But Man is Born to Trouble …

KU Leuven
Faculty of Theology and Religious Studies



But Man is Born to Trouble …

Metaphors in the Discussion on Hope and Consolation in Job 3–31

A dissertation presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctor's Degree in Theology

Promoter

Prof. dr. dr. Pierre Van Hecke

by

Hanneke van Loon

2017

Promoter:
Prof. dr. dr. Pierre Van Hecke

Dissertation committee:
Prof. dr. Bénédicte Lemmelijn
Prof. dr. Eibert Tigchelaar
Prof. dr. Ellen van Wolde

© 2017, H. van Loon

Typesetting by TAT Zetwerk, Utrecht

Contents

Acknowledgments IX

Introduction 1

1 Metaphor and Biblical Exegesis: A Proposal 5
1 New Developments in Cognitive Linguistics and Biblical Exegesis 5
1.1 *Lexical Semantics, Metaphors, and Emotions* 6
1.2 *The Importance of Cognitive Linguistics for Biblical Exegesis* 8
2 Metaphor in Cognitive Linguistics 9
2.1 *Metaphor and Thought* 11
2.1.1 Conceptual Metaphor Theory 12
2.1.2 Conceptual Blending Theory 13
2.1.3 Class Inclusion Theory 14
2.1.4 Career of Metaphor Theory 15
2.2 *Metaphor and Language* 16
2.2.1 Metaphor and Simile 17
2.2.2 Analogies, Extended Similes, Extended Metaphors, and Allegories 18
2.2.3 Personification 20
2.2.4 Metaphor and Metonymy 21
2.3 *Metaphor and Communication* 24
2.3.1 The Interaction between the Conceptual, Linguistic and Communicative Dimensions of Metaphors 24
2.3.2 Metaphor and Rhetoric 25
2.3.3 Metaphor and Stylistics 27
3 Metaphor and Biblical Exegesis 29
3.1 *Exegetical Approaches to Biblical Metaphor* 30
3.2 *The Exegetical Approach to Biblical Metaphor in This Dissertation* 34

2 The Theme of Suffering in the Book of Job 37
1 Literary Approaches to the Book of Job 37
1.1 *Dell: The Misuse of Genre* 39
1.2 *Newsom: Genres as Voices in a Polyphonic Dialogue* 42
1.3 *Perdue: Metaphors of Cosmology and Anthropology* 44
1.4 *Summary and Outlook* 48

2 The Structure of Job 3–31 50
2.1 *Job 23–27: Wolfers (1993)* 50
2.2 *Job 28: Lo (2003) and Jones (2009)* 52
3 Metaphors of Suffering in Job 3–31 57
3.1 *The Development of Job's Suffering in Job 3–31* 57
3.2 *The Selection of Passages and Metaphors* 60

3 Suffering in the Opening Speech (Job 3): The Unrest of Being Imprisoned in Life 63
1 Job 3:20-26 in the Context of Job 3 63
2 Job 3:20-26: Text and Translation 64
3 Metaphors in Job 3:20-26 68
3.1 *Light (3:20)* 68
3.2 *Treasure Hunting (3:21-22)* 70
3.3 *Way (3:23)* 72
3.4 *Food (3:24)* 75
3.5 *Movement (3:25-26)* 76
3.6 *Agitation (3:26)* 78
4 The Conceptualization of Suffering as Being Imprisoned in Life 80

4 Suffering in the First Speech Cycle (Job 4–15:16): The Loss of Hope 83
1 The Conceptualization of Suffering in Job 7:1-11 83
1.1 *Job 7:1-11 in the Context of Job 4–7* 84
1.2 *Job 7:1-11: Text and Translation* 89
1.3 *Metaphors in Job 7:1-11* 93
1.3.1 Service (7:1-3) 93
1.3.2 Day (7:4) 95
1.3.3 Fabric (7:6) 96
1.3.4 Wind (7:7) 98
1.3.5 Cloud (7:9) 99
1.4 *The Conceptualization of Suffering as a Lack of Hope—Part I* 100
2 The Conceptualization of Suffering in Job 10:18-22 101
2.1 *Job 10:18-22 in the Context of Job 8–10* 101
2.2 *Job 10:18-22: Text and Translation* 108

2.3 *Metaphors in Job 10:18-22* 110
2.3.1 Visibility (10:18) 111
2.3.2 Existence (10:19) 112
2.3.3 Light and Darkness (10:20-22) 114
2.3.4 Departure (10:21) 116
2.4 *The Conceptualization of Suffering as a Lack of Hope—Part II* 118
3 The Conceptualization of Suffering in Job 14:4-12 119
3.1 *Job 14:4-12 in the Context of Job 11–15:16* 119
3.2 *Job 14:4-12: Text and Translation* 124
3.3 *Metaphors in Job 14:4-12* 128
3.3.1 Boundary (14:5) 129
3.3.2 Service (14:6) 130
3.3.3 Tree (14:7-10) 131
3.3.4 Water (14:11-12) 133
3.3.5 Sleep (14:12) 134
3.4 *The Conceptualization of Suffering as a Lack of Hope—Part III* 136

5 Suffering in the Second Speech Cycle (Job 15:17–22:30): The Denial of Consolation 137
1 The Conceptualization of Suffering in Job 17:6-16 138
1.1 *Job 17:6-16 in the Context of Job 15:17–17:16* 138
1.2 *Job 17:6-16: Text and Translation* 141
1.3 *Metaphors in 17:6-16* 145
1.3.1 Light and Darkness (17:7.12-13) 145
1.3.2 House (17:13-14) 148
1.3.3 Rest (17:13.16) 149
1.3.4 Decomposition (17:14.16) 151
1.4 *The Conceptualization of Suffering as a Lack of Social Recognition* 152
2 The Conceptualization of Suffering in Job 19:20-29 153
2.1 *Job 19:20-29 in the Context of Job 18–19* 153
2.2 *Job 19:20-29: Text and Translation* 155
2.3 *Metaphors in Job 19:20-29* 160
2.3.1 Body (19:20.22.26-27) 161
2.3.2 Redemption (19:25) 165
2.3.3 Dust (19:25) 166
2.3.4 Vision (19:26-27) 168
2.4 *The End of Job's Existential Suffering?* 170

3 Winding Up the Dialogue 171
3.1 *Exploring Job's New Understanding of Reality* 171
3.2 *A New Status Quo* 176
3.3 *Opening Up New Perspectives on Hope and Consolation: The Case of the Poor* 177

6 The Suffering of the Poor in Job 23–31: On Morality in an Imperfect World 179
1 Job 23–31: On Morality in an Imperfect World 180
2 The Suffering of the Poor 203
2.1 *Job 24:2-12: Cattle, Food, and Nakedness* 204
2.2 *Job 30:3-8: Food and Cattle* 208
2.3 *Job 31:13-22: Birth and Family; Food and Clothing* 210
3 The Topic of the Poor and Needy, and the Discussion of Job's Yield 213

Conclusion 215
1 But Man is Born to Trouble … 215
2 Metaphors and the Rhetorical Development in Job 3–31 216
3 Interpretational Cruces and Other Interpretational Decisions 218
4 Notes for Future Research 222

Bibliography 225

Acknowledgments

Writing a dissertation requires efforts and a sense of purpose, but even so, the final result is a matter of fortuity. In acknowledgment of Job's stand that nothing should be taken for granted, I here wish to thank those who have directed my course and made me arrive at this point.

The research for the present dissertation was carried out as part of the project "Depicting Suffering, Imagining God. The Use of Metaphor in the Conceptualisation of Suffering and of the Divine in the Book of Job" which was funded by the Research Council of the KU Leuven.

First of all, I thank Pierre Van Hecke for initiating this project and for providing me with a theme and a theoretical approach. I would not have been analyzing metaphors and writing on suffering in the book of Job, if I were not asked to come to Leuven and assigned to this challenging task. Interpreting metaphors in the book of Job is like solving puzzles within a puzzle, and it takes linguistic and literary explorations to find a way out. I appreciate Pierre for considering my investigations with an open view, and I am happy that I could trust on his sharp, accurate, and critical comments to advance on my ways.

Furthermore, I thank my former teachers in Tilburg and Leiden. Besides Pierre, I mention Ellen van Wolde, Holger Gzella and Karel Jongeling. Their originality and creativity has been an example when I was developing my approach to the book of Job.

To conclude, I thank those who have been there during the process of writing my dissertation. I am happy to have been part of the research unit Biblical Studies at the KU Leuven, and I especially thank Johan de Joode, Jannica de Prenter, Bärry Hartog and Arjen Bakker for their company and friendship. I also thank my current employer TAT Zetwerk for helping me to turn my manuscript into a book. I am grateful for having a family that keeps drawing my attention to what matters in life. I thank them for their support and for creating the conditions to finish this dissertation.

Introduction

> For misery does not grow out of the dust,
> nor does trouble sprout from the ground,
> but man is born to trouble just as sparks fly upward.
>
> Job 5:6-7

When Job finds himself in an emotional state of turmoil, Eliphaz confronts him with the harsh reality that humans cannot escape trouble. Has Job been naive and is it only because of his misfortune that he comes to realize that doing good does not guarantee a life without pain? I hold that Job was well aware of the fact that trouble is part of life. The reason for his agitation is not his misfortune as such, but the existential lack of sense and perspective it confronts him with. Job accepts that life comes with trouble, but he does not accept that it comes without meaning. Indeed, if humans are born to trouble, they have the responsibility to address it.

In this dissertation, I seek to explore how Job's determination to make sense of a broken world can serve as a guideline regarding how one can arrive at a more comprehensive understanding of one's place in the world. From an exegetical perspective, I aim to address how developments in the conceptualization of his situation enable Job to deal with his misfortune.[1] As I hold that Job's process of repositioning takes place in chapters 3–31, it is these chapters that I focus on in this dissertation. Metaphors play an important role in the attempts of both Job and his friends to explain how one should relate to misfortune. In my investigation of Job's changing understanding of his situation, I therefore focus attention on metaphors. From a theoretical perspective, the purpose of this dissertation is to illustrate how the more recent understanding of metaphor as a phenomenon of thought can be applied to improve the interpretation of metaphors in literary texts, and more specifically the metaphors in selected passages from Job 3–31.

---

1 This dissertation on the conceptualization of suffering is part of the project "Depicting Suffering, Imagining God. The Use of Metaphor in the Conceptualisation of Suffering and of the Divine in the Book of Job," that was led by prof. dr. dr. P.J.P. Van Hecke. See also Van Hecke's article "Jobs pijn in beeld. Het gebruik van metaforen in Jobs zelfbeschrijvingen" (Van Hecke 2009). The findings of my colleague Johan de Joode can be found in his dissertation *Landscapes of Hurt and Healing. An Exploratory Cognitive-Linguistic Analysis of Spatial Metaphors in the Book of Job* (2015).

My approach to metaphors is based on the understanding of metaphor in cognitive linguistics. It is the claim of cognitive linguistics that the ubiquity of metaphors in language demonstrates that metaphors are a phenomenon of thought. In cognitive linguistics, metaphor is studied as a mechanism that structures the manner in which people think, and in this regard, all metaphors—including the conventional ones that are used without notice—are of interest. My concern in this dissertation, however, is not the functioning of metaphor as such, but the interpretation of metaphors in specific passages of a work of poetry. My application of the cognitive understanding of metaphor therefore does not entail that I provide an overview of all metaphors, but inspired by Steen (2008), I select only the metaphors that explicitly shift the attention of the reader away from the conceptual domain of the discourse topic—the target domain—to conceptualize it in terms of another conceptual domain—the source domain. In my discussion of these 'deliberately used metaphors', I explain how the concepts that they introduce relate to the rhetorical development of the dialogue, and what they mean for Job's conceptualization of his situation.

In my discussion of metaphors, I build on the cognitive linguistic framework. Even so, this dissertation is not a linguistic study, that is, it does not offer a systematic overview of metaphors. The main objective of this study is thematic: the clarification of metaphors serves to reveal a fresh perspective on Job 3–31 and on the theme of suffering therein. It will be clear that my thematic approach has its limits. The discussion of the various stages of Job's suffering requires that I take a stand in the interpretation of the structure and rhetorical development of Job 3–31. These topics, however, do not concern a matter of established facts. As it is not my intention to write a full commentary on chapters 3–31, my references to scholarly literature principally serve to clarify my position in the scholarly debate; they do not pretend to be an exhaustive overview of everything that is written on the book of Job. My approach to Job 3–31 is characterized by the basic assumption that the Masoretic Text makes sense as it stands. As regards the structure of Job 3–31, this entails that I assume with Wolfers (1993, 1995) that there are only two complete speech cycles (3:1–15:16 and 15:17–22:30) and that the chapters 23–31 are a monologue that is interrupted by Bildad's reply (25) and Job's reaction to it (26). As regards the contents of Job 3–31, it entails that I assume with Lo (2003) and Yu (2011) that there is progression in the dialogue and that Job develops an argument throughout these chapters.[2]

2 It has often been claimed that there is no progression in the dialogue between Job and his friends.

This dissertation is structured as follows. In chapters 1 and 2, I present the theoretical framework that underlies my approach to metaphor and the interpretations of the book of Job that inspire my understanding of chapters 3–31. The main body of this dissertation consists of chapters 3–5, in which I trace the rhetorical development and the development of Job's conceptualization of suffering in Job 3, Job 4:1–15:16 and Job 15:17–22:30. In chapter 6, I explain how the restoration of hope leads in Job 23–31 to a critique on society. To conclude, I present an overview of my findings.

This claim especially concerns the so-called second (15–21) and third (22–27) speech cycles. Cf. Seow (2013: 67): "the second cycle (chs. 15–21) consists mostly of passionate asseverations and *ad hominem* attacks instead of arguments, with Job and the friends largely talking past each other in their charges and countercharges. Then the third cycle becomes chaotic, representing "a breakdown of response." " See also the references in Van Hecke (2011a: 3–4, n. 1).

CHAPTER 1

Metaphor and Biblical Exegesis: A Proposal

Recent Biblical scholarship has been following the developments in functional and cognitive linguistics. Whereas functional linguistics taught Bible scholars to interpret the structure of language in terms of its communicative function, cognitive linguistics made them aware of its relation to the functioning of human cognition. The idea that metaphors are not merely a matter of language but that they reflect the way people think brought about that the study of metaphor developed into an important field within cognitive linguistics. In this chapter, I explore the significance of developments in cognitive linguistics on metaphor for the interpretation of Biblical texts. I thereby focus my attention on the current debate.[1]

1. New Developments in Cognitive Linguistics and Biblical Exegesis

Since the start of the third millennium, more and more scholars in the exegesis of the Hebrew Bible have found inspiration in cognitive linguistics. From the works of for example Doyle (2000), Kruger (2000, 2001), Van Hecke (2001, 2003, 2011a), Dille (2004), Kotzé (2005a, 2005b), van der Merwe (2006a, 2006b, 2007), Hayes (2008), van Wolde (2008, 2009) and Jindo (2009, 2010) it appears that especially the cognitive approach to lexical semantics, metaphors, and emotion has been thought to be fruitful. To give an impression of the developments within these research fields and of the general approach of cognitive linguistics to language, the first paragraph starts with a short characterization of each of them. Thereafter, the second paragraph discusses some implications of the cognitive linguistic approach for the study of Biblical texts.

1 For extensive overviews of the metaphor research from Aristotle via Richards (1936) and Black (1962) to Lakoff and Johnson (1980) and further to Fauconnier and Turner (1997, 2002), see especially Howe (2006: 11–107), but also Doyle (2000: 51–68), Dille (2004: 1–20), Weiss (2006: 1–17) and Jindo (2010: 5–53). For overviews of approaches to the study of imagery in the Old Testament, see Nielsen (1989: 25–35) and Weiss (2006: 20–32).

1.1. *Lexical Semantics, Metaphors, and Emotions*

Cognitive linguistics is the approach to language that emerged in the 1970s and 1980s at the University of California at Berkeley and San Diego around the work of Talmy (1988, 2000a, 2000b), Lakoff (Lakoff and Johnson 1980, Lakoff 1987, Lakoff and Turner 1989), Fauconnier (1994 [1985], 1997, 2002) and Langacker (1987, 1991, 2008).[2] Because these scholars and their followers developed theories around their own research interests, cognitive linguistics did not emerge as a fixed theory, but rather as a collection of approaches that share the basic assumption that language is an expression of human thinking (Geeraerts and Cuyckens 2007: 4). That is, cognitive linguistic approaches have as a common characteristic that they study language in relation to the processing mechanisms of the human mind, and understand it as having a categorizing function with regard to the human experience of the world (Geeraerts and Cuyckens 2007: 5).

As for lexical semantics, the categorizing function of language entails that lexical items are considered repositories of conceptual knowledge. If words are repositories of conceptual knowledge, the meaning of words lies in the conceptualization they evoke. Because the conceptualization of a lexical item extends beyond a dictionary definition in that it also includes for example associations, relations, and experience, meaning becomes a matter of encyclopedic knowledge of the world (Geeraerts and Cuyckens 2007: 5). In this line, the cognitive linguistic approach of lexical semantics involves that it takes into account the knowledge of the world in its broadest sense when describing the meaning of a lexical item (cf. Geeraerts 2007: 1161–1162).

Not only lexical items, but also linguistic phenomena such as metaphors are explained in relation to human cognition. Whereas metaphor was earlier considered a purely linguistic phenomenon that embellishes texts or supports its rhetoric, it became understood in cognitive linguistics as a processing mechanism that enables the conceptualization of abstract categories such as thoughts and emotions. In this

2 Their approaches were further elaborated on by e.g. Gibbs (1994), Turner (1996), Croft (1993), and Sweetser (1990, 1999), and gave rise to other grammatical models such as for example Croft's Construction Grammar (2001). On the development and background of cognitive linguistics, see Geeraerts and Cuyckens (2007: 3–8) and Nuyts (2007: 544–545). For an overview of the approaches and themes within cognitive linguistics, see Geeraerts and Cuyckens (2007). Introductions in cognitive linguistics include Dirven and Verspoor (2004), Croft and Cruse (2004) and Evans and Green (2006).

regard, Lakoff and Johnson (1980) observed that it is often not only one abstract entity (for example 'claim') that is viewed in terms of another concrete entity (for example 'indefensible'), but that it is rather one abstract conceptual domain (for example 'argument') that is viewed in terms of another concrete conceptual domain (for example 'war'):

> ARGUMENT IS WAR
> Your claims are indefensible.
> He attacked every weak point in my argument.
> His criticisms were right on target.
> I demolished his argument.
> I've never won an argument with him.
> You disagree? Okay, shoot!
> If you use that strategy, he'll wipe you out.
> He shot down all of my arguments.
>
> Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 4

Since Lakoff and Johnson have shown that linguistic metaphors do not occur accidentally and that they trace back to conceptual domains, metaphor in cognitive linguistics is in the first place studied as a conceptual phenomenon.

A specific field of metaphor study in cognitive linguistics is the study of metaphors that conceptualize emotions. As emotions are abstract in the sense that they are not things but experiences, they often trigger metaphorical language. In Kövecses' studies on metaphor and emotions (1986, 2000, 2008), he has identified a number of metaphorical conceptualizations for different emotions. Expressions of anger include for example the following:

> anger is hot fluid in a container: She is *boiling with* anger.
> anger is fire: He's doing a *slow burn*. His anger is *smoldering*.
> anger is insanity: The man was *insane with* rage.
> anger is an opponent in a struggle: I was *struggling with* my anger.
> [...]
>
> Kövecses 2008: 381

In his investigation of the linguistic expressions of emotions across languages, Kövecses (2000: 139–181) found similarities and differences. This has led to the insight that the cultural context plays an important role in the conceptualization of the world,

and that the conceptualization of the world even determines the conceptualization of such basic human experiences as emotions.[3]

Although it is clear that cognitive linguistics opens up new perspectives on lexicography, metaphor, and emotion, it is different thing to apply these insights in Biblical exegesis. Biblical exegesis is not a question of describing complete underlying conceptualizations of each lexical item, but of the explanation of texts, and therefore it is necessary to keep in mind the different goals of cognitive linguistics and Biblical exegesis and to understand the implications thereof when using the cognitive linguistic approach to Biblical texts.

1.2. *The Importance of Cognitive Linguistics for Biblical Exegesis*

Biblical scholars have mainly used the cognitive linguistic approach for word and metaphor study. For example, in the case of describing the meaning of lexical items, cognitive linguistics inspired Biblical scholars to promote an integrative approach that looks beyond the Biblical text and to allow for example anthropological or archeological findings to attribute to the understanding of lexical items.[4] In the case of the study of metaphors, it brought to the fore that linguistic metaphors that were previously considered incoherent can actually be understood as reflecting the same conceptual metaphor.[5]

The contribution of cognitive linguistics to Biblical exegesis can however be understood in a more encompassing way. If language has a function in cognitive processing, every linguistic phenomenon can be traced back to the conceptualization of the world. For sentences this involves that not only lexical items, but also grammatical constructions have semantic functions that contribute to the meaning of a sentence. As Langacker (2008: 55) puts it: "an expression's meaning is not just the conceptual content it evokes—equally important is how that content is construed." According to construction grammar theories, "there is continuum between the lexicon and syntactic constructions" (Croft 2001: 17). From the radical semantic approach of cognitive linguistics, it follows that there is more to the meaning of sentences than the sum of the meanings of its lexical items alone (Evans and Green 2006: 215).

---

3 See Kövecses (2000: 164–181) for a detailed explanation on how the cultural context determines the conceptualization of emotions.

4 See for example van Wolde (2009).

5 See for example Kruger (2000, 2001).

The importance of cognitive linguistics for Biblical exegesis is therefore that it offers an integrative framework that takes into account the interaction between the lexical and grammatical properties of language. As such it is able to construe not only the meaning of words, but also the meaning of sentences and compositions. In what respect this integrative framework is of significance for the investigation of metaphors in the Hebrew Bible, will be further clarified in § 3. At this point, it is first in order to discuss the cognitive linguistic approach of metaphors in more detail.

2. Metaphor in Cognitive Linguistics

As has been mentioned above, metaphor research in cognitive linguistics starts from the assumption that metaphor has a function in human cognition. Reasoning from the idea that language structures the experience of the world, cognitive linguistics understands metaphor as a mechanism that enables the conceptualization of abstract categories or undifferentiated experiences—for example thoughts or feelings—in more concrete terms. Although scholars generally agree on the function of metaphors, opinions differ on what types of linguistic evidence reflect metaphoric processing. There is, for example, discussion on whether both conventional and new linguistic metaphors are processed as metaphors in thought; and whether there is a difference in cognitive processing between metaphors and similes, or between deliberately and non-deliberately used metaphors (cf. Steen 2007: 54–57, 2011: 30–36).[6]

To bring in view the background of issues in metaphor research in cognitive linguistics, it is useful to introduce Steen's "taxonomy for metaphor properties." In this taxonomy, Steen presents the three different dimensions that are of importance for the study of metaphor, namely the communicative, conceptual, and linguistic dimension. The communicative dimension groups the metaphors in deliberately used and non-deliberately used ones; the conceptual dimension in conventional and novel ones, and the linguistic dimension in metaphor and similes. In the table below (taken from Steen 2011: 39) it becomes clear how combination of the properties non-deliberate or deliberate, with conventional or novel, and metaphor or simile, results in eight metaphor categories:

6 For collections of different approaches to metaphor research in cognitive linguistics, see Ortony (1993) and Gibbs (2008).

TABLE 1.1 *Taxonomy for metaphor properties*

Communicative values	Conceptual values	Linguistic values	Examples
Non-deliberate	Conventional	Metaphor	Lakoff attacked Glucksberg
		Simile	He's as stubborn as a mule
	Novel	Metaphor	?
		Simile	?
Deliberate	Conventional	Metaphor	Wasps, the wrong weather, and why this summer's got a very nasty sting in the tail (newspaper headline)
		Simile	More like the shadow of his thoughts or something
	Novel	Metaphor	Juliet is the sun
		Simile	Every junkie's like a setting sun

STEEN 2011: 39

The combination of the properties 'non-deliberate' and 'novel' is incompatible—note the question marks in the last column. Non-deliberately used metaphors are always conventional and only show variation with regard to their linguistic expression. Deliberately used metaphors, on the other hand, are either conventional or novel, and can either be expressed as metaphor or as simile.

An impression of the distribution of metaphors over these six metaphor categories can be given on the basis of Steen's findings in a corpus of British English and Dutch (2011: 49–53). According to Steen, an average of 13,6% of the linguistic forms in natural conversation are metaphors. With regard to these metaphors:

- 99% of the metaphors have their metaphorical sense described in dictionaries and can be therefore considered conventional, only 1% of the metaphors is novel;
- 0,5% of the metaphors are lexically signaled as a simile;
- deliberately used metaphors are sometimes lexically signaled, but more often they can be recognized by the fact that they consist of more than one metaphorically used word. Steen does not give a percentage of deliberately used metaphors, but holds that there are "much more deliberate metaphor-related words than novel ones." (2011: 50)

From Steen's findings it appears furthermore that prepositions and determiners are most often used metaphorically (above 30%), followed by verbs, nouns, adjectives, adverbs (25%–10%), and conjunctions and other function words (less than 2%). Prepositions, verbs, and nouns account for an average of 65% of the metaphors found in conversation, and for 80% of the metaphors found in news and academic discourse. As for the four different registers in the corpus, most metaphors occur in academic discourse (18,5%), followed by news texts (16,4%), fiction (11,8%) and conversation (7,7%). Although fiction does not have the highest percentage of metaphors in general, it does have the highest percentage of linguistically signaled metaphors.

It follows from the above that most metaphors in language are non-deliberate, conventional, and not signaled; that they are mostly prepositions, verbs, and nouns; and that their highest occurrence is in academic discourse and news texts. It is these metaphors that cognitive linguists refer to when speaking of the ubiquity of metaphors. The fact that metaphors are ubiquitous can be explained by the hypothesis that metaphors are grounded in human cognition. This, however, does not exclude that there are deliberately used metaphors that have rhetorical or stylistic functions. It is therefore important to note that the observations of older metaphor theories do not necessarily prove to be inadequate.

In the following paragraphs, I discuss the different dimensions of metaphor research in cognitive linguistics. Because metaphor is in the first place regarded as a conceptual phenomenon, I start with an overview of different approaches to metaphor in thought. Thereafter I discuss the different types of linguistic evidence that reflect conceptual metaphors, and finally, I examine the cognitive linguistic approach to the communicative dimensions of metaphor.

2.1. *Metaphor and Thought*

In studies that apply a cognitive linguistic approach to the study of metaphors in Biblical Hebrew, two theories stand out. Most often referred to is the Conceptual Metaphor Theory as developed by Lakoff and Johnson (1980),[7] followed more recently by Fauconnier and Turner's Conceptual Blending Theory (2002).[8] Both theories focus on metaphor in thought and aim to model how people think in metaphors. Not so much referred to in Biblical Studies but well-established in cognitive linguistics, are two other theories on metaphor in thought, namely the Class Inclusion Theory of

7 For example Dille (2004), Jindo (2009), Kotzé (2005a) and Kruger (2000, 2001).

8 For example Hayes (2008), Riegner (2009), and Van Hecke (2005a, 2010).

Glucksberg (1993) and the Career of Metaphor Theory of Bowdle and Gentner (2005). The development of these theories can be understood as follows.[9]

2.1.1. *Conceptual Metaphor Theory*

Metaphor research in cognitive linguistics started off with Andrew Ortony's edited work *Metaphor and Thought* (1979)[10] and Lakoff and Johnson's *Metaphors We Live By* (1980). Lakoff and Johnson's Conceptual Metaphor Theory asserts that metaphor is in the first place a conceptual phenomenon. As was already shortly mentioned above in § 1.1, Lakoff and Johnson define metaphor as a mapping across conceptual domains, or as "the way we conceptualize one mental domain in terms of another" (Lakoff 1993: 203). The notion of 'mapping' is understood in the mathematical sense of the word as a set of correspondences. In this regard, LOVE IS A JOURNEY is the name of the mapping that views the target domain LOVE in terms of the source domain JOURNEY. This mapping entails that lovers correspond to travelers, the love relationship to the vehicle, the lovers' common goals to their common destination on the journey, and so on (Lakoff 1993: 207). Because elements and their corresponding counterparts form sets that are part of broader experiential domains, Lakoff and Johnson understand metaphors as mappings between domains. This view allows them to attribute clusters of similar linguistic metaphors to a single conceptual metaphor and to account for the systematic and overall appearance of metaphors.

Conceptual Metaphor Theory has set the scene for metaphor research, but some questions were left for further consideration. Because Conceptual Metaphor Theory does not easily explain characteristics of metaphors that can be deduced from neither the source nor target domain, Fauconnier and Turner have extended it by adding more mental spaces and by adding the notion of 'blending'. I explain this theory in the next paragraph. The main criticism on the Conceptual Metaphor Theory concerns the fact that it implies that every metaphor activates in the mind both the source and target domain, and that all conventional metaphors are always processed by cross-domain mapping.[11] Especially this latter implication has been criticized by Glucksberg (1990) and by Bowdle and Gentner (2005). Their theories and argumentations are discussed below.

---

9 The next paragraphs are based on Steen's overview of the state of art in contemporary metaphor theory (2011: 28–36).

10 For the second updated edition with additional articles, see Ortony (1993).

11 With 'processed by cross-domain mapping' I refer to the cognitive process that activates both the conceptual source and target domain; if it is assumed that the activation of two conceptual domains

2.1.2. Conceptual Blending Theory

Fauconnier and Turner (Fauconnier 1994 [1985], Fauconnier and Turner 2002) developed a theory on cognition that explains how people combine and blend mental images all the time. To explain how people combine images from different inputs, Fauconnier and Turner introduce a theory with a number of mental spaces, including one or more input spaces, a generic space in which the similarities of the input spaces are combined, and a blended space in which these similarities integrated in a coherent new picture. The theory is often illustrated with the riddle of the Buddhist monk:

> A Buddhist monk begins at dawn one day walking up a mountain, reaches the top at sunset, meditates at the top for several days until one dawn when he begins to walk back to the foot of the mountain, which he reaches at sunset. Making no assumptions about his starting or stopping or about his pace during the trips, prove that there is a place on the path which he occupies at the same hour of the day on the two separate journeys.
>
> Fauconnier and Turner 1998: 136–137[12]

If one analyzes the cognitive process that is needed to come to the solution, one can imagine that in a first step there are two input spaces: one with a monk going up the mountain, one with a monk going down the mountain. In a second step, the similarities of the input spaces are combined in a generic space. Once the two input scenes are merged into one scene with one mountain, one path, and two monks, a third step opens the blended space that sets the picture in motion so that image of two monks walking in opposite directions on the same path on the same hill on the same day offers the solution to the riddle.

Conceptual Blending Theory is used to explain various linguistic phenomena, including for example clausal constructions, counterfactuals, and compounds (cf. Turner 2007). When the many-space theory is applied to metaphors, it analyzes the source and target domain as input spaces, collects the similarities in the generic space and takes a starting point in the emergent structure of the blended space to explain

---

is necessary to understand a metaphor, it follows that the processing of metaphors takes more time than the processing of literal language as in the latter case only one concept or domain needs to be activated. The amount of processing time is an experimental tool that is used for the study of metaphors in psycholinguistics.

12 Fauconnier and Turner took the riddle from Koestler (1964), who attributes it to Karl Duncker (1945); cf. Fauconnier (1997: 151 n. 1).

characteristics of the metaphor that cannot be reduced to the input of the source and target domain. A well known example is 'digging your own grave.' In the source domain of grave digging, the conceptualization of digging is intentional and occurs after the moment death, but in the metaphor 'digging your grave' it is unintentional and occurs before the moment of 'death'. Conceptual Metaphor Theory explains the occurrence of these changes by assuming a blended space in which elements and structures of the source and target input spaces are merged:

> In the target input, making mistakes is unintentional and brings one closer to failure. The blend receives this causal and intentional structure by selective projection from the target input: in the blend, digging is unintentional and brings one closer to death. But in the source input, both the causal order and the intentionality have the reverse structure: in this source, it is someone's dying that causes the grave to be dug and the digging is moreover intentional. The temporal order of events in the blend (digging before dying, making mistakes before failing) is also taken from the target input, not the source input.
>
> Fauconnier and Turner 1998: 166–167

Conceptual Blending Theory is especially apt for modeling the processing of new metaphors and for explaining entailments that one would not expect on the basis of the input spaces. The theory can be applied to both novel and conventional metaphors. The main criticism raised is that, like Conceptual Metaphor Theory, Conceptual Blending Theory overestimates the amount of processing that is needed for the understanding of conventional metaphors.

2.1.3. Class Inclusion Theory

The theory that offers a solution for the processing cost of conventional metaphor is Glucksberg and Keysar's Class Inclusion Theory. Although the assumption of the existence of conceptual metaphors indeed accounts for the systematic and overall appearance of conventional metaphors, Glucksberg and Keysar (1990, 1993) propose a different explanation. In their Class Inclusion Theory, they argue that metaphors do not reflect a mapping process, but a categorization process: "we argue that metaphors are exactly what they appear to be: class-inclusion assertions, in which the topic of the metaphor is assigned to a diagnostic category" (1993:3). To understand a metaphor, the category of the source domain is extended to a new and *ad hoc* superordinate category which fits the target domain (1990: 7–9). For example:

> A person who says "my job is a jail" is [...] employing a prototypical basic object name to refer to a superordinate category that has no conventional name of its own. [...] By naming the category "jail", "my job" inherits those properties of "jail" that can plausibly be attributed to "my job". The words "a jail" can refer either to a specific instance, jail, or to the class, jail. As a metaphor vehicle, "a jail" refers to a class of things, whereas when "a jail" is used literally it would refer to an actual jail or jails.
>
> Glucksberg and Keysar 1993: 410

Once that superordinate category is so often used that its sense has become conventionalized, it can be directly accessed. Against the background of this scenario, Glucksberg especially argues against the position that the use of conventional metaphors triggers processing by cross-domain mapping (1990: 15). As Steen points out:

> This is a valid criticism of an approach that claims to be usage-based: why would people have to re-enact the same mappings across conceptual domains, spaces, or categories over and over again if they have conventionalized metaphorical senses at their disposal that they can pull directly from their mental dictionaries when needed?
>
> Steen 2011: 30–31

Following Steen, I agree with Gluckberg and Keysar's proposal that conventional metaphors do not evoke cross-domain mapping. The simplicity of their idea that metaphors are processed as class-inclusion statements is attractive, but it is difficult to oversee the implications of the proposal that all metaphors—including novel and deliberately used ones—are understood by categorization rather than by cross-domain mapping. In the end, both cognitive processes start from two conceptual domains. The main difference is that Conceptual Metaphor Theory and Conceptual Blending Theory assume that these domains are incongruent, while Class Inclusion Theory assumes that they are congruent. Either way, all theories presented so far offer only one cognitive scenario for all categories of metaphors, and this is precisely where the Career of Metaphor Theory that I discuss next comes in.

2.1.4. Career of Metaphor Theory

Covering both conventional and novel metaphors, Bowdle and Gentner's Career of Metaphor Theory (2005, 2008) combines features of Conceptual Metaphor Theory and Class Inclusion Theory, while it also accounts for the linguistic signaling of

metaphors. According to the Career of Metaphor Theory, the processing of metaphor changes with the conventionalization thereof. Novel metaphors and metaphors constructed as similes are processed by cross-domain mapping, but once metaphors have become conventional, they are processed by categorization. By differentiating between conventional and novel, and signaled and non-signaled metaphors, Bowdle and Gentner allow to explain different uses of metaphor in language by different manners of processing of metaphor in thought.

Because the Career of Metaphor Theory offers the most comprehensive theory to account for processing cost, the difference between conventional and new metaphors, and the difference in linguistic expression between metaphors and similes, I take this theory as my starting point for understanding metaphors in thought. That is, I assume that metaphors do not trigger cross-domain mapping if they are either conventional or not linguistically signaled, and I assume that metaphors do trigger cross-domain mapping if they are either novel or linguistically signaled. I explain in the next paragraph what this decision involves for the interpretation of metaphors in language.

2.2. *Metaphor and Language*

In cognitive linguistics, metaphor is primarily thought of as a cognitive operation, and this entails that linguistic metaphors are studied as phenomena that have their origin in metaphorical thinking. In the previous paragraph I explained that I assume with the Career of Metaphor Theory that conventional and non-signaled metaphors are not processed as metaphors in thought, but even so, they are part of the category of metaphors in language, and as such I discuss also these below.

The main criteria to trace metaphors in a text is the occurrence of non-literal language. I follow Steen in understanding the notion of 'literality' in terms of direct and indirect meaning: words are literal if they have direct meaning, that is, if their meaning is not understood in terms of another meaning, and words are non-literal if they have indirect meaning, that is, if their meaning is understood in terms of another meaning (Steen 2007: 66).[13] It should be noted, however, that non-literal language

13 Another way to find metaphors is to search for 'incongruity', cf. Kittay (1989). Steen, however, notes that incongruity is on the one hand a too broad criterion as it also signals other forms of figurative language, while on the other hand, it is too narrow as it does not signal conventional metaphors. Steen remarks that conventional metaphors could indeed be signaled with the incongruity criterion if incongruity is understood in the terms of an opposition between the contextual sense of a word

only traces metaphors, while it is not only metaphors that reflect metaphorical thinking: so do similes, analogies, extended similes, and allegories. In addition to the characterization of the main linguistic expressions of metaphor in thought, I elucidate in this paragraph the cognitive linguistic approach to the phenomenon of personification and to the distinction between metaphor and metonymy.

2.2.1. Metaphor and Simile

From the perspective of metaphor in thought, both metaphor and simile are linguistic expressions of conceptual metaphor. To account for the difference in linguistic expression, the Career of Metaphor Theory proposes that metaphor and simile reflect different processing mechanisms. Because the linguistic expression of metaphors that are not signaled corresponds to the grammatical form of categorizing utterances, conventional metaphors reflect a classifying process. The linguistic expression of similes, on the other hand, corresponds to the grammatical form of literal comparisons and reflects a comparison process. Compare for example:

> The mind is a computer
> The mind is like a computer
> A sparrow is a bird
> A sparrow is like a robin
>
> Bowdle and Gentner 2005: 200

The main difference between classification and comparison processes is that only the comparison process involves a mapping between two conceptual domains.

Now does this mean that linguistic metaphors actually do not reflect cross-domain mapping? This is in fact what Steen calls the 'paradox of metaphor', namely, that "most metaphor is *not* processed metaphorically by a cross-domain mapping involving some form of comparison" (2008: 213). Regarding linguistic metaphors, the Career of Metaphor Theory proposes that only novel metaphors and linguistically signaled metaphors are processed by cross-domain mapping; for Steen, however, the determining factor is deliberate usage. I come back to this question in §3 below. For now, it is important to keep in mind that the linguistic expression of a metaphor as either metaphor or simile indeed affects the way in which it is cognitively processed.

---

and its most basic sense, but that this understanding is actually in keeping with the understanding of literality in terms of direct and indirect meaning (Steen 2007: 279–281).

2.2.2. Analogies, Extended Similes, Extended Metaphors, and Allegories

Some metaphors stretch over the boundary of the proposition:[14] this is the case for analogies, allegories, extended comparisons, and extended metaphors. The characterizations below show how the cognitive linguistic approach to metaphor describes how cross-domain mapping occurs in figures of speech that extend from beyond the boundary of the proposition up to even the entire literary work.

Analogies: In a study on the processing of metaphors and their often noted directionality,[15] Gentner et al. argue that most metaphors start like analogy,[16] that is "a mapping between two represented situations in which common relational structure is aligned" (2008: 109). For example:

> A man is not necessarily intelligent because he has plenty of ideas, any more than he is a good general because he has plenty of soldiers
>
> Chamfort as quoted in Gentner et al. (2001: 199)

In this analogy, the two propositions share a similar relational structure. Whereas metaphor maps further inferences from the source to the target, analogy stops once the common structure is found: in this regard, the main difference between analogy and metaphor is that "alignment highlights parallel structure [...], and inference-projection creates new knowledge in the target" (Gentner et al. 2001: 207–208). Although analogy and metaphor both involve cross-domain mapping, it is their

14 On the conceptual level, the units that build a discourse are propositions. Propositions are states of affairs, situations, or events that are denoted by sentences (Lambrecht 1994: 53). There is, however, no one to one correspondence between a proposition and a sentence (the sentence in example 2 for example covers two propositions), or between a proposition and a clause (the sentence in 3 covers three clauses but expresses only two propositions). I follow Crisp et al. in their understanding that propositions are expressed in 'semi-independent clauses': "We take a text or T-unit to be a semi-independent clause, a category that covers main clauses, matrix clauses plus their embedded clauses, non-restrictive relative clauses and most adverbial clauses. Appositions can also function as T-units. Such T-units form semantic wholes in that they present a state of affairs as relatively integrated and separated" (2002: 57).

15 The directionality of metaphors entails that information of the source domain is transferred to the target domain and not the other way around; for this reason, metaphors cannot be reversed. Cf. Gentner et al. (2001: 220).

16 This does not apply to the class of image metaphors, as image metaphors do not align relational structures but only map literal similarities from target to source domain, cf. Steen (2007: 63).

focus on the shared relational structure that distinguishes analogies from extended metaphors and extended similes.

Extended Similes and Extended Metaphors: It often occurs that more than one word within a proposition is metaphorically used. This is for example the case in the following sentence that consists of two propositions that both have more than one metaphorically used word:[17]

> She *grew* moody and *inward* and *sat* behind her *dustlines*, *besieged* within her own *fortifications*
>
> Crisp et al. 2002: 58

Extended similes and metaphors, however, do not only extend over the boundary of a clause, but also over the boundary of a proposition, as in the examples below.

> He spoke, and they caught the body from the ground in their arms, lifting him high with a great heave, and the Trojan people behind them shouted aloud as they saw the Achaians lifting the dead man, and made a rush against him *like dogs, who sweep in rapidly on a wounded wild boar, ahead of the young men who hunt him, and for the moment race in raging to tear him to pieces until in the confidence of his strength he turns on them at bay, and they give ground and scatter for dear one way and another*; so the Trojans until that time kept always in close chase assembled, stabbing at them with swords and leaf-headed spears, but every time the two Aiantes would swing round to face them and stand fast, the color of their skin changed, and no longer could any endure to sweep in further and fight for the body.
>
> *Iliad* 17.772–734; Ben-Porat (1992: 740–741) as quoted in Steen (2007: 333–334)

> (...) I was angry with my foe:
> I told it not, my wrath did *grow*.
> And I *water'd* it in fears
> Night and morning with my tears;
> And I *sunn'd* it with smiles,

17 The extended similes and extended metaphors in the following examples are in italics. For a taxonomy of metaphors within a proposition on the basis of the properties 'singular' or 'multiple', 'simple' or 'complex', and 'pure' or 'mixed', see Crisp (2002).

> and with *soft* deceitful wiles.
> And it *grew* both day and night (...)
>
> Blake (1966: 218) as quoted in Crisp (2008: 298)

Extended similes and metaphors differ in two respects: extended similes are grammatically signaled and use literal language, whereas extended metaphors are not grammatically signaled and use non-literal language.

Allegories: Like extended metaphors, allegories are not lexically signaled and expand over more than one proposition, but unlike extended metaphors, allegories use literal language (cf. § 2.2 above) and make no reference to the target domain (Crisp 2008: 291). Because of this latter feature, Steen remarks that allegories can actually be read in two ways:

> For instance, Animal Farm is a text about a farm, which may be taken as an explicit model for thinking about a more abstract, implicit target that has to do with totalitarian politics. Or is Animal Farm a text about a farm which, as an explicit target, is structured by our knowledge of a prior cultural text about totalitarian politics which acts as an implicit source?
>
> Steen 2007: 316

While Steen notes that the directionality of allegories remains a matter of discussion, I follow Crisp here in opting for the first interpretation, that is, even if allegories create an own textual reality, I assume that the picturing of this reality primarily serves to open up new perspectives on an implicit target domain.

2.2.3. Personification

Personification is a type of metaphor that occurs when a predicate that is normally used with a human entity is applied to a non-human entity so that the latter is turned into an agent. In cognitive linguistics, the phenomenon of personification has been explained from different perspectives.

Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 33–34) view personification as part of the class of ontological metaphors.[18] Ontological metaphors view abstract entities in terms of

18 Besides the class of ontological metaphors, Lakoff and Johnson also distinguish the class of structural metaphors and orientational metaphors. While ontological metaphors change the ontological

concrete entities. The concrete entities can be objects, substances or containers. In the case of personification, an abstract entity is understood in terms of an object, more specifically, in terms of a person. By specifying an abstract entity as an person, it is possible to attribute human motivations, characteristics, and actions to it. Lakoff and Johnson examples include the following:

> Inflation *has attacked* the foundation of our economy.
> Inflation *has pinned* us to the wall.
> Our biggest *enemy* right now is inflation.
> The dollar *has been destroyed* by inflation.
>
> Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 33

The specific human aspects that are attributed to an abstract entity do not so much aim to characterize it as human, but rather enable a way to think about it and to adopt an attitude toward it.

While Lakoff and Johnson explain personification to be driven by the need to make an abstract entity more concrete, Turner (1996: 12) focuses on the human tendency to construct stories. In line of Lakoff and Turner (1989), Turner approaches personification not as a result from ABSTRACT ENTITIES ARE OBJECTS, but from EVENTS ARE ACTIONS (Turner 1996: 28). For example, the event "he died" could be metaphorically expressed as the actions "he left us", or "Death took him" (Turner 1996: 32). The personification of 'death' in the latter example is used to conceptualize dying as a forced departure, and as a consequence, death is conceptualized as the enforcer of departure.

According to the above-mentioned scholars, personification is either driven by the need to conceptualize abstract entities in terms of concrete entities, or by the tendency to conceptualize events in terms of actions. As these different understandings of personification might depend on different discourse functions, I leave here both possibilities open.

2.2.4. Metaphor and Metonymy

Besides metaphor, that is, the thinking of one concept in terms of another, also metonymy, that is, the thinking of one concept in contiguity with another, leads to

---

status of a concept from abstract to concrete, structural metaphors such as ARGUMENT IS WAR serve to structure the understanding of a target domain, and orientational metaphors such as HAPPY IS UP to give the target domain a spatial orientation (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 14).

figurative speech. The most important difference between metaphor and metonymy is that metaphors are based on similarity, whereas metonymies are based on contiguities. Instead of referring to the literal referent, metonymies refer to another entity that relates to it:

> He likes to read the *Marquis de Sade*. (= the writings of the marquis)
> He's in *dance*. (= the dancing profession)
> *Acrylic* has taken over the art world. (= the use of acrylic paint)
> The *Times* hasn't arrived at the press conference yet. (= the reporter from the Times)
> Mrs. Grundy frowns on *blue jeans*. (= the wearing of blue jeans)
> *New windshield wipers* will satisfy him. (= the state of having new wipers)
>
> Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 35

The relation between the literal referent and entity that is referred to follows various patterns, but is always based on contiguity. Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 38–39) mention the most well known: 'part for whole' (synecdoche), 'producer for product', 'object used for user', 'controller for controlled', 'institution for people responsible', 'place for institution' and 'place for event'; one can further think of 'container for contained', 'possessor for possessed', 'effect for cause', and so on.

Warren (2003: 118–123) proposes to understand such referential metonymies as "modifier-head constructions", whereby the metonymy functions as a modifier that refers to an implicit head, for example:

> (...) *we hear the kettle is boiling*, but we interpret the noun phrase in this example as "that which is in the kettle, i.e. the water;" we hear *Caedmon is difficult to read*, but we interpret *Caedmon* as "that which is by Caedmon, i.e. his poetry;" we hear *the shoes are neatly tied*, but we interpret *shoes* as "that which is part of the shoes, i.e. the laces."
>
> Warren 2003: 118

In this perspective, referential metonymies are actually abbreviated noun phrases. According to Warren, metonymy is "basically a syntactic construction on a par with compounding, genitive constructions and adjective-noun combinations, whereas metaphor is a semantic operation" (Warren 2003: 125).

Although most referential metonymies are easily recognizable, difficulties arise with propositional metonymies with a conceptual source and target domain that are

both contiguous and similar.[19] This is for example the case for expressions that have figuratively used perception verbs:[20]

> I see what you mean
>
> Steen 2007: 59

On the one hand, it can be supposed that this expression has its origin in the metaphor SEEING IS UNDERSTANDING; on the other hand, it can be argued that UNDERSTANDING IS SEEING is actually a metonymy that originates from the fact that understanding typically involves seeing. This apparent contradiction can be solved by understanding similarity and contiguity as two independent scales. In this regard, Steen (2007: 59) proposes that by judging whether the degree of similarity or the degree of contiguity is more prominent or relevant in a specific context, either the metaphorical or the metonymical interpretation can be chosen; in the case that both similarity and contiguity are equally prominent and relevant, it should be acknowledged that one can choose either way.

Warren's understanding of metonymies offers an additional possibility to distinguish metonymies from metaphors. By understanding metonymies as abbreviated noun phrases, Warren points out that metonymies are actually only superficially non-literal and that the source domain of metonymical expressions is not hypothetical:

> [...] metaphor is hypothetical in nature. Life is thought of *as if it were* a journey. Metonymy, on the other hand, is non-hypothetical. There is nothing hypothetical about *the kettle* in *the kettle is boiling*, for instance.
>
> Warren 2003: 116

The non-hypothetical status of the source domain is an additional characteristic of metonymies by which they can be distinguished from metaphors which can be understood to have a hypothetical source domain.

---

19 Cf. Steen (2007: 57–61). For collections of approaches to the interaction of metaphor and metonymy, see e.g. Barcelona (2000) and Dirven and Pörings (2003).

20 For the discussion on contiguity and similarity in metaphors and metonyms of perception, see Sweetser (1990), Feyaerts (1999, 2000), and Radden (2000).

2.3. *Metaphor and Communication*

Lakoff and Johnson have underlined the naturalness and ubiquity of metaphors and emphasized that they are not only embellishments and rhetorical strategies. The idea that metaphors have their origin in human cognition, however, still allows for the possibility that some metaphors are primarily used for rhetorical or stylistic reasons. While this point has been recognized by various cognitive linguistic scholars,[21] it has received little attention in the cognitive linguistic approaches to metaphors in the Bible.[22] This paragraph therefore seeks to point out the relevance of acknowledging the rhetorical and stylistic functions of metaphors for metaphor research, and to elucidate how these functions can be understood within the framework of cognitive linguistics. In order to recognize the characteristics of rhetorically or stylistically used metaphors, I firstly address the interaction between the conceptual, linguistic and communicative dimension of metaphors, and, secondly, I explain the cognitive principles that underlie the rhetorical and stylistic functions of metaphors.

2.3.1. *The Interaction between the Conceptual, Linguistic and Communicative Dimensions of Metaphors*

From Steen's taxonomy (cf. § 2.2) it can be deduced that the category of deliberately used metaphors is the category of metaphors that has a specific rhetorical or stylistic function. Starting from this assumption, it is possible to deduce the conceptual and linguistic properties of rhetorically or stylistically used metaphors.

According to Steen, deliberately used metaphors have the communicative aim to change the addressee's perspective on the topic, whereas non-deliberate metaphors have the communicative aim to keep the addressee's attention on the topic itself. Non-deliberate metaphor "does not ask the addressee to pay conscious attention to the structure of an alien source domain that may be involved in the semantics of the words used" (2011: 37). If deliberately used metaphors invite the addressee to shift attention from target domain to the source domain, it follows that deliberate metaphors will be metaphorically processed; non-deliberately used metaphors, on

21 See for example Goatly (1997), Pilkington (2000), Steen (2000), Stockwell (2002), Charteris-Black (2004), and Semino and Steen (2008); also worth noting is the recent interest for cognitive stylistics (or cognitive poetics) as appears from edited works on this theme by Semino and Culpeper (2002), Steen and Gavins (2003), and Brône and Vandaele (2009).

22 In this regard, Weiss (2006) and Jindo (2010) are exceptions.

the other hand, do not invite the addressee to shift the perspective and will not be metaphorically processed.

The communicative aim of the speaker correlates with the linguistic expression of metaphors. A speaker who intends to cause a shift of perspective may employ lexical and grammatical means to signal the introduction of a source domain. This can be done by using a simile construction, by linking up more than one metaphor within a proposition, or by extending the metaphor over more than one proposition (Steen 2011: 50). In an extensive overview on the signaling of metaphors, Goatly (1997: 172–187) furthermore mentions the use of explicit markers ('metaphorically'), intensifiers ('literally', 'really'), hedges or downtowners ('in a way', 'a bit of'), semantic metalanguage ('in more than one sense'), mimetic terms ('image', 'likeness'), symbolism terms ('symbolically'), superordinate terms ('sort of', 'kind of'). Besides lexical markers, Goatly (1997: 187–195) notes the frequent use of terms of mental processes of perception (e.g. 'seem', 'appear', 'feel like'), orthographic devices (inverted commas) and modals and conditionals ('might', 'would', 'as it were').[23] The speaker who employs deliberately used metaphors to shift the perspective of the addressee can choose from a broad supply of linguistic means. The next sections discuss how the shift of perspective plays a role in respectively the rhetorical and stylistic functions of metaphors.

2.3.2. Metaphor and Rhetoric

Metaphor has been understood to have a rhetorical function because of its frequent use in persuasive speech.[24] The clearest domains of rhetorically used metaphors are politics and advertisements: in these domains, people even make money by inventing suitable metaphors for campaigns that intend to affect the public opinion (cf. Grady 2010). The rhetorical use of metaphors is not limited to discourses that consciously make use of the art of persuasive speech. Functional linguistics assumes that the general function of discourse is to modify the pragmatic information of the addressee.[25] This entails

23 This enumeration should not be taken as definite or complete; it merely serves to underline that the signaling of metaphor is not restricted to certain lexical markers, but is also expressed by constructions, verbs, or modalities. Because many of the linguistic means to signal metaphors are not used solely to signal metaphor, it is always necessary to take into account the broader communicative context.

24 Different explanations have been given for the function of metaphors in persuasive speech. In the Middle Ages, for example, metaphors, as forms of deviant and non-literal language, were suspected to have a function in concealing the truth (cf. Johnson 1981: 11). For an overview of the understanding of the function of metaphor in the philosophical tradition, see Johnson (1981).

25 With 'pragmatic information' I refer with Dik and Hengeveld to "the full body of knowledge, beliefs,

that all discourse is essentially rhetorical. Against this background, rhetorically used metaphors can be defined as those metaphors that serve to modify the pragmatic information of the addressee.

In the broad field of persuasive discourse, the role of metaphors lies in their ability to evoke a change of perspective with regard to the topic that is under consideration. The speaker can control the change of perspective by choosing a source domain that fits his or her argument. While the source domain is generally chosen for its concreteness and explanatory power, it can, for example, also be chosen because it evokes certain positive or negative associations (cf. Goatly 1997: 157–158) or because it focuses attention on aspects of the target domain that are specifically relevant for the speaker. By mapping a specific source domain to target domain, rhetorical metaphors enable the communication of evaluations. In this regard, Jonathan Charteris-Black points out the importance of their indirectness and of their possibility to put forward shared opinions:

> In the expression of a value system there appear to be two alternatives: either values can be expressed directly—as they are for example in legal codes, sets of moral precepts or bald statements of what is good or bad—or they can be expressed indirectly. When the latter occurs this is normally done through metaphor; this is because a literal statement of a value system is unlikely to take into account the feelings of the addressee: it is likely to count as an imposition of a set of values. The advantage of using metaphors—especially those that have become the conventional ways of expressing certain points of view—is that this taps into an accepted communal system of values.
>
> Charteris-Black 2004: 11–12

According to Charteris-Black, the indirectness of metaphors avoids the risk of prescribing the addressee what to think: instead of prescribing certain values, the speaker uses metaphors that evoke the values that are needed for the argument and that he or she assumes the addressee will share. By taking a starting point in shared opinions, the speaker invites the addressee to a common ground, and with the distance to the addressee reduced, a point can more easily be made. In this line, Charteris-Black notes that metaphors are a manner of strengthening the relation between

---

assumptions, opinions, and feelings available to an individual at any point in the interaction" (1997: 10). See for example Dik and Hengeveld (1997: 8–12) for an introduction on the functional model of verbal interaction.

speaker and addressee: firstly, because metaphors offer the speaker and the addressee a common ground, and secondly, because metaphors establish "a joint act of meaning creation" (Charteris-Black 2004: 12) in which speaker and addressee arrive at a shared understanding that is not literally spelled out.[26] While the first reason is especially applicable to rhetorical metaphors, the second applies to deliberately used metaphors in general.

2.3.3. Metaphor and Stylistics

Metaphors have a special role in poetry.[27] In the definition of Merriam-Webster's dictionary, poetry is:

> writing that formulates a concentrated imaginative awareness of experience in language chosen and arranged to create a specific emotional response through meaning, sound, and rhythm.

In his discussion of the poetic effects of metaphors, Adrian Pilkington (2000) offers a conceptualization theory that elucidates what can be understood by 'formulating a concentrated imaginative awareness of experience' and 'creating a specific emotional response', and how metaphors have a role in establishing these effects.

Pilkington argues within the framework of Relevance Theory that the poetic effect of metaphors depends on their ability to evoke a variety of weak implicatures.[28] In terms of cognitive linguistics, the implicatures of metaphors can be understood as the mapping between the source and the target domain. While in most communicative

---

26 The same notion is described by Goatly under the heading 'cultivating intimacy' (1997: 160).

27 This special role is understood in various ways. Shen (2002: 212–213) distinguishes three cognitive linguistic approaches to it: (1) the 'foregrounding approach' that supposes that poetic structures violate cognitive principles; (2) the 'poetic effect approach' that supposes that poetic structures maximally exploits cognitive principles; and (3) the 'conventionalist approach' that supposes that poetic structures are requires unique cognitive principles. I will here adhere to the second understanding and assume that metaphors in everyday language and poetry indeed depend on the same cognitive functions and the same linguistic means, but that the fundamental difference in the communicative use leads to poetic effects.

28 'Implicature' is a term coined by H.P. Grice that refers to what is implicitly communicated by a statement. For example, "it's cold in here" uttered in a room with an open window could express the request to close the window. The role of implicatures in communication is further elaborated on in Sperber and Wilson's relevance theory (1995). See Tendahl and Gibbs (2008) for a comprehensive article on relevance theory and cognitive linguistics as complementary perspectives on metaphor.

contexts, only some straightforward correspondences between the source and target domain are selected as relevant, the aesthetic quality of metaphors in poetry lies in their ability to evoke a wide range of possible correspondences. With regard to this wide range of possible correspondences, Pilkington (2000: 119–121) follows Henry Coombes (1963) in pointing out the importance of both the originality of the metaphor and of its efficient embedding. While the originality avoids that the addressee automatically picks the figurative sense as listed in the dictionary, originality *per se* is not enough. For example:

> … black as the inside of a wolf's throat
>
> Coombes (1963) as quoted by Pilkington (2000: 119)

Although the metaphor in the example above is original, it will not be effective if the encyclopedic knowledge of 'a wolf's throat' does not add something relevant to the concept of blackness. The originality of a metaphor can only be considered successful if its mapping evokes some new correspondences, and to this end it should either be embedded in the experience of the real world or in the reality that is construed in the text.

Besides the feature of poetic metaphors to activate an array of correspondences, metaphors are also known for their ability to create an emotional response from the reader. Pilkington relates this emotional response to the information that is involved in the conceptualization of a lexical item. Consider his comment on the metaphor "My love is like a red, red rose":

> [First] we explore the encyclopaedic entry attached to the concept ROSE and derive assumptions of the kind that a rose is beautiful, delicate and fragrant. We then derive implicatures of the kind that 'my love' (the poet's love) is beautiful, delicate and fragrant. This analysis seems inadequate, however: although this may not be an extremely rich poetic simile, it is a lot richer than this implicature analysis would seem to suggest. One way of enriching it is to appeal to phenomenal state attitudes. The experience of a rose (the way it looks and smells, for instance) feels like something. The feeling evoked by 'my love' is created by analogy with this feeling.
>
> Pilkington 2000: 157

Pilkington asserts that the conceptualization of a concept such as ROSE does not only evoke implicatures, but also 'phenomenal state attitudes'. He thereby understands

'phenomenal states' as the sensory experience of a certain entity that qualifies one's attitude toward that entity.[29] According to Pilkington, the main intention of poetic metaphors is to communicate phenomenal states. What makes metaphors poetic is not only the evocation of propositional statements, but especially the activation of remembered phenomenal states. If it is assumed that the phenomenal dimension of conceptualization can be understood to communicate the poet's 'imaginative awareness of experience' and to activate the reader's 'specific emotional response,' this dimension should be taken into account when studying metaphors in poetry. It should furthermore be noted that the activation of phenomenal states might also play a role with deliberately used metaphors in other genres.

3. Metaphor and Biblical Exegesis

In Biblical exegesis, metaphor research has mainly been done within the context of literary and rhetorical approaches to the Hebrew Bible (Jindo 2010: 8–13).[30] As literary and rhetorical studies have primarily focused on Biblical narrative (cf. Berlin 1997: 25–26), especially metaphors in narratives have been discussed. Since the 1990s, however, there has been more scholarly attention for metaphors in poetry—traditionally the more obvious area for metaphor research.[31]

The introduction of the cognitive linguistic approach to metaphor in the Hebrew Bible has led to a new interest in Biblical metaphors, but it appears, in fact, that Biblical scholars that take a cognitive approach have not necessarily been interested in the meaning of metaphors in their narrative or poetic context. In their review of cognitive approaches to metaphors in Biblical Hebrew, Andrea Weiss (2006: 21–32) and Job Jindo (2010: 13–21) distinguish between studies that show interest in theory, in specific metaphors, in method, or in a specific text.[32] Jindo observes that the theory-oriented

29 Attitudes differ from emotions, in that they are attached to a particular object and stored in the long-term memory; emotions, on the other hand, are temporary states that are evoked by concrete states of affairs (Pilkington 2000: 152–153).

30 Alonso Schökel (2000 [1987]: 5) offers a bibliography of metaphor research in Biblical Hebrew until the 1980s. Besides Alonso Schökel (2000 [1987]), classical works include Lowth (1829 [1753]), König (1900, 1907), Weiss (1984), Watson (1984), Alter (1985), and Landy (1983, 2001). More recent collections on metaphors in the Hebrew Bible include Camp & Fontaine (1993) and Van Hecke (2005c, 2010).

31 See especially Van Hecke (2005c, 2010). See Van Hecke (2005b: 1 n. 1) for an overview of recent literature; for a discussion of more recent approaches, see Foreman (2011: 22–29).

32 Jindo bases himself on Weiss in distinguishing between the metaphor-oriented, text-oriented, and theory-oriented approach; to these, Jindo adds the method-oriented approach.

approach especially focuses on the role of metaphor in biblical thinking, while the metaphor-oriented approach pays attention to the conceptual world behind the text, and the text-oriented approach mostly studies metaphors within the boundaries of the syntactic and semantic context of a text. According to Jindo, it is especially the method-oriented approach as employed by scholars as Meir Weiss and Edward Greenstein that helps to enhance the understanding of metaphors in their literary context.

Both Weiss (2006: 32–34) and Jindo (2010: 13–14) are aware of the fact that the cognitive linguistic approach to metaphors runs the risk of leading to theoretical reflections that in the end do not affect the understanding of the text.[33] Taking note of their words of warning, this study builds on their insights to advance a method that is able to describe the meaning and function of metaphors in their literary context in order to enhance the understanding of a text. In the following paragraphs, I firstly discuss the exegetical approaches as proposed by Weiss and Jindo, and secondly, I present my own approach which adopts elements of their approaches, while it also integrates the observations made in § 2 above.

3.1. *Exegetical Approaches to Biblical Metaphor*

In response to Nielsen's question if there is any significance "to whether we consider one theory of metaphor more correct than the other" (1989: 66), Weiss observes that biblical metaphor studies so far, regardless of the theoretical models they introduce, follow a similar pattern: "[…] they closely examine the wording of the passage at hand and glean information from relevant verses in other parts of the Bible and from extrabiblical sources" (2006: 28–29). While acknowledging this state of affairs, Weiss formulates her own line of approach. Her study specifically intends to:

> […] explore the mechanics of metaphor and to provide a means of identifying metaphor and distinguishing it from other forms of figurative language. In addition, this study applies current linguistic research on metaphor to the biblical text in an attempt to advance our understanding of the ways metaphor function in the Tanakh.
>
> Weiss 2006: 32

33 Cf. also Foreman (2011: 20–21).

Besides exploring the mechanics of metaphor, Weiss explicitly aims at enhancing the interpretation of the biblical text. To this end, she chooses not to examine a certain metaphor throughout a certain book, but rather "to investigate the various metaphors found in a particular passage and situate them in their surrounding narrative context" (2006: 33). To clarify her approach, Weiss quotes Asif Agha (personal communication) that

> the real task of analysis is not merely to catalogue the cases of metaphor, but to understand the dramatic and rhetorical effects of the implicit meanings conveyed by tropes.
>
> Weiss 2006: 33

Weiss thus envisions to enhance the interpretation of the biblical text by bringing in view the "interactional effects" of metaphors (2006: 34).[34]

The study of Jindo shares Weiss's aim to develop an exegetical approach to biblical metaphor that enhances the interpretation of the biblical text, but whereas Weiss seems to translate cognitive metaphor theory into a step-by-step approach, Jindo presents it in a more heuristic form (2010: 3). In order to cultivate an attitude toward metaphor, Jindo gives the following set of principles:[35]

> 1. Because the phenomenon of metaphor is first and foremost conceptual, the exegete should clarify the interrelations of metaphorical verbal expressions on the conceptual level and the cognitive orientation as reflected in the use of these expressions. [...]
> 2. Because the phenomenon of metaphor involves systematic correspondences between two conceptual domains, the exegete should approach metaphor holistically and not atomistically. [...]
> 3. Because the conceptual information upon which metaphorical communication is established is already known to language users and therefore, usually not spelled out in the given discourse, the exegete must clarify this information. [...]
>
> Jindo 2010: 33–35

34 In a later chapter, Weiss adds that "[w]hen considering the potential impact of figurative language in a narrative, one must evaluate the interactional consequences that operate in several spheres: within the story and between the text and its receptors" (2006: 123).

35 For a comparable set of principles, even if not inspired by cognitive linguistics, see Nielsen (1989: 66–67).

Translated into cognitive linguistic terminology, Jindo's guidelines for metaphor study in the Bible entail firstly, that one explores the use of different source domains: source domains that are at first sight unrelated may actually express different perspectives on a same target domain. Secondly, that one explains elements of a mapping in relation to the complete mapping: if metaphors evoke complete source domains, also the meaning of the occurrence of these source domains should be taken into account. Thirdly, that one explicates in what sense a certain mapping modifies the knowledge or assumptions of the audience.

As Jindo specifically pays attention to the creative and cognitive value of metaphors, he adds to these principles what he considers the most important features thereof:

> – Metaphors as semantically open entities: The meaning of a literary metaphor is open and not fixed in its immediate syntactic or literary context. [...]
> – Metaphors as conceptual constructs: In poetry, metaphors may function not merely as literary ornaments but also as conceptual constructs of a poetic reality that the composition is designed to represent.[36]
> – Metaphors as mode of orientation: Metaphor has a cognitive value, and it thereby orients our perception of the object it describes.
>
> Jindo 2010: 44–45

In my discussion of metaphor and stylistics (see §2.3.3 above), I have explained Jindo's descriptions of poetic metaphors as 'semantically open entities' and 'conceptual constructs' with Pilkington's proposals that they are mappings that include a wide range of possible correspondences and that are able to evoke phenomenal states. Jindo's description of poetic metaphors as 'mode of orientation' corresponds to what I described in §2.3.2 on metaphor and rhetoric, namely that source domains can be used to modify the addressee's perspective. The lists of principles and features quoted above show that Jindo's understanding of the cognitive linguistic approach

36 On poetic metaphors as conceptual constructs, compare also Alonso Schökel (2000 [1987]: 100–101): "(...) we can translate the Bible into a language which is more abstract and less expressive, but we will not reach the original meaning. We are dealing with poets, and what comes before the image is not the concept, but the formless experience. The image gave a certain form to the experience; it was the first vision or spiritual reflexion, the first formulation which could be communicated. By means of the image the author understood what he had experienced and expressed it and it is the image which he intends to put across."

to poetic metaphors corresponds to my own understanding thereof, but my main reason to quote them here is that they clarify why the interpretation of metaphors in the Hebrew Bible cannot be reduced to a step-by-step procedure. What was already mentioned by Weiss is more elaborately brought in view by Jindo, namely that it is relatively easy to describe the propositional information that a poetic metaphor expresses, but that it is more difficult to bring in view its textual scope, the literary reality it evokes, and the specific perspective it introduces, because these aspects require an overview of the complete literary context and an understanding of other figures of speech found therein. To understand the poetic import of metaphors, it is necessary to go back and forth through the text to become aware of and acquainted with the literary realities that are thereby evoked. In this sense, metaphor research is a never-ending exercise. With Jindo, I therefore hold that a cognitive linguistic approach to metaphor will not result in uncovering the one and only meaning of the metaphor (cf. Jindo 2010: 518), but that it rather aims at offering an array of possible and plausible interpretations that take into account how metaphors are interrelated and embedded in the whole of the composition.[37]

In the end, the explanation of metaphors is an exegetical process. In this regard, Jindo remarks that biblical scholars have disclosed understandings of conceptual models without the use of cognitive linguistics (Jindo 2010: 51–52). Also in the book of Job, conceptual models have been identified and put to use as an interpretative framework. The lawsuit interpretation as developed by Habel (1985: 54–57), for example, has inspired many scholars,[38] but also Perdue's reading based on metaphors of cosmology and anthropology (1991) serves as an example of how the uncovering

37 For a similar view on the role of a cognitive literary approach with regard to the interpretation of texts, see Freeman: "In applying the principles and methods of cognitive linguistics to literature, I am not claiming that it produces insights into Dickinson's poetry that cannot be achieved by any sensitive close reading or other literary critical approaches. A cognitive poetics, in this sense, is not just another literary theory that contributes readings resulting from its own particular approach. Rather, by revealing the cognitive processes by which a literary work is created and understood, cognitive poetics has explanatory power. It explains how both writer and reader make conceptual projections and mappings that create new meanings. It focuses on process, not product. It is limited by these constraints. It cannot explain why a poet like Dickenson thinks the way she does, nor can it (as yet) describe the novel uniqueness of literary creativity. What it can do (…) is illuminate those imaginative capabilities that enable poetry to happen" (2002: 43).

38 As Newsom observes: "For a generation or more it has been taken for granted that legal language and an underlying legal metaphor permeates Job's speeches and is key to understanding the book itself. Some have gone so far as to attempt to describe the very genre of the work as a "lawsuit drama"" (2003: 150). Newsom herself, however, takes a more critical stance toward the legal interpretation of the book of Job: "Habel's analysis is rich and insightful, yet his interpretive

of conceptual models can be employed to open up new perspectives on the narrative development. Even if these examples show that conceptual models can be retrieved without it, the added value of cognitive linguistics is that it provides a theoretical approach that clarifies how texts construct these conceptual models, and that offers the tools to identify and interpret the elements by which they are evoked.[39] This enables exegetes to describe how already identified conceptual models are evoked by a text, but it also helps them to trace conceptual models that do not immediately catch the eye—and especially the latter is what I aim for in the present study.

3.2. *The Exegetical Approach to Biblical Metaphor in the Present Study*

In the present study, I subscribe the exegetical approaches of Weiss and Jindo, but instead of investigating a particular passage or section, I focus attention on a central theme, namely that of suffering in the book of Job. By examining the figurative language that relates to theme of suffering, I bring in view Job's conceptualization thereof as it develops throughout his dialogue with his friends in chapters 3–31. My methodology shows similarities with both that of Weiss and Jindo. Like Weiss, I set out to identify metaphors, to describe their mapping, and to explain their rhetorical effects, but whereas Weiss' analysis is mainly inspired by the work of Eva Kittay, Asif Agha and Roger White (Weiss 2006: 32), I take a starting point in the career of metaphor theory and the three-dimensional taxonomy of Steen (see § 2 above). This entails that I mainly pay attention to deliberately used metaphors, that is, metaphors that trigger cross-domain mapping and that have rhetorical and/or stylistic functions (see § 2.2 and § 2.3. above). When it comes to deliberately used metaphors, I agree with Jindo that a more heuristic approach is required. I will therefore take a starting point in what Jindo has put forward as the most important features of poetic metaphors (cf. § 3.1 above) to describe the import of the deliberately used metaphors. By establishing for each deliberately used metaphor with what other expressions it interacts, what conceptual reality it evokes, and in what way it affects the orientation of the reader,

---

decision to maximize the presence and shaping influence of legal language obscures a more complex and subtle situation. Though Job on occasion uses unmistakably technical legal expressions, much of the language in question is at home both in legal and more general discourse." (2003: 150).

39 Cf. Jindo (2009: 52): "[...] few scholars have attempted to reformulate their intuitive gestalt approach into a practical and analytical method."

the coherence and interaction of the figurative expressions related to suffering will be illuminated, and the conceptual models that underlie the presentation of suffering within the composition of the text will be disclosed.

To trace Job's conceptualization of suffering in chapters 3–31, I proceed as follows. Before discussing the metaphors in the passages that relate to suffering,[40] I begin by explaining the rhetorical context of the passage concerned, that is, I clarify the topic of discussion and the arguments that Job and his friends have been developing during the dialogue up until the speech in which the passage is found. After having established the discourse positions of Job and his friends, I discuss the textual and interpretational difficulties of the selected passages. Only against this background I study the metaphors that play a role in Job's conceptualization of suffering. My study of metaphors entails that I identify the deliberately used metaphors that occur in the selected passages, that I describe their mappings and the correspondences thereby evoked, and that I explain the rhetorical function of these metaphors in relation to both the storyline and the readership of the book of Job. It must be noted that my discussion of metaphors is always aimed at illuminating the development of the theme of Job's suffering against the background of the development of the dialogue between Job and his friends. The interpretation of metaphors is not a purpose in itself, but rather serves as a means to bring in view the conceptualization of suffering throughout Job 3–31. I thus envision to contribute to the interpretation of the book of Job by employing the cognitive linguistic approach to metaphors in the investigation of the theme of suffering.

Before turning to the analysis of figurative language in the book of Job in chapter 3, the next chapter will firstly set forth the most important approaches to the book of Job and to the theme of suffering therein.

40 On the selection of these passages, see the next chapter.

CHAPTER 2

The Theme of Suffering in the Book of Job

In this dissertation, I aim to bring in view the conceptualization of suffering as it develops through the dialogue between Job and his friends in the chapters 3–31. In this chapter, I define my approach to the theme of suffering in recent scholarship on the book of Job. Firstly, I describe the tenets and interests of current approaches to the book of Job, secondly I discuss the structure of Job 3–31, and finally, I consider what this entails for the theme of suffering; this last paragraph also includes an overview of the passages that I study more closely in the next chapters.

1. Literary Approaches to the Book of Job

In modern commentaries, it is often said that the book of Job is one of a kind. With this statement, scholars refer to the extraordinary skill of the poet, but also to the impossibility of classifying the book of Job as belonging to a certain genre or a certain literary tradition.[1] The main problem of the classification of the book of Job is that it combines a diversity of forms (e.g. lament, hymn, disputation, proverbs, litigation) and genres (e.g. cultic, wisdom, legal) in a manner that is both subversive and constructive. To account for the final form of the book of Job, some scholars have analyzed the narrative framework (chapters 1–2 and 42:7-17), the speech cycles (chapters 3–27), the wisdom poem (chapter 28), Job's monologue (chapter 29–31), the speech of Elihu (chapters 32–37) and the divine speeches (chapters 38–42:6) as separate units in order to relate them to different authors and/or to different phases of the history of the text.[2] When the reconstruction of the historical development did not lead to satisfying answers, scholars began to look at the question of its form and meaning from different angles.[3] In this dissertation, I follow the trend that adopts a

1 E.g. Fohrer (1963: 47), Andersen (1976: 33), Pope ([3]1973: xxxi), Hartley (1988: 37–38), and Seow (2013: 61). For an overview of genres found in the book of Job, see for example Dell (1991: 88–107) and Seow (2013: 47–65).

2 So e.g. Budde (1896), Duhm (1897), and Pope ([3]1973). See also Müller (1988).

3 On the interpretation history of the unity of the book of Job, see Newsom (2003: 4–11).

literary approach and that studies the book of Job as it is transmitted by the Masoretic tradition.[4]

Newsom (1993: 88) locates the emergence of final form readings of the book of Job in the commentaries of Habel (1985), Clines (1989), and Good (1990) that appeared in the 1980s and 1990s. A final form reading calls for the clarification of the meaning of the plot and the composition of the book as a whole, and because plot and composition are topics of the field of literary studies, the literary approach entered the scene as the new paradigm for the interpretation of the book of Job. The literary approach triggered a range of fresh perspectives. Newsom describes how Habel, for example, focuses the attention on the narrative plot and singles out the forensic metaphor as a conceptual framework (Newsom 1993: 89–90), while Clines, on the other hand, emphasizes the role of the reader and delineates different ways in which meaning can be construed (Newsom 1993: 90–91), and Good presents a deconstructive reading that resists stable meaning (Newsom 1993: 91–92).

The literary approach also gave rise to new questions.[5] As it was recognized that texts may evoke an array of meanings and that no reader can escape his or her context dependent reading strategy, some shifted their attention from the content and the interpretation of the book of Job to the formal features by which interpretations are established.[6] Dell (1991), for example, examined the use and misuse of genres, Perdue (1991) analyzed the effect of metaphorical processes, Cheney (1994) studied characterization as established by genre and composition, Köhlmoos (1999)—inspired by Eco (1996 [1979])—investigated text strategies, and Newsom (2002, 2003)—inspired by Bakhtin (1984)—employed ideas on dialogic truth and polyphonic texts. By studying the function of genres, concepts, and compositions, scholars intended to bring in view how texts steer reading processes and build narrative worlds. I understand my study as a similar project in that I investigate metaphors as a means by which the text controls the conceptualization of the reader. Below, I summarize the research on literary strategies in the book of Job and their effect on the reader that I build upon in the following chapters.

---

4 My approach to the book of Job has especially been inspired by Newsom (2003), Wolfers (1993, 1995), Perdue (1991), Yu (2011), Lo (2003), Jones (2009), and Seow (2013).

5 Cf. Newsom (1993: 93–99).

6 Cf. Newsom (2003: 10): "Meaning is not generated merely through propositions but also through the textures of language, through the invocations of styles and forms of speech that themselves have histories and social resonances."

1.1. *Dell: The Misuse of Genre*

One possible literary approach to the meaning of the book of Job is the study of the use and juxtaposition of genres. In her study of genres in the book of Job, Dell defines genre as the correspondence between form, content, and context. The correspondence between these three elements is essential:

> For example, to be classed as a 'lament' in genre or Gattung a psalm needs not only to be in the same form as other laments, but needs to contain also the content traditionally found to accompany such a form and to derive from a Sitz im Leben in which such a form would be relevant and comprehensible.
>
> Dell 1991: 88–89

As correspondences between form, content, and context may be found within sentences, passages, chapters, speeches, or whole works, it follows that the term 'genre' can be applied to different textual levels. With regard to the book of Job, Dell proposes to recognize the scope of its particular genres and to consider each genre in its own respect instead of searching for an overall classification (Dell 1991: 100–103). The most dominant genres in the book of Job are legal, hymnic, and wisdom, but also forms such as laments, psalms, and proverbs occur (Dell 1991: 103–107). As Dell considers the idea that the book of Job is collection of genres (so Habel 1985: 42–46) or a book *sui generis* (so Pope [3]1973: xxxi) unsatisfactory, she directs her attention to the use and function of these genres. She thereby elaborates on Fohrer's idea that the book of Job employs literary forms "in functions other than those proper to them" (Dell (1991: 109n1), cf. Fohrer (1963: 50–53)).

Dell is especially interested in the deliberate misuse of literary forms, that is, "a traditional form being used with a different content and context and thus having a different function" (Dell 1991: 110). After listing examples of forms that are misused (Dell 1991: 125–136), Dell observes that the misuse of literary forms is concentrated in the speeches of Job:[7]

7 Dell finds only some possible cases of misuse of forms in the speeches of the friends; in this regard, she mentions Job 4:12-21, 5:3-7, 9:2-4, 22:15-16 (Dell 1991: 136–137).

> Notably it is what Job himself says that is really unorthodox in content, particularly on issues that are traditionally treated in wisdom and cultic circles, and this is matched by the forms which the author of Job uses in order to misuse them.
>
> Dell 1991: 135

Furthermore, she concludes that in the speeches of Job the technique of misusing forms especially occurs in discussions on the place of man in the world:

> [...] this technique is only used in passages where Job is generalizing about life and man's lot and is not used in passages where he is simply describing his own condition; nor is it used in judicial parts nor in parts addressed to the friends; and finally it is not used in the two traditional accounts about the prosperity of the wicked in 21:1-22 and 24:1-17.
>
> Dell 1991: 137–138

Based on the conclusion that the misuse of forms typically occurs in Job's speeches in passages that concern the fate of mankind, Dell suggests that the misuse of forms has a function in expressing protest, and more specifically, skepticism. With this idea, Dell returns to the question of the overall genre of the book of Job. She proposes that Job's overall genre is characterized by its misuse of forms, and as she understands that this technique is used to express skepticism, she argues that the overall genre of the book of Job is best described as parody (Dell 1991: 148).

With the starting point that parody is the overall genre of the book of Job, Dell states that the prose tale is used to introduce the themes that will be contested and inversed in the poetic dialogue. The dialogue thus parodies the prose tale and its rigid ideas on piety, the retribution principle, and one's attitude toward suffering (Dell 1991: 203–204). At the same time, the dialogue and the divine speeches are parodies of themselves, as both the friends and God neglect to address Job's concerns (Dell 1991: 199–208).[8] According to Dell, the strategy of depicting the friends as failing to see what is at stake is meant to devaluate the reader's appreciation of them (Dell 1991: 204). The description of God as ignoring Job's accusations, on the other hand, shows with an anticlimax that "Job's presupposition that God would answer his questions is all wrong" (Dell 1991: 206), and so the emphasis on God's power only serves to underline

8 Dell does not comment on Job 28 or the Elihu speeches, because she regards them as secondary (cf. 1991: 195–198).

the distance between Job and God. After the dialogue has thus ended in an anticlimax, there are two more unexpected turns: firstly, Job repents,[9] and secondly, God approves of Job's words and restores him. Dell explains Job's repentance as reflecting "the author's experience—that often one does not receive a satisfactory answer but all one can do before such a God is to bow down and repent" (Dell 1991: 208). The restoration now follows on Job's change of attitude: this is in line with what the prologue and the friends have been propagating, but it is also motivated by the fact that Job has been in the right and that his friends have been in the wrong. While this verdict indeed confirms the suggested negative evaluation of the friends (see above), the concrete outcome of events actually puts the friends in the right and, moreover, it overrules every skeptic attitude that has been upheld in the dialogue (Dell 1991: 208–209). In the end, no solutions are offered, and according to Dell, this is what the arrangement of book of Job was communicating all along:

> The problem of why the innocent suffer is not answered, rather innocent suffering is seen to be simply a fact of life. The doctrine of retribution is shown to contradict the findings of personal experience, and yet at the end it seems to be the only answer. In terms of the God-man relationship, one is no nearer a solution. God is not portrayed as a God who cares for man's plight, and the only justification Job receives is in 42:7. There is no straightforward meaning to the book. Rather, simple solutions to problems raised are shown, by the irony used and the inconsistencies highlighted by the author, to be non-existent.
>
> Dell 1991: 209

Dell's analysis of genre in the book of Job points out that on the level of the plot the misuse of genre can be used to add a skeptical tone to the words of a character, and that on the level of the arrangement of the book it can be used to support the destabilization of its overall message. For this dissertation it would have been especially relevant how genres are employed as a means to present the rhetorical

9 There is actually no consensus on Job 42:6. Most scholars acknowledge that the ambiguity of the verse is deliberate and that possible readings include that Job repents of what he has said, that he reconciles himself to his fate, and that he rejects his present condition (see e.g. Morrow (1986: 211–225), van Wolde (1994: 242–250), and Krüger (2007: 217–223) for overviews of interpretations). As Newsom notes, the preference for one interpretation over another mainly depends on one's understanding of the divine speeches (Newsom 1996: 629). Dell's repentance interpretation may indeed mainly be motivated by her ironical reading of the winding up of the plot.

stance of characters and to question the worldviews they represent, but Dell's study does not include a more fine-grained analysis of genre on the level of the rhetorical development within the dialogue. For that reason, I only incidentally refer to Dell in my discussion of the dialogue and of metaphors in specific passages. Her interpretation of the general plot and her idea that the misuse of genre functions as a communicative strategy, however, function as a frame of reference for my general approach to the book of Job.

1.2. *Newsom: Genres as Voices in a Polyphonic Dialogue*

While Dell is particularly interested in the misuse of genre on the level of composition and its consequences for the interpretation of the plot, Newsom opens her study on the composition of the book of Job with a more fundamental examination of the communicative function of genre in general. Newsom's approach to genre takes a starting point in the recognition thereof by the reader:

> The recognition of genre involves a perception that certain texts bear a striking family resemblance to one another. That perception serves to establish some rough and usually implicit assumptions about what to expect from the text in question.
>
> Newsom 2003: 4

Newsom proposes that the recognition of genre invokes a set of expectations, and that any shift of genre in the book of Job causes the reader to move from one set of expectations to another (Newsom 2003: 13). In her explanation of the meaning of genre shifts in the book of Job, Newsom works with the heuristic assumption that—except for the Elihu speeches—the book of Job is the work of a single author (Newsom 2003: 16). By means of genre shifting, this author evokes different sets of value systems and rhetorical strategies to guide the reader through different conceptualizations of the organization of the world. Among the genres in the book of Job, Newsom identifies the didactic narrative (Job 1–2), the wisdom dialogue (Job 3–27), and the wisdom poem (Job 28); although not modeled on a specific genre, she furthermore regards the last speech of Job (29–31) and the divine speeches (Job 38–41) as autonomous parts (Newsom 2003: 17). In summary, she describes the meaning of these genres as follows.

Firstly, the didactic narrative is "a genre that presents its perspective simply and accessibly, without complex shading" (Newsom 2003: 18). After submerging the reader

in a world of "clear values and simple truths," the author of Job proceeds with the wisdom dialogue to confront him with a more complex one:

> The form of the wisdom dialogue [...] has no evaluative narrator to tell the reader what's what, no plot to award victory to on position over another. Instead it simply presents voice against voice, requiring the reader to become much more active in judging the validity of the characters' claims.
>
> Newsom 2003: 18

The wisdom dialogue functions as a means to bring in view the complexities of the question of suffering, but the author does not aim to arrive at solutions (Newsom 2003: 19). When the wisdom dialogue reaches its limits, the wisdom poem comes in with a new voice to underline its shortcomings by explaining that wisdom is inaccessible for human beings. Against this background, Newsom understands Job's last speech as a final attempt to picture his understanding of the functioning of a moral world. The divine speeches serve as a counterpart to Job's words and bring the story to another level by opening up a new perspective on the question of morality:

> There is no message in them to be decoded allegorically but rather the sense of a wholly different form of perception which, if embraced, would reorient and reorganize one's entire sense of value and meaning.
>
> Newsom 2003: 19

The consecution of genres could suggest that the perspective that is introduced by God is the perspective that the author of Job considers as the key to the question of suffering. In this line of thought, however, it is difficult to understand why the author would return to the didactic narrative genre in the epilogue (Newsom 2003: 20–21). Newsom therefore proposes a different reading. Instead of seeing the genres as constituting a didactic process, she introduces a rhetorical model that is developed by Bakthin and argues that the book of Job is better understood as a "polyphonic work" in which different genres are juxtaposed in order to interact and to contribute to a "dialogic truth" (Newsom 2003: 21). This means that she proposes to abandon the idea that a single perspective encompasses the whole truth, and to replace it by the idea that truth emerges in the interaction of voices, or, in the case of literature, in the interaction of genres.

If the book of Job is read as a search for truth in which different voices pose their own views, the reader is not urged to agree with one of those voices. He or she rather

takes the position of an outsider that oversees the interaction of arguments (Newsom 2003: 23). This new role of the reader allows Newsom to interpret Job's reply and the narrative epilogue. Although the reader understands the authority of the divine speeches and sees how Job in his reply initially reverts to God's words, the text, in the end, leaves him or her with the ambiguity of Job 42:6[10] and with the epilogue that simultaneously closes and reopens the story (Newsom 2003: 28–30). In a polyphonic reading of the book of Job, such an ending supports the idea that truth can only be found at the "intersection of unmerged perspectives" (Newsom 2003: 30).

In Newsom's approach, genres function as prototypes that are put in dialogue with each other. Newsom's analysis shows how the Bakhtinian understanding of the following up of genres leads to a new appraisal of truth claims that, among other things, allows for an explanation of the meaning of the epilogue within the composition of the book of Job. Newsom shares Dell's idea that the composition of the book of Job is a means to express that there is no simple solution to the problem of piety and suffering. However, whereas Dell interprets the use of genres within this composition as a distortion technique that expresses doubt, Newsom sees it as a technique of juxtaposition that envisions the emergence of new insight, and whereas Dell mainly presents a new perspective on the composition as a whole, Newsom also offers a detailed explication of each of the genres and the worldview—or in Newsom's words the 'moral imagination'—they evoke. I share Newsom's understanding of the plot in terms of the interaction of different sets of worldviews and I take her work as an important input for my explanation of the rhetorical development in Job 3–31. Even if my study differs from that of Newsom in that my focus is not on the plot but on the theme of suffering, and not on genre but on metaphors, I follow a similar rationale in that I track the worldviews—or in the terminology of cognitive linguistics, 'conceptualizations'—that are evoked by metaphors and in that I describe what the interaction of these views entails for the reader's understanding of suffering. In the end, however, my main topic is not the reader, but the character Job and the development of his conceptualization of suffering throughout the dialogue.

1.3. *Perdue: Metaphors of Cosmology and Anthropology*

Dell and Newsom describe the rhetorical strategy of the book of Job from the perspective of the use of genres and their juxtaposition in its composition. Another

10 On the ambiguity of Job 42:6, see n. 9 above.

approach to the description of the rhetorical strategy of the book of Job is provided by Perdue, who is inspired by developments in metaphor theory. By focusing on metaphors, Perdue's study concentrates on the role of conceptual models and how they serve as a device to structure the meaning of the book of Job.

In his study *Wisdom in Revolt: Metaphorical Theology in the Book of Job* (Perdue 1994), Perdue starts from the assumption that religious language is metaphorical, or put differently, that religious understandings are expressed in terms of human experience (Perdue 1991: 22). According to Perdue, metaphors are used to express religious understanding, and in this regard, he is especially interested in how they work, that is, how they move "an implied audience through a process which begins with the shattering of previous structures of linguistic reality to the reconstruction of a new and more compelling one" (Perdue 1994: 23). As metaphors move readers through stages of (1) absurdity and destabilization, (2) mimesis and (3) transformation and restabilization (Perdue 1991: 24–26), they may change their world:

> Metaphors serve not only to alter the perception and therefore the meaning of an object, but, if they are especially compelling ones, they may even become organizing images which recreate the world into something more compelling and true, including one's imagining and activating of values.
>
> Perdue 1991: 25

With the idea that metaphors can be employed as a communicative device to either emphasize or change a certain interpretation of the world, Perdue reads the book of Job against the background of wisdom literature. To that end, he firstly detects the metaphors that play a central role in wisdom literature, and in a following step, he investigates how these metaphors function within the book of Job.

Inspired by von Rad (1972), Perdue identifies in wisdom literature two creation traditions that explain the origin and the maintenance of the world, namely the cosmology tradition and the anthropology tradition (Perdue 1991: 20–22). The first includes the metaphors of fertility, artistry, word, and struggle, the latter the metaphors of slave and ruler. According to Perdue, the same traditions and metaphors shape the book of Job: in his view, the plot of the book of Job stages the slave-ruler relationship against the background of the cosmological struggle between God and the chaos powers (Perdue 1991: 30). By grounding his interpretation in traditions that explain the origin and maintenance of the world, Perdue pictures the book of Job as establishing an event in which the audience is moved toward a better understanding of the world (Perdue 1991: 75).

In Perdue's reading, the prologue serves to question the metaphors that are used to affirm the stability of creation:

> Questions are raised, and doubts begin to emerge, as the conventional wisdom metaphor of the just God loses its evocative power, and is replaced with one of a corrupt judge and failing ruler whose suspicions lead to the devastating of the faithful slave. The absurdity of this metaphor disorients both the character Job and the implied wisdom audience.
>
> Perdue 1991: 109

Job's first speech (Job 3) continues the destabilization of metaphors that was started by the narrator: he misuses the power of words, wishes barrenness instead of fertility, devalues the worth of artistry, and considers humans to be slaves and not rulers (Perdue 1991: 96–108). After the reader's ideas on the righteousness of God and the power of humans have thus been destabilized, the scene is set for Job in the role of a slave that rebels against an unjust ruler. Before following Job's lead in rejecting all positive metaphors, the disoriented audience, however, may wish to seek an explanation for the course of events within the traditional paradigms. In Perdue's view, it is to this end that Job's friends come in to offer their services (Perdue 1991: 108–110).

Perdue shows that in the first speech cycle (Job 4–14), the friends adopt the metaphor that humans are slaves, but that at the same time, they uphold the idea that God is a righteous judge. To make these metaphors compatible, the friends ascribe the low status of humans to their inherent sinfulness. Claiming that Job's inherent human sinfulness explains his situation as being the result of the principle of retribution, the friends advice Job to acknowledge his human condition and to turn to God. Job is not convinced by this solution. Even if humans are not without sin, Job refuses to take the metaphor of God as a righteous judge as an indisputable truth: according to Perdue, he prefers to uphold the metaphor of God as the Divine Warrior who uses his power to enslave his creation (Perdue 1991: 147–148).

Perdue describes how the consequences of Job's new metaphor for God are further developed in the following two speech cycles (Job 15–21, 22–26) and the oath of innocence (Job 29–31).[11] With God as his personal enemy, Job protests against the worldview that is presented by the friends. The friends who now see where Job's ideas

11 As Perdue considers Job 28 and Job 32–37 secondary material, these chapters are not included his description of the metaphorical process (Perdue 1991: 193–195). For the analysis of the metaphorical process in these chapters, see chapter 9 of his study (Perdue 1991: 242–259).

on God will lead him, try to stop him: they warn him that rebelling against God will certainly seal his fate, that man must know his place in the universe and acknowledge his imperfection, that it is hubris to think that man is better than God. For Job, however, there is no way back. Not he, but God is in the wrong. Having nothing left to lose, Job wants God to explain why such an exceptional amount of misfortune has fallen to him. Meanwhile, Job constructs himself a new reality that allows him to regain control over his life:

> Since God has abused divine privilege in the misrule of heaven and earth, it is time for humanity, incorporated within the metaphor of the primal king, to assault the divine throne, remove the divine ruler, and take charge of the cosmos. In the emerging vision of Job, the world is to be ruled by human kings, guided by wisdom and expressing their own humaneness in their policies and actions.
>
> Perdue 1991: 195

According to Perdue, Job offers his audience a new perspective on his situation with an alternative understanding of God and humanity. Although the audience can choose to stick with the interpretation of the friends, it is Job's conception of reality that now determines the course of the plot. The audience is to await whether the plot allows it to persist: if God enters the scene, it is expected that the issue will soon be settled.

With this expectation of the audience in mind, Perdue understands the divine speeches (Job 38–41) as serving to adjust the worldview that was put forward by Job. In the first speech, God firstly restores the cosmology metaphors (Perdue 1991: 203–212), and secondly he questions the man-as-ruler metaphor (Perdue 1991: 212–216). When God in his second speech pictures his righteousness by his providential care over creation and challenges Job with the duties that come along with kingship over creation (Perdue 1991: 218–232), Job reconsiders his earlier stand. Job's last words in 42:1-6 acknowledge God's superiority and righteousness, and enable him to step away from his man-as-ruler metaphor and to withdraw his accusations (Perdue 1991: 232–238). Although the re-adoption of constructive metaphors does not immediately solve Job's relation with God, Perdue sees it as a new starting point for the formulation of a paradigm that is not rigidly fixed on the principle of retribution, but that indeed leaves space for questioning and disputation (1991: 236).

Perdue reads the narrative epilogue (Job 42:7-17) as closing off the plot with judgment and redemption. Now that His authority is reestablished, God's positive judgment of Job's words underlines the appreciation of the fresh attitude that they

express. In addition to this, and more importantly, God's appreciation of Job's new attitude reaffirms the integrity of God in that it counters the image of God that appeared from the prologue:

> Indeed it is the integrity of God, more than Job's, that is rescued by the final judgment. Like Abraham Job has rightly questioned divine justice, deconstructed the inadequate, naïve language of faith formulated by the friends, and moved to reestablish a discourse that makes faith articulate. (…) Now through the issuance of divine decree, the integrity of Yahweh is regained, the world is ordered, and creation is sustained.
>
> Perdue 1991: 239–240

By reading the book of Job as a succession of interacting metaphors, Perdue understands the book of Job as an event that generates a more subtle understanding of religion in its audience. Like Newsom, Perdue presents the book of Job as a confrontation between different perspectives, but whereas Newsom pictures this confrontation as resulting in an encompassing and contradictory whole, Perdue describes it more as a linear process that constitutes a transformational development. From the perspective of genre and composition, there is not one perspective that represents the whole truth, but from the perspective of the character Job, there is, in the end, a new understanding of his place in the world. As I focus in this study on the character of Job, my approach corresponds to that of Perdue in that I understand Job's consideration of different views on suffering as a linear process that enables him to find a new way of dealing with his situation. My approach differs from that of Perdue in that I do not investigate how Job elaborates on traditional metaphors that are found in wisdom literature, but that I focus attention on the metaphors by which Job expresses his understanding of his situation.

1.4. *Summary and Outlook*

As explained above, the interest of recent approaches to the book of Job is not so much the topic and message, but rather the literary strategies by which these are expressed. In this study, I follow the lead of these approaches. My investigation of the conceptualization of suffering acknowledges the impact of the ironical use of genre in statements on suffering, and it explains apparent contradictions as part of the rhetorical strategies in the ongoing dialogue. As this dissertation investigates Job's dealing with trouble in the dialogue between Job and his friends in chapters 3–31,

the two most important structural issues that need to be dealt with are the so-called third speech cycle in Job 23–27 and the wisdom poem in Job 28.

Of the above described scholars, Newsom interprets both the difficult passages (Job 24:18-25, 26:5-14, 27:14-23) in the third speech cycle (Newsom 2003: 164–168) and the wisdom poem in function of their contribution to the dialogical truth (Newsom 2003: 174–182).[12] Dell and Perdue, however, do not treat the final form of the third speech cycle and the wisdom poem as part of the overall design. With regard of these chapters, Dell warns that the search for unity should not be pushed too far:

> there is no merit in enforcing a unity on disparate material and a criticism of modern interpretations, for example, R Gordis, is that interpretations of individual passages and sections are often forced to fit in with a very subjective view of the unity of the whole book.
>
> Dell 1991: 194

The decision whether a passage was part of the original work depends on what one understands to be the message of the author and whether the passage fits into that message or not. Dell argues that the main message of the author of Job is a skeptical one, and therefore she proposes that

> those parts of Job which do not show evidence of the deliberate misuse of forms (or parodying of traditions) might be seen as unoriginal to the author since this technique is clearly a characteristic feature of his work.
>
> Dell 1991: 196

As Dell does not find the misuse of genre technique in the disputed passages in the third speech cycle, she understands them to be spoken by the friends (Dell 1991: 138); with the same argument she considers Job 28 as a later addition (Dell 1991: 196). Also

12 Newsom ascribes the difficult passages to Job, but she considers Job 28 as a new voice, "different from either the voice of the prose tale narration or from the characters who speak in the wisdom dialogue" (Newsom 2003: 169). In her commentary on the book of Job, Newsom ascribed Job 26:5-14 to Bildad: "What happens in these chapters represents the deterioration of the dialogue. Bildad begins to speak in 25:1-6, but is interrupted by Job, who sarcastically mocks what Bildad has said (26:1-4). Undeterred, Bildad completed his speech (26:5-14), at which point Job resumes his discourse. Such a structure may be the author's attempt to represent the interruptive and even overlapping speech of the parties to a conversation that has irretrievably broken down" (Newsom 1996: 516).

Perdue rearranges the third speech cycle so that the disputed passages are assigned to the friends, and so that it matches the arrangement of the first two speech cycles (Perdue 1991: 85). Perdue considers the wisdom poem as a later addition because its message fits neither the arguments of Job nor that of the friends:

> it would seem best to regard the poem as a later insertion, written and placed into the dialogues to represent the views of a pious sage who objects to the quest to discover wisdom.
>
> Perdue 1991: 84

Although there is an increasing tendency among modern scholars to approach the book of Job in its final form and to explain contradictions as part of its rhetorical strategy, this does not necessarily involve that the structure of the final form is accepted as such. In this study, however, I choose to start from the assumption that there is no reason to restructure the third speech cycle or to reject the wisdom poem if they can be explained as part of the overall structure. As described above, Newsom did explain the difficulties in the third speech cycle as way of the author to express the impossibility of a solution, and she considered the wisdom poem as a voice that emphasized this message. In the next paragraph I discuss an alternative proposal for the structure of Job 23–27 by Wolfers and alternative proposals for Job 28 by Lo and Jones.

2. The Structure of Job 3–31

2.1. *Job 23–27: Wolfers (1993)*

The question of the third speech cycle (23–27) is a problem that has different aspects. Firstly, the speech of Zophar is missing, secondly, the speech of Bildad (Job 25) is very short, and thirdly, some passages ascribed to Job (Job 24:18-24; 26:5-14, 27:14-23) seem strange in his mouth. Wolfers points out that the interaction of these difficulties has given rise to the idea that the third speech cycle is damaged or incomplete:

> The theory of an original complete third cycle does not depend only on the frustrated anticipation of regularity, but is strongly supported by the almost unanimous conviction of scholars that portions of chs xxiv, xxvi and xxvii, all

> of which are attributed to Job in the MT, are inappropriate to him, but express views which are suitable to his opponents.
>
> Wolfers *1993*: 385

Wolfers's solution to the problem of Job 23–27 consists of two parts: firstly, in proposing that there are only two speech cycles in the book of Job that both start and end with a speech of Eliphaz, namely Job 4–15:16 and Job 15:17-22, and secondly, in demonstrating that the disputed passages can actually be understood as being Job's.[13]

Wolfers uses the thematic division of chapter 15 as an argument to propose that the first speech cycle does not end in chapter 14, but in the first half of chapter 15, and that the second speech cycle thus only starts in the second half of chapter 15:

> [...] we find that the description of the wicked, the second-cycle theme, begins not after any brief introduction, but in v. 20. The description itself does have its own brief introduction, vv. 17–19, but the whole of the first half of the chapter, vv. 2–16, is take up with entirely different material. This material is all related to the first cycle of speeches.
>
> Wolfers *1993*: 400

According to Wolfers, the contents of Job 15:1-16 close off the first cycle, and in Job 15:17-35, the theme of wicked opens the second speech cycle. If the first speech cycle does not end in a speech of Job but in a speech of Eliphaz, the same can be suggested for the second speech cycle. Wolfers therefore proposes that the second speech cycle does not end with the speech of Job in chapter 21, but with the speech of Eliphaz in chapter 22. This restructuring enables a fresh look at Job 23–27.

Wolfers describes the "dynamic intention" of Job 23–27 as follows:

> from ch. xxiii onwards Job embarks upon a monologue, beginning as an address to God, designed to culminate in the mighty clearance oath of ch. xxxi. After xxiv, however, incautiously concluded with its challenge to anyone to

13 Wolfers is not the first scholar who explains how the disputed passages are spoken by Job and how they fit in the argument that Job puts forward in these chapters. In clear overviews, Lo describes the ways in which Newsom, Andersen, Hartley, Good, and Whybray have interpreted all or some of these passages as Job's speech (Lo 2003: 114–117, 157–158, 183–186). Lo's own interpretation is given on pp. 121–123, 160–165, 187–193. While I consider Wolfers' interpretation of the difficult passages as original and thought provoking, my main interest at this point is how he uses his findings to argue for an alternative interpretation of the structure of Job 23–27.

> call him a liar, Bildad interrupts with the brief and ineffectual ch. xxv. Job responds to this with intemperate fury, delivering ch. xxvi which is also an interruption to the speech he planned to make. Then he returns to his original path with ch. xxvii.
>
> Wolfers 1993: 402

Wolfers thus interprets Job 23–27 as consisting of a monologue of Job (Job 23–24) that is shortly interrupted by a speech of Bildad (Job 25) and Job's reaction on it (Job 26). As an additional argument that chapter 27 does not continue chapter 26 but chapter 24, Wolfers draws attention to introduction formula in 27:1: "and Job again took up his parable." Normally, there is no new introduction when the preceding chapter is by the same speaker; that this formula appears here should "alert the reader that these speeches do not belong in the same category as the preceding cycle-speeches" (Wolfers 1993: 402). In the present study, I follow Wolfers' proposal that the structure of Job 3–31 includes an opening speech (Job 3), two speech cycles (Job 4–15:16 and Job 15:17-22) and a closing monologue (23–31) with a short interruption by Bildad (Job 25).

2.2. *Job 28: Lo (2003) and Jones (2009)*

The question left to discuss is the position of Job 28. Wolfers does not take a particular stand toward Job 28. He proposes that Job's monologue stretches from chapter 23 to chapter 31, but he considers it uncertain whether chapter 28 is part of it (Wolfers 1993: 402). Alison Lo, however, in her study *Job 28 as Rhetoric. An Analysis of Job 28 in the Context of Job 22–31* (2003) does explain how Job 28 can be understood as part of Job's words. Although Lo is not the first scholar who understands Job 28 to be spoken by Job,[14] Lo differs from other scholars in that she explicitly takes into account the change of tone and genre by explaining the rhetorical impact thereof on both the development of the plot and the modification of the viewpoint of the audience (Lo 2003: 16).

To reconstruct the rhetorical situation of the book of Job, Lo lists the three main questions that are introduced in the dialogue between Job and his friends. The first question is the question of theodicy, which comes in three forms, namely in the concept of retribution (Lo 2003: 63–65), the concept of human depravity (Lo 2003: 65–

14 See Lo (2003: 3–5) for an overview of the proposals of Whybray, Janzen, Childs, and Good.

66) and the concept of divine chastisement (Lo 2003: 66–67). Secondly, there is question of the authorization of knowledge (Lo 2003: 67), and thirdly, the question of the conception of God (Lo 2003: 67–68). According to Lo, the audience of the book of Job may struggle with the same problems as Job and his friends. The friends represent those who are tempted to choose for the righteousness of God above the righteousness of one who suffers, and who are inclined to uncritically accept claims based on revelation, observation, and tradition. Job, on the other hand, represents those who believe in human integrity and who reject the uncritical acceptance of tradition. Lo points out that despite the fact that they adopt different approaches to the problem of suffering, both Job and his friends assume that only the wicked must suffer. On this basis, Lo reasons that like Job and his friends, the audience believes in a righteous God who rewards those who fear Him (Lo 2003: 71).

After Lo has deduced the beliefs of the audience from the concerns discussed in the dialogue, she explains how the rhetorical strategy of the book of Job seeks to modify them. More concretely, Lo refers to Newsom and claims that the rhetorical strategy directs the reader "from less to more adequate perspectives" (Newsom 1996: 337) as quoted in (Lo 2003: 73):

> Within the dialogues, the friends' moral perspectives are shown to be inadequate by the compelling power of Job's words. The inadequacy of Job's perspective, however, is disclosed by the extraordinary speeches of God from the whirlwind. Surely one is supposed to adopt and endorse the perspective articulated by none other than God.[15]
>
> Newsom (1996: 337) as quoted in Lo (2003: 73)

Lo suggests firstly, that Job's perspective serves to replace that of his friends, and secondly, that God's perspective serves to replace that of Job. In the process of guiding the reader to a better understanding, Lo interprets Job 28 as a conclusion and evaluation of the dialogue that also sets the scene for Job's oath of innocence in chapters 29–31 (Lo 2003: 215).

---

15 It must be noted that Newsom does not consider the divine speeches as the final true perspective, as she continues this quote as follows: "Yet the book gives the last word to the prose tale. Moreover, the transition to the prose conclusion creates ironies that undermine the conviction that the book as a whole endorses the perspective of the divine speeches as the one true point of view" (Newsom 1996: 337). Also in her other studies on the book of Job, Newsom holds that it is problematic to understand the book of Job "as a kind of *Bildungsroman*" (2003: 20; see also 2002: 107).

Chapter 28 follows on the collapse of dialogue in chapter 27, where Job in verses 7–23 has declared that the fate of the wicked may befall his friends (Lo 2003: 227). When the dialogue collapses, the friends disappear from the scene and Job is on his own again. According to Lo, verse 28 is the main assertion of chapter 28 (Lo 2003: 213). Reflecting on the question of wisdom, Job comes to the conclusion that the only thing one can do is to fear God and depart from evil (Lo 2003: 227). Job knows that this is exactly what he has done so far, but nevertheless, misfortune has happened to him. Lo argues that it is Job's realization that he did his duty but that this did not protect him against trouble that prompts Job's anger and motivates him to state a public oath of innocence (Lo 2003: 227). With regard to the audience and the modification of their exigency, Lo notes that Job 28 does not offer a solution to the problem of suffering and the righteousness of God. Because Job in this chapter still struggles with the discrepancy between his belief and the reality he faces, she considers chapter 28 as part of the process that intends to involve the audience in recognizing that it is problematic to assume that suffering is only given to the wicked (Lo 2003: 230). That the book of Job does not end in 28:28, and that it does not end after the Elihu speeches, shows that submission requires a "first-hand" experience of God:[16]

> Job does not submit himself to God until he encounters God face to face (42:1-6). In terms of content, despite the similarities between Job 28 and the Yahweh speeches, the story does not reach its climax until Job's total submission to God in his final confession (42:1-6).
>
> Lo 2003: 231

By understanding Job 28 as an intermediate stage in Job's process toward complete submission, Lo offers the linear reading that was deliberately avoided by Newsom. I follow Lo's approach in that I too set out to explain Job 28 from the perspective of its function in the rhetorical development in the book of Job, and I also share Lo's view that Job's reflections in this chapter are a decisive step forward in his relation to God; unlike Lo, however, I propose that the importance of this step is not diminished by the divine speeches.

My argument to read Job 28 as an existential reinterpretation of the world is partly inspired by Scott Jones's *Rumors of Wisdom: Job 28 as Poetry* (2009). Like Lo, Jones studies Job 28 from the perspective of its rhetoric, but he mainly focuses on its inner dynamic.

16 For the idea that Job's 'conversion' is only complete after his confrontation with God, see also Whybray (1998: 16).

Jones reads Job 28 as a quest-for-wisdom poem in which the author uses different conceptualizations of wisdom to guide his audience to a better understanding (Jones 2009: 236). In this process, the traditional 'quest for wisdom' genre is not used to affirm a traditional perspective on wisdom, but exactly to subvert it and to adopt a critical attitude:

> [T]he speaker of Job 28 utters this poem not because it reflects his own traditional and philosophical reflection on transcendent wisdom, but to take on this mode of conception in order to highlight its inadequacy. [...] This is not a poem praising wisdom, immanent or transcendent. Rather, it critiques the modes by which "sages" like Job's friends seek out wisdom, and it ultimately commends Job's moral character (see 1:1, 8; 2:3), equating it with wisdom and understanding (28:28).
>
> Jones 2009: 238

To substantiate that Job 28 does not function as a traditional wisdom account, Jones explains it as part of Job's speeches that are characterized as *mashal* in 27:1 and 29:1.[17] With reference to Stephen Curkpatrick (2002: 70) and Timothy Polk (1983: 572–573), he understands a *mashal* to be an "extended metaphor which poses a riddle requiring a solution" (Jones 2009: 240).[18] According to Jones, Job's *mashal* in chapter 28 serves to picture the search for wisdom of his friends as an impossible mission and to present himself as the wiser one (Jones 2009: 243). Like Lo, Jones takes Job 28 as a lesson to the friends who claim to have access to wisdom, but whereas Lo also considers it as an serious attempt of Job to reformulate his standing in relation to God, Jones rather sees it as a presumptuous action of Job to restore his social status. In Lo's explanation, the divine speeches therefore function as a confrontation that leads to a new attitude, while Jones, on the other hand, highlights that they serve to relegate Job to his proper place. Even if my interpretation of Job 28 shows more similarities with Lo's than with Jones', it is Jones' approach to Job 28 as a *mashal* upon which I build to argue for a different understanding of Job 28.

17 See also Whybray (1998: 12).

18 Jones furthermore refers to Susan Niditch who defines the *māšāl* as "a form of oblique and artful communication that sets up an analogy between the communication [...] and the real-life settings of the listeners" that as such "provides a model of or a model for reality and points to unresolved tensions and ambivalences in Israelite worldviews" (Niditch 1993: 86).

I agree with Jones that Job's *mashal* allows him to reinterpret what has been said before. In my view, however, this implies that Job puts not only the reasoning of his friends in a new perspective as Jones—and also Lo—suggests, but also his own.[19] What this new perspective entails for Job's position is sketched by Newsom:

> What he [Job] seeks, though he may not employ the term *ḥokmāh* for it, is a point of coherency, a vantage point from which God, the world and his own experience make sense. For Job to be vindicated by God presumes the existence of a set of transcendent values, continuous between God and humankind, that serves as the ground by which the distortions of the world can be put right. In order to assert its own claims, the wisdom poem is attempting to shift the plane of the argument by looking at the assumptions embedded in Job's passionate quest.
>
> Newsom 2003: 177

Instead of understanding Job 28 like Newsom as a new voice, I take it with Lo and Jones as Job's own words: as such, it is not an external comment that allows the reader to grasp Job's assumptions, but rather a figure of speech that Job employs to restructure his own thoughts and that allows him to become aware of the views that he had silently been entertaining. In my view, it is Job's recognition of man's shortcomings that results in a fundamental new understanding of his place in the world and of his relation to God. I give a more elaborate discussion of Job 28 and its role in the book of Job when I discuss the rhetorical development of Job 23–31 in chapter 6 of the present study. At this point, I proceed to explain how my understanding of the structure of Job 3–31 and the function of Job 23–27 and Job 28 therein correlates to my interpretation of the theme of suffering.

19 So also Whybray (1998: 15–16): "He now declares his conclusion, that neither he nor the friends nor any human being possesses wisdom at all. Wisdom is the possession of God alone, and human beings, however hard they try and whatever ingenuity they may display, can never attain to it."

3. Metaphors of Suffering in Job 3–31

3.1. *The Development of Job's Suffering in Job 3–31*

The book of Job discusses the case of a righteous and God fearing man who was confronted with misfortune. But what exactly is its topic and its message? In her overview of interpretations of the book of Job in the first chapter of *The Book of Job as Sceptical Literature* (Dell 1991), Dell shows that the decisions on the topic and message largely depend on the interpretation of the structure of the book and the weight given to its parts.

Traditional Jewish and Christian interpretations that focused on the figure of Job in the prologue and epilogue, understood the book of Job as a tale about a pious and patient sufferer (Dell 1991: 6–28).[20] In early modern scholarship, the prologue and epilogue remained in the center of attention, and accordingly, suffering and disinterested righteousness were considered as the most important themes (Dell 1991: 29–34). When in the first half of the 20th century more weight was given to the poetic dialogue and the discussion between the friends, interest shifted to the question of retribution and theodicy in confrontation with the suffering of the righteous (Dell 1991: 35–39). The book of Job was seen as a new development in thinking about the retribution principle in that it pointed out the problem of applying it to individuals. Scholars recognized that the epilogue did not solve the issues raised in the dialogue, but as God states that Job is in the right and that the friends are not (Job 42:7), it was maintained that the main message of the book of Job was to demonstrate "the necessity of breaking out of old dogmatic ways of thinking" and to emphasize "that personal experience is more relevant than dogma" (Dell 1991: 36). Later scholars highlighted the importance of the divine speeches and studied the book of Job from the perspective of the relation and confrontation between God and man (Dell 1991: 39–44). Last in Dell's overview of interpretations is the modern approach that understands the book of Job as a book of protest (Dell 1991: 44–52). This approach recognizes that the character of Job pushes the expression of doubt and questioning to the extreme, and

20 One may add to this overview the interpretations of the book of Job in medieval Jewish philosophy as described in Eisen (2004). Most characteristic of the medieval Jewish philosophers is that Elihu is seen as the friend who brings the most important message and gives the true explanation for Job's suffering (Eisen 2004: 222). Eisen describes that according to Saadiah Gaon, for example, Elihu asserted that the suffering of the righteous can be caused by God as a test, and that the book of Job is thus "written down so that when we suffer, we will know that it is either because of sin or because of trial. We will therefore affirm that despite our suffering, God is just" (Eisen 2004: 22).

moreover assumes that the author of the book deliberately includes inconsistencies and loose ends to evoke an ironical tone that undermines traditional truths.

Indeed, the modern literary strategies described in the first paragraph of this chapter all bring in view how the form of the book of Job reflects that its message destabilizes one's knowledge about God and the world. According to Dell the key to the message of the book of Job lies in the recognition that "the juxtaposition of various parts into a new structure was done with skeptical intent in order to heighten the contradictions inherent in Job's situation" (Dell 1991: 216). Newsom supposes that

> the purpose of the book is not to advance a particular view: neither that of the prose tale, nor that of the friends, nor that of Job, nor even that of God. Rather, its purpose is to demonstrate that the idea of piety in all its "contradictory complexity" cannot in principle "be fitted within the bounds of a single consciousness."
>
> Newsom 2003: 30

Perdue's leading interpretation principle is that the book of Job is a process that deconstructs the traditional worldview of the sages and replaces it by a new hermeneutic: "the book aims at *speaking correctly* about God, as Job, his servant has done" (Perdue 1991: 75). While traditional approaches have explicitly focused their attention on a theme and what the book of Job meant to say about it, recent studies treat the book of Job as a work of protest and as a work of art that uses a variety of literary means to engage the reader in recognizing the complexity of Job's case.

Now what does this involve for the present study that intends to bring in view the conceptualization of suffering in Job 3–31? With the above scholars I understand the book of Job as a book of protest that takes the reader along the diverse questions and issues that are evoked by Job's misfortune. This means that I discuss how the book of Job challenges readers to put the problem of suffering in perspective and how it involves them in thinking about the attitude that one should adopt toward one who suffers. The main topic of my interest, however, is not the reader, but the character Job. In the following chapters, I bring in view how Job suffers from and protests against the situation he finds himself in, and how his suffering goes through different phases that I here summarize as follows.[21]

---

21 Note that my summary introduces here some new interpretations of verses and passages; the clarification of the interpretational decisions that I have taken is given in the following chapters, in the paragraphs where I discuss the rhetorical context of the selected passages.

In the opening speech (Job 3), Job's only wish is that God let him die. Job had expected to die (cf. 1:21; 2:10), and now that death has not come, he pictures *Sheol* as a place of rest (3:13-15.17-19). This conceptualization of death suggests that right from the start of chapter 3, Job's suffering mainly exists in his experience of unrest.[22] I propose that in the course of chapter 3, Job's experience of unrest mounts to a new level when he realizes that death—his only escape—is not within his control (3:20-23).

In chapter 7, in the first stage of the first speech cycle (Job 4–15:6), Job still wishes to die, but he now motivates his death wish as based on a lack of hope. Job does not believe that there is a future ahead of him, and therefore he perceives the prolongation of his life as nothing more than an unnecessary extension of suffering (7:1-10). In chapter 9, however, the realization that God does not behave as a righteous judge on earth, allows Job to see his case in a wider perspective: he is not the only one who is confronted with misfortune, there are indeed others who have died without proper judgment (9:22). This realization both terrifies and confuses him, but nevertheless, Job reaffirms that he believes that God is righteous (9:32-35). Since the beginning of the dialogue, this is the first constructive thought that Job holds on to.[23] Job finds consolation in his belief that in a court setting he would be declared innocent by God, but this does not change his view on the reality of his circumstances. Job is still convinced that his life will end, and only now he becomes aware that his recognition is not assured if he dies in the miserable state that he currently finds himself in (10:18-22). While Job struggles with the fact that he can no longer set his hopes on death, the friends begin to add to Job's sadness and frustration. They refuse to give him the consolation that he desires, namely that they acknowledge that he is completely innocent and that his suffering is unjust. During the first speech cycle, the tension between Job and his friends rises and ends in Job's accusation that the friends are uncritical and untrue (13:4-5). The main source of Job's suffering at the end of chapter 14 nonetheless remains his idea that he will die before his integrity has been recognized.

In the second speech cycle (15:17–22:30), Job's awareness of the hostile attitude of his environment grows. Since God treats him as an enemy, people have begun to hate him. Job notices that his friends are inclined to do the same and he urges them to be loyal. He feels that his end is near, and while he cannot think of a fundamental

22 Cf. Newsom (2003: 93–94): "Job identifies the characteristic feature of his suffering most explicitly in the exquisite pair of verses that conclude the chapter (...). Job experiences his suffering as turmoil (*rōgez*)."

23 For an explanation on why Job's death wish moves to the background once he takes up the idea of a court setting, see Mathewson (2006: 105–110, especially p. 108).

solution for the problem of his untimely death, he has no strength left to continue in an endless discussion on whether the state of his body would prove his guilt. The only thing that he now considers to be within his reach and for which he desperately longs is the compassion of his friends (19:26-27, 21:5).

After Eliphaz has made clear in chapter 22 that he will neither reject the traditional solutions, nor his own vision to acknowledge Job's innocence, Job is on his own. From chapter 23 onwards, Job turns away from his friends to address a broader audience.[24] Job's main topic is the existence of distasteful affairs in the world (24:2-12). When Bildad in chapter 25 denies Job's description of reality, Job continues with a final statement on his innocence and on the question of knowledge. At the end of chapter 28, Job has arrived at a new understanding of his place in the world. Through a new perspective on the question of hope and consolation he regains control over his situation. His suffering now merely consists of the concreteness of physical hardships and social opposition, and from this new position Job faces his community to seek rehabilitation. When Job succeeds in opening up the eyes of his community and in putting an end to the social dimension of his own suffering, his true accomplishment is that he has shown that human morality necessarily transcends the capricious nature of the world.

3.2. *The Selection of Passages and Metaphors*

Job's sincere protest against the incomprehensibility of his situation and against simplified visions on it drives the plot development in Job 3–31. In the following chapters, I examine the metaphors that Job uses throughout the different phases of his suffering in Job 3–31. As I have explained in the previous chapter, I focus my attention on the metaphors that are deliberately used, that is, the metaphors that draw the attention of reader to the source domain to establish rhetorical and poetic effects. In this paragraph, I give an overview of the passages and the most important metaphors therein that I will discuss in the next chapters. The passages that I have selected represent the different stages and turning points in the development of Job's suffering that I have described above.[25]

---

24 On my interpretation of the structure of Job 23–31, see § 2 above.

25 There is neither an authoritative reading of the book of Job, nor is there an authoritative list of passages that relate to Job's suffering. My selection of passages is therefore based on the interpretation of Job 3–31 and theme of suffering therein that I have developed in this chapter. As a consequence, the interpretations of the passages and the metaphors that I present in the

- In chapter 3, I present Job's opening speech where his main concern is the unbearable turmoil he experiences. I discuss the metaphors in 3:20-26 where Job describes how the fact that death is out of his reach adds to his unrest. The source domains include light (3:20), treasure hunting (3:21-22), way (3:23), food (3:24), movement (3:25-26) and agitation (3:25-26).
- Chapter 4 concerns the passages in the first speech cycle that bring in view how Job suffers from a lack of hope, that is, 7:1-10 on the lack of hope in life, 10:18-22 on the lack of hope in death, and 14:4-12 on the lack of hope on reward. In these passages, the source domains include service (7:1-3), day (7:4), woven fabric (7:6), wind (7:7), and cloud (7:9); invisibility (10:18), nonexistence (10:19), light and darkness (10:20-22) and departure (10:21); and boundary (14:5), service (14:6), tree (14:7-10), water (14:11-12) and sleep (14:12).
- Besides existential questions, Job's misfortune also confronts him with external side effects. In chapter 5, I focus attention on the passages in the second speech cycle that describe his experience of the hostile attitude of his environment and his frustration about the lack of reward. The key passages related to Job's suffering from the behavior of his friends and his environment in the second speech cycle are Job 17:6-16 and 19:20-29. The source domains include light and darkness (17:7.12-13), house (17:13-14), rest (17:13.16) and decay (17:14.16); and body (19:20.22.26-27), redemption (19:25), dust (19:25) and vision (19:26-27).
- In the monologue in chapters 23–31, Job changes his rhetorical strategy by translating his insights on suffering into a critique on society. Descriptions of social wrongs are found in Job 24:2-12, 30:2-8 and 31:13-22 and discussed in chapter 6 of this study. The source domains here include cattle (24:2-5, 30:4-7), food (24:5-6.10-11, 30:3-4, 31:17), nakedness (24:7-8), birth (31:15.17-18), family (31:15.17-18) and clothing (31:19-20).

When these passages and source domains are presented in a table, it appears that some of source domains that Job uses to describe his suffering occur in more than one passage (light and darkness, food, service, and cattle), but that he uses most of them only once. In the following chapters, it will become clear that the introduction of new source domains can be explained from the dynamics of the dialogue and that it reflects the development of new perspectives.

---

following chapters are the result of the hermeneutical circle that explains the parts in relation to the whole and the whole in relation to the parts. On hermeneutics and the interpretation of metaphors, see the discussion in § 3.1 of the previous chapter.

TABLE 2.1 *Passages on the theme of suffering and their source domains*

	3:20-26	7:1-10	10:18-22	14:4-12	17:6-16	19:20-29	24:2-12	30:2-8	31:13-22
Light and darkness	x		x		x				
Treasure hunting	x								
Way	x								
Food	x						x	x	x
Movement	x								
Agitation	x								
Service		x		x					
Day		x							
Fabric		x							
Wind		x							
Cloud		x							
Visibility			x						
Existence			x						
Departure			x						
Boundary				x					
Tree				x					
Water				x					
Sleep				x					
House					x				
Rest					x				
Decomposition					x				
Body					x				
Redemption						x			
Dust						x			
Vision						x			
Cattle							x	x	
Nakedness							x		
Birth									x
Family									x
Clothing									x

CHAPTER 3

Suffering in the Opening Speech (Job 3): The Unrest of Being Imprisoned in Life

When Job is struck by disaster, his first reaction demonstrates that he believes that his life is over: "Naked came I out of my mother's womb, and naked shall I return there; the LORD has given, and the LORD has taken away; blessed be the name of the LORD" (Job 1:21, JPS). Job does not accuse God of unrighteousness: "The good we accept from God, but the evil we would not accept?" (Job 2:10, JPS). Within the perspective of a nearby death, Job makes up the balance of his life and is at peace. But Job does not die. Job sits and waits, and his friends come to join him. No one finds words to explain what has happened to Job, but after seven days and nights, Job makes a start.

As I will demonstrate, Job's main concern in the opening speech is his experience of unrest: at the start of chapter 3 Job's desire for death is a desire for rest, and in the course of chapter 3, his agitation only rises when he pictures how death is not within his control. In this chapter, I focus on the passage that describes this latter development: 3:20-26. I proceed as follows: firstly, I discuss the context and contents of 3:20-26, and thereafter, I offer an overview and analysis of the metaphors therein. Finally, I describe the argument that is construed by the interaction of source domains and what this entails for the conceptualization of Job's suffering in the opening speech. The source domains discussed in this chapter are light (3:20), treasure hunting (3:21-22), way (3:23), food (3:24), movement (3:25-26) and agitation (3:25-26).

1. Job 3:20-26 in the Context of Job 3

Job's message in chapter 3 is that he wants to be no more: he imagines that he never came into existence by cursing the night of his conception and the day of his birth in verses 3–10, and in the lament in verses 11–19, he envisions that he would have been better off if he had died at birth. Through imaginary scenarios Job envisages how his existence could have been made undone.[1] Job's imaginary scenarios, however,

1 On hypothetical thinking in the Book of Job, see also Hartley: "Through imaginative exploration

do not only express his death wish, they also open up the discussion on manners of perceiving the world. In this regard, Perdue remarks that mentioning the possibility that darkness takes control over light (verses 3–10) serves to destabilize the belief that God has conquered chaos once and for all.[2] Perdue furthermore asserts that the notion that slaves are free from their master in death (verse 19) serves as a prelude to the idea that humans are slaves that only find rest after they have died.[3] It can be inferred that in verses 3–10 and 11–19, Job communicates to his audience that he is putting the common worldview to the test. When Job describes his current situation in verses 20–26, his description is provided against the background of a cosmology in which chaos may regain control and of an anthropology in which humans are only slaves.

2. Job 3:20-26: Text and Translation

Like 3:11-19, 3:20-26 is generally read as a lament.[4] The content of the laments in Job 3, however, differs from prototypical laments in that Job complains about God instead of about enemies, and in that he asks for death, rather than for delivery from distress.[5] In the last passage of chapter 3, Job pictures how his misfortune confronts him with an ironic contradiction:[6] Job wants to die, but God imprisons him in life.[7]

---

he [Job] is able to identify his highest goal and then to decide on a way to its attainment" (1994: 91).

2 See Perdue (1991: 47–56, 59–60) on the metaphor of struggle.

3 See Perdue on the metaphor of slave (Perdue 1991: 66–69). The HUMANS ARE SLAVES metaphor appears more explicitly in Job 7:1-3 and is also found in Job 14:6.

4 E.g. Horst (1968: 38–42), Habel (1985: 102–106), and Clines (1989: 75–77); Hartley (1988: 88) considers verses 3–13 as curse and verses 14–26 as lament.

5 E.g. Clines (1989), Dell (1991: 125–126), and Newsom (1996: 369). Dell (1991: 125): "Job 3:11-26 contains the misuse of a lament form. Use of the question 'Why?' and a description of distress are characteristic of a complaint. However laments usually concern distress concerning a particular situation and an attempt to improve it by appeal to God to change it. Death is usually the *un*desirable outcome of being the victim of God's wrath (...). In *Job* on the other hand there is a description of death as desirable (...). The complaint is that the sufferer is still alive."

6 Cf. Newsom (1996: 369): "He [Job] expands the wish for death with a reflection on the irony that life is given to those who crave death (vv. 20–24)."

7 The Hebrew texts given below and in the next chapters are taken from the WTT version as available in *Bibleworks 7*. I have only changed the presentation of the text in the case of words with a *kethib-qere* reading: whereas *Bibleworks* presents the *kethib* in parentheses and the *qere* in brackets, I present

Job 3:20-26

20 לָמָּה יִתֵּן לְעָמֵל אוֹר וְחַיִּים לְמָרֵי נָפֶשׁ׃
21 הַמְחַכִּים לַמָּוֶת וְאֵינֶנּוּ וְיַחְפְּרֵהוּ מִמַּטְמוֹנִים׃
22 הַשְּׂמֵחִים אֱלֵי־גִיל יָשִׂישׂוּ כִּי יִמְצְאוּ־קָבֶר׃
23 לְגֶבֶר אֲשֶׁר־דַּרְכּוֹ נִסְתָּרָה וַיָּסֶךְ אֱלוֹהַּ בַּעֲדוֹ׃
24 כִּי־לִפְנֵי לַחְמִי אַנְחָתִי תָּבוֹא וַיִּתְּכוּ כַמַּיִם שַׁאֲגָתִי׃
25 כִּי פַחַד פָּחַדְתִּי וַיֶּאֱתָיֵנִי וַאֲשֶׁר יָגֹרְתִּי יָבֹא לִי׃
26 לֹא שָׁלַוְתִּי | וְלֹא שָׁקַטְתִּי וְלֹא־נָחְתִּי וַיָּבֹא רֹגֶז׃ פ

20 Why does He give light to the sufferer,
and life to the bitter of soul?
21 Those who expect death while it does not come,[8]
they search for it more than for hidden treasures;[9]
22 those who rejoice exceedingly
exult when they reach the grave.
23 The man whose way is hidden,
God has hedged him about.
24 Because my sighing comes as[10] my bread,
my roaring pours forth as water;

---

the *kethib* in the running text and the *qere* in superscript. The translations of the passages under discussion are mine. For other verses mentioned, I take a starting point in the NRSV and JPS.

8 English translations of verse 21–22 often translate הַמְחַכִּים and הַשְּׂמֵחִים as a relative clauses of מָרֵי נָפֶשׁ that are continued by the verbs וַיַּחְפְּרֵהוּ and יָשִׂישׂוּ as follows: "who long for death, but it does not come, and dig for it more than for hidden treasures; 22 who rejoice exceedingly, and are glad when they find the grave?" (NRSV). Several Dutch translations present an alternative reading by taking verse 21–22 as autonomous sentences that both exist of two coordinated clauses: "Zij wachten op de dood die uitblijft, ze zoeken naar hem meer dan naar schatten; hun vreugde kent geen grenzen, ze jubelen als ze hun graf gevonden hebben" (They wait for the death that is not there, they search for it more than for treasures; their joy knows no limit, they exult when they find their grave) (NBV, see also the NBG and the Willibrord translation). I follow the Dutch translations in taking verse 21–22 as autonomous sentences, and as I explain in §3.2, n. 26 below, I furthermore choose to understand the participles as noun phrases that function as the subjects of the finite verbs. Cf. GKC §116w.

9 On the "independent force" of the *wayyiqtol* after "nouns standing absolutely", cf. GKC §111h. On the use of the *wayyiqtol* for present tense, cf. JM §118o and §118r. See also Groß (Gross 1976: 110) on the present tense interpretation of the *wayyiqtol* in Job 3:21.

10 With Horst, I understand the preposition לִפְנֵי 'before' here in the sense of "as if it were": "Dagegen ist wohl auf 1 S 1 1–16 (Duhm, Budde, Dhorme) und Hi 4 19 zu verweisen, von wo sich die Bedeutung

[25] because the fear I fear advances against me
and what I dread comes to me,
[26] I have no repose, no quiet, no rest, but turmoil came.

The interpretation of the structure and content of verse 20–26 largely depends on two decisions: firstly, on the understanding of the construction of verse 23, and secondly, on the translation of כִּי in verses 24–25 and how it relates these verses to what precedes and what follows.

Verse 23 is generally read as a continuation of verse 20, with לְגֶבֶר 'to a man' (3:23) being a new indirect object to the verb יִתֵּן 'he gives' (3:20). In most cases, this decision results in a translation similar to the following: "(Why does He give light) to a man whose way is hidden, whom God hedges around?" (3:23).[11] This translation, however, presents a grammatical problem concerning the expression of the subject in clause 23b. According to the principles of pragmatics, a given topic is preferably referred to by a pronoun, while a new or reactivated topic is referred to by a substantive noun.[12] If God functions as a given topic in verse 23a ("Why does *He* give light to a man"), it is unlikely that God is expressed as a reactivated topic in the relative clause of 23b ("whom *God* hedges around"). I therefore propose that verse 23 is better understood as an autonomous clause with 23a as a *casus pendens* and 23b as its comment: "The man whose way is hidden, God has hedged him about."[13] In my view, Job arrives at this conclusion after he has realized that his only desire—death—is categorically outside his reach.

The declarative interpretation of verse 23b offers a new perspective on the translation of כִּי in verses 24–25. Most scholars translate כִּי as 'for' and understand verses 24–26 as depicting Job's condition and stating the motivation for Job's curse and lament

---

"in der Art von" oder nog treffender "als sei es" ergibt" (Horst 1968: 56). See also BDB 817.2 4f, Clines (1989: 75) and Gordis (1978: 39).

11 E.g. Dhorme (1967 [1926]: 38), Gordis (1978: 30), Habel (1985: 99), Hartley (1988: 97) and Clines (1989: 68).

12 On the grammatical expression of given and resumed topics, see for example Dik and Hengeveld (1997: 318–319, 325–326) and Lambrecht (1994: 165–171).

13 The verb סכך in hifil is also used with the preposition ל in Psa 91:4. Another example of a *casus pendens* that is preceded by the preposition ל is 2 Sam 6:23. See also JM §156d. The same interpretation of the construction in verse 23 is found in the Dutch Willibrord translation: "Voor een sterke, voor wie de weg verborgen is: God heeft een bescherming rond hem gebouwd!" (For a strong one whose way is hidden: God has built a protection around him). Even if verse 23a is understood as a continuation of verse 20, verse 23b can be read as a declarative clause that marks the closure of verse 20–23: "(Why does He give light) to a man whose way is hidden? God hedges him around!" On the use of the *wayyiqtol* after a nominal clause, see also 3:21 and n. 9 above.

in verses 3–23,[14] or, more narrowly, for Job's question in verse 23.[15] However, if it is considered that Job in 23b arrives at a conclusion, it is unlikely that he proceeds, in verse 24–26, with providing a motivation for his earlier outburst. I therefore suggest that these verses are better understood as describing how Job feels after he has concluded that God has hedged him about. In this reading, Job does not offer an explanation for his death wish or an excuse for his cursing or lamenting, but instead, emphasizes how his conceptualization of his situation affects his experience of it. Concerning the conjunctions כִּי in verses 24a and 25a, I propose that they are best translated as 'because' and understood as subordinating conjunctions that introduce the cause of the event described in the main clauses that follow:

(24a) Because my sighing comes as my bread,
(24b) my roaring pours forth as water;
(25) because the fear I fear advances against me and what I dread comes to me,
(26) I have no repose, no quiet, no rest, but turmoil came.[16]

The main clause of כִּי in verse 24a is 24b, and the main clause of כִּי in 25 is 26. In 24b, the main clause is introduced by the *wayyiqtol* וַיִּתְּכוּ,[17] and in 26 by the *qatal* לֹא שָׁלַוְתִּי. Verses 24–26 thus offer a twofold description of how Job experiences his imprisoned state: firstly, he describes that bad food causes his roaring to pour forth as water, and secondly, that the actualization of his fear causes his unease. With the above interpretation of the structure and content of 3:20-26, I now examine the metaphors in this passage more closely.

14 Cf. Habel (1985: 102–103, 112) and Clines (1989: 76).

15 Cf. Dhorme (1967 [1926]: 40). Alternatively, Duhm (1897: 24) and Horst (1968: 40, 56) consider 24 as an interrupting remark and verse 25 as stating the reason for Job's lament in verse 23; Fohrer (1963: 126) reads verse 24 as describing the condition that gives the reason for Job's lament in verse 23, and verse 25–26 as stating the reason for that condition.

16 See BHRG §40.9.I.3. I thus do not understand כִּי as a coordinating conjunction that "provides the reason for a preceding expression or expressions by marking with כִּי the *motivation given by* speakers to explain something they have said" (BHRG §40.9.II.2(ii)).

17 The *wayyiqtol* may introduce a main clause, see also n. 9 above. Translations have recognized this for example in Job 6:21, תִּרְאוּ חֲתַת וַתִּירָאוּ "At the sight of misfortune, you take fright" (JPS) and 14:10, וְגֶבֶר יָמוּת וַיֶּחֱלָשׁ "Maar wanneer een man sterft, dan ligt hij krachteloos neer" (But when a man dies, he lies without strength) (NBG).

3. Metaphors in Job 3:20-26

From the beginning of his opening speech, Job longed for rest, but his conclusion that God has imprisoned him in life causes his unrest to mount to another level. To illustrate how Job arrives at his conclusion and how this conclusion shapes Job's experience of unrest, it is useful to clarify in this paragraph the deliberately used metaphors in Job 3:20-26. In the following sections, I discuss the source domains of light (3:20), treasure hunting (3:21-22), way (3:23), food (3:24), movement (3:25-26) and agitation (3:26).

3.1. *Light (3:20)*

The source domain of light is found in verse 20: לָמָּה יִתֵּן לְעָמֵל אוֹר וְחַיִּים לְמָרֵי נָפֶשׁ "Why does He give light to the sufferer, and life to the bitter of soul?" In this parallelism, אוֹר 'light' functions as a metaphor for חַיִּים 'life'.[18] The noun אוֹר reactivates the source domain of light and darkness that was referred to by an unusually high number of terms regarding light and darkness in verses 3–9,[19] and the interrogative sentence draws attention to it by suggesting a negative interpretation of light. I therefore categorize אוֹר as a deliberately used metaphor.

LIFE IS LIGHT[20]
life is the confrontation with reality
life is the lack of rest
life is something negative

Van Hecke explains the positive interpretation of light and the negative interpretation of darkness as being based on the correlation of vision, control, and understanding:

18 Cf. Fohrer (1963: 124): "Er (Gott) gibt חַיִּים, die "Lebensdauer" des persönlichen Daseins. Dies ist dem "Licht" gleichgesetzt. Das Leben ist Licht im Gegensatz zur Finsternis der Unterwelt und als Merkmal, das den Tag gegenüber der Nacht kennzeichnet (...)."

19 Van Hecke points out that light terminology occurs "strikingly often" throughout the book of Job (2011b: 96); for his discussion of light and darkness metaphors in the book of Job, see Van Hecke (2011b: 95–98).

20 Here and in the next chapters I begin the discussion with a schematic presentation of the deliberately used metaphor and its most relevant correspondences. I assume with Pilkington that poetic metaphors evoke a wide range of stronger and weaker correspondences (cf. chapter 1, § 2.3.3); the list of correspondences is therefore not exhaustive, but serves as a first guide to the discussion.

> As darkness impedes our capacity to see and act, and makes us more vulnerable to external danger, it is natural to describe a state of emotional despair or a lack of mental defence against threat in terms of a darkness that surrounds the speaker. This use of the light and darkness metaphor is strongly consistent with the conceptualizations of human understanding and control of terms of our visual faculty.
>
> Van Hecke 2011b: 97

Regarding the LIFE IS LIGHT metaphor, Reece (1989) remarks that the connection between light and life has its origin in the contrastive and more obvious connection between darkness and death. Reece offers three types of experiences that play a role in the conceptualization of death as darkness: firstly, the experience of darkness as related to the characteristics of sleep,[21] secondly, the experience of darkness as bringing an end to the activities of the daytime, and thirdly, the experience of darkness as the result of vision loss that may come with old age (Reece 1989: 130). If the conceptualization of death as darkness includes the notions of unconsciousness, rest, and old age, the conceptualization of life as light comprises their contrasts: light then relates to the experience of waking up and being restored, of daytime and activity, and of youth and vitality.

The conceptualization of life in terms of light usually has a positive connotation, whereas death in terms of darkness evokes negative associations. In verse 20, however, Job uses a lament to question the positive interpretation of light. For him light no longer comes with control and understanding, but on the contrary, he considers the consciousness, activity, and vitality of light as adding to the intensity of his suffering;[22] it is indeed exactly the unconsciousness, rest, and finality of darkness that would enable an escape. By questioning the positive interpretation of the LIFE IS LIGHT metaphor for the sufferer, Job invites his audience[23] to take his condition as an argument to reconsider the generally accepted positive approach to life.

---

21 Reece mentions "closed eyelids and darkness, unconsciousness or at best, limited awareness, prone body" (1989: 130).

22 Cf. Hartley (1988: 99): "the light of a beautiful day only makes them more aware of their sorrows and increases their longing for death."

23 With the term "Job's audience" I refer both to Job's inner and outer story audience. As I have explained in the previous chapter, my focus is on the literary character Job. When I describe how the inner story characters and the outer story readers may respond to Job's arguments, I seek to explore the assumptions that Job reacts against and the assumptions that he holds himself. It is not my intention to trace the intentions of the historical author, nor the profile of the historical audience.

3.2. *Treasure Hunting (3:21-22)*

In verses 21–22, Job brings in view how the sufferer is orientated toward death. The search for death is compared to treasure hunting: הַמְחַכִּים לַמָּוֶת וְאֵינֶנּוּ וַיַּחְפְּרֵהוּ מִמַּטְמוֹנִים: הַשְּׂמֵחִים אֱלֵי־גִיל יָשִׂישׂוּ כִּי יִמְצְאוּ־קָבֶר: "Those who expect death while it does not come, they search for it more than for hidden treasures; those who rejoice exceedingly would exult when they reach the grave." In verse 21, the source domain of treasure hunting is introduced by the phrase וַיַּחְפְּרֵהוּ מִמַּטְמוֹנִים "they search for it more than for hidden treasures", and in verse 22, the source domain is elaborated by picturing the successful outcome of the search: יָשִׂישׂוּ כִּי יִמְצְאוּ־קָבֶר "they would exult when they reach the grave." Clines suggests that "perhaps most hidden treasure in the ancient world was in tombs" (Clines 1989: 100). In verse 22, the treasure seekers of verse 21 become "grave-robbers who are overjoyed to reach the tomb where buried treasure lie" (Clines 1989: ibid.). For treasure seekers, finding a grave is a promise for finding treasures; for sufferers, however, it implies that they have found death.[24]

DEATH IS A HIDDEN TREASURE
death is a desirable thing
finding death is not within one's control

Job presents death as an object more searched for than hidden treasures. Death is a very precious object that is not easy to find. Like the search for hidden treasures, the search for death is an enterprise that is beyond one's control. Regardless of the efforts that are spent upon it, there is no guarantee that one will find the desired object and that one's search will be successful; and whereas treasure hunters at least know that the objects they search for are located in the ground, there is no specific place that the sufferer can explore to find death. The successful outcome of the search for death as a hidden treasure is a question of fate.[25]

---

24 As the place where the scenarios of treasure hunting and having passed away come together, the grave functions as the unifying factor of the source and target domain in the DEATH IS A HIDDEN TREASURE metaphor. Cf. Newsom: "The graverobbers' eagerness and exultant delight at the discovery of a rich grave grotesquely becomes the image of the one for whom the grave itself is the treasure (v. 22)" (Newsom 1996: 370).

25 The possibility of committing suicide is left out of consideration in the comparison between the search for death and the search for hidden treasures; for references on suicide in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East, see Clines (1989: 98). Note that searching for hidden treasures is more

The DEATH IS A HIDDEN TREASURE metaphor challenges the audience to think about death as a positive thing. Furthermore, it makes imaginable both the obsession with a particular object that cannot be obtained by one's own efforts and the frustration that is thereby involved.[26] If the audience is willing to accept the metaphor that death is a hidden treasure, they may agree with Job that for those who expectantly wait for it, death indeed is more difficult to find than hidden treasures, and they may feel empathy with his frustration that there are no means to get access to what Job wants most.[27] Even so, they may find it difficult to accept Job's presentation of finding death as a joyous event. In my view, it is indeed precisely because of Job's emphasis on joy, that a bitter note is added to his otherwise forthright interpretation of his state of affairs.

In verse 22, the positive association of the three different terms for joy (שָׂמֵחַ 'to be joyful', גִּיל 'rejoicing, exultation' and שׂוּשׂ 'to exult') contrasts with the negative overtones of other terms used in the immediate context (עָמֵל 'sufferer', מַר 'bitter', מָוֶת 'death', קֶבֶר 'grave'). The source domain of treasure hunting explains why both the treasure seeker and the sufferer would 'exult' (יָשִׂישׂוּ) when they find a grave, but whereas the parallel participle phrase 'those who expect death while it does not come' (הַמְחַכִּים לַמָּוֶת וְאֵינֶנּוּ) in verse 21 clearly applies to the sufferer of verse 20, the participle phrase 'those who rejoice unto exultation' (הַשְּׂמֵחִים אֶל־גִּיל) appears as a

---

likely to have a positive outcome than searching for death, while paradoxically, only few people will find hidden treasures, whereas it ensured that all will find death.

26 In note 8 above, I remarked that I choose to translate the participles in verses 21–22 as noun phrases that function as the subject of the finite verbs in these verses. At this point I can explain that this decision is motivated by the fact that verses 21–22 introduce a new source domain. In verse 21, the DEATH IS A HIDDEN TREASURE metaphor identifies the sufferer and the bitter of soul of verse 20 as ones who expect death, and asserts about them that they search for it more than for hidden treasures. While the participle phrase serves "to indicate a condition, the contingent occurrence of which involves a further consequence" (GKC §116w), the assertion communicates the main message of the metaphor, namely the idea that sufferer is waiting for an object that cannot be obtained by one's own efforts and that this involves insoluble frustration. If both the participle and the finite verb in verse 21 are translated as coordinated clauses ("Why does He give light … To those who wait for death but it does not come, Who search for it more than for treasure" (JPS)) the metaphor presents a series of characterizations of sufferers in which the rhetorical force of the metaphor—namely that the sufferer is one who suffers from not finding what he is looking for—is easily lost.

27 Both Fohrer (1963: 125 n. 44) and Clines (1989: 100) note that the idea that one can suffer from the frustration of longing for death is also expressed in Sophocles' *Electra*, 1007–1008: "the truly hateful thing is not death but desiring it and never attaining it" (translation as cited by Clines), and in Ovid's *Ibis*, 123–126 in which it is wished that an enemy "might have reasons for dying but not the means" (recapitulation as given by Clines (1989: 100)).

strange characterization for both treasure seekers and sufferers. For both treasure seekers and sufferers, the moment of exultation is the moment that the treasure is found, but as long as the search continues, the fact that they are removed from the object of their desire rather affects their emotional state negatively, and in the case of the sufferer, to an extent that is almost unbearable (see n. 27). The extremely negative emotional state of the sufferer is quite the opposite of the extremely joyful state that is expressed by the participle phrase in verse 22. Because of this salient contrast, I suggest that 'those who rejoice exceedingly' is best interpreted as a case of antiphrasis, that is, as a case in which a word or phrase is used opposite to its usual sense to express humor, or, as is the case here, irony: 'those who rejoice exceedingly' are in fact those who are extremely disturbed.

By means of the source domain of treasure hunting, the moment of finding death is conceptualized as a moment of joy. The ironical use of 'being joyful' in the participle phrase, however, thwarts an exclusively positive interpretation of the metaphor. When it assumed that Job states that 'those who are extremely disturbed' will exult when they die, the audience is presented with discomfort, as they would doubt whether one should categorize the relief that is felt when an end is put to a situation of extreme despair as a case of genuine joy.

3.3. *Way (3:23)*

In verse 23, the treasure hunting metaphor shifts to the way metaphor: לְגֶ֣בֶר אֲשֶׁר־דַּרְכּ֣וֹ נִסְתָּרָ֑ה וַיָּ֖סֶךְ אֱלוֹהַ֣ בַּעֲדֽוֹ "the man whose way is hidden, God has hedged him about." The source domain of the way is evoked in verse 23a by the noun דֶּ֫רֶךְ. In verse 23b, the image of a hidden way is followed by the image of the obstruction of movement. As both images are used to conceptualize the impossibility of progression on a way, the source domain of the way is elaborated on and can be marked as deliberately used. While the source domain is clear, the target domain is more difficult to establish. Below I explain that the concept of the HIDDEN ROAD is here used to conceptualize man's final destination, that is, DEATH.

DEATH IS A HIDDEN ROAD
death is man's final destination
death is a place that man cannot reach by choice

The source domain of the way is part of the commonly used LIFE IS A JOURNEY metaphor. As Lakoff and Johnson explain, the source domain of the journey imposes

on its target domain "an entity structure including a beginning, a destination, a path, the distance you are along the path, and so on" (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 219).[28] Regarding Job 3:23, Clines explains that the road can be understood as "one's destiny ("way of life" as an objective genitive, the way that leads to life) or one's state of being on the way to reaching one's destiny ("way of life" as a subjective genitive, the way surrounded by life, the way constituted by life)" (Clines 1989: 101). Clines' distinction between 'way of life' as either an objective genitive or a subjective genitive reflects Zehnder's distinction between "Lebenswandel" and "Lebensweg." In a comprehensive study on way metaphors in the Old Testament, Zehnder shows that the source domain of the way is related to two main target domains, namely ethics and history. Within the domain of ethics, the way metaphor refers to conduct and way of life ("Verhalten/Lebenswandel"); within the domain of history, on the other hand, it concerns the course of life and how one fares ("Lebensweg/Ergehen") (Zehnder 1999: 473). When Clines (1989: 101) concludes that "for the way to be hidden, sc. to the one who walks on it, means that one feels oneself to have lost control of one's destiny and to have lost one's grasp on its present significance," he does not decide on either interpretation. Zehnder, on the other hand, classifies the road metaphor in Job 3:23, together with the ones in Jer 10:23 and Prov 20:24 as belonging to the latter target domain, in which he more specifically attributes it to the subdivision in which way refers to 'the course of life as determined by fate' ("Schicksalhafte Lebensführung") (Zehnder 1999: 361–362). Zehnder thus understands the road metaphor in Job 3:23 as referring to the course of life that does not depend on human actions but is determined by God.[29] Based on Zehnder, Job's complaint in verse 23 that his road is hidden does not imply that he does not know the right way to go, but rather that he has no possibility of controlling his fate.

While I argue below that Zehnder's interpretation is more accurate, I do not think that the sense of 'course of conduct' is completely absent in verse 23. The fact that the 'hidden road' evokes different mappings actually reflects what was explained by Pilkington as a characteristic of poetic metaphors. The ambiguity involved is intentional and not meant to be narrowed down to a single interpretation. This, however, does not rule out that the context gives prominence to one specific

28 See also Lakoff (1993:222–225).

29 In Zehnder's definition: "der Lebensweg steht zwar weiterhin [...] in seiner ganzen Ausdehnung im Blick, aber nur unter dem Blickwinkel der für den Menschen unverfügbaren, von aussen her sein Leben bestimmenden Fügungen. Der Übergang vom aktiven Handlungsbereich zum passiven Ergehensbereich ist hier also definitiv vollzogen" (1999: 362).

interpretation of the metaphor. It can certainly be imagined that Job feels that his way is hidden for him in the sense that he does not know where to go and that he has lost direction in life,[30] but it can also be noted that in verses 20–23 and in the preceding verses of chapter 3, Job knows very well where he wants his life to be heading, namely to *Sheol*. If it is not the road of life, but the road to death that is hidden, Job expresses that it frustrates him that there is no possibility for humans to actively attain death. Like there is no place to search for death even though one knows for sure that it will be found, there is no way one can go to reach death, even though one knows for sure that death is life's final destination. Note that the DEATH IS A HIDDEN ROAD metaphor does not only concern sufferers who search for death, but that it is rather a statement about the situation of mankind in general.

About a man whose way to death is hidden, Job states that God closes him in. If life is a journey, closing in means that one cannot go any further, that one is stuck in a certain situation.[31] I propose that the 'closing in' metaphor, like the 'hidden road' metaphor, functions on both the particular and the general level: as a sufferer, Job is fixed in a state of disorientation, but as a man, Job is incarcerated in life and there is no way to escape—he is existentially imprisoned. Note that Job's accusation that God closes him in (סכך) recalls the Adversary's saying about God fencing Job around (שׂוּך) (Job 1:10). With 'fencing around' the Adversary refers to the protective actions of God; with 'closing in', however, Job refers to an obstructive act of God.[32] Keeping a man alive is in itself something positive, but it is a negative act to block one's way, even if it is the way to death.[33] By conceptualizing the fact that God keeps him alive in terms of closing in, Job restructures and restates his lament of verse 20 in the form of an accusation: starting from "why does He give life to the sufferer?," the metaphorical reasoning that "death is like a hidden treasure" leads Job to conclude that "God hides the road to death and locks man up in life".[34] Job feels like he is imprisoned in life,

30 This is indeed the interpretation given by most scholars; see for example Newsom (1996: 370), Habel (1985: 111–112), Newsom (1996: 370) and Van Hecke (2011b: 95).

31 As Clines notes, here also "the conventional metaphorical code of "spaciousness" for salvation, "narrowness" for distress and danger shines through" (1989: 101).

32 So for example Gordis (1978: 39): "It [fencing in] is obviously not being used here in the favorable sense of "protection," which occurs in Job 1:9[10]."

33 Cf. Clines (1989: 101): "Previously God's protection has ensured that his life was safe (and within chaps. 1–2 God still makes sure of that: "only spare his life," 2:6). But for a man who wants to die God's sustaining of his life is a hostile and constrictive act. Job wants his life-support to be switched off but God insists on keeping him alive."

34 It must be noted that this interpretation of the metaphors in verse 23 offers a second argument

and in my view, it is exactly the understanding that the human condition does not allow for an escape that greatly preoccupies him at the end of chapter 3.

With the way metaphor, Job again employs a conventional metaphor in an unexpected manner. If the audience expects that Job uses the image of the hidden road to describe the disoriented state of the sufferer in life, they will be surprised to find that at the same time, Job interprets the fact that mankind is given no access to death in terms of being locked in. The audience suddenly finds itself in a different position: they are not asked to show sympathy or invited to offer direction, but instead they are provoked to react to Job's interpretation of life as imprisonment on Earth.

3.4. *Food (3:24)*

After Job has confronted his audience with the rather bold statement on life as imprisonment on Earth, he continues with a description of how he experiences his present state. In verse 24, he introduces the source domain of food: כִּי־לִפְנֵי לַחְמִי אֲנָחָתִי תָּבֹא וַיִּתְכוּ כַמַּיִם שַׁאֲגֹתָי "Because my sighing comes as my bread, my roaring pours forth as water."[35] Both לֶחֶם 'bread' and מַיִם 'water' evoke the source domain of food.[36] As this source domain is extended beyond the clause, it is used deliberately, even if, as explained below, it appears that the image of water actually pictures the manner in which Job brings forth his roaring.[37]

---

against understanding verse 23 as a continuation of verse 20. The question "why does He give life to a man who cannot reach death, who God keeps alive" is logically invalid.

35 On this translation and my interpretation of the structure of verse 24, see § 2 above.

36 Clines (1989: 102): "[…] the conjunction of bread and water impels us to see here also an image of sustenance […]."

37 Because both לֶחֶם and מַיִם evoke the source domain of food and because of a seemingly similar imagery in Psa 42:4, 80:6, and 102:10, Clines states that "the groans become the lamenter's drink" (1989: 102). As it is difficult to conceptualize how the roarings that Job pours forth serve as Job's drink, I suggest that the poet rather plays with the fact that מַיִם can participate in different source domains. While the image of water is mainly used to picture the outpouring of Job's roarings, the collocation of water and bread may have a different function. Clines (1989: 75) states that "[…] bread and water are images not simply of food but of minimum levels of subsistence": in this sense, I would propose that the collocation of bread and water in verse 24 is used to allude to the idea of prison food (cf. 1 Kgs 22:27), and to reactivate the idea of imprisonment that was already evoked in verse 23.

Poor Circumstances are Bad Food
the state of being imprisoned in life causes disgust
the state of being imprisoned in life should be rejected

God provides man with bread to sustain his heart (cf. Psa 104:14-15). When Job states that his sighing comes as his bread, he understands circumstances in terms of food: his present situation is one of sighing that, unlike bread, does not sustain his heart,[38] and therefore Job's roaring pours forth as water. While literally denoting the sound of lions, roaring is metaphorically used for human crying in distress.[39] It is thus his crying that pours forth as water and runs "in a continuous stream"[40] out of his mouth. If sighing is understood as a kind of bad food, the causality that is involved in being given bad food is imposed on the pouring out of roaring. Bad food is literally associated with vomiting (e.g. Job 20:14-15, Prov 23:8) and disgust (e.g. Num 21:5, Job 6:7), but metaphorically, the dismissal of something bad can be understood as a moral act. The bad food metaphor thus implies that Job has judged his sighing as something that should be rejected and it conceptualizes the pouring out of roaring as an inevitable physical and moral reaction.

While Job considers himself to be imprisoned in life, he feels that he is supposed to live on food that does not sustain his soul. If the audience agrees that sighing is indeed bad food, they cannot blame Job for crying as they will recognize that crying is as inevitable and necessary as one's rejection of bad food. The food metaphor thus gives insight in how Job feels and why he complains, and at the same time, it offers an argument against those who would judge Job's complaints as being inappropriate and as showing a lack of strength.

3.5. *Movement (3:25-26)*

After Job has explained that his current condition of sighing is one in which he can only cry, verse 25 introduces a second causal clause that gives the reason for the unrest he says he feels in verse 26: כִּי פַחַד פָּחַדְתִּי וַיֶּאֱתָיֵנִי וַאֲשֶׁר יָגֹרְתִּי יָבֹא לִי׃ לֹא שָׁלַוְתִּי וְלֹא שָׁקַטְתִּי וְלֹא־נָחְתִּי וַיָּבֹא רֹגֶז "Because the fear I fear advances against me, and what I dread comes to me, I have no repose, no quiet, no rest, but turmoil came." In verse 25, the

38 Clines (1989: 75): "it is sighs that nourish, or rather, fail to nourish him."

39 E.g. BDB (Brown et al. 2001: 980.2), HALOT (Köhler and Walter 1994–2000: 1367); cf. Psa 22:2; 32:3.

40 Driver and Gray (1921: 39).

source domain of movement is evoked by אתה 'to come, to advance' and extended by בוא 'to come'; in verse 26 it is elaborated on by the verb בוא 'to come' that introduces רֹגֶז 'turmoil' as a new topic. The movement metaphor is part of the event structure metaphor that conceptualizes Job's state of unrest as a spatial event that is caused by another spatial event.[41]

CAUSES ARE MOVING FORCES
the confrontation with fearsome situations causes the experience of turmoil

EMOTIONS ARE MOVING FORCES
one is delivered to the experience of turmoil
the experience of turmoil is beyond one's control

The event structure metaphor is a conventional metaphor that expresses a change of state "in terms of space, motion, and force" (Lakoff 1993: 220). As part of the event structure metaphor, states are understood in terms of locations, changes in terms of movements, and causes in terms of forces (Lakoff 1993: ibidem). When Kövecses discusses the event structure metaphor with regard to emotions, he explains that these "are assumed to lead to certain behavioral responses that the self undergoes. [...] The emotion is conceptualized as a force and the effect of the emotion, that is, the behavioral responses, as the effects of the force" (Kövecses 2000: 57). This latter metaphorical structure also underlies verses 25–26: the 'fear he fears' and 'what he dreads' are conceptualized as a force, and the unrest that Job experiences as the effect of the force. Job experiences unrest, because he is confronted with 'the fear he fears' and 'what he dreads'.

Thus far, Job has nowhere stated that he was afraid of anything.[42] Until chapter 3, Job patiently underwent all that happened to him; he maintained his silence and was ready to face death (cf. 1:21, 2:10). Only when death did not come, Job was no longer quiet. In verse 25, Job's fear is thus not to face calamities or death, but to

41 Compare de Joode (2015: 163) on verses 25–26 as instances of the ILL-BEING IS A MOVING OBJECT metaphor. While de Joode takes the 'the fear he fears', 'what he dreads', and 'turmoil' as a referring to an external evil that comes to meet Job, I interpret them below as referring to the mental reality and the emotional state that Job is confronted with.

42 With Gordis (1978: 39), Clines (1989: 103), and Newsom (1996: 370) one can refer to 1:5 as an evidence for Job's anxious attitude. While an anxious attitude may reflect a general fear for misfortune, I argue in n. 43 below that the fear for misfortune is not what Job refers to in 3:25.

discover that God has decided to withhold his destiny from him.[43] In my view, Job's fear is the conclusion that he arrived at in verse 23, that he is trapped in life, and I propose that it is this state of affairs that is conceptualized here as a force that moves toward him. Job is unable to walk away or to defend himself; he is subjected to the force of his new understanding of himself and the world and can only undergo the confrontation with it.[44] The longer Job's life is extended, the more Job's fear that God withholds his destiny from him proves to be well-founded, and the more Job's unrest increases.

The source domain of movement that is part of the common event structure metaphor goes almost unnoticed. The structure that is imposed by the CAUSES ARE FORCES metaphor, however, is a powerful instrument to conceptualize the abstract state of affairs that Job fears as a force that causes his unrest. Like the food metaphor, the movement metaphor explains Job's reaction as being inevitable. If Job's audience would be inclined to consider Job's unrest as an unexpected reaction, they can hardly deny that it is a logical effect of being confronted with the frightening thought of being trapped in life.

3.6. *Agitation (3:26)*

The event structure metaphor in verses 25–26 conceptualizes Job's unrest as the effect of the realization of his fear. While physical agitation is literally a behavioral response, it is used here to conceptualize the disturbed state of Job's mind. In verse 26, the source domain of physical agitation is deliberately used because it is evoked by four different terms and because it extends beyond the clause: לֹא שָׁלַוְתִּי וְלֹא שָׁקַטְתִּי וְלֹא־נָחְתִּי וַיָּבֹא רֹגֶז "I have no repose, no quiet, no rest, but turmoil came." The verbs שׁלה 'to be at

43 Most commentators understand that the object of Job's fear is any calamity that he can imagine, and that at this point, Job is thus afraid that any calamity that he can think of will happen to him, e.g. Horst (1968: 56): "Wenn ein unentrinnbares Geschick in seinem Bereich festhält, dem wir dumpfe Hoffnungslosigkeit nur noch durchpulst von der Furcht und dem Grauen vor immer neu eintretenden Schrecknissen"; see also Driver and Gray (1921: 39), Fohrer (1963: 126), and Gordis (1978: 39). As I pointed out above, Job was able to uphold an acquiescent attitude after facing calamities in 1:21 and 2:10; I therefore think that it is problematic to assume that it is the possible occurrence of (additional) calamities that in 3:26 causes Job's unbearable unrest. Clines (1989: 103) and Newsom (1996: 370), on the other hand, argue that Job's fear is identified in verse 26 and that it is "the loss of ease, of quiet, of restfulness; [that] it is the advent of turmoil" (Clines 1989: 103). I argue here and in §3.6 below that the event structure metaphor conceptualizes Job's unrest not as the content, but as the result of Job's fear.

44 On the EMOTION IS FORCE metaphor, see also Kövecses (2000: 62–65).

ease', שׁקט 'to be quiet' and נוח 'to be at rest' refer to states of calmness; the noun רֹגֶז 'turmoil' refers to an inner state of agitation.[45]

EMOTIONAL DISTURBANCE IS PHYSICAL AGITATION
turmoil is aimless commotion
turmoil is the incapacity to act normally

When Job states that 'turmoil came', he uses the event structure metaphor to picture that he, that is, his emotional state, is confronted with and subjected to רֹגֶז 'turmoil'.[46] As Newsom explains, the turmoil that רֹגֶז refers to is a kind of agitation "that cannot be shaped into purposeful activity" (Newsom *1996*: *97*). In a similar manner, Kövecses describes the agitation that is involved in the EMOTIONAL DISTURBANCE IS PHYSICAL AGITATION metaphor as "a kind of incapacity [...]; when it happens, the self is unable to act normally" (Kövecses 2000: 82). Through the combination of both the event structure and agitation metaphors, Job thus expresses that he feels that his mind is caused to be in a continuous state of aimless commotion.

Job's description of his disturbed state of mind is meant neither as an implicit request for help and guidance, nor as an excuse for everything that he has just said, but instead serves as a clarification of his mental state, namely that it is the inevitable reaction to the realization that he is delivered to God's hegemony over life and death. Job has already pointed out in verses 21–23 that it is frustrating for those who have set their minds on death that God keeps it out of their reach and thus withholds their destinies from them. If Job's audience accepts the argument in verses 25–26 that the blocking of one's destiny causes an unrest that makes it impossible to continue living one's life, they must acknowledge that Job's complaint that God keeps him alive is indeed legitimate.

45 TWOT (Bowling 1980: 831) states that רֹגֶז "[c]an refer either to external disturbances or troubles or to inner emotional agitation as in anger." While TWOT holds that "Job uses this term for external disturbances (3:17, 26; 14:1)," I argue that here in verse 26, Job rather refers to his mental state.

46 On the event structure metaphor and the CAUSES ARE FORCES metaphor that is part of it, see § 3.5 above.

4. The Conceptualization of Suffering as Being Imprisoned in Life

In 3:20-26, Job protests against the fact that God keeps the sufferer alive, because He thereby brings the sufferer to a dead-end situation that causes emotional turmoil and makes a purposeful life impossible. Job establishes his argument through a number of deliberately used metaphors that structure the reality of his suffering and legitimate his complaint. In this paragraph, I summarize how the metaphors discussed in the previous paragraph contribute to Job's argument.

The theme under discussion is introduced in verse 20: why does God give light to the sufferer? The negative interpretation of light that is implied in the question with לָמָּה 'why' aims to trigger one's reflection on the default positive attitude toward life.[47] To Job, life is trouble and sorrow, and death offers rest. While the audience recognizes that light is generally something positive, they may sympathize with Job and understand that in his circumstances, it primarily causes Job pain as it forces him to witness his misfortune in all clarity. In the following verses, however, it appears that it is not only this recognition that Job seeks from his audience; he particularly wants them to consider a highly specific interpretation of how the sufferer suffers from life. Verse 21 clarifies that Job understands sufferers as those who long for death. The treasure hunting metaphor expresses the manner of frustration that these sufferers are confronted with; that it is not within one's control whether one finds what one is looking for. The frustration that accompanies the search for death exceeds even that which comes with treasure hunting, because whereas the treasure hunter at least has a place to explore, there are no means for the sufferer to translate their desires into actions. At this point, Job wants his audience to visualize the agonizing effect of being preoccupied with something that is out of reach, in order to acknowledge that those searching for death indeed finds themselves in an impossible position.

If the audience was willing to agree with Job's interpretation of his situation so far, they are in verse 23 provoked with a bold and uncomfortable conclusion: through the way metaphor, Job claims that a man who is given no access to death is actually denied his destiny and that, as such, he is imprisoned in life by God. Whether one

47 Also in verses 3–10 Job conceptualizes light as something negative, but there light is not a metaphor for life but for order. By envisioning how God would allow darkness to take control over light, Job imagines how the night of his conception and the day of his birth can be made undone. The negative interpretation of light in verses 3–10 specifically relates to Job's negative evaluation of the two moments in the order of time that enabled his existence; it does not reflect a negative evaluation of light *per se*.

agrees with it or not, this assertion reflects how Job assesses his situation, and the audience can deduce that it is this existential realization that at this point constitutes the main source of Job's suffering.

That Job's interpretation of his situation has an inevitable impact on his behavior is explained in the last verses of chapter 3. By conceptualizing his state of affairs in terms of bad food, Job presents his roaring as an expression of disgust and a refusal to both accept it and act upon that acceptance. His imprisonment in life provides him with bad food and Job is not only justified in protesting against this, he is morally obliged to do so. That Job's protesting roars are actually all that are left to him becomes clear in verse 25–26, where the EVENT STRUCTURE metaphor pictures that, in all other respects, the continuation of his life delivers him to turmoil. Job realizes that he has no control, and because the fear that God decides to keep him alive becomes more real by the day, he is subjected to an ongoing emotional agitation that can only be dissolved by death.

CHAPTER 4

Suffering in the First Speech Cycle (Job 4:1–15:16): The Loss of Hope

In this chapter I demonstrate that in the first speech cycle, Job's idea that he is imprisoned in life develops into a more general conviction that there is no hope—neither in life, nor in death. At first, Job's loss of hope is limited to his life on earth: because he expects that his death is close at hand, Job experiences his time left on earth as an unnecessary and painful delay. Up until that point, Job believes that death will bring him relief, but when in the course of the discussion Job loses his positive interpretation of death, his loss of hope is complete. When the discussion takes yet another turn, Job is able to change his view on death and to consider his own fate from a more general perspective so that at the end of the first speech cycle, the source of Job's suffering is a new existential question, namely that he cannot see what he can hope for if he cannot trust that God allows the righteous to die in peace.

As becomes clear in the outlines that I present in §1.1, §2.1, and §3.1 below, the passages that mark a new development in Job's interpretation of his situation are 7:1-11, 10:18-22 and 14:4-12. To describe the conceptualization of suffering involved in each of these passages, I proceed as I did in chapter 3: firstly, I embed the passages in their context, secondly, I discuss their text and translation, and finally, I describe the metaphors and the conceptualization of suffering that is established by the source domains. The source domains discussed in §1.3 are service (7:1-3), day (7:4), fabric (7:6), wind (7:7), and cloud (7:9); in §2.3, invisibility (10:18), nonexistence (10:19), light and darkness (10:20-22), and departure (10:21); and in §3.3, boundary (14:5), service (14:6), tree (14:7-10), water (14:11-12), and sleep (14:12).

1. The Conceptualization of Suffering in Job 7:1-11

After Job has explained that he wants to die and that he is delivered to turmoil as long as God does not end his life, Eliphaz attempts to change Job's view on the matter in chapters 4–5. Job, however, rejects Eliphaz's proposal, and it is in 7:1-11 that he again tries to clarify to his audience why he believes that God must let him die. Different from chapter 3, his main argument in chapter 7 is not his psychological state of

turmoil, but rather the reality of human transience. Before I turn to 7:1–11 and the metaphors therein, I first clarify the main exchange of arguments that precedes and follows this passage.

1.1. *Job 7:1–11 in the Context of Job 4–7*

Job 4–5 That Job wants to die and that he sees God as the one who imprisons him in life does not fit Eliphaz's understanding of reality. In my view, Eliphaz aims to counter Job's reasoning in two ways.[1] Firstly, he points out that Job overlooks the fact that he is righteous. Job's righteousness should be his source of hope and trust: because he is righteous and 'the innocent will not perish, the upright will not be destroyed' (cf. 4:7), Job is foolish to think that God would cut him off. Secondly, Eliphaz emphasizes that death is not something positive. Whereas Job pictured death in terms of a hidden treasure and a place of peace, Eliphaz highlights its destructive character. To die is to perish, to be destroyed and to be completed (4:7.9). According to Eliphaz there is no future in death.

Because of death's destructive character, Eliphaz assumes that the ideal scenario is that one dies when everything to be done in life is achieved, when offspring is established, and when life is lived to the fullest (5:24–26). Any death before is untimely, and for Job, it is pointless to ask for an untimely death, because it is not given accidently or arbitrarily, but only when one brings it upon oneself by 'plowing evil' or 'sowing mischief' (4:8). In that case it only takes 'a breath of God' or 'a breeze of His nostrils' for them to be gone (4:9). Against Job's claim that God persistently refuses man to die, Eliphaz stages the ease with which God will execute an appointed death. To underscore that Job is wrong in assuming that it is God's inclination to keep humans alive, Eliphaz pushes his argument even further with the lion metaphor (4:10–11): the sinner only has to roar or raise his voice, and God makes sure that it is not just the sinner but also his offspring that is punished.[2] According to Eliphaz, God certainly does not exercise restraint in judgment even as it involves the sinner's sons.

---

1 According to Clines, "Eliphaz's appeal to Job takes for granted Job's fundamental agreement with him. It is only a matter of Job's "recalling" and reflecting upon a truth that is as self-evident and well known to him as to Eliphaz; that will be enough to restore Job's equilibrium" (1989: 124). I think it is not necessarily so that Eliphaz starts from the assumption that Job is comforted that easily; in my view, it can be argued more convincingly that Eliphaz's 'truth' does not intend to bring Job immediate peace, but that it serves instead to convince him that it is irrational to think that he is destined to die, and that it is therefore useless to fight against the fact that he lives on.

2 Scholars have found it difficult to explain why Eliphaz in verses 8–11 gives such an elaborated account

After Eliphaz has dismantled Job's death wish by proving that Job is righteous and that he will live on, he proceeds with accounting for Job's current situation. In this regard, Eliphaz stresses that human righteousness must be seen in its proper perspective (4:17-21). Through the image that before God humans are beings of dust who like moths risk a sudden death,[3] he suggests that Job adopts a more humble stance and that he accepts his misfortune as a risk that comes with the human condition. This perspective confirms Job as a righteous one, but because it allows him to be imperfect because of his human nature, it also enables him to bend his angry frustration into a more constructive attitude: instead of letting himself be ruled by vexation (5:2), he should resign to his fate and seek unto God to help him out (5:8). Job may even find meaning in his suffering when he thinks of it as a reproof of God (5:17).

Job 6–7 When Eliphaz has finished his speech, Job is urged to speak again. Because of the heavy weight of his agitation and misfortune his words stammer out (6:2-3).[4]

---

of the fate of the wicked that Job could so easily apply to himself (cf. Fullerton (1930: 330–331, n. 2) and Newsom (1996: 377)). Fullerton explains that the author puts verse 8 in Eliphaz's mouth to picture him "as so obsessed by the orthodox doctrine of rewards and punishments, that having formulated the comforting side of it, he almost unconsciously and automatically adds the threatening side as well, unmindful of the unfortunate inference Job might draw from it with regard to himself" (Fullerton 1930: 332). While Fullerton's explanation is quite possible, he admits that he has to exclude verses 9–11: "if these verses are included, the warning is no longer simply the reverse side of the promise in v. 7. It becomes, so to speak, an end in itself [...]" (Fullerton 1930: 331 n. 2). Even if it is argued that also verses 9–11 can be read in a consolatory way and as a manner of the author to express his critic on Eliphaz's approach, scholars fail to clarify why the fate of the wicked is described so extensively (cf. Clines (1989: 125), Newsom (1996: 377)). My suggestion above that Eliphaz uses the fate of the wicked to illustrate that Job is wrong in asserting that God imprisons man in life, does explain why Eliphaz elaborates on this theme: in this manner he can point out that in the case of the wicked, God does kill with ease and that he does not exercise restraint. Note that my reading implies that Eliphaz is not being unconsciously insulting when he describes the fate of the wicked: as I understand it, Job made a bold claim on God's behavior, and now Eliphaz neatly points out why Job is wrong.

3 In most of its other occurrences, the image of the עָשׁ 'moth' is used to refer to its destructive power (cf. Job 13:28, Psa 39:12, Isa 50:9, 51:8, Hos 5:12), but even so, it can be argued that in Job 4:19, it is rather the moth's vulnerability that is referred to (cf. Clines (1989: 135)). I agree with Clines that Eliphaz's account in verses 19–21 focuses on the risk that human vulnerability entails: "Vv 19c–21 b present therefore not the universal fate of humans, but the *danger* their precarious existence lays them open to: they *can* be crushed like a moth, they *may* die and never be noticed, they *can* live and die without ever acquiring wisdom" (1989: 135).

4 Note that the WEIGHT metaphor here establishes a similar argument as the FOOD metaphor did in 3:24 (see chapter 3, §3.4). Like bad food, heavy weight causes a physical reaction of expulsion in the body: when Job's words stammer out, it is the weight of his emotions that causes them to leave

Eliphaz has not convinced Job that he should temper his agitation (cf. 5:2): on the contrary, it is exactly the advice to resign to his fate that Job resists. On the one hand, Job refuses to follow Eliphaz in considering misfortune as an accidental event that mortals may have to cope with (cf. 4:17–21). Returning to the food metaphor that he introduced in 3:24, he interprets his suffering as an attack that is willfully assigned to him by God (6:4). Just as a wild ass would not bray over grass and a bull would not bellow over his fodder (6:5), Job would not be agitated if he were given a portion appropriate for man. A willfully assigned attack, however, does not count as a risk that come with the human condition. With the conceptualization of misfortune as a hostile attack from God, Job also rejects Eliphaz's other proposal, namely that misfortune functions as a beneficent punishment (cf. 5:17). In verse 6 he interprets this latter idea as the suggestion to eat 'the tasteless without salt' and to find 'taste in the juice of mallows'. Taste is a common metaphor for the ability to judge.[5] When Job asks whether the tasteless must be eaten without salt and whether there is taste in the juice of mallows, he questions the sense of stomaching a punishment that cannot be subjected to a proper judgment.[6] According to Job, Eliphaz's interpretation of misfortune as punishment lacks reason: because it concerns wrongdoings that one is not capable of knowing, it demands that one consents that its rationale cannot be comprehended. Rather than accepting speculations, Job trusts his own sense, that is, he relegates his misfortune to the category of sick food and states as a general principle that he will not reconcile himself to situations that the reasonable mind can only judge as tasteless, inappropriate, and offensive: "my soul refuses to touch those things that are like sick food to me" (6:7).[7]

---

his mouth. Like the pouring out of roaring, the stammering out of words is conceptualized as an inevitable reaction that is not a matter of choice. Cf. Clines on 5:3: "It is not surprising that his words, in his lament of chap. 3, or in the renewed cry in the present speech, have been "unrestrained"; they have been squeezed out of him, so to speak, by the weight that presses down upon him" (Clines 1989: 170).

5 E.g. BDB 381.1, TWOT (Alexander 1980: 352). Cf. Job 12:11, "Truly, the ear tests arguments as the palate tastes (יִטְעַם) foods" (JPS); Job 12:20, "He deprives trusty men of speech, And takes away the reason (טַעַם) of elders" (JPS).

6 I follow Newsom in understanding the source domain of TASTE as representing "the certainty of the body's knowledge" (2003: 135). I propose that Job uses it here to conceptualize critical judgment as a reliable human faculty. In my view, Job's argument focuses not so much on the particularity of personal experience (so Seow 2013: 458), but rather on the unavoidability of the faculty to judge as such: Eliphaz cannot expect him to set an innate sense aside in order to accept interpretations that lack reason.

7 To Job, his fate is inappropriate as sick food; he therefore rejects his fate, as well as speculative explanations that intend to make him look at it in a more constructive manner.

After Job has thus rejected both the interpretation of his misfortune as an accidental event and as a punishment from God, he is back where he started and he reiterates that he hopes for death. Eliphaz had said that Job should consider his fear of God as the basis for his confidence (כִּסְלָה) and the integrity of his ways as the basis for his hope (תִּקְוָה) (4:6). In his advice, however, Eliphaz wrongly started from the assumption that Job wants to live on, and Job spells out to him here that it is not life but death he hopes for:[8] he wants to be crushed and to be cut off (6:8-9). By adopting Eliphaz's terminology (cf. 4:19), Job shows that he rather acknowledges the destructive character of death, than that he considers his suffering as a positive thing (cf. 5:17). Job refuses to make sense of pain when he did not 'hide (כחד) the words of the Holy One' (6:10).[9] The verb כחד 'to hide' in the D-stem means "to keep something back, to refuse to make it known," and it "has to do with refusing to declare something" (Oswalt 1980: 436). It draws attention to Job's active involvement in proclaiming the words and commands of God, and it suggests that there must be a better reward for Job than the suffering he is now facing. Job does not accept that Eliphaz does not denounce his suffering but that he instead seeks ways to justify it and to even see it as favorable. Rather than busy themselves with speculative argumentations, his friends should unconditionally choose his side: "a friend owes loyalty to one who despairs, or he forsakes the fear of the Almighty" (6:14).[10]

Even though Eliphaz's suggestions have offered neither hope nor consolation, they did enable Job to formulate a more articulate view on his own situation. In reaction to the belief that one should strive for a long life (cf. 5:26), he conceptualizes death as a reward (7:1-4) and his life as being completed (7:5-6). He furthermore adopts the idea that human nature is insubstantial: not to allow for the possibility of accidental misfortune (cf. 4:19-21), but to argue that the end of his life is near (7:7). Taking into account the frailty of human life, Job considers it more realistic that his life will not be restored and that Eliphaz and his friends will shortly be witnessing his death (7:8-9). In Job's view, human downfall is an irreversible movement: who goes down, will not get up again (7:10).

---

8 E.g. Hartley (1988: 134), Clines (1989: 172–173), Newsom (1996: 387). Hartley (1988: 134): "In describing his curse-lament as *my hope* (*tiqwâ*) Job is countering the words of Eliphaz. Eliphaz thought Job's hope should be his upright life (4:6) or the assurance that God delivers individuals from troubles (5:15-16). But Job believes that his only hope is death itself."

9 I translate 6:10 as follows: "Or should it still be my consolation and should I exult in pain that he does not spare, when I did not hide the words of the Holy One?"

10 For a detailed explanation of the comparison of the friends as unreliable wadis (Job 6:14-21), see de Joode and van Loon (2014: 46–50).

Against the background of this more elaborate presentation of how he understands his situation, Job assents to Eliphaz's suggestion to seek God (cf. 5:8).[11] In 7:12, Job for the first time directly addresses God.[12] The conclusion that Job drew on God in chapter 3, namely that He had locked him up in life (3:20), is also the first question that he here confronts Him with: "Am I the Sea, or the Dragon, that you put a guard (מִשְׁמָר) over me?" According to Job, God has put a guard over Job as if he were a chaotic power that needs to be restricted in space: whereas the Sea and the Dragon were not allowed to access the sphere of the ordered cosmos, Job is not allowed access to sphere of death.[13] To Job, this is incomprehensible, and it furthermore contradicts God's current interference in his personal life.[14] If God is determined to keep him alive, then why does He scare Job with dreams and visions so that He causes Job to choose death over life (7:13-15)? Job does not understand what keeps God from letting him go when human life is only a breath (7:16). How can it be explained that God is so obsessed with the doings of creatures that cannot last (7:17-19)?[15] As a provocative solution to Eliphaz's idea that Job will not die because he is innocent, Job concludes his speech with a new thought experiment. If Job's innocence is truly the thing that keeps him alive, would a change in his behavior give way to death:

---

11 Cf. Fohrer (1963: 179) and Seow (2013: 496).

12 I assume that in 7:1-11 Job addresses Eliphaz and therefore I do not take 7:7 as an address to God, cf. § 1.2 below. For the interpretation of 7:7 as an address to God, see e.g. Habel (1985: 159).

13 Commentators generally consider Job's self-comparison with a chaotic power as a rhetorical exaggeration that serves to highlight his insubstantial nature and to argue that God's way of guarding him is out of all proportion (e.g. Driver and Gray (1921: 71), Hartley (1988: 149), Clines (1989: 188), and Newsom (1996: 395)). I agree that the comparison can be read as an exaggeration that underlines Job's ephemeral state, but I also propose that the actual argument of the comparison is not an exaggeration in that it concerns the specific sort of guarding that both Job and the chaotic powers are in fact confronted with, namely that God blocks their way. When Job complained in chapter 3 that God blocks his way to death, Eliphaz had asserted in chapter 4 that God keeps him alive because of his righteousness. In chapter 7, Job holds that as a good servant he should be rewarded with rest: he can understand that the Sea and the Dragon should be controlled, but he cannot see why God would not let him pass away and leave the earthly sphere.

14 Most commentators take verses 13–14 as describing Job's experiences of God having set a guard over him (verse 12). I propose, however, that verses 12–15 picture the paradoxical situation of God who is determined to keep him alive (verse 12), while at the same time, he is the reason that Job's wants to die (verses 13–15). In my view, Job's problem is not that he is confronted with misfortune, but that his misfortune has not led to his death and that his current situation does not fit his understanding of God and the world.

15 In 7:8-10, Job had transformed Eliphaz's notion of human transience into an argument to explain why he refuses to hope that there is a future for him; here in verses 16–18 he uses it to question why God does not deliver him to death.

> If I would sin, what do I do to you O Watcher of man? Why have You made me into a target for You so that I am a burden to myself?[16] What if You would neither forgive my transgression nor remove my iniquity? Surely now I would now lie down in the dust; if You would seek me, I would not be there![17]
>
> Job 7:20–21

Verse 21 thus pictures the irony that is in the belief that God keeps the righteous alive: for the righteous this implies that their doings are scrutinously watched by God, while the wicked are allowed to escape His inspection as they are given the peace of death.

1.2. *Job 7:1–11: Text and Translation*

Throughout chapters 6 and 7, Job's death wish has remained, but his thinking about it has become more articulate. Whereas in chapter 3, Job explained why staying alive causes an unbearable unrest that can only be solved by death, he here clarifies that he feels that his life is completed and that he sees death as an appropriate conclusion. To bring in view the conceptualization of suffering that is involved in Job's new understanding of his situation, I focus on 7:1–11, where Job gives detailed description of his approach to life and death:

---

16 I read verse 20b as Job's accusation that God makes him into a target (מִפְגָּע) that should be kept alive, even if life is a burden to him and he desires to die (cf. Job 2:6, where God delivers Job to the Adversary with the only condition that he spares Job's life—in this perspective, God has indeed made Job into a target that should be kept alive). I follow MT in that I read עָלַי 'to myself' instead of עָלֶיךָ 'to You'. The MT reading עָלַי 'to myself' is mentioned as one of the eighteen *tiqqūnê sōp̄ᵉrim* 'corrections of the scribes' in which the assumed original text—in this case עָלֶיךָ 'to You'—is changed to protect God's transcendence, but I hold with Budde (1896: 35) and Driver and Gray that the MT text "*upon thee* would form an anticlimax on the preceding line, whereas *upon myself* follows it naturally and forcibly" (Driver and Gray 1921: 2:48).

17 Verse 20a is generally understood as a rhetorical question that is used to argue that Job's misfortune is disproportional. Verse 21 has either been taken as an additional argument, namely that there is no use in punishment when Job will die soon anyway (so Clines 1989: 194), or instead, as an ironical request, namely that God is asked to forgive Job's sins so that he may die in peace (so Gordis 1978: 83). In my view, Job's problem is not his misfortune but the fact that God does not let him die; furthermore, I hold that Job rejects the idea that he is being punished for sins (see my outline of chapter 6 above). I therefore propose that verses 20–21 elaborate on a question that Eliphaz raised in chapter 4, namely how Job's innocence is a matter to God and how it relates to God's decision to keep him alive.

Job 7:1-11

[1] הֲלֹא־צָבָא לֶאֱנוֹשׁ עַל־אֶרֶץ וְכִימֵי שָׂכִיר יָמָיו׃
[2] כְּעֶבֶד יִשְׁאַף־צֵל וּכְשָׂכִיר יְקַוֶּה פָּעֳלוֹ׃
[3] כֵּן הֻנְחַלְתִּי לִי יַרְחֵי־שָׁוְא וְלֵילוֹת עָמָל מִנּוּ־לִי׃
[4] אִם־שָׁכַבְתִּי וְאָמַרְתִּי מָתַי אָקוּם וּמִדַּד־עֶרֶב וְשָׂבַעְתִּי נְדֻדִים עֲדֵי־נָשֶׁף׃
[5] לָבַשׁ בְּשָׂרִי רִמָּה וְגִישׁ [וגוש] עָפָר עוֹרִי רָגַע וַיִּמְאָס׃
[6] יָמַי קַלּוּ מִנִּי־אָרֶג וַיִּכְלוּ בְּאֶפֶס תִּקְוָה׃
[7] זְכֹר כִּי־רוּחַ חַיָּי לֹא־תָשׁוּב עֵינִי לִרְאוֹת טּוֹב׃
[8] לֹא־תְשׁוּרֵנִי עֵין רֹאִי עֵינֶיךָ בִּי וְאֵינֶנִּי׃
[9] כָּלָה עָנָן וַיֵּלֶךְ כֵּן יוֹרֵד שְׁאוֹל לֹא יַעֲלֶה׃
[10] לֹא־יָשׁוּב עוֹד לְבֵיתוֹ וְלֹא־יַכִּירֶנּוּ עוֹד מְקֹמוֹ׃
[11] גַּם־אֲנִי לֹא אֶחֱשָׂךְ פִּי אֲדַבְּרָה בְּצַר רוּחִי אָשִׂיחָה בְּמַר נַפְשִׁי׃

[1] Is it not a term of service that man has on earth?
His days are as the days of a hireling.
[2] As a slave that gasps for shade,
and as a hireling that waits for his wage,
[3] so I was made to possess months of futility for me,
nights of misery one appointed to me.
[4] When I lie down, I say:
"When will I rise, and will He measure off the evening?,"
but I am filled with restlessness till morning twilight.
[5] My flesh is clothed with maggots and clods of earth,
my skin throbbed and dissolved,
[6] my days ran swiftly from the loom,
and they have come to an end without thread/hope.[18]
[7] Remember that my life is wind,
my eye will not see good again;
[8] the eye of the one who sees me, will not behold me,
while your eyes are on me, I will be no more.
[9] When a cloud fades it goes,
so one who goes down to Sheol does not come up;

18 The noun תִּקְוָה means both 'thread' and 'hope', and both meanings here fit the context because the first elaborates on the image of the loom, while the latter reactivates the theme of hope that occurred earlier in 4:6, 5:16, and 6:6. On this wordplay, see also Noegel (1996: 50).

[10] he returns to his house no more,
his place does not know him anymore.
[11] Also I will not stop my mouth;
let me speak in the distress of my spirit
and protest in the bitterness of my soul.

Among scholars opinions differ whether chapter 7 must be understood as an address to God,[19] or that 7:1-6 is either a continued address to the friends or a soliloquy, and that the address to God only begins from 7:7 onwards.[20] Recently, it has also been argued that chapter 7 in its entirety simultaneously addresses both God and the friends.[21] As could be deduced from my outline of chapters 4–7 in the previous paragraph, I adopt yet another position by taking verses 1–11 as being addressed to the friends, and 12–21 as being addressed to God.[22] While this decision has neither consequences for the translation nor for the subdivision of 1–11, I show in § 1.3 that the metaphors in this passage are best explained if it is interpreted as a new development in the dialogue that started off with Job's outcry in chapter 3.

As regards the text of 7:1-11, translational difficulties are especially found in verse 4 and verse 6. In verse 4, the meaning of וּמְדַד־עֶרֶב, often translated as "but the night is long" (NRSV) or "night drags on" (JPS), is disputed. The basic meaning of the verb מדד is 'to measure', and in the three other occurrences in the D-stem it is used in the sense of 'to measure off'.[23] While מדד in the Dt-stem is in 1 Kgs 17:21 figuratively used as 'to extend, to stretch', it is not sure whether this allows for a similar figurative

19 E.g. Fohrer (1963: 175), Habel (1985: 141), Hartley (1988: 142), Clines (1989: 167), and Seow (2013: 489).

20 Cf. Driver and Gray (1921: 69), Pope (³1973: 60), Newsom (1996: 393) for the first interpretation of 7:1-6, and Kroeze (1961: 109) for the latter.

21 So Yu (2011: 239); while I consider Yu's approach fresh and thought provoking (see especially pp. 240–246 on how the entire chapter can be read as a refutation of Eliphaz's first speech), I nevertheless prefer to take the one who is primarily addressed as the addressee. Even if it can be discussed who is addressed in verses 1–11, I hold that God is the main addressee of verses 12–21.

22 Based on the interpretation of address, I choose for a two-partite division of chapter 7. Most scholars divide the chapter in two main parts, namely either in verses 1–10 and 11–21, in verses 1–11 and 12–21, or in verses 1–10 and 12–21 with verse 11 as a transition verse (cf. van der Lugt (1995: 97)). Alternatively, it is argued that chapter 7 consists of three units, namely verses 1–5, 6–16, and 17–21 (so e.g. Clines 1989), or verses 1–8, 9–16, and 17–21 (so e.g. Habel (1985: 153–156) and van der Lugt (1995: 98)). While these proposals on a three-partite structure of chapter 7 are incompatible with my interpretation of address, I explain in n. 30 below why I do not think that there is a shift of theme after verse 5.

23 Cf. BDB 551.1; the other three occurrences of מדד in the D-stem are 2 Sam 8:2, Psa 60:8, 108:8.

and intransitive understanding of וּמִדַּד in Job 7:4.[24] Another problem in verse 4 is the place of the *atnach* on עֶרֶב which is here the main disjunctive accent. Most scholars assume that the scope of the direct speech only includes מָתַי אָקוּם 'when will I rise';[25] the *atnach*, however, is found with the words that follow. To avoid both the lexical and textual difficulties, I choose to stick to the most natural interpretation of מדד as 'to measure off' and of the *atnach* as marking the end of the direct speech, and to follow the Dutch Statenvertaling in translating verse 4a as "when I lie down, I say: "when will I rise, and will He measure off the evening?"'"[26] In my view, Job here conceptualizes his life in terms of a day. When Job asks when he will rise, he refers to the moment that he will wake up in the 'after-life', that is, death; and when he asks when God will make an end to the evening, he refers to the evening of his life, that is, its final phase. On this interpretation, see §3.1.2 below on the source domain of 'day'.

A second difficulty is found in verse 6 and concerns the phrase יָמַי קַלּוּ מִנִּי־אָרֶג, often translated as "my days are swifter than a weaver's shuttle" (NRSV). The main questions are (1) whether the noun אֶרֶג 'loom' can indeed be used to refer to the weaver's shuttle, (2) whether קלל here means either 'swift' or 'light', and (3) whether מִן introduces either the locative 'from' or the comparative 'more than'.[27] The underlying problem is that it is not exactly understood what image is pictured and what it intends to express. Most scholars suggest that the main idea of verse 6 is that Job's former days have passed by too fast, and that as such, it forms a seeming contradiction to verse 4 where Job complains about the present evening that lasts too long.[28] With Szpek (1994: 287), however, I question whether the picture of the quick movement of the weaver's shuttle is "contextually appropriate" here, especially since the metaphor of the loom is used elsewhere to conceptualize life in terms of a fabric that is finished when cut off from the loom.[29] Even though the verb קלל creates an apparent contrast to the

24 For that reason it has also been suggested that וּמִדַּד should be read (1) as וּמִדֵּי "and as often as (evening comes)" (e.g. Driver and Gray (1921: 69), Fohrer (1963: 163)), (2) as a phonetic variant of מַדַּד "the night is extended, is long" (so Gordis 1978: 80), or (3) that it should be analyzed as מִן 'from' and דַּד 'breast, front', "and from the former part (literally breast) of the evening" (so Reider 1920: 61).

25 E.g. Fohrer (1963: 159), Hartley (1988: 143), Clines (1989: 157), and Seow (2013: 488, 502).

26 So also van der Lugt (1995: 91) and Tur-Sinai (1967: 134–135).

27 On the various interpretations of 7:6, see Szpek (1994).

28 E.g. Clines (1989: 185), Newsom (1996: 394).

29 Cf. Isa 38:12: דּוֹרִי נֻסַּע וְנִגְלָה מִנִּי כְּאֹהֶל רֹעִי קִפַּדְתִּי כָאֹרֵג חַיַּי מִדַּלָּה יְבַצְּעֵנִי מִיּוֹם עַד־לַיְלָה תַּשְׁלִימֵנִי: "My dwelling was pulled up en removed from me like a shepherd's tent; Like a weaver I rolled up my life when he cut me from the thrum; between a day and a night you complete me." Dhorme also quotes

slow progression of time in verse 4, I propose that Job in verse 6 does not complain that his former days have passed by too fast, but that he here, as in verses 4–5, clarifies that he believes that his life is heading for death.[30] By conceptualizing his life as a woven fabric for which no thread is left—see also §1.3.3—Job can account for the fact that at this point he only waits for God to cut off his cloth from the loom. Based on this interpretation, I prefer to translate verse 6 as follows: "my days ran swiftly from the loom, and they have come to an end without thread/hope." I thus choose to understand אֶרֶג as referring to a loom, קלל in the sense of swiftness and מִן as a locative.

1.3. *Metaphors in Job 7:1–11*

In reaction to Eliphaz's attempt to offer hope and consolation, Job elaborates on his death wish by arguing that his life is completed and that there is no hope for him. In the following, I discuss how the source domains of service (7:1–3), day (7:4), fabric (7:6), wind (7:7), cloud (7:9) and taste (7:11) give further insight in the conceptualization of Job's suffering.

1.3.1. *Service (7:1–3)*

The first source domain that Job introduces to justify his death wish is that of service: הֲלֹא־צָבָא לְאֱנוֹשׁ עַל־אָרֶץ וְכִימֵי שָׂכִיר יָמָיו׃ כְּעֶבֶד יִשְׁאַף־צֵל וּכְשָׂכִיר יְקַוֶּה פָּעֳלוֹ׃ כֵּן הָנְחַלְתִּי לִי יַרְחֵי־שָׁוְא וְלֵילוֹת עָמָל מִנּוּ־לִי׃ "Is it not a term of service that man has on earth? His days are as the days of a hireling. As a slave that gasps for shade, and as a hireling that waits for his wage, so I was made to possess months of futility for me, nights of misery one appointed for me" (verses 1–3). In these verses the source domain of service is evoked by צָבָא 'service', שָׂכִיר 'hireling' (2x), עֶבֶד 'servant, slave', פֹּעַל 'wage' and מנה 'to appoint'. The LIFE IS SERVICE metaphor is thus an extended and deliberately used metaphor. In verses 1–3, this mapping entails that humans are servants, that death is reward, and that the prolongation of life is a backhanded gift:

R. Moses Ibn Ezra: "Man in the world weaves like a weaver, and certainly his days are the thread" (Dhorme *1967* [*1926*]: 101).

30 According to Clines verse 6 introduces a new theme: "Job's thought moves from the depiction of the misery of his existence (vv 1–5) to a reflection upon its brevity (vv 6–10)" (*1989*: 185). Because I argue that verse 6 elaborates on the theme of completion that is introduced in verse 4, I prefer to take these verses together. Cf. note 22; see also §1.3.2 and §1.3.3.

LIFE IS SERVICE
humans are servants
death is reward
the prolongation of life is a backhanded gift

According to Perdue, the conceptualization of humans as servants in the book of Job reacts against the wisdom tradition that generally pictures man as a ruler (Perdue 1991: 69). The idea that humans are servants obviously has consequences for one's approach to mankind,[31] but in my view, the LIFE IS SERVICE metaphor in chapter 7 is primarily used to present the relation between life and death in terms of being in service and being free[32] and in terms of work and reward. Death is the freedom that follows the fulfillment of one's term,[33] and death is the reward that God gives to those who have loyally served Him. It may appear that Job uses the LIFE IS SERVICE metaphor to accuse God of not giving him his proper reward, but if Job's addressee in verses 1–11 is not God but Eliphaz (see § 1.2. above), it can be argued that this metaphor aims to challenge Eliphaz's idea that God will not cut the innocent off because they will die in a proper time when they have reached an old age (cf. 4:7 and 5:26).[34] By conceptualizing life as service, Job motivates why he does not strive for a long life and why he longs for the rest of death. As Eliphaz has confirmed in 4:6 that Job has been a

31 Perdue explains that whereas the ruler metaphor "emphasized the goodness of human nature and the freedom to go forth into the world to master life and to rule responsibly as the vice-regents of God", the slave metaphor "eradicates significant human freedom, places severe restrictions on the human capacity to create and shape cosmos and society, and constructs an unbridgeable chasm between the divine sovereign and the human creature" (Perdue 1991: 63, 67).

32 Cf. Driver and Gray (1921: 68): "The point of comparison between Job's life and the day of the hireling thus lies in their common toil and their common longing for the end of it"; see also Perdue (1991: 126) and Mathewson (2006: 71).

33 When Job compares death in verse 2 to the צֵל 'shade' that brings the slave relief, he continues with conceptualizing death as something positive. While it may seem that Job continues reversing the negative connotation of darkness into something positive as he did in chapter 3, this is not the case as צֵל actually has the positive connotation of "protection from harm" (NIDOTTE, (Price 1997: 808)).

34 Also Yu (2011: 242) interprets the comparison of humans to hirelings and slaves in verses 1–2 as being addressed to Eliphaz, but he sees Job's image as an confirmation of Eliphaz's presentation of humans as low creatures in 4:19-21. According to Yu, however, Job does not speak with his own voice: "We take care to distinguish the perspective of Job's persona from Job's. Job's persona resides in the world according to Eliphaz and speaks as one of the brutish human slaves that have the misfortune of living in a world ruled by a divine terror. Job does not live in that world; he does not believe that God is an absurd deity who waits to pounce on every slight human error." For my argument against Yu's interpretation, see n. 50.

loyal servant, the LIFE IS SERVICE metaphor challenges him to agree that Job should be given his proper פֹּעַל 'wage', and that Job should not be appointed for an additional period of time.

In the rhetorical development of the dialogue, Job uses the LIFE IS SERVICE metaphor to modify Eliphaz's view that life is precious, but on the level of the book, it involves the reader in a meta-level discussion on the way to approach life. One's approach to life generally functions as the background of one's actions, but here, Job broaches it as a topic of discussion.[35] The LIFE IS SERVICE metaphor shakes the 'epistemic security'[36] that life is something precious to make the audience aware that there is more than one way of looking at it.

1.3.2. Day (7:4)

Whereas verse 3 already mentioned that nights of misery were appointed to Job, verse 4 zooms in on one of those nights, and describes how Job longs for its end: אִם־שָׁכַבְתִּי וְאָמַרְתִּי מָתַי אָקוּם וּמִדַּד־עָרֶב וְשָׂבַעְתִּי נְדֵדִים עֲדֵי־נָשֶׁף "When I lie down, I say: "When will I rise, and will He measure off the evening?," but I am filled with restlessness till morning twilight."[37] If the longing for the end of one's day is taken as parallel to the longing for the end of one's service, DAY, like SERVICE, is used as a source domain to conceptualize LIFE.[38] The phrases אִם־שָׁכַבְתִּי 'when I lie down (to sleep)',[39] מָתַי אָקוּם 'when will I rise, get up',[40] עֶרֶב 'evening, night', and נֶשֶׁף 'twilight' all refer to specific moments of the day, but only the references within Job's quoted speech, that is the second and third phrase, can be understood metaphorically. As the source domain in the quoted speech still extends over the clause, the LIFE IS A DAY metaphor in verse 4

35 Cf. Tsur (2009: 270): "Particular occasions of birth and death in everyday life are perceived as figures, and life only as ground, at best. But when we speak of Human Life, Life becomes the figure, only marked at its extremes by birth and death, which thus become ground." According to Tsur, the reversal of "habitual figure-ground relationships" can be used "to achieve certain poetic effects," and "to yield heightened awareness" (2009: 272–273, 274).

36 This phrase is borrowed from Katz (1992: 7–8) as quoted by Tsur and used in his explanation of the effects of a figure-ground reversal in a poem discussed in his article (Tsur 2009: 274).

37 On this translation, see § 1.2 above.

38 Cf. Lakoff and Turner (1989: 11–12); Perdue hints at such a metaphorical understanding: "Pointing to the approach of night (7:4) when relief is gained or wages are given may suggest the imagery of death which is the one and only means of release from the degradation of human existence" (1991: 128). Most commentators, however, interpret the direct speech in verse 4 only in a literal sense as expressing Job's experience of troublesome nights, e.g. Habel (1985: 158–159) and Clines (1989: 184).

39 Cf. BDB 1012.1 1b.

40 Cf. BDB 877.2 1a.

can be marked as a deliberately used metaphor. The conceptualization of life in terms of a day, involves that the getting up is the getting up in *Sheol*, and that the evening that God must measure off is the evening of Job's life.

LIFE IS A DAY
last phase of life is evening/night
death is a new day[41]

Job feels like he has reached the end of his life: if he dies, it is not an untimely death. I propose that like the LIFE IS SERVICE metaphor, the LIFE IS A DAY metaphor serves to counter Eliphaz's belief that he will not be cut off (4:7) and that there is a long life ahead for him (5:26). More than the LIFE IS SERVICE metaphor, the LIFE IS A DAY metaphor asserts that Job feels like he finds himself in the last phase of his life. A hireling can be hired for another term, but one's life can only be followed by a completely new day. Although Job repeatedly made clear that he wants to die (cf. 3:20 and 6:8-9), it is only at this point that Job explains to his friends that he does not consider death as an untimely escape, but rather as a proper conclusion of a completed life.

Unlike the friends, the audience already could have deduced Job's attitude to death from 1:21 and 2:10. The LIFE IS A DAY metaphor here confirms that the resignation there expressed was not just a pose. Together with the friends, the audience is expected to recognize that it is not his misfortune, but the extension of a completed life that Job protests against.

1.3.3. Fabric (7:6)

Job believes that he finds himself in the evening of his life and that his end already manifests itself in the marks on his body (7:5). In verse 6, the source domain of weaving singles out another aspect of Job's approach to his life and its end: יָמַי קַלּוּ מִנִּי־אָרֶג וַיִּכְלוּ בְּאֶפֶס תִּקְוָה "my days ran swiftly from the loom, and they have come to an end without thread/hope."[42] The source domain of weaving is evoked by אָרֶג 'loom' and

41 Death is often conceptualized as sleep, darkness, or night, but I propose that Job here presents death as a new beginning. I do not wish to suggest that this entails that Job believes in an afterlife, but I rather assert that at this point in the dialogue, Job has still set his hope on death because he considers it as the start of a new period that is more positive than his current life (cf. 3:13-15.17-19). The idea that there is a future in death is also implied by the LIFE IS SERVICE metaphor in 7:1-2 which entails that death is reward.

42 On this translation and the interpretation thereof, see §1.2 above.

תִּקְוָה 'thread'. As it extends beyond the clause, the LIFE IS A WOVEN FABRIC metaphor is a deliberately used metaphor.

LIFE IS A WOVEN FABRIC
a completed life is a fabric with no thread left
death is being cut loose from the loom

When Job conceptualizes his life as a fabric that ran swiftly from the loom, he presents his life as quickly having headed to its end. Even though the weaver's shuttle moves quickly, weaving is actually a time-consuming process. I therefore propose that the speed referred to by קלל 'to be swift' rather bears on the efficient and effective progression that is involved in the production of a fabric, and translated to the target domain, on the rapid and inescapable course toward completion that Job's life has set in since the recent train of events. Job believes that his days have been completed (כלה 'to be complete, to be at an end'), that his life has come to its end, and that there is no thread (תִּקְוָה 'thread' and 'hope') left. With no thread left, the fabric of Job's life is completed, and there is no hope for a further future. In my view, Job is still addressing Eliphaz (see also §1.2 above), and in that perspective, I propose that this statement should not be taken as a complaint.[43] Job has resigned to the fact that his life has moved into gear and that his fabric is complete. His death will not be untimely; on the contrary, Job wants Eliphaz to understand that he only waits for God to cut him off (cf. Job 6:9) so that his fabric can be removed from the loom.

From the beginning of chapter 7, the book of Job has involved the audience in a discussion on the meaning of life. The conceptualization of life as a woven fabric, that is, as a concrete object with a beginning and an end, offers a perspective on life in which oneself is not involved: it allows that the meaning of life and death can be considered from a less emotional and more objective point of view. The metaphor of weaving presents the audience with another image that asserts that Job's life has approached its completion. Like Eliphaz, the audience may come to understand that life does not need to be long to be fulfilled. Most people have a lust for life, but the

43 Verse 7:6 is generally taken as a complaint that Job's day have gone by too fast. In §1.2 above, however, I have argued that the metaphor of the loom does not concern the quickness of the shuttle but rather the completion of the fabric. The idea that Job's fabric is completed is coherent with the idea that Job's term is done (7:1-3) and that his day has come to an end (7:4). I propose that this threefold emphasis on completion is best understood as an argument against Eliphaz who claimed that Job's time has not yet come.

character Job challenges this natural tendency by offering perspectives that explain also the longing for death as a logical desire.

1.3.4. Wind (7:7)

After Job has shown Eliphaz that there is more than one manner to approach life and death, he now continues with a theme that Eliphaz himself introduced into the discussion (cf. 4:19-21): זְכֹר כִּי־רוּחַ חַיָּי לֹא־תָשׁוּב עֵינִי לִרְאוֹת טוֹב "Remember that my life is wind, my eye will not see good again." The source domain of wind is only evoked in the first clause by the noun רוּחַ 'wind, breath', but as the imperative זְכֹר 'remember!' explicitly draws attention to this mapping, it is signaled as a deliberately used metaphor.[44]

LIFE IS WIND
life is transitory
human nature is transient
human decline is a natural process

With the LIFE IS WIND metaphor Job joins in on Eliphaz's presentation of humans as transient and insubstantial beings.[45] When Eliphaz suggested that human nature is insubstantial, he used this image to argue for their moral imperfection. Job, however, pushes the argument in another direction and maps the image of insubstantiality to human life as such to assert that it is transitory.[46] By emphasizing the temporality of life, Job suggests that his present state is a matter of transience, and thereby he circumvents Eliphaz's reasoning that his suffering is caused by God as punishment

44 With reference to Psa 89:48 and Job 10:9, the imperative זְכֹר 'remember' is mostly interpreted as an appeal to God to remember "the frailty of human life" (TWOT, (Schottroff 1997: 386)), e.g. Habel (1985: 159–160) and Clines (1989: 186). In those verses, however, the appeal occurs in the context of a petition. While Clines argues that verse 7 is "an appeal to God to ignore him" (1989: 186), I rather propose that it here serves to draw the attention to the conceptualization of life in terms of transitoriness. Note that Eliphaz has used the imperative זְכֹר 'remember' in a similar manner in 4:7.

45 See also Yu (2011: 243). As I already remarked in n. 34 above, I do not agree with Yu's interpretation of the rhetorical function of the allusions to Eliphaz's speech he finds in chapter 7; for further discussion on this issue, see n. 50.

46 Cf. Clines: "the point is that Job's life is bound to cease at any moment" (Clines 1989: 186). On the figurative meaning of רוּחַ 'wind', see TLOT: "from a human perspective, the wind has an incomprehensible and fleeting character" (Albertz and Westermann 1997: 1205); NIDOTTE: "רוּחַ as wind can also be used to depict powerlessness, worthlessness, or vanity" (Van Pelt et al. 1997: vol. 3, 1074).

for sin.[47] Job thus intends to modify Eliphaz's train of thought: if Eliphaz is willing to see the insubstantiality of human nature as a matter of the transitoriness of human life, he may accept that Job's present state is not a matter of judgment, but of having entered into the process of life coming to an end. Instead of trying to change Job's mind with speculative reasoning, the friends may then recognize the reality of Job's situation and support him while he waits for death.

To the audience, the LIFE IS WIND metaphor puts the character of human life in a temporal perspective. The metaphor emphasizes that life does not last forever. Humans are bound to die and moral achievements do not change the fact that life passes by and that humans disappear from the earth. With the LIFE IS WIND metaphor Job offers the audience an alternative explanation for the decline that comes along with human existence.

1.3.5. Cloud (7:9)

In verse 9, Job concludes his interpretation of life and death with another image from nature: כָּלָה עָנָן וַיֵּלֵךְ כֵּן יוֹרֵד שְׁאוֹל לֹא יַעֲלֶה "When a cloud fades, it goes, so one who goes down to *Sheol* does not come up." The source domain of cloud is only referred to by the noun עָנָן 'cloud', but it is signaled as a deliberately used metaphor by the adverb כֵּן 'so, thus' that explicitly marks the transition from the source to target domain.

PEOPLE ARE CLOUDS
human nature is transient
human decline is irreversible

Like the source domain of wind, the source domain of cloud evokes the idea that human nature is transitory.[48] Unlike the wind, the cloud is a visible phenomenon that is used here to picture the irreversibility of the completion of life. Winds pass by invisibly to move on to other places, but clouds can be seen to fall apart and to be gone forever. I propose that the PEOPLE ARE CLOUDS metaphor serves to refute

47 It is generally recognized that in verses 7:7-8 Job asserts that life is transitory and irreversible. Most scholars takes these assertions as an argument that his suffering is futile and that God should end it; so e.g. Habel (1985: 161) and Newsom (1996: 394). In my view, Job's problem is not his suffering, but that God does not let him die; I therefore understand Job's conceptualization of life as part of the reflections on his death wish and as serving to counter the perspectives that were provided by Eliphaz.

48 Cf. NIDOTTE: "The nom. עָנָן is most frequent in figures of speech or metaphors for transitoriness, immensity, and impenetrability. As a metaphor, it signifies transitoriness" (Futato 1997: vol. 3, 465).

Eliphaz's proposal to turn to God and to pray for a change of fortunes (cf. 5:8–16).[49] In Job's eyes, this advice is naive: it does not face the severity of Job's situation and it does not think through the implications of the frailty of human life. Job wants Eliphaz to acknowledge that like the disappearance of the wind and the disintegration of a cloud, the falling apart of human existence is a natural process, and furthermore, that there is no turning back once the process of decline has set in.

As people are generally inclined to hold on unto life, it can be hard to imagine that someone wants to die. At this point, the wind and cloud images invite the audience to see the disintegration of human existence as a natural and irreversible process. Once the audience is willing to join Job in reflecting on the meaning of life, it takes only one more step to put themselves in Job's position to see that his death wish is credible and well-founded. Job seeks to face the fact that mortal life has its limits, and it is plain logic that in his situation, this entails that he does not cherish hope, but that he waits for death to come.

1.4. *The Conceptualization of Suffering as a Lack of Hope—Part 1*

In the opening speech, Job described that he suffered from an unbearable unrest because he felt as if he was locked up in life. Throughout the first speech cycle it becomes clear that a lack of hope on a future in this life is the underlying source of Job's suffering.

In 7:1–11, the lack of hope is presented as a very reasonable position.[50] Job clarifies that he refuses to assume that there is still a future for him on earth, because he feels that his service is done, that his evening has come, that his body decomposes, that his

49 Different from most scholars I hold that Job's metaphors for life and human nature are best explained as arguments in response to Eliphaz's first speech in chapters 4–5. See n. 47 above.

50 At this point, my interpretation differs from that of Yu who also offers an interpretation of 7:1–11 as addressed to Eliphaz (Yu 2011: 240–246), see also §1.2 and n. 34 and 45 above). While I take Job's words as being sincere, Yu argues that Job's account is a satire of "the world according to Eliphaz" (2011: 246). According to Yu, Job picks up Eliphaz's argument on the frailty of human nature to make it ridiculous and to completely reject it. Although I agree with Yu that Job rejects that human insubstantiality implies human immorality (cf. Job 6:4-7 and §1.1 above), I propose that Job agrees with Eliphaz that human life is transient when he uses this argument in verses 7–10 to point out that Eliphaz is wrong in assuming that Job's life will be prolonged and that he will die in an old age (cf. §1.3.4 and §1.3.5). In my view, Job is in chapter 7 still willing and trying to enter into a dialogue with his friends and I think that at this point, a satirical account would be a too unexpected and too hostile reaction; I will, however, argue that a satirical reading enables a better understanding of Job 12:13–25 (cf. §3.1 below).

fabric is completed and that there is no thread left. Humans are frail, life is transitory, and death is irrevocable, and therefore it is not realistic for Eliphaz to suppose that Job will recover.[51]

It may seem as if Job advocates that death is something positive and that he does not actually suffer from the idea that he will die, but it must be noted that it is exactly the belief that there is no hope on a future that causes Job to experience the extension of his life as unbearable. Because Job believes that there is no future for him, he is convinced that he should be given death, and because death is not given, he interprets his situation as confining and bitter. Even though Job locates his suffering in verse 11—as in 3:24-26—in the fact that he is locked in a fearful and distasteful situation, the friends and the audience can deduce that Job's suffering of being alive depends on his belief that his life has reached completion.

2. The Conceptualization of Suffering in Job 10:18-22

In chapter 7 it has become clear that the turmoil that Job experiences because he is alive actually depends on his belief that his life has already arrived at its end. While Job does not suffer from the perspective that he will soon die, his belief that there is no future makes it impossible for him to find sense in the continuation of existence. That Job's lack of hope becomes even more encompassing after he has begun to explore the idea of a starting a lawsuit in chapter 9 appears in 10:18-22, where Job in an address to God pictures the consequences of dying in his current insignificant state.

2.1. *Job 10:18-22 in the Context of Job 8–10*

Job 8 After Eliphaz and Job have had their say, it is Bildad's turn to shed light on the matter. Bildad reacts on the speech in which Job rejected the comfort that Eliphaz offered, repeated that he wants to die, and concluded with a provocative imaginative scenario that God would consider him guilty so that his death wish could be fulfilled: "What if you would not forgive my transgression or remove my iniquity! Surely now (כִּי עַתָּה) I would lie down in the dust; if you would seek me, I would not be there" (Job

51 Job asserts repeatedly that it is his time to die and that there is no chance that he will recover to justify his death wish and to refute Eliphaz's advise. Meanwhile, however, Job is still alive: even if he—like every man—will certainly die, death is in the end a matter that remains beyond his control. See also chapter 3, n. 23.

7:21).[52] In my view, Bildad, like Eliphaz, wants to change Job's mind about his death wish and his current idea of how the world works, and I propose that in chapter 8, Bildad is especially provoked by Job's attempts to impose his will regarding life and death.[53] According to Bildad, God's principles are absolute (8:3), and there is no way that God will let a righteous man die. Job's reasoning is nonsensical and he would better face his real situation: "If you earnestly seek God and supplicate the Almighty, if you are blameless and upright, surely now (כִּי עַתָּה) He would rouse Himself over you and restore you to your righteous estate" (8:5-6).

When Bildad quite boldly confronts Job's scenario with this counter scenario, he takes a less theoretical and more pragmatic approach to Job's situation than Eliphaz did. To restore Job, two things are necessary: firstly, he should adopt a proper attitude to God, and secondly, he should be righteous. At this point, Job fails to meet the first criterion: as Eliphaz suggested, Job did put his case before God, but as it appears, Bildad does not consider the manner in which he did so in 7:12-21 as "earnestly seeking God". Whether Bildad believes that Job meets the second criterion, he does not say. This is not his point.[54] His point is that if Job indeed seeks God and if he is indeed righteous, God would already have solved Job's problem. In that case there would be no need to continue speculative theories or imaginary scenarios, and there would be no need to get involved in endless discussions—for that matter, Job's argument that his current state implies that there is no future for him can easily be contradicted: "even though your beginning is insignificant, your future may grow very great" (8:7).

As regards the question of a future, Bildad's most important advice to Job is that he should keep in touch with God (8:5). When Eliphaz gave Job a similar advice, he based it on his empathic understanding of what he would do in Job's situation: "but

52 On this interpretation see the outline in § 1.1 and n. 16 above.

53 It has been generally recognized that Bildad emphasizes in 8:1-10 that God is just, but there are different proposals on why Bildad introduces this topic. Clines, for example, sees it as a reaction to Job's critical approach to God in 7:11-22 (Clines 1989: 202), Newsom as an answer to Job's questions in 6:24.26.30 (Newsom 1996: 399–400), and Seow as a refutation that God has a role in his suffering (Seow 2013: 516). I propose here that Bildad's plea on God's righteousness is triggered by Job's presentation of the idea that his life is completed and its implication that God is wrong in not letting him die.

54 Cf. Newsom (1996: 401): "Bildad does not explicitly say whether he thinks Job has sinned. Given Bildad's views, he must assume so, else how could he account for Job's other catastrophic losses and his ominous skin disease? The critical difference is that God has not taken Job's life, perhaps indicating that Job's sin was not as serious as that of his children. In any event, that is not Bildad's concern. Like Eliphaz, he is primarily concerned to reassure Job about the prospects for his future restoration."

I would seek God, and before God I would lay my case" (5:8). Bildad here presents the same advice as an integral part of a worldview that has been passed down for ages (8:7-10). Like a plant needs water to grow and dries without it, man needs God. The MAN IS A PLANT metaphor in verses 11–12 foregrounds that man runs dry without God, that is, without God, man will have no future. Without God, one's hope (תִּקְוָה) will perish,[55] and one's confidence (כֶּסֶל) and security (מִבְטָח) will appear unreliable (8:13-14). According to Bildad, the only way for Job to restore his hope on a future is thus by putting his confidence in God.

To illustrate what Job may expect when he indeed would put his confidence in God, Bildad continues with another MAN IS A PLANT metaphor in verses 16–19. Bildad's second plant metaphor describes a different kind of plant, namely one that has its roots connected with a water source.[56] About this plant Bildad says that it can be considered a stone house. A man that is as well-watered as this plant is ensured of a future. Even if such a plant is swallowed up,[57] if its roots are connected to a spring, they will certainly sprout out anew. This comparison illustrates what Bildad said in 8:7: "even though your beginning is insignificant, your future may grow very great." Although it may seem as if Job is fading away, as long as he keeps connected to the live-giving source, he will certainly be restored from the dust.[58] There is still hope, for

55 Cf. Seow (2013: 521): "Just as the tedious activity of weaving comes to a halt when the yarn (*tiqwâ*) is finished, life come to an end when hope (*tiqwâ*) is gone (*7:6*) ... Bildad, however, takes exception to Job's generalization in his application of the metaphor to all mortals. To Bildad, it is the *tiqwâ* of the miscreants in particular that expires; they are ones whose hope perishes."

56 In the tradition of Saadiah Gaon, several scholars have observed with reference to Psa 1 and Jer 17:5-8 that Bildad's second plant metaphor in verses 16–19 describes a different plant than verses 11–12, cf. Gordis (1978: 521), Habel (1985: 175–178), Wolfers (1995: 387–388), Newsom (1996: 402–403), and Seow (2013: 522–525). I translate verses 16–19 as follows: "The other one is green in the sun, and over its garden its shoot springs up; when its roots are intertwined around a spring, one beholds a stone house. If one would swallow it up from its place and one would deceive it (saying) "I did not see you," see, this is the joy of his way, from the dust they will sprout out anew." Also Wolfers (1995: 326) translates גַּל in verse 17 as 'spring'. On the translation גַּל 'spring', cf. Cant 4:12, BDB 164.2, and NIDOTTE (Grisanti 1997b: 859); see also Seow (2013: 523–524). For an extensive overview of interpretations of this passage, see (Aron 2016).

57 Unlike Newsom (see n. 54 above) I do not think that Bildad considers Job's situation as a question of punishment of God. In my view, his picturing of the possible scenario that a plant may be swallowed up in 8:18 rather suggests that Bildad regards misfortune as something that comes along with mortality and that is beyond one's control. What lies within one's control is how one deals with it. One should not hold God responsible for trouble, but one needs Him to uphold hope for a better future. Like it has been handed down for generations: God is the only solid basis to keep man's hope alive.

58 In his self description "my flesh is clothed with maggots and clods of earth (וְגִישׁ עָפָר)" (7:5), Job

God will not refuse the innocent and He will not support the wicked; Job will live, and his enemies will be no more (8:20-22).

Job 9–10 In chapter 8, Bildad set out to counter Job's argument that his end is near and that his life is over by claiming that Job's current physical state does not exclude the possibility of restoration. Bildad offered Job a clear and pragmatic theory, and unlike Eliphaz, he did not urge Job to calm down, but instead he advised him to adopt a more constructive attitude that is grounded in a long tradition.

Job acknowledges that Bildad is right in saying that God is righteous (9:2, cf. 8:3),[59] yet he points out that God's supremacy is problematic for those who want to contend with Him (9:3-4). Job knows that God's power is matchless (9:5-10) and that He does not recede from His judgment (9:12-13): now how can he trust that such a powerful persecutor will turn into an impartial judge that is willing to grant him mercy (9:15)?[60]

Even though there is no way for Job to contest that he has been given misfortune (9:20), he refuses to give in. Like he already clarified in 6:4-10 (see § 1.1 above), he rather dies than that he repents for sins that he is not able to perceive (9:21).[61] Regarding

---

presented 'dust' as one's final destiny. By stating that וּמֵעָפָר אַחֵר יִצְמָחוּ "from the dust they will sprout out anew" (8:19) Bildad asserts that 'dust' is not necessarily the end of one's story. Job will return to this metaphor in 14:7; see § 3.3.3 below.

59 Cf. Yu (2011: 256): "Although Job 9.2a does not specify precisely what it is Job is affirming, we can infer from the use of the legal language in 9.2b that Job is responding to Bildad's portrayal of God as a fair judge (...)"; Seow (2013: 543): "Some interpreters, finding no common ground whatsoever between Job and Bildad, think that Job's words must be sarcastic or ironic. Yet the two do agree on some things, not least Bildad's overall view about the sovereignty of God (Saadiah)."

60 See also Yu's explanation of Job's rhetorical strategy in 9:1-20: "Repeating his tactic in refuting Eliphaz's argument, Job co-opts Bildad's legal metaphor and speaks as a person who is facing the practical problems of confronting God in a non-metaphorical trial. By making the metaphorical literal, Job reveals the absurdity of the legal metaphor as a theodicy for real human suffering. He begins, not by exposing God's conflict of interest as both judge and litigant, but by enumerating the insurmountable obstacles that a mortal would face in pursuing a case against God at a non-metaphorical trial" (Yu 2011: 258). Most translation take verse 15a as a relative clause with either Job or God as its referent. Against the background of Yu's explanation that Job here expounds on God's double role, I propose to understand 9:15a as the subject phrase of a nominal clause: "Will the one who I cannot answer even if I am righteous, become the judge that I must appeal to for mercy?"

61 In line with this interpretation of 6:4-10, I propose to understand 9:21bc as a conditional sentence in which Job states that his life would lose its value if he cannot trust his conscience: "(I am blameless;) if I do not know my soul, I reject my life." Most translations, however, take 21b as an assertive clause, for example NRSV: "I am blameless; I do not know myself; I loathe my life." For different interpretations of the assertive reading, see e.g. Seow (2013: 548), Habel (1985: 194), and Newsom (1996:

his current situation, Job can therefore only conclude that all is one and that God completes both the blameless and the wicked in the same manner (9:22). If God's whip—a metaphor for natural disaster—indeed sweeps away the innocent with the wicked, God does not recognize the efforts of the first (9:23),[62] and it is this state of affairs that presents Job with a contradiction. Job believes that the preservation of justice on earth does not depend on its implementation by earthly judges and that it is God who serves as its final judge, but if God indeed serves as the final guarantor of the righteous, then who is He that on the level of life and death He does not seem to function as a judge at all (9:24)?[63] How can it be maintained that God's judgment is the ultimate reason for humans to be righteous, if God destroys both the innocent and the guilty?

As Job starts to realize that his situation is part of a broader problem, he cannot simply shift his look toward the future and hope for restoration as suggested by Bildad (9:25-27, cf. 8:5-7). Job's suffering has now become a question of righteousness, and it is with this question that Job turns to God when he addresses Him for a second time in verses 28–31:

> I would fear all my sufferings if I knew that You would not declare me innocent; If I am indeed wicked, to what end do I toil in vain? If I washed myself in snow and cleansed my hands with lye, would You then dip me in the pit so that my clothes abhor me?[64]

412); on the idiomatic understanding of 21b in the sense of 'I do not care about myself', see Clines (1989: 237).

62 Cf. Mathewson (2006: 102): "Sudden death, reserved for the wicked according to Eliphaz (4:7-11), actually demonstrates the injustice of God."

63 Translations generally understand 9:24 as Job's accusation that God is responsible for the lack of justice on earth: "The earth is handed over to the wicked one; He covers the eyes of its judges. If it is not He, then who?" (JPS). In my view, Job does not accuse God (so also Clines (1989: 238)), but instead he struggles to understand God's role at the face of his notion of morality and his experience of the lack of justice in the world. I therefore propose to translate 9:24ab as a conditional question: "Is the earth given into the hand of the wicked when He covers the face of its judges (…)?"

64 Different from most translations, I interpret verses 28 and 29, like 30–31, as unmarked conditional sentences (cf. JM §167). While noting that the conditional interpretation of verse 29 is also found in the Vulgate and the Peshitta, Seow, however, argues for an indicative interpretation, precisely because "the conditional is marked in the immediate vicinity of the verse (vv. 27, 30)" (2013: 569).

In this second address to God, Job does not insist that He let him die, as he did in 7:11-21, but like Bildad suggested in 8:5, he seriously seeks God. Job shows that he still counts on God to acknowledge his righteousness, and because of this, Job states that—even if there is no impartial judge—he is willing to go to court with Him (9:32-35).[65]

Job can only imagine how a meeting with his litigant-judge would proceed. The first part of chapter 10 presents what he would say if he gave free way to the bitterness of his soul. His main ambition would be to get to know what he is charged with (10:2) or how God's dealings with the innocent and wicked should be understood (10:3). Job can imagine that the human eye may not see everything, but he trusts that God's eye will not fail (10:4); he can imagine that shortness of human life limits human knowledge and that humans may be tempted to explain suffering by searching for iniquity (10:5-6), but he expects of God that He already knows whether someone is righteous or not.[66] There is no authority beyond God (10:7), and therefore Job urges Him to take responsibility. Job trusts that God acts according to His righteousness, and therefore he cannot understand what is happening to him. What adds to his confusion is his understanding of the positive relation between God and man. God is involved in every aspect of human life (10:8-9) and God surely made man with care (10:10-12).

When Job in verse 13 reflects on what he imagined to say to God, he comes to the conclusion that even without spelling it out, God will take these things into account.[67] Job knows the principles of God's righteousness:

---

65 Cf. Clines (1989: 242): "Because he and God can never be disputants on the same footing (v 32), what Job needs is an arbitrator who can mediate between the two parties (v 33). But since no such arbitrator exists, Job is cast back on his own resources; he will have to argue his case with God single-handed." I agree with Greenstein that Job literally wants to go to court with God: "Although interpreters typically understand Job's lawsuit as a "metaphor," it is figurative only if one defines the legal process as a purely human affair. In the book of Job, the human hero regards his litigation with God as altogether real; he pursues it deliberately at the highest personal risk (e.g., Job 13:13-14)" (1996: 243).

66 Cf. Perdue (1991: 143): "With a strong measure of satire, Job asks if God has creaturely limitations that might explain the ruthless efforts to destroy an innocent man." In my view, the rhetorical questions in verses 4–6 do not serve as an accusation of God, but as a call upon Him to act according to His superhuman nature.

67 Job 10:13: "But these things (אֵלֶּה) you store your heart; I know that this (זֹאת) is with you." Most scholars understand אֵלֶּה 'these things' and זֹאת 'this' in verse 13 as referring to the words that follow in verse 14, namely that God stored in his heart that he would watch Job for wrongs. Cf. Perdue (1991: 145): "God's true motive in creating Job was to engage in a constant surveillance of his actions, to 'watch' for every fault and to use any real or imagined iniquity as the basis for punishment." So

> If I had sinned and you had watched me, you would not acquit me of my sin; If I were wicked, woe to me, but I am righteous, I do not lift my head; be satisfied[68] with dishonor and see my misery, or is it exalted that you hunt me like a lion,[69] so that you again show yourself as incomprehensible in me?
>
> Job 10:14-16

Job would not complain about his suffering if he were wicked, but he is righteous; as he has only now become convinced of the fact that God will in the end acknowledge this, it is in verse 15 for the first time that he appeals to God to see his present misery. Despite his restored trust in God's righteousness, Job still condemns his present situation: while Eliphaz presented Job's misfortune as punishment (cf. 5:16), and Bildad categorized it as collateral damage (cf. 8:18), Job in verse 16 cynically pictures it as 'exalted' behavior that serves to add to God's incomprehensibility. In verse 17, Job therefore asks for God's intentions:

> if you renew your witnesses before me to increase your vexation against me, are they replacements[70] or service (צָבָא, cf. 7:1) to me?[71]
>
> Job 10:17

---

also e.g. Clines (1989: 248), and Newsom (1996: 414). I propose instead that אֵלֶּה 'these things' and זֹאת 'this' refer to the event of God's careful creation of man as described in verses 8–12. Cf. JM §143b: "זה can refer to something already mentioned (Gn 2.4; 9.17,19)—anaphoric use—or to something that is about to be mentioned (5.1)—cataphoric use." On the anaphoric interpretation of verse 13, see also Gordis (1978: 114) and Andersen (1976: 166).

68 I understand שְׂבַע in line with רְאֵה as an imperative masculine singular, cf. Perdue (1991: 141) and Wolfers (1995: 329).

69 With e.g. Gordis (1978: 114–115), Habel (1985: 200), Newsom (1996: 415) and Seow I assume that Job refers to himself as a hunted lion. Cf. Seow: "As in lion hunts elsewhere in the ancient Near East, notably in Mesopotamia, the treatment of Job appears to be a spectacle of divine power." (Seow 2013: 582). See e.g. Hartley (1988: 189) and Clines (1989: 250) for the interpretation of God as a hunting lion. On lion metaphors, see (Strawn 2005).

70 Cf. Clines (1989: 222): "חליפה, lit. "exchange," in connection with צבא "hard service" or "military service," will most probably signify "release" from that service (as in 14:14)."

71 Most translations read verse 17 together with verse 16 as accusations of how God adds to Job's suffering, e.g. NRSV: "Bold as a lion you hunt me; you repeat your exploits against me. You renew your witnesses against me, and increase your vexation toward me; you bring fresh troops against me." I propose that after Job's sincere address of God in verse 15, verses 16–17 make better sense when they are understood as questions that appeal to God's responsibility.

Job still longs for death: now can he expect that those who come to testify against him foretell the end of his life, or are they yet another challenge that he must cope with to prove that he continues to be a loyal servant? Against the background of Job's questions on the inconsistency between his belief in God's righteousness and his experience of a lack of justice in the world, Job's thinking about his own future triggers a new perspective on the meaning of his current existence in verses 18–22.

2.2. *Job 10:18-22: Text and Translation*

After Job has imagined what he would say to God if he were to meet Him in court (10:3-12), and after he has called upon God to recognize his suffering and to acknowledge the unrighteousness thereof (10:13-17), Job ends his speech to God in 10:18-22 by confronting Him with the question that is now unsettling his understanding of the world:

Job 10:18-22

18 וְלָמָּה מֵרֶחֶם הֹצֵאתָנִי אֶגְוַע וְעַיִן לֹא־תִרְאֵנִי׃
19 כַּאֲשֶׁר לֹא־הָיִיתִי אֶהְיֶה מִבֶּטֶן לַקֶּבֶר אוּבָל׃
20 הֲלֹא־מְעַט יָמַי יֶחְדָּל וַחֲדָל יָשִׁית וְשִׁית מִמֶּנִּי וְאַבְלִיגָה מְעָט׃
21 בְּטֶרֶם אֵלֵךְ וְלֹא אָשׁוּב אֶל־אֶרֶץ חֹשֶׁךְ וְצַלְמָוֶת׃
22 אֶרֶץ עֵיפָתָה | כְּמוֹ אֹפֶל צַלְמָוֶת וְלֹא סְדָרִים וַתֹּפַע כְּמוֹ־אֹפֶל׃ פ

18 But why did You bring me forth from the womb?
I will expire while an eye does not see me;
19 I will be as though I have not been,
as though I am carried from belly to the grave.
20 Is it not the triviality of my life that comes to an end?
If one turns away from me, would I brighten up a little,[72]

72 In my translation of verse 20 I choose to follow the *kethib* and read יֶחְדָּל 'it will come to an end' and יָשִׁית 'one will turn away'. My translation of the *kethib* differs somewhat from the translations given by Driver and Gray (1921: 104): "Are not my days few? Let him cease, let him set from me that I may brighten up a little"—but note that the jussive of שִׁית is actually יָשֵׁת instead of יָשִׁית—and Dhorme 1967 [1926]: 154): "Will not my brief span of life come to an end? Now depart from me …"

> [21] before I go and do not return
> to the land of darkness and deep darkness?
> [22] The land of shining like dark gloom,
> of deep darkness and no order,
> it shines like dark gloom.[73]

Scholars have noted that verses 18–19 recall 3:11, where Job asked for the reason of his birth, and that verse 20 is reminiscent of 7:16.19 and 14:6, where Job ordered God to leave him alone. In chapter 10, Job still wants to die, but in contrast to chapter 3 it can be observed that his attitude toward death has become "decidedly negative" (Newsom 1996: 415).[74] As for the cause of Job's change of attitude, Newsom and Mathewson point to the introduction of the legal metaphor: "the ability to imagine a trial, even if it seems a practical impossibility, is enough to make Job no longer desire death" (Newsom 1996: 416).[75] I take this interpretation here as an argument to read *yiqtol* forms in verses 18–19 as and to follow the *kethib* reading of חדל 'to cease' and שית 'to put' in verse 20.

With reference to GKC §107n, the *yiqtol* forms of גוע 'to expire', היה 'to be', and יבל (*hophal*) 'to be brought' in verse 18b and verse 19 are commonly understood as expressing "a wish which is asserted subsequently with reference to a fixed point of time in the past."[76] While it is possible that Job in verses 18–19, as in chapter 3, presents his audience with an imaginary scenario that describes how he would not have existed, I propose that at this point in the dialogue, the verses make better sense when they are understood as a protest against the fact that he will die in such a futile condition. Unlike Bildad, Job does not trust that he will sprout out again like a tree.[77] That he will just die without having been judged according to his deeds, however,

---

73 Cf. Greenstein (2011: 193–194): "a land of shining like darkness, deep-darkness and amorphousness; it shines like darkness" and Seow (2013: 576): "A land whose flicker is as gloom, Pall and chaos, (A land) whose shining is as gloom."

74 See also Habel (1985: 201), Clines (1989: 251), and Mathewson (2006: 92).

75 Mathewson (2006: 105): "Significantly, at almost the exact moment that Job's conception of death seems to shift and Sheol begins to be conceived of negatively (10:18-22), Job employs the legal metaphor for the first time." Mathewson elaborates on this idea in chapter 4 "Shifting death and the legal metaphor" of his study *Death and Survival in the Book of Job: Desymbolization and Traumatic Experience*; see especially §4.3.

76 E.g. NRSV: "(…) Would that I had died before any eye had seen me, and were as though I had not been, carried from the womb to the grave" (Job 10:18-19). E.g. Kroeze (1961: 143), Fohrer (1963: 201), and Dhorme (1967 [1926]: 154).

77 Cf. 8:16-19; see also §3.3.3 on the tree metaphor in 14:7.

contradicts Job's belief in God's righteousness, and therefore he confronts God with the insignificance of his life at the moment of his soon-to-come death: what is the meaning of Job's life when in the end it will be 'as though he has not been, as though he were carried from belly to the grave' (10:19)?

Most translations and scholars read 10:20 as an echo of 7:16 and 7:19, and interpret it following the *qere* as a direct address of God: "My days are few, so desist (וַחֲדָל)! Leave me alone (וְשִׁית), let me be diverted a while" (JPS).[78] However, if verses 18–19 are not taken as a death wish but, on the contrary, as an existential question on the futility of Job's existence at the moment of death, it is hard to imagine how being left alone would lighten up Job's mood.[79] I therefore propose that verse 20 is not a request, but a rhetorical question that invites the audience to confirm that Job finds himself in a dead-end situation: "Is it not the triviality of my life that comes to an end (יֶחְדָּל)? If one turns away (יָשִׁית) from me, would I brighten up a little, (before I go and not return ...)." Now that Job's life is ending in an unfortunate way and people are turning away from him, what reason is there to keep his spirits up? What can one hope for when it is no longer self-evident that "bodily existence in historical circumstances" is "the proper locus of the vindication of God and the fulfilment of man?" (Andersen 1976: 168).[80]

2.3. *Metaphors in Job 10:18-22*

Job has adopted Bildad's advice to take God's righteousness seriously, but once he has restored his belief in justification, he can no longer reconcile himself with death. I hold that Job 10:18-22 shows that Job's experience of the incongruity between the trust in God and the harsh reality of his situation has changed his understanding of suffering. The following paragraphs bring in view how the source domains of

78 E.g. Habel (1985: 181), Clines (1989: 222–223), and van der Lugt (1995: 125).

79 According to Clines, ""Cheer" he cannot induce in himself because he knows his divine enemy is brooding over him (9:27, בלג as here); it is only God's absence that would cheer him. The mood is the same as in 7:16" (1989: 251). For similar views see e.g. Hartley (1988: 191) and Seow (2013: 584). I propose, however, that Job's mood has changed since chapter 7, and that since chapter 9 his problem is no longer God's presence and attention, but God's apparent absence and indifference in His role as judge.

80 I have only borrowed Andersen's wording; Andersen actually uses the phrases to explicate the view that underlies Job's desire for 'a little comfort': "His preference for a little comfort (20b) in this life points back to bodily existence in historical circumstances as the proper locus of the vindication of God and the fulfilment of man."

visibility (10:18), existence (10:19) and light and darkness (10:20–22) establish a new conceptualization of Job's state of affairs.

2.3.1. Visibility (10:18)

Job introduces the source domain of visibility in 10:18 to motivate his question on the reason of his existence: וְלָמָּה מֵרֶחֶם הוֹצֵאתָנִי אֶגְוַע וְעַיִן לֹא־תִרְאֵנִי "But why did You bring me forth from the womb? I will expire while an eye does not see me." While the noun עַיִן 'eye' and the verb ראה 'to see' evoke the source domain of visibility, the clause וְעַיִן לֹא־תִרְאֵנִי "and an eye does not see me" has Job as its topic and specifies that the metaphor concerns his being invisible.[81] The source domain is neither linguistically signaled, nor extended beyond the clause, but as the concept of invisibility is elaborated on by the concept of nonexistence in verse 19 (see § 2.3.2 below), I consider it here as being deliberately used to conceptualize Job's experience that he is not given recognition.

BEING RECOGNIZED IS BEING SEEN[82]
being invisible is not being recognized, being overlooked

In everyday life, people generally want to be seen. If one's presence is not noted or if one's voice is not heard, one may feel as if one is overlooked or considered invisible.[83] By stating that he will be considered invisible, Job pictures his fear that he will not be recognized and appreciated. His apparent invisibility at the end of his life contradicts with his trust in God. If it was God who brought him into life, how can it be explained

81 It must be recognized that my translation here implies that Job in 18b complains of the fact that he is currently not being seen and that he wishes that one would see him. See also my translation and remarks in § 2.2 above. In translations in which Job wishes in 18b that nobody would have seen him, the opposite is implied, namely that Job complains on the fact that he is currently being seen.

82 The source domains of SEEING and RECOGNIZING are both contiguous and similar. In chapter 1, § 2.2.4, I referred to Steen's proposal to understand similarity and contiguity as two independent scales. While verse 18 could suggest that Job is simply stating that he is not recognized, verse 19 elaborates on Job's invisibility and explicitly signals the hypothetical nature thereof: "I will be as though (כאשר) I have not been." I therefore take the scale of similarity as more prominent: by picturing himself *as if* he is considered invisible, he points out the problem that his current situation causes that he is looked at *as if* he is no longer a person that should be taken into account.

83 This is not to say that in special circumstances, one would rather be temporary invisible, for example, when onerous tasks need to be done. In this line it can be explained that Job had rather remained invisible than that he came into existence in chapter 3, and that he rather remained invisible than in the center of God's attention in chapter 7.

that God allows his life to end without acknowledging all the efforts he made? What is the meaning of life and righteousness, when eventually nothing thereof is appreciated by either God or men?

While overhearing Job's address to God, the friends and the audience will understand that Job does not accept Bildad's view that he can still be restored from his current very minimal condition (cf. 8:7).[84] Job is convinced that he will die, but whereas he previously resigned to this fate, he now protests that he is not given recognition for the life that he has lived when he dies with a damaged body and without leaving anyone or anything behind. If the friends and the audience are willing to consider the scenario in which Job, despite his righteousness, dies in his current condition, they must acknowledge that this presents questions for one's appraisal of life. What indeed is the meaning of life if one may not be recognized and if all may result in nothing? How is the possibility of such a scenario compatible with the belief in the righteousness of God? And what then is the use in living a good life?[85]

2.3.2. Existence (10:19)

Job fears that he will depart without being seen. In verse 19, the theme of visibility is elaborated on with the theme of existence: כַּאֲשֶׁר לֹא־הָיִיתִי אֶהְיֶה מִבֶּטֶן לַקֶּבֶר אוּבָל "I will be as though I have not been, as though I am carried from belly to the grave." The source domain of existence is evoked by both the verb היה 'to be' (2x), and by the phrase מִבֶּטֶן לַקֶּבֶר 'from belly to the grave'. That the metaphor more specifically concerns Job's nonexistence appears from the phrases כַּאֲשֶׁר לֹא־הָיִיתִי אֶהְיֶה "I will be as though I have not been" and מִבֶּטֶן לַקֶּבֶר אוּבָל "(I will be as though) I am carried from the belly to the grave" that both assert that Job's life has not come into being. Because the comparison is marked by the compound preposition כַּאֲשֶׁר 'as though' and because it is extended beyond the clause, the source domain of nonexistence is signaled as deliberately used.

84 Cf. Yu (2011: 265): "In the context of the larger narrative, Job's riposte to Bildad continues the pattern the author has established by the Eliphaz-Job skirmish, the presentation of a conventional sapiential explanation for suffering followed by its refutation." Different from Yu who asserts that Job rejects "Bildad's conventional legal metaphor of righteous divine judgeship," (2011: 265) I hold that Job exactly confirms the metaphor of God as judge, but that he dismisses Bildad's conceptualization of man as one who like a plant can be restored from nothing.

85 In my view, it is at this point that Job arrives at the question with which the Adversary challenged God in 1:9: is Job indeed willing to hold on to his loyalty to God when he finds out that his perfect conduct may have been for nought?

Significance is Existence
being nonexistent is being insignificant, unsuccessful

In verse 19, the concept of nonexistence serves to explain why Job asserts that he is considered invisible: Job cannot be seen by an eye, because it is as though he has not been and as though he has not come into existence. Elaborating on the idea of Job's being invisible, the concept of being nonexistent literally brings in view why Job cannot be seen, but at the same time, it conceptualizes Job as an inexistent, that is, an insignificant being. Job compares his current state to the state in which he came out of the belly and complains is that he sees no development, no progression, no advancement. At the end of his life, it will be as if life did not bring Job anything.[86] With the concept of nonexistence, Job protests against the fact that his current condition makes it impossible for him to be recognized by his community both at this moment and after his death.[87] If Job dies without leaving anyone or anything behind, there will be nothing that can testify of his righteousness; his fate cannot be distinguished from the fate of the wicked, and his name will not be remembered.

It is difficult to accept that the righteous are swept away without judgment, but it is even more problematic when they are swept away at a moment that they are stripped from everything that they had accomplished during their life. The theme of insignificance presents the friends and the audience with another thorny issue that is overlooked by the hopeful perspectives offered so far. Given that they take one more step into the scenario that despite of his righteousness, Job dies in his current condition, how would that make them to reconsider their view on Job? Who will still believe that he is righteous? And that his community will remember him as a righteous one?

---

86 Note that Job expressed a similar thought in 1:21 "And he said: 'naked I came from my mother's womb, and naked I will return there; the Lord gave and the Lord has taken away; blessed be the name of the Lord.'" While in the prologue, the nakedness metaphor allowed Job to resign to his fate, I propose that it is here, by reflecting on the implications thereof, that Job realizes that being insignificant is actually problematic for his recognition after death.

87 With the similar wording לא היו היו "they have become as if they had never existed" the issue of the lack of recognition after death is also expressed in Sir 44:9: ויש מהם אשר אין לו זכר וישבתו כאשר שבתו כאשר לא היו היו ובניהם מאחריהם "But among them were those of whom there is no remembrance, and they perished whenever they perished. They have become as if they had never existed, they and their children after them" (translation of Jeremy Corley (2008: 169)).

2.3.3. Light and Darkness (10:20–22)

After Job has presented the issue of lack of recognition in terms of invisibility and nonexistence, he concludes that there is no reason for him to brighten up with only an encompassing darkness ahead of him. The source domain of light and darkness extends over verses 20–22: הֲלֹא־מְעַט יָמַי יֶחְדָּל וְחֲדַל יָשִׁית מִמֶּנִּי וְאַבְלִיגָה מְעָט: בְּטֶרֶם אֵלֵךְ וְלֹא אָשׁוּב אֶל־אֶרֶץ חֹשֶׁךְ וְצַלְמָוֶת: אֶרֶץ עֵיפָתָה כְּמוֹ אֹפֶל צַלְמָוֶת וְלֹא סְדָרִים וַתִּפַע כְּמוֹ־אֹפֶל "Is it not trivial life come to an end? If one turns away from me, will I brighten up a little, before I go and not return to the land of darkness and deep darkness? The land of shining like dark gloom, of deep darkness and no order, it shines like dark gloom." The terms that refer to light and darkness are בלג 'brighten up' (v. 20),[88] חֹשֶׁךְ 'darkness' (v. 21), צַלְמָוֶת 'deep darkness' (v. 21–22), עֵיפָתָה 'shining' (v. 22),[89] אֹפֶל 'dark gloom' (v. 22, 2x), and יפע 'to shine forth'. The source domain of light and darkness extends over several clauses and is referred to by different terms some of which are also repeated; as such, it can be taken as deliberately used. In these verses, it is used to conceptualize both Job's mood and his evaluation of death.

HAPPY IS LIGHT
not brighten up is not being happy, not adopting a more positive attitude

DEATH IS A PLACE OF DARKNESS
death is a place of sleep, rest, and old age
death is a negative place, a place where unsettled questions are obscured

DEATH IS A PLACE OF LIGHT
death is a positive place, a place that has shiny aspects

With a rhetorical question, Job states that he is not planning to brighten up.[90] The HAPPY IS LIGHT metaphor is a conventional metaphor in which the concept of light expresses that the emotion involved is evaluated as something positive.[91] The concept

88 The verb בלג 'to brighten up, to be cheerful' has been related to the Arabic root بلج (blj) 'to shine, to dawn (morning, aurora); to be happy, be glad' (cf. NIDOTTE (Grisanti 1997a: 660); Wehr (1976: 71)). Besides Job 10:20, it also occurs in Job 9:27, Psa 29:14, and Amos 5:9.

89 On עֵיפָתָה 'shining' as a derivative of עיף 'to shine', cf. Ginsberg (1958: *61–*65) and Seow (2013: 593–594); on the ָה-ending, cf. GKC §90g. See also Gordis (1978: 115).

90 On this interpretation of verse 20, see also §2.2.

91 In his study on the concept of light in the Old Testament, Reece categorizes the light metaphors that are used to denote "an attitude of mind" within the category of LIGHT IS SUCCESS metaphors (Reece

of light is not specifically used to express the positive evaluation of emotions, but as Kövecses notes: "Good things in general (like life) are metaphorically UP, LIGHT, WARM, and VALUABLE, while bad things (like death) are DOWN, DARK, COLD, and maybe also NONVALUABLE" (Kövecses 2008: 44). Saying that one will not brighten up is a very general manner of expressing that one's mood will not become more positive. Even though the metaphor is common, it appears from the extension of the source domain of light and darkness into the following verses that it is deliberately chosen.

Job's statement that he will not brighten up is an upbeat for his depiction of death as a land of darkness. In the latter conceptualization two metaphors are combined, namely STATES ARE LOCATIONS, and DEATH IS DARKNESS. In the discussion on the LIFE IS LIGHT metaphor in §1.3.1 in chapter 3, I already mentioned Reece's proposal that the conceptualization of death as darkness has its origin in the associated experience of darkness and sleep, darkness and the end of daytime activity, and finally darkness and old age. When death is conceptualized as darkness, death is—depending of the context—pictured as involving unconsciousness, inactivity, and lack of sight. Although these states commonly evoke negative associations, Job imagined in chapter 3 that they would allow him to escape his suffering, and therefore, he evaluated darkness as something positive. Here in chapter 10, however, Job's attitude toward death has changed. Now that he has come to think that a righteous God should somehow recognize human righteousness, there is a problem in being invisible and nonexistent at the moment of death, because death means an irrevocable departure into darkness that definitively leaves the question of recognition unsettled. In my view, Job does not protest against the darkness of death in that it involves that he will be unconscious, inactive or unable to see, but instead, against the fact that it makes his remembrance and his protest against the lack of God's recognition to silently disappear from the scene.

After death is conceptualized in verse 21 as a land of darkness, it is conceptualized in verse 22 as a land of light. Death is the land 'of shining like dark gloom (of deep darkness and no order)' and the land that 'shines like dark gloom'. The root עיף

1989: 132). On the mapping between LIGHT and SUCCESS, Reece comments: "the distance between vehicle and tenor is so great, no logical or experiential justification can bring them together. It is as though the grounding has been lost because of cultural or perceptual shifts. So to say, the Ancients could see the relatedness of light and success but not so the moderns. Whatever the tie, the metaphoric use of light to describe both positive mental attitudes and circumstances of prosperity became extremely common" (Reece 1989: 134).

that underlies עֵיפָתָה 'shining' refers to the glimmering of daybreak.[92] The verb יפע (hifil) 'to shine, cause to shine' denotes the shining of a light source or the shining appearance of God.[93] The common positive interpretation of shining light is here, however, modified by its conceptualization in terms of dark gloom. According to Job, the 'shiny' aspects of *Sheol* are actually instances of the category of darkness: death may offer rest after service, it may be the preordained destination for a dead-end life and it may allow him to escape God's attention, but eventually, the benefits of death all lead to the erasure of Job's name from history and the covering up of his protest. Death does not shine like a new day; what Job earlier thought of as death's brilliance he now understands to be as blinding as dark gloom.

While Job in verses 20–22 expounds before God why he cannot change his current mood, he overloads his friends and audience with disorienting metaphors of light and darkness.[94] Job had been playing with the default interpretation of light as something positive and darkness of something negative when he stated in chapter 3 that he suffered from the former and longed for the latter. In verses 20–22, however, Job holds on to the positive interpretation of light and to the negative interpretation of darkness, but he adds to the sense of disorientation, firstly, by using the same source domain to conceptualize both his mood and his evaluation of death, and secondly, by conceptualizing death in terms of light which in turn is conceptualized in terms of darkness. Whether or not one is able to keep up with Job's chain of conceptualizations, at the end of chapter 10 it will be clear that for Job, there is light in neither life nor death, that he has no hope at all, and that he feels confronted with an encompassing darkness. To comfort Job and to offer him an alternative perspective, the friends and audience are urged to consider whether they agree that death is an all consuming cover-up, and if so, whether Job is right in considering that as problematic.

2.3.4. Departure (10:21)

In verses 20–22, Job's conceptualization of death is dominated by the source domain of light and darkness, but in verse 21, this source domain is joined by the source

92 Cf. Ginsberg (1958: 64*r), Gordis (1978: 115–116) and Seow (2013: 593).

93 Cf. Job 3:4 and 37:15 for יפע with a light source as subject, and Deut 33:2, Psa 50:2, 80:2, 94:1, and Job 10:3 for יפע with God as subject.

94 Greenstein cites Job 10:22 as an example of 'tactical difficulty' which involves that "the poet takes an ordinary usage and makes it strange for the purpose of defamiliarization—shaking the reader out of one's expectations or routine" (Greenstein 2011: 193).

domain of departure: בְּטֶרֶם אֵלֵךְ וְלֹא אָשׁוּב אֶל־אֶרֶץ חֹשֶׁךְ וְצַלְמָוֶת: אֶרֶץ עֵיפָתָה כְּמוֹ אֹפֶל צַלְמָוֶת וְלֹא סְדָרִים וַתּוֹפַע כְּמוֹ־אֹפֶל "Before I go and not return to the land of darkness and deep darkness? The land of shining like dark gloom, of deep darkness and no order, it shines like dark gloom." Whereas the verbs הלך 'to go' and שוב 'to return' and the prepositional phrase אֶל־אֶרֶץ 'to the land' conceptualize death in terms of travelling, the phrase וְלֹא אָשׁוּב specifies death as a journey that definitively leads away. Although the source domain of departure is not extended, the use of the contrastive word pair הלך 'to go' and שוב 'to return' within one single clause marks the DEATH IS DEPARTURE metaphor as deliberately used.

DEATH IS DEPARTURE
death allows no return

In verse 21, the specific characteristic of death as departure focused on is that it allows no return.[95] Job highlights this particular aspect because it is the irreversibility of death—combined with the consuming force of its darkness—that he regards as a problem for the question of recognition.[96] Once Job enters into the sphere of death, his fate is determined and it cannot be reconsidered thereafter. If Job dies in his current state, he foresees that the question of his righteousness will forever remain unresolved.

With the argument of death as a land of no return, Job stresses the urgency of his case. He expects to die soon, and if God does not confirm his righteousness before he dies, he will be gone forever. In verses 18–22, Job addresses God, but his appeal may also urge the friends and the audience to reflect on their own position vis-à-vis the question concerned. Job protests against God's lack of recognition, but where do the friends and audience stand in this question? Do they believe that Job is innocent, and if so, do they dare to testify for Job and will they continue to do so, even if God does not change his attitude and Job indeed dies?[97]

---

95 Cf. Lakoff (1989: 11): "death is actually understood as a particular kind of departure, namely, a departure which is one way, with no return (…)."

96 Note that the idea of the irreversibility of death also occurred in 7:9-10, but there Job was conceptualizing the impossibility of his physical restoration to reject Eliphaz's assertion that there is a long life ahead of him (see §1.3.5).

97 While the question of recognition is here brought before God, Job will come to elaborate on the friends' role in recognizing him in 17:6-16 and 19:26-29 (see chapter 5), and on the audience's role in recognizing him in chapters 29–31 (see chapter 6).

2.4. *The Conceptualization of Suffering as a Lack of Hope—Part II*

In 10:18-22, death cannot comfort Job anymore. Job is still convinced that he will soon die, but he does no longer accept his death in the acquiescent manner that he demonstrated in 1:21 and 7:1-11. Instead of picturing decay and death as matters that come with mortality, Job laments his current state. When he says that he feels like he is invisible and inexistent and that he will leave for death as a place of darkness, he does not use these metaphors with counterintuitive positive associations as he did in chapters 3 and 7. The expectation that he will die with a damaged body and without leaving anyone or anything behind that can testify of his righteousness, makes him feel unrecognized and worthless, and the realization that death will put an end to his name and that it will leave both the question of his righteousness and the question of the meaning of morality undecided, outweighs the positive effects of death that he was longing for in his earlier speeches. Job's protest has shifted its focus: instead of being directed against the postponement of death, it now denounces the consequences of dying in a state in which he is not recognized.

Job's new understanding of his situation again affects his conceptualization of suffering. In chapter 7, when Job longed for death as the appropriate and inevitable conclusion of his present state and when he was waiting for his postponed death, he suffered from the experience that his life was nothing more than biding his time. In chapters 9–10, however, Job has re-established his belief in the righteousness of God. This hope allows him to adopt a more constructive attitude and to seriously approach God, but the introduction of the idea of a court setting with God as a righteous judge also made that Job can no longer consider death as a hidden treasure or an appropriate conclusion of his situation. In my view, it is only now that Job starts to suffer from the unrighteousness of the misfortune that he is given.[98] As Job is not yet able to turn his belief in God's righteousness into an hopeful perspective in life or death, he can only stand by helplessly while he waits for his death to confirm God's unjust judgment and to relegate his name and the question of human morality into oblivion. In my view, the main source of Job's suffering at this point is that there is no single hopeful perspective that can offer him consolation.[99]

---

98 It may seem quite straightforward that Job suffers from the idea that his misfortune is unjust. Note, however, that I hold that Job specifically suffers from the unrighteousness of his misfortune in the perspective of his approaching death. Dying without recognition is problematic, and therefore death is no longer a desirable option.

99 Although it has been remarked by several commentators that Job's picture of death here is more

3. The Conceptualization of Suffering in Job 14:4-12

The incompatibility of his belief in God's righteousness and the harsh reality of his condition have resulted in a temporal vacuum of meaningful perspectives. When Job in chapter 13 actually begins his case against God, it appears in 14:4-12 that it is no longer his personal lack of hope, but the lack of hope for mankind in general that has moved into the center of his attention. To explain this development, I firstly describe the main exchange of arguments in the last part of the first speech cycle. Next, I discuss the text of 14:4-12 and the metaphors that Job uses to conceptualize his situation.

3.1. *Job 14:4-12 in the Context of Job 11–15:16*

Job 11 Now that Job has adopted Bildad's advice to take God's righteousness seriously, and now that he no longer longs for darkness, it may seem as if Job again begins to find some more common ground with his friends. Zophar, however, does not empathize with Job's despair. He immediately points out the weakness of Job's reasoning, namely that it assumes that Job is able to know that he is innocent (11:4).[100] Job himself has acknowledged that humans are fallible (cf. 10:3-6), so how can Job be so sure that he does not deserve his fate? In reaction to Job's wish to appear before God to find proper judgment, Zophar goes along with imagining a meeting between Job and God. Instead of choosing Job's side, however, Zophar presents the case from God's perspective. If God were to meet Job in court, God would show Job that his self-knowledge is incomplete: if God were to reveal the things that Job was unaware of,

---

negative than before in chapters 3 and 7, 10:18-19 is commonly read as a death wish (cf. §2.2 above). As I propose that 10:18-19 are better understood as a lament on his current miserable state, I hold that Job no longer sets his hopes on death, and that this is precisely the reason that the main source of Job's suffering in 10:18-22 is a complete lack of hope.

100 Whereas Eliphaz speculated on human fallibility to uphold Job's righteousness, Zophar infers Job's guilt by combining the belief that God is righteous with the belief that God has knowledge that cannot be fathomed by humans. Yu (2011: 273) notes with Clines (1989: 258) and Newsom (1996: 418) that Zophar is the first friend that explicitly states that Job has sinned. I agree that Zophar wants Job to accept that he is punished for wrong behavior, but in my view, Zophar's main argument concerns the question of knowledge, and his main aim is to convince Job that he cannot actually know whether he is innocent. Cf. Seow (2013: 607): "To Zophar, Job has been much too sure he is innocent and does not deserve suffering. Job thinks he can be proven right, if only he were given his day in court. To Zophar, however, such a view of God does not sufficiently acknowledge divine transcendence."

Job would certainly recognize that God has already done him a favor by forgetting some of his iniquity (11:5-6). Zophar thus implies that Job should take into account that there is knowledge that exceeds his human capacity and that he should consent that a meeting with God may not have the outcome that he imagined.

Whereas Job was assuming that God would put him in the right, Zophar asserts that Job is not in the capacity to understand God's reasoning (11:7-9). If Job agrees that before God his knowledge falls short, he should admit that he better gives up his attempt to understand God's actions. Job must simply accept his fate, because he knows that God possesses supreme knowledge. If God imprisons, or if he assembles for judgment, He does so, because He knows that iniquity is done (11:11). Compared to God who knows everything, man is empty and hollow: 'the colt of a wild ass'[101] will only become intelligent when he is 'born a man' (11:12), that is, when he overcomes his natural instincts and enters the process of civilization.[102]

As Zophar is convinced that the knowledge of humans is insignificant and that it is inevitable that God's actions are beyond them, Zophar can only advice Job to direct his heart and stretch out his hands to God (11:13).[103] Once Job has re-established himself as solid and unafraid (11:15), he will decide to forget his misery[104] and to remember his suffering as water that has passed away (11:16).[105] Heavy weather may seem destructive when one is in the middle of it, but it can be looked back on as having washed away the dirt and fertilized the land: because the world shines at its best when the water has left (11:17), Job will not remember his misery with anger or frustration. Zophar is

101 With Driver and Gray I understand עיר פרא as an apposition, with "עיר denoting the genus, and פרא the species" (1921: 2:71).

102 As Hartley remarks on Job 11:12: "The interpretation of this verse tends to polarize around two opposing views. Either the proverb teaches that the most stupid, obstinate person can be changed, or it affirms human incorrigibility" (Hartley 1988: 198); for different interpretations, see also Driver and Gray (1921: 2:70–71). With Driver and Gray I follow Rashi and ibn Ezra in interpreting the verse according to the first view. For my interpretation of this verse, see also chapter 6, § 2.1.

103 Zophar's strategy is similar to that of Bildad in Job 8: they both try to convince Job that his preoccupation with suffering and death is useless, and that the only thing he can actually do is changing his attitude.

104 Note that שכח 'to forget' is understood as being the result of a deliberate decision, cf. TWOT "Forgetting is not simply a psychological act of having a thought pass from one's consciousness, a temporary or permanent lapse of memory" (Hamilton 1980: 922). Job will decide to forget his suffering, like God has decided to forget some of Job's sin (cf. 11:6).

105 The metaphor of water that passes away is also used by Job in 6:15 to describe the treacherous behavior of the friends. Whereas Job understood the water as something positive and its passing away as negative, Zophar here uses the metaphor the other way around: once the water/trouble is gone, the world will shine anew.

convinced that the positive results that will go forth from Job's confrontation with trouble will outweigh his negative experience of it.

The problem of Job's lack of hope on restoration will be resolved when Job is prepared to look at the world with new eyes: when he decides to leave his trouble behind, he will regain trust that there is hope and he will be able to find rest (11:18-19). According to Zophar, it is the capability to shift away one's attention from misfortune that distinguishes the righteous from the wicked: "but the eyes of the wicked will fail; when refuge perishes from them, their hope is the exhalation of life" (11:20).[106]

Job 12–14 By introducing the theme of wisdom, Zophar casted doubt on Job's innocence and especially on his knowledge thereof. The most obvious thing for Job to do is to turn the tables: if Zophar claims that Job's knowledge falls short, then what about Zophar's own knowledge? How can Zophar know better, or anyone else for that matter, if the reasoning of all humans is subjected to the same limits as Job's?[107] As Job points out to his friends: "I have an understanding as you have, I am not inferior to you, and whoever is not like these?" (12:3). To prove that he indeed knows what his friends know, Job shows that he can predict their reasoning namely, that on the one hand they consider Job as a joke, and that they look at his ruin with contempt, because they believe misfortune 'is ready for the ones who slip their feet' (12:4-5), while on the other hand, they accept an apparent lack of punishment of the wicked (12:6) with the argument that everything is always part of God's plan (12:7-10).[108] According to the friends, every state of affairs reflects God's judgment. Because God knows whom He punishes, and because in the end, the wicked will not survive, the friends condemn any agitation about what appears to be wrong in the world.

---

106 Cf. Clines: "For Zophar in this speech, it is not death, not even premature death, not divine punishment, not physical illness that is the true punishment they endure. It is that, unlike the righteous man of vv 18–19, they lose confidence" (1989: 271).

107 Cf. Yu: "If God is a supreme sage whose dealings with human affairs is shrouded in mystery, impenetrable to human decipherment, then how can Zophar claim to know that Job's plight signifies that God has exercised mercy, exacting from Job less punishment than he deserves?" (Yu 2011: 276).

108 With e.g. Newsom (1996: 426–427) and Seow (2013: 621), I read verses 5–6 as Job's representation of the reasoning of the those who are not confronted with misfortune. Because of the occurrence of singular suffixes, verses 7–10 are generally recognized as "Job's ironic restatement of the Friends' injunction addressed to him (...)" (Gordis (1978: 137), see also Clines (1989: 292) and Newsom (1996: 427–428)).

To Job, the reasoning of the friends is wrong. Instead of making their own judgment, the friends ascribe what they do not understand to the unfathomable knowledge of God.[109] Job wants the friends to adopt a more critical attitude. Like the palate tastes the food, the friends must try the words that they are saying to Job (12:11).[110] They must try them for themselves, and not simply accept them because they have been handed down for generations (12:12).[111] Assuming that the friends will agree with him that in the end, God alone is the one who possesses the ultimate wisdom and strength (12:13), Job asks them to consider whether this involves that what is subjected to God's will, must go the way that God has set out (12:14-15). If the friends believe that God's omniscience and omnipotence entails that God determines everything, do they indeed conclude that God's subjects are denied their own choice or their own perspective, and that God's responsibility includes both the one who goes astray and the one who leads astray (12:16)?[112]

In verses 17–21, Job illustrates that such a view does not correspond to reality. To show that God cannot be made responsible for everything, Job gives the example of a society of which the elite is led away, and he asks: if the counselors and priests are brought down, does this indeed affect the critical faculty of judges and firmly seated? If the ones who are trusted are deprived of speech, does this indeed entail the elders lose their taste? While authorities are necessary to represent and maintain what is good and what is bad, their disappearance does not need to result in moral disorientation of the people.[113] Even if God were to take the authorities away, the

109 Job 12:11–13:2 is often understood as a "parodic performance of a wisdom discourse" (Newsom 1996: 428); see also Seow (2013: 625–628). I agree that Job adopts a certain manner of speaking to cast doubt on the manner of reasoning of his friends, but in my view, his main aim is to explore how he can escape destructive traditional thought schemes and how he can relate his belief in God's wisdom and control to his belief in man's free will and morality.

110 Compare the JUDGMENT IS TASTE metaphor in 6:4-7 (cf. §1.1 above). Like he tasted Eliphaz's account on unintentional sin and considered it tasteless, Job now asks the friends to taste their own argumentation and to consider the consequences thereof. See, however, Clines (1989: 295) and Van Hecke (2011a: 341–345) for interpretations of 12:11 as an alleged quotation of the friends.

111 With JPS and NRSV, I read 12:12 as a rhetorical question.

112 Cf. Wolfers: "At this point Job feels that he has proved conclusively that everything that happens on earth does so by the will and act of the Lord—a defin[i]tive statement of the omnipresence of God in history and a metaphysical rejection of free will" (Wolfers 1995: 101). I agree with Wolfers that Job asserts in verse 16 that God is omnipotent, but in my view, verses 17–21 and 22–25 show that Job precisely seeks to investigate how such an understanding of God relates to the possibility of free will.

113 Compare also 9:24 where Job asserted that the blinding of the judges must not hand over the land in the hands of the wicked, cf. §2.1 and n. 63 above.

people that are left behind would know what to do; their personal actions do not depend on what happens to their authorities. The going astray of authorities does not need to imply that the people's judgment is led astray.

Job concludes his reflection on the responsibility of God and the responsibility of man by pointing out that in this regard, the idea of hidden knowledge as presented by Zophar (cf. 11:7-9) runs the risk of making right what is wrong. If God indeed were to uncover deep things out of darkness, this would overshadow man's ability to discern between what is good and bad (12:22). As a result this God would be one who both makes great and destroys, and who takes away the sense of the leaders without offering them orientation so that they grope around in the dark (12:23-25). While Job believes that God controls everything, he refuses to believe that man is but a puppet on a string: he is convinced that man has the ability to know what is right and wrong, and therefore he rejects the idea of hidden knowledge that allows man to uncritically accept everything that comes on his way.

By taking over the theological manner of speaking of the friends, Job shows that he has heard and understood their reasoning, but that he rejects it as a too easy and dangerous solution. In the end, Zophar did not offer Job a conclusive argument that he should take into account, and therefore Job continues with the plan that he introduced in 9:32-35. After Job has tried once more to convince his friends that they should recognize that he speaks the truth and that they better keep silent if they only try to argue that what is wrong is right (13:4-12), he announces to them that he will go to court (13:13-17).

Job described in his previous speech how he imagined to speak to God from the bitterness of his soul (cf. 10:1-2, see § 2.1 above), but now he has truly prepared his case and actually starts it (13:18-22).[114] Job begins his plea with requesting God to disclose what he has done wrong and with suggesting that in view of his insignificant and transient state, it is futile that God would strive for persecution (13:23-28). After restating his view on the nature of man (14:1-3), Job appeals to God by wishing for the pure to be distinguished from the defiled (14:4)[115] and for him to be temporary concealed in *Sheol* (14:13). Job elaborates the first wish with a further explanation (14:5-6) and an exposition on the mortality of man (14:7-12), and the second with a description of how he would act if it came true (14:14-17). After Job has shortly

114 I follow Hartley (1988: 205), Van Hecke (2011a: 252–253), and Yu (2011: 275) in dividing this speech into an address to the friends (12:1–13:17) and an address to God (13:18–14:22).

115 On this interpretation of 14:4, see § 3.2 below.

opened up two hopeful scenarios, he concludes his plea with underlining God's responsibility in the matter of the lack of hope that is involved when humans die (14:18-22).

Job 15:1-16 In his response to Zophar, Job asked the friends to taste their advice and to reconsider whether this is what they would say if they imagine that they themselves would appear before God: would the friends dare to look God in the eye and say what they said to Job? In reaction to Job's rejection of their words, Eliphaz answers in chapter 15 with a reflection on his role of comforter. Even if he understands the point of Job's reasoning, he does not agree with it:

> Proving a reasoning is of no use, when it are words by which one cannot profit; furthermore you annul fear, and you restrain the prayer before God.[116]
>
> Job 15:3-4

Eliphaz does not trust Job's words (15:5-6), and he rejects them with the same reasoning that Job used to reject Zophar's words (cf. 12:3): neither the friends, nor Job can claim to know more than the other (15:7-9). After doing away with the claim to wisdom as a non-argument, Eliphaz urges Job to reconsider the value of tradition (15:10-11) and to adopt a more humble attitude (15:12-16), and thus he brings back the discussion to the same themes with which he started it in chapter 4.

3.2. *Job 14:4-12: Text and Translation*

When Job starts his case against God, his reflection on the temporary nature of man in general (14:1-3) motivates Job to present God with two wishes (14:4-12 and 14:13-17) that open up scenarios that would enable a less negative perspective on death. Especially in his first wish in verses 4–12 it becomes clear that Job has broadened his personal problem with recognition and death (cf. 10:18-22) into a question that concerns mankind in general.

---

116 Job 15:3 is often translated as a rhetorical question that serves to assert that Job does not behave as a wise one: "Should he [a wise one] argue with useless talk, With words that are of no worth?" (JPS). The verb הוֹכֵחַ, however, is an infinitive absolute, and therefore I propose to read it as the subject of a nominal clause (cf. GK §113b). In this reading, verse 3 presents a pragmatic perspective on the evaluation of arguments: even if there is truth in Job's words—but this one cannot know, cf. 15:7-9—they should be rejected because they are not constructive. As I show below in chapter 5, §3.1, Eliphaz elaborates on this pragmatic approach in 22:6-9.

Job 14:4-12

4 מִי־יִתֵּן טָהוֹר מִטָּמֵא לֹא אֶחָד׃
5 אִם חֲרוּצִים | יָמָיו מִסְפַּר־חֳדָשָׁיו אִתָּךְ חֻקָּו חָקַקְתָּ וְלֹא יַעֲבֹר׃
6 שְׁעֵה מֵעָלָיו וְיֶחְדָּל עַד־יִרְצֶה כְּשָׂכִיר יוֹמוֹ׃
7 כִּי יֵשׁ לָעֵץ תִּקְוָה אִם־יְכֻרַת וְעוֹד יַחֲלִיף וְיֹנַקְתּוֹ לֹא תֶחְדָּל׃
8 אִם־יַזְקִין בָּאָרֶץ שָׁרְשׁוֹ וּבֶעָפָר יָמוּת גִּזְעוֹ׃
9 מֵרֵיחַ מַיִם יַפְרִחַ וְעָשָׂה קָצִיר כִּנְטִיעָה׃
10 וְגֶבֶר יָמוּת וַיֶּחֱלָשׁ וַיִּגְוַע אָדָם וְאַיּוֹ׃
11 אָזְלוּ־מַיִם מִנִּי־יָם וְנָהָר יֶחֱרַב וְיָבֵשׁ׃
12 וְאִישׁ שָׁכַב וְלֹא־יָקוּם עַד־בְּלִתִּי שֲׁמַיִם לֹא יָקִיצוּ וְלֹא־יֵעֹרוּ מִשְׁנָתָם׃

4 O that the pure be distinguished from the defiled,
that it be not one!
5 Even if[117] his days are determined,
the number of his months is with you:
when You set his limit, he will not pass.
6 Look away from him so that he will cease,
so that he can accept as a hireling his day.
7 For there is hope for a tree:
if it is cut down it will renew, its shoots will not cease;
8 if its root grows old in the earth,
or if its stem dies in the dust,
9 at the scent of water it will bud,
and make branches as a plant,
10 but a man that dies is prostrate,
a mortal expires, and where is he?
11 Waters disappear from the sea,
and a river that dries up remains dry,
12 so a man lies down and does not rise,
until the heavens are no more they will not wake up,
nor will they be roused from their sleep.

117 On the concessive interpretation of אִם as 'even if, even though', cf. JM §171d.

In verses 4–12, the main difficulties concern the meaning of verse 4, the intent of verses 5–6, and the connection between verses 11–12. Verse 4 is commonly translated as "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean one? No one!" (JPS). In this sense, the verse is explained as referring to the impossibility for man to be morally perfect.[118] While this assertion does not seem self-evident in Job's mouth,[119] it must be noted that the expression מִי יִתֵּן in all its other occurrences in the Book of Job and in the Hebrew Bible is not translated as a literal question ('who will give?') but as an exclamatory question that serves to expresses a wish ('o would that', 'if only').[120] Recognizing the illocutionary function of מִי יִתֵּן, Clines interprets verse 4 as

> expressing a hopeless wish (…) that human nature could be otherwise, and that one example of a "pure being" (generally speaking) could be distinguished from the mass of the "impure" (…).
>
> Clines 1989: 326

In his translation "Who can make the unclean into the clean? No one!" (Clines 1989: 277), however, the desiderative force of verse 4 is lost when לֹא אֶחָד 'not one, no one' is understood as an answer to the preceding question. Because exclamatory questions are normally not followed by an answer, I argue with Wolfers that it is more likely that לֹא אֶחָד is in apposition with מִי יִתֵּן, and that verse 4 is better translated as "O that the pure be distinguished from the defiled, that it be not one!,"[121] the sense of the verse being that "Job wishes that God would show some discrimination between good and bad men" (Wolfers 1995: 479).[122]

The interpretation of verse 4 as a wish for a discrimination between the good and the bad allows that verses 5–6 are understood as Job's thoughts on what this would entail: it is a fact that the life of man is determined in the sense that it cannot be extended forever, but what Job asserts is that in the end, the number of one's months

---

118 E.g. Dhorme (1967 [1926]: 196), Habel (1985: 240), and Clines (1989: 326).

119 See Job 4:17 where Eliphaz introduced the idea of the moral imperfection as an explanation for inexplicable suffering, and Job 6:4-7, where Job rejected this proposal as tasteless (see §1.1 above).

120 So also Seow (2013: 684). On מִי יִתֵּן as an exclamatory question that expresses a wish, see JM §163d and GKC §151b.

121 Cf. Wolfers (1995: 334): "Would that the pure were distinguished from the defiled! Not blent!" For an alternative understanding of לֹא אֶחָד as 'not one', see Seow (2013: 684).

122 Cf. Job 9:22: "It is all one I therefore say, He finishes the blameless and the wicked." Job came to the conclusion that God does not discriminate between good and bad as he recognized that righteousness does not protect one from suffering or dying an accidental death (see §2.1 above).

is in God's hands, so that God may decide to change it and set the limit that one cannot pass (14:5). Job's request to God to "look away from him [i.e. man in general] so that he will cease, so that he can accept as hireling his day" (14:6) therefore aims at establishing God's recognition of man's moral record by asking for God's active role in determining the moment of one's death.[123] The death of the righteous should not be at the mercy of an arbitrary determination of one's days, but instead, the pure should be granted a death at a point that they may look at their life with resignation and with the feeling that their state of service is being recognized.[124]

In the tree comparison in verses 7–10 is becomes clear why Job wishes that God recognizes the efforts of the righteous by using his capacity to provide a proper moment of death. Unlike a tree, man cannot be restored from death. Exactly because death is irreversible, it is necessary that acknowledgment is given before the moment of death. If man were like a tree, he could hope for a second chance or for a change of fortunes, but as this is not the case, man can only comfort himself with what that he leaves behind at the moment of his death. After verses 7–10, verses 11–12 are often understood as a second comparison: "The waters of the sea fail, And the river dries up and is parched. So man lies down never to rise (…)" (JPS). It has repeatedly been pointed out that the comparison cannot be between the sea and river on the one hand, and man on the other, because vast bodies of water are unlikely to disappear, while man is destined to sleep an eternal sleep.[125] If man is not compared to a sea or a river, another possibility is that the irreversibility of man's death is compared to the irreversibility of the evaporation of water,[126] but more often, it has been proposed that the running

123 With Wolfers (1995: 398) and Seow (2013: 686), I hold that וְיַחְדָּל 'that he may cease' in 14:6 can be taken in the sense of 'ceasing to be, coming to an end', i.e., 'passing away', cf. BDB 293.1 1. Note that חדל in the same sense is found in 14:7. As it is mostly thought that this sense does not fit the context, it has been proposed to read 14:6 in line with 7:16 and 10:20 (*qere*), and to emend the *yiqtol* וְיַחְדָּל so that it is read as the imperative וַחְדָל 'and cease!' (e.g. Dhorme (1967 [1926]: 197–198), Gordis (1978: 148), Pope ([3]1973: 107), Hartley (1988: 230) and Clines (1989: 277). Alternatively, ויחדל has been understood in the sense of 'cease from being troubled' (cf. 14:1), i.e. 'that he may rest' (so e.g. JPS (1917), NBG, SVV). With regard to the latter suggestion it must be noted that in 3:17, Job used the image of the wicked that 'cease from troubling' (חָדְלוּ רֹגֶז) to picture the state of rest that is found in *Sheol*, cf. NIDOTTE (Hill 1997: 26); it can therefore be questioned whether a cessation of trouble indeed refers to a state of rest during life on earth.

124 On this interpretation of the LIFE IS SERVICE metaphor, see §3.3.2 below; on this metaphor, see also §3.1.1 above.

125 E.g. Dhorme (1967 [1926]: 200), Horst (1968: 209), Hartley (1988: 234) and Clines (1989: 329); Habel (1985: 241), however, reads 14:11 as quoting Isa 19:5, and as such, he does not consider it as a problem that the disappearance of sea and rivers is not a very common event.

126 E.g. Gordis (1978: 149) and Clines (1989: 329).

dry of substantial waters is pictured to underline the even greater improbability of man waking up from death.[127]

Even if these latter interpretations are imaginable, I argue for an alternative explanation that takes a starting point in the meaning of water as it was pictured in the comparison in verses 7–10. In the tree metaphor, water represents the source of life that enables the tree to revive and humans to be restored. If the availability of water pictures the promise of life, its counterpart, that is, the lack of water, represents the risk of death. I therefore suggest, like Gordis and Clines, that the comparison is not between man, on the hand, and the sea and the river, on the other hand, but that the similarity concerns the disappearance of water. However, whereas Gordis and Clines explain that the drying up of water pictures the irreversibility of death, I propose that it represents death as the result of God's intervention (see §3.3.4 below). With this understanding of the water metaphor I choose to read verses 11–12 as a comparison in which God's active role in the drying up of waters is mapped to the event of man's death.[128]

3.3. *Metaphors in Job 14:4-12*

After Job has rejected the friends' stoic attitude by arguing that man is expected to take responsibility for his own decisions, Job takes his personal issue with the lack of recognition to a higher level. It is not just Job's personal righteousness, but human morality as such that is at stake when God does not recognize one's efforts at the face of death.[129] To show how Job in 14:4-12 pictures the lack of hope

127 E.g. Dhorme (*1967* [*1926*]: 200), Horst (*1968*: 209) and Hartley (*1988*: 234). For a more elaborate argumentation on this position, see Van Hecke (2011a: 206–210).

128 Van Hecke (2011a: 206–208) argues that the *waw* at the beginning of verse 12a should not be understood as a *waw* of comparison (cf. GKC §161a, JM §174h), firstly, because the meaning of the comparison is problematic, and secondly, because 11a has no fronted constituent and thus displays another syntactic structure than 12a . In my view, however, the meaning of the comparison is not a problem if it is taken as a comparison between events. Precisely the position of מַיִם after the verb can be taken as a signal that it does not function as a comparative or contrastive topic. Note also that 11b is syntactically parallel to 12a.

129 Cf. Job 14:3: "It is also on this one [i.e. mortals in general] that you open your eyes, when you bring me into judgment with you." Whereas this verse is often understood as a rhetorical question that underlines the absurdity of God's attention for man who is transient (cf. 7:17, e.g. Clines (*1989*: 325)), I propose that Job rather intends to point out that God's dealings with him cannot be dissociated from God's dealing with mortals in general.

that concerns mankind in general, I discuss in the following paragraphs the source domains of boundary (14:5), service (14:6), tree (14:7–9), water (14:11–12), and sleep (14:12).

3.3.1. Boundary (14:5)

When Job begins to explain what he envisions by his wish that the pure are distinguished from the impure (14:4), he introduces in verse 5 the source domain of boundaries: אִם חֲרוּצִים יָמָיו מִסְפַּר־חֳדָשָׁיו אִתָּךְ חֻקָּו עָשִׂיתָ וְלֹא יַעֲבֹר "Even if his days are determined, the number of his months is with you: when you set his limit, he will not pass." In this verse the source domain of boundary is referred to by the verbs חרץ (pass.) 'to be decided, to be determined' and עבר 'to pass over, through', and by the noun חֹק 'boundary, limit'.[130] Because the source domain extends beyond the clause, and because it is elaborated on by assigning God an active role in it, the LIFE IS A RESTRICTED SPACE metaphor can be regarded as deliberately used.[131]

LIFE IS A RESTRICTED SPACE
setting the limit is determining the length of life
passing the boundary is passing away

The conceptualization of STATES in terms of LOCATIONS is commonly used to speak about the transition from one state into another.[132] Job uses it here to draw the attention to the boundary of life. It is not for the first time that Job observes that life must come to an end, and also here it is not something that he protests against: Job is very much aware of the fact that man cannot live forever—this was already implied when he conceptualized life as a day and as a fabric in chapter 7. Here in chapter 14 Job returns to this matter to take it as a starting point to think about the pure-impure distinction. What Job asserts about the boundary of human life is that it is controlled by God. As God is the one who controls this boundary, Job wishes that God uses his power and that He employs it to choose a proper moment for the righteous to die (see §3.3.2). Even though it has been assumed by all participants throughout the

130 The noun חֹק often occurs in cultic and legal contexts, but it is also used to refer "to the order God has imposed on his creation, i.e., the boundaries of the waters (Job 26:10; 38:10; Prov 8:29), regulation of rains and the seasons (Job 28:26; Jer 5:24), and heavenly bodies (Job 38:33; Jer 31:35, 36; 33:25)" (NIDOTTE, (Enns 1997: 2:250–251)). I take it here in this latter sense. Compare also de Joode (2015: 201, 203).

131 On the use of the concept of boundaries in the book of Job, see de Joode (2015: 63–82).

132 Cf. Lakoff (1993: 219–222) on STATES ARE LOCATIONS as an instance of the EVENT STRUCTURE metaphor.

entire discussion[133] that God decides on the moment of death, it is only here that it is introduced as a topic of discussion and that Job reflects on it as part of his thinking about God's responsibility in maintaining the moral order.

Job pictures God's control over the boundary of human life as a means that can be employed to recognize one's moral efforts. Whereas Eliphaz suggested in 5:24-26 that the proper moment for the righteous to die is the moment that life has been lived to the fullest, it can be supposed that for Job it would at least involve that the righteous do not die 'when an eye does not see them' and 'when they are as if they have not been' (10:18-19). By focusing on God's responsibility in setting the limit of one's life, Job's audience is challenged to consider the question of recognition at the moment of death from a less personal angle: taking into account that one is realistic about the limitations of human nature, what should be the moment that God should let one die? What are the conditions that would enable the righteous to die in peace?

3.3.2. Service (14:6)

To explain what the conditions of a peaceful death for the righteous should include, Job introduces in verse 6 the source domain of service: שְׁעֵה מֵעָלָיו וְיֶחְדָּל עַד־יִרְצֶה כְּשָׂכִיר יוֹמוֹ "Look away from him so that he will cease, so that he can accept as a hireling his day." The source domain of service is evoked by the noun שָׂכִיר 'hireling', and as it is signaled by the preposition כְּ 'as, like', it is categorized as a deliberately used metaphor.

LIFE IS SERVICE
accepting one's day is being at peace with the outlook of death
accepting one's day is being at peace with one's relation to God

When Job used the LIFE IS SERVICE metaphor in 7:1-3, he did so to explain that he felt like he had been serving his term as a loyal servant, and to argue that at the end of his service, he should be given death as a proper reward. Here in 14:6, however, Job draws the attention to the hireling's service and his acceptance thereof. According to

133 For example, when Job argued that God should let him die, because life is intolerable when feeling like being imprisoned (3:20-26, cf. chapter 3, §1.4) and having arrived at life's end (7:1-11, cf. §1.4 above), and when Eliphaz and Bildad tried to convince Job that God does not cut off the righteous (4:7), and that one who keeps his connection with God will certainly sprout out again (8:16-19, cf. §2.1 above).

Gerleman in TLOT, the basic meaning of the verb רצה is 'to accept',[134] and whereas it is mostly used as involving a positive evaluation ("to find something good, be pleased with something"), it also occurs with a neutral or negative appraisal ("to let something come to one, to (have to) accept something as one's portion") (Gerleman 1997: 1259–1260).[135] As a hireling is not typically understood as someone who takes his working day as something that he genuinely enjoys,[136] I read the verb here in its latter sense. What Job wishes then is that God ensures that at the moment of death, the righteous are enabled to look back at their life with satisfaction and with the expectation that God will give them some credit for their efforts.

Job's scenario that the righteous are enabled to accept death as the hireling accepts his day, envisions a less glorious recognition for the righteous than Eliphaz did in 5:24-26 (see § 1.1 above). By taking a realistic stance toward the temporality of life (14:5) and a humble stance toward one's recognition (14:6), Job tries to find the minimal requirements that according to him would allow the righteous to die in peace. The modesty of Job's proposal to God should strike the audience: depending on whether they are willing to accept Job's sincerity, it may evoke their sympathy, but at least, it challenges them to reflect on their own ideas on what the recognition of the righteous could consist of.

3.3.3. Tree (14:7-10)

Job wished that in the face of death, God would enable the righteous to be reconciled with their fate. In verses 7–10, he explains this wish by pointing out the difference

134 "The original context of the expression may be sought in the distribution of plunder or inheritance; recipients could find the portions distributed to them to be either good or poor, either be pleased to accept them or reject them" (Gerleman 1997: 1259).

135 Whereas e.g. HALOT (Köhler and Walter 1994–2000: 1280–1282) and NIDOTTE (VanGemeren 1997: 3:1185–1188) assume the existence of רצה I 'to be pleased with' and רצה II 'to pay, redeem', Gerleman holds in TLOT that this division "rests on weak etymological foundations and cannot withstand a semasiological examination," and that "[t]he few instances of *rṣh* II may be subsumed without effort into the semantic scope of *rṣh* I with the basic meaning "to accept," with the distinction that, instead of a positive, an indefinite or negative assessment comes to light here (...)" (Gerleman 1997: 1259).

136 As Clines adheres to the interpretation of רצה as including a positive evaluation, he proposes that it should be understood as being used ironically: "The point is rather that the little "pleasure" or "comfort" (10:20) that remains for a person in Job's position is comparable to the necessitous lot of the day-laborer. Who ever heard of a "hired laborer" "enjoying" his work? The term has an irony in it, as if Job were to say, I will snatch what pleasure I can—if any!—from the days that are left to me" (1989: 327).

between a man and a tree: כִּי יֵשׁ לָעֵץ תִּקְוָה אִם־יִכָּרֵת וְעוֹד יַחֲלִיף וְיֹנַקְתּוֹ לֹא תֶחְדָּל׃ אִם־יַזְקִין בָּאָרֶץ שָׁרְשׁוֹ וּבֶעָפָר יָמוּת גִּזְעוֹ׃ מֵרֵיחַ מַיִם יַפְרִחַ וְעָשָׂה קָצִיר כִּמּוֹ־נָטַע׃ וְגֶבֶר יָמוּת וַיֵּחֱלָשׁ וַיִּגְוַע אָדָם וְאַיּוֹ׃ "For there is hope for a tree: if it is cut down it will renew, its shoots will not cease; if its root grows old in the earth, or if its stem dies in the dust, at the scent of water it will bud and make branches as a plant, but a man that dies is prostrate, a mortal expires, and where is he?" The source domain of the tree can be understood as deliberately used because it extends over several clauses and because it is referred to by the nouns עֵץ 'tree' (14:7), יוֹנֵקֶת 'shoot' (14:7), שֹׁרֶשׁ 'root' (14:8), גֵּזַע 'stem' (14:8), and קָצִיר 'branches' (14:9) and by the verb פרח (hiphil) 'to bud, bring into bloom'.

Man is not a Tree

man's connection to God is not like a tree's connection to water in that it does not enable restoration from death

The PEOPLE ARE TREES metaphor was introduced by Bildad when in 8:16-19 he tried to offer Job hope by reminding him of the fact that even though his current condition may suggest a nearby end, he will certainly be restored if he ensures his connection with God (cf. §2.1).[137] By bringing in view how a tree may survive destruction, age, and even death, Job, however, points out that the conceptualization of man in terms of a tree has its limits. Like trees, people may be restored after being struck down, but in the end, water cannot bring man back to life. Man, like a flower (cf. 14:2), will cease and be gone forever.[138] The PEOPLE ARE TREES metaphor may offer hope for a temporary recovery, but the hope for a life after death that is there for a tree, is not there for man. Job does not reject the use of the PEOPLE ARE TREES metaphor as such (cf. 29:19), but by bringing in view its limits he is able to clarify that the lack of hope of humans that he here wants to focus on, is the lack of hope for a future after death.

---

137 On the PEOPLE ARE TREES metaphor in the Hebrew Bible, see Stordalen (2000: 89–90), and on the concept TREE in the Hebrew Bible, see Nielsen (1989: 74–85). The PEOPLE ARE TREES metaphor is an instance of the PEOPLE ARE PLANTS metaphor. For other examples of the PEOPLE ARE PLANTS metaphor in the book of Job, see Palmer (1906: 15–16, 24–26). On the PEOPLE ARE PLANTS metaphor in the Hebrew Bible, see Basson (2006) and Stordalen (2000: 87–94); on the PEOPLE ARE PLANTS metaphor in general, see Lakoff and Turner (1989: 6).

138 Cf. Stordalen (2000: 89): "Job considers the *difference* between human beings and trees. While a hewn tree may shoot again from its root, a human being is gone forever once he is down. Job therefore denies the metaphor people-are-trees and opts for the likeness of humankind to perishable flowers (cf. 14:2)."

Just as Job does not protest against the fact that human life is temporary (14:5, cf. §3.3.1), he does not protest against the fact that for humans there is no future after death (14:7-12). What Job wants his audience to understand is that the irrevocability of death is a problem for those who are not recognized for their efforts at the moment of death. Job thus translates his personal experience of not being recognized while being confronted with the encompassing darkness of death (10:18-22, cf. §2.4 above) into an issue that concerns mankind in general. His exposition presents his audience with a clear and impersonal reasoning: those who—like Zophar—have been reluctant to be affected by the disorientating imagery of light and darkness, can hardly disagree with Job that life is limited, that the end of man's life is in God's hands and that there is no life after death. Now is the audience also ready to acknowledge what is at stake, and does it agree with Job's request to God that He should take his responsibility in ensuring one's recognition at the moment of death? And if not, are there yet other perspectives to offer, now that Job has strategically put the tree metaphor out of action?

3.3.4. Water (14:11-12)

The comparison between a man and a tree in verses 7–10 is followed in verses 11–12 by a depiction that zooms in on the source domain of water: אָזְלוּ־מַיִם מִנִּי־יָם וְנָהָר יֵחֱרַב וְיָבֵשׁ: וְאִישׁ שָׁכַב וְלֹא־יָקוּם עַד־בְּלִתִּי שָׁמַיִם לֹא יָקִיצוּ וְלֹא־יֵעֹרוּ מִשְׁנָתָם: "Waters disappear from the sea, and a river that dries up remains dry, so a man lies down and does not rise, until the heavens are no more they will not wake up, nor will they be roused from their sleep." The role of water was already introduced in the tree metaphor in verse 9, but it is only in verse 11 that it is brought in view more prominently. As its source domain is evoked by almost all the words of verse 11, that is, by the nouns מַיִם 'water', יָם 'sea', and נָהָר 'river', and by the verbs חרב 'to be dried up', and יבשׁ 'to be dry', it is signaled as deliberately used.

Death is the Drying Up of Waters
death is within God's control

The tree metaphor in verses 7–10 presented water as a source of life that enables restoration, and as I explained in §3.2 above, I suggest that it is this role of water that Job elaborates on when he pictures its disappearance from a sea and a river in verse 11. The drying up of a vast body of water is in itself an unlikely event (cf. §3.2, note 125), but it is a phenomenon that is more often referred to in the Hebrew Bible. I therefore take verse 11 as an allusion to Isa 19:5-7, where in a similar wording is envisioned

how God will cause the waters of the Nile to disappear, so that the connected canals and brooks will run dry and the plants and crops will wither.[139] With this image as a starting point, I propose that Job here pictures the disappearance of a sea and a river to bring in view that the source of life is completely in God's control. By doing so, Job conceptualizes death as a case of God's responsibility: when God decides to dry up man's energy, man passes away and no new supply of water can wake him from his sleep.[140]

With an image that hints at God's control of the waters, Job places the PEOPLE ARE PLANTS metaphor in a wider perspective. In the end, it is not the frailty of human nature, but God who ensures that there is no future for man.[141] Job's elaboration on the PEOPLE ARE PLANTS metaphor seems plain and innocent, but the audience may notice that it actually presents them with a new view on life and death: it is a common thought that God chooses the moment of one's death (cf. 14:5 and § 3.3.1 above), but does the audience agree that God can be thought of as the one who keeps a future away from them?

3.3.5. Sleep (14:12)

After verse 11 has implicitly identified God as the ultimate cause of man's death, verse 12 draws the attention to death's irreversibility by the introduction of another source domain, namely that of sleep: וְאִישׁ שָׁכַב וְלֹא־יָקוּם עַד־בִּלְתִּי שָׁמַיִם לֹא יָקִיצוּ וְלֹא־יֵעֹרוּ מִשְּׁנָתָם "but a man lies down and does not rise; until the heavens are no

139 It must be noted that in almost all other texts on the disappearance of waters, God is understood as being its cause. Van Hecke (2011a: 207 n. 320) remarks that except in 1 Ki 17:7, the running dry of seas and rivers is waters is caused by God: "In Gen 8:7.13 the drying up of the flood waters can hardly be regarded as a regular natural phenomenon. In the following cases, God is invariably the direct or indirect cause of the drying up of water: Is 44:27; Jer 50:38; Joel 1:20; Nah 1:4; Ps 66:6; 74:15; 106:9." See also Job 12:15.

140 Dhorme (1967 [1926]: 199–200) mentions that Ehrlich (1918: 237) follows the Jewish commentators who take 14:11 as referring to "a vain attempt to reanimate the dead man, as one might try to reanimate a tree, an attempt which exhausts for this purpose the seas and the rivers." I find this interpretation attractive as it would point out that also in regard of the restorative power of water, the comparison between a man and a tree fails to offer man a hopeful perspective; I think, however, that it is more straightforward to understand the focus on the lack of water in 14:11 as pointing to its destructive consequences, than to comprehend it as being the result of a hypothetical scenario in which it is attempted to bring a man back to life by using all the water of the world.

141 In Bildad's presentation of plant metaphors in chapter 8, it was assumed that God himself, like water, functions as a source of life, and that it is up to man to decide whether or not he maintains his connection to it. As Job presents God as the one who controls the source of life, he asserts instead that man's access to it solely depends on the will of God.

more, they will not wake up, nor will they be roused from their sleep." The source domain of sleep is evoked by the verbs שׁכב 'to lie down', קום 'arise, stand', קיץ 'awake', and עור (nifal) 'be roused', and by the noun שֵׁנָה 'sleep', and as it is repeatedly referred to and as it extends over the clause, it can be categorized as deliberately used.

Death is Eternal Sleep
death is irreversible

In their discussion of the DEATH IS SLEEP metaphor, Lakoff and Turner explain that "the corpse corresponds to the body of a sleeper, and the appearance of the corpse—inactive and inattentive—to the appearance of the sleeper," and that "when sleep is conceived of as rest, death can be a final rest—one from which we will not wake (...) (Lakoff and Turner 1989: 18–19)."[142] Clines remarks that "in this passage, "sleep," is not to be misunderstood as signifying some temporary state" (Clines 1989: 330). In the context of plants and drying up of water, the concept of sleep as a temporary state is indeed out of place, and in my view, it is introduced here precisely to play on this incompatibility. When speaking of man in terms of plants and of death in terms of water, the death involved is not the temporary sleep of a tree, but the eternal sleep from which one cannot wake up. If man were a tree, a lack of water would not bother him: he would be asleep in the ground and shoot out again. Men, however, are like plants that wither as soon as they run dry.[143]

The source domain of sleep underlines the non-temporal character of death and implies that restoration is impossible after God's intervention. God may restore,[144] but in the end, He is the one who causes that man will not rise again. In verses 7–12, Job takes a realistic stance toward the frailty of man's life and God's role in it: if his audience is willing to do the same, they may understand that Job's request for recognition in verses 4–6 is not arrogant, but sincere, and that it is not motivated by anger or fear, but by his conviction that its fulfillment is the only consolation that offers a counterbalance for the lack of hope that man is confronted with in the face of death.

---

142 See also Reece (1989: 130); cf. chapter 3, §3.1. According to Thomson, the conceptualization of death in terms of sleep in the Old Testament is grounded in the perception of sleep as "the result of a Divine intervention" and as "a state of death" (Thomson 1955: 423).

143 For other examples of the PEOPLE ARE PLANTS metaphor as highlighting the perishable condition of man, see Stordalen (2000: 87–88).

144 See e.g. the expositions of Eliphaz and Bildad in Job 5:18-20 and Job 8:6-7.

3.4. *The Conceptualization of Suffering as a Lack of Hope—Part III*

When Job longed for death, he held the lack of hope on restoration as a reasonable position (cf. 7:1-11), but when came to think of the consequences of dying in his current state, he was no longer able to accept his death as a hopeful perspective (cf. 10:18-22). In reaction to Zophar's claims that Job cannot know whether he is innocent, Job warns in chapter 12 against any view of God that denies man the capability—and thereby the responsibility—to distinguish between right and wrong. Job's trust in man's moral judgment triggers him in chapter 14 to perceive his personal lack of recognition as a righteous person in the face of death as a case that concerns the lack of recognition of human righteousness as such.

In 14:4-12, Job pictures his view on life and death in terms of boundaries, trees, waters, and sleep. From the use of these more concrete and more neutral source domains it appears that Job's very negative view on his situation and on his death as expressed in 10:18-22 is not maintained now that it concerns death of man in general. The consideration of his own fate in the perspective of the general limitations of human existence enables Job to take a more distant and matter-of-fact stance toward death and to shift his attention to the question of the recognition of morality. Job accepts that God cannot extend the boundaries of life and that man cannot be restored once he has died, but in the end, God is in control over one's life, and so it is God's duty to ensure that one does not die without being respected. As Job envisions how God could recognize the efforts of the righteous, however, he is confronted with a new reality of suffering. Hypothetical scenarios, both in verses 4–12 and 13–17, offer hope for as long as their reality is kept up, but as soon as Job returns to the real world in verses 18–22, Job does not trust that God will truly undertake action, and this very fact becomes a source of suffering itself.[145] When he concludes in verse 19 that God destroys the hope of man, I therefore argue that it is not so much the hope for a future after death or restoration as such, but rather the hope for a solution for the problem recognition at the face of death that he refers to. I propose that at the end of chapter 14, Job's suffering is dominated by the existential problem that he cannot hope that God intercedes to guarantee that the righteous are given what they deserve.[146]

145 See e.g. Clines (1989: 334) and Seow (2013: 679).

146 That the presence of תקוה 'hope' is indeed a condition for life was already implied in the LIFE IS A WOVEN FABRIC metaphor in chapter 7 (cf. § 1.3.3 above). See also Newsom (1996: 443–445).

CHAPTER 5

Suffering in the Second Speech Cycle (Job 15:17–22:30): The Denial of Consolation

In the first speech cycle, the friends tried their best to comfort Job and to open up a more positive perspective on his situation. They aimed at convincing him that God will only destroy the wicked and that He will make the impossible possible, but in the end, Job refused to be consoled with any explanation that does not respect his righteousness. Because his friends refuse to take a critical stand, Job wishes that they stop their attempts (cf. 13:4-5). They carry on, however, and in the second speech cycle they present him with descriptions of the fate of the wicked to demonstrate that there is indeed judgment in the world.

In the second speech cycle, Job initially does not react to the friends' claim that the wicked are indeed judged by God, but instead, he chooses to confront them with their way of treating him.[1] Job had already criticized the lack of loyalty of his friends in Job 6:14-30 and 13:7-13, but his criticism there was mainly motivated by the frustration that they safeguard God's righteousness rather than Job's innocence. From chapter 16 onwards, however, Job begins to see that his friends' disloyalty does not only result in a theoretical disagreement, but that it also undermines the respect he is given as a person in his community. The denial of consolation from his friends adds a new dimension to his suffering, but it also leads Job to restore his belief in God as his Redeemer (cf. 19:25).

The first two paragraphs of this chapter discuss the passages in which Job's reflection on the issue of social recognition triggers a new understanding of suffering. As I show in the outlines in § 1.1 and § 2.1 below, Job launches fresh perspectives in

1 For descriptions of the fate of the wicked, see 15:20-35, 18:5-21, and 20:4-29. It is only in chapter 21 that Job enters into this discussion and that he points out that the friends' descriptions do not correspond to reality (see § 3.1 below). E.g. Newsom (1996: 446) and Seow (2013: 697): "Unlike the first cycle, there is a persistent focus on the part of the friends in the second, each of them emphasizing the fate of the wicked as retribution for their wicked but without a corresponding description of the fate of the righteous (chs. 15, 18, 20). As for Job, he continues with his concern with God's role in his unjust suffering (chs. 16–17, 19), turning to the fate of the wicked only in his last speech (ch. 21)." Different from Seow, I argue in § 1.1 and § 2.1 below that Job in chapters 16–17 and 19 is not so much concerned about God's but rather about his friends' role in his unjust suffering.

17:6-16 and 19:20-29. In the same manner as in the previous chapters, I explain the context, text, and translation of these passages before I discuss the metaphors and the conceptualization of suffering that is thereby established. With the claim that Job's existential suffering comes to an end in 19:25 (cf. § 2.4 below), I conclude in the third paragraph with an exposition on the themes that wind up the second speech cycle in Job 20–22 and that set the stage for a critical exposition on society in the third speech cycle (Job 23–31, see chapter 6).

1. The Conceptualization of Suffering in Job 17:6-16

With the general lack of recognition from God for the moral efforts of man as the main source of suffering (cf. chapter 4, § 3.4), Job shifts his attention toward the behavior of his friends to discover that they too misjudge him. When Job pictures in 17:6-16 how he expects his friends to act and why he urges them to do so, it becomes clear that their recognition is indeed the last straw within reach that he can hold on to.

1.1. *Job 17:6-16 in the Context of Job 15:17–17:16*

Job 15:17-35 Eliphaz understands that Job's critical reasoning keeps him from accepting their consolations, and so he closed off the first speech cycle in 15:1-16 by reminding Job that his claim to knowledge is no better than that of his friends. Because no one can claim to possess knowledge, Eliphaz opens up the second speech cycle by calling upon his experience and the wisdom delivered to him to point out where Job's reasoning goes wrong (15:17-19).

In my view, Eliphaz's description of the fate of wicked serves to counter Job's accusation that they adopt an uncritical attitude.[2] According to Job, the friends keep their calm when 'the tents are at ease for robbers' (cf. 12:6), because they accept every

2 The fate of the wicked is generally recognized as a recurring theme in the second speech cycle, but there is no consensus on its function. According to Clines (1989: 344) "the description of the wicked serves a different function in the mouth of each of the three friends: for Eliphaz, it is a picture of what Job is not; for Bildad (chap. 18) it is a picture of what Job may become; for Zophar (chap. 20) it is a picture of what Job must avoid." Newsom (1996: 446), on the other hand, understands that "at this point the issue is more a struggle over religious ideology than an accusation against Job," so also and Seow (2013: 703). I agree with Newsom and Seow that the fate of the wicked in chapter 15 serves to underline that God is just, but I add that this claim specifically functions in the discussion on moral behavior. According to Job, God's justness demands that injustice in the world should be

state of affairs in the world as the will of God (12:7-10.11-16, cf. chapter 4, §3.1). To justify their attitude, Eliphaz presents in verses 20–35 the picture of the wicked that is delivered by tradition: it may seem from the outside as if the wicked are at peace, but in fact, they are not (15:20-24); their rebellious attitude is based on false theories (15:25-28), and so they will bring about their own destruction (15:29-30). According to Eliphaz there is no need for agitation or frustration when one trusts in what tradition learns, namely that eventually, the problem will solve itself. Job is therefore wrong in asserting that the 'all is in God's hands'-reasoning of the friends entails that they are indifferent to the moral behavior of others. On the contrary, it is precisely because the friends are convinced that there are consequences to wrong behavior, that Eliphaz indirectly addresses Job when he warns those who believe that they can challenge God (15:31-35).[3]

Job 16–17 Job is getting impatient: the arguments of his friends only serve to justify their attitude and while they shake their heads at him, they neglect to acknowledge the existential problem that is at stake (16:2-5). To make his friends aware of their attitude, Job once again explicates his manner of speaking:[4] he speaks up, not to spare himself, but because he cannot risk that he is passed over (16:6). If he kept silent, Eliphaz would take the chance to count him among the wicked and to call his current state as a witness against him:

> indeed now that He has made me weary,
> you would destroy my whole community;
> that it shriveled me serves as an evidence;
> that my leanness arises in me, answers to my face.[5]
>
> Job 16:7-8

protested against, while Eliphaz holds that agitation should be avoided, because in the end, only God is in the position to act as a judge.

3 Unlike Clines, I do not think that Eliphaz's description of the fate of the wicked is "a picture of what Job is not" (1989: 344). In chapter 4, §3.1, I have argued that Eliphaz rejects Job's manner of reasoning because it is not constructive; I therefore suggest that Eliphaz here indeed alludes to Job when he pictures the wicked in verses 25–28 as those who overconfidently wish to confront God.

4 So also in 6:2-6 and 13:13-16.

5 I propose to explain the alternating use of the third and second person in 16:7 by taking the third person as referring to God and the second person as addressing Eliphaz. Most commentators, however, understand the second person as addressing God and therefore consider the alternating use problematic, see e.g. Clines (1989: 381) and Habel (1985: 264). As regards 16:8, I propose to read וַתִּקְמְטֵנִי as an impersonally used 3rd fem. sg.: "it shriveled me," cf. GKC §144b.

After this point, Job becomes more and more concerned about how the misfortune that God has brought upon him affects the behavior of his community. Since God is treating him as an enemy, the world has turned against him (16:9-11). He is being attacked on all fronts and hurt in all respects (16:12-14), and despite of his innocence, his appearance speaks against him (16:15-17). With no one willing to acknowledge his innocence, Job can only ask that at least the injustice that is done to him may leave a stain on the earth so that it is not be passed by unnoticed (16:18). Although Job does not trust that God will get Himself actively involved (cf. 14:18-22), or that his community will change its attitude, he ends chapter 16 by emphasizing that he still believes that God—in principle—will confirm his righteousness (16:19).[6] His wish that God may judge "a man with God as (He would judge) a mortal to his friend" (16:21), therefore primarily serves as a challenge to the friends to imagine the judgment that God would pass on them.[7]

In my view, Job challenges his friends because he supposes that his current condition leads his friends to count him among the wicked. Job knows that misfortune commonly evokes contempt (17:1-2, cf. 12:5), but he expects his friends to know better and to stand up for him (17:3), instead of rejecting his reasoning, supposedly to safeguard the exaltation of God (17:4, cf. 15:4).[8] Different from Eliphaz (cf. 15:3-6), Job holds that it is not words, but social interaction that matters to God (cf. 6:14). I propose that by playing off his own behavior against that of his friends, Job assigns himself an advisory role. In the next, I discuss how this new role enables Job in verses 6–16 to turn the tables and to picture an improvement of his situation.[9]

---

6 I follow e.g. Kroeze (1961: 194), Andersen (1976: 197) and Gordis (1978: 178–179) in understanding עֵדִי 'my witness' and שָׂהֲדִי 'my witness, the one who testifies for me' as referring to God; for interpretations of verse 19 as referring to a third party, see e.g. Newsom (1996: 460) and Habel (1985: 274–275). Clines (1989: 390) suggests that there is no third party and that "Job's own protestation of innocence" functions as a witness; see Seow (2013: 739) for a similar interpretation.

7 In my view, Job's wish in verse 21 is not that a third party arbitrates between man and God, but rather that his friends, who now mock him (cf. 16:20), are judged according to their social record. I propose that Job introduces here the idea that moral behavior is not a matter of theology, but of investing in relationships between men.

8 While most scholars take 17:3-4 as directed to God, I argue that the context suggests that in these verses—as in 16:3 and 16:7, see. n. 5 above—the second person is used to address Eliphaz: שִׂימָה־נָּא עָרְבֵנִי עִמָּךְ מִי הוּא לְיָדִי יִתָּקָעַ: כִּי־לִבָּם צָפַנְתָּ מִשָּׂכֶל עַל־כֵּן לֹא תְרֹמֵם: "Come now, stand surety of me with you, who is the one who claps my hand [=becomes my guarantor]? If you [=Eliphaz] keep their [=the mockers' (חֲלָקִים, cf. 17:2)] heart away from sense, you [=Eliphaz] therefore do not exalt."

9 I follow e.g. Clines (1989: 375–377), van der Lugt (1995: 193–196), and Seow (2013: 753) in dividing chapter 17 into verses 1–5, 6–10, and 11–16. For other proposals on the structure of chapter 17, see van der Lugt (1995: 201–202).

1.2. *Job 17:6-16: Text and Translation*

In the first speech cycle, Job and his friends have not come to an agreement about how his situation should be understood and what he should do. The ethical perspective, however, has not yet been explored. In the second speech cycle, Job's experience of the hostile reactions to his condition leads him to reflect on the social dimension of the question of recognition. When Job presents himself as a test case for the behavior of his friends in 17:6-16, he approaches his suffering in a more concrete and practical way:

Job 17:6-16

וְהִצִּגַנִי לִמְשָׁל עַמִּים וְתֹפֶת לְפָנִים אֶהְיֶה׃ [6]
וַתֵּכַהּ מִכַּעַשׂ עֵינִי וַיִּצְרְי כַּצֵּל כֻּלָּם׃ [7]
יָשֹׁמּוּ יְשָׁרִים עַל־זֹאת וְנָקִי עַל־חָנֵף יִתְעוֹרָר׃ [8]
וְיֹאחֵז צַדִּיק דַּרְכּוֹ וְטֶהֱר־יָדַיִם יֹסִיף אֹמֶץ׃ [9]
וְאוּלָם כֻּלָּם תָּשֻׁבוּ וּבֹאוּ נָא וְלֹא־אֶמְצָא בָכֶם חָכָם׃ [10]
יָמַי עָבְרוּ זִמֹּתַי נִתְּקוּ מוֹרְשֵׁי לִבָּי׃ [11]
לַיְלָה לְיוֹם יָשִׂימוּ אוֹר קָרוֹב מִפְּנֵי־חֹשֶׁךְ׃ [12]
אִם־אֲקַוֶּה שְׁאוֹל בֵּיתִי בַּחֹשֶׁךְ רִפַּדְתִּי יְצוּעָי׃ [13]
לַשַּׁחַת קָרָאתִי אָבִי אָתָּה אִמִּי וַאֲחוֹתִי לָרִמָּה׃ [14]
וְאַיֵּה אֵפוֹ תִקְוָתִי וְתִקְוָתִי מִי יְשׁוּרֶנָּה׃ [15]
בַּדֵּי שְׁאֹל תֵּרַדְנָה אִם־יַחַד עַל־עָפָר נָחַת׃ ס [16]

[6] When He makes me a byword among the people,
must I become a spit in the face?[10]
[7] My eye grew dim from vexation
and my forms are all as a shadow:
[8] the upright are appalled at this
like the innocent agitates himself over the impious,
[9] yet if the righteous takes hold of his way,
the clean of hands will grow in strength!

10 On the use of the *weqatal* and the *yiqtol* in the protasis and apodosis of a temporal clause, cf. JM §166i. On the omission of the particle הַ in interrogative clauses, cf. GKC §150a and JM §161a; see also Mitchell (1908: especially pp. 127–129).

[10] So indeed, all of you, come again now!
Will I not find a wise man among you?
[11] That my days were passed, that my schemes[11] were rooted out,
the desires of my heart:
[12] if one makes night into day,
light is close because of darkness.
[13] If I expect that *Sheol* is my house,
would I spread my bed in darkness?
[14] would I say to the grave "you are my father,"
"mother" and "sister" to the worm?[12]
[15] Where, then, is my hope?
my hope, who regards her?
[16] Will it go down[13] to the parts of *Sheol*,
or are we together when rest[14] is over dust?

Even if verses 6–16 present no real textual difficulties, it has not been considered easy to establish what is communicated in this passage, for example, with what intention Job mentions the behavior of the righteous (17:8-9), what he requests of his friends (17:10), or how the description of a lack of hope (17:11-16) relates to his depictions thereof in 10:18-22 and 14:4-11.[15]

---

11 Even though זִמָּה 'plan, device' is in all its other occurrences used in a negative sense, it has been assumed by most scholars and translations that in Job 17:11, it can be understood as e.g. 'plans' (Clines 1989: 369), 'tendons' (JPS) or 'purposes' (NRSV). I here follow Wolfers (1995: 405), who interprets the suffix as an 'objective genetive': "the evil purposes devised *against* me."

12 Verses 13–15 are generally understood as a conditional sentence with verses 13–14 as *protasis* and verse 15 as *apodosis*, for example NRSV "If I look for Sheol as my house, if I spread my couch in darkness, if I say to the Pit, 'You are my father,' and to the worm, 'My mother,' or 'My sister,' where then is my hope? Who will see my hope?" In my translation I propose, however, to interpret 13a as *protasis* and 13b–14 as *apodosis*. On the use of the *qatal* in an unreal *apodosis*, see JM §167k and BHRG §19.2 iii.

13 With Pope ([3]1973: 131) and Seow (2013: 768) I interpret תֵּרֵדְנָה (*qal yiqtol* 3fp) as תֵּרֵדֶנָּה (*qal yiqtol* 3fs + energic *nun*).

14 I follow the MT vocalization. Based on Theodotion and the Peshitta most scholars propose, however, that נֶחָת 'rest' or 'lowering' should be revocalized and read as נֵחָת 'we will descend' (cf. Seow (2013: 768)).

15 Cf. Clines on the coherence in Job's speeches after chapters 12–14: "From that point on, Job has nothing novel to say, and essentially waits for God's reply. The rest of Job's speeches (here in chaps. 16–17; also 19; 21; 23–24; 26–31) fill out many themes already adumbrated in the earlier speeches, but they make no further logical or dramatic developments of importance. This recapitulatory

Clines (1989: 396–397) and Newsom (1996: 462) suggest that Job refers to the righteous in verses 8–9 to reveal the irony of their behavior: the righteous are appalled when they see what has happened to Job, but as they hold on to their way, they can only see his misfortune as a confirmation of wickedness. In the words of Clines:

> The sight of the suffering of the godless, far from unsettling them, only serves to "strengthen" them in their righteousness. (…) There is irony here, not against the honesty of the righteous who are genuinely provoked to greater godliness by the fate of the wicked, but against their intelligence, which will not let them question their conviction that any sufferer must be a godless person.
>
> Clines 1989: 397

Against this background, verse 10 has been read as a desperate (Clines 1989: 397–398) or mocking (Newsom 1996: 462) invitation to his friends to attack him again. In both cases, it is assumed that Job has given up on the possibility that his friends will reconsider their belief: "I will not find a wise man among you" (17:10). At this point, however, I disagree.

In the present chapter I claim that it is only in the second speech cycle that Job becomes aware that the behavior of his friends is actually part of the problem of recognition that he is struggling with. Job has given up on his friends with regard to their theoretical views on his suffering, but he has only started to challenge the attitude they have adopted so far. When Job in verse 9 speaks about a צַדִּיק 'a righteous one', I therefore propose that he sincerely pictures what he understands as the code of conduct of a righteous one, namely that the righteous makes an effort to keep on track.[16] As opposed to the friends' idea that one should keep one's calm (cf. 12:4-10; chapter 4, §3.1.),[17] Job asserts that it is right to be dismayed at injustice done to the

---

and elaborative character of the speeches may account for their less strongly marked coherence" (Clines 1989: 377). On Job 16–17, van der Lugt (1995: 203) remarks that "commentators of chapters 16–17 are confronted with an almost inextricable fusion of motifs and themes." Newsom (1996: 461) says that "unlike some of Job's other speeches, chap. 17 does not have a clear structure."

16 As Wolfers (1995: 274) notes, the verb אחז 'to grasp' (17:9) does normally not imply that one holds on to something that is already in one's possession, but rather that one grasps or seizes something in order to bring it (again) under one's control.

17 The idea that one should not let oneself be ruled by agitation about the well-being of the wicked is also found in Psa 37, 49, and 73: see Irsigler (1998) for an analysis thereof.

good and to be agitated about the lack of judgment on the wicked (17:8),[18] and that it is exactly the determination of the righteous ones to act according to the principle of righteousness, regardless of the concrete circumstances in the world, that enables the clean of hands to grow in strength (17:9).[19] When Job asks his friends in verse 10 to come again, he urges them to reconsider their current attitude in the light of the behavior of the righteous as pictured in verses 8–9. Job's call upon his friends is not a rhetorical but a genuine question: "will I not find a wise man among you?" (10b). It is indeed important to Job that the friends change their approach: on the one hand, it is his responsibility to warn his friends against continuing on a wrong path, and on the other hand, he believes that at this point, they are the only ones within his reach that would be able to show him the recognition that he so desperately longs for. If Job cannot hope that God will distinguish between the pure and the defiled (cf. 14:4, chapter 4, § 3.2), he can still aim at convincing his friends of their duty so that his righteousness is at least confirmed by them before he dies.

In verse 10, Job has asked his friends to reconsider their approach, and I suggest that the recurrence of the theme of lack of hope in verses 11–16 is staged against this background. So far, the friends have not acknowledged that there is no hope for Job. They may have been acting with the best intentions, but according to Job, they go wrong because of their optimistic approach.[20] The desires of his heart are that his

18 Cf. Gordis (1978: 525): "The just man will be deeply troubled by the injustice in the world (8a), but he will not surrender to injustice. On the contrary, he will actively seek to combat it (8b). (…) For Job, as for biblical religion generally, the ideal saint is not he who resigns himself to unjust suffering, but he who actively battles against it."

19 In my interpretation, Job counts himself among the טֶהֱר־יָדַיִם "clean of hands"; this would accord with the use of טָהוֹר in 14:4 where Job wished that the clean ones would be distinguished from those who are defiled, cf. chapter 4 § 3.2.

20 Cf. Newsom (1996: 462): "Job exposes the fatuous quality of what they say by contrasting the reality of his situation (v. 11) with the false comfort that the friends give (v. 12). (…) Job seeks to contest the friends' insistence on the power of hope." See also Kroeze (1961: 203), Fohrer (1963: 294), van der Lugt (1995: 206). Other scholars reject this reading, because they cannot see how it would make sense to Job's argument, e.g. Clines (1989: 398): "Now it is true that the friends have in general encouraged Job to believe that his misery will, or may, soon be over, and Zophar has actually spoken of Job's life becoming brighter than the noonday, even its darkness being as morning light (11:17). Yet Job does not upbraid the friends for encouraging him, but only for failing to recognize his innocence"; Seow (2013: 757–758): "The couplet in v. 12 has often been taken as an allusion to the comfort the friends proffer, that is, their advice to look forward to brighter prospects that lie beyond the present gloom. […] Yet such a reading leaves v. 12 as a *non sequitur*, connected neither with v. 11 nor v. 13."

days are done and that he is declared innocent (17:11); his friends, however, refused to take Job's wishes seriously and simply tried to replace them by bright stories. Job now states that this is not how it works. When night is turned into day, the light thereof only serves to overrule and block out the presence of negative perspectives (17:12).[21] Both for his own good and that of his friends, Job insists that his friends face the reality that he is on the threshold of death, and that they admit that he is not in the position to cherish hope (17:13-16). Even though he again describes his lack of hope, Job has abandoned his desperate mood of the chapters 10 and 14: he knows that he will have to deal with the fact that there is no future in either life or death, and that there is no recognition from God, but at this point there is one thing that he wants to achieve before he dies, namely that his friends return to be on his side.

1.3. *Metaphors in 17:6-16*

Job suffers from the hostile reactions of his environment because they threaten the recognition of his righteousness. From his address to the friends in 17:6-16 it appears that a change in his friends' behavior would at least alleviate the impact of the social dimension of his suffering. As he confronts his friends with their responsibility, he conceptualizes his situation in terms of light and darkness (17:7.12-13), household (17:13-14), rest (17:13.16), and decay (17:14.16).

1.3.1. *Light and Darkness (17:7.12-13)*

By now, it has become clear that the source domain of light and darkness recurs throughout the book of Job.[22] It already appeared in passages where Job reflected on his situation, namely in 3:20 and 10:20-22, and here in chapter 17, terms of light and darkness are found in verses 7 and 12–13. In verse 7, terms of darkness are used to describe Job's physical condition: וַתֵּכַהּ מִכַּעַשׂ עֵינִי וְיֹצְרַי כַּצֵּל כֻּלָּם "My eye grew dim from vexation, and my forms are all as a shadow." Both the verb כהה 'to grow dim' and the noun צֵל 'shadow' evoke the source domain of darkness, and because it extends beyond the clause and because it is linguistically signaled by the preposition כְּ 'like', it can be marked as deliberately used. In verses 12–13, the already activated

21 On this interpretation of source domain of light and darkness, see §1.3.1 below.

22 Van Hecke (2009: 96) shows the book of Job shows a relatively high amount of terms of light and darkness.

source domain stands out even more: לַ֭יְלָה יָשִׂ֣ימוּ אוֹר קָר֑וֹב מִפְּנֵ֖י־חֹֽשֶׁךְ׃ אִם־אֲקַוֶּ֗ה שְׁא֣וֹל בֵּיתִ֣י בַּחֹ֣שֶׁךְ רִפַּ֣דְתִּי יְצוּעָֽי "if one makes night into day, light is close because of darkness. If I expect that *Sheol* is my house, would I spread my bed in darkness?" In these verses, the source domain is signaled by לַ֭יְלָה 'night', יוֹם 'day', אוֹר 'light' (v. 12), and חֹֽשֶׁךְ 'darkness' (2*, v. 12–13), and these terms are used here to conceptualize two different target domains, namely the consolation of the friends in verse 12, and death in verse 13.

BODY IS A SHADOW
the body has a fleeting nature
the body is insubstantial
the body is an inferior representation of its original state

NEGATIVE IS DARK and POSITIVE IS LIGHT
changing night into day is giving negative circumstances a positive interpretation
light that exist because of darkness is a positive perspective based on speculation

DEATH IS DARKNESS
death is a negative place
death is a place of isolation

In Job 17:6-16, the source domain of light and darkness shows its wide applicability. In its first occurrence in verse 7, it describes the bad condition of Job's body. TWOT notes that for the verb כהה "[t]he idea of the eyes becoming weak in old age is prominent" (Oswalt 1980: 430). At first glance, the 'becoming weak (כהה) of the eyes' may not evoke the association with light and darkness. Yet diminished sight results in darkness, and furthermore, as shown by Van Hecke (2014: 571–573), the eye may be conceptualized as a source of light: as such, an eye that becomes weak can be understood as an eye of which the light is dimmed. Because the weakening of the eyes is associated with old age, or, as Seow says, with "people on the verge of death (Gen 27:1; Deut 34:7; 1Sam 3:2)" (Seow 2013: 756), the weakening of the eyes does not only comprise the darkness that results from diminished sight or the growing dim of light, but it also foreshadows the ultimate darkness of death. The second part of verse 7, where Job states that 'all his forms are like a shadow (כַּצֵּל),' confirms that here especially this latter sort of darkness is evoked. The noun צֵל 'shadow' usually has the positive connotation of 'protection from harm' (cf. 7:2; 40:22), but it can also be used in a negative sense when its "ephemeral and fleeting" (Hartley 1980: 767) character is

foregrounded (cf. 8:9, 14:2).[23] It is the latter sense which applies: by comparing the forms of his body to a shadow, Job asserts that they are on the verge of fading away into non-existence.

At first, Job did not protest against the temporality of life and the disintegration of his body (cf. 7:1-11), but his opinion changed when he realized that God's lack of recognition of his personal life (cf. 10:18-22) and of human life in general (14:4-12) is actually problematic. In the latter two passages, his miserable condition caused vexation, but here in chapter 17, Job holds that it is the other way around and that his vexation is the cause of his sorry state. Job is indeed aware that his vexation is destructive, but at the same time he cannot act differently, because he is morally obliged to ventilate his indignation over any unjust situation (17:8, cf. §5.1.2 and n. 18 above).[24] Job expects his friends to 'grasp control over their way' and to share his protest: this is both their duty and the only way to help him 'grow in strength' (17:9).

Job prefers vexation over hopeful perspectives. By means of the POSITIVE IS LIGHT and NEGATIVE IS DARK metaphors, Job pictures in 12a the friends' way of dealing with bad circumstances. In their attempts to comfort Job, they turned the negative into the positive, that is, they asserted that his present misfortune will eventually lead to a better future (cf. 5:17-26, 8:7, and 11:16-19). In 12b, Job states that such hopeful perspectives can only exist because of darkness, and thus he warns against uncritically proposing that something bad can be turned into something good:[25] even if it is offered with best intentions, such hope can only exists at the cost of one's integrity.[26] In verse 12, the source domains of light and darkness thus justify Job's negative stance toward his poor circumstances as the proper disposition. Job's integrity demands him to accept that he is heading for *Sheol*, and his friends should understand that the outlook of death is a dark reality that no blinding light can veil.

---

23 Cf. NIDOTTE (Price 1997: 3:809).

24 Cf. 5:2. Note that Job agrees here with Eliphaz on the destructive force of כעס 'vexation', but according to Job, he is not a fool that is naively overruled by his vexation; instead, his integrity involves that he cannot reconcile himself to his situation and it is their lack of vexation that shows that his friends cannot be counted among the righteous.

25 Cf. Seow (2013: 757–758): "… [T]he friends who refuse to recognize the reality of darkness that Job confronts are like the shallow moral perverts of the prophet Isaiah's days: "They turn darkness to light and light to darkness" (Isa 5:20b)."

26 Compare Job's rejection of explanations based on the presumption of moral imperfection (cf. 4:17-18, see also 6:4-7) and imperfect self-knowledge (cf. 11:4-6), and of hopeful perspectives based on metaphors that misrepresent reality (cf. 8:16-19, see also 14:7-10).

At the background of these metalevel observations, Job continues in verses 13–16 by reflecting on how he relates to death. In verse 13, the DEATH IS DARKNESS metaphor confirms that death, as in 10:18-22 and 14:6-16, is still an unwanted outlook for Job. In these passages, Job's negative view of death resulted from his conclusion that death veils the question of his integrity and the question God's recognition of human morality in darkness. In the next paragraph, I show that Job's negative evaluation of death here in chapter 17 results from his interpretation of death as a place without a community.

1.3.2. House (17:13-14)

The extensive use of darkness terms has already set the pessimistic tone, when the source domain of house is introduced in verses 13–14: אִם־אֲקַוֶּה שְׁאוֹל בֵּיתִי בַּחֹשֶׁךְ רִפַּדְתִּי יְצוּעָי: לַשַּׁחַת קָרָאתִי אָבִי אָתָּה אִמִּי וַאֲחוֹתִי לָרִמָּה "If I expect that *Sheol* is my house, would I spread my bed in darkness? Would I say to the grave "you are my father," "mother" and "sister" to the worm?" In these verses, the source domain is signaled by the nouns בַּיִת 'house', אָב 'father', אֵם 'mother', and אָחוֹת 'sister'. Because it is referred to several times and because it extends beyond the clause, it can be regarded as deliberately used.

DEATH IS A HOUSE
death is an eternal dwelling place

DEATH IS NOT A HOUSE
co-occupants of the grave are not family members
death is not a place of community

The DEATH IS A HOUSE metaphor conceptualizes death as an eternal dwelling place.[27] Job shows with this more positive conceptualization that he accepts *Sheol* as his final abode, but this acceptance does not entail that he stops protesting against death's encompassing darkness (v. 13b, see § 1.3.3 below). Death is everyman's final abode, but even so, it is a place of isolation where there is no community that one can relate or belong to (v. 14). Without a community that allows for the restoration of status, death is a place of darkness that consumes man's life and the record thereof.

27 For similar conceptualizations, see בֵּית מוֹעֵד לְכָל־חָי 'house of meeting for all living' in Job 30:23, and בֵּית עוֹלָמוֹ 'his eternal home' in Ecc 12:5.

Above, I have suggested that in the second speech cycle, Job's main issue is that his friends withhold him their recognition. I propose that by emphasizing that he is leaving for a place where there is no community to rely on, Job presents his current situation as urgent and critical—both for himself and for his friends. Only his earthly community, that is his friends, can offer the recognition that Job is longing for, and only in the earthly time that is left for Job, the friends can take up their responsibility and act as righteous ones. While Job's reflections on the DEATH IS A HOUSE metaphor are primarily used to incite his friends to adopt a new attitude, the portrayal of death as a cold and anonymous place also adds *pathos* to his argument.[28] Even if the friends are not willing to obey to Job's appeal, the harsh reality of his outlook may at least make them more sensitive to his negative state of mind and his rejection of their optimistic perspectives.

1.3.3. Rest (17:13.16)

As an elaboration on the DEATH IS A HOUSE metaphor, the source domain of rest is introduced in verse 13 אִם־אֲקַוֶּה שְׁאוֹל בֵּיתִי בַּחֹשֶׁךְ רִפַּדְתִּי יְצוּעָי "If I expect that *Sheol* is my house, would I spread my bed in darkness?" where it is evoked by the phrase רפד יצוע 'to spread a bed'.[29] The source domain reappears in verse 16 בַּדֵּי שְׁאוֹל תֵּרַדְנָה אִם־יַחַד עַל־עָפָר נָחַת "Will it go down to the parts of *Sheol*, or are we together when rest is over dust?" where it is referred to by the noun נַחַת 'rest'. It may seem that the source domain is not presented very prominently in each of these verses, but as Job's longing for rest has been a reason for him to desire death in chapter 3 (cf. 3:17-19.26), its twofold occurrence here, in a passage on death and the lack of hope, reactivates a theme. I therefore consider the source domain of rest as deliberately used.

DEATH IS REST
spread one's bed is making preparations for death
death is the end of earthly struggle

28 Cf. Hays (2013: 227): "Job had entertained the idea of treating death as a return to family (notably to the mother in 1:21a), as a source of comfort, but he gives up that hope. He gives up hoping that death might be a return to family, which was a typical hope of ancient Near Eastern mortuary cults, and which even undergirded common biblical formulations such as "gathered to his kin" and "slept with his ancestors" (...)."

29 On רפד, cf. Seow (2013: 767).

Since chapter 3, Job has been longing for rest. At first, Job hoped to find rest in death. Job felt agitated because God had locked him up in life (3:23-26) and because he had been thinking that his service on earth was done (7:1-2), but when he realized that death would not bring him peace (10:18-22, 14:4-12), another sort of unrest emerged, namely one that was caused by the lack of hope on recognition from God. I propose that in the second speech cycle, a social dimension is added to Job's unrest (see §1.1 above). It is problematic that Job is not given recognition by his friends, because he expects to die, and death will cut off any possibility of restoration within his community. As long as his earthly community does not give him an honest appreciation of his life, Job cannot allow himself to 'spread his bed in darkness'.

Job does not fear death and he longs for its rest,[30] but he will not surrender until he has ensured that his remembrance will be in accordance with his righteous life. When Job asks his friends in verse 15 to confirm that there is no hope in death, he implies that there is still hope for him as long as he lives. I therefore suggest that Job's rhetorical questions are actually a call upon his friends to take a stand: will the friends allow that his hope goes down to the *Sheol*, or will they enable that Job and his hope are together when there is rest over dust?[31] After Job's negative interpretation of death in the previous verses and chapters, the positive conceptualization of death as rest in verse 16 comes as a surprise. If the negative context is taken into account, the image of rest has a cynical import, as it comprises the end of struggling with unanswered questions and going to a place of utter isolation. On the other hand, if the positive conceptualization is taken at face value, it reveals that the possibility that social recognition puts the social dimension of his suffering to an end actually allows Job to return to the disposition that he held up until chapter 7. I hold that both interpretations apply and that the ambiguity in tone exactly express how Job's mood swings between the fear that he will be forsaken both in life and in death, and the hope that in the end, he will be restored by both God and his friends.

30 Job longs for rest, but he refuses to spread his bed *in darkness*; see §1.3.1 above.

31 Most scholars interpret נַחַת 'rest' as נֵחַת 'we will go down' to read verse 16 as a parallelism that pictures the destruction of hope: "Will it descend to Sheol? Shall we go down together to the dust?" (e.g. Pope ([3]1973: 131), Clines (1989: 375) and Seow (2013: 768)). Since chapter 3, however, the theme of rest has been a topic in Job's thinking about death. I agree that 16a envisions how Job's hope would be destroyed, but I propose that the אִם-clause in 16b pictures a counter scenario in which Job's reunion with hope results in a peaceful death (see my translation above).

1.3.4. Decomposition (17:14.16)

After Job has pictured death as a place of darkness in verse 13, he pictures it as a place of decomposition in verse 14 לַשַּׁחַת קָרָאתִי אָבִי אָתָּה אִמִּי וַאֲחוֹתִי לָרִמָּה "Would I say to the grave "you are my father," "mother" and "sister" to the worm?", where the source domain is evoked by the nouns שַׁחַת 'pit', and רִמָּה 'maggot'. In verse 16, בַּדַּי שְׁאוֹל תֵּרֵדְנָה אִם־יַחַד עַל־עָפָר נָחַת "Will they go down to the parts of *Sheol*, or we are together when rest is over dust?" it is again referred to by the noun עָפָר 'dust'.

BODY IS DUST
the body is transient
humans are mortal

In TWOT, שַׁחַת is defined as "pit, destruction, grave, corruption" (Harris 1980: 911). The pit is a place of decay and corruption where worms eat away the bodily remains. Through the DEATH IS DECOMPOSITION metonymy, Job draws the attention to the concrete and physical character of death. So far, Job has been especially concerned about the fundamental issues that were involved in death. Job's fear has been that he would be left without a community, not that maggots would feed themselves with what is left of him. In my view, the introduction of the source domain of decomposition here mainly serves to add an emotional charge to Job's argument. The friends agree with Job on the negative character of death, but so far, Job's death has merely been a hypothetical scenario for them. To Job, death is a fast approaching reality. His need for recognition is urgent. While Job seeks to point out to his friends that they are his only community left and that he depends on them, the image of corruption evokes the concrete and physical character of death. Although it is useless to fight the matter-of-fact event that a corpse in the grave will be eaten by maggots, the grisly image of decay alerts the friends that they should move beyond theoretical expositions and take into account the reality that Job will soon die.

While the nouns שַׁחַת 'pit' and רִמָּה 'worm' in verse 14 have outspoken negative overtones, the noun עָפָר 'dust' in verse 16 is more neutral. Dust is the material that covers the surface of the earth. As a metaphor, it is the material to which the human body returns when it falls apart after one's death, and as a metonymy, it is the place in which dead bodies lie down (cf. NIDOTTE (Hayden 1997: 472)). When Job asks his friends if he will be united with his hope when "rest is over dust," the image of dust simultaneously refers to the body and the grave. The BODY IS DUST metaphor and the DUST IS GRAVE metonymy unemotionally present death as a physical reality. Mortality is the universal fate of mankind, and it is not a problem if Job dies united

with his hope, that is, when he is given recognition. The frailty of human nature is part of the problem that Job is struggling with, but he does not need his friends to explain his condition or the fact that he is facing death—in this regard he wants them to keep silent (cf. 13:1–2; 16:2–3). He only needs them to acknowledge the reality of death so that they shift their perspective and consent to his request to confirm—as the righteous would—that his misfortune is undeserved and problematic.

1.4. *The Conceptualization of Suffering as a Lack of Social Recognition*

In the beginning of the second speech cycle, Job still suffers from a fundamental lack of hope, but he also becomes aware of an additional and more concrete source of suffering, namely the hostile behavior of his community and the disloyalty of his friends. Whereas Job cannot face-to-face discuss his discontent with God, the friends can be directly confronted with what Job thinks they do wrong.

When Job presents himself as a test case for the righteous, he demands his friends to take a stand. According to Job, the righteous would be appalled at his situation and so he expects the same of his friends. In the above, I have claimed that the outspoken grisly conceptualization of death in verses 13–14 as a dark place where his community consists of creatures of corruptions is mainly rhetorical: it is addressed to the friends and serves to draw their attention to the reality of Job's death. The friends must realize that there is no community in death and that they are the only community that Job depends on for his recognition. I have furthermore proposed that the chapter ends in a different tone with the more neutral conceptualization of death in terms of rest and dust. If verses 15–16 are read as rhetorical questions that assert that there is no hope for Job, the image of rest and dust presents a cynical downplay of Job's emotional disposition at the face of death. However, if it is assumed that Job allows for the possibility that the friends come to his help, the image rather marks that he adopts a more dispassionate opinion about death. Such a change of attitude suggests that the notion of social recognition has opened up a more constructive perspective.

In chapter 17, the dialogue between Job and his friends shifts from the theoretical to the practical level. To Job, the question is not how his misfortune can be explained, but how it affects social relations. The change of topic brings a change in the rhetorical situation. In the new discussion, Job is not a victim, but on the contrary an expert who employs his 'victim experience' to gain back control and restore his hopes. The envisioning of hope comes with the risk of disappointment. The imagination that his friends return to him and restore his esteem turns his current situation into one of utter desolation. Job demands of his friends that they take responsibility and offer

him consolation, but if they do not change their behavior, Job will feel more alone than ever before. Even so, his new advisor role marks the start of a phase in which Job reflects on his suffering from a social perspective.

2. The Conceptualization of Suffering in Job 19:20-29

At the end of chapter 17, the main reason for Job to resist death was that it will consume the testimony of his righteousness; at that point, Job's only hope was the possibility of human recognition. When it turns out in chapter 18 that Bildad is not willing to submit to Job's argument, Job is nevertheless able to upkeep his hopes, and in chapter 19, he once again tries to convince his friends that they are going wrong. In 19:20-29 it appears that Bildad's response has made Job more determined and more belligerent, and that from this point on, Job has decisively regained control over the situation.

2.1. *Job 19:20-29 in the Context of Job 18–19*

Job 18 Bildad feels very well that the mood has changed and he blames the others for letting the discussion head in the wrong direction (18:2).[32] Already in his first speech, Bildad had made clear that the solution is not in elaborate theories. What Job should do is what he already pointed out in chapter 8: firstly, he should confirm that God is righteous, and secondly, he should seriously search for God. To Bildad, it makes no sense to speculate on the nature of humans as Eliphaz and Zophar tended to do. Humans are not stupid as cattle (18:3, cf. 11:12) and humans are not unclean (18:3, cf. 4:17 and 15:14).

In chapter 18, Bildad, like Eliphaz, returns to Job's statements on the wicked in chapter 12 (cf. 12:4-10). In reaction to Job's accusation that the friends do not get agitated when the tents of the wicked are at ease, Eliphaz had pointed out that they are rightly doing so because tradition learns that the wicked are not truly at ease

32 In verses 2–3, Bildad addresses his audience in the second person plural: "How long will you (plural) put nets around words? Gain understanding (plural) and then we will talk! Why are we considered as animals? Why are we unclean in your (plural) eyes?" I assume here that Bildad addresses not only Job, but also the other friends who have been speculating on the imperfect nature of man (cf. Eliphaz in 4:17-19, Zopar in 11:12). Most scholars, however, have found problematic to understand how Bildad would also address the other friends. See Clines (1989: 409) for an overview of proposals to emend the text.

and that their success will not last (cf. 15:20-29). In chapter 18, Bildad continues on his theme in chapter 8 that miracles happen to the righteous. He pictures here the other side of the coin, namely that miracles do not happen to the wicked. Even if the wicked seem to flourish, when misfortune happens to them, there is no backing (18:5-11). Job's current state is no reason for despair, if like a tree he would upkeep a steady connection with God. Job contested that man is like a tree (cf. 14:7-12), because he rejected that an untimely death can be solved by the promise that one's offspring will be rewarded (cf. 14:20-21). Bildad, however, understands that Job's hopes are now set on his testimony and plays the tree metaphor anew. He envisions Job's fear that his suffering is seen as punishment from God (18:12-15), that he is considered a withering tree who did not keep his roots connected to the source of life (18:16), and that without a family or community, his house and name will disappear from the earth (18:17-19) so that he is wrongly counted among the wicked (18:20-21). It thus appears that according to Bildad, Job's fate is in his own hands: only God can restore his status and safeguard his testimony. Job has pictured his misfortune as an assignment to his friends, but Bildad rejects any responsibility. Job should not busy himself with accusing his friends; he should know better and shift his attention to God.

Job 19 Bildad rather leaves it to God to judge whether or not Job should be counted among the wicked. Because Job had explicitly asked his friends to choose his side, Job feels betrayed by Bildad's insensitive response (19:2-3). In his eyes, there is no risk in believing a friend on his word. If it turns out that Job is not true, the friends will not be blamed for showing loyalty: "even if I truly went astray, it is with me that my error dwells" (19:4). Job continues his earlier attempt to make his friends see that their attitude toward him is not without obligations. He already presented his situation as a test case for the righteous, and now he adds that it is set up by God. According to Job, God is not only testing Job's loyalty, but He is also testing the loyalty of his friends (19:5-6).[33]

Because God has made him into a test case, it is impossible for Job to escape his situation (19:7-10). The only thing he can do is to make his friends see what is going on—namely that they, like his whole community, are walking into God's trap (19:11-19)[34]—and to urge them to reconsider their position (19:20-29). The friends must not

33 Yu here remarks: "Job intensifies his rhetoric, directed not to the comforters' sympathy [...] but to their sense of shame and fear" (Yu 2011: 312).

34 The lament in verses 11–19 pictures how Job experiences the impact of social hostility, but I propose that its rhetorical function is to describe the social mechanism that is started in when someone is

think of him as one who 'escaped' death (19:20). Their duty is to show sympathy (19:21); they are not in the position that they can judge him like God, and so they should not try and draw conclusions on the state of his body (19:22).[35] Job is convinced that in the end, God will confirm his innocence (19:23–25). The friends should move beyond outward appearances and allow for the possibility that God will not recognize Job in this life; they should look Job in the eyes so that he does not have to die as a stranger (19:26–27).[36] More explicitly than before (cf. 13:7–12 and 17:5), Job's advise to his friends is followed by a warning. The friends cannot simply stand by and wait to see how things turn out. What happens to Job involves also them, and when they take a wrong decision, they will certainly be punished by God (19:28–29).

2.2. *Job 19:20–29: Text and Translation*

Bildad has refused to answer Job's call for loyalty, and so in the beginning of chapter 19, Job still finds himself in a dead-end situation (19:7–10) in which he is treated like an enemy by both God and his community (19:11–19). It could be expected that Job's suffering is now reaching its climax, but in 19:20–29 it appears on the contrary that Job positively restores his confidence:[37]

---

struck by misfortune. In this sense, I do not consider 19:16–19 as a key passage in the description of Job's suffering. Even if Job obviously suffers from isolation, his understanding of the social principle enables him to distance himself from his situation and to put his situation in perspective.

35 Cf. Hartley (1988: 290): "Job beseeches his friends to share the weight of his suffering made unbearable by his complete estrangement from the community. They must come to realize that it is not some fault in Job that is the cause of his suffering, but the hand of God that has struck him. Then they can freely show him mercy." E.g. Habel, Clines (1989: 453), and Newsom (1996: 474.477) understand Job's appeal in 19:21 as ironic because the reason that Job addresses the friends instead of God—namely God's hostile behavior toward Job—is exactly the reason that the friends will not show him mercy. In my view, however, there is no irony here. I propose that Job understands very well why the friends show him no mercy and that he exactly tries to enfeeble their reasoning by convincing his friends that judgment is not a concern of man (19:22). It may be custom routine to show 'contempt for ruin' (19:11–19, cf. 12:5), but Job wants his friends to recognize that such practices are wrong.

36 Job 19:26–27: וְאַחַר עוֹרִי נִקְפוּ־זֹאת וּמִבְּשָׂרִי אֶחֱזֶה אֱלוֹהַּ׃ אֲשֶׁר אֲנִי אֶחֱזֶה־לִּי וְעֵינַי רָאוּ וְלֹא־זָר כָּלוּ כִלְיֹתַי בְּחֵקִי׃ "When after my skin, one cuts off this, that from my flesh I will behold God, what I envision for me is that one sees my eyes, and not a stranger, when my kidneys come to an end within me." On this translation and interpretation, see § 2.2 below.

37 Clines notes that in this speech, Jobs speaks with more self-confidence and "less in sorrow than in anger" (Clines 1989: 438–439).

Job 19:20-29

20 בְּעוֹרִי וּבִבְשָׂרִי דָּבְקָה עַצְמִי וָאֶתְמַלְּטָה בְּעוֹר שִׁנָּי׃
21 חָנֻּנִי חָנֻּנִי אַתֶּם רֵעָי כִּי יַד־אֱלוֹהַּ נָגְעָה בִּי׃
22 לָמָּה תִרְדְּפֻנִי כְמוֹ־אֵל וּמִבְּשָׂרִי לֹא תִשְׂבָּעוּ׃
23 מִי־יִתֵּן אֵפוֹ וְיִכָּתְבוּן מִלָּי מִי־יִתֵּן בַּסֵּפֶר וְיֵחָקוּ׃
24 בְּעֵט־בַּרְזֶל וְעוֹפֶרֶת לָעַד בַּצּוּר יֵחָצֵבוּן׃
25 וַאֲנִי יָדַעְתִּי גֹּאֲלִי חָי וְאַחֲרוֹן עַל־עָפָר יָקוּם׃
26 וְאַחַר עוֹרִי נִקְּפוּ־זֹאת וּמִבְּשָׂרִי אֶחֱזֶה אֱלוֹהַּ׃
27 אֲשֶׁר אֲנִי | אֶחֱזֶה־לִּי וְעֵינַי רָאוּ וְלֹא־זָר כָּלוּ כִלְיֹתַי בְּחֵקִי׃
28 כִּי תֹאמְרוּ מַה־נִּרְדָּף־לּוֹ וְשֹׁרֶשׁ דָּבָר נִמְצָא־בִי׃
29 גְּוּרוּ לָכֶם | מִפְּנֵי־חֶרֶב כִּי־חֵמָה עֲוֹנוֹת חֶרֶב לְמַעַן תֵּדְעוּן שַׁדִּין׀ : ס

20 My bones cling to my skin and my flesh,
so I have escaped with the skin of my teeth?[38]
21 Have pity on me, have pity on me, you, my friends;
because it is the hand of God that touched me!
22 Why do you pursue me like God?
Are you not satisfied with my flesh?
23 O would, then, that my words are written down;
that they are recorded in a book,
24 with an iron pen and lead,
forever hewn in the rock,
25 but I know that my Redeemer lives,
and that He is the Last[39] who will rise over dust.
26 If after my skin, this[40] has been cut down,[41]
that from my flesh I will behold God,

38 On this translation, see below.

39 I follow Seow in translating אַחֲרוֹן as a substantive and as a reference to God: "Importantly, the term appears as a divine epithet, "the last" (Rashi, Ramban), which, together with its opposite, "the first," conveys the sense of divine sovereignty over all history—God as the beginning and the end of history" (Seow 2013: 806).

40 By taking זאת 'this' in נִקְּפוּ־זֹאת 'one will strike off this' as an cataphoric reference to the next clause וּמִבְּשָׂרִי אֶחֱזֶה אֱלוֹהַּ 'and from my flesh I will behold God', verse 26 describes how in the general opinion it is rejected that Job will see God while he is still alive. For the figurative understanding of נקף of 'strike off, cut down' in 19:26, compare the metaphorical senses of כרת 'to cut off, to cut down': "to root out, eliminate, remove, excommunicate or destroy by a violent act of man or nature," TWOT (Smick 1980: 456). On this interpretation, see §3.3.1 below.

41 See also Wolfers for this syntactical interpretation of 26a: "There is (…) difficulty in determining

[27] what I envision for me[42] is that one sees my eyes,[43] and not a stranger
when my kidneys come to an end within me.
[28] When you say: "how do we persecute him,"
and that the root of the matter is to be found in me,
[29] you yourselves should fear the sword
for anger is one of the sins of the sword;
that you may know that there is judgment!

As was the case for the chapters 16–17, scholars have found it difficult to discover a clear structure in chapter 19.[44] I follow Clines in taking a starting point in the verses where Job addresses his friends. As Clines remarks, "the friends are spoken to both at the beginning and end (vv 2–6, 28–29), as well as in the course of the speech (vv 21–22)" (Clines 1989: 435). I agree with Clines that Job addresses his friends in verses 2–6 and 28–29, but different from Clines, I propose that the address in the course of the speech begins in verse 20. Whereas Clines sees verse 20 as a conclusion of Job's complaint on his friends and family in 13–19 (Clines 1989: 436), I take it with van der Lugt as the beginning of a new section in which body terms (עוֹר 'skin', 19:20.26; בָּשָׂר 'flesh', 19:20.22.26) are given a prominent place.[45] Like van der Lugt, I

---

the subject of the verb in the sentence. This can only be solved if we maintain faith that the text is intact and incorrupt, for then we find the sentence has exactly the same form as e.g. "That after the main course, there will be served dessert." In this, the verb *served* services both nouns, but with implied difference in tense, and with the desiderative applicable only to the second subject. In full the sentence is "(would that) after the main course (has been served), there will be served dessert". Transferring this to Job, we read: (Would that) after my body [or skin] (has been נקף), there will be נקף this" (Wolfers 1995: 490).

42 The אֲשֶׁר-clause is generally understood as modifying אֱלוֹהַּ in 19:26. I propose that this clause is better understood as an independent relative clause, cf. GK §138e.

43 On object clauses introduced by ו, cf. JM §177h. In most translations, וְעֵינַי 'my eyes' is understood as the subject of ראה 'to see'. I propose, however, that the verse makes better sense when וְעֵינַי 'my eyes' and זָר 'stranger' are taken as direct objects, and when the masculine plural in רָאוּ 'they see'—as נִקְּפוּ in 19:26—is taken as an impersonal subject. On the interpretation of my translation, see below.

44 See the overview of different divisions in van der Lugt (1995: 223–224) on which he remarks that it shows "that there [is] hardly any consensus about the exact delimitation of main units in ch. 19". See also n. 15 above.

45 Even if only few scholars have considered verse 20 as the beginning of a new section (Van der Lugt 1995: 226 n. 7), van der Lugt concludes on the basis of an analysis of verbal repetitions that verse 20 "is to be taken as the first line of the second canto" (Van der Lugt 1995: 226).

understand verse 20 as a "summarizing, single line [that] provides the special ground for Job's cry for mercy on the part of the friends in v. 21a [...]" (Van der Lugt 1995: 226).

In verses 20–29, the main difficulties concern the sense of וְאֶתְמַלְּטָה בְּעוֹר שִׁנָּי 'and I will escape on the skin of my teeth' (19:20), the identity of the גֹּאֲלִי 'redeemer' (19:25), and the interpretation of the circumstances (נִקְּפוּ־זֹאת עוֹרִי וְאַחַר 'and after my skin one cuts off this') and bodily state (מִבְּשָׂרִי 'out of my flesh') in which Job asserts to see God (19:26).

There is no certainty about the exact meaning of the phrase 'escaping on the skin of one's teeth' in verse 20. Seow remarks that if teeth are understood to have no skin, it may refer to an escape whereby one is left with nothing at all, while, on the other hand, if the skin of one's teeth is understood to refer to one's gums, it may be supposed that one is left without teeth, that is, without the ability to eat or speak (Seow 2013: 801). For both scenarios, however, it needs to be explained in what sense Job 'has escaped'. While it is generally assumed that it is an escape from death to which Job refers, it is unexpected that at this point, Job describes his situation as such.[46] Indeed, since 10:18–22 Job is not looking forward to death (cf. chapter 4, § 2.4), but so far, he did not fear death, and compared to being dead, he did not consider being alive in his current bodily state as the better alternative.[47] On the contrary, it was exactly his current bodily state that caused unrest and that kept Job from giving in to death. Instead of taking verse 20b as Job's own interpretation of his situation, I therefore propose that in verse 20, Job confronts his friends with the way he thinks they see him: "My bones cling to my skin and to my flesh, so I have escaped with the skin of my teeth?" To Job, it appears that his friends believe that his body represents who he is (v. 20a), and that in his mean condition, he should only be grateful to still be alive (20b). I propose that this outline of how he is approached is the background against which Job urges his friends in verse 21 to take another stand and to sympathize with him.

The friends should sympathize with Job, because is it not up to them to judge him like God (19:22). Even if Job is convinced that God is treating him as an enemy (19:7–11),

46 Cf. Clines (1989: 450): "it is strange that Job should say that he has "escaped" (מלט hithp), since that seems to be the last thing he would claim has been his experience." The only way for Job to 'escape' death would be that either God or his friends restore their loyalty so that a faithful memory of him will be kept alive.

47 Cf. NIDOTTE: "The surrounding context suggests that Job has been delivered from death but in a condition where death might have been a better alternative" (Long 1997: 3:360).

this does not involve that he has given up his belief in the principle of righteousness.[48] Whatever happens, Job trusts that in the end, his גֹּאֵל 'redeemer' will put him in the right (19:25). I follow here the traditional interpretation that גֹּאֵל 'redeemer' refers to God.[49] It has been argued that Job could not consider God to be his redeemer when at the same time he holds Him responsible for his misfortune,[50] but in my view it is exactly Job's unshakable trust in God's righteousness that explains why he does not save God in his relentless protest against wrongs. By presenting God as a kinsman responsible for his deliverance, Job elaborates on the legal metaphors that pictured God as his litigant/judge (cf. 9:15.33) and witness (cf. 16:19). Earlier, he had desired to face God so that he could be put in the right, but at this point, the knowledge that in the end he will be redeemed is enough. With Newsom I assume that Job envisions his redemption

> [...] as taking place sometime in the future. That this is understood to be after Job's death is likely from the general context, even if the phrase "upon the dust" more likely means "upon the earth" (cf. 41:33[25]) than referring to Job's grave.[51]
>
> Newsom 1996: 478

If Job is indeed able to draw comfort from the trust that in the very end he will be vindicated by God, this involves that he has moved beyond the frustration that God does not employ his power to ensure that the one dies at a moment that fits ones moral efforts (cf. 14:4-12; chapter 4, §3.3).

By establishing a hopeful perspective that neither depends on his present situation, nor on his condition at the moment of death, Job is able to take off the urgency of his case, and at the same time, it provides him with another argument to condemn the behavior of the friends. If the body does not reflect man's moral record, the friends are wrong in taking it as an excuse for holding back their sympathy. At the background of this reasoning, verses 26–27 function as another appeal to the friends. Verse 26

48 On Job's fundamental belief in justice, see also 10:13-15 (cf. chapter 4, §2.1), 13:18 (cf. chapter 4, §3.1), and 16:19 (cf. §1.1 above).

49 Andersen (1976: 209): "(...) verses 25–27 are so tightly knit that there should be no doubt that the Redeemer is God"; see also e.g. Gordis (1978), Hartley (1988: 293), van der Lugt (1995: 227) and Erickson (2013: 300 n. 26). For an overview of other interpretations see Seow (2013: 823).

50 So e.g. Habel (1985: 305–307), Clines (1989: 459), Newsom (1996: 478), and Seow (2013: 805).

51 See also Andersen (1976: 210): "There would be no need for Job to deposit a written testimony, if he expects to be vindicated before he dies."

pictures Job's current state of affairs: his body is in decline, and his community has given up on him.[52] In these circumstances he needs his friends to look him in the eye and to see him as the person he knows himself to be: "what I envision for me is that one sees my eyes, and not a stranger, when my kidneys come to an end within me" (19:27). Job trusts that eventually God will put him in the right. What matters now is not that he will see God before he dies, but that his friends stop treating him like a stranger while he is alive. With everything and everyone turned against him, he wants his friends to be on his side when life fails him.

2.3. *Metaphors in Job 19:20–29*

In the previous section (17:6-16, see § 1 above), Job was suffering from a complete lack of hope, and he had considered his friends as the last ones left to offer him recognition. In chapter 19, Job's transcendent approach to the body leads to a transcendent approach to reality, and to the restoration of the hope that in the end, he will be recognized by God. The restoration of hope definitely revives Job's morale,[53] but even so, he still longs for the consolation of his friends.

With God as his Redeemer, Job's suffering is put in a new perspective. Job can live with the reality of his misfortune, because he trusts that in the end God will judge that he is righteous and that what happened to him was wrong and undeserved. This trust takes off the main weight of his suffering and it also changes his understanding of the role of his friends. Their role is not to judge his case and to recognize his innocence, but to suspend their judgment and approach him unprejudiced as the friend they know. Job aims at restoring the relation with his friends and community to put an end to the social dimension of his suffering. At the beginning of this new project that he elaborates on in the following chapters,[54] Job uses the source domains of body

52 Job himself believes that he will die without seeing God, but unlike his enemies, he does not believe that this is because he is wicked, but because in an inexplicable way, God allows it to happen. If like his community, his friends are tempted to think that Job will indeed die, he wants them to explain his misfortune as he does and to stop seeing him as one who is wicked.

53 Note that from chapter 19 onwards, there are no more desperate outbursts, neither on bodily suffering, nor on the experience of animosity.

54 I propose that from this point onwards, the main rhetorical aim in Job's speeches is to build the awareness that a community has the duty to take responsibility for its sufferers. In this project, it appears that Job's conceptualization of his friends has changed: in the first speech cycle, his friends started off as equals that are in principle on his side, but by now they have become grouped among those who contribute to his misery and that of other sufferers.

(19:20.22.26-27), redemption (19:25), transience (19: 25), and vision (19:26-27) to picture the possibility of hope and consolation in an imperfect world.

2.3.1. *Body (19:20.22.26-27)*

Whereas it can be imagined that Job suffers from the pain in his body, it is only here in chapter 19 that the source domain of the body features so prominently.[55] In verses 20, 22, and 26–27, especially the repeated occurrence of עוֹר 'skin' (19:20.26) and בָּשָׂר 'flesh' (19:20.22.26) stand out, and the source domain of body is furthermore referred to by עֶצֶם 'bone' and שֵׁן 'tooth' in verse 20, and עַיִן 'eye', כִּלְיָה 'kidney' and חֵיק 'bosom' in verse 27. The source domain of the body can be understood as deliberately used, because it appears throughout the passage. To establish what the source domain exactly refers to, I take a closer look at each of these verses.

At first sight, verse 20, בְּעוֹרִי וּבִבְשָׂרִי דָּבְקָה עַצְמִי וָאֶתְמַלְּטָה בְּעוֹר שִׁנָּי "My bones cling to my skin and to my flesh, so I have escaped with the skin of my teeth?" can be taken as literally describing the lean or weak state of Job's body. In discussions on the abrupt change of topic between verses 13–19—on alienation—and 20—on Job's body, however, it has been suggested that the body terms are used metaphorically to express Job's mental condition. Clines, for example, states that

> [t]he absence of his friends and relations and the deprivation of human intimacy have not of course induced some recurrence of his malady, but have weakened his spirit and sapped his vigor.[56]
>
> Clines 1989: 451

---

55 It must indeed be noted that so far, Job has not described his grief as directly related to his bodily condition. Of course, Job has mentioned the state of his body before. In this regard, Newsom for example remarks that "a significant number of Job's representations of the body are invasive images." The examples she mentions—"the poisoned arrow that penetrates the body (6:4; cf. 7:20), worms that cloak and feed on broken and oozing skin (7:5), dreams that invade the interiority of psychic space (7:14), images that culminate in the graphic description of penetration and disemboweling in 16:12-14" (Newsom 2003: 135)—however, are not so much used to describe Job's pain as such, but rather to clarify the reason for his anger (6:4), to explain why he expects (7:5) and desires (7:14) to die, and to picture his friends what has happened to him since God has been treating him as an enemy (16:12-14). It thus appears, that so far, Job's suffering did not so much result from the condition of his body, but rather from the fact that the condition of his body has turned the world he thought to know into an inexplicable place.

56 For a similar interpretation, see e.g. Seow (2013: 801): "[…] Job is not merely describing his physical appearance. Rather, as elsewhere in the book, the disintegration or distortion of the human body is a metaphor for one's shattered state. […] Disembodiment is a metaphor for the loss of personal wholeness, integrity. In this sense, v. 20 is related to the preceding verses. The absence of friends and

This understanding implies that the atypical idiom of 'bones cleaving to skin and flesh' is looked at as an inversion of the common conceptualization of the body: normally, the bones are the firm structure that supports the skin and flesh, but here, the skin and flesh are presented as the more solid parts that keep the bones together. According to Clines, this inversion asserts that Job's bones have become weak, whereby "the collapse of his bones is [...] the expression of the overpowering sense of weakness and being worn out [...]" (Clines 1989: 451). Clines takes Job's reference to his bones as a reference to the most solid part of his body, but I prefer to understand it as a reference to the inner self.[57]

INNER SELF IS BONES[58]
the inner self is of a different order than the bodily self
the inner self is not reflected by the bodily self

In my view, verse 20 is a question that contests the friends' assumption that the disposition of Job's bones—his self—depends on the condition his skin and flesh—his damaged exteriors.[59] So far, the friends did not take into account the possibility that Job's body misrepresents who he is. The metaphorical interpretation of bones and the metonymical interpretation of skin and flesh play out the paradox that the self and the body are different entities, while at the same time they are inextricably bound up with each other.[60] Although it is not clear what Job exactly refers to with 'the skin of

---

relations and the deprivation of human intimacy have thoroughly destroyed Job's sense of self and caused him to fall apart completely."

57 Cf. BDB (Brown et al. 2001: 782–783). So also Wolfers (1995: 127). Wolfers interprets עצמי 'my bones' as referring to the self, and דבק 'to cling' as a complaint on survival: "My ghost clings to my skin and my flesh; and I am escaped by the skin of my teeth—I continue reluctantly, precariously, to live, because the life-force won't depart" (Wolfers 1995: 127). I do not agree with Wolfers' interpretation on דבק 'to cling' as a complaint on survival, because in my view, survival can only be an issue when Job actually desires to die. This is here in chapter 19 no longer the case.

58 The counterpart of this metaphor, namely SKIN AND FLESH ARE THE BODILY SELF, is a metonym because of the contiguity between the source and the target domain.

59 Cf. Erickson (2013: 306): "[...] it is notable that Job reverses the image of Ps 102:6. The psalmist complains, "my bones cling to my skin," suggesting that his bones are holding onto the skin so that the skin will not fall off. Job, by contrast, laments that his skin clings stubbornly to his bones; he cannot escape the corrupted garment of flesh he wears." I agree with Erickson on the conceptualization; in my view, however, is does not function as complaint, but rather as a projection of the friends' reasoning that he intends to modify.

60 For references on the distinction between the self and the body in the Hebrew Bible and the Book of Job, see Erickson (2013: 296 n. 5 and 299). As Erickson notes: "Job's speeches push the distinction

his teeth' (see § 2.2 above), it could be argued that a non-metaphorical understanding of skin in verse 20a suggests the same for verse 20b. In contrast to the damaged skin to which Job's 'self' sticks, the skin of his teeth can be imagined to be the only part of Job's skin that is not affected by decease.[61] The 'escape by the skin of his teeth' can in that case be understood as provoking his friends who tend to deduce Job's fate from his body: would they indeed go so far to hold the undamaged skin of his teeth as a prediction of the fact that he will not die? Should they not admit that such reasoning is quite far-fetched?

In verse 20, בְּשָׂרִי was used as a metonymy to refer to Job's physical body, and in this same role it occurs in verse 22 as part of a metaphorical expression: לָמָּה תִרְדְּפֵנִי כָמוֹ־אֵל וּמִבְּשָׂרִי לֹא תִשְׂבָּעוּ "Why do you pursue me like God? Are you not satisfied with my flesh?" As an object of שׂבע 'to be satisfied', בָּשָׂר 'flesh' is conceptualized as something that can be consumed.[62] I propose that the question whether Job's flesh is not enough serves to evoke the counter scenario that his friends would eat his bones as well. Job indirectly warns the friends not to touch his bones. They should accept his bodily condition as an accidental fact that is not to be used to make claims about his inner self. The friends should know their limits: Job's flesh is not a starter that allows his friends to devour his integrity as well.

Job has established a transcendent approach to his body,[63] and in verses 26–27, he widens its scope to his existence as such: וְאַחַר עוֹרִי נִקְפוּ־זֹאת וּמִבְּשָׂרִי אֶחֱזֶה אֱלוֹהַּ: אֲשֶׁר אֲנִי אֶחֱזֶה־לִּי וְעֵינַי רָאוּ וְלֹא־זָר כָּלוּ כִלְיֹתַי בְּחֵקִי "If after my skin, one has cut down this, that from my flesh I will behold God, what I envision for me is that one sees my eyes, and not a stranger, when my kidneys come to an end within me."[64] In my view, Job envisions in verse 26 that his friends let go of judgments both on Job's appearance and of the expectation that he will live.

---

between the aspects of the self that are observable by others and the features of the self that remain hidden from sight. Although Job does not possess a sense of the self's "inner depths" as moderns do, Job's presentation of the self indicates a disjunction between what is written on the body and the essence of one's character, as righteous or wicked" (Erickson 2013: 299).

61 Cf. Rashi: "by the skin of my teeth: All his flesh was afflicted with boils and worms except his gums".

62 TWOT (Waltke 1980: 869): "The usual sense of the verb is "to be satisfied by nourishment.""

63 Cf. Erickson: "As many scholars engaged in the philosophical and theological understandings of disability have observed, the whole, healthy body tends to be absent to consciousness; it is often the onset of pain and/or disability that makes one acutely aware of having a body. Yet that same pain-filled body that is impossible to ignore also compels the self to identify strategies to go beyond, even transcend, the experience of the body."

64 On this translation, see § 2.2 above.

The Revelation of The Inner Self is The Removal of Skin
the inner self is revealed by stripping off appearances

Job conceptualizes his skin as being ripped off. The removal of the skin can be understood as something that Job desires to happen when it causes the revelation of his self. I propose that Job not only wants that one looks beyond the skin, but also that one does away with the perspective that 'from his flesh he will behold God.'[65] Job does not expect that he will see God from his flesh, because of the bad condition of his body. To Job, the bad condition of his body is no reason to doubt that he will be vindicated by his Redeemer. His friends, however, hold another opinion. Job wants his friends to abandon the idea that God's recognition necessarily implies the restoration of the body, because it hinders them to approach Job anew (cf. § 2.3.4 below).

Job had been expecting to die from the very first moment that misfortune struck him. According to the friends, Job's righteousness will protect him against death, and in the first speech cycle, the friends hold that Job will not die. In the second speech cycle, however, they start to describe the wicked who will not be restored. On the one hand, these descriptions function as a warning to Job, but in anticipation of the possible event of Job's death, they also serve to bolster the interpretation of untimely death as the result of wickedness. In chapter 19, the idea that Job will be vindicated by God even if it is not during his life offers an escape from the theory of retribution. If the friends accept that death is not a matter of judgment, there is no longer need to seek explanations for Job's misfortune and the outcome thereof.

Now how is Job's conclusion that the friends may indeed relegate the matter of recognition to God different from Bildad's apparent refusal to take up the responsibility to confirm the injustice of Job's situation (cf. Job 18)? Both Job and his friends hold that God is the final judge, but the friends see this as an argument to refrain from judgment and to reiterate what has been delivered by tradition, whereas Job understands the lack of justice in the world as a responsibility for man. To Job, this responsibility entails among others that one is loyal to a friend and that one puts effort in breaking the sort of isolation that he pictured in verses 13–19. When Job envisions in verse 27 that one 'sees his eyes, and not a stranger',[66] the underlying idea

65 In this phrase, 'my flesh' functions as a metonym for 'my body.' I take 'from my flesh' in the sense of 'while being alive'; so e.g. Clines (1989: 458.461) and Newsom (1996: 479). On the interpretation of מִבְּשָׂרִי as 'away from my flesh', that is, 'while being death', see Erickson (2013: 308).

66 Note that what Job envisions is a counter image to Job 19:15: "גָּרֵי בֵיתִי וְאַמְהֹתַי לְזָר תַּחְשְׁבֵנִי נָכְרִי הָיִיתִי

is that one's eyes reflect one's true identity: Job hopes that the community recognizes him as the person he knows himself to be and that this is the reality כָּלוּ כִלְיֹתַי בְּחֵקִי 'when my kidneys come to an end within me.'

IDENTITY IS EYES
seeing one's eyes is seeing one's true identity
seeing one's eyes is establishing a real connection

INNER SELF IS KIDNEYS
the inner self is hidden in the body
the inner self is the affective self

As in verse 20, Job distinguishes between an inner and outer self. With the kidneys as the innermost self,[67] Job here pictures the moment that his affective self stops operating, that is, the moment that he loses his presence in the worldly interaction. Job's body is broken, but his mind is as collected as ever before. As long as he is mentally present, Job does not want his body to frustrate social relationships. Job wants his friends to reestablish their connection and to make it possible that he does not die as a stranger.

2.3.2. Redemption (19:25)

Job has pointed out to his friends that there is a distinction between the self and the body of skin and flesh, and that they should not base their judgments on his appearance alone. In the case that these arguments would not convince them to stop pursuing him and to shift their attention away from his flesh, he wishes his message to be communicated to the world in another way. If it is not the friends that keep his memory alive, his words must be recorded, so that his testimony is available for generations to come. Job's frustration that there is no real scenario that guarantees that his innocence will be acknowledged on earth, however, is outweighed by the relief that follows on his recognition of God as his Redeemer: וַאֲנִי יָדַעְתִּי גֹּאֲלִי חָי וְאַחֲרוֹן עַל־עָפָר יָקוּם "but I know that my Redeemer lives, and that He is the Last that will rise over dust." The source domain of redemption is referred to by גֹּאֲלִי 'my Redeemer', and it is elaborated on in the next clause that specifies that He is the אַחֲרוֹן עַל־עָפָר

בְּעֵינֵיהֶם "the guests in my house have forgotten me; my serving girls count me as a stranger; I have become an alien in their eyes" (NRSV).

67 Cf. HALOT (Köhler and Walter 1994–2000: 479).

יָקוּם "Last one that will rise over dust." I therefore consider the GOD IS A REDEEMER metaphor as deliberately used.

GOD IS A REDEEMER
God is a related kin
God has a responsibility to restore

In NIDOTTE, the understanding of God in terms of a גֹּאֵל 'redeemer' is explained as portraying him as one "who, like his familial counterpart, helps those who have fallen into need", and in Job 19:25 as the "ultimate lawyer who will eventually intervene to protect Job's legal rights" (NIDOTTE, (Hubbard 1997: 792)). In my view, the conceptualization of God as גֹּאֵל in chapter 19:25 especially serves to add a new dimension to the legal metaphor (cf. Job 9–10, 13–14, 16). Whereas legal officers formally represents the interests of a clients, the redeemer is related by family ties, and as such, the interests he represents are also his own. Legal officers establishes that justice is done, but the redeemer ensures that a disarray within his family is restored. I therefore propose that the GOD IS A REDEEMER metaphor highlights that Job's trust in God is based His solidarity and His responsibility to restore those who relate to Him.[68]

While Job's wish for his words to be recorded (19:23-24) pictures his desire for justice as a matter of personal recognition, I suggest that the concept of the redeemer opens up the possibility to understand justice on a higher level, namely not only in terms of judgment, but also in terms of kinship and restoration. Job establishes that justice is a matter of God's personal responsibility for man and for the order of the world as such. I hold that this development starts to shift the discussion away from the legal paradigm (מְשֹׁפֵט 'judge' in 9:15; מוֹכִיחַ 'mediator' in 9:33, and עֵד 'witness' in 16:19) and the topic of personal innocence and theodicy. Job's friends are confronted with a new view on reality: even if they do not dare to leave the traditional roads and if they do not have the courage to look beyond Job's flesh, they can hardly reject that as a Redeemer, God will stand up for Job as He will do for any of His creatures.

2.3.3. Dust (19:25)

As he elaborates on the conceptualization of God as Redeemer, Job uses the source domain of dust: וַאֲנִי יָדַעְתִּי גֹּאֲלִי חָי וְאַחֲרוֹן עַל־עָפָר יָקוּם "but I know that my Redeemer

68 Cf. Hartley (1988: 293): "the author's choice of this term for Job is an intentional allusion to the special nuances of deliverance and love that are associated with this title for God."

lives, and that He is the Last who will rise over dust." Although the source domain is only referred to by עָפָר 'dust', it stands out against the concept of permanence that is evoked in verses 23–24, and it also recalls Job's earlier conceptualization of his body and the grave as dust (cf. 17:16, see §1.3.4 above). As עָפָר 'dust' may here be associated with transience, death, and decay (Seow 2013: 703), it challenges the reader to reflect on its meaning in the present context, and in this sense I propose that it can be understood as a deliberately used metaphor.

PHYSICAL REALITY IS DUST
the physical world is ephemeral
the meaning of the physical world is limited

Opinions differ on what is exactly meant by the statement that Job's Redeemer is the Last one who will rise over dust. When קום is taken in a legal sense as 'to appear in court,'[69] the phrase עַל עָפָר is interpreted as a locative 'in the world'.[70] The locative interpretation, however, does not include any of the associations of עָפָר mentioned above. Seow therefore suggests that 'rising over dust' is better understood as "to come out of dormition to stand over all things ephemeral, including the adversaries of Job (his "friends"), who are also *'āpār* (4,19)" (Seow 2013: 703). I follow Seow that עפר is used here to conceptualize the world as something ephemeral. Through the PHYSICAL REALITY IS DUST metaphor, Job puts the importance of everything said and done into perspective. Job is very much convinced that he is right and that the friends are wrong, but regardless of the outcome of their discussion, and regardless of how his life ends, in the perspective of redemption, the reality of the world grows pale. Job and his friends will die, and even words written in rock will not last forever, but Job's Redeemer lives, and when He rises over dust, He will stand up for those who belong to Him.

Job knows that he relates to God, because he knows that he is righteous. In 4:19, Eliphaz used the source domain of dust to conceptualize human nature as ephemeral and to point out that human righteousness cannot compete with that of God. Here in verse 25, Job turns these ideas around: it is the righteous ones that belong to God, and therefore the principle of righteousness is the only thing that matters in the

69 E.g. Habel (1985: 293) and Clines (1989: 460).

70 Cf. Seow (2013: 703): "[...] those who take v. 25b to be strictly a trial scene have tended to interpret *'al-'āpār* to mean 'upon the earth', as if meaning 'in the world.'"

ephemeral world. With this reasoning Job invalidates every argument of the friends that is based on a certain state of affairs in the world, and shifts all attention to proper behavior.[71]

2.3.4. Vision (19:26-27)

Job has arrived at the insight that righteousness will prevail over the accidental character of reality. In Job's explanation of how this changes his understanding of the role of his friends, a prominent role is given to the source domain of vision וְאַחַר עוֹרִי נִקְפוּ־זֹאת וּמִבְּשָׂרִי אֶחֱזֶה אֱלוֹהַּ: אֲשֶׁר אֲנִי אֶחֱזֶה־לִּי וְעֵינַי רָאוּ וְלֹא־זָר כָּלוּ כִלְיֹתַי בְּחֵקִי "When after my skin, one has cut down this, that from my flesh I will behold God, what I envision for me is that one sees my eyes, and not a stranger, when my kidneys come to an end within me." The source domain is referred to by the verb חזה 'to behold, to envision' (19:26-27), the noun עַיִן 'eye' (19:27), and the verb ראה 'to see' (19:27). Because it is several times referred to, and because it extends beyond the clause, it can be understood as deliberately used.

Being Righteous is Seeing God
not being righteous is not seeing God

What does it mean to see God from the flesh, that is, before one dies?[72] In Psalm 11:7 and 17:15, seeing God is reserved for the righteous,[73] and when Job announces in chapter 13 that he will take his case to court, he says in verses 15–16: "See, if He is to kill me, I will not wait; I will surely defend my ways before Him—even more so, this will be salvation to me, for it is not before Him that an impious one comes." I propose that both Job and his friends believe that seeing God is only for the righteous, but that Job understands it as an event that transcends earthly reality, whereas the friends assume

71 According to Job, human morality should not be put into perspective. Compare the discussion between Zophar and Job on this topic in chapters 11–12 (cf. chapter 4, §3.1). When Zophar claimed that man can impossibly know whether he is innocent, Job argued that it is wrong to see the world as a reflection of God's judgment, because it would allow man to become indifferent. According to Job, man is able to distinguish between right and wrong, and therefore he is responsible to act according to this knowledge.

72 Above in §2.2, I have explained that I understand מִבְּשָׂרִי 'from my flesh' as 'while I am alive' and that I take verse 25b as what is referred to by זֹאת 'this' in verse 25a, so that I read verse 25 as Job's description of how it is rejected that he will see God while he is alive.

73 Psa 11:7: "For the LORD is righteous; he loves righteous deeds; the upright shall behold his face" (JPS); Psa 17:15: "Then I, justified, will behold Your face; awake, I am filled with the vision of You" (JPS).

that seeing God takes place during man's lifetime. Job is convinced that eventually he will see God, and therefore the question of recognition no longer depends on the judgment of the friends. The friends busy themselves with thinking about Job in terms of seeing or not seeing God (*19:26*), but Job envisions that they just see him (*19:27*). In my view, the SEEING GOD IS BEING RIGHTEOUS metaphor in verse *26* functions as a conventional metaphor that is used to draw attention to the verb when it recurs in verse *26*.[74]

The verb חזה 'envision' in verse *27* is used in the sense of seeing a reality that exists in the mind. The shift from the idiomatic to the non-figurative use of חזה demands that the audience actively interprets the different senses of the verb and the meaning of the sentence. I propose that this word play highlights the transition from the topic of Job's seeing of God to what Job envisions as his major concern. When Job explicitly announces that what follows is a reality that he imagines himself, he invites his friends to picture with him a scenario in which 'one sees his eyes, and not a stranger.' It is generally assumed that Job emphasizes in verse *27* that he will see God with his own eyes,[75] but I propose that he shifts the discussion away from the question whether he will or will not see God. The question here is that they stop seeing him as a stranger (*cf.* verse *15*): the friends should see Job's eyes, that is, they should set aside their reasoning and prejudices, and simply face him.

In verse *27*, the verb ראה 'to see' is used in its plain and non-figurative sense. In the context of Job's plea to look beyond appearances and against the background of the activated source domain of vision, however, it stands out and triggers reflection on the meaning of visual perception. Job has turned the world into an ephemeral place in which reality does not tell anything about whether or not one is righteous. Now what is the value of seeing in an ephemeral world? What can be seen when what

74 As I explained in chapter 1, conventional metaphors function do not shift the attention of the reader from the topic. Even so, one may reflect on the implications of this metaphor. In TLOT, Vetter explains that "'To see" Yahweh or his act means: to experience God's intervention either in the history of the people or of the nations [...] or in individual existence [...]" (Vetter 1997: 402). In NIDOTTE, Naudé suggests that facing God involves the experience of "qualities of the divine presence" (Naudé 1997: 2:57). I suggest, however, that the 'seeing of God' in verse *26* evokes a meeting that includes some sort of examination—compare the English use of 'see' in 'seeing a doctor' whereby one presents oneself in order to be examined. Seeing God is presenting oneself to God in order to have one's moral qualities appreciated. This idea shows some overlap with Job's desire to start a case, but I do not think that 'seeing God' here specifically evokes a courtroom setting.

75 E.g. NRSV: "and my eyes shall behold, and not another." I have found no other translation in which וְעֵינַי רָאוּ 'that it is my eyes that one sees' is interpreted as an object clause with עֵינַי 'my eyes' as a fronted object and רָאוּ 'one sees' as an impersonal plural.

the eyes see is often not what it seems to be? As Job has pointed out, there is more to the world than appearances, but if the friends want to rely on their visual sense, they should draw attention to the eyes. The eyes, like the עֶצֶם 'self' in verse 20, and the כְּלָיוֹת 'kidneys' in verse 27, reflect one's inner being, but unlike the latter, the eyes can be seen by others. It appears that according to Job, the truth about man is neither in his skin, nor in his flesh, but in his eyes.

2.4. *The End of Job's Existential Suffering?*

Job's appeal to his friends to act as his community did not yield any effect. At the start of chapter 19, Job is more alone than ever before, but exactly this utter isolation enables him to see the world anew. I hold that in 19:25, Job restores his belief that in the end the righteous and the wicked will not be treated the same (cf. 9:22 and 14:4), and that for this reason, his personal struggle with the apparent lack of judgment in the world comes to an end.[76] In this sense, I take verse 25 as the climax of Job's reasoning.[77]

When Job clarifies to his friends that they wrongly assume that his outward appearance reflects some moral deficiency, his reasoning involves something more. It is not only the human body, but the whole world that withdraws itself from the principle of righteousness. The world is accidental and ephemeral, and therefore it is not the place where one should expect to be rewarded for one's moral efforts. If

76 Modern commentators like Clines, Habel and Newsom are reluctant to identify God as Job's Redeemer and to give verse 25 the weight that it is given in the Christian tradition in which it is understood as picturing an eschatological event. Even so, also their interpretations reflect that chapter 19 introduces a new course. Newsom (1996: 479), for example, remarks that "By the time one reaches chap. 19, it is no longer the story of a suffering man but that of a man unjustly accused." Clines (1989: 470) explains that the novelty of the verse is that it exposes "for the first time his complete assurance that even heaven must in the end accept that he is an innocent man undeservedly suffering."

77 Job's restoration of trust in God is in the first place a personal accomplishment. This personal accomplishment, however, holds a program for his friends and his community. In my view, the climax of Job's reasoning closes off one project, namely that of Job's existential suffering, and opens up a new one, namely that of the struggle against systemic wrongs in society. Cf. Newsom: "The unjustly accused person who seek justice accomplish more than simply personal vindication. They also redeem a compromised system. Their determination to right the wrong done to them is a commitment to the belief that the system of justice is not wholly corrupt, but that through the exposure of its own failures it can be called back to its true nature." (1996: 480).

righteousness is worth striving for, it is not because it guarantees worldly rewards, but because in the end, 'the Redeemer will rise over dust.' Job had earlier lamented the miserable condition of his body in the face of death (cf. 10:18-22), but now the source domain of the body helps him to distinguish between his appearance and his inner self. The possibility of taking distance from his body gives Job the space to reconsider his relation to God. God is no longer the distant judge that fails to execute justice on earth, but instead He becomes the kinsman who will reclaim Job from an imperfect world. With God as his kinsman Job is no longer alone, and even more, with this new understanding of God, Job is a free man that can fare on his integrity.

The world is accidental, but precisely because man is able to perceive where things go wrong, it cannot be approached with an indifferent attitude. Job's friends have the responsibility to do good and to make the world a better place. In Job's case, they should stop acting like God and start breaking Job's isolation. Even if Job is able to see his earthly situation in a broader perspective, this does not involve that the suffering that results from the behavior of his friends does not affect him anymore. Both for his and their own good, the suffering that results from Job's alienation from his community should end.

3. Winding Up the Dialogue

With God as his Redeemer, Job's existential suffering has come to an end. The righteous ones, that is, those who take responsibility and actively engage themselves to improve unjust situations (cf. 17:8-9) will be redeemed. Job has reestablished his moral compass. In his reaction to Zophar, Job simply stands his ground. As there is no development in Job's conceptualization of his suffering in chapter 21, this last paragraph does not focus on a passage to explore its metaphors. In the next, I describe how the second speech cycle comes to an end and how it prepares the stage for a new discussion in chapters 23–31.

3.1. *Exploring Job's New Understanding of Reality*

Job 20 In his first speech in chapter 11, Zophar called Job's innocence into question by starting the lack-of-knowledge discussion. Job protested against the idea of hidden knowledge in the field of morality in chapter 12, and in chapter 19 he arrived at the conclusion that it is precisely the possibility of self-knowledge that is the basis to hope on an eventual vindication by God. In Zophar's view, however, Job's exposition

lacks critical reflection. In his reply to Job, he builds forth on his position of chapter 11, namely that man cannot trust knowledge about his conscience.[78]

Instead of answering to Job's call to change their attitude, Zophar brands it as an 'insulting correction' (20:3). Job has no right to criticize him and the others, because his case is solely based on Job's own experience and observations (20:4).[79] Job may be right that it occurs that the wicked are at peace (20:5, cf. 12:6), but they will not last, for—according to Zophar—it is not mankind in general but only the wicked ones that are subjected to ephemerality (20:6-11).[80] When Job would argue that he cannot swallow this and similar arguments (cf. 6:6-7; 12:11), Zophar counters that Job's belief in his integrity is actually a sweet evil that he refuses to give up (20:12-13) and that corrupts his inner being (20:14-15).[81] Job may be thinking that he is able to distinguish between right and wrong, but can his reasoning be sincere when he only accepts a conclusion that acquits himself from guilt? According to Zophar, Job is corrupting himself: for this reason his words are crooked, and because of his crooked words he will get himself killed (20:16). While Job believes that he will be saved by his Redeemer, Zophar warns that he should not expect any recompense for his so-called integrity (20:17).

The wicked eagerly takes what suits him, but at the same time, he rejects the tasks assigned to him (20:18). Job may think that he has been a good servant (cf. 7:1-2), but in

78 Yu presents Zophar's speech as a strategy of bluff: Zophar has no choice but to continue the project that Eliphaz and Bildad started—that is "to convict Job of transgression before the public eye, thereby rendering his speeches the impious rants of a wicked man," because "to accede to Job at this point means not only accepting the shame of failure and dismissal but also Job's characterization of the previous comforter speeches, their ulterior motives, their callousness, and their cruelty" (Yu 2011: 319–320). In my view, Zophar's speech is not only aimed at winning the argument; I hold that Zophar correctly points out a possible flaw in Job's reasoning and that he thus adds another argument to the discussion.

79 Note that Zophar takes refuge with the argument of tradition, now that the 'knowledge' question has been banned from the dialogue by Eliphaz (cf. 15:7-9).

80 It has been noted that Zophar's speech in chapter 20 takes up vocabulary passages from the speeches of Job, see e.g. Habel (1985: 314–315) and Yu (2011: 322–323). Habel and Yu propose that Zophar satirically alludes to Job's words in his description of the wicked to categorize him among them. In my understanding, the rhetorical situation is that Zophar reproaches Job for making a display of both hypocrisy and hubris. I suggest that Zophar returns to the theme of ephemerality as presented in 7:1-11 as an example of how Job's interpretations are driven by self-interest and to warn him for a lack of critical self-reflection. In my view, the tone of the speech is therefore not so much satirical, but rather pedantic.

81 I suggest that Zophar elaborates on the distinction that Job has made between his outer and inner being in chapter 19. Zophar here pictures that one's inner being does not stand alone and that it can be corrupted by some evil desire or wish. Job may too easily assume that his intentions are pure.

Zophar's eyes he has been trying to save his efforts: "the one who returns work[82] and does not swallow, when there is profit from his exchange, he will not take delight." Job had argued that he cannot be expected to swallow bad food (cf. 6:5-7). Zophar, however, sees Job's protest against his fate as a refusal of good food. Because Job does not take up his duty, he will not enjoy the yield that results from his new worldview (cf. 19:25).[83] Like Eliphaz (cf. 15:3), Zophar points out that Job's doings are not helpful. He is prepared to put his own interest above the interests of everyone else when he breaks down the tradition that he did not build, but while he destroys everything nothing will come in its place (20:19-21).[84] Job may think that he has thought things through, but according to Zophar, he is at the point of imprisoning himself in a wrong reasoning (20:22), and for that reason God should stop him (20:23).

After Zophar has suggested that Job's new understanding of God and the world is actually driven by self-interest and that it is only for his sake that Job rejects the consolation that is offered by his friends, he concludes his speech by restating the worldview he shares with his friends. Indeed, the wicked cannot escape his punishment (20:24). The world is not accidental and cosmic powers will ensure the downfall of the wicked (20:25). Eventually, at the day of His anger, the house of the wicked will be carried off (20:28). What happens to the wicked is thus not ephemerality, but punishment from God that is brought upon him because of his sayings (20:29).

Job 21 In my view, it is only in chapter 21 that Job begins to lose his patience. Why would Zophar continue to speculate on his integrity, when he already announced that he is prepared to put himself at risk (cf. 13:13-15) and when he has just pointed out that the friends are not in the position to judge him (cf. 19:22)? What comes of his words is a question between him and God; the friends' only task is to register his

82 The noun יְגָע in 20:18 is a *hapax legomenon*. It has been translated as 'goods' (JPS) and 'fruit of toil' (NRSV). Understood in parallel with הֵל תְּמוּרָתוֹ 'the profit of his recompense', it seems to have a positive connotation. The root יגע, however, has a negative connotation. I therefore follow Seow in taking it as "an alternative form of *yᵉgîaʿ*, lit., "weariness, labor,"'"—I do not follow him in his next step, namely that "by extension, it takes on the sense of the effect of that labor" (Seow 2013: 855).

83 I propose that the verb בלע 'swallow' picks in on the discussion on accepting or protesting against ones fate, and I therefore take verse 18 as Zophar's depiction of Job's doings. In my view, verses 18–23 metaphorically describe what the rejection of 'work' leads to.

84 Zophar here introduces the theme of the poor that will be elaborated on in 22:6-9, 24:2-12, 30:2-8, and 31:13-22. Commentators generally understand Zophar's accusations as exemplary for the wicked, so e.g. Clines (1989: 491), Newsom (1996: 485) and Seow (2013: 842). I contend that the topic rather serves to explore the implications of Job's deconstruction of the commonly held worldview. I elaborate on this interpretation in my discussion of Job 22 below and in my discussion of Job 23–31 in chapter 6.

situation: "Turn to me and be appalled (cf. 17:8)! Put your hand on your mouth!" (21:5). Job cannot imagine that his friends keep treating him as a theoretical object and that they remain distant and untouched by his suffering (21:6).

This being said, Job continues in 21:7-15 with the theme of the wicked that his friends have been so eager to discuss. In chapter 12, Job introduced the idea of the wicked that are at peace as an example of a state of affairs in the world that does not reflect justice, and that one should thus not be indifferent about. The friends, however, did not agree with Job's presentation of the peace of the wicked and they tried to convince him that one way or another, the wicked will certainly come to an end. While the friends continued on the theme of the wicked (cf. 15:20-35, 18:5-21, and 20:4-29), Job did not react to it.[85] Job was never interested in the peace of the wicked as such: to him it was mainly a case study on how one should relate to the world, and in the end, it was not the peace of the wicked, but the experience that his outer appearance did not reflect his inner being that made him conclude that reality is not a place that reflects God's righteousness. Now that Zophar has cast doubt on the selflessness of Job's claim that the world is accidental, Job shifts back his attention to the peace of the wicked.

As Job sees it, both his own situation and the situation of the peace of the wicked prove that the world is accidental. Even if Zophar refuses to believe that a man can have knowledge about his own innocence, what about the peace of wicked? The friends have tried to convince him that they are not actually at ease and that their success is only temporary (cf. Eliphaz in 15:20-29), that they do not qualify for God's miracles (cf. Bildad in 18:5-12), and that the ones who are subjected to ephemerality are actually purposefully punished by God (cf. Zophar 20:6-11.24-27). As a counter argument Job puts forward that there are indeed wicked that do have success (21:7-15), and that it is only seldom that they suffer from misfortune (21:17-18). Job does not accept the objections that there may be a delay of punishment (21:19-21) or that God's wisdom exceeds that of man (21:22-26).[86] What the friends have been asserting simply does not match the empirical experience of reality (21:27-33) and for that reason, their words do not comfort him (21:34).

---

85 Cf. Yu (2011: 324): "Having already twice demurred from engaging the comforters in futile disputation and receiving repeated verbal pounding in consequence, Job changes his tactic and returns to the disputational battlefield in this speech with the goal of silencing the comforters by directly rebutting the comforters' main argument in the Second Cycle: Job's suffering proves his wickedness. Actually, the comforters' main argument in the Second Cycle is not "Job's suffering proves his wickedness," but "the wicked is doomed to suffer.""

86 I follow Gordis (1978: 231) in taking 21:22 as a quote that presents the position of the friends.

Job 22 By confronting them with a reality in which the fate of the wicked is not as the friends have pictured it, Job pointed out that the friends have not succeeded in convincing him that God deals with man in the world according to the principle of righteousness. According to Job, fortune is arbitrarily distributed, and the wicked do have a point when they say that there is no worldly profit in serving God. Eliphaz is not impressed by Job's critical observations on the wellbeing of the wicked. Like Job, Eliphaz is very well aware of the imperfection of the world, but unlike Job, he does not think that it is of any use to protest against it. If Job is convinced that he is righteous and that in the end he will be rewarded, he should be satisfied.

Again, the dialogue is back on the topic of morality and whether one should adopt an active or passive attitude. While Job feels that the friends' indifference causes alienation, the friends hold that Job's protest is too much driven by his own specific situation. Why is it so important to Job to declare himself righteous:

> is it God that man benefits, when the prudent one benefits himself? Is it a delight to the Almighty when you are righteous? Or a gain when you make your ways blameless? Is it because of your piety that He would reprove you when He enters into judgment with you?
>
> Job 22:2–4

According to Eliphaz, Job's demand to accept his innocence shows how little he cares for the interests of his community. Job is in the wrong when he rejects the traditional truths on the fate of the wicked for egocentric reasons.[87] If the friends would answer to Job's appeal and deny that the worldly reality reflects the principle of retribution, this would involve that they, like Job, would leave the poor empty handed (22:6-9).[88]

---

87 Like Zophar, Eliphaz holds that Job is not in the position to reject the traditional worldview, but whereas Zophar adduced the speculative argument that Job lacks self knowledge, Eliphaz takes a more pragmatic course when he admonishes that Job's interests outweigh the interests of the poor.

88 I interpret Eliphaz's accusations in 22:6-9 as metaphorically expressing that Job takes away an essential need of the poor. If these accusations are understood literally, as scholars usually do, it is difficult to explain what motivates Eliphaz to utter them. Could Eliphaz's accusations serve to adjust "the facts to the theory" (Gordis (1978: 238), so also e.g. Clines (2006: 554–555) and Newsom (1996: 499–500)) or would Eliphaz indeed dare to accuse Job, only to shame him (cf. Yu (2011: 334–335))? In my view, the friends have so far been sincere. I do not think that Eliphaz actually believes that he can save the worldview of the friends by charging Job with unfounded claims. I therefore hold that Eliphaz's argument does not concern his concrete doings, but rather the reasoning he has been developing throughout the dialogue: according to Eliphaz, Job is pushing them to adopt a worldview that harms the poor. While I hold that Eliphaz's accusations should not be understood

It is indeed because Job casts doubt on the commonly held worldview that he can expect to meet trouble (22:10-11).

Eliphaz advises Job to adopt a more positive approach. When Job cannot accept the image of an omniscient God (cf. 21:22), he should instead take a starting point in the numinous experience of Him (22:12). Eliphaz is very well aware that Job tends to protest against any image of God that allows reconciliation with injustice in the world, but Job must realize that he thereby risks to lose every footing (22:13-16). Having thus clarified where Job's doings go wrong, Eliphaz presents Job with a more constructive manner to deal with the world as it is. The fact that reality contradicts God's righteousness should not worry the righteous (22:17-20).[89] Serving God is not about reasoning about reality, but about directing one's attention (22:21-23). If Job chooses gold over dust (22:24-25), every problem, including that of his rejection by his community (22:29), will be resolved (22:26-30).

3.2. *A New Status Quo*

In the first speech cycle, the discussion ended in a disagreement on the question of hope. Job arrived at the conclusion that there is no explanation for his misfortune and that there is no hope in life and death. The friends, on the other hand, asserted that Job's misfortune and the inexplicability thereof are matters of limited human knowledge and human morality and maintained that he will certainly be restored by God. In the second speech cycle, Job found a way to reestablish God as his hope, but now the discussion ends in a disagreement on the question of consolation. Whereas Job considers it the duty of his friends to show their loyalty, the friends hold that Job's request is insincere and self-focused.

Job envisions that his reinstallation in his community is possible when his friends admit that his outer appearance does not match his innocence, and more generally, that the worldly reality does not reflect one's moral efforts. The image of the world as an accidental place, however, goes against the principle of retribution as exemplified by the fate of the wicked. According to Zophar, Job is not in the position to make

---

literally, I agree with Shveka and Van Hecke that "By filing this charge [...] the debate between Job and his friends is transformed into a legal conflict between them" (2014: 99).

89 I read verses 17–20 as follows: "The ones who say to God "go away from us", what should God do them? Would He fill their house with good things? The counsel of the wicked is far from me! The righteous will see and rejoice; the innocent will mock them! If our adversaries are not destroyed, a fire consumes their remnant."

judgments on reality when he is not prepared to doubt his innocence. Eliphaz, on the other hand, accepts that reality is not a perfect reflection of the principle of retribution, but to him, the issue at stake is that the righteous ones can trust that in the end, they will be rewarded by God. Job is doing wrong by denying that there is any order in the world. He is doing wrong to the friends by asking them to consent to something that is not true (22:6a), and more importantly, he is doing wrong to the poor by withholding them something vital (22:6b–9).

At this point, one can only guess what exactly Eliphaz is aiming at, but it can be imagined that the main problem with denying the order in the worldly reality is that it may result in a lack of perspective. Especially the poor will be frustrated when they discover that one cannot control or improve one's situation: in that case, what is the use of worship and prayer (cf. 15:3-4)? What is life worth living for? Or who is God that He allows the world to be like this? For the sake of the poor, Job must accept that—as long as his situation does not improve—he will be considered a stranger by his friends and his community. Now can Job live with this idea?

3.3. *Opening Up New Perspectives on Hope and Consolation: The Case of the Poor*

Eliphaz offered Job a way to be at peace with his isolated status: when Job would see that his appeal for rehabilitation is actually a matter of vanity that risks to harm the poor, he would understand that he better puts his hopes on his Redeemer and that it is for a greater good that he reconciles himself to his current state. Eliphaz overlooks, however, that the interests of the poor are not opposed to that of Job. In the third speech cycle Job will claim that his interests and the interests of the poor indeed fall together. By categorizing himself among the poor, Job changes the tables. In the next chapter I show how Job takes his own experience as a starting point to demonstrate that his worldview is not a personal matter, but that it indeed holds an answer to the position of the poor in society.

CHAPTER 6

The Suffering of the Poor in Job 23–31: On Morality in an Imperfect World

Both the theoretical discussion on the theme of hope in the first speech cycle (4–15:16) and the practical discussion on the theme of consolation in the second speech cycle (15:17-22) have ended in a stalemate. The friends refused to confirm that an untimely death destroys a man's hope and they were unwilling to admit that Job's misfortune is at odds with his moral status. Job had found a solution for the question of hope in 19:25, but at the end of the second speech cycle the question of consolation has not yet been settled. Job thus opens up the last part of the dialogue against the background of the unsettled question of consolation. In this chapter, I show that in the third speech cycle (23–31), Job changes his strategy. He pauses his search for personal consolation and continues on the general topic of what serves as hope and consolation for other sufferers in society (23–27). When Job arrives at the conclusion that the actual question of the discussion concerns the meaning of God and morality in a world that cannot be fully understood (28), he ends the dialogue with a final exposition that confronts his friends and his community with their responsibilities for the world (29–31).

In the previous chapters, I have shown how Job's conceptualization of his personal suffering developed throughout the opening speech and the two speech cycles, and how it has come to an equilibrium at the end thereof. As Job has found a way to restore his hope and to reconcile himself to his mortality, it is Job's description of other sufferers that I draw attention to in this chapter. In the following, I discuss the passages in chapters 23–31 where Job pictures the suffering of the poor and needy, namely 24:2-12, 30:2-8, and 31:13-22. My aim is to bring in view what Job's latest understanding of his place in the world involves for his understanding of suffering others. In this chapter, I proceed as follows. I start by construing the thrust of Job's argument in chapters 23–31 (§1). Thereafter I describe the metaphors found 24:2-12, 30:2-8 and 31:13-22 and how Job uses them to picture the suffering of the poor (§2). To conclude, I explain how Job uses the topic of the poor and needy in chapters 23–31 to argue that his worldview is the solution for the problem of suffering, not only for himself, but for society as a whole (§3).

1. Job 23–31: On Morality in an Imperfect World

After two speech cycles, Job turns away from his friends to lead the discussion in a new direction.[1] In the speeches that follow, Job unfolds an answer to Eliphaz's accusation that the consolation that Job envisions for himself would harm the poor.[2] In the course of chapters 23–31, it appears that Eliphaz has overlooked the fact that Job categorizes himself among the poor and that Job's interests do not differ from theirs. Eliphaz had labeled Job's desire for recognition as vanity, but Job demonstrates that the sole consolation for the poor is exactly what he desires for himself, namely to be seen and to be supported by one's community.

Job 23–24 In chapter 23, Job starts off his monologue by restating his relation with God. Eliphaz had confronted Job in the previous chapter with his insinuation that God's transcendence involves a lack of knowledge and an inability to do justice on earth (cf. 22:13-14). In 21:22, Job indeed casted doubt on the friends' argument that God is an omniscient judge, but he only did so to point out that this conceptualization cannot be accepted as an explanation for the fact that the righteous and the wicked are not distinguished in death (21:23-26). Job's topic had been ephemerality and death, and he asserted that these cannot be understood in terms of God's knowledge or judgment.

When Job in chapter 23 wishes that God could be met (23:3), he envisions a scenario in which God would act as a judge in the world (23:4-5), and thereby he shows Eliphaz

1 My main argument to take 23 as a new start is that Job's speech no longer addresses his friends, cf. Wolfers (1993: 401–402). Even if it has been noticed that Job begins a 'monologue' or 'soliloquy' in chapters 23–24 (e.g. Driver and Gray (1921: 199), Clines (2006: 598), Yu (2011: 339), this observation has not been given much attention because the assumption that there are three speech cycles that all begin with a speech of Eliphaz is not questioned (see for example Driver and Gray (1921: 1:xxi), Clines (2006: 547) and Yu (2011: 330–331)). On chapter 23 as the start of the third speech cycle, see also chapter 2, § 2.1.

2 In the discussion of chapters 22–27, attention is often focused on the rhetorical effects of the so-called 'disputed passages' (Job 24:18-24, 26:5-14 and 27:14-23), the shortness of Bildad's speech in chapter 25, and the lack of a speech of Zophar. I do not follow scholars who interpret the MT as representing the collapse of the dialogue (e.g. Andersen (1976: 57), Newsom (2003), Lo (2003: 53–75) and Seow (2013: 67)), but instead I join Wolfers (1993, 1995) in reading chapters 23–31 as a monologue that is shortly interrupted in chapters 25–26. My general understanding of these chapters is inspired by Wolfers' exposition on it in (cf. 1995: 225–257) and I specifically elaborate on his idea that chapter 24 concerns "the fate of the poor and oppressed" (1995: 227); different from Wolfers who takes the description of "melancholy fate of the poor" as a complaint on "divine injustice" (1995: 241), I contend that it serves to reflect on the theme of social injustice and to make a case for new perspectives on hope and consolation.

that he does not doubt God's ability to judge (23:6-7). Even if he believes that he will not find God on earth (23:8-9),[3] this does not entail for Job that He would lack knowledge: "but He knows the way that is with me; would He test me, I shall come out as gold" (23:10). Job thus shows that Eliphaz has misrepresented his understanding of God. Job is perfectly able to think of God as both transcendent, and omniscient and righteous. Different from Eliphaz, however, Job wants to make this image of God compatible with his own innocence (23:11-12). In Eliphaz's view, God's righteousness and omniscience imply that Job's misfortune is caused by his guilt. Job, on the other hand, holds on that he is without blame, and therefore he concludes that God's transcendence must be understood as involving His absence in worldly affairs.

What does it mean that God is not present in the world? Eliphaz had presented God's distance as more awe-inspiring and overwhelming than the experience of facing the stars (cf. 22:12). Job here clarifies that his experience of God's distance is of another category: the idea that God can do whatever He wants (23:13) and that He is free to allow not only Job, but mankind in general, to be delivered to the arbitrary course of worldly events (23:14) makes him feel humble and futile, but above all, it frightens him to the bone (23:15). Job's fear of the God is not motivated by a lack of trust in his own integrity, but springs from the insight that there is not a single correlation between his doings and his fortune:

> Indeed God has made my heart faint, and the Almighty has terrified me,
> for I was not destroyed because of darkness,
> nor is it because of me that He would conceal gloom.[4]
>
> Job 23:16-17

3 Job's description of the elusiveness of God is often taken as a source of frustration or suffering. Clines, for example, says that chapter 23 "heightens Job's demands for a legal disputation with God by the idea of his making a journey to God's own dwelling, only to dash his hopes still further by the recognition that this is no more than an unrealizable fantasy" (2006: 592); similarly Hartley (1988: 339). I claim, however, that Job's trust in God (cf. 19:25) has turned his search for an encounter with God into a matter of lesser concern. In my view, the imaginary scenario in 23:3-12 serves to emphasize the solidness of Job's expectation that God will recognize him: Job trusts in God's righteousness, even if He is not there.

4 This translation of verse 17 is mine. I take the verse as two coordinated clauses whereby the scope of the negation לא in the first clause extends to the clause (cf. JM §160q; for a similar construction, see for example Psa 9:19), and I take מפני as a preposition with a causal sense (cf. BDB 818.6c). The NRSV reads "If only I could vanish in darkness, and thick darkness would cover my face!," and the JPS has "Yet I am not cut off by the darkness; He has concealed the thick gloom from me."

In my view, Job here pictures the realization that he is not given misfortune because he did something wrong, while at the same time, his doings do not cause God to hide away misfortune. The idea that God is not actively present in the world puts Job's relation with God in another perspective. After chapter 19, God is no longer pictured as Job's enemy (*cf.* 6:4; 16:7.9-14; 19:6-12).[5] God has become Job's Redeemer, but as long as he lives, God is not there, and this indeed fills Job with a breathtaking fear.[6]

The theme of God's elusiveness brings Job back to a question introduced in chapter 14, where he wished that "the clean were distinguished from the unclean, that they are not one" (14:4, see chapter 4, §3.2). In chapter 24, Job opens with the question why it is

> that from the Almighty times of judgment are not concealed,
> but that those who know him would not see His days?
>
> Job 24:2

When Job wished that God would take up an active role in ending one's life, he knew that such a thing would not happen, but in his conceptualization of the world as a place where God is absent it is not even possible that God intercedes to change one's fate. It keeps striking Job as awkward that every verdict is known to God, but that He allows His believers to live in a world in which it cannot be witnessed that judgment is done. That this is indeed the state of affairs in the world is described in the following. As Job points out, there are those who act at the cost of the poor and needy (24:2-4), and there are others who can barely survive (24:5-8). There are those who take the last little bit from the poor (24:9), and there are others who struggle and who are continually confronted that they lack the things they need (24:10-11). God, however, does not pay attention to circumstances that clearly should be considered tasteless (24:12).[7]

---

5 On 30:20-23, see below.

6 As the diversity in translations shows, there is no agreement on the meaning of verse 17. Its interpretation largely depends on the understanding of the development of the dialogue so far. I do not take verse 17 as a wish or lament that concerns his personal situation, because I hold that Job has by now accepted his unfortunate fate. For different proposals, see Gordis (1978: 262–263).

7 Job's description of the world in verses 1–12 is often understood as a complaint on God, see for example Clines: "it constitutes a charge against God (though it is not couched in the second person) that, in doing nothing to punish the wicked, he has abdicated his responsibility for world order" (2006: 592). I hold that it also serves to open the eyes of Job's friends for reality. Reality is harsh and it

After Job has criticized God's attitude, he says:

> They would be among the rebels against the light?
> They would not know His ways and not sit on His paths?
> The one who rises against the light is the murderer who kills the poor and needy, and in the night he may be as the thief![8]
>
> Job 24:13-14

While it is not immediately obvious who Job refers to by 'they' in verse 13, I propose that it can be deduced who 'they' are if the subjects of verse 13 and verse 14 are understood as contrastive topics: not 'they' should be categorized as rebels against the light (24:13), but instead, the "one who rises against the light" is "the murderer that kills the poor and needy," and who "is in the night as the thief" (24:14).[9] I suggest that Job refers to the poor and needy as the ones who are wrongly thought to be rebels against the light and that the true rebels against the light are those who treat the poor badly.

Job brings in view his understanding of rebels-against-the-light with a three-fold characterization: they are the murderer of the poor and needy, the thief in the night, and the adulterer who waits for twighlight. The rebel-against-the-light ruthlessly picks the most easy targets, makes use of the time that the world is covered in ignorance, and assumes that his actions go unnoticed when they are not seen. The rebel-against-the-light works his way through constructions that are not fully revealed, so that eventually, persons like him find themselves captured in their own theories: "One who digs in the dark through houses, by day they lock themselves in,

---

cannot be explained in terms of the fate of the wicked and the fate of the righteous; according to Job, reality rather suggests that God is not present in this world.

8 The JPS translates: "They are rebels against the light; They are strangers to its ways, And do not stay in its path. The murderer arises in the evening To kill the poor and needy, And at night he acts the thief." I share Wolfers' idea that verse 13 questions the wickedness of the poor and that verse 14 asserts who should be understood as the actual wicked. Wolfers (1995: 229–230) translates: "(He says) "They were among the rebels against the Light." They knew nothing of its ways Nor did they dwell in its paths. It is the murderer who revolts against the Light. He kills the poor and needy, Or at night it might be, say, a thief." My translation differs from Wolfers' in that I take verse 13 as three interrogative hypothetical clauses. On the use of the *qatal* in hypothetical conditions, see BHRG § 19.2, 1, iii.

9 Verses 13–17 are rather cryptic and there is no consensus on the interpretation of this passage. In my translation, Job here deconstructs the 'elite' assumption that the situation of the unfortunate ones in society results from their wrongdoing: according to Job it is not the unfortunate ones who are wicked, but the elite that firmly imposes this view on society.

they do not know light!" (24:16).[10] Job warns for mixing up light and darkness and to declare wrong what is right: "When altogether morning is deep darkness to them, surely He takes notice of deep dark terrors!" (24:17).[11]

Job protests against the absence of God, but even more, he protests against those who make use of His absence to push the limits. Job calls for light and openness, and in verses 18–20 he pictures what the truth about God and the world involves. According to Job it is an illusion to assume that God would help the poor and needy:[12]

> While He is light on the water, their portion in the land is cursed;
> He does not turn into the road of the vineyards.
> When drought and heat snatch away the snow waters,
> *Sheol* is for who would have gone wrong.[13]
>
> Job 24:18-19

---

10 I propose that Job in verse 16 conceptualizes THEORIES in terms of BUILDINGS and that the same metaphor can be found in 8:15, 20:19 and 27:18. On the THEORIES (and ARGUMENTS) ARE BUILDINGS metaphor, see also Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 46, 52–53).

11 From translations it appears that the singular verb has been considered problematic in this context, so for example JPS: "For all of them morning is darkness; It is then that they discern the terror of darkness." In my view, the transition from a plural to a singular verb shows that verse 17 does not function as a parallelism. I propose to read the verse as conditional clause with God as the subject of the verb יַכִּיר in 17b. On the use of כִּי in the protasis and the apodosis of a conditional clause, see JM §167c and §167s. Compare also 12:22, where Job rejects the understanding of God as one who "uncovers the deeps out of darkness, and brings deep darkness to light" (NRSV). Job warns that light must not be mistaken for darkness: clear questions like the possibility of self-knowledge or the absence of God in the world must not be obscured with speculative or soothing theories.

12 Job 24:18-24 is the first of the 'disputed passages' in 'third speech cycle' (cf. Wolfers 1993: 386). It is generally thought that this passage describes the "eventual downfall of the wicked" (Clines 2006: 668), so also e.g. Newsom (1996: 511–512) and Lo (2003: 102). In other speeches, however, Job protests against the friends' assumption that the wicked will be punished (cf. 12:6; 21:28-33). Scholars have therefore interpreted the passage as a imprecation (Andersen (1976: 230), Hartley (1988: 352)) or as quotation of the friends (Gordis 1978: 269), and furthermore it has been suggested that this passage should be attributed to Bildad (so van der Lugt (1995: 281–285)) or Zophar (so Pope ([3]1973: 195) and Clines (2006: 589). For an overview of proposals, see Clines (2006: 589) and Lo (2003: 108–118). Different from other scholars, I propose with Wolfers (1995: 227) that the topic of this passage is not the destruction of the wicked, but God's abandonment of the poor. In this sense, verses 18–24 elaborate on Job's description of God's absence in the world in 23:3.8-9 and 24:2-12.

13 As in verse 17b, translations tend to neglect the singular subject in verse 18a (קַל־הוּא עַל־פְּנֵי־מַיִם), so for example JPS: "May they be flotsam on the face of the water; May their portion in the land be cursed; May none turn aside by way of their vineyards." In my translation above, the singular subject in verse 18a—as in verse 17b—refers to God: in this understanding, verse 18 contrasts God's position with that of the poor. For God as the subject of verse 18a, see also Good (1990: 280) and Wolfers (1995: 235).

God does not pay attention to the poor. When they get disconnected from the source of life, they perish without recognition, "when the womb forgets him, his sweetness is the worm; he will not be remembered, and so injustice is broken like a tree" (24:20). With the poor, the injustice done to them disappears into the grave. The image of the tree, however, reveals that Job trusts that this unresolved question is not rooted out, but that it remains slumbering below the surface (cf. 8:17–19; 14:7).

Even if God is not present in the world, Job believes that God's sympathy is with the poor and needy, and so it is not they, but the successful ones that must reconsider their doings:

> The One who takes care of a barren woman who does not bear,
> or the widow whom one did no good,
> He will seize the mighty ones with His strength;
> if He arises one will not trust life.
>
> Job 24:21–22

One's worldly condition does not predict God's final verdict, and in the end, the same fate awaits everyone:

> If He gives one security, one is at ease,
> but His eyes are on their ways.
> They may have been exalted for a little while, but He is not there,
> and when they are brought low,
> they are like all that shut their mouth;
> as the heads of grain they are cut off.
>
> Job 24:23–24

After this summary of his view on the world, Job asks with a rhetorical question to agree with it (24:25). While Job does not actually intend to continue the discussion with his friends, Bildad indeed takes up Job's words as a challenge.

Job 25 In chapter 25, Bildad offers a short reply to Job's provocative reinterpretation of the distance of God. Whereas Job asserted that the absence of God filled him with fear (23:15), Bildad holds that God is not absent, and that it is instead the very idea that He controls everything that happens on earth that is frightful (25:2). God does not deliver the world to chaos, but instead, "He imposes peace in His heights" (25:2,

JPS). God's light shines on everyone (25:3), and for this reason, Job should reconsider his conceptualization of man.

Verses 4–6 are commonly interpreted as an echo of Eliphaz's argument in 4:17-19 and 15:14-17 that man's morality is not absolute and that it should be seen in the perspective of God.[14] I have proposed, however, that Bildad has rejected the argument that man is unclean in 18:3 (cf. chapter 5, § 2.1). I therefore suggest that rather than repeating Eliphaz's argument, Bildad here questions the conceptualization of man that underlies Job's argument in chapter 24. Since chapter 10:18-22, Job has been picturing it as a loathsome situation that man ends up with worms and maggots (17:14), and he used this image to point out that the righteous and the wicked share the same fate and that there is no reward for moral behavior (21:26, 24:20). Bildad agrees with Job that morality will not prevent a body to fall apart and that human mortality is no reason to believe that human morality is imperfect, but whereas Job takes equality in death as a proof for God's absence in this world, Bildad approaches the matter from another perspective. To Bildad, God's light shines on everyone. It is not man's limits that matter, but man's ability to perceive God's light. One should not ask "how would a man be righteous with God, or how can one born of a woman be pure?" but take as a starting point that God's presence in the world prevents that man is looked at as a being of decay:

> Look! As far as the moon, does He not shine?
> And the stars, would they not be bright in His eyes?
> Indeed is it that man is a maggot and son of man a worm?[15]
>
> Job 25:5-6

By confronting Job's rhetorical question on God's dealings with man (cf. 24:21-25) with a rhetorical question on Job's conceptualization of man, Bildad brings in a more positive perspective. Even if it is so that death is indiscriminate, this does not entail that God is absent and that man is reduced to his mortal nature. The world is not a place of darkness. Even in the night, there is the light of the moon and the

14 E.g. Driver and Gray (1921: 1:215–216), Clines (2006: 633) and Newsom (1996: 517).

15 I take אף כי in the sense of 'indeed (is it) that?' as adding emphasis to the question, cf. Gen 3:1; HALOT (Köhler and Walter 1994–2000: 65). Note that my translation opposes the general understanding of this passage in that I read verse 5 as the confirmation—not the rejection—of the brightness of the luminaries, and verse 6 as the rejection—not the confirmation—of the conceptualization of man as a worm.

stars. God is present in this world, and in His light, man is more than a being of decay.

Job 26 Bildad tried to guide Job to a more positive perspective on man, but Job sticks to his view. Job may actually agree that man is more than just dust, but his main problem with Bildad's approach is that it involves no convincing solution for social injustice:

> How you have helped (the one) without strength;
> delivered (the one) with an arm that has no power!
> How you have advised (the one) without wisdom;
> sound insight you have declared abundantly![16]
>
> Job 26:2–3

Because of his reluctance to speculate on the nature of God and man, Bildad does not aim at offering an explanation for the existence of suffering and misfortune.[17] His words therefore do not address the problem that has now moved in the center of Job's attention, namely how one can help the poor in a world that God allows to be as it is, that is, a place where the wicked and righteous are treated in the same way. Those without strength, power, and wisdom are not helped with toothless theories that do not dare to face the reality of their lives.

In verses 5–14 Job turns away from Bildad's optimistic conceptualization of man to delve deeper into the theme of God's absence in the world. In reaction to Bildad's hymn in chapter 25, Job explores what God's absence entails for the conceptualization of God as the One with power and control.[18] Job shares the belief that God's power

16 Cf. Newsom (1996: 517): "He [Job] sardonically refers to himself, the recipient of Bildad's help, rescue, and counsel, as one "without power … without strength … without wisdom" (26:2-3a). There is a subtle linguistic play, however. The words that at first glance appear to describe Job could also be taken as phrases describing Bildad's advice. "How you have helped, without strength, How have you rescued, with a powerless arm! How have you counseled, without wisdom! …" " I agree with Newsom on the wordplay, but in my view, Job refers not to himself but to the poor as the recipient of Bildad's help.

17 Compare also 8:18 where Bildad presented misfortune as something that may occur to the righteous (cf. chapter 4, n. 56).

18 Job 26:5-14 is the second of the disputed passages in the book of Job. It has been found difficult to understand how Job would utter a hymn on God's power when he has just rejected Bildad's hymn on the same theme. Scholars have attributed the passage to Bildad or read it as a parody on either God or Job's friends. See Lo (2003: 152–159) for a discussion of approaches. According to Lo, "Job says

and control reach beyond the worldly reality (26:6-8), but he asks why it is that this same God makes Himself invisible (26:9).[19] Job also shares the belief that God has put an end to chaos (26:10-13), but is it not ironic that all that is heard of Him is a "whisper of a word" and that the "thunder of His deeds" cannot be understood (26:14)?

There is no doubt that God does great things, yet when God's dealings with man are concerned, Zophar and Eliphaz claimed that one cannot know anything at all (cf. 11:7-12; 15:7-9). Only Eliphaz went as far as suggesting that he heard a "whisper of a word" (cf. 4:12). Job does not accept his protest against social injustice to be silenced by the argument that mankind lacks knowledge. He is convinced that man can distinguish between good and bad, and if there is any meaning to that, it should be discussed why one is not given insight in the 'thunder of His deeds'. Job is very well aware that there are no answers, but precisely the question that there are no answers is something that should be thought about. If God does not show Himself, what does it involve for man's perception of God and man's relation to Him?

Job 27 Bildad's plea to focus on the positive aspects of man's relation to God and to leave the difficulties for what they are, reintroduces the question of the presumed lack of knowledge, and with this question on the background, Job continues in chapter 27 on the topic that he was discussing in chapter 24. In chapter 24, Job had described the world as a place where God is absent and where anything can happen, and he had warned against the possibility to take advantage thereof. In chapter 27, Job declares that the worldview that he has presented in chapters 24 reflects the truth and it is a matter of integrity that he does not give up on it (27:2-6).[20] With this final statement it is up to the friends to make their decision: do they dare to trust Job's integrity and

---

the same kind of things as Bildad did in chapter 25, but his emphasis is on the fact that human beings have very limited understanding" (2003: 164). I agree with Lo that Job's hymn serves to react to Bildad's understanding of knowledge, but different from Lo, I hold that Job challenges the idea that human beings have a limited understanding.

19 "The One who stretches out Zaphon over chaos, who suspends earth over emptiness; the One who wraps up the waters in His clouds, yet no cloud burst under their weight, He shuts off the view of His throne, Spreading His cloud over it." (26:7-9, translation based on JPS). Cf. Habel: "The cloud functioned as the "mask of God" both identifying his manifest operations and veiling his essential being, that is, his glory or face" (Habel 1985: 372).

20 With Shveka and Van Hecke (2014: 106–111) I read chapter 27 as an elaboration on the case that Eliphaz started in chapter 22. Shveka and Van Hecke: "Job is not primarily concerned with admitting or denying what the friends said was the case, but with claiming that, as juridical parties, they are not in the right, as a means to affirm his own innocence" (2014: 107). While she does not refer to chapter 22, Lo offers for a similar interpretation (2003: 168–169).

accept the consequences of his reasoning, or do they prefer to stick to the ideas that have been handed over for ages? In the latter case, it is they who will turn out to be the wicked ones (27:7).[21] Job underlines with rhetorical questions that he is innocent and that he trusts that in the end he, and not the wicked, will be saved by God (27:8-10).[22]

Now that he has stated his innocence and trust in God, Job continues his discussion on the worldview that Eliphaz rejected as wicked (cf. 22:6-9), namely that God does not act as a judge in this world (21:7-33). Job had concluded that God is not present in the world (cf. chapter 23–24), and when he announces to teach the friends 'what is in the control of God' and what is 'with the Almighty' (27:11) this is what he hints at. The friends have been witnessing what has happened to Job (27:12), and as they see it, Job has been given 'the portion of the wicked man' and 'the inheritance of the violent ones' (27:13).[23] Job agrees that what he has been given is what would be appropriate for the wicked. Job, however, trusts that he is innocent, and therefore he maintains that the so-called fate of the wicked is blindly distributed. What Job pictures in verses 14–23 is not what the wicked befalls, but what anyone—either righteous or wicked—may receive:

---

21 Like the friends' descriptions of the fate of the wicked were meant as a threat to Job, Job uses it here as a threat to them: "my enemy will be like a wicked one, who rises against me as an unrighteous" (27:7). Cf. Shveka and Van Hecke (2014: 110): "As for identifying the "the enemy", in the context of the dialogues, it stands to reason that Job contrasts himself with his friend here: not HE is the wicked one—on the contrary, he holds fast to his righteousness (v. 6), HIS FRIENDS should be regarded as wicked." See Lo (2003: 169n302) and Shveka and Van Hecke (2014: 108–111) for overviews of different interpretations of verse 7.

22 I follow Kroeze's understanding that verses 8–10 serve to support Job's declaration of innocence: "We kunnen echter in deze woorden ook een voortzetting van Jobs onschuldsbetuiging zien. Dan heeft het eerste כי niet zozeer op vs. 7 betrekking als wel op 2–7. Job bedoelt dan: een goddeloze heeft geen hoop op God, maar ìk wel, vgl. 13:16" (1961: 188). Compare also Wolfers (1995: 248).

23 Job 27:13-23 is the third of the disputed passages in the third speech cycle. Scholars have found it difficult to explain how Job can here assert that the wicked will receive punishment, after he had earlier claimed that they escape punishment (12:6; 21:7-18); the passage is therefore often reassigned to Zophar. See Lo (2003: 166–168, 178–187) for an overview and discussion of the various proposals. According to Lo (2003: 193), Job adopts the friends' manner of speaking to picture their own fate: "Job turns the tables and uses his friends' argument as a weapon against them. This is heavily ironic. But it needs to be noted again that it is not mere parody. The crucial thing is that, in the flow of the argument, Job uses his friends' words against them." I propose here that Job adopts the friends' manner of speaking to picture the fate of mankind in general. In this understanding, the tone in verses in 14–23 is cynical rather than ironic in that it presents the unfortunate events that people—whether they are righteous or wicked—are confronted with as if it are punishments from God.

> This is the portion of the wicked man from God,
> the inheritance of the violent that one receives from the Almighty.
>
> Job 27:13

Misfortune happened to Job and it may happen to anyone. Everyone risks that his offspring dies because of violence or famine (27:14), and that they are denied an appropriate death (27:15). The friends would hold that it is the rich man's indifferent attitude toward his wealth (27:16) that causes his downfall and that his downfall will eventually come to the benefit of the righteous and innocent (27:17). Job, however, does not accept such an explanation. In his view, the rich man's only mistake is that his house—that is his life, his accepted view on the world[24]—lacks solidity (27:18). The lack of solidity causes that all he believes in can suddenly be gone: "If a rich man lies down and is not gathered, it may be gone when he opens his eyes" (27:19). At that point, he is delivered to chaos:

> Terror overtakes him like the water;
> by night, a storm wind steals him away;
> if the East wind lifts him, he goes,
> it whirls him away from his place.
>
> Job 27:20-21

At that point, he will try to flee from God's control (27:22), while being mocked by his community (27:23).

It is obvious that Job's description of the so-called fate of the wicked can be read as his own story. Job is the rich man who lost his children, whose understanding of the world could not withstand the confrontation with trouble, who was delivered to chaos and swept from his place. Job realizes that he has been naive, and now that he knows better, he wants to share the knowledge he gained with his friends. Job wants the friends to take his advice both to save his friends from wickedness, and to save himself and other sufferers from the wrong and painful judgments that may result from a the naive understanding of God. While it may seem that Job's new understanding of the world and of God is very dark and negative, the following chapters show how Job transforms it into a more constructive approach.

---

24 Cf. Clines (2006: 673); on this metaphor, see n. 10 above.

Job 28 The knowledge that he is innocent and that God is his Redeemer led Job to proclaim a fearsome view on reality where God is not present to execute judgment. By means of an extended metaphor[25] Job reflects on the value of this knowledge and thereby he opens up yet another new perspective on himself, God and the world.[26]

When Job pictures the search for wisdom as a quest for precious stones, it seems in verses 1–11 that wisdom can be found. Only in verse 12, it becomes clear that this is not the case. From the description it appears that the search for wisdom does not fail because of a lack of efforts. Like miners, Job was willing to go beyond the familiar thoughts of tradition, to explore new territories, to face the darkness of reality, to put an end to mysteries and expose them to light. It may have occurred to the friends that Job had classified the insights at which he arrived as wisdom, but here he puts his search in a broader perspective. Even if Job is able to uncover valuable insights on death and on the fortuity of fate, he knows that this will not lead him to understanding the reward of moral efforts or the meaning of life. In the end, it must be accepted only God can understand the full extent of the ways of the world.[27]

By presenting his own search for wisdom as a quest for precious stones, Job explains to his audience that he values what he has found, but that he is also very well aware of the limits of his knowledge. By presenting God as the one who oversees the workings of the world, Job furthermore asserts that he—like the friends—trusts that God understands the principles behind the reality and the questions with which it confronts man. It thus appears that Job has moved beyond his protest against God's distance from the world in chapters 23–24. Instead of considering God's distance as a matter of inactivity or indifference, he begins to comprehend that it existentially characterizes the relation between man and God. I suggest that it is this new understanding that allows Job to relate to God as his Lord—אֲדֹנָי (28:28)—who

25 On my understanding of Job 28 as an extended metaphor or *mashal*, see chapter 2, § 2.2.

26 Compare Wolfers (1995: 492): "God is capricious and even actively malign toward those who obey Him. Yet Job maintains both his integrity and his loyalty to his Persecutor. How can he defend, even to himself, this course as being the path of wisdom? Chapters 27 and 28 together answer this question in perhaps the only way possible, by expressing *a priori* certainty that transcends, and boldly proposes always to transcend, every item of contrary evidence. They insist, in fact, on the superiority of intuitive knowledge (27:2-6) and revealed knowledge (28:28) to Wisdom and Understanding."

27 Cf. Jones (2009: 101–102): "For the poem in Job 28, true wisdom is not gained through brash ventures to the edges of the world, but by taking one's place within an ancient plan. Even while heroic exploration ultimately fails to reveal wisdom, wisdom may nonetheless be born from that failure by recognizing, creating, and maintaining limits. […] Wisdom is found in a moral universe that is fundamentally rooted in the awe of the God who ordered the world (v. 28)."

knows about the nature of reality and the questions with which it confronts man.[28] At the end of chapter 28, this new title marks that Job does not fear God because He withdraws Himself (cf. 23:13) or because He would control everything (so Bildad in 25:3), but that he has transformed the existential awe for God into a disposition that obliges him to face the harshness of reality as a servant that trusts in the omniscience and righteousness of his Lord.

Now how does Job's conclusion differ from what the friends have been trying to explain to him all along? Eliphaz already told Job in his first speech that he should put his trust in his fear (of God) and the integrity of his ways (cf. 4:6), Bildad stated that in the case of misfortune, all one can do is turn to God (cf. 8:5-7) and Zophar was actually the one who started the discussion on the imperfect knowledge of man as opposed to the perfect knowledge of God (cf. 11:4-6). It appears from their approaches to reality that Job understands the fear of God on a more fundamental level. To the friends, the fear of God is the acceptance that man's knowledge is limited and that any attempt to understand the world is a case of hubris—for this reason they did not dare to support a friend in trouble (cf. 6:14). Job's understanding of the fear of the Lord, on the other hand, entails that man lives with the assumption that the human limitations are taken into account by both man and God and that man has the unconditional responsibility to fare on his integrity. The fear of the Lord that Job presents in verse 28 is not an empty slogan when it is understood as the outcome of Job's thinking about reality, morality, and the relation of God to this world.[29] Job may not be able to know the place of wisdom, but he certainly knows the place of man and God in the world. Job had already restored God as his hope (19:25), but now the achieved concept of the fear of the Lord also allows him to reinstate God as his consolation (28:28).

Job 29–31 In the last part of the dialogue, Job regains his calm. Now that he has returned to God as his hope and consolation, the only issue left is that his insights

28 Cf. Habel (1985: 401): "The selection of the title *ʾᵃdōnāy* may be an ingenious ploy of the poet at this point. Not only does the new title produce a striking contrast with the titles which have preceded, it allows the listening audience to hear a veiled reference to the name of Yahweh in that title because of their familiarity with the idiom "the fear of Yahweh" (cf. Prov. 10:27; 14:26, 27)." I elaborate on Habel's view and suggest that the title אדני specifies the new manner in which Job relates to God.

29 Cf. Wolfers (1995: 492–493): "This is the philosophy by which Job lived before his trial—Godfearing and shunning evil. He may no longer be תם וישר, *simple and straight*, for now he is experienced and broken, but as he emerges from despair, anger and grief, he reasserts that part of his character over which he has retained control."

will find no ear and remain without consequence.[30] In order to restore his position and to improve the position of other unfortunate ones, the community should accept his view of the world, and this is indeed what Job aims to establish in his final statement.[31]

To remind his audience[32] of how he was looked at before misfortune befell him, Job starts in chapter 29 with looking back. He pictures his earlier welfare (29:2-6), his former status within his community (29:7-11), his good works and his great expectations (29:12-18), and his success and position (29:19-25). Against the background of his previous speeches, Job's self-description appears overconfident and self-important.[33] Indeed, after having criticized the attempts of the friends to comfort him, how can Job be so sure that he has been of help to the poor (cf. 29:12-16)? And after having reproached the friends for lacking a critical attitude, how can he so bluntly profile himself as the leader who finds it self-evident that he is held in awe (cf. 29:7-11.21-25)? Did not his experience of being categorized among the poor inform his interpretation of his old life?

30 Note that I thus assume that Job does not categorize his physical state as suffering as such. The problem with his physical state is that it causes that others to think of him as being punished by God, and as long as this thought is not abandoned, Job's words are not heard. Cf. Pelham (2012: 335): "It may not be until ch. 29 that we are made to recognize just how stripped of its prior power Job's language has become [...]." Job physical state thus only adds to his suffering in so far as it hinders him in reaching his goal, that is, convincing his community of his insights so that they change their doings.

31 In my interpretation below, chapters 29–31 are directed to Job's community, because I hold that after his friends (chapters 27–28), it is them, not God, that he seeks to convince of his integrity. I differ here from the explanation of chapters 29–31 as being addressed to God "to provoke God to action" (Habel (1985: 405); so also e.g. Hartley (1988: 385) and Seow (2013: 68–69)). The idea that Job does not utter 29–31 to provoke God opens up another perspective on the divine speeches, see also Pelham (2012).

32 Cf. Habel (1985: 404): "Chapters 29–31 are not a soliloquy in which Job reflects on his past and present situation, but a formal testimony (*māšāl*, 29:1) addressed to a public assembly." So also Lo (2003: 216).

33 Cf. Perdue (1991: 192): "Of course we may take this rather exalted self-praise simply as social description and argue that Job was a Near Eastern king dethroned by some unknown catastrophe. But it is wise to see the language in its full metaphorical range as it describes the nature and function of Job and others who saw themselves in the 'divine image', that is as sovereigns commissioned by God to master and rule over creation. Sages especially use royal language to speak of their tasks and mission in the world (cf. Qoh. 1:12–4:3). It is this powerful metaphor in the sapiential and priestly traditions that the book of Job seeks to deconstruct." Newsom rejects that there is arrogance in chapter 29 and holds that "the expressions that echo traditional language about God are also the poet's way of reminding the reader that Job's expectations of God are similar to what he expects of himself" (1996: 540). In my reading of the dialogue so far, chapter 28 marks the point that Job has moved beyond the desire to confront God; I therefore interpret Job's description of the past as a challenge to the audience's understanding of leadership and obedience.

At first sight, chapter 29 expresses a nostalgic longing for the past.[34] I propose, however, that it actually presents Job's cynical reflection on the meaning of his success. At the time, Job believed that he was acting righteously and judging well (29:1-13), but looking back, he now realizes that his attitude had turned into a way of dressing (29:14); that it had become a pose that he enjoyed showing around (29:15-17). Now is there any wrong in taking pride in doing good? In the description that follows, it appears that Job's self-importance has led to unrealistic expectations (29:18) that—combined with his success (29:19-20)—resulted in an uneven distribution of responsibility within the community (29:21-25). When Job describes that he became someone on whom the community depended, he does not picture a situation that he considers right and to which he longs back, but rather one that he now realizes to have been wrong. Job sees that the community honored him, not so much because he was doing good, but mainly because he was doing well (29:19-20). From his own experience, he has come to the conclusion that there is no correlation between fortune and righteousness, and now Job points out to his audience that also his own popularity has really been empty.

The explanation of Job's former position as a self-assumed leader who was eagerly received by an uncritical community suggests that Job has come to consider his old life as a breakable bubble. When Job elucidates how he is approached in his present condition, it does not come as a surprise to him that he finds no loyalty. Most commentators think of chapter 30 as a lament or complaint on his present situation.[35] I hold that the concept of God as his Redeemer in chapter 19 has led Job to move beyond the stage of self-pity, and therefore I suggest that his concern goes one step further. I propose that in chapter 30, Job pictures his current state not in order to call upon the community's kindness and compassion, but so as to reveal the mechanisms in society that cause him to be relegated to his current position.

The first verse of chapter 30 immediately brings in view the contrast that Job finds problematic. When he was rich, he was a most honored man, but now that he has lost everything, he is despised even among the lowest figures in society. Those whom he once rejected, now reject him, and he cannot even blame them for it, because—as he has come to realize in the course of the dialogue—their position is as accidental as his own.[36] Job happened to be rich and to be honored; the outcasts happened to be

34 So e.g. Clines (2006: 979) and Lo (2003: 217).

35 E.g. Kroeze (1961: 327), Habel (1985: 417), Hartley (1988: 395) and Clines (2006: 978).

36 Compare, however, Gordis (1978: 540–541): "The tragedy of Job's condition is deepened by the contempt visited upon him by the most contemptible elements in society. He despises his former

poor and to be driven from society. Can they be blamed for being unwilling to see beyond Job's outside appearance, when in his former life, he thoughtlessly discarded them as those without means (30:2)? The description of the outcast's marginality in verses 3–8 pictures how they are done wrong, but is not meant as an excuse for their present attack on Job as described in verses 9–15: Job perfectly well understands that the outcasts attack him because they believe that God has rejected him (30:11).[37]

According to Job, exactly this is where things in society go wrong: he is wrongly considered as rejected by God, and so are the outcasts. The outcasts, however, do not discern any similarity between their situation and that of Job. Instead of teaming up with him, they make him into a target at which they loosen their anger about the society that does not care for them at all. In the end, Job realizes that he has fallen prey, not to God, but to the unshakable beliefs of society. Again I underline that I do not think that this is something that Job complains about, but instead, something that he only now becomes aware of, and that he wants his community to recognize as wrong. His new understanding of the functioning of society enables him to see his position in another perspective. Indeed, with the experience that misfortune turns one into an outcast, Job realizes that his personal self-importance (נְדִבָתִי) and safety (יְשֻׁעָתִי) were temporary constructs that like wind and clouds are bound to fade away (30:15). If it is not because of one's righteousness that one is honored and doing well, it logically follows that one's social appreciation is as accidental as one's fortune.[38]

After having exposed the social implications of the fortuity of fate, Job proceeds with describing his personal state in verses 16–23 and 24–31. Among scholars, it is generally assumed that in verses 20–23, Job addresses God. In the perspective of my proposal that Job arrived at a satisfactory understanding of God in chapter 28, it would

---

inferiors, both for their abject poverty (vv. 3–7) and for their low ancestry (v. 8). Thus he clearly reflects the upper-class bias of Wisdom literature in general [...]." Also Wolfers (1995: 431) sees Job's words here as an attack, and for this reason he claims that those referred to are not the poor: "It is true their description bears a distinct resemblance to that of the unfortunate poor driven into the wilderness in Chap. 24, but it would be unthinkably inconsistent should Job show such compassion and understanding in one chapter, and then heap abuse on the same people in another." Different from Gordis and Wolfers I suggest that these verses picture not Job's contempt for the poor, but rather—in line of chapter 24—his concern for their circumstances; I therefore maintain that Job refers to the poor in verses 3–8. On this passage, see also §2.2. below.

37 Cf. Newsom (1996: 191): "So, here, Job perceives, and perceives correctly, that when the contemptible spit in his face, they do so as the instrument of the social order. They do so because they assume that God has already dishonored Job, making him vulnerable to their violence."

38 Cf. Clines (2006: 1005): "Job can only mean that what he once prized so highly, his dignity and his security, were, in the end, of little consequence and no permanence."

come as a surprise to find Job calling upon a responsibility that he already dismissed in chapters 23–24, where he came to the conclusion that God is not present in this world. In my view, Job's thinking has since then taken into account that God cannot be called upon.[39] I therefore suggest that Job in verses 20–23 addresses his community. After he has once more pictured the reality of his impending death (30:16-19),[40] Job—using the second person singular—calls upon the responsibility of every single person in his audience.

So far it seemed as if Job was presenting the story of his life to an undefined audience, but here and in the following it becomes clear that the audience he is facing is in fact the community that once appreciated him. They may not have despised him like they despise the sorry figures at the margin of society, but from Job's address it appears that also they have failed to deal with him sincerely: "If I cry to you, will you not answer me? I have withstood, did you see me?" (30:20). Job blames his community that in response to his misfortune, they have turned away from him without looking back and without remembering who he has been to them. In the perspective of his past efforts and his passionate attempts to make sense of the world, Job takes this as a matter of hardheartedness: his community has not been willing to change; on the contrary, they have used all that is in their power to justify their negative approach toward him (30:21). Instead of lifting him up on the wind to make him ride, they choose to dissolve him to become soothed themselves (30:22). Job knows that his community assumes that he will die, that is, that they do not intend to restore him (30:23).[41] While I hold Job has already accepted that he will soon take his place in 'the house assigned for all the living', I read this image here as an indirect warning to his

39 Note also that Job has not addressed God since 13:18–14:22—on the address in 16:7-8, see chapter 5, n. 5. This also fits in the interpretation that I advance in this dissertation, namely that from chapter 16 onwards, Job has shifted his attention to his friends, and from chapter 29 onwards, to his community.

40 Job accepts that his body is approaching death. God has carefully fashioned his body like clay, and the disintegration thereof is not a matter of God's carelessness but of inevitability. Note that in 10:9, Job was still resisting the fact that God would allow his body to fall apart. Compare also the much discussed verse 42:6. At this point—but I admit that I have not yet studied the exact developments from chapter 31 up to chapter 42—I suggest that Job there asserts that he will not take man's transient nature as an excuse for an indifferent attitude: "(according to the hearing of the ear I heard you, but now my eye has seen you,) therefore I refuse to comfort myself over dust and ashes" (42:5-6).

41 With the assumption that Job addresses his audience, I translate verses 22–23 as follows: "If you lift me up the wind, you make me ride, but if you dissolve me, you are soothed. For I know that you turn me to death and the house appointed for all living." In verse 22, I follow the *kethib* to read תְּשֻׁוֶּה as a *pu'al* 2nd masc. sg. of the root שׁוה.

community. Death is indeed everyone's fate: that Job is approaching death does not mean that his community is allowed to treat him like one already gone.

His community has not been treating Job according to his moral standards, and he urges them to reconsider their behavior. Job presents them with the general rule that one does not "send a hand to ruin, if in his calamity there is a cry for help" (30:24).[42] They know that Job has helped others (30:25), and now that he himself asks the others for help, they must understand that he is disappointed to be confronted by disloyalty and narrow-mindedness (30:26). Not God, but Job's community has let him down, and they are indeed the reason that his 'bowels boil without respite,' and that 'days of misery' confront him (30:27). Job wants his community to recognize how he has dealt with his misfortune and how he has kept himself standing: "did I go about mourning without sun? I have risen, I cry in the assembly for help!" Even if his existential crisis has come to an end in 28:28, Job's restoration on earth can only be achieved when his community takes its responsibility. Job depends on them. He has already dismissed his friends, and there is no other family he can rely on—"am I a brother to the jackals, or companion to the ostriches?" (30:29).[43] Job's dependency, however, is not one that is based on personal weakness. Job's skin blackens, and his self[44] "burns from desolation" (30:30), but did his lyre "turn into mourning?" or his pipe "into the voice of those who weep?" (30:31). Job has endured his sufferings, and it has led him to new understanding of God and the world that others can learn from. He now expects his community to show some respect and take his words to heart.

Chapter 31 has often been understood as a series of vows that serves to provoke God to enter the stage.[45] Those who give a less prominent role to the lawsuit paradigm suggest that chapter 31 serves to restore Job's place in his community.[46] I argue below

---

42 Job's argument here slightly differs from the one he used for his friends in 6:14: he urged his friends to be loyal on account of their friendship; now he urges his community to be fair on account of the rules within society.

43 For a similar use of the family metaphor, see 17:14 where Job pointed out that there is no community in death.

44 As in 19:20 I understand עַצְמִי as referring to the self; see also chapter 5, n. 57.

45 E.g. Gordis (1978: 339), Habel (1985: 431), Hartley (1988: 406) and Clines (2006: 1012). There is no consensus on the order of the series of vows; some scholars suggest that they are randomly ordered (so Andersen (1976: 258)), while others discern three or more groups (e.g. Newsom (1996: 552) and Clines (2006: 1012)). For an overview of different structures of chapter 31, see van der Lugt (1995: 358).

46 Newsom, for example, proposes to read Job's last speech as "a testimony by which he attempted to rehabilitate himself in the eyes of his peers and the community at large, a community that has already drawn provisional conclusions about him from their own interpretation of his ghastly fate" (2003: 185). In a similar way, Pelham argues that "Job has constructed his oath so that no intervention

that it is not such much his position that Job wants to ensure, but the implementation of his insights.

Job begins in chapter 31 with confirming his integrity, and he does so by highlighting that he has not let himself be seduced by his eyes (31:1). Job thus points out that he is able to put himself at a distance from what he is seeing and that he is aware of how he relates to reality. Verse 7 is generally read as a threefold conditional with an apodosis in verse 8, for example in the NRSV:

> (7) if my step has turned aside from the way,
> and my heart has followed my eyes, and if any spot has clung to my hands;
> (8) then let me sow, and another eat;
> and let what grows for me be rooted out.
>
> Job 31:7–8, NRSV

Because of the *petuha* at the end of verse 7,[47] I propose to translate the tricolon as an autonomous clause that closes off the first section by emphasizing, as in verse 1, that Job's eyes have not lead his heart from the way:

> (7) Does my step turn aside from the way?
> When my heart followed after my eyes, a stain would cleave to my hand![48]
> (8) I will sow, and another will devour? My growths are uprooted!
>
> Job 31:7–8, my translation

---

from God is necessary to prove his innocence," because "by this point in the book, Job has learned that God does not answer him" (2012: 348). My interpretation of chapter 31 takes a starting point in these latter approaches in that it assumes that it is aimed at reestablishing Job's position by convincing his audience.

47 Because the other *petuhot* in the book of Job clearly signal the beginning of a new paragraph in the following verse, I assume that also the *petuha* in verse 7 announces that a new paragraph starts in verse 8. Note that in the modern chapter division, 15 of the 26 *petuhot* in the book of Job are found at the end of a chapter (1:22, 3:26, 5:27, 7:21, 8:22, 10:22, 11:20, 14:22, 20:29, 22:30, 25:6, 31:40, 35:16, 37:24, 39:30) and 2 are found after the first introductory verse at the beginning of a chapter (3:1 and 32:1). Besides the *petuha* in 31:7, 8 other *petuhot* appear in the middle of a chapter, namely in 1:5, 2:10, 28:11, 28:19, 32:5, 40:2, 40:5, and 42:6, and these can all be understood as marking the change between literary units.

48 I thus understand the אִם-clause as expressing a rhetorical question, and the two *qatal* clauses following the *oleh-wayyored* accent as expressing a conditional-apodosis pair (cf. BHRG 19.2, 1.iii). In the Book of Job, the tricolon is often used to close off a section, cf. van der Lugt (1995: 478–482); van der Lugt, however, does not mention the occurrence of the *petuha* and categorizes 31:7–8 among the tricola that open a higher unit.

After Job has pictured integrity as the ability to hold on to one's principles, even when it is attractive to take another direction, Job introduces the main topic of chapter 31 in verses 8–12. Alluding to the proverb that the wicked sow, but another eats, Job asserts that even this scenario does not apply to him, for his growths are uprooted (31:8). This indeed is what Job here frustrates the most, namely that nobody has been willing to accept the new perspective that he has been developing throughout the dialogue with his friends, from the moment that misfortune struck him.[49] Job refuses to accept that he—the one who used to be highly respected and who is known for holding on to his integrity—is no longer given any attention:

> Has my heart been open to a woman,
> when I lied in wait at the door of my friend?[50]
>
> Job 31:9

In my view, verse 9 does not serve to convince Job's community that he abstained from adultery, but instead, to underline that he has been waiting for his friends to support him, and that he had set his mind on finding a solution together. Job has not been distracted, and if there is a woman that has his attention, it is his own wife:[51]

---

49 The noun צֶאֱצָא refers to the produce of the earth (Isa 34:1; 42:5) and metaphorically to human descendants (Isa 22:24; 44:3; 48:19; 61:9; 65:23; Job 5:25; 21:8; 27:14). When Job exclaims that his 'offspring is uprooted', he reminds one of the death of his children, yet at the same time, he uses the proverbial scenario of sowing and seeing the produce eaten by others to conceptualize himself as a wicked one who will not enjoy his own produce (cf. 5:5 and 27:17, see also Lev 26:16; Deut 28:30 and Isa 65:22). While the first interpretation adds an emotional load to Job words, I propose that Job here especially plays on the irony that this proverb presents him with. If his community considers him wicked, the proverb predicts that they will take his produce; Job indeed wants them to eat his produce (compare Jesus' use of this proverb in Joh 4:37), but instead they uproot what Job offers them. His community does not accept anything from his because of his position, and this is exactly what bothers Job in chapter 31. Note that the verb יצא is also used to refer to words going forth from the mouth (cf. Job 8:10; 15:13; 26:4; Prov 10:18; Neh 6:19). Compare furthermore the metaphorical use of תְּבוּאָה 'harvest', 'profit' in 31:12, see n. 52 below.

50 Instead of taking verses 9–10 as an protasis–apodosis, I understand the אִם-clause in verse 9—like that in verse 7—as a rhetorical question, and verse 10 as picturing a state of affairs that verses 11–12 comment on.

51 Commentaries generally understand 31:9-12 as picturing "the fundamental principle of Israelite ethics, sexual avoidance of a neighbor's wife" (Newsom 1996: 553). I suggest, however, that the situation pictured in verses 10–12 is not so much a hypothetical scenario, but what Job fears will actually occur if he is not able to change the view of his community.

> My wife will grind for another, and others will kneel down over her:
> when that is shameful, this is an iniquity (to be judged) of judges,
> that a fire that consumes down to Abaddon uproots all my yield!
>
> Job 31:10-12

Job foresees that his wife—after his death—is destined to depend on the benevolence of others (31:10). Because this is a consequence of the accidental misfortune that befell Job, one cannot actually consider such a situation a disgrace, and those who do so, should know that they are wrong. Rather than busy themselves with useless judgments on his wife, Job wants his audience to direct their attention to the wrong they themselves participate in, namely their indifference about the fact that Job's insights[52] are about to fall prey to destructive intuitions.

What is at stake for Job is not only his honor and that of his wife, but also that of the poor and needy. The theme of the poor was introduced by Eliphaz at the end of the second speech cycle in chapter 22. In 22:6-9, Eliphaz accused Job of withholding the food from the poor, that is, he conceptualized Job's ideas as a threat for the already mean conditions on which their wellbeing depends (cf. chapter 5, §3.1). In this last part of the dialogue, the poor featured in chapter 24, 29 and 30. In chapter 24, Job pictured them as being exploited and left to their fate (24:2-12); in chapter 29, he mentioned them in his account on how he used to care for them (29:12-17); and in chapter 30, he described how they are denied access to society (30:3-8). Against this background, I argue below that in 31:13-22, Job sets out to reverse Eliphaz's metaphor by showing that his ideas are exactly the food the poor need. Job used to do good to the poor, and now that he sees their situation from what he has experienced himself, he can help them in a more fundamental way, namely by confronting his audience with the question how society imprisons them in their position.

Job is not holding on to the truth for superficial reasons, but because it is the only way to go.[53] Even if he were in the position to do so, he is not free to put his interests above that of his subordinates, because he knows that in the perspective of life (and death) all people are equal (31:13-15). Similarly, he refuses to put the interests of one group above that of another: "If I withhold because of the delight of the poor, I cause

52 Compare also Prov 18:20 where תְּבוּאָה is used in the context of speaking and Prov 3:14; 8:19 and Sir 6:19 where it is used in the context of wisdom; cf. HALOT (Köhler and Walter 1994–2000: 1679).

53 Job's statement in verses 13–15 can be read as refuting Eliphaz's argument in 22:2-4 that his integrity is not a pleasure to God: here he makes clear to his audience that it is surely not for selfish reasons that he holds on to his integrity.

the eyes of a widow to fail" (31:16). His community must realize that withholding the truth from the poor leads to arbitrary decisions, and therefore, they may reconsider the value of what Job offers:

> Do I eat my bit alone, and would not the orphan eat thereof,
> that since my youth, He is great[54] to me as a father,
> and that since the belly,[55] He is my mother that I lead to?[56]
>
> Job 31:17–18

Job believes that God is not an active force in the world, but like this did not withhold him from considering Him his Redeemer in 19:25 and his Lord in 28:28, it does not withhold him here from conceptualizing Him as a father and a mother. God is the one who guides him, He is the one he came from, and He is the one he heads for. Job wants to show that his understanding of God is constructive. It offers the orphan a father and a mother, and it offers warmth to those without clothes or covering (31:19–20). Supporting the poor and needy is more important to Job than his personal wellbeing, and he underlines this when he closes off the second part of the chapter in verses 21–22:

---

54 Cf. 2 Sam 7:22 and Psa 104:1 for God as the subject of גדל.

55 The phrase מבטן אמי is often taken together as 'the belly of my mother.' In this reading, however, it is unclear who the suffix 3fs in אנחנה 'I guided her' refers to (see n. 56 below). Because מבטן in the sense of 'from the womb' also occurs on itself (e.g. Job 3:11; 10:19; Psa 22:10; 58:4), I choose to read both מנערי and מבטן, and אב and אם as parallels; in this reading, אמי functions as a predicate that is followed by a relative clause and the suffix 3fs can be taken as an accusative of direction (cf. JM §125n).

56 Job 31:18: כִּי מִנְּעוּרַי גִּדְּלַנִי כְּאָב וּמִבֶּטֶן אִמִּי אַנְחֶנָּה. The meaning of verse 18 has been found difficult to establish, mainly because it is not immediately clear what should be understood as the referents of the verb גדל 'to be great' and the suffix 3rd feminine singular attached to נחה 'to lead'. Most scholars take the orphan (cf. 31:17) as the subject of גדל: "he grew up with me as though I were his father" (JPS) and the widow (cf. 31:16) as the direct object of נחה: "Since I left my mother's womb I was her guide" (JPS). While these translations are correct, it is commonly agreed that these statements should not be taken literally. There has, however, not yet been offered a satisfactory explanation on what Job means by stating these things. As I argue that Job in 31:13–22 wants to show the value of his insights, I propose to take a starting point in the idea that verse 18 elaborates on verse 17 by picturing the understanding of God ('my bit') that is indeed worth sharing with the ones without parents ('would not the orphan eat thereof'), namely the understanding of God as a father and as a mother. On the conceptualization of God as a parent, see also Dille (2004). On the conceptualization of death as returning to the mother's womb, cf. 1:21.

> If I waved my hand against the fatherless, because I see that my help is in the gate, my arm may drop off my shoulder, may my forearm break off at the elbow!
>
> Job 31:21-22

After Job's plea that his thoughts are with the poor and that they indeed favor the poor, Job closes off his monologue by predicting his vindication and by calling upon one's responsibility for the earth. When misfortune struck him (31:23), Job did not put his trust in gold and richness (31:24-25), he neither worshipped the sun nor the moon (31:26-28),[57] and unlike his friends, he did not wish his enemies the worst (31:29-31).[58] Instead he kept his house and heart open to the world (31:32-33), and it is for this reason that Job is confident to come out to stand the contempt of the masses (31:34) and to speak with confidence:[59]

> O that I had someone to hear me!
> —Here is my mark! The Almighty will answer me—
> and the statement the man striving with me wrote!
>
> Job 31:35

Job will indeed wear his fate with pride:

> If I cannot carry it on my shoulder, I bind it around me as a crown;
> when I give Him account of my steps, I approach Him as a prince!
>
> Job 31:36-37

---

57 This could be taken as a sneer to Eliphaz's suggestion in 22:12, and that of Bildad in 25:5-6, to understand one's relation to God in terms of the experience of being overcome and being insignificant when facing the moon and the stars and the wideness of the universe.

58 Cf. Eliphaz in 5:3.

59 If chapter 31 does not serve to provoke God, then why is He addressed in verses 35–37? With Pelham (2012: 349) I hold that "Job's oath is structured in such a way that God does not need to appear" and that מי יתן signals that Job still considers the appearance of God as an unrealizable wish. As Pelham (2012: 349–350) explains: "The beauty of the oath is that it is self-validating. If curses are not rained down on Job, then it is *as if* God has appeared and *as if* Job has stood before him like a prince [...] In this way, God's hand *is* forced, not in the sense that God is compelled to speak, but in the sense that, by not saying anything, God is understood to have made a proclamation by those witnessing the oath, and the content of that proclamation is defined by Job."

Verses 38–40 are often considered as misplaced after Job's appeal in verses 35–37. Newsom (1996: 555) understands verses 35–37 as an aside. I elaborate on this view and take them as the upbeat for the bottom line of Job's plea in verses 38–40. When verses 35–37 underline how Job, despite the circumstances, trusts in God, he closes off with an oath that highlights his existential emphatic attitude:

> If my land cries out against me, and its furrows weep together,
> would I eat its yield without payment,
> and cause the soul of its owners to breath out?
> Instead of wheat nettles will grow, instead of barley, stinkweed!
> The words of Job are at an end.
>
> Job 31:38-40

With a rhetorical question, Job presents his moral principle. He does not eat the yield of the earth without payment, that is, he does not accept the wisdom he has gained without passing it on in order to improve the life of other sufferers. Job thus ends the chapter with a call to take responsibility for the earth: even if the earth is a place of transience and temporality, a place of arbitrariness and decay, where God's justice does not rule, this does not entail that anything goes. Nothing should ever be taken for granted.

2. The Suffering of the Poor

In search for hope and consolation, Job arrived at a new understanding of his place in the world. Because he has experienced himself that the ideas about man and God upheld in society lead to a crooked interpretation of reality and unjust exclusions, Job has set out to show his audience where they go wrong and why they fail to live up to their responsibility. To overcome the fact that he is relegated to a position in which it is not self evident that he is listened to, Job centers his argumentation around the wellbeing of the poor and needy. As I mentioned in the introduction of this chapter, Job pictures the suffering of the poor and needy in 24:2-12, 30:2-8 and 31:13-22. Job's descriptions of the poor do not constitute a new phase in his conceptualization of his situation, but they reflect the understanding of his own suffering at which he arrived in discussion with his friends and they also elaborate on it from the new position in which he starts to recollect a constructive view on the world. My main aim in this paragraph is to show how Job's characterization of human suffering in society

builds on his new understanding of the world. Because I read these passages on the poor as Job's application of his worldview to wrongs in society, I take the metaphors therein as a starting point to recapitulate the views on suffering that were passed in review in the dialogue. My procedure therefore differs from that in chapters 3–5 in this dissertation in that I do not present a detailed analysis of the contents and of the metaphors in these passages. For each of these passages, I firstly clarify how the conceptualization of the suffering of the poor functions in the argument that is developed in chapters 23–31, and secondly, I explain how it relates to the metaphors that Job and his friends introduced in the dialogue.

2.1. *Job 24:2-12: Cattle, Food and Nakedness*

In chapter 24, Job's description of the situation of the poor serves as an example of injustice that—like the wellbeing of the wicked in chapter 21—proves that God is not actively involved in the world (24:12). In chapter 21, Job mainly used this argument to reject the hopeful perspectives offered by the friends as unrealistic (cf. 21:34). From chapter 23 onwards, however, as the discussion takes a more general turn, Job changes his strategy, and instead of arguing why the friends' worldview is not realistic and why he is more in the right, he takes a more constructive approach by exploring the implications of his worldview for society. In this project, the assertion that God is not paying attention to distasteful affairs (24:12) is mainly used to trigger the community's reflection on their responsibility in the matter of the poor. Because of their unfortunate situation, the poor are easily thought of as those who have gone wrong (24:13, cf. § 1 above), but as Job sees it, the real problem is that the poor are the victim of those who make advantage of God's absence.

The first source domain that Job introduces to picture the situation of the poor is CATTLE. In 24:2, the powerful ones are presented as corrupt shepherds and the people as the flock that is led in the wrong direction. In verses 3–4, the shepherds are said to be responsible for the position of the poor:

> They drive the donkey of the fatherless, they take in pawn the widow's ox,
> they turn the needy away from the road;
> altogether, the poor of the land are made to hide themselves.
>
> Job 24:3-4

The cattle metaphor continues in verse 5 where the poor are compared to wild asses who survive on what they come across:

> See, like wild asses in the desert they go about their tasks searching for prey:
> the wasteland is His bread for the young ones!
>
> Job 24:5

In verses 5 and 7, two more source domains are brought in, namely that of FOOD and NAKEDNESS. The poor live of the wasteland, that is, they eat what happens to be provided (24:5), what is left over by others, or what is available from a plainly suspicious source (24:6). Day and night they are naked: in the night, their only shelter against the weather is a rock (24:7-8), and by day, they are not entitled to take a share and to fulfill their hunger and thirst (24:10-11).

In the speeches so far, cattle, food, and nakedness metaphors have occurred in the speeches of both Job and the friends. The source domain that one comes across first is that of NAKEDNESS. After he lost his possessions and his children, Job stated:

> Naked I came from my mother's womb, and naked shall I return there;
> the LORD gave, and the LORD has taken away;
> blessed be the name of the LORD.
>
> Job 1:21

At that point, when he was expecting to die soon, being naked in the sense of being stripped of possessions and relations was not something that Job considered problematic. However, when he did not die, he began to look at his situation from wider perspective: he no longer hoped for death, and he no longer spoke of himself anymore as naked, but rather as invisible and nonexistent (10:18-22; cf. chapter 4, §2.3.1). Still later Job understood the importance of distinguishing between outer appearances and inner directionality, and that in the end, it is only one's integrity (19:25, cf. chapter 5, §2.3.1) and one's yield (31:8, cf. §1 above) that matter. The nakedness metaphor has thus moved to the background in Job's reasoning, but in 22:6, it is reactivated by Eliphaz: "(You exact a pledge from your brothers for nothing,) and you strip off the clothing of the naked ones." Eliphaz here uses nakedness in the same sense as Job did in 1:21: the naked ones are those who have no possessions or family to rely on, but whereas Job employed it in a neutral sense to explain how he was at peace with his losses, Eliphaz takes it up negatively to characterize the poor as being vulnerable. According to Eliphaz, Job takes away the last layer of protection from those who have nothing.

The source domain of FOOD was used by Job to introduce the sense of taste. Job's friends expected that his belief in God would oblige him to accept his fate and to

swallow it all, but Job refuses to put aside his natural and built-in ability to distinguish between right and wrong. Job trusts that his personal compass keeps him on the right track, and therefore he does not hesitate to conceptualize his misfortune (3:23, 6:5) and the friends' advice (6:7) as inappropriate food that makes him sick (see also 6:30). The friends who rely on what they have learned, rather than on personal judgment, give less weight to the taste of food; to them, the most important characteristic of food is that it sustains. Eliphaz said that the wicked will find that in the end, their food will fail to support them (15:23). Zophar pointed out that taste cannot be trusted, because the sweet is not necessarily the right: the wicked eat what they like, but eventually, their food turns out to be poison that ensures that they will lose everything they gained (20:14–15). When Eliphaz asserts in 22:7 that Job denies the weary their water and the hungry their food, he criticizes Job for replacing the constructive ideas transmitted by tradition by the subversive thought that one's fate is entirely accidental. By maintaining that there is nothing one can do to affect one's circumstances, Job, according to Eliphaz, withholds the poor a hopeful perspective.

The source domain of CATTLE was evoked when Job compared his protest to the sound of wild ass and the ox who lack food in order to draw attention to the fact that even animals raise their voice when they are in need (6:5). Job appreciated the cattle's natural instinct to openly denounce an objectionable situation—and furthermore, it can be imagined that Job sympathizes with the wild ass' independency and its ability to survive in the desert. Zophar picked in on Job's conceptualization of man in terms of a wild ass in the conclusion of his first speech on the unfathomable knowledge on God:

> For He knows empty men; He sees iniquity that one cannot understand,
> but a hollow man comprehends when the colt of an ass is born a man.
>
> Job 11:11–12

According to Zophar, man, unlike God, cannot fathom the real nature of the world in which he lives. The 'heart' of man is of another order, yet his destiny is not in the way of the wild ass (cf. 6:15, Gen 16:12), but instead, in the process of civilization.[60] Before

60 Cf. Rashi on Job 11:12: "will gain understanding: Heb. ילבב, he will gain for himself a heart [i.e., understanding] to return to his Creator and to search through his deeds-or [he will remain] a man who was like a wild donkey, accustomed to the desert, hasty, without sense." And "a man will be born: He will teach himself to be a new man according to the order of people, and he will determine his way."

God, man is wild and removed from reality, but unlike the wild ass, man is able to overcome his natural instincts to become tamed. Man does not need to be a wild ass in desert if only he directs his heart (11:13).

Now how does the metaphorical development of the three source domains as described above inform the interpretation of the metaphors in 24:2-13? When Job pictures the people as cattle that is led away in the wrong direction and as wild asses in the desert searching for food, he no longer praises their instincts. Instead of choosing their path, the poor, like cattle, follow their leaders (24:2). Once they are brought off the track they find themselves, like wild asses, in a no man's land where the wasteland is their food (24:4-5). Regarding the food, Job neither speaks of its taste, nor does he allude to the aspect of its sustainability, but instead, he mentions possible places where it can be found. In the desert, taste is a luxury; there is no choice but to take every chance to get a hand on whatever food available. The poor eat anything out of bare necessity, and they are already beyond the point that they depend on the sustaining food envisioned by the friends, that is, what has been delivered from the fathers. According to Job, Eliphaz wrongly assumes that the poor are in the position to cherish hope for a change of fortune, and therefore, Job rejects Eliphaz's accusation that he denied the poor a constructive perspective as ungrounded. With a similar reasoning, Job rejects Eliphaz's charge that he leaves the poor naked. As Job sees it, the poor are led into the wasteland where their last clothing and covering has already fallen away (24:7). Their vulnerability is already complete; they are already naked to the bone, and there is nothing more to strip off from them. The poor have nothing left to lose, and Eliphaz is wrong in assuming that there is still something that protects them against harm that can be taken away from them.

To picture the situation of the poor, Job returns to source domains that he earlier introduced to conceptualize his own situation, but he adjusts the interpretation thereof so that they concur with his current view on the world. The poor, like Job, find themselves banned from society, in an incomprehensible and incompassionate universe where they can only take life as it comes, without any possibility to guard themselves against new obstacles. Job, however, differs from the poor in one essential aspect, namely that his suffering from a lack of perspective has been resolved, because he has been able to reestablish his hope (cf. 19:25, see chapter 5 § 2).

2.2. *Job 30:3-8: Food and Cattle*

In chapter 30, in his exposition of how beliefs in society have caused his downfall, Job again describes the situation of the poor, and again he takes up the source domains of FOOD and CATTLE. Now what is the function of the conceptualization in verses 3–8 within chapter 30? How does it relate to verses 1–2, and in what sense does it differ from that in 24:2-12?

In verse 1, Job starts picturing the extent of his loss of honor by stating that the men that laugh at him are young ones whose fathers Job—in his better days—would have rejected to put them with his sheep dogs. At first sight, it is not immediately clear how this statement should be understood. It has been taken as an insult,[61] but so far, Job has never spoken so offensively about others, and especially after his description of the poor in chapter 24 and how he used to support them in chapter 29, it would come as a surprise to find Job speaking about them here in a such a depreciatory way.[62] I therefore propose to read verse 1 as a factual description of reality, with verse 2 as a an explanation for this harsh state of affairs: "even if the strength of their hands was of use to me, on them, vigor is gone" (30:2).[63] The reason that Job nor anyone else hires the poor is that they are of no use: even if one were willing to overlook their social status, they lack the energy and vitality that an employer expects of his employees. By picturing the circumstances of the fathers, Job makes painfully clear how the young ones who laugh at him are destined to be stuck in their situation, because there is no possible way that they can work themselves back into society.

Against this background I propose that the description of the poor in verses 3–8 serves to explain why Job is let down even by those who experience a lack of recognition themselves. The first source domain that Job introduces in verses 3–8 is that of FOOD. Whereas food was scarce and of a dubious origin in chapter 24, here in chapter 30, there is no food at all:

---

61 E.g. Gordis (1978: 330), Habel (1985: 418), Hartley (1988: 397) and Newsom (1996: 544).

62 Cf. Newsom (1996: 545): "One of the interpretive problems posed by this section is its striking contrast with Job's sympathetic description of the destitute in 24:3-8." On the description of the poor in chapter 24 and 30, see also n. 36 above.

63 The verse may represent how Job used to think of the poor, but I propose that the bold language here mainly serves to kindle the curiosity of the audience. In my view, Job plays on the low appraisal of the poor: at first sight, he suggests that he abides by the commonly held stance, but when he brings in view the reality of their situation, the bitter irony is that the poor are despicable, only because society does not give them any chance.

> Because of want and starvation they are barren;
> the ones who gnaw the dry while yesterday is ruin and desolation.
> Job 30:3

The circumstances of the poor are that of CATTLE: with nothing to eat, they are forced to feed themselves with edible plants available (30:4), and expelled from society as thieves, they are made to live in inhospitable places (30:5-6). Their cries are considered as merely inconvenient: "when they bray in the bushes, they are joined under the nettles" (30:7). The life of the poor is the life of cattle, and they are not looked at as people, but discarded as weed or nettles, that is, as annoying sprouts that are of no use: as "sons of a fool, indeed, sons of no name" they are "smitten from the earth" (30:8).

As in chapter 24 Job pictures the poor as being led into the desert where they are left to their fate, but now his focus is not on their struggle to survive, but on how their minimal circumstances deny them the possibility to become man. Job asserts here that the efforts of the poor are useless when in the end, it does not bring them any closer to a life that allows them to participate in the process of civilization. Of course it is possible to live without a perspective and to do whatever you can, but in the end, this is nothing more than living like a wild ass in the desert (cf. 11:12). A man is no man if he cannot fulfill his destiny.

With this new interpretation of the poor's situation, Job again envisions the problem of the poor as a problem he was confronted with himself. Like the poor, Job had found himself imprisoned in life with no reason to continue living (cf. Job 3). What allowed Job to regain control over his situation is the trust in his self knowledge. His intuitive certainty that man can know of himself whether he is righteous made him declare the world accidental and allowed him to hope on recognition from God. That the poor do not sympathize with Job is because they have not learned to trust in their integrity, and therefore, they are not able to put themselves at distance from the situation they find themselves in. Indoctrinated by society that they have done wrong, the poor laugh with tragic laughter[64] when even respected members of the society turn out to be corrupt. To them, Job's fate merely confirms the general fallibility of man and the general lack of hope for humanity. There is no hope for them, and if there is no hope for someone as Job, there is no hope for anyone at all.

64 On the notion of tragic laughter as "a means of resistance in contexts of oppression", see Claassens (2015: 144 ff.).

2.3. *Job 31:13–22: Birth and Family; Food and Clothing*

The dark conceptualization of the poor in chapter 30 is not the end of Job's story. Based on his own experiences, Job has a well-defined idea of how their position in society can be restored. The solution that Job envisions as a cure for the poor can be found in verses 13–22 of his final plea in chapter 31. In the next, I clarify what source domains Job uses to conceptualize his solution and how the use thereof in this passage relates to the earlier use thereof.

The first source domain that Job brings in to present a constructive version of his worldview is that of BIRTH. Job focuses on the common origin in God to substantiate his idea that social status should not be an argument treat people differently (31:13):

> did not He who made me in the belly (בַּבֶּטֶן) make him?
> Did He not form us in the same womb (בָּרֶחֶם)?
>
> Job 31:15

People not only have their origin in God, for God is also their destiny:

> (Do I eat my food alone, and would not the fatherless eat of thereof,
> that since my youth He is great to me like a father),
> and that since the belly He is my mother that I lead to?[65]
>
> Job 31:17-18

With the source domain of BIRTH, Job also introduces that of FAMILY. Both the source domains of BIRTH and FAMILY occurred in earlier speeches of Job and his friends, and both were already activated in Job's first reported words in 1:21. When he was expecting to die soon, Job took a neutral stance toward both birth and death: birth is moving from God and death is returning to Him, and life is nothing more than the period in between. In chapter 3, however, Job has not died and therefore he has come to think more negatively about life. Birth is no longer the moment he leaves God and starts to head for Him again, it is instead the moment that he is confronted with trouble (3:11). Eliphaz had translated this observation into a general rule, namely that mortals are indeed destined to meet trouble (5:7). While Eliphaz related man's mortal nature to an imperfection in morality (4:17-21), Job merely questioned how

65 On this interpretation of verse 18, see §1 and n. 56 above.

it makes sense that mortal man is the subject of God's attention (7:17), and to his mind, it was nonsensical for God to judge a man born of a woman (14:1–3). Eliphaz again gave his own interpretation of Job's remark when he confirmed that mortal man cannot compete with God in righteousness (15:14). Job and Eliphaz differ in their understanding of the meaning of mortality, but both consider it as a troublesome case for man's relation to God. Bildad, however, disagrees on this point. According to him, there is no use in the problematization of man's mortality (25:4.6), and he rather wishes to focus on the fact that man is more than his transient nature (25:3.5).[66] When Job in chapter 31 bases his argument on birth, it appears that Bildad has convinced him to shift away the attention from man's mortality. Birth is no longer the start of a troublesome life or the cause of an existential imbalance in man's relation to God, but the ground to strive for a righteous society that includes the poor and needy.

Like the source domain of BIRTH, the role of the source domain of FAMILY changes with the developments in Job's conceptualization of death. In Job 1:21, both birth and death were thought of as the mother's belly, and Job comforted himself with the idea that in the end, he would return to the safe place where his life has started. In chapter 3, the safeness of birth and death were contrasted with the turmoil of life on earth, and life became the place where Job wished to stay for only the shortest possible time (3:11). When Job in chapter 10 no longer thought of death as a better place than life, the image of death as the mother's womb moved to the background, and the source domain of FAMILY was instead used to cynically question the existence of relations in death:

> If I expect that *Sheol* is my house,
> would I spread my bed in darkness?
> would I say to the grave "you are my father,"
> "mother" and "sister" to the worm?
>
> Job 17:13-14

Job's negative interpretation of death changed after Bildad's assertion in chapter 25 that man is more than a maggot or a worm (25:5–6). Even if Job did not consider Bildad's proposal as a final answer to the problem of mortality, it made him realize that there is value in self-knowledge and that in the end, God will recognize man's moral efforts (28:28). This insight allowed Job in chapter 31 to come back to his con-

66 On this interpretation of 25:3–6, see § 1 above.

ceptualization as death as a return to his mother (31:18). Whereas the source domain of FAMILY in 1:21 especially served to picture the individual relation of man to life and death, it includes in 31:18 also the relation between people on earth. All men have their origin and destiny in God. Once they have come into the world, God watches over them, and when they return to Him, He expects them to have taken care for each other as brothers and sisters. In the end, the source domain of FAMILY does not only provide a comforting perspective on death, it also sets the standard for morality in an imperfect world.

In verses 17–18, the source domains of BIRTH and FAMILY are introduced within the source domain of FOOD. According to Job, one should serve to the poor the comforting perspective that God is there as the father who watches them and as the mother who is the origin and destiny of their life. Job's food for the poor is thus not—like Eliphaz seemed to assume in chapter 22—the bold idea that the world is accidental and that God does not act in the world. This is indeed what Job believes, but here he shows—like he did in chapter 19 (God as his Redeemer) and 28 (God as his Lord)—that this view is still very well compatible with a positive conceptualization of God. After he pictured how the poor and needy are already beyond the point that they can appreciate the traditional food (Job 24:1-12), and how the lack of food turns them away from society (Job 30:3-8), Job argues that the food that helps to reconcile them to society is the idea that in their origin and in their destiny, all people are the same before God and the idea that people should take care of each other as brothers and sisters until they return to their Father.

With the source domain of FOOD, Job counters the metaphor that Eliphaz introduced when he accused Job in chapter 22, and the same holds for the source domain of CLOTHING that is found in verses 19–20:

> If I see one who perishes without clothing,
> or that there is no covering for the poor;
> would not his loins bless me,
> as he warmed himself with the shearing of my sheep?
>
> Job 31:19-20

Job is not stripping the poor and needy from their last clothing (cf. 22:6), but instead, he offers them the warmth of the shearing of his sheep. Even if he has no longer physical riches to offer, Job's mental labor has certainly resulted in a product that is very well equipped to help the poor and needy reestablish hope and consolation so that they are able to regain control over their situation and so that they no longer

deliver their fate to accidental misfortune. Job's ideas do not leave the poor and needy naked, but exactly offer them the cover by which they can protect themselves against the cold world.

3. The Topic of the Poor and Needy and the Discussion of Job's Yield

As I remarked at the beginning of this chapter, Job's suffering came to an end when he regained control over his situation by reestablishing his belief in God in chapter 19 and by redefining his place in the world in chapter 28. Job's discussion of the suffering of the poor in chapters 24, 30, and 31 is thus taking place while Job is addressing the last issues that still bother him, namely the issue of his personal yield and the issue of the attitude of society. These issues affect Job personally in so far as he is not given the recognition that he desires of his community, but they also affect society in general in so far as the poor and needy are left to their fate and the elite are not doing their duty. Job wants to have his yield accepted, not only for his own sake, but also for the sake of society. In Job's current position, however, it is not so easy to communicate his message.

Job accused his friends time and again for their lack of loyalty (cf. 6:14, 6:22-30, 12:4, 13:4-5, 16:2-3, 17:3.6-16, 19:2-6.21-22, 21:2-6.34, 26:2-3) and he even threatened them to change their behavior (cf. 13:7-11, 19:26-29, 27:5-7), but these strategies did not succeed in changing their mind. At the end of the second speech cycle in chapter 21, Job had been pleading for an honest look on reality. He wanted his friends to admit that reality does not reflect a righteous judgment of God, and that therefore it cannot be deduced from one's physical condition whether one should be counted among the good or the bad. Eliphaz made clear that he understood what Job was saying, but that he did not find it appropriate to elaborate on it, because putting the traditional worldview at risk would harm the poor (cf. 22:6-9). I have proposed that in chapters 23–31, Job takes this move of Eliphaz as a starting point to change his strategy.

By picking in on the topic of the poor and needy and by presenting their suffering in the form of an answer to Eliphaz's accusation, Job shifts the discussion away from his own situation and from his own desires. In the discussion of the situation of the poor and needy, Job's main challenges are firstly, to make his community see that their attitude embodies an evil in society, and secondly, to make them appreciate the more constructive interpretation of his worldview. Society should stop excluding the poor and needy because they would have gone wrong. Those who are doing well should indeed be aware that misfortune may fall upon everyone, including themselves, and

therefore, they must not judge, but act upon the principle that a man knows his heart. It should be accepted that life does not come without pain, but that even so, the belief that God is as a father and a mother should inspire man to do good and offer him the trust that—whatever the circumstances—there will be recognition, even if the difficulties are not taken away.

In chapter 31, Job has come to his rhetorical finale. Job establishes his position as the right one. He no longer reacts to every possible argument that could be adduced to weaken his arguments, but instead he pictures himself as one who kept himself standing, who has not let himself be misled to take an easy way out, but was willing to put everything at stake to fulfill his duty. Even if Job's circumstances are the same as in chapter 3, the audience now finds itself confronted with a strong man who is showing a great sensitivity for social wrongs. With this empowerment of his person, Job hopes to get his yield accepted by his community, so that he can finally die in peace.

Conclusion

The purpose of this dissertation was to explore on the one hand how Job's determination to make sense of a broken world can serve as a guideline for how mortals can arrive at a more comprehensive understanding of their place in the world, and on other hand, how the concept of deliberately used metaphors can be applied to improve the interpretation of metaphors in key passages in Job 3–31. In this conclusion, I firstly summarize my findings on the theme of Job's suffering and on metaphors and rhetorical development in Job 3–31; thereafter, I present an overview of specific interpretations and, finally, discuss the implications of this dissertation for future research.

1. But Man is Born to Trouble …

In chapters 3–6 of this dissertation, I have described the development in Job's conceptualization of suffering, namely that it began with the experience of turmoil at being imprisoned in life (Job 3) and with the lack of perspective in a life that has reached its end (Job 7). This conceptualization then continued with a complete loss of hope for himself (Job 10) and for mankind in general (Job 14). I have maintained that in addition to the experience of existential suffering, Job became increasingly aware of the disloyalty of his friends (Job 17 and 19), and that this triggered a transcendent understanding of the self and the restoration of a hopeful perspective (Job 19). I have furthermore claimed that Job's existential suffering ends in 19:25, and that from that point on, he initiates a project in which he intends to convince his friends and his community of the accidental nature of worldly reality (Job 21) and of the value of this recognition by drawing attention to the situation of the poor (Job 24, 30, 31).

The book of Job illustrates that addressing calamity requires unconditional trust in the ability to distinguish right from wrong and unconditional determination to respect moral integrity. After Job had moved beyond the idea that there is hope in death and that there is no perspective in life, he had to overcome the frustration that worldly circumstances do not reflect moral efforts (Job 10, 14). Job was able to do so when in the confrontation with his biased friends, he came to understand that his inner self transcends earthly reality (Job 19). At first sight, this may be considered Job's most important achievement. I have advanced the position, however, that this is only a first step. The real value of this understanding of the self and the world

appears when it is transferred to the community and the world, that is, when it is recognized that there are others whose circumstances may not reflect their moral integrity. The insight that misfortune is accidental offers a new perspective on the position of the unfortunate in society. If it recognized that the poor are excluded from society (Job 24, 30), not because of their actions, but because of their accidental troublesome situations, it necessitates that one takes a stand against their structural repression. It is a disturbing thought that the world is accidental and God is not present in the world (Job 23–24), but in the acceptance that human knowledge of the world is inadequate, God appears as a Lord that properly values man's efforts (Job 28:28). One should account for one's conduct before God, but with God as the father/mother that all mankind comes from and returns to (Job 31:18), morality is in the first place a worldly affair. In the end, the true yield of Job's confrontation with misfortune is the insight that morality indeed matters if it is understood as the existential responsibility to care for all people and to promote the realization of a righteous society (Job 31).

It has often been thought that there is a paradox in God's judgment of the friends in chapter 42: as the friends had predicted, God restores Job, but even so, God judges them to be in the wrong. How can this be? In this dissertation, I have argued that Job and his friends do not so much differ in their understandings of God, but rather in their understandings of and approaches to human nature and worldly reality. I suggest that the friends erred when they took the transcendent nature of God as an argument to place human morality in perspective. Rather than exploring the implications of the fortuity of life for their understanding of God, they preferred to accept the world as it is. To Job, the world is a project that makes an appeal to one's morality and demands action. I hold that Job truly showed himself to be righteous when he moved beyond his personal suffering and presented his audience with a view that addresses the matter of structural injustice in society.

2. Metaphors and the Rhetorical Development in Job 3–31

In this dissertation, I have studied Job's manner of dealing with trouble against the backdrop of his confrontation with his friends concerning different conceptualizations of hope and consolation. By examining the interactions of metaphors, I have developed the following interpretation of the rhetorical development in Job 3–31.

In the first speech cycle, Job and his friends use a wide range of source domains to investigate how Job's situation makes sense. In chapter 3, Job had set his hope on

death as a place of rest and as a hidden treasure. Eliphaz replied in chapters 4–5 that death is a place of destruction and not something that Job can hope for: the righteous die when their long lives have come to full completion. In chapters 6–7, it appears that Eliphaz's images have modified Job's view: Job now admits that death is destruction, but even so, he hopes that God allows him to die. According to Eliphaz, the completion of life entails that one dies at an old age, but Job feels that his service is done, that he is ready for a new day and his thread has come to an end. Job does not hope for a future in life. In chapter 8, Bildad agrees that Job's circumstances suggest that he will die, but even so, he can hope for a future. People are like trees and as long as they are connected to their source, they will be restored. In his reaction, in chapters 9–10, Job does not take up Bildad's tree metaphor. On the contrary, Job explores the scenario that he will die, and only now he begins to see that his current circumstances cast a shadow on his moral integrity. The unresolved question of his recognition causes Job to no longer hope for death. With death as a place of darkness, Job has lost every perspective. According to Zophar in chapter 11, the question of hope is a matter of decision: Job is not a wild ass that is resigned to the factuality of his circumstances, but a man who he can use his ability to rise above his situation and to seek for sense in God. In chapters 12–14, Job indeed widens the scope of his personal situation to the human condition in general. The lack of hope that Job is confronted with is only exemplary of humanity's lack of hope in general. Man is not a tree that can rise from death, so if God has not recognized the righteous at the moment of death, what is there for man to hope for?

Eliphaz does not enter the discussion on this existential theme in chapter 15. Instead he rejects Job's reasoning as arrogant and unconstructive and thereby leads the dialogue in the second speech cycle in a new direction. While the friends bolster their position by picturing the fate of the wicked, Job uses new source domains to confront the friends with the reality of his situation. When Job appeals to his friends in chapters 16 and 17, he pictures that death may be everyone's house, but that it is ultimately no place for community. If the friends hold back their loyalty, Job can only wait for death to confirm the insignificance of his life. Bildad, in chapter 18, does not answer Job's appeal. Like Eliphaz, Bildad stresses that there is indeed order in the world: there is no hope for wicked; if Job wants to save his testimony, he needs to turn to God. Job continues his search for community in chapter 19 where he explains that the friends fail to look beyond accidental appearances. God is his Redeemer, but he calls upon the friends to see beyond his flesh and to look him in the eyes. According to Zophar in chapter 20, however, Job's desire for recognition is a sweet evil that he wrongly entertains. In order to make clear that his request is not a matter of self-

interest, Job, in chapter 21, subverts the depiction of the fate of the wicked that was promoted by the friends. The confrontation between Job and his friends reaches its height in chapter 22 when Eliphaz denounces Job's reasoning that there is no order in the world as a social wrong.

Job's speeches from chapter 23 onwards on the one hand emphasize the reality of the world's arbitrary nature, while on the other hand, they build a perspective that constructively addresses the absence of God. In chapters 24 and 30, the conceptualization of the unfortunate ones as cattle that is misled, despised and left to its fate underscores where the community fails. In the absence of God, the community is responsible for a righteous society. Bildad warns in his interruption in chapter 25 that Job's conclusion regarding God's absence is too hasty. God is indeed in the world, and it is precisely in His light that man is more than dust. While Job may actually agree with this view, he explains in chapters 26–27 that this does not excuse the friends from changing their approaches to the world. The perspective that should be offered to the unfortunate is not that God will save them from calamity. God is not there and the world cannot be understood, but in chapters 28 and 31 Job asserts that this does not imply that morality is meaningless and that there is no consolation: God is a Lord that acknowledges man's efforts and a parent that watches over mankind as His family.

3. Interpretational Cruces and Other Interpretational Decisions

My interpretation of the rhetorical development has started from the assumption that the Masoretic Text of the book of Job makes sense as it stands. In accordance with Wolfers, this entails that I read Job 3–31 as consisting of two speech cycles (3:1–15:16 and 15:17–22:30) and a monologue (23–31). In my reading of Job 3–31 from this perspective, I have advanced several translations and interpretations that do not follow the majority view. I list here the verses where a deviating reading has played a decisive role in my explanation of the rhetorical development.

– Job 3:23: "The man whose way is hidden, God has hedged him about."
  Compare NRSV: "Why is light given to one who cannot see the way, whom God has fenced in?" and JPS: "To the man who has lost his way, Whom God has hedged about?"
  I have proposed that Job here arrives at the conclusion that God imprisons mankind in life. As Job is waiting for death to come, the realization that man cannot escape life causes Job's emotional turmoil in 3:26.

– Job 7:6: "My days ran swiftly from the loom, and they have come to an end without thread/hope."
  Compare NRSV: "My days are swifter than a weaver's shuttle, and come to their end without hope."
  I hold that Job here—as in verses 1–5 and 7–10—contends that his life has reached its completion. Eliphaz asserted that Job can hope for restoration, because the proper time for the righteous to die is when they have reached an old age. Job does not believe that there is a future ahead of him. He believes that the proper time to die has come and he suffers from the fact that he is still alive.
– Job 10:18-20: "But why did You bring me forth from the womb? I will expire while an eye does not see me; I will be as though I am carried from belly to the grave! Is it not the triviality of my life that comes to an end? (…)"
  Compare NRSV: "Why did you bring me forth from the womb? Would that I had died before any eye had seen me, and were as though I had not been, carried from the womb to the grave. Are not the days of my life few? (…)" and JPS: "Why did You let me come out of the womb? Better had I expired before any eye saw me, Had I been as though I never was, Had I been carried from the womb to the grave. My days are few, so desist!"
  I have proposed that Job realizes here that his current miserable state will have a negative effect on the recognition that he is given after death. With this problem unsolved, Job can no longer set his hope on death.
– Job 14:4-5: "O that the pure is distinguished from the defiled, that it is not one! Even if his days are determined, the number of his months is with You: when You set his limit, he will not pass."
  Compare NRSV: "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? No one can. Since their days are determined, and the number of their months is known to you, and you have appointed the bounds that they cannot pass" and JPS: "Who can produce a clean thing out of an unclean one? No one! His days are determined; You know the number of his months; You have set him limits that he cannot pass."
  I have suggested that Job wishes here that God awards the righteous with a worthy death. If the righteous are not distinguished from the wicked in death, then what is the sense of morality? Job is at loss concerning the question of what mortals can hope for.
– Job 19:26-27: "If after my skin, this has been cut down, that from my flesh I will behold God, what I envision for me is that one sees my eyes, and not a stranger when my kidneys come to an end within me."
  Compare NRSV: "and after my skin has been thus destroyed, then in my flesh I

shall see God, whom I shall see on my side, and my eyes shall behold, and not another. My heart faints within me!" and JPS: "This, after my skin will have been peeled off. But I would behold God while still in my flesh, I myself, not another, would behold Him; Would see with my own eyes: My heart pines within me."
Job has restored his trust in God as his Redeemer, but he is still a stranger to his friends and family. I have suggested that in these verses, Job imagines that his friends set aside the idea that Job's righteousness can only be proven by his recovery from his current situation, and that this allows them to see beyond his outward appearance and to look him in the eye. In this scenario, the social aspect of his suffering would be brought to an end.

– Job 31:17–18: "Do I eat my bit alone, and would not the orphan eat thereof, that since my youth He is great to me as a father, and since the belly, He is my mother that I lead to?"
Compare NRSV: "or have eaten my morsel alone, and the orphan has not eaten from it—for from my youth I reared the orphan like a father, and from my mother's womb I guided the widow—" and JPS: "By eating my food alone, The fatherless not eating of it also? Why, from my youth he grew up with me as though I were his father; Since I left my mother's womb I was her guide."
In chapter 22, Eliphaz accused Job of harming the poor by denying them their basic needs. I have proposed that, in these verses, Job reveals that his worldview is indeed constructive and that it is able to offer the poor hope and consolation.

While my reading of chapters 3–31 is marked by these interpretational cruces, it has also been affected by two other interpretational decisions: to respect the alternation of persons and to be cautious in accepting rhetorical explanations for apparent contradictions. At various points, the alternation of persons has been found to be problematic. The decision to respect the text as it stands played an important role in my explanation of 16:7-8, 18:2-3 and 24:17-18.

– Job 16:7-8: "Indeed now that He has made me weary, you would destroy my whole community; that it shriveled me serves as an evidence; that my leanness arises in me answers to my face."
Compare NRSV: "Surely now God has worn me out; he has made desolate all my company. And he has shriveled me up, which is a witness against me; my leanness has risen up against me, and it testifies to my face." and JPS: "Now He has truly worn me out; You have destroyed my whole community. You have shriveled me; My gauntness serves as a witness, And testifies against me."

In my understanding, Job states here how the misfortune that God has brought upon him, causes his friends to deny him their loyalty. In a similar manner, I propose that verses 9–10 suggest how God's treatment of Job (verse 9) is the reason that his community shows hostile behavior (verse 10). If it is assumed that these verses serve to elucidate the principle that underlies the friends' and the community's attitude toward Job, the alternation of persons does not appear to be a problem.

– Job 18:2-3: "How long will you (plural) put nets around words? Gain understanding (plural) and then we will talk! Why are we considered as animals? Why are we unclean in your (plural) eyes?"
  If it is assumed that Bildad also addresses the other friends, the sense in which Bildad's view differs from theirs can be deduced. In this dissertation, I have characterized Bildad as the friend who does not wish to speculate on the deficiency of man's nature, but rather emphasizes man's possibilities. This characterization has also informed my interpretation of chapter 25. Whereas most commentaries understand Bildad to restate Eliphaz's view that man's righteousness and purity should be placed in perspective, I have argued that Bildad here directly opposes this manner of speculation by asserting that man is indeed more than a being of decay.
– Job 24:17: "When altogether morning is deep darkness to them, surely He takes notice of deep dark terrors!"
  Compare NRSV: "For deep darkness is morning to all of them; for they are friends with the terrors of deep darkness" and JPS: "For all of them morning is darkness; It is then that they discern the terror of darkness."
  I have proposed that Job, in chapter 24, considers that God does not interfere in worldly affairs, but that this does not entail that anything is allowed. The alternation of persons does not appear to be a problem if it is assumed that Job asserts here that God takes note of wrongdoing.
– Job 24:18: "While He is light on the water, their portion in the land is cursed; He does not turn into the road of the vineyards."
  Compare NRSV: "Swift are they on the face of the waters; their portion in the land is cursed; no treader turns toward their vineyards" and JPS: "May they be flotsam on the face of the water; May their portion in the land be cursed; May none turn aside by way of their vineyards."
  I have suggested that Job envisages here that God does not attend to the interests of the poor. In this interpretation, the alternation of persons again does not appear to be a problem.

The difficulty of Job appearing to contradict what he has said before occurs particularly in the 'disputed passages': Job 24:18-24, 26:5-14 and 27:14-23. In my reading of Job 23–31, I have shown how these passages can be understood in their context.

- In my view, 24:18-24 does not concern the fate of the wicked, but instead indicates the situation of the poor. In this sense, it does not contradict Job's account of the fate of the wicked in chapter 21.
- The hymn-like passage in 26:5-14 may seem to repeat Bildad's description of God in chapter 25. In my understanding, Job's words indeed confirm that God's deeds are great, but I hold that Job's picture serves precisely to question how God's magnificence can be reconciled with the absence of God's interference in the world.
- Like 24:18-24, 27:14-23 has been thought to describe the fate of the wicked and to contradict Job statements in chapter 21. I have proposed that Job's description concerns 'the fate of wicked' that can happen to everyone. According to Job, 'the fate of wicked' is actually blindly distributed misfortune; it is not a matter of judgment.

4. Notes for Future Research

In this dissertation, I have explored how the linguistic concept of deliberately used metaphors can be applied to improve the interpretation of metaphors in key passages in Job 3–31. From this dissertation, it can be concluded that the concept of deliberately used metaphor functions as a productive tool to foreground the different conceptualizations at play, thereby providing a solid starting point to describe the interactions of varying conceptualizations within a passage. The structural analysis of deliberately used metaphors in key passages has resulted in describing the development of Job's conceptualization of his situation and in distinguishing between the different stages in Job's perception of his suffering.

The analysis of deliberately used metaphors can be used to trace conceptualizations in certain passages. Deliberately used metaphors, however, do not only interact with other deliberately used metaphors that occur within the same passage, but also with themes or concepts that occur in others. As the interpretation of metaphors in Job 3–31 is not a matter of established facts, my interpretation of the metaphors in key passages in relation to metaphors in the broader context is the result of a hermeneutical circle that explains the parts in relation to the whole and vice versa.

This entails that my interpretation of the metaphors in key passages is as much informed by my interpretation of Job 3–31 as my interpretation of the whole of Job 3–31 is informed by my interpretation of the metaphors in the key passages. Because of this hermeneutical circle, the analysis of deliberately used metaphors does not only trace conceptualizations in specific passages, but it also grants new perspectives on other passages in the text.

The concept of deliberately used metaphor offers a valuable linguistic tool to provide input for fresh perspectives on passages and their broader contexts, but ultimately the interpretation of conceptualizations remains a matter of exegesis. The value of my findings can therefore only be tested and refined in future exegetical research. It needs to be explored whether difficulties arise if my proposals on the exegetical cruces and on the structure of Job 3–31—and particularly 23–27—are taken as starting point for other studies on the book of Job. The most obvious avenue for future study is what my interpretation of Job 3–31 entails for the interpretation of Job 32–42.

Bibliography

Albertz, R., & Westermann, C. (1997). רוּחַ. In E. Jenni & C. Westermann (Eds.), *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament* (pp. 1202–1220). Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers.

Alexander, R.H. (1980). טָעַם. In R.L. Harris, G.L. Archer & B.K. Waltke (Eds.), *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament* (pp. 351–352). Chicago: Moody Press.

Alonso Schökel, L. (2000 [1987]). *A Manual of Hebrew Poetics*. Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico.

Alter, R. (1985). *The Art of Biblical Poetry*. New York: Basic Books.

Andersen, F.I. (1976). *Job: An Introduction and Commentary*. Nottingham: Inter-Varsity Press.

Aron, P. (2016). Bildad's Contribution to the Debate—A New Interpretation of Job 8:17-19. *Vetus Testamentum*, 1–27.

Bakhtin, M. (1984). *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* (C. Emerson, Ed. and Trans.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Barcelona, A. (2000). *Metaphor and Metonymy at the Crossroads: A Cognitive Perspective*. Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Basson, A. (2006). 'People are Plants'—A Conceptual Metaphor in the Hebrew Bible. *Old Testament Essays*, *19*(2), 573–583.

Ben-Porat, Z. (1992). Poetics of the Homeric Simile and the Theory of (Poetic) Simile. *Poetics Today*, *13*(4), 737–769.

Berlin, A. (1997). On Reading Biblical Poetry: The Role of Metaphor. In *Congress Volume Cambridge 1995* (pp. 25–36). Leiden: Brill.

Black, M. (1962). Metaphor. In M. Black (Ed.), *Models and Metaphors: Studies in Language and Philosophy* (pp. 25–47). Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP.

Blake, W. (1966). *Blake: Complete Writings with Variant Readings*. (G. Keynes, Ed.). London: Oxford UP.

Bowdle, B.F., & Gentner, D. (2005). The Career of Metaphor. *Psychological Review*, *112*(1), 193–216.

Bowling, A. (1980). רָגַז. In R.L. Harris, G.L. Archer & B.K. Waltke (Eds.), *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament* (pp. 830–831). Chicago: Moody Press.

Brône, G., & Vandaele, J. (2009). *Cognitive Poetics: Goals, Gains and Gaps*. Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Brown, F., Driver, S.R. & Briggs, C.A. (2001 [1906]). *The Brown, Driver, Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon: With an Appendix Containing the Biblical Aramaic*. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers.

Budde, K. (1896). *Das Buch Hiob, übersetzt und erklärt*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Camp, C., & Fontaine, C.R. (1993). *Semeia 61: Women, War and Metaphor: Language and Society in the Study of the Hebrew Bible*. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press.

Charteris-Black, J. (2004). *Corpus Approaches to Critical Metaphor Analysis*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire; New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Cheney, M. (1994). *Dust, Wind and Agony: Character, Speech and Genre in Job*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.

Claassens, L.J. (2015). Tragic Laughter: Laughter as Resistance in the Book of Job. *Interpretation: A Journal of Bible and Theology*, *69*(2), 143–155.

Clines, D.J.A. (1989). *Job 1–20*. Dallas: Word Books.

Clines, D.J.A. (2006). *Job 21–37*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers.

Coombes, H. (1963). *Literature and Criticism*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Corley, J. (2008). Sirach 44:1-15 as Introduction to the Praise of the Ancestors. In G.G. Xeravits & J. Zsengellér (Eds.), *Studies in the Book of Ben Sira papers of the Third International Conference on the Deuterocanonical Books, Shime'on Centre, Pápa, Hungary, 18–20 May, 2006* (pp. 151–181). Leiden; Boston: Brill.

Crisp, P. (2008). Between Extended Metaphor and Allegory: Is Blending Enough? *Language and Literature*, *17*(4), 291–308.

Crisp, P., Heywood, J., & Steen, G. (2002). Metaphor Identification and Analysis, Classification and Quantification. *Language and Literature*, *11*(1), 55–69.

Croft, W. (1993). The Role of Domains in the Interpretation of Metaphors and Metonymies. *Cognitive Linguistics*, *4*, 335–370.

Croft, W. (2001). *Radical Construction Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford UP.

Croft, W., & Cruse, D.A. (2004). *Cognitive Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Curkpatrick, S. (2002). Between Mashal and Parable: "Likeness" as a Metonymic Enigma. *Horizons in Biblical Theology*, *24*(1), 58–71.

Dell, K.J. (1991). *The Book of Job as Sceptical Literature*. Berlin; New York: De Gruyter.

Dhorme, É.P. (1967 [1926]). *A Commentary on the Book of Job* (H. Knight, Trans.). London: Nelson.

Dik, S.C., & Hengeveld, K. (1997). *The Theory of Functional Grammar. Part 1: The Structure of the Clause*. Second, revised edition. Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Dille, S.J. (2004). *Mixing Metaphors: God as Mother and Father in Deutero-Isaiah*. London; New York: T&T Clark International.

Dirven, R., & Pörings, R. (2003). *Metaphor and Metonymy in Comparison and Contrast*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Dirven, R., & Verspoor, M.H. (2004). *Cognitive Exploration of Language and Linguistics*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Doyle, B. (2000). *The Apocalypse of Isaiah Metaphorically Speaking: A Study of the Use, Function and Significance of Metaphors in Isaiah 24–27* (Vol. 151). Leuven: Peeters.

Driver, S.R., & Gray, G.B. (1921). *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Job together with a New Translation*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Duhm, B. (1897). *Das Buch Hiob* (Vol. 16). Freiburg i.B.: Mohr.

Duncker, K. (1945). *On Problem-Solving*. Washington: American Psychological Association.

Eco, U. (1996 [1979]). *The Role of the Reader: Explorations in the Semiotics of Texts*. Bloomington: Indiana UP.

Ehrlich, A.B. (1918). *Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel: Textkritisches, Sprachliches und Sachliches: Bd. 6, Psalmen, Sprüche und Hiob*. Leipzig: Hinrichs.

Eisen, R. (2004). *The Book of Job in Medieval Jewish Philosophy*. New York: Oxford UP.

Enns, P. (1997). חֹק. In VanGemeren (Ed.), *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis* (Vol. 2, pp. 250–251). Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Erickson, A. (2013). "Without My Flesh I Will See God": Job's Rhetoric of the Body. *Journal of Biblical Literature, 132*(2), 295–313.

Evans, V., & Green, M. (2006). *Cognitive Linguistics: An Introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University.

Fauconnier, G. (1994 [1985]). *Mental Spaces: Aspects of Meaning Construction in Natural Language*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge UP.

Fauconnier, G. (1997). *Mappings in Thought and Language*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge UP.

Fauconnier, G., & Turner, M. (1998). Conceptual Integration Networks. *Cognitive Science, 22*(2), 133–187.

Fauconnier, G., & Turner, M. (2002). *The Way We Think: Conceptual Blending and the Mind's Hidden Complexities*. New York: Basic Books.

Feyaerts, K. (1999). Metonymic Hierarchies: The Conceptualization of Stupidity in German Idiomatic Expressions. In K.-U. Panther & G. Radden (Eds.), *Metonymy in Language and Thought* (pp. 309–332). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Feyaerts, K. (2000). Refining the Inheritance Hierarchy: Interaction between Metaphoric and Metonymic hierarchies. In A. Barcelona (Ed.), *Metaphor and Metonymy at the Crossroads* (pp. 59–78). Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Fohrer, G. (1963). *Das Buch Hiob* (Vol. 16). Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn.

Foreman, B.A. (2011). *Animal Metaphors and the People of Israel in the Book of Jeremiah*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Freeman, M.H. (2002). The Body in the Word: A Cognitive Approach to the Shape of a Poetic Text. In E. Semino & J. Culpeper (Eds.), *Cognitive Stylistics: Language and Cognition in Text Analysis*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Fullerton, K. (1930). Double Entendre in the First Speech of Eliphaz. *Journal of Biblical Literature, 49*(4), 320–374.

Futato, M.D. (1997). עָנָן. In VanGemeren (Ed.), *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis* (Vol. 3, pp. 465–466). Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Geeraerts, D. (2007). Lexicography. In D. Geeraerts & H. Cuyckens (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics* (pp. 1160–1174). Oxford: Oxford UP.

Geeraerts, D., & Cuyckens, H. (Eds.). (2007). *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford UP.

Gentner, D., & Bowdle, B. (2008). Metaphor as Structure-Mapping. In R.W. Gibbs (Ed.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought* (pp. 109–128). New York, NY: Cambridge UP.

Gentner, D., Bowdle, B.F., Wolff, P.M., & Boronat, C. (2001). Metaphor is Like Analogy. In D. Gentner, K.J. Holyoak & B.N. Kokinov (Eds.), *The Analogical Mind: Perspectives from Cognitive Science* (pp. 199–253). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Gerleman, G. (1997). רצה. In E. Jenni & C. Westermann (Eds.), *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament* (pp. 1259–1261). Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers.

Gibbs, R.W. (1994). *The Poetics of Mind: Figurative Thought, Language, and Understanding*. Cambridge; New York, NY: Cambridge UP.

Gibbs, R.W. (2008). *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought*. New York, NY: Cambridge UP.

Ginsberg, H.L. (1958). An Unrecognized Allusion to Kings Pekah and Hoshea of Israel (Isa 8:23). In M. Avi-Yonah et al. (Eds.), *Eretz-Israel; Archaeological, Historical and Geographical Studies, Vol. 5: Dedicated to Professor Benjamin Mazar on His Fiftieth Birthday* (pp. 61*–65*). Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society and Hebrew University.

Glucksberg, S., & Keysar, B. (1990). Understanding Metaphorical Comparisons: Beyond Similarity. *Psychological Review, 97*(1), 3–18.

Glucksberg, S., & Keysar, B. (1993). How Metaphors Work. In A. Ortony (Ed.), *Metaphor and Thought. Second Edition* (pp. 401–424). Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Goatly, A. (1997). *The Language of Metaphors*. London; New York: Routledge.

Good, E.M. (1990). *In Turns of Tempest: A Reading of Job, with a Translation*. Stanford: Stanford UP.

Gordis, R. (1978). *The Book of Job: Commentary, New Translation and Special Studies*. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America.

Grady, J.E. (2010). *Metaphor in Communicating Public Interest Issues*. Paper presented at the RaAM 8 Conference: Metaphor and Domains of Discourse.

Greenstein, E.L. (1996). A Forensic Understanding of the Speech from the Whirlwind. In M. Haran & M.V. Fox (Eds.), *Texts, Temples, and Traditions: A Tribute to Menahem Haran* (pp. 241–258). Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbraun.

Greenstein, E.L. (2011). "Difficulty" in the Poetry of Job. In D.J.A. Clines & E.J. van Wolde (Eds.), *A Critical Engagement: Essays on the Hebrew Bible in Honour of J. Cheryl Exum* (pp. 186–195). Sheffield, England: Sheffield Phoenix Press.

Grisanti, M.A. (1997a). בָּלַג. In VanGemeren (Ed.), *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis* (Vol. 1, pp. 660–661). Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Grisanti, M.A. (1997b). גָּל II. In VanGemeren (Ed.), *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis* (Vol. 1, pp. 858–859). Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Gross, W. (1976). *Verbform und Funktion: wayyiqtol für die Gegenwart?: Ein Beitrag zur Syntax poetischer althebräischer Texte*. S[ank]t Ottilien: EOS-Verlag.

Habel, N.C. (1985). *The Book of Job. A Commentary*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press.

Hamilton, V.P. (1980). שָׂכַח. In R.L. Harris, G.L. Archer & B.K. Waltke (Eds.), *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament* (pp. 922–923). Chicago: Moody Press.

Harris, R.L. (1980). שׁוּחַ. In R.L. Harris, G.L. Archer & B.K. Waltke (Eds.), *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament* (pp. 911). Chicago: Moody Press.

Hartley, J.E. (1980). צָלַל III. In R.L. Harris, G.L. Archer & B.K. Waltke (Eds.), *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament* (pp. 767). Chicago: Moody Press.

Hartley, J.E. (1988). *The Book of Job*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Hartley, J.E. (1994). From Lament to Oath: A study of Progression in the Speeches of Job. In W.A.M. Beuken (Ed.), *The Book of Job* (pp. 79–100). Leuven: Peeters.

Hayden, R.E. (1997). עָפַר. In VanGemeren (Ed.), *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis* (Vol. 3, pp. 472–473). Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Hayes, E.R. (2008). *The Pragmatics of Perception and Cognition in MT Jeremiah 1:1–6:30: A Cognitive Linguistics Approach*. Berlin; New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Hays, C.B. (2013). "You Destroy a Person's Hope": The Book of Job as a Conversation about Death. In K.J. Dell & W.L. Kynes (Eds.), *Reading Job Intertextually* (pp. 219–233). New York: Bloomsbury.

Hill, A.E. (1997). חָדַל. In VanGemeren (Ed.), *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis* (Vol. 2, pp. 26–27). Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Horst, F. (1968). *Hiob 1–19* (Vol. 16/1). Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag.

Howe, B. (2006). *Because You Bear This Name: Conceptual Metaphor and the Moral Meaning of 1 Peter*. Boston; Leiden: Brill.

Hubbard, R.L., Jr. (1997). גָּאַל. In VanGemeren (Ed.), *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis* (Vol. 1, pp. 789–794). Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Irsigler, H. (1998). Quest for Justice as Reconciliation of the Poor and the Righteous in Psalms 37, 49 and 73. *Skrif en Kerk*, *19*(3), 584–604.

Jindo, J.Y. (2009). Toward a Poetics of the Biblical Mind: Language, Culture, and Cognition. *Vetus Testamentum*, *59*, 222–243.

Jindo, J.Y. (2010). *Biblical Metaphor Reconsidered: A Cognitive Approach to Poetic Prophecy in Jeremiah 1–24*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

Johnson, M. (1981). Introduction: Metaphor in the Philosophical Tradition. In M. Johnson (Ed.), *Philosophical perspectives on metaphor* (pp. 3–47). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Jones, S.C. (2009). *Rumors of Wisdom: Job 28 as Poetry*. Berlin; New York: Walter de Gruyter.

de Joode, J. (2015). *Landscapes of Hurt and Healing. An Exploratory Cognitive-Linguistic Analysis of Spatial Metaphors in the Book of Job*. Dissertation, KU Leuven, Leuven.

de Joode, J., & van Loon, H. (2014). Selecting and Analyzing Metaphors in the Hebrew Bible: Cognitive Linguistics and the Literary. In K. Smelik & K. Vermeulen (Eds.), *Approaches to Literary Readings of Ancient Jewish Writings* (pp. 39–52). Leiden: Brill.

Katz, S.T. (1992). Mystical Speech and Mystical Meaning. In S.T. Katz (Ed.), *Mysticism and Language* (pp. 3–41). New York: Oxford UP.

Kittay, E.F. (1989). *Metaphor: Its Cognitive Force and Linguistic Structure*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Koestler, A. (1964). *The Act of Creation*. New York: Macmillan.

Köhler, L., & Baumgartner, W. (1994–2000). *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Leiden; New York: Brill.

Köhlmoos, M. (1999). *Das Auge Gottes: Textstrategie im Hiobbuch*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

König, E. (1900). *Stilistik, Rhetorik, Poetik in Bezug auf die biblische Litteratur*. Leipzig: Dieterich.

König, E. (1907). *Die Poesie des Alten Testaments*. Leipzig: Quelle & Meyer.

Kotzé, Z. (2005a). A Cognitive Linguistic Methodology for the Study of Metaphor in the Hebrew Bible. *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages*, *31*(1), 107–117.

Kotzé, Z. (2005b). Humoral Theory as Motivation for Anger Metaphors in the Hebrew Bible. *Southern African Linguistics & Applied Language Studies*, *23*, 205–209.

Kövecses, Z. (1986). *Metaphors of Anger, Pride, and Love: A Lexical Approach to the Structure of Concepts*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kövecses, Z. (2000). *Metaphor and Emotion: Language, Culture, and Body in Human feeling*. New York: Cambridge UP.

Kövecses, Z. (2008). Metaphor and Emotion. In R.W. Gibbs (Ed.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought* (pp. 380–396). New York: Cambridge UP.

Kroeze, J.H. (1961). *Het boek Job*. Kampen: Kok.

Kruger, P. (2000). A Cognitive Interpretation of the Emotion of Anger in the Hebrew Bible. *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages*, *26*(1), 181–193.

Kruger, P. (2001). A Cognitive Interpretation of the Emotion of Fear in the Hebrew Bible. *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages*, *27*(2), 77–89.

Krüger, T. (2007). Did Job Repent? In T. Krüger et al. (Eds.), *Das Buch Hiob und seine Interpretationen* (pp. 217–229). Zürich: Theologischer Verlag.

Lakoff, G. (1987). *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal about the Mind*. London: University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, G. (1993). The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor. In A. Ortony (Ed.), *Metaphor and thought: Second Edition* (pp. 202–251). Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, G., & Turner, M. (1989). *More than Cool Reason: A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lambrecht, K. (1994). *Information Structure and Sentence Form: Topic, Focus, and the Mental Representations of Discourse Referents*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Landy, F. (1983). *Paradoxes of Paradise: Identity and Difference in the Song of Songs*. Sheffield: Almond.

Landy, F. (2001). *Beauty and the Enigma: And Other Essays on the Hebrew Bible*. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press.

Langacker, R.W. (2008). *Cognitive Grammar: A Basic Introduction*. New York: Oxford UP.

Langacker, R.W. (1987). *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar: Vol. I, Theoretical Prerequisites*. Stanford, CA: Stanford UP.

Langacker, R.W. (1991). *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar: Vol. II, Descriptive Application*. Stanford, CA: Stanford UP.

Lo, A. (2003). *Job 28 as Rhetoric: An Analysis of Job 28 in the Context of Job 22–31*. Leiden; Boston: Brill.

Long, G.A. (1997). עוֹר. In VanGemeren (Ed.), *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis* (Vol. 3, pp. 360–361). Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Lowth, R. (1829 [1753]). *Lectures on the Sacred Poetry of the Hebrews*. Translated from the original Latin by G. Gregory. A new edition with notes by Calvin E. Stowe. Boston; New York: Crocker & Brewster; Leavitt.

van der Lugt, P. (1995). *Rhetorical Criticism and the Poetry of the Book of Job*. Leiden; New York: E.J. Brill.

Mathewson, D. (2006). Death and Survival in the Book of Job: Desymbolization and Traumatic Experience. New York: T&T Clark.

van der Merwe, C.H.I. (2006). Lexical Meaning in Biblical Hebrew and Cognitive Semantics: A Case Study. *Biblica*, *87*(1), 85–95.

van der Merwe, C.H.J. (2006). Biblical Hebrew Lexicology: A Cognitive Linguistic Perspective. *Kleine Untersuchungen zur Sprache des Alten Testaments und seiner Umwelt*, *6*, 87–112.

van der Merwe, C.H.I. (2007). A Cognitive Linguistics Perspective on הִנֵּה in the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, and Ruth. *Hebrew Studies*, *48*, 101–140.

Mitchell, H.G. (1908). The Omission of the Interrogative Particle. In R.F. Harper, F. Brown & G.F. Moore (Eds.), *Old Testament and Semitic Studies in Memory of William Rainey Harper* (pp. 113–129). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Morrow, W.S. (1986). Consolation, Rejection, and Repentance in Job 42:6. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, *105*(2), 211–225.

Müller, H.-P. (1988). *Das Hiobproblem: seine Stellung und Entstehung im alten Orient und im Alten Testament*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Naudé, J.A. (1997). חָזָה. In VanGemeren (Ed.), *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis* (Vol. 2, pp. 56–61). Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Newsom, C.A. (1993). Considering Job. *Currents in Research: Biblical Studies*, 1, 87–118.

Newsom, C.A. (1996). The Book of Job. In *The New Interpreter's Bible. The First Book of Maccabees, the Second Book of Maccabees, Introduction to Hebrew Poetry, the Book of Job, the Book of Psalms. Vol. IV* (pp. 319–637). Nashville, TN: Abingdon.

Newsom, C.A. (2002). The Book of Job as Polyphonic Text. *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*, 87–108.

Newsom, C.A. (2003). *The Book of Job: A Contest of Moral Imaginations*. Oxford; New York: Oxford UP.

Niditch, S. (1993). Folklore and Wisdom: *Mashal* as an Ethnic Genre. In S. Niditch (Ed.), *Folklore and the Hebrew Bible*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Nielsen, K.C.C. (1989). *There is Hope for a Tree: The Tree as Metaphor in Isaiah*. Sheffield: JSOT Press.

Noegel, S.B. (1996). *Janus Parallelism in the Book of Job*. Sheffield: Sheffield AP.

Nuyts, J. (2007). Cognitive Linguistics and Functional Linguistics. In D. Geeraerts & H. Cuyckens (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics* (pp. 543–565). Oxford; New York: Oxford UP.

Ortony, A. (Ed.). (1979). *Metaphor and Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Ortony, A. (Ed.). (1993). *Metaphor and Thought: Second Edition*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Oswalt, J.N. (1980). בָּהָה. In R.L. Harris, G.L. Archer & B.K. Waltke (Eds.), *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament* (pp. 430). Chicago: Moody Press.

Palmer, E.F. (1906). *An Inductive Study of the Metaphorical Language in the Book of Job by Earle Fenton Palmer*. Lancaster: New Era Printing company.

Pelham, A. (2012). Job's Crisis of Language: Power and Powerlessness in Job's Oaths. *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*, *36*(3), 333–354.

Perdue, L.G. (1991). *Wisdom in Revolt: Metaphorical Theology in the Book of Job*. Sheffield: Almond Press.

Perdue, L.G. (1994). Metaphorical Theology in the Book of Job: Theological Anthropology in the First Cycle of Job's Speeches (Job 3; 6–7; 9–10). In W.A.M. Beuken (Ed.), *The Book of Job* (pp. 129–156). Leuven: Peeters.

Pilkington, A. (2000). *Poetic Effects: A Relevance Theory Perspective*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Polk, T. (1983). Paradigms, Parables, and *Mᵉšālîm*: On Reading the *Māšāl* in Scripture. *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, *45*(4), 564–583.

Pope, M.H. ([3]1973 [1965]). *Job: Introduction, Translation and Notes*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Price, J.D. (1997). צָלַל III. In VanGemeren (Ed.), *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis* (Vol. 3, pp. 807–810). Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Rad, G. v. (1972). *Wisdom in Israel*. Nashville: Abingdon Press.

Radden, G. (2000). How Metonymic are Metaphors? In A. Barcelona (Ed.), *Metaphor and Metonymy at the Crossroads* (pp. 93–108). Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Rashi. *The Complete Tanach with Rashi's Commentary. English Translation with Rashi's commentary*. R.A.J. Rosenberg (Ed.). Judaica Press: Chabad.org.

Reece, W.D. (1989). *The Concept of Light in the Old Testament: A Semantic Analysis*. Dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.

Reider, J. (1920). מְדַד in Job 7:4. *Journal of Biblical Literature, 39*(1/2), 60–65.

Richards, I.A. (1936). *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*. New York; London: Oxford UP.

Riegner, I.E. (2009). *The Vanishing Hebrew Harlot: The Adventures of the Hebrew Stem* ZNH. New York: Peter Lang.

Schottroff, W. (1997). זכר. In E. Jenni & C. Westermann (Eds.), *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament* (pp. 381–388). Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers.

Semino, E., & Culpeper, J. (2002). *Cognitive Stylistics: Language and Cognition in Text Analysis*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Semino, E., & Steen, G. (2008). Metaphor in Literature. In R.W. Gibbs (Ed.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought* (pp. 232–246). New York: Cambridge UP.

Seow, C.L. (2013). *Job 1–21: Interpretation and Commentary*. Grand Rapids; Cambridge: Eerdmans.

Shen, Y. (2002). Cognitive Constraints on Verbal Creativity: The Use of Figurative Language in Poetic Discourse. In E. Semino & J. Culpeper (Eds.), *Cognitive Stylistics: Language and Cognition in Text Analysis* (pp. 211–230). Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Shveka, A., & Van Hecke, P. (2014). The Metaphor of Criminal Charge as a Paradigm for the Conflict between Job and His Friends. *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses, 90*(1), 99–119.

Smick, E.S. (1980). כָּרַת. In R.L. Harris, G.L. Archer & B.K. Waltke (Eds.), *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament* (pp. 456). Chicago: Moody Press.

Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1995). *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Second Edition. Oxford; Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

Steen, G. (2000). Metaphor and Language and Literature: A Cognitive Perspective. *Language and Literature, 9*(3), 261–277.

Steen, G. (2007). *Finding Metaphor in Grammar and Usage: A Methodological Analysis of Theory and Research*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Steen, G. (2008). The Paradox of Metaphor: Why We Need a Three-Dimensional Model of Metaphor. *Metaphor & Symbol, 23*(4), 213–241.

Steen, G. (2011). The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor—Now New and Improved. *Review of Cognitive Linguistics, 9*(1), 26–64.

Steen, G., & Gavins, J. (2003). *Cognitive Poetics in Practice*. London: Routledge.

Stockwell, P. (2002). *Cognitive Poetics: An Introduction*. Hoboken: Routledge.

Stordalen, T. (2000). *Echoes of Eden: Genesis 2–3 and Symbolism of the Eden Garden in Biblical Hebrew Literature*. Leuven: Peeters.

Strawn, B.A. (2005). *What is Stronger than a Lion?: Leonine Image and Metaphor in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East*. Fribourg; Göttingen: Academic Press; Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Sweetser, E. (1990). *From Etymology to Pragmatics: Metaphorical and Cultural Aspects of Semantic Structure*. Cambridge; New York, NY: Cambridge UP.

Sweetser, E. (1999). Compositionality and Blending: Semantic Composition in a Cognitively Realistic Framework. In T. Janssen & G. Redeker (Eds.), *Cognitive Linguistics: Foundations, Scope, and Methodology* (pp. 129–162). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Szpek, H.M. (1994). The Peshitta on Job 7:6: "My Days are Swifter (?) than an ארג". *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 113(2), 287–290.

Talmy, L. (1988). The Relation of Grammar to Cognition. In B. Rudzka-Ostyn (Ed.), *Topics in Cognitive Linguistics* (pp. 165–205). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Talmy, L. (2000a). *Toward a Cognitive Semantics: Vol. I, Concept Structuring Systems*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Talmy, L. (2000b). *Toward a Cognitive Semantics: Vol. II, Typology and Process in Concept Structuring*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Tendahl, M., & Gibbs, R.W. (2008). Complementary Perspectives on Metaphor: Cognitive Linguistics and Relevance Theory. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 40(11), 1823–1864.

Thomson, J.G.S.S. (1955). Sleep: An Aspect of Jewish Anthropology. *Vetus Testamentum*, 5(4), 421–433.

Tsur, R. (2009). Metaphor and Figure-Ground Relationship: Comparisons from Poetry, Music, and the Visual Arts. In G. Brône & J. Vandaele (Eds.), *Cognitive Poetics: Goals, Gains and Gaps* (pp. 237–277). Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Tur-Sinai, N.H. (1967). *The Book of Job: A New Commentary* (2nd ed.). Jerusalem: Kiryath Sepher.

Turner, M. (1996). *The Literary Mind*. New York: Oxford UP.

Turner, M. (2007). Conceptual Integration. In D. Geeraerts & H. Cuyckens (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics* (pp. 377–393). Oxford: Oxford UP.

Van Hecke, P. (2001). Shepherds and Linguists: A Cognitive-Linguistic Approach to the Metaphor "God is Shepherd" in Gen 48,15 and Context. In A. Wénin (Ed.), *Studies in the Book of Genesis* (pp. 479–493). Leuven: Leuven UP, Peeters.

Van Hecke, P. (2003). Searching for and Exploring Wisdom: A Cognitive-Semantic Approach to the Hebrew Verb *ḥāqar* in Job 28. In E.J. v. Wolde (Ed.), *Job 28: Cognition in Context* (pp. 139–162). Leiden; Boston: Brill.

Van Hecke, P. (2005a). Conceptual Blending: A Recent Approach to Metaphor: Illustrated with the Pastoral Metaphor in Hos 4,16. In *Metaphor in the Hebrew Bible* (pp. 215–231). Leuven: Peeters; Leuven UP.

Van Hecke, P. (2009). Jobs pijn in beeld. Het gebruik van metaforen in Jobs zelfbeschrijvingen. *Collationes*, 39, 207–223.

Van Hecke, P. (2010). "Is My Flesh Bronze?" (Job 6:12). Metaphors of Fluidity and Solidity in the Description of the Body in the Book of Job. *The Classical Bulletin*, *86*(1–2), 101–115.

Van Hecke, P. (2011a). *From Linguistics to Hermeneutics: A Functional and Cognitive Approach to Job 12–14*. Leiden; Boston: Brill.

Van Hecke, P. (2011b). "I Melt Away and Will No Longer Live": The Use of Metaphor in Job's Self-Descriptions. *ET-Studies*, *2*(1), 91–107.

Van Hecke, P. (2014). A New Look at מבט. In H. Ausloos & B. Lemmelijn (Eds.), *A Pillar of Cloud to Guide (Exod 13,21). Text-critical, Redactional, and Linguistic Perspectives on the Old Testament in Honour of Marc Vervenne* (pp. 569–579). Leuven: Peeters.

Van Hecke, P. (Ed.). (2005b). *Metaphor in the Hebrew Bible*. Leuven: Peeters.

Van Hecke, P., & Labahn, A. (Eds.). (2010). *Metaphors in the Psalms*. Leuven: Peeters.

Van Pelt, M.V., Kaiser, W.C., & Block, D.I. (1997). רוּחַ. In VanGemeren (Ed.), *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis* (Vol. 3, pp. 1073–1078). Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

VanGemeren (Ed.). (1997). *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Vetter, D. (1997). חזה. In E. Jenni & C. Westermann (Eds.), *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament* (pp. 400–403). Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers.

Waltke, B.K. (1980). שָׂבַע. In R.L. Harris, G.L. Archer & B.K. Waltke (Eds.), *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament* (pp. 869). Chicago: Moody Press.

Warren, B. (2003). An Alternative Account of the Interpretation of Referential Metonymy and Metaphor. In R. Dirven (Ed.), *Metaphor and Metonymy in Comparison and Contrast* (pp. 113–130). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Watson, W.G.E. (1984). *Classical Hebrew Poetry: A Guide to Its Techniques*. Sheffield: JSOT Press.

Wehr, H., & Cowan, J.M. (1976). *A Dictionary of Modern Written Arabic (Arabic-English)* (3rd ed.). Ithaca, NY: Spoken Language Services.

Weiss, A.L. (2006). *Figurative Language in Biblical Prose Narrative: Metaphor in the Book of Samuel*. Leiden; Boston: Brill.

Weiss, M. (1984). *The Bible from Within: The Method of Total Interpretation*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press; Hebrew University.

Whybray, N. (1998). *Job*. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press.

van Wolde, E. (1994). Job 42,1–6: The Reversal of Job. In W.A.M. Beuken (Ed.), *The Book of Job* (pp. 223–250). Leuven: Peeters.

van Wolde, E. (2008). Sentiments as Culturally Constructed Emotions: Anger and Love in the Hebrew Bible. *Biblical Interpretation: A Journal of Contemporary Approaches*, *16*(1), 1–24.

van Wolde, E. (2009). *Reframing Biblical Studies: When Language and Text Meet Culture, Cognition, and Context*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

Wolfers, D. (1993). The Speech-Cycles in the Book of Job. *Vetus Testamentum*, 43(3), 385–402.

Wolfers, D. (1995). *Deep Things out of Darkness: The Book of Job: Essays and a New English Translation*. Kampen; Grand Rapid: Pharos; Eerdmans.

Yu, C. (2011). *To Comfort Job: The Speeches in the Book of Job as Rhetorical Discourse*. Unpublished dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Zehnder, M.P. (1999). *Wegmetaphorik im Alten Testament: Eine semantische Untersuchung der alttestamentlichen und altorientalischen Weg-Lexeme mit besonderer Berücksichtigung iherer metaphorischen Verwendung*. Berlin; New York: W. de Gruyter.