-announcement of the birth of a male child is characteristic of a number of barren birth stories in Jewish scriptural traditions and a common herald of a coming "child of promise" (e.g. Isaac, Esau and Jacob, Samuel). Moreover, stories that specifically detail the *conception* of a child are overwhelmingly about the forthcoming birth of a significant person in the traditions (e.g. Gen 4:1, 17, Gen 21:2, Exod 2:2, Jud 13:3, 1 Sam 1:20).

The prophecy about Job was about a "strong man". In terms of seeing Job as a parabolic figure for a Davidic king, this prophecy links to the following text:

> David the son of Jesse said, and the <u>man</u> (גבר) *who was* raised up
> on high, the anointed of the God of Jacob… 2 Sam 23:1

In the light of this Messianic (משיח) understanding, Job's lament is very significant.[25]

---

[23] For a discussion of animals as military and political figures see W. P. Brown, *Seeing the Psalms A Theology of Metaphor* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002), ch. 6.

[24] Contrary to some commentators, this verb is used for conception *and* for being pregnant, rather than the actual giving birth, and so Job is *not* lamenting the day and night in which he was *born* — see Gen 16:11, 38:24, Jud 13:5, 7, 2 Sam 11:5 — so Dhorme, *Job*, 24, R. Alter, *The Art of Biblical Poetry* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1985), 78, Pope, *Job*, lii, Y. Pyeon, *You Have Not Spoke, You Have Not Spoken What is Right About Me: Intertextuality and the Book of Job* (New York: Peter Lang, 2003)*,* 69, and other commentators.

[25] Compare here Jeremiah's deliberate pastiche of Job 3 in Jer 20:14-18. A link has been noted by scholars such as Dhorme, *Job*, clix-clixii; Pope, *Job*, 27-28; N. C. Habel, *The Book of*

A political context also explains the *fear* that Job expresses in his speeches.

> "For the thing which I <u>greatly feared</u> (פחד פחדתי) is come upon me, and that which I was afraid of is come unto me. I was not in safety, neither had I rest (שׁקט), neither was I quiet (נוח); yet <u>trouble</u> (רגז) came." Job 3:25-26

This utterance is telling. If we consider this remark in the light of the prologue and Job's happy circumstances in the beginning, it is difficult to think of a reason why Job should greatly fear anything. His only concern is whether his sons might transgress a cultic law. However, a parabolic reading makes these words very poignant.

Job did not greatly fear death. The earlier part of his opening speech makes this quite clear. Rather, the thing which he feared was punishment from God upon the people. His lament that he was not in safety and not in rest — whereas he might have reasonably expected to have safety and rest — is a remark alluding to the reward that God had previously given to righteous leaders of the nation.

The typical concept of rest[26] here is an Edenic motif relating to the nation and the work of the nation in the land. The land is presented as a "second" place of rest that God was preparing for the nation. The people attempted to enter the land, but they did "not enter into...rest" (Psa 95:11, cf. Heb 3:16-19). Had Israel entered the land, their *work* would have been the destruction of the inhabitants. When they did eventually enter the land, this is what they did, but success was not the result of their labour; God worked through them (Josh 24:13). The land was given as a place of "rest" from war for the people (Josh 11:23, 14:15[27]).

The same typology is reflected in Judges, which illustrates a constant pattern: Israel would be placed in the position of captivity, and so they would "groan" and this "by reason of..."[28] those that oppressed them. A man would

---

Job, (OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1985) 103, although they differ in how they read the direction of dependency. Jeremiah offers an early reading of Job 3 in the political context in which he found himself, one in which cities have been destroyed and there is the cry of war.

[26] For a discussion of this theological motif, see the essay, "There Remains still a Rest for the People of God" in G. von Rad, *From Genesis to Chronicles* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005).

[27] These verses use the same word for "rest" as Job 3:26.

[28] This expression is often part of a cluster of allusions to the Exodus redemption. Another example is found in 2 Chronicles 20 where Jehoshaphat was dismayed "by reason of" a great

be "sent", as Moses was "sent" (Exod 3:12, Jud 3:9, 6:14), of whom the Lord would say, "I will be with thee" (Exod 3:14, Jud 2:8, 6:16). This judge would redeem them from this state of chaos (Jud 6:4), and make a new beginning (Jud 7:19). The seed of the Serpent would be "cast down" (Gen 3:14, Jud 3:25), and the nations would again be "subdued" with "dominion" restored to Israel (Gen 1:28, Jud 3:30).[29] The land would have "rest" all the days of the judge (Gen 2:2, Jud 3:11).[30] [31]

Job's lack of "rest" and "quiet" in the land, which he might have reasonably expected as a righteous Davidic king, causes him to curse his birth and wish for the *ironic* "rest" and "quiet" of death:

> For now should I have lain still and been quiet (שׁקט), I should have slept: then had I been at rest (נוח). Job 3:13

Job's lament can be seen against this background. Parabolically, he was a righteous king— he might have reasonably expected "rest" during his days, but the "dread (פחד) he dreads (פחדתי)" of a calamity in the land had happened. The word פחד is used in a number of places in the book of Isaiah to describe this effect on the people of the threat of invasion, for instance,

> Fear (פחד), and the pit, and the snare, *are* upon thee, O inhabitant of the land (ארץ). And it shall come to pass, *that* he who fleeth from the noise of the <u>fear</u> (פחד)... Isa 24:17-18 cf. Isa 2:10, 19, and 21

Job's language alludes to the Deuteronomy 28 curses, and the word for this fear (פחד) occurs in the Prophets mainly in connection with an expectation of war:

> And thy life shall hang in doubt before thee; and thou shalt <u>fear</u> (פחד) day and night, and shalt have none assurance of thy life: In the morning thou shalt say, Would God it were even! And at even thou shalt say, Would God it were morning! For the <u>fear</u> (פחד) of thine heart wherewith thou shalt <u>fear</u> (פחד), and for the sight of thine eyes which thou shalt see. Deut 28:66-67

---

multitude of enemies (2 Chron 20:15). He and the people were delivered, and the land had "rest" for the rest of his reign (2 Chron 20:30).

[29] See also Jud 4:23, 5:13, 8:28, and 11:33.

[30] The word here for "rest" is the same word as in Job 3:26; see also Jud 3:30, 5:31, 8:28, 18:7, 27.

[31] Job also wishes for "quiet" and this word occurs in the same kind of passages in Josh 1:13, 21:44, 22:4, and 23:1.

The author of Job may have taken his alliteration פחד פחדתי directly from Deuteronomy 28.

Job states that "trouble" (רגז) had come, and this word occurs only twice outside the book of Job — in Isaiah and Habakkuk:

> And it shall come to pass in the day that the Lord shall give thee rest from thy sorrow, and from thy <u>trouble</u> (רגז), and from the hard bondage wherein thou wast made to serve. Isa 14:3, cf. Hab 3:2

The context of this verse suggests that "trouble" can be invasion, exile and enslavement. Thus Job's reflection is that a comparable calamity has come upon the land. There was an *object*[32] of fear and this had "come" upon Job. Hence, Job castigates those who would "raise Leviathan (a mythical representation of an invader)" to curse his day.

In his opening speech, Job describes the appeal of death as the place where *equally* the weary and "the wicked ones" avoid the coming "trouble":

> There <u>the wicked ones</u> (רשעים) have forgone (חדל[33]) *the* <u>trouble</u> (רגז); and there the labour of strength (יגיע) rests. *There* the prisoners rest together; they hear not the voice of the <u>oppressor</u> (נגש). Job 3:17

If the "trouble" (רגז) is an invasion of the land and the capture of the people, both "the wicked ones" and those who labour in the field equally forgo this fate when they are in the grave. This parallelism may identify "the wicked ones" as the ruling (land-owning) class, who go to the grave, along with the poor who work in the field.

Job says that the prisoners rest in the grave and do not hear the voice of "the oppressor". The Hebrew word (נגש) is used of a taskmaster (Egypt), but it is used of foreign enemies as well. The Qal participle form of the word that is used in Job 3 only occurs elsewhere in Isaiah 14:4 and Zechariah 9:8,

> That thou shalt take up this proverb against the king of Babylon, and say, how hath the <u>oppressor</u> ceased! The golden city ceased! Isa 14:4

---

[32] It is this sense of an "object" that makes Job's usage of this word "fear" connect to Isa 14:3, rather than, say, Job 14:1.

[33] This word is rare (4x) and has the sense of "leaving" rather than "cessation" as in the A.V. — see Jud 5:6, 7 (roads deserted, villages emptied), Job 19:14 (kinsfolk leave), and particularly Jer 51:30 (Babylon forgoes fighting).

In the terms of any parabolic reading, Job would be saying that the prisoners of the grave "rest" from a foreign army.

These are a few examples of Job's shared vocabulary; if the prophetic context for this shared vocabulary was to be significant, it would be necessary to show across the whole of Job a similar framework. All we have done in this paper is set out a few illustrations.

Conclusion
A parabolic reading is necessarily based on intertextual clues that prompt the reader to supply different meanings and intent for the text. In a recent monograph, Y. Pyeon observes, "…previous scholarship rarely discussed the possibility of another level of connection between the speeches: Job and his friends employ references to other biblical texts in order to present a debate concerning divine righteousness".[34] This judgement is too sweeping; commentaries such those by Pope or Habel cite relevant intertexts, but outside the Wisdom Literature, prophetic intertexts receive comparatively little development. This essay, like that of Pyeon, seeks to redress this imbalance.

Crenshaw's recent study of theodicies in Jewish traditions, *Defending God*, identifies texts that contribute to a theodicy of atonement. He proposes that the royal figure of Josiah may be the catalyst for the Suffering Servant poem of Isaiah 53.[35] Tracing a "royal theodicy" in Job is supportive of the general thesis that Israelite traditions encode this kind of theodicy, and Crenshaw cites other texts that illustrate atonement as restoration of harmony between God and man; Job deserves consideration as another example.[36]

We have argued that disinterested righteousness compliments an atonement theodicy because it makes self-sacrifice possible. Animal sacrifice stipulated an unblemished requirement, and the moral counterpart for this in an atonement theodicy is innocence. However, of itself, innocence is not sufficient to make vicarious suffering possible; this crucially requires the element of disinterest on the part of the individual. It is this element that the author of Job has proven and linked to the existing Israelite tradition of a suffering royal figure. Such a figure, through suffering, could restore

---

[34] Pyeon, *You Have Not Spoken What is Right About Me*, 43-44.

[35] Crenshaw, *Defending God*, 144.

[36] This is not to say that other theodicies are not illustrated in Job, see Crenshaw, *Defending God*, 120.127; it is rather the claim that the author's point of view is centred in an atonement theodicy.

harmony between God and man, and bring about an end to the evil that had befallen the people.[37]

It remains to ask whether it is possible to establish that Job is intentionally using vocabulary in the same way as the eighth-sixth century prophets. The question of intentionality is a question of purpose and design: does the shared vocabulary of Job share a design with its use in the eighth-sixth century prophets. A building block may be used in a detached house or a terrace house; and each house may evince a different design. Equally, each house may share design characteristics comprised of the building blocks configured in the same way. Intentional use of vocabulary used elsewhere can be proven if it is shown to be part of a larger shared design,[38] such as a theme, a motif, or a narrative plot. Our two case studies attempt to illustrate the possibilities in this project.

---

[37] In a recent essay, "The Servant of Isaiah 53 as Triumphant and Interceding Messiah" in *The Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 in Jewish and Christian Sources*, (eds., B. Janowski & P. Stuhlmacher; Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 2004), 216-217, J. Ådna observes that the LXX rendering of Job 42:8, εἰ μὴ γὰρ δι' αὐτόν ἀπώλεσα ("but for his sake I would have destroyed you") suggests an early vicarious reading of Job's presence.

[38] This is a form of the Design Argument for the existence of God.