

KRISTIN KLAUS

Style of Old Greek Job. Its value for textual,
literary, and redaction criticism
of Hebrew Job



KRISTIN KLAUS

Style of Old Greek Job. Its value for textual,
literary, and redaction criticism
of Hebrew Job



UNIVERSITY OF TARTU

Press

School of Theology and Religious Studies, Faculty of Arts and Humanities,
University of Tartu

Dissertation is accepted for the commencement of the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Religious Studies on July 8th 2026, by the Council of the School of Theology and Religious Studies, University of Tartu.

Supervisor: Prof. Urmas Nõmmik (University of Tartu)

Reviewers: Prof. Kristin de Troyer (University of Salzburg)
Prof. Juliane Eckstein (University of Education Freiburg)

Opponent: Prof. Juliane Eckstein (University of Education Freiburg)

Commencement: September 14th 2026, 16:15, Ülikooli 18–204 (University Senate Hall), Tartu

This research was supported by the Estonian Research Council's institutional research project PRG938.

ISSN 1406-2410 (print)
ISBN 978-9908-57-323-6 (print)
ISSN 2806-2639 (pdf)
ISBN 978-9908-57-324-3 (pdf)

Copyright: Kristin Klaus, 2026

University of Tartu Press
www.tyk.ee

CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS	10
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	11
INTRODUCTION	12
Introduction to the introduction	12
Style: poetry	13
Style: poetic techniques	15
Masoretic Text	23
Vorlage	24
The Greek text	25
Translation technique	26
Textual criticism	30
Literary growth of Hebrew Job and redaction criticism	31
Nature and structure of the dissertation	34
JOB 4–5	39
Introduction	39
I: 4:2–5	41
II: 4:6–9	43
III: 4:10–12b	44
IV: 4:12c–16	47
V: 4:17–21	49
VI: 5:1–2	52
VII: 5:3–5	53
VIII: 5:6–7	55
IX: 5:8–10	57
X: 5:11–13	58
XI: 5:14–16	60
XII: 5:17–19	61
XIII: 5:20–23	62
XIV: 5:24–26	64
XV: 5:27	66
JOB 8	68
Introduction	68
I: 8:2–4	69
II: 8:5–7	70
III: 8:8–10	72
IV: 8:11–13	73
V: 8:14–15	75
VI: 8:16–19	77
VII: 8:20–22	79

JOB 12–14	82
Introduction	82
I: 12:2–3	85
II: 12:4–6	86
III: 12:7–10	89
IV: 12:11–13	90
V: 12:14–16	91
VI: 12:17–19	93
VII: 12:20–22	94
VIII: 12:24–25	95
IX: 13:1–3	96
X: 13:4–6	97
XI: 13:7–10a	99
XII: 13:10b–12	101
XIII: 13:13–16	102
XIV: 13:17–19	105
XV: 13:20–23	106
XVI: 13:24–25	108
XVII: 13:26–27	109
XVIII: 13:28–14:4	110
XIX: 14:5–6	113
XX: 14:7–9	114
XXI: 14:10–12	115
XXII: 14:13–14	117
XXIII: 14:15–17	118
XXIV: 14:20–22	119
JOB 15	123
Introduction	123
I: 15:2–3	124
II: 15:4–6	126
III: 15:7–9	127
IV: 15:11–13	129
V: 15:14–16	131
VI: 15:17–19	133
VII: 15:20–21	134
VIII: 15:22–26a	134
IX: 15:28–30a	138
X: 15:30b–33	139
XI: 15:34–35	142
JOB 19	144
Introduction	144
I: 19:2–3	145
II: 19:4–5	147
III: 19:6–8	148

IV: 19:9–12	149
V: 19:13–15	151
VI: 19:16–18	152
VII: 19:19–20	154
VIII: 19:21–24	156
IX: 19:25–27	157
X: 19:28–29	159
JOB 21	161
Introduction	161
I: 21:2–3	162
II: 21:4–6	163
III: 21:7–10	164
IV: 21:11–14	166
V: 21:16–18	168
VI: 21:19–22	170
VII: 21:24–26	172
VIII: 21:27–34	174
JOB 25	176
Introduction	176
I: 25:2–3	176
II: 25:4–6	178
Excursus: lowliness redaction	180
JOB 29–31	186
Introduction	186
I: 29:2–4	189
II: 29:5–6	190
III: 29:7–11	191
IV: 29:12–17	192
V: 29:18–24	195
VI: 30:1–4	198
VII: 30:5–8	200
VIII: 30:9–10	202
IX: 30:11–18	202
X: 30:19–22	206
XI: 30:23–24	208
XII: 30:25–26	209
XIII: 30:28–31	210
XIV: 31:5–6	211
XV: 31:7–8	212
XVI: 31:9–12	213
XVII: 31:13–15	216
XVIII: 31:16–23	217
XIX: 31:24–28	220

XX: 31:29–30	222
XXI: 31:31–32	223
XXII: 31:33–37	224
XXIII: 31:38–40b	226
JOB 38–39	228
Introduction	228
I: 38:2–3	230
II: 38:4–7	232
III: 38:8–11	233
IV: 38:12–15	236
V: 38:16–18	238
VI: 38:19–21	239
VII: 38:22–25	240
VIII: 38:28–30	243
IX: 38:31–33	244
X: 38:34–35	246
XI: 38:36–38	246
XII: 38:39–41	249
XIII: 39:1–3	250
XIV: 39:5–7	252
XV: 39:9–12	253
XVI: 39:19–20	255
XVII: 39:21–23	256
XVIII: 39:24–25	258
XIX: 39:26–30	259
JOB 40:6–41:26	262
Introduction	262
I: 40:7–8	264
II: 40:9–14	265
III: 40:15–18	267
IV: 40:19–20	269
V: 40:21–23	271
VI: 40:25–29	272
VII: 40:30–41:1	273
VIII: 41:2–3	275
IX: 41:5–8	277
X: 41:10–13	279
XI: 41:14–17	280
XII: 41:18–21	282
XIII: 41:22–24	283
XIV: 41:25–26	285
CONCLUSIONS	286
Style and value for literary criticism	286

Style and value for textual criticism	291
Style and value for redaction criticism	296
Greek text	303
Further research	304
SUMMARY	305
REFERENCES	308
SUMMARY IN ESTONIAN	317
APPENDIX I: Redaction models	320
APPENDIX II: Strophic structures in Hebrew Job: a selection	327
APPENDIX III: Texts of OG and MT Job	332
Job 4–5	332
Job 8	337
Job 12–14	340
Job 15	348
Job 19	352
Job 21	355
Job 25	359
Job 29–31	360
Job 38–39	370
Job 40:6–41:26	378
CURRICULUM VITAE	385
ELULOOKIRJELDUS	387

ABBREVIATIONS

General

11Q10	the book of Job as attested and survived in Qumran Cave 11
B	bicolon
Ch./chs.	chapter/chapters
HB	Hebrew Bible
LXX	Septuagint
M	monocolon
Ms./Mss.	manuscript/manuscripts
MT	Masoretic Text
OG	Old Greek
P	Peshitta
Pl.	plural
Sg.	singular
T	tricolon
Te	tetracolon
V./vv.	verse/verses
Vg	Vulgate

Reference works

BDB	Brown-Driver-Briggs Lexicon
CAL	the Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon project, https://cal.huc.edu/
LSJ	The Liddell, Scott, Jones Ancient Greek Lexicon
LXX ^{Zi}	Ziegler, J. 1982. <i>Iob</i> . Vol. XI, 4. Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
NETS	Pietersma, A., and B.G. Wright. 2007. <i>A New English Translation of the Septuagint: And the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included under That Title</i> . New York ; Oxford University Press.
NRSVUE	New Revised Standard Version Updated Edition (2021)

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This dissertation has been in the works for nearly six years. During this time, the people around me supported me through it all.

My biggest thanks and gratitude go to my supervisor, professor Urmas Nõmmik for his infinite wisdom, guidance, patience, and kindness. Thanks to him I have found a passion in scholarship and studying the book of Job and biblical poetry. His feedback and advice have made the biggest impact on the formation and completion of this dissertation but also on me as an aspiring scholar.

My friends and colleagues at the Department of Classical Philology and the School of Theology and Religious Studies have all played a considerable role in me completing my doctoral studies: Elo-Mall Toomet, Neeme Näripä, Beatrice Veidenberg, Anni Polding, Kadri Novikov, Ivo Volt, Kaidi Hõbejõgi; Agne Pilvisto, Ergo Naab, Rahel Toomik, Amar Annus, Sander Tulk, Anu Põldsam. Special thanks go to professor Janika Päll and associate professor Maria-Kristiina Lotman who have kept me employed all these years, in addition to giving emotional support and sharing their wisdom. The head of the School of Theology and Religious Studies Roland Karo navigated the administrative side of it all, ensuring that this dissertation gets defended.

I also want to thank my first reviewer, Professor Kristin de Troyer for her very valuable feedback and corrections, and my second reviewer and opponent for my defence, Professor Juliane Eckstein.

Finally, my grandmother Zoja and brother Lauri encouraged me all these years and made the journey manageable.

Thank you.

INTRODUCTION

Introduction to the introduction

The book of Job is one of the most if not the most complex book of the Hebrew Bible that has been subject to different interpretations since the ancient times. The complexity shows itself in the subject matter (suffering, loss, a range of human emotions), the form and the poetry (prose narrative, poetic dialogues with prosaic introductions), and the language and text of the book (rare vocabulary and expressions, difficult and elliptic syntax). Furthermore, a considerable number of scholars think that the book of Job we read today is not the version of the first author but rather grew over centuries to the form we see today. These complexities are studied by literary critics, textual critics, and redaction critics, respectively.

The first known translation and interpretation of Hebrew Job, with all its complexities, is the Old Greek Job (OG Job)¹, a translation into Ancient Greek. Similarly to the Hebrew text, it displays its own complexities in its form, text, and growth. Adding to the complexity is the fact that the source text that the translator used has not survived.

Previous studies have concluded that this translation is sophisticated in style, although not poetry, unlike its Hebrew counterpart. OG Job is one of the more interesting translations in the Septuagint (LXX) corpus, as the translator has taken many liberties in paraphrasing, omitting, but also adding content, making it theoretically difficult to use to deal with the textual and redaction criticism of the Hebrew text.

This dissertation attempts to connect these aspects of Job, namely style (poetry and poetic techniques and most importantly strophic structure) and text (the Hebrew of the Masoretic Text [MT] and the *Vorlage*², the Greek of the translation and translation technique, and textual and redaction criticism of the Hebrew). In this attempt, it tries to answer the question: **Can the style of OG Job help find answers to textual, literary, and redaction critical questions of Hebrew Job?**

The background for these aspects will be now discussed in detail. The first two sections of the introduction discuss style and more specifically (1) poetry and (2) poetic techniques, giving a brief overview but also the most significant findings already made in the field. The next sections discuss the characteristics

¹ The terms “Septuagint” (LXX) and “Old Greek” (OG) need to be distinguished. LXX proper refers to the initial translation of the Pentateuch from Hebrew and thus to the 72 or 70 (*septuaginta*) translators who according to legend translated the first five books of the HB. LXX is also used to refer to the whole of the HB translated into Ancient Greek with some added original compositions, commonly called the Apocrypha. OG refers to the oldest Greek translation of the HB after the Pentateuch, without the later supplementations from Origen in his Hexapla.

² In this dissertation, two specific terms are used for the Hebrew text. Masoretic Text (MT) is the current authoritative text version of the HB, transmitted from the Middle Ages. The oldest complete manuscript of this text is from the 11th century CE—the Leningrad Codex. The specific source text that the OG translator used is called the *Vorlage*. Just like the original OG itself, the *Vorlage* of this translation is not available to us, and both are hypothetical.

of: (3) the Hebrew MT, (4) the Hebrew *Vorlage* of OG Job, (5) the Greek text of Job, (6) the translation technique observed in OG Job. The last sections cover (7) the textual criticism and (8) the literary growth of Hebrew Job. Finally, the nature of this dissertation is discussed, describing the research questions and methods, as well as the structure of the dissertation.

Style: poetry

The book of Job has a unique structure as it comprises a narrative frame and poetic speeches between Job, his four friends, and finally God. The speeches are not absent in prose and have short narrative introductory verses, introducing the speaker. Tod Linafelt has discussed why poetry and verse were necessary in Job in the first place. In essence, the form is dictated by the contents: in order to let the characters express their feelings, thoughts, and ideas, poetry is needed. Ancient Hebrew prose cannot accommodate these expressions, and they are used to put the dialogues between the characters into context (the narrative frame).³ The poetic part of the book of Job has been described as a “literary dialogue” (Linafelt), a mix of elegiac, didactic, lyric, and epic (Édouard Dhorme), but also a composition without parallel that does not fit into a single genre (Samuel Terrien)⁴. Urmas Nõmmik has said that “the book has a complex literary history, which suggests that not all of its authors during a couple of hundreds of years have had precisely the same idea of the poetic form.”⁵

There is no doubt that the speeches in Hebrew Job are **poetry**. The same type of acknowledgement has not always been afforded to the OG translation. It has been claimed that although the Job-translator was not well-versed in Semitic poetry they had decent knowledge of Greek pagan literature⁶, which was part of the education system also in Egyptian Alexandria⁷. Being familiar with Greek poets and/or poetry is one of the characteristics used when describing the Job-translator: the translator was read and educated in Greek literature and used vocabulary that is known to have been used in archaic or classical Greek poetic works (epic, lyric, drama)⁸.

More than just poetic vocabulary, the overall poetic side of the translation has been recognised as well. John Gammie maintains that earlier scholars had not properly recognised the poetic style of OG Job. He focuses primarily on sound effects, like assonance (which according to him, is a favourite device of the translator) and alliteration, but also mentions other poetic elements in this translation. Assonance does not appear in only small segments of the text but also on a larger scale, involving several cola at a time. He also says outright that the Job-translator had “poetic mastery” and consciously wanted to create a poetically significant

³ Linafelt 2021.

⁴ Terrien 1963, 6–8; Dhorme 1967, lxxv; Linafelt 2016, 81.

⁵ Nõmmik 2026, 9.

⁶ Swete 1914, 316.

⁷ Wissmann 2010, 62.

⁸ Margolis 1917, 36; Gerleman 1946, 14; Ziegler 1985, 110–2; Fernández Marcos 1994, 259; 2000, 60; Witte 2007, 40; 2020.

translation. Much later, Evangelia Dafni has concluded that the translator of Job was “a poet, or at least a student of great Greek poets.” She is sure that the translator knew Homer’s epics very well and even claims that the Hebrew author had this knowledge as well. She perceives the translation to be in a free poetic style that makes use of Greek epic-poetic language and poetical thought. Marieke Dhont, noticeably the most knowledgeable person on OG Job and its style today, has also agreed that the Job-translator used poetic vocabulary and other stylistic elements, and probably knew that the Hebrew source text was a poem⁹.

The OG translator of Job wrote in what has been called “a higher register of Koine.” With that they oftentimes use a higher register overall or syntactical constructions that were no longer the norm in Hellenistic Greek, such as the optative mood.¹⁰ Compared to other translations in the LXX corpus, OG Job also has fewer Hebraisms and Septuagintalisms and is generally less interlinear or isomorphic¹¹.

Others, however, have maintained that even though the translator may have comprehension of the Hebrew poetry and that the translation has good literary style, it still is not poetry or poetic, but rather prose or prosaic.¹² Rogers is of the opinion that the translator lost the contrast between poetry and prose by collapsing the parallelistic nature of Hebrew poetry, often omitting for example the second colon in a parallelistic bicolon.¹³ Dhont offers food for thought, saying that maybe in the specific Jewish-Greek polysystem in Alexandria, OG Job could have been seen as poetry, influenced by Hebrew and perhaps even Greek poetry, but having its own distinct character¹⁴.

Although a lot of work has already been done in studying the style of OG Job, there has been a call for further study of the poetic style of the speeches of OG Job,¹⁵ including on the macro-level¹⁶. In this dissertation, poetry and poetic expression is looked at by mapping and comparing certain poetic techniques in both languages, focusing on the marked expressions as contrasting to the unmarked language of everyday speech or ordinary prose. In this way, the wider definition of “poetic” and “poetry” as marked language, proposed by Martin West, is the guiding principle.¹⁷ The dissertation concentrates more on the macro-level stylisation; however, this always needs to take into account stylisation on the micro-level as well. We will now look at the specific techniques that will be studied.

⁹ Gammie 1987, 14–9; Dafni 2006; 2007, 61–2; Dhont 2014a; 2016a; 2018a, 41, 299.

¹⁰ Cox 1987, 201; Dhont 2018b, 620.

¹¹ Cox 2009, 667; Dhont 2018b, 624–30; Cox 2021.

¹² Cox 2006, 111; Witte 2007, 42; Althann 2009, 349, 355; Cox 2009, 667; Kepper and Witte 2011, 2047; Law 2013, 54; Witte 2016, 415; Strawn 2017, 475; Witte 2019, 377; Gorea 2021, 375.

¹³ Rogers 2012, 397–8.

¹⁴ Dhont 2018a, 301.

¹⁵ Haralambakis 2012, 206.

¹⁶ Dhont 2018a, 298; Häberlein 2024, 364–8.

¹⁷ West 2007, 26.

Style: poetic techniques

Wilfred Watson, in his *Classical Hebrew Poetry: A Guide to Its Techniques*, has laid out a list of **criteria that indicate the presence of poetry**. Under broad indicators, he lists the presence of established line forms, ellipsis, unusual vocabulary, conciseness, unusual word order, archaisms, use of metre and rhythm, and regularity and symmetry; under structural indicators, he lists word pairs, chiasmic patterns, envelope figure, break-up of stereotyped phrases, repetition in various forms, gender-matched parallelism, and tricolon; under other indicators, he mentions rhyme and other sound patterns; finally he mentions, as a negative indicator, the absence or rare use of prose elements (“the relative pronoun, the definite article and the object-marker”, as well as the consecutive *waw*).¹⁸ These techniques are also commonly used in Greek poetry.

Repetition has been said to be the basis of a greater part of poetic devices and of poetic language in general¹⁹. Although repetition is a universal poetic technique, many different kinds of repetitions are used in world poetry. Repetition can occur on a small or large scale, from individual sounds (consonants, vowels, syllables) to words, phrases, entire verses or lines, or even longer strophes and structures.

Lexical repetitions could be categorised according to several aspects. Firstly, the word or words, even just roots, are repeated in their exact form or in a different inflectional form. Secondly, repetitions can be judged by the positions of repeated words. They can appear in the same position constantly or in completely different positions every time; in poetry, this would mean either repetition in the same metrical position or in a different one.

In this dissertation, root repetitions are considered to be the same as “true” repetitions. If and when the position of the repeated words is significant, the terminology used is largely based on Watson’s: (1) repetition-initial, (2) end-repetition, (3) immediate repetition, (4) framing repetition, and (5) other (no pattern of position, except for the fact that the words are repeated in consecutive cola).²⁰

Visually, one of the main ways we can immediately recognise that we are reading poetry instead of simple prose is **lineation**, which is also often used in various definitions of poetry. In prose, the length of a line does not usually correspond to a unit of thought, and a single sentence can be written on more than one line. In most poetry, lines have a certain length both visually and audibly. In classical poetry especially, the length of a single line is dependent on the metre and genre of the poetic work.

On the one hand, modern editions of Ancient Hebrew (biblical), the LXX, and Ancient Greek poetry show the poems in lineated and (often) strophic or stanzaic form. On the other hand, we have yet to find exactly what the earliest manuscripts of biblical poetry looked like exactly. From the time of the translation of the LXX,

¹⁸ Watson 1986, 46–7, 54.

¹⁹ Mazur 2012, 1168.

²⁰ Watson 1986, 274–8. For more “classical” terminology, see Alonso Schökel 1988; Lausberg 1998.

we do not have extensive biblical manuscript evidence—not for the text that the translators used nor the texts that they produced.

However, we do have extant manuscripts of Greek and Roman books. Focusing on Greece, literature might have been written on papyrus book-rolls from the 5th century BCE. For poetic works in hexametre or trimetre, the length of the line equalled that of the verse, whereas, for lyric poetry and prose, the written line was shorter. It has been said that starting from the 2nd century BCE, 18 to 25 letters were written per line in works of lyric poetry and prose. Lyric poetry's metrical strophes were distinguishable, although a lot of evidence for that still comes from medieval manuscripts. Spaces were kept in between columns. In prose, the text was written in several narrow columns.²¹

This is comparable to several biblical manuscripts, both in Hebrew and Greek: poetic books and parts of books are written in two wider columns, but prose is written in three to four narrower columns. Thus, although the earliest full or almost full LXX manuscripts are from the 4th century CE, it would be reasonable to assume that the tradition of distinguishing prose from poetry was known to the translators and their scribes and to the scribes of the Hebrew source text. The Book of Job is written in two formats in the Greek manuscripts: in Vaticanus and Sinaiticus (4th century CE), the whole of Job is written in two wide columns with indentations, the narrative and dialogues are not differentiated visually; the prosaic books are written in three (Vaticanus) or four (Sinaiticus) narrow columns without indentations. In Alexandrinus (5th century CE), all books are written in two columns; however, the poetic books are more stichographic, as new verses begin with an indentation, while prose books are more justified. In these manuscripts, and other partial ones, Job is written stichometrically in a way that every colon begins on a new line; if the colon is longer than a line, it is extended with a noticeable indentation.

In the significantly later Hebrew manuscripts, most importantly, in the 11th century Codex Leningradensis, prose books are written in three narrower columns while Psalms, Job, and Proverbs are written in two wider columns. Two manuscripts from Qumran also display stichographic layouts in Job, namely 4QJob^a and 4QpaleoJob^{c22}. Shem Miller has argued that stichography “is not only a scribal practice but is also a poetic device that visually represents the structure of a poetic text according to the basic building blocks of Hebrew poetry”²³. In this sense, at least based on the major biblical manuscripts, both the Hebrew and OG Job make use of this poetic device.

Colometry in ancient Hebrew biblical poetry studies the number of consonants in a colon or a half-verse. For *mašal* verse type, which is by some considered the archetype of ancient Hebrew verse, the colometry should show that the two halves of a bicolon are balanced, with a difference of no more than two or three consonants, and up to a certain number of consonants in one colon. Nömmik maintains that in the book of Job, at least in the original dialogue parts,

²¹ Maehler 2004.

²² Seow 2013, 5; Miller 2015, 184.

²³ Miller 2012, 5–6.

the normal colon length is 12–15 consonants, with a variation allowance of two consonants: a colon shorter than 12 consonants is considered too short while a colon longer than 17 consonants already approaches prose. He also emphasises that the difference of the cola in one verse cannot be too big: the verse can be considered balanced if the difference is no more than four consonants²⁴. A certain length for a verse (also visually) and a limited number of consonants or syllables per verse, which repeats throughout the poem, can be considered a repetition of structure.

The importance of colometric analysis for the analysis of larger strophes in a poem cannot be underestimated. Proper colometric analysis (and therefore the correct decoding of the micro-level) can help to distinguish the macro-level structure of a poem. Proper understanding on the level of a bicolon can “bring into relief the accretions which have gradually become a part of the biblical text.” This means that along with isolating the basic poetic strophes, colometric analysis seeks to identify any disruptions or expansions in the text brought on by glosses and comments. If a colon is too long, later additions and corruptions can be suspected.²⁵

In Hebrew Job, **verses** are mostly either bicola or tricola²⁶, although occasional tetracola can be found. In OG Job, verse structure is more varied, from monocola to tetracola, and does not always follow Hebrew. Omitting a colon from a bicolon has been considered something that interferes with the poetry of Job²⁷. It has been noted that the original Hebrew poem of Job was mostly made up of bicola, and that tricola and other verse forms might be a consequence of later glosses, or cola that have gone missing in the copying process, and different authors and thus different poetic profiles²⁸. Tricola were recognised as a structuring device in poetry already in the 19th century, especially marking the end of strophes. This phenomenon has been further studied by van der Lugt who concluded that tricola are more often than not found at the end of short strophes; however, since the strophes are mostly quite short, this is bound to happen.²⁹ Since the alternating verse structure has been of interest for the Hebrew text for centuries and it has been claimed that the OG translator broke the poetic structure by changing the verse structure, it will be studied in *this dissertation* to see if these claims hold up. As a result, it will be seen, whether verse structure is followed by the translator and whether in the Greek speeches tricola and other verse forms have a structuring function.

It is generally maintained that Biblical Hebrew poems are divided into **smaller units**. These units are usually called strophes, stanzas, cantos, or more neutrally literary units. If these units are quite long, it is common to divide these into even smaller ones, usually also called strophes or sub-strophes. Some say that these

²⁴ Nömmik 2012, 402, 407; 2026.

²⁵ Loretz and Kottsieper 1987, 27–8, 44–6, 49, 52.

²⁶ van der Lugt 1995, 474–5.

²⁷ Witte 2007, 37. He lists as examples, the following verses: 10:4, 20:14, 31:27, 33:8, 34:6, 34:11, 34:18, 37:6, 37:7, 39:6.

²⁸ Fohrer 1963, 54; Nömmik 2026, 9–11.

²⁹ van der Lugt 1995, 482; especially, see historical overview on pp. 9–10.

units should be within the limits of one poem of similar or equal length³⁰. Others again say that the most important thing is the sense unit, which is formally backed up by different rhetoric techniques and markers, including a certain length of the unit³¹. Watson simply states that “stanzas can be regular, but need not be” and that the notion of regularity is based on classical Greek poetry³². In terms of theme and smaller topics, it is said that even if several strophes carry the same theme, each strophe is still separate and distinct in one way or another³³.

In the simplest of terms, strophes are the building blocks of poems and are made up of verses, which in turn are made up of cola. Unless the speech is very short, these building blocks are repeatedly used in one poem, therefore constituting a repetition of structure on the macro-level.

In the book of Job, the strophic structure is said to be masterful³⁴. Jan Fokkelman is sure that the Job-poet began a new strophe or train of thought after two or three verses (mostly two or three bicola); Webster, however, thinks that the basic length is rather three to five verses. Fokkelman has managed to show that the speeches in the book of Job fit into an exceptionally regular pattern where the train of thought changes after two or three bicola (a strophe) and bigger strophes of sense (stanzas) form from one or more strophes. This same type of strict thematic-formal division was before him done by Pieter van der Lugt³⁵. They look at the poetry and strophes of Job synchronically.

Just like Nömmik has related verse structure to the literary growth of Job, he has also looked at the larger poetic structure diachronically. In terms of strophic markers, he considers word and root repetition especially important, but also emphasises the importance of deictics, sound, different types of verses, word pairs, and chiasmus. He says that although strophes may or may not have a regular length within a poem originally, different strophic structures may be a sign of different authors and scribes. Since the Hebrew book of Job grew over centuries, its once regular or mostly regular strophic structure got corrupted. In its original form, the dialogues of the Job-poem consisted mainly of strophes that were three to four bicola long. He is sure that over time, Job’s original strophic structure changed quite significantly, with smaller and bigger additions, but also textual corruption.³⁶

Not everyone sees the strophic structure of Job as entirely regular. Van der Lugt himself has noted that in terms of strophic structure, some speeches do have consensus among scholars, whereas others do not. For every speech, he provides an extensive list of different ways previous scholars have divided the speeches in Job into strophes.³⁷ A similar list is given in Appendix II of this dissertation, only covering the chapters studied and scholars that are consulted more often. How

³⁰ For example, van der Lugt 1995, 33; Fokkelman 2012, 7.

³¹ For example, Skehan 1971, 98; Watson 1986, 163; but also Fokkelman 2012, 10.

³² Watson 1986, 160, 162.

³³ Fohrer 1963, 55; Webster 1983, 38.

³⁴ Terrien 1963, 33–4.

³⁵ Webster 1983; 1984; van der Lugt 1995; Fokkelman 2012.

³⁶ Nömmik 2026.

³⁷ van der Lugt 1995. See especially pp. 31–32.

this strophic structure converts into Greek, is one of core pieces of analysis of this dissertation. Can the Greek structure of the speeches give any insight into how the strophic structure of the Hebrew text might have looked like at the time of the translation?

The strophic structure of the OG translation has not been studied extensively before. There have been mentions that the translator was stylistically capable of handling larger structures, more than one verse at a time. Cox has studied some “blocks” of text in the speeches in an unpublished article and has mentioned the translator’s capability of forming the translation into blocks and paragraphs by means of particles. Dhont has expressed that studying OG Job and more specifically the OG translator in how they stylised the speeches on the macro-level would be fruitful. She has asked, “To what extent does the narrative structure of the Greek differ from that of the Hebrew and what are the effects of these differences?”.³⁸ More recently, Maximilian Häberlein, focusing on the speeches of God, has found that the translator was capable of handling and connecting larger blocks of text, structuring the speeches³⁹. One of the impulses of this dissertation was exactly Dhont’s statement and question, while the other is the fact that the study of macro-level structuring of OG Job has been attempted (Cox, Häberlein) and the structuring of Proverbs, in many cases similar to OG Job, has been briefly studied by Cook. He has concluded that there are cases where the Greek translator understood the macro-structure differently than the later Masoretes and even enhanced the structure at times. He has found that the translator of Proverbs was more interested in the large picture rather than simply the lexical level.⁴⁰

This dissertation builds upon previous work done in studying the style of OG Job. The methodology used in dividing the OG text of Job into smaller strophes is mainly inspired by Fokkelman and van der Lugt. This means that the skeletons of the poems (as van der Lugt calls them) are established on thematical grounds first and then the formal characteristics that support this structure are established⁴¹. Any conflicts between theme and form, if they arise, are commented upon. In the textual analysis, however, the literary growth of Hebrew Job, including the possibility of changed strophic structure, that is diachronic poetics, is always taken into account.

Similes have been said to be “perhaps a universal feature of poetry and colourful discourse”⁴². The simile is understood as a technique of comparison or likening two or more subjects. They are also usually marked by particles or adverbs, although elliptic similes occur as well. Since they are often marked, they can be tracked and compared. In Hebrew, regular similes are introduced by the following particles: כ, כמו, משל, עם, כן ... כ. In Greek, similes can be introduced by the adverbs ὡς, ὥσπερ, ἴσα and the like, all bearing the meaning “like, as.”

³⁸ Cox 2005; Dhont 2018a, 298; Cox n.d.

³⁹ Häberlein 2024.

⁴⁰ Cook 2002.

⁴¹ van der Lugt 1995, 34–5.

⁴² West 2007, 95.

Since Robert Lowth's study *De sacra poesi Hebraeorum* in the 18th century, **parallelism** has been considered the most typical trait of Hebrew Biblical poetry (parallelism is also thought to be a universal element of oral poetry by some⁴³). He categorised the different types of parallelism as synonymous, antithetical, and synthetical.⁴⁴ After Lowth, scholars have come up with many different ways to deal with and categorise parallelism.

The idea of parallelism is built on an additive manner of thinking and expression. Usually, in this way of expression, the whole is not described but rather its several aspects. According to Nömmik, the *mašal* itself is the most important idea because its origins in Hebrew are associated with comparison and analogy. He also argues for not using the terms "synonymous" and "antithetic" parallelisms, proposing a simple "parallel" instead of "synonymous parallelism," and by doing that, "antithetic parallelism" seems to be a problem as well.⁴⁵

Watson categorises, largely inspired by mathematics, parallelism in the following way: (1) parallelism or proper congruence where the consecutive cola have the same sequence of the same sign; (2) chiasmus or mirror symmetry or reflexive congruence where the consecutive cola have the same sign appear in the opposite sequence; (3) proper anti-congruence where the consecutive cola have the same sequence of opposite signs; and (4) reflexive or chiasitic anti-congruence where the consecutive cola have the reversed sequence of opposite signs. He additionally distinguishes gender-matched parallelism, parallel word-pairs, number parallelism, staircase parallelism, synonymous-sequential parallelism, noun-verb parallelism, vertical parallelism, and "Janus" parallelism.⁴⁶

In Ancient Greek literature, a technique equal to parallelism was also used, usually called *parison* (lit. "almost equal"), which pertains to structural parallelism.⁴⁷ Related to it is the *isocolon* (lit. "equal length or colon") which is simply a "sequence of clauses or sentences of identical length"⁴⁸.

There have been cautions and movements against believing that *parallelismus membrorum* is the main characteristic of Hebrew poetry in and of itself and that it is rather one of the supporting characteristics alongside other poetic techniques⁴⁹. However, it is still a technique that is used tersely in biblical poetry⁵⁰ and in the book of Job, both in the Hebrew and in OG. The parallelism in Hebrew is generally followed in the OG translation, although the translation has previously been characterised as breaking the poetic structure by leaving parts of verses untranslated (see the overview in the "Translation technique" section of this introduction) Dhont and Beeckman have found that the translator sometimes made the parallelism present in Hebrew Job tighter in Greek⁵¹. *In this dissertation*, we will

⁴³ Cuddon 1999, 637.

⁴⁴ Lowth 1753.

⁴⁵ Nömmik 2012.

⁴⁶ Watson 1986, 118–59.

⁴⁷ Brogan 2012, 734.

⁴⁸ Cuddon 1999, 432.

⁴⁹ Loretz and Kottsieper 1987, 17; Kugel 1998; Nömmik 2012.

⁵⁰ Berlin 2008, 5.

⁵¹ Dhont 2014b; 2016a; Beeckman 2020, 37; 2022b, 18; 2024, 327.

see, if and how parallelistic structures are used in the OG translation on the larger level, to see if these structures, including the related variation with verse structures, play any role on the macro-level. To simplify the discussion of the analysed speeches in this dissertation, parallelism is looked at in terms of whether the signs (à la Watson) are used in the same sequence (symmetry) or the opposite sequence (chiasmus). Occasionally, other types of parallelism, like number parallelism, are discussed.

Transition and discourse markers, although not strictly related to poetry, can help determine the versification and strophic structure of a poetic text. It is a problematic and wide category of words and elements, since there is no distinct word-class of “discourse markers” and several word classes are usually counted as markers, like conjunctions, particles, and adverbs.⁵² For example, besides these types of transition markers, strophes can also be marked with word and root repetition, deictics, sound, different types of verses, word pairs, and chiasmus⁵³.

The OG translator is especially known for using a variety of particles. These are found in a much larger concentration and in a larger variety in Greek than in Hebrew; however, omitting them is not uncommon, either. Especially numerous are *δέ* and *γάρ*, which according to Cox, were added about 150 and 100 times, respectively. Although he emphasises the stylistic motivation behind this addition, and rather argues against these being simply verse indicators, it has to be noted that both particles are connected with Wackernagel’s law—they have a fixed position in a clause—and therefore they can almost be seen as punctuation, helping to distinguish cola and verses from each other.⁵⁴

Further problems arise with the fact that most strophes in Job, at least in Hebrew Job as established earlier, are quite short and not all transition markers can be equally significant⁵⁵. De Regt has concluded that rhetorical questions are a structuring device in poems, in which they can mark both the beginning and end of a section⁵⁶. Therefore, it is not necessary to duplicate here lists of what are considered transition and discourse markers by different entities. All of the relevant markers for the selected speeches are discussed in context in the commentary chapters of this dissertation.

Marked vocabulary can aid in stylising the poetic text. What is considered marked is often quite subjective, but two trackable types are 1) rare vocabulary, and 2) poetic vocabulary, i.e. vocabulary that has mostly or only been attested in poetic texts. Although the book is written in Hebrew, Aramaisms are not infrequent⁵⁷. The meanings of some words are sometimes derived from or with the help of other Semitic languages. In the Hebrew text we also come across common words that have special spellings or variant forms, which Fohrer considers to reflect the author’s linguistic and literary environment. Further, Job is abundant

⁵² For Hebrew, van der Lugt 1995; Merwe et al. 2017 have been consulted; for Greek, Cox 2005; Muraoka 2016; Emde Boas 2019; Fresch 2021 have been consulted.

⁵³ Nõmmik 2026, 11.

⁵⁴ Cox 2009, 668; 2015a, 390.

⁵⁵ van der Lugt 1995, 40–1.

⁵⁶ de Regt 1994.

⁵⁷ See, for example, Terrien 1963, 29–30.

in rare words and expressions, even *hapax legomena*. Fohrer links these to the author's linguistic and literary environment as well as their high level of education.⁵⁸ Seow has argued that conservative orthography (that is, without *matres*), extensively used in Job, is important not only for textual critical issues, but, according to him, is also an archaising poetic technique that increases the possibility of wordplay. Indeed, he concludes that "Poetry in Job, it seems, is written not only for the ear. It is written as well for the eye."⁵⁹ Strawn has argued against the conservative orthography being archaising but does agree that it is artistic⁶⁰.

Poetic-epic vocabulary use in OG Job was already discussed above. For rare vocabulary in Hebrew, words that appear less than ten times in the HB are counted⁶¹. If a word appears only in the poetic books (Job, Psalms, Proverbs) or in Job only in the dialogues, it is marked as potentially poetic; the word is marked as poetic if BDB categorises it thus. In Greek, words that appear less than 50 times⁶² before and during the LXX translation centuries (before the 1st century BCE, i.e. up until the 2nd century BCE) are counted⁶³. Lists of Homeric vocabulary that the translator has used have been compiled⁶⁴ and these are consulted in this dissertation. For further poetic vocabulary, Mangin's dissertation⁶⁵ and the LSJ lexicon are consulted. Rare vocabulary in both Hebrew and Greek is marked in an abbreviated way in the commentary. For Hebrew, a total number of occurrences of a word in the HB is given (e.g., 5x = five times); then, the number of occurrences in Job, Psalms, and Proverbs are given (representing the poetic books of the HB). If there are no occurrences outside of Job, only the count for Job is given. For Greek, a total number of occurrences before the 1st century BCE is given (e.g., 20x = 20 times); then, the number of occurrences in the LXX and OG Job are given. If there are no occurrences besides the OG Job, the count for LXX is not given.

Concentrating on these select poetic techniques and comparing their use in the MT versus the OG Job, especially on the macro-level, it might be possible to give new literary critical⁶⁶ insights into how the OG translator saw and understood the

⁵⁸ Fohrer 1963, 54.

⁵⁹ Seow 2011.

⁶⁰ Strawn 2017, 465–8.

⁶¹ Unless otherwise stated, all statistics are from STEP Bible stepbible.org (Last accessed 12/05/2024). The data is occasionally cross-referenced with BDB.

⁶² I thank Urmas Nõmmik and Anu Põldsam for a helpful discussion of deciding the criteria for rare vocabulary in Hebrew and Janika Päll for rare vocabulary in Greek.

⁶³ Unless otherwise stated, all statistics are from TLG (Thesaurus Linguae Graecae) <https://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/>. Last accessed 08/05/2024. TLG data are not unproblematic, since LXX vocabulary is placed chronologically into the 3rd century BCE. This is why the statistics used here are that of Greek literature before the 1st century BCE. Occasionally, the evidence is corroborated by Mangin, Dhont, and LSJ.

⁶⁴ Ziegler 1985, 110–2; Witte 2007, 40; Dafni 2007, 37.

⁶⁵ Mangin 2005.

⁶⁶ Literary criticism is in this dissertation understood as a narrower discipline within a broader literary criticism that inquires about the formal aspects of a written work. See, for example, Jobling 2001; Lozada 2023.

poetics of the Hebrew Job and how the Hebrew text, in whatever form it was before the translator, was transformed into Greek.

Masoretic Text

The book of Job is a famously difficult text; it has been estimated that around 20% of the text is rather unintelligible or could be interpreted in differing ways⁶⁷. The rare vocabulary, discussed in the previous section does not aid in understanding it. Not only is the text of the Leningrad Codex of the MT problematic and difficult for the modern translator, but it was also such in the ancient manuscripts, including the ones that contained the *Vorlagen* of the old translations, such as the OG, Vg, and P. The Hebrew was unvocalised and unpunctuated and most likely did not have any markings separating verses from each other. The script at times was easily misread due to confusion of letters (*dalet* and *resh* or *yod* and *waw*), but also intentional or unintentional metathesis. The “dense poetry and sophisticated language” add to the difficulties in understanding and interpreting⁶⁸.

When the Masoretes, who were not allowed to change the consonantal text of the HB, were not satisfied with it, they had to give the preferred or better consonantal reading in the margins. However, the vowels of the “better” reading were transposed onto the consonantal text that they could not change. This system is called the *qere* (“to be read”) and *ketiv* (“written”). The Book of Job has been supplied with these “better” readings in several passages. Most of the time, these corrections pertain to the missing consonants (mostly *yod*) in suffixed noun forms, for example, in the ten speeches studied in this dissertation, these are in 5:18 (*ketiv* יָדָו, *qere* יָדָיו), in 14:5 (*ketiv* חָקוּ, *qere* חָקֵי), in 15:15 (*ketiv* בִּקְדָּשׁוּ, *qere* בִּקְדָּשָׁיו), in 21:20 (*ketiv* עֵינָו, *qere* עֵינָיו), in 31:20 (*ketiv* חֲלָצוּ, *qere* חֲלָצָיו), in 38:41 (*ketiv* יָלְדוּ, *qere* יָלְדָיו), in 39:26 (*ketiv* בְּנָפּוּ, *qere* בְּנָפָיו), in 39:30 (*ketiv* וְאַפְרָחוּ, *qere* וְאַפְרָחָיו), in 40:17 (*ketiv* פָּחְדוּ, *qere* פָּחְדָיו). Other examples include providing a contextually better reading as in 13:15, where the *ketiv* reads לֹא (“not”) while the *qere* reads לוֹ (“for/in him”), and in 30:11, where the *ketiv* reads יִתְרוֹ, while the *qere* reads יִתְרִי, revealing a more suitable suffix. Other times, the correction lies rather in the proper end-form of a consonant, like in 38:1 and 40:6, where the *ketiv* reads מִן, while the *qere* reads מִן, revealing a proper end-form of *nun*. The corrections can also be about word-division, such as in 38:12, where the *ketiv* reads יִדְעָתָהּ שְׁחַר, while the *qere* reads יִדְעָתָהּ שְׁחַר. Sometimes, the Masoretes corrected a consonant in a word, especially if a very similar-looking consonant should be read instead, such as in 21:13, where the *ketiv* reads גְּבִלּוֹ, while the *qere* reads גְּבִלּוֹ. The remaining corrections are in 19:29 (*ketiv* שְׂדִין, *qere* שְׂדִין), in 30:22, (*ketiv* תְּשׁוּהָה, *qere* תְּשׁוּהָה), in 31:11 (the *ketiv* reads two pronouns as הוּא and הוּא, while the *qere* forms are proposed as הוּא and הוּא); and in 39:12 (*ketiv* יָשׁוּב, *qere* יָשׁוּב).

Problems have been identified also with written *matres*. Seow has described how the evidence from 4QpalaeoJob^c shows most *matres* missing, even in

⁶⁷ Fernández Marcos 1994, 262.

⁶⁸ Strawn 2017, 450–1.

passages where the MT has them, and therefore the orthography present in the MT may not be original. He has said that introducing *matres* in the Qumran manuscripts (4QpalaeoJob^c; 2QJob; 4QJob^a; 4QJob^b) is “part of the book’s history of interpretation”. Besides the Qumran manuscripts, *matres* are often missing in the Aleppo Codex (MT^A) and the Bomberg Bible (MT^B). He deems the *Vorlage* forms without *matres* superior, because they allow more room for interpretations such that can be witnessed in the ancient translations.⁶⁹

Vorlage

OG Job is estimated to be 1/6 shorter than the current Hebrew Job (MT)⁷⁰. Is the translation shorter because the Hebrew text that the translator used, that is the *Vorlage*, was shorter or were the omissions intentional? Unfortunately, the *Vorlage(n)* that the OG translator and other ancient translators used is lost to us. There are, however, some general truths about it that scholars have agreed upon.

Very few scholars have thought that a shorter or a very different Hebrew text was used for the translation. Terrien has ambiguously said that the possibility that the *Vorlage* was very different from the MT cannot be excluded.⁷¹ Hatch thought that the Greek translation was made from a Hebrew text that existed between its earlier shorter version and its later expanded version. Fohrer has claimed that sometimes the shorter version is explained by a *Vorlage* that is different from the MT in vv. 2:1, 20:23, 31:1–4, 39:13–18, and 41:9. Some glosses (22:24, 40:1) were added to the Hebrew text after the Greek translation, while others were recognised by the translator and intentionally omitted (23:9, 24:25b) and sometimes even omitted alongside original passages (9:24, 12:3f). He categorises some omissions and abridgments to be intentional, either due to theology (12:21, 13:19f, 19:28, 20:3–4a; 21:15, 23; 22:13–16, 31:35; 40:2) or to simplify exegetically difficult or corrupt text (14:12, 16:8, 20:20b–21a, 22:29f). In other instances, he categorises the omissions and abridgments to be intentional, made in order to condense the text.⁷² Urmas Nõmmik considers the possibility that 28:15–19, 30:2–4(?), 31:1–4(?), and 39:13–18 were missing in the *Vorlage*⁷³.

Witte has suggested that in 24:14–18, 28:14–19, and 39:13–18 the *Vorlage* was not identical with the MT and these sections are considered later additions to the Hebrew. However, in most cases, he thinks that the translator is the one behind major differences and the shortening of the text, especially since the omissions and abridgments are seen more as the book progresses, they are often found in textually difficult verses, and they are often minimising redundancies.⁷⁴ Curiously enough, the large untranslated section in ch. 21, longer than the one in ch. 39, is not mentioned in *Vorlage*-discussions.

⁶⁹ Seow 2011, 64–7. Cf. Strawn 2017.

⁷⁰ Dhorme 1967, cxcix–cciii.

⁷¹ Terrien 1963, 34–5.

⁷² Hatch 1889, 244–5; Fohrer 1963, 55–6.

⁷³ Nõmmik 2025.

⁷⁴ Kepper and Witte 2011, 2045; Witte 2019, 375.

Most scholars, however, are in agreement that the *Vorlage* was nearly identical to the MT, and that the differences and omissions are mostly intentional.⁷⁵ Häberlein, in studying the two speeches of God, and Beeckman, using the content- and context-related approach to study the translation of certain groups of words, have identified a few passages where the *Vorlage* may have differed in minor details from the MT⁷⁶. Dhorme has claimed, based on the MT, that there is nothing different about the verses that were translated and those that were not.⁷⁷ More recently, Juliane Maria Eckstein who has applied the idiolect test on the asterisked passages of the Greek translation of Job, has reached the conclusion that the translator is the one responsible for the omissions in the Greek text and therefore did not work with a shorter *Vorlage*⁷⁸. Gray has linked the technique of summarising and shortening to the translator's capability of looking further than the single verse that they were translating⁷⁹, which is something that this dissertation hopes to expand our knowledge of.

Seow and Gorea have pointed out, that in the fragments that survive of Job in the Qumran manuscripts, namely in the Aramaic 11Q10, the passages that are missing in the OG are indeed preserved⁸⁰. Assuming that they both translate from the same or similar Hebrew text, the OG translator shortened the text intentionally. In 11Q10, the following sections of the speeches studied in this dissertation have been preserved and will be used for comparison: 19:11–19, 19:29–20:6, 21:2–10, 21:20–27, 24:24–26:2, 29:7–16, 29:24–30:4, 30:13–20, 30:(25)27–31:1, 31:8–16, 31:26–32, 31:40–32:3, 38:3–13, 38:23–34, 39:1–11, 39:20–29, 40:5–14, 40:23–31, 41:7–17, 41:25–42:2, 40:5⁸¹.

The Greek text

The oldest version of the **Greek translation** originates from Alexandria, from the 2nd century BCE, and more probably the second half of it. The additions in chs. 2 and 42 are considered slightly later, from the 1st century BCE, possibly before the mid-century, originating in Alexandria, but not OG in the strictest sense. Reed dates the addition in ch. 42 between the OG and Theodotion translations, but before 60 BCE. Cook, however, argues, that the addition in ch. 2 are from the OG translator while the one in 42:17 is later. The translator is very convincingly identified, by Cox, as an Alexandrian urbanite, familiar with the higher cultural setting, industry, and even zoos in the city; all of this is reflected in the

⁷⁵ See, for example, Gerleman 1946, 23; Heater 1982, 5; Fernández Marcos 1994, 254; Cox 2014; 2015a; Strawn 2017, 463.

⁷⁶ Beeckman 2024, 327–8; Häberlein 2024, 353–5.

⁷⁷ Dhorme 1967, cciii.

⁷⁸ Eckstein 2015; 2018.

⁷⁹ Gray 1974, 342–3.

⁸⁰ Gorea 2021, 376–7; Seow 2023, 35.

⁸¹ Gray 1974, 331; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1999, 1184–201.

OG translation.⁸² It is possible that 11Q10, which has some parallels to OG, was also translated approximately the same time.⁸³ Unlike the Hebrew text, as of yet, a full of commentary of OG Job has not been published; however, Cox’s commentary for *The SBL Commentary on the Septuagint* series is set to be published in 2026⁸⁴.

As noted previously, the OG translation is approximately 1/6 shorter than the MT. Before the publication of Ziegler’s critical edition, Dhorme compiled a list of the lacunae of LXX Job, i.e. verses that were omitted in the original translation and were later supplemented by Origen. In the speeches that are studied in this dissertation, he lists the following lacunae: 5:23a; 12:3b, c, 4, 8b–9, 18b, 21a, 23; 13:19b, 20b; 14:12c, 18–19; 15:10, 26b–27; 19:24a, 28b; 21:15, 19b, 21, 23, 28–33; 29:10–11a, 13a, 19–20, 24b–25; 30:2–4a, 7a, 11–13, 16a, 18b, 20b, 22b, 26b–27a; 31:1–4, 18, 23b–24a, 27a, 35a; 38:26–27, 32; 39:1a, 2b–3a, 3b–4, 6b, 8, 13–18, 28b, 29b; 40:23b–24, 25b; 41:4, 8a, 9, 15b, 18b, 21a, 24.⁸⁵

Ziegler lists the following asterisked verses in his critical edition: 12:8b–9, 18b, 21, 23; 13:19b, 20b; 14:12c, 18–19; 15:10, 26b–27; 19:24a, 28b; 21:15, 19b, 21, 23, 28–33; 25:6b; 29:10b–11a, 13a, 19–20, 24b–25; 30:1c, 2–4a, 7a, 11b–13a, 16a, 18b, 20b, 22b, 27; 31:1–4, 18, 23b–24a, 27a, 35a; 38:26–27, 32; 39:1a, 3b–4, 6a (6b is meant), 8, 13–18, 28, 29b; 40:23b–24, 26a, 31b; 41:4, 8a, 9, 15b, 18b, 21a, 24b.⁸⁶

Since the Greek manuscripts are not without errors, Dhorme lists verses where the Greek manuscripts have gotten corrupt over time and thus the original translation did not contain these “errors”: 4:6, 12, 16; 12:11; 14:14; 19:20; 21:16, 22, 23, 28; 29:1; 30:14, 21, 28, 31; 31:10, 24; 38:30; 39:22; 40:22.⁸⁷

These lists are consulted in analysing the selected speeches in this dissertation.

Translation technique

In a case where we only possess the translation, a much later version of the “original” Hebrew text, and where the translation is considerably shorter than the received Hebrew text, what can be known or said about **the translation technique** of OG Job? Eckstein has very sharply noted that often the arguments about translation technique and the *Vorlage* tend to end up being circular, because we do not possess the actual *Vorlage*⁸⁸.

Still, the OG translator has been widely described with statements like: 1) the translator translates freely and not word for word, they paraphrase and rewrite; 2) the translator abbreviates the text more and more as the chapters go on or abbreviate.

⁸² Heater 1982, 10; Reed 2001; Witte 2007, 53; Cook 2010; 2011a, 340–2; Kepper and Witte 2011, 2057; Cook 2013; Cox 2015b, 5–7; Witte 2016; Cox 2017, 175; Witte 2019, 376–7; Cox 2023; Seow 2023, 33.

⁸³ Witte 2007, 53.

⁸⁴ An example of the commentary, based on ch. 34, has been published in Büchner 2017.

⁸⁵ Dhorme 1967, cciii.

⁸⁶ Ziegler 1982, 150–1.

⁸⁷ Dhorme 1967, cciv.

⁸⁸ Eckstein 2018.

viates when the Hebrew is too difficult; 3) the translator has vocalised the consonantal text differently than the later Masoretes; 4) the translator has often “mis-read” the consonantal text or used metathesis in order to make sense of the text; 5) the translator has used contextual translation when the Hebrew was not understood; 6) the translator has used anaphoric/associative translation when the Hebrew was not fully understood⁸⁹; 7) the translator breaks the poetic structure by leaving a part of the verse untranslated; 8) the translator does not translate into Greek poetry; 9) the translator is more at home with Koine Greek than some other LXX translators. Claude Cox has summarised the translator’s activity as that of “a creative editor”⁹⁰. Even the abbreviation of the text was done for stylistic and sociological reasons, to be suitable for the Hellenistic audience, without too much repetition and redundancy, claims Cox⁹¹.

Why does the OG translation often not correspond to the Hebrew text word for word? In what follows, some translation techniques are discussed that can aid in understanding some of the differences between Hebrew and Greek of Job.

It has been noted that the OG translator has “favourite words” and even phrases which are the so-called default equivalents for them; favourite words and phrases are also sometimes used even if they do not correspond to the Hebrew⁹². Ziegler also clarifies that favourite words are often chosen when the underlying Hebrew word is difficult, and the translator did not know an exact equivalent. He considers the following as favourite verbs of the translator: ἀμφιάζειν (29:14b, 40:10b; 31:19), ἀπαλλάσσειν (9:34a, 27:5b, 34:5b; 3:10b; 7:15a; 9:12a; 10:19b), ἀποποιεῖσθαι (8:20a, 19:18a, 36:5a; 14:15b; 15:4a, 40:8a), ἐνάλλεσθαι (6:27b; 16:4c; 16:10a; 19:5b), σβέννυναι (18:5a, 18:6b, 21:17a; 4:10b; 16:15b; 30:8b; 34:26a; 40:12a), τιτρώσκειν (6:9a; 16:6b; 20:24b, 41:20a; 33:23b; 36:14b; 36:25b), χειροῦσθαι (3:8b; 13:15a; 30:24a), χράσθαι (13:20a; 23:6b; 30:14b; 34:20b; 10:17b, 16:9a, 18:4a, 19:11a). All of these appear as an equivalent of at least two different Hebrew verbs. He also lists the translator’s favourite phrases, although in this list he does not differentiate between OG and asterisked passages: εἰς κενὸν κοπιᾶζειν (39:16b ※; 2:9bγ), εἰς κενὰ καὶ μάταια κοπιᾶζειν (20:18a), κενὰ ἀποβήσεται (15:31b; 15:35b; 34:20a), τὰ σῖτα ζητεῖν (6:5a; 38:41c; 39:29a; and a similar 9:26b), πτώμα ἐξαίσιον (18:12; 20:5a; 37:16b), ἐνδοξά τε καὶ ἐξαίσιον (5:9b; 10:9b [sic]; 34:24b).⁹³

Related to this is the issue of semantic levelling, wherein several Hebrew words are consistently translated with a single Greek word. One example of such levelling is with different God-names, for which κύριος is used more often than other Greek equivalents (although some neologisms in the context of the LXX are used as well). This semantic levelling also brings about the minimising of the extra- and pre-Israelite context but brings it closer to orientalist Hellenistic

⁸⁹ Already noted by Ziegler 1971, 22–8, but later in more detail by Heater 1982.

⁹⁰ To mention only a few overviews that agree on most if not all of these statements: Heater 1982; Fernández Marcos 1994; Cox 2009, 667–8; Kepper and Witte 2011; Cox 2014; 2015a; Witte 2016; Cox 2017; Witte 2019, 375–6; Gorea 2021.

⁹¹ Cox 2015b, 4.

⁹² Cox 1987, 200; 2015a, 390.

⁹³ Ziegler 1971, 16–7.

religious literature where κύριος designates different Gods (Witte). Other examples can be seen in representing Job's pain with the noun ὀδύνη throughout the book, rendering several different words in Hebrew, or the general vocabulary of wrongdoing, reduced significantly in the translation.⁹⁴ Dhont has also argued that semantic levelling has happened with the names of 'monsters' in Job⁹⁵.

The OG translator of Job has been known to occasionally double-translate words, cola, or verses. It could have been done for rhetorical reasons, to strengthen a certain statement or claim. It could also have been done to represent the double meanings that can be gleaned from the Hebrew consonantal text. Dhont has proposed that in some cases, the exact meaning or connotation of a word was not certain for the translator and therefore a double translation could have helped in relaying the context and meaning in a surer way.⁹⁶ Strawn has noted that double translations may be the result of wanting to reproduce more accurately the poetry and double meaning in the Hebrew text⁹⁷. Noegel has studied the technique of Janus parallelism in Job and has come to the conclusion that the Greek translator often related the polysemy of the Hebrew words very cleverly in Greek⁹⁸.

Gray has noted that expansions helped to smoothen out some abruptness, make some verses clearer and more explicit⁹⁹. Cox has studied additions meticulously and concluded that the biggest reason for additions has been for emphasis, these additions include personal pronouns and adjectives. Other additions are made for clarification, personalisation and localisation, and rhetorical flare, but also theological reasons. Some "additions" are made to complete the verse or sentence or for the sake of better Greek.¹⁰⁰

The tendency to Hellenise certain terms or groups of terms has been noticed in the OG translation. For example, Fernández Marcos has considered the technique of semantic levelling of God-names, translating the "sons of God" and "Satan" as ἄγγελοι and ὁ διάβολος respectively, and Še'ol as ᾗδης Hellenisations¹⁰¹. Seow has listed several words used that reflect "the Hellenistic cultural milieu," such as ψυχή ('soul'), ᾗδης ('Hades'), κῆτος ('sea-monster'), δράκων ('dragon'), σειρήν ('siren'), μονόκερως ('unicorn'), ἑωσφόρος ('morning star'), and τάρταρος ('Tartarus')¹⁰². However, Dhont argues that using κῆτος as a translation equivalent for both Leviathan and Rahab, the translator is not so much Hellenising, but rather demythologising. She also emphasises that Hellenising in Job is more linguistic than cultural.¹⁰³ It has been confirmed that the translator often

⁹⁴ Kepper and Witte 2011, 2052; Cox 2015a, 394; Witte 2016, 419; Cox 2017, 179; 2022, 648.

⁹⁵ Dhont 2018b, 620–2.

⁹⁶ Dhont 2016b; Cox 2022, 658.

⁹⁷ Strawn 2017, 469–71.

⁹⁸ Noegel 1996.

⁹⁹ Gray 1974, 343.

¹⁰⁰ Cox 2016a.

¹⁰¹ These and further examples in Fernández Marcos 1994, 257–9.

¹⁰² Seow 2023, 37.

¹⁰³ Dhont 2018b, 620–4.

translated idiomatic expressions into understandable and idiomatic Greek, but not systematically, and had no problems rendering the expressions literally at times.¹⁰⁴

Some differences are theological, cosmological, and mythological. Not everyone agrees on the differences between Hebrew and Greek. Fernández Marcos has said that, for example, direct questions to God are often paraphrased “into statements on the human condition or *status*” and that the translation does not show a belief in immortality or resurrection; but often theological differences are actually there due to underlying textual issues in Hebrew¹⁰⁵. Some mythological allusions have been removed in the Greek translation, such as in Job 3:8 where the mention of Leviathan is de-mythologised into a simple big sea-creature, Resheph into a vulture, Yam and Tannin into the sea and the dragon and so on. However, the opposite happens as well, where Greek mythology is brought in, for example the names of Job’s daughters in the epilogue, turning jackals into sirens, and so on¹⁰⁶. Witte has concluded that the angelology of OG Job is more intense than that of Hebrew Job, God’s sovereignty is emphasised, the distance between God and man is highlighted, severe accusations against God are mitigated¹⁰⁷. Gammie, however, has found that the “functions attributed to angels” remain largely the same in the Greek translation, although their “judgmental function” and overall existence was emphasised more; that the demonology in OG Job is not advanced; and that the translator both mythologised (more than the Hebrew) and demythologised the passages that portray the demonic.¹⁰⁸ Cook has come to the conclusion, after analysing chapters 1, 14, 19, and 42, that the OG Job does not refer to life after death or the possibility of resurrection¹⁰⁹. Kwon understands the differences in Greek Job to be due to the translator’s theology and that this includes defending God more rigorously and making him more omnipotent, making Job to break religious laws more intensely, but also demythologising¹¹⁰. Gehman and Gard thought that the basis of changes is theological in many cases but not consistently and systematically and that the translator had no wish to rewrite the Hebrew¹¹¹. Fohrer has said that the translator has softened theologically offensive expressions (10:13, 12:6, 21:22, 22:2, 23:15, 24:12, 27:2, 30:20–23), avoided signs of human presumption towards God (1:5, 5:8, 22:17, 31:35–37, 40:8), altered passages that question God’s perfection (7:20, 12:6, 21:9, 32:2, 33:23f.26), avoided or changed images that portray God as a destructive power or persecutor of humankind (1:16, 9:13, 16:13f, 19:6, 34:24–26, 37:24, 42:11), eliminated anthropomorphisms (4:9, 10:4, 14:3), emphasised God’s transcendence (9:14f, 13:3.9.22), elevated God’s being to a higher level (6:9, 9:20–23, 12:25) and

¹⁰⁴ See, for example, Mangum 2018.

¹⁰⁵ Fernández Marcos 1994, 255–7.

¹⁰⁶ Cox 1987, 202–3; Fernández Marcos 1994, 257–9.

¹⁰⁷ Witte 2016, 419–20; 2020.

¹⁰⁸ Gammie 1985.

¹⁰⁹ Cook 2011.

¹¹⁰ Kwon 2019.

¹¹¹ Gehman 1949; Gard 1953; 1954.

expressed the belief in resurrection that God grants (14:14, 3:21, 4:20, 5:11, 6:10, 7:9, 14:22, 40:13, 42:17).¹¹²

It has been claimed that the OG translator made efforts to make the narrative frame and the dialogues more connected and in tune, by either adding connecting words (for example, *δικαιος* to describe Job) or paraphrasing verses that would bring in conflict between them. Moreover, the translator's overall ability of strengthening the connection between different parts of the book, for example the opposite ends of the narrative frame¹¹³, or between the narrative frame and the dialogues¹¹⁴ has been noted. Anaphoric translation technique also shows that the translator knew the book very well.

Textual criticism

The LXX translations of individual books of the HB have been used to emend the MT, mostly by retroversion. However, with translations such as OG Job, where the *Vorlage* is assumed to be very similar to the current MT, but the Greek text is very different from the MT, the value for textual criticism¹¹⁵ is evaluated to be rather negative.

The general agreement is that the OG translation, with its liberties, including minuses and pluses, should be used with much caution, if at all, to restore corrupted words or passages¹¹⁶. Some have noted that the OG and other versions may help with some difficult parts in the Hebrew text, even if not directly, but may not help with others¹¹⁷. Gard has theorised that even in passages where the Greek translator extensively rewrites or paraphrases, some traces of the underlying Hebrew text can be detected, including the sequence of verses. Similarly, Aejmelaeus has noted that while using "free" translations with good Greek usage (including Job) in textual criticism of the HB is difficult, it should still be done to determine the relationship between the Greek and Hebrew. She also reminds us that the *Vorlage* of OG, in all likelihood, will never be recovered.¹¹⁸ The importance of paying attention not only to morphology, syntax, and vocabulary, but also to general style, including poetic techniques and literary structures, in textual criticism of the HB has been emphasised in the recent years¹¹⁹.

¹¹² Fohrer 1963, 55–6.

¹¹³ Cox 2016b; Seow 2023, 42–3.

¹¹⁴ Dafni 2007, 52–4.

¹¹⁵ The main aim of textual criticism is to find the possible original reading and textual form of a literary work before any modifications were made to it either intentionally or unintentionally (such as by scribes). In this case, this literary work is the HB, whose Hebrew sources and its ancient translations are utilised in trying to find the original reading. On textual criticism of the HB, see for example Steck 1998; Tov 2001; Kooij 2008; Würthwein 2014, 165; Tov 2015; Screnock 2021; Salvesen 2021.

¹¹⁶ See, for example, Fohrer 1963, 55; Ziegler 1971; Heater 1982, 5–6; Wevers 1996, 88, 93; Strawn 2017, 456.

¹¹⁷ See, for example, Dhorme 1967, cxcī–cxcīī; Gray 1974; 2010, 87; Cox 2015a, 393; 2017, 179.

¹¹⁸ Gard 1967, 14; Aejmelaeus 1987, 65.

¹¹⁹ Screnock 2021, 139.

Respecting these opinions, *in this dissertation*, all passages, including problematic ones, will be worked on a case-by-case basis, individually, and taking into consideration the peculiarities of translation technique and style. Further, this is not done only on the verse-level, but also on the possible strophe-level, because some differences and changes may reflect or be influenced by others in the surrounding verses. Additionally, this study does not only pay attention to morphology, syntax, and vocabulary, but also the poetic style, also on the strophe-level. On this larger level, the problems associated with word- or verse-level emendations, especially in cases of paraphrases and stylisations, can be bypassed. From these cases general conclusions can be made on the validity of the emendations proposed in previous scholarship, thus determining the value of OG Job's style for textual criticism.

Literary growth of Hebrew Job and redaction criticism

Some of the most notable researchers of Hebrew Job agree that the book grew over centuries. This means that the Book of Job that we read now from the MT is not what it was in its earliest days. In its oldest and shortest form, it is sometimes dated to the 6th or 5th century BCE, Hartley goes as far as to say that the book is from the 7th century BCE¹²⁰. More specifically, the growth has been hypothesised to have happened (1) from the 5th to the 3rd century BCE (Witte); (2) from the 5th to the 2nd century (Vermeylen); (3) from the 4th to the 2nd century BCE (Nömmik); (4) from 450 to 350 BCE (Habel). The growth has been theorised on the basis of thematic, theological, ideological, textual, lexical, and colometrical differences in the sections of the book.

In this dissertation, one of the aims is to find out whether the OG translator noticed any of the later additions in any capacity. Numerous theories on the literary growth of the Hebrew book of Job can be found. It is not the purpose of this dissertation to provide another one. Instead, it is hoped that the OG translation can shed some light on some of the critical problems in the Hebrew text of Job.

For the Book of Job, the most influential models of literary growth come from Markus Witte, who in turn inspired the models of Urmas Nömmik, Jürgen van Oorschot, Otto Kaiser, and Wolf-Dieter Syring. In a unique way, Jacques Vermeylen created his own model.¹²¹ These models are referenced and used throughout this dissertation. For a detailed overview of their models, see Appendix I of this dissertation. In this brief introduction, some agreements and disagreements are discussed.

On the distinction of the prose narrative and the poetic dialogues, the main argument is whether they were, at first, separate pieces of literature and later connected to each other, or were they created at approximately the same time and together. The scholars, whose work was consulted for this dissertation, agree that

¹²⁰ Hartley 1988, 17–20.

¹²¹ van Oorschot 1987; Witte 1994a; Syring 2004; Kaiser 2006; van Oorschot 2007; Nömmik 2010; Witte 2021; Nömmik 2025.

they were separate pieces at first and were connected into a single book of Job later.

Although Elihu speeches are not studied in this dissertation, they are an example of a major agreement in terms of literary growth. None of the scholars, whose work was consulted for this dissertation, think that the Elihu speeches were original to the poem of Job. There are disagreements, however, on when these speeches were incorporated into it. Witte maintains that the Elihu speeches were added after the narrative and poem were connected into one book; Kaiser positions the speeches and the Elihu redactor after lowliness redaction, but before majesty redaction; Syring thinks that they are not original but very old and were added to the poem before it was connected to the narrative; Van Oorschot thinks that they were added with the righteousness redaction; Nömmik considers Elihu speeches originally a separate work that were added to Job after reworking Job's last monologue but before the transience redactions; Vermeylen positions them into the third redaction (out of four), added with a large group of other additions.

In the speeches that are analysed in this dissertation, the following sections may have been added later to the Hebrew text.

The sections 4:12–21, 15:11–16, and 25:1–6 are later additions, categorised under the lowliness redaction after Witte. Witte himself dates this redaction as early, to the period when the narrative and poem were still separate; others think that this redaction was later (Kaiser) or even very late (Syring, van Oorschot, Nömmik, Vermeylen).

Job's final monologue is thought to be very partly original, consisting originally of 30:20–23, 31:35–37. The beginning and end of ch. 31 are thought to be later. How late, however, is a matter of disagreement: Witte positions 31:1–3, 38–40a in the righteousness redaction (final identifiable redaction); Van Oorschot places vv. 31:1–3, 11f, 15, 18, 23, 28, 33f, 38–40 also in the righteousness redaction (second to last stage of identifiable editing); very similarly, Kaiser positions vv. 31:1–3, 11–12, 15, 18, 23, 28, 34c, 38–40b in the righteousness redaction (also one of the final identifiable redactions); Nömmik thinks the end of ch. 31 was added with the late *Fortschreibungen* and that the beginning in vv. 1–4 added so late that it may have been missing from the OG *Vorlage*; Syring, however, places 31:1–34, 38–40a in the first redaction (at the same time that the narrative and poem were connected); and Vermeylen places 31:1–10, 13–17, 19–22, 24–35aa, 38–40a in the second redaction.

Sections 12:7–13:2 and 39:13–18 are later: Witte and Kaiser position these into the majesty redaction (one of the later redactions); Syring positions these into the theological editing (final stage of growth before glosses). Van Oorschot, however, positions them into fear-of-God redaction, the first stage of redactions; Vermeylen places 13:1–2 in the second redaction and the passages of ch. 12 in the third redaction. Most distinctly, Nömmik attributes 12:7–8, 10–25 and 13:1–2 to the book editor, the first editor of Job; 39:13–18 was such a late *Fortschreibung* that it was possibly missing in the OG *Vorlage*.

Vv. 30:1–8 are considered very late: Witte, Kaiser, van Oorschot position these verses in the righteousness redaction (final or one of the final identifiable

redactions); Syring places them in the theological editing (final redaction); Vermeylen places them in the fourth and last redaction of the book. Nömmik differs from the others a bit and claims that 30:1c–d, 5–8 was added as a late *Fort-schreibung* whereas vv. 2–4 might be such a late addition that they may have been missing from the OG *Vorlage*; v. 3c is a gloss that cannot be dated.

There is no consensus whether vv. 12:4–6 are later or not. Syring thinks that these verses were original to the poem of Job, whereas Witte and van Oorschot place them in righteousness redaction (final or one of the final identifiable redactions), Kaiser in the majesty redaction (one of the later redactions; vv. 12:4–13:2, 39:13–18, 29:1 + many other passages), and Vermeylen places vv. 12:3b–12, 14–15 in the third redaction (out of four). For Nömmik, vv. 12:3c–6* and 9 are glosses that cannot be dated.

These are some of the bigger sections that all of these scholars have covered in their models. In this dissertation, these and others possibly later verses will be discussed in the relevant sections of the commentary.

The value of OG Job for redaction criticism¹²² has been very rarely covered in literature. One aspect, which relates also to textual criticism, is that the *Vorlage* of OG Job represents a stage in the literary growth of Hebrew Job. Witte has noted that the translator has made more frequent omissions in those sections of Job that have been by some, including himself, found to be secondary to the book (24:14–18, 28:14–19, 39:13–18). He finds that the *Vorlage* of the translation must have been different from the MT in some respects. Wevers argues for the *Vorlage* of OG being earlier than the MT and also diverging from it and emphasises the fact that the development of Hebrew Job continued after the Greek translation. Fernández Marcos has argued, however, that the book was translated into Greek when it had already been completed in Hebrew, i.e. after the “literary formation and growing.”¹²³

Firstly, studying omissions and changes on the strophic level could give a step towards finding out whether some passages were indeed missing in the *Vorlage* and thereby representing a stage before Hebrew Job stopped growing. That is, if omissions in strophes in general follow the same logic, we might not be able to judge any of the passages in Hebrew to be younger than the OG *Vorlage*. If the omissions in strophes are not all the same, we might be able to give some preliminary judgments on the state and length of the *Vorlage*. Secondly, redaction critics have judged some passages to be secondary because they do not fit too well in the general context. If some additions were at first integrated into the main text a bit poorly by the redactors, it could have resulted in later scribes making errors. If some abruptness or inconsistency was noticed in the *Vorlage* by the OG translator, we might assume that some of the abrupt parts coincide with suspected later additions. If so, these could have been very late ones that had not been copied

¹²² Redaction criticism studies the growth and expansion of a literary work, identifying the hypothetical original layer of a work and later additions to it. On redaction criticism of the HB, see for example Steck 1998. The theory and models of literary growth of Hebrew Job are discussed above, throughout the chapters, and in Appendix I.

¹²³ Fernández Marcos 1994, 251; Wevers 1996, 87; Witte 2007, 37.

and edited as much as the earlier ones. If some passages were adopted early on, the text kept being copied and then kept being expanded, the earlier additions might have been integrated more and more smoothly as time went on and could thus have been less objectionable for the translator. Thus, the value of the (strophic) style of OG Job for redaction criticism is evaluated in two ways *in this dissertation*—in terms of later additions being somehow noticed or bothersome and in terms of omissions correlating to a shorter *Vorlage*.

Nature and structure of the dissertation

Translation is simply a translation in the best of conditions when the source text is well preserved and there are no issues in reading the script or handwriting. However, when we add circumstances such as handwritten scrolls that are not easy to handle and may be damaged at some points, possibly different handwritings in one scroll, the troubles of interpreting a consonantal text with no punctuation or division of units, and finally, aside from the textual issues, poetic expressions and frequent use of rare vocabulary, not to mention possible contradictions and out of balance structures in the text due to the literary growth over centuries, the translation process is turned into a mix of decoding, understanding, interpreting, and then translating.

The present research will be trying to bridge these two aspects of Job: the style of the OG translation and the textual peculiarities and the literary growth of the Hebrew text that had their influence on the translator. This approach aims to be novel in attempting to give an understanding of both the style of OG Job itself, i.e. the first fully attested ancient translation, Jewish exegesis, and interpretation of the book of Job, and the value of this translation and its style in the textual, literary, and redaction criticism of Hebrew Job. In short, the main research question is: **Can the style of OG Job help find answers to textual, literary, and redaction critical questions of Hebrew Job?**

Methodologically, the focus is on close reading both the OG and the MT of Job, in order to determine the poetic structure of the speeches. Thus, the dissertation firstly surveys and maps relevant poetic techniques used in the speeches of Job, having the macro-level, which is the strophic level, as the focal point. In determining the macro-level structure of the speeches in Job, the approaches to the Hebrew text and methods used by van der Lugt and Fokkelman have made the greatest influence; the cursory studies into the macro-level structure of OG Job by Dhont, Cox, and Häberlein have been extremely helpful. In mapping poetic techniques overall, inspiration and impulses have been found in the works and methods of Dhont¹²⁴, Cox, Cook, van der Lugt, and Nömmik, who have been referenced throughout these introductory sections.

From the start, the working assumption has been that the OG translator had their own ideas and understanding of the style and poetics of the book of Job. These ideas can be identified and described. Identification of these ideas may help

¹²⁴ Cf. similar approach to Psalms in Jones 2021.

explain the translator's decisions regarding the Hebrew source text on the micro- and macro-level.

In this attempt, the following research questions form and influence the course of the analysis and the research task at hand:

(1) Are the speeches in OG Job strophic in structure just like their Hebrew counterparts?

(2) If the speeches in OG Job are strophic in structure, does the OG translator work on the level of the strophe when stylising and introducing changes to the text?

(3) If the translator does work on the level of the strophe, in both style and contents, are the differences and intentional changes in relation to the Hebrew text systematic?

(4) If the translator made regular, systematic changes to the text, both stylistically and in contents, how do these relate to differences in verses that are considered to be problematic in Hebrew? Were some changes made because of the difficult Hebrew? Were these changes harmonised with the context of the strophe and the speech? Are there any similarities in these changes, additions, and omissions that could shed light on the issues of the Hebrew text? Do the differences and changes coincide with suspected later additions to the Hebrew text (redactions)?

Therefore, the OG translation is compared to the Hebrew text, which itself is looked at both diachronically (literary growth) and synchronically (current MT). By this multifaceted and experimental comparison it is hoped that we can gain some insight into whether and how the OG translator noticed the poetic structure of the Hebrew Job (relating to the literary criticism of Hebrew Job), textual irregularities (relating to the textual criticism of Hebrew Job), and later additions (relating to the redaction criticism of Hebrew Job) in their *Vorlage* and if these triggered differences on a larger scale than a single verse.

Studying all of the speeches in the book of Job in such a manner is not feasible in a dissertation, and thus a selection of speeches was made. The dissertation is structured around these chosen speeches chosen for study, i.e. chs. 4–5, 8, 12–14, 15, 19, 21, 25, 29–31, 38–39, and 40–41. These speeches were chosen for several varied reasons. Firstly, in both Greek and Hebrew, they represent varied stages of textual difficulties. For example, ch. 8 contains no asterisked passages and also has less textual problems in the Hebrew; chs. 4–5, 15, and 25 contain passages from the lowliness redaction (à la Witte) and have therefore characteristics to compare. Chs. 19 and 21 contain interesting theological discussion points and ch. 21 also has a large minus in OG that surprisingly has not been considered secondary by redaction critics. Chs. 29–31 were chosen because of how different the three chapters in one speech are and especially because ch. 30 is notoriously difficult and the Greek translation has major divergencies. The speeches of God were chosen as a certain control group as previous scholarship has emphasised the fact that the translator's omissions waned in these. Most of these speeches (chs. 4–5,

19, 21, 29–31, 38–39, and 40:6–41:26) were additionally read and discussed with the participants of the project “The Emergence of the Biblical Book of Job on the Backdrop of the so-called Job Literature” at the University of Tartu. Overall, the choice of speeches under study reflects a variety in terms of textual problems in Hebrew, asterisked passages in Greek, and overall length.

Due to the overall large volume of text analysed in these ten speeches, the main body of the dissertation is formatted as a commentary with the initial conclusions made right away. Each speech is briefly and broadly introduced with information about the topic and theme of the speech, division into strophes according to the OG text, a list of the asterisked verses in Greek, and verses thought to be secondary in the Hebrew text.

Each strophe, according to the OG text, has its own sub-chapter¹²⁵ and is analysed regarding its style and differences between OG and MT, including issues related to textual and redaction criticism of the Hebrew text. With style, the stylistic and poetic techniques that the translator used in their translation, whether independently or reflecting from the Hebrew, is meant. These are the techniques that have been covered in the introduction to this dissertation.

Under differences, everything that has changed during the translation process, whether it is an unusual translation choice for a specific word, change of person or time, a partial or complete paraphrase and so on, is documented and discussed. Differences that are due to different verb government rules or prepositions taking different cases in Greek are not counted as explicit changes unless they significantly alter the meaning. For example, some compound verbs in Greek take their object in a particular case according to their prefix not their main word. Under omissions are categorised the nontranslation of suffixes, words, phrases, whole cola, and verses that are explicitly not translated by the Greek translator. Under additions, very explicitly added words that have no clear source in the MT are considered; this does not mean that they were not there in the specific manuscript of the *Vorlage*.

For the readers’ convenience, differences and changes are already categorised (the categories are underlined in the chapters, and verse numbers are emphasised in bold and italics), although not with absolute certainty, as many of the categorisations can be argued with. These differences can be intentional (style, syntax, rhetorics, religion and religious law) or unintentional (reading or vocalising the consonantal text differently than the later Masoretes, the *Vorlage* being different than the later MT, unknown words). If the other Greek translations and other versions (11Q10, P, Vg) have translated in the same or similar way, we may assume that the difference was already there in the pre-MT and the specific *Vorlage*. If OG is the only one that translates a certain way, then again, we can see the reasons behind it either in the specific manuscript of the *Vorlage* or in the intentional way that the translator handles the text. Thus, the proposed reasons for differences between the Hebrew and the Greek are the following: reading or vocalising the consonantal text differently than the later Masoretes; intentional

¹²⁵ To find the commentary of only certain verses or strophes, the reader is invited to refer to the table of contents at the very beginning of this dissertation.

changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics; changes regarding religion or religious culture and law; utilising the context or the translator's previous knowledge for the meaning of unknown words; *Vorlage* different than the later MT; problems with the *Vorlage* manuscript; later Greek manuscript corruption; translator's limited vocabulary; possibly ideological or personal changes. For some differences, a definite source cannot be given with the evidence that we currently have, and they are categorised as “differences that are harder to explain.”

After the commentary chapters, the dissertation is concluded thoroughly. Summaries and conclusions are made on the main findings, characteristics of the translator's activities in both style and text. The conclusions are structured in a way that ties together the style with conclusions about the value of the style of OG for literary criticism, textual criticism, and redaction criticism of Hebrew Job. General summaries of the dissertation can be found in both English and Estonian.

This dissertation has three appendices. Appendix I gives an overview of different models of the growth of Hebrew Job that are regularly referenced throughout. The main points of each scholar's model and the order in which they think Job grew are listed. Appendix II covers a selection of different strophic divisions of the Hebrew speeches while in the main body of the dissertation, division according to the Greek text is used. Appendix III covers the full text and NRSVUE/NETS translations of the speeches (adjusted where needed) analysed in this dissertation. In the Greek and Hebrew texts, the following are marked: strophes and verse numbers according to the Greek text; lexical repetitions (bold), similes (double underline), parallelistic structures (/ next to the verse), transition markers (single underline), rare vocabulary (grey background); additions and omissions (boxed¹²⁶). The text of the speeches is not repeated in the body of the dissertation.

Finally, a note on the texts used for analysis. The editions that are the basis for the analysis are BHS¹²⁷ for the Hebrew and Ziegler's Göttingen edition¹²⁸ for the OG. For both Hebrew and Greek several different English translations are consulted, including the NRSVUE and NETS; these two are also used in the appendices of this dissertation. Pietersma wrote a review on Ziegler's edition a couple of years after its publication. Following are the main flaws he sees in it. Firstly, Ziegler had discarded over 20 manuscripts, which might or might not have been crucial in some passages. Secondly, he very rightly criticises the compiling of an ecclesiastical text that punctuates also the non-OG or asterisked parts (making it look, while asterisked, as a joined part of the rest), thus straying from the rest of the Göttingen LXX editions. Third, he sees terminological confusion throughout, especially concerning LXX- *versus* Theodotion-Job. Fourth, Pietersma does not agree with all textual critical decisions concerning asterisked

¹²⁶ In the Greek text, a boxed word or section refers to a plus in comparison to the MT; in the Hebrew text, a boxed word or section refers to a plus in comparison to the OG.

¹²⁷ Based on the Codex Leningradensis.

¹²⁸ Based mainly on Codex Vaticanus but additionally covers over 60 Greek manuscripts and several early papyri, daughter versions, and early commentaries are utilised as well. Greek Job in full is preserved in Alexandrinus, Vaticanus, and Sinaiticus; however, only the Sahidic and Vetus Latina translations of represent the shorter OG.

passages (especially some of those that differ from Rahlfs' edition). Moreover, he mentions flaws in paying attention to translation technique and Greek usage. Overall, he is not satisfied with Ziegler's work, despite it being more advanced than the previous ones.¹²⁹ Peter Gentry has proposed some corrections to Ziegler's edition concerning asterisks and the text itself as well¹³⁰.

¹²⁹ Pietersma 1985.

¹³⁰ Gentry 1995, 536–7.

JOB 4-5

Introduction

Chapters 4–5 contain the first speech of Eliphaz: *Eliphaz reproaches Job and emphasises that the pure should not be afraid, even if God chastens them, they will get their blessings in the end.*

In the OG translation, the speech divides into 15 strophes:

- I (4:2–5, 4B) *Addressing and reproaching Job.*
- II (4:6–9, 4B) *If you are pure, your fear is groundless.*
- III (4:10–12b, 3B) *Illustration with lions and first conclusion.*
- IV (4:12c–16, 1M3B1T) *Introducing and describing the auditory “vision”.*
- V (4:17–21, 2B1T2B) *Retelling and explaining the auditory “vision”.*
- VI (5:1–2, 2B) *An exhortation and a warning to fools.*
- VII (5:3–5, 1B2T) *Curses against fools.*
- VIII (5:6–7, 2B) *A proverb about hardship.*
- IX (5:8–10, 3B) *Beseeching the Lord who does wonderful things in nature.*
- X (5:11–13, 3B) *Beseeching the Lord who deals justly with people.*
- XI (5:14–16, 3B) *Curses against the unjust and prayers for the weak.*
- XII (5:17–19, 3B) *The chastening from the Lord is a blessing.*
- XIII (5:20–23, 1T1B1T) *The seven troubles He will save you from.*
- XIV (5:24–26, 3B) *Your blessings after God’s chastening.*
- XV (5:27, 1T) *Conclusion: we are right, you should think it over.*

Some **keywords** are repeated throughout the speech. For example, אָבַד “to perish” is used four times in Hebrew ch. 4 (vv. 7, 9, 11, and 20) but not even once in ch. 5. The Greek translator noticed this repeating word and made it a keyword that unites both chapters. Thus, ἀπόλλυμι translates all of the occurrences of אָבַד in Hebrew but is additionally used either as a translation equivalent of a synonym or completely independently in 4:7 for a second time, 4:9 and 21 and 5:11 and 15. Theonyms are used in both chapters multiple times in both languages. In both languages, “hope” (תְּקוּהָה and ἐλπίς) is used in 4:6 and 5:16.

The Greek text of this speech contains no asterisked passages; however, v. 23 only has one colon where Hebrew 23a is untranslated. This means that the OG translation covers or should cover more or less the whole speech that has been preserved in the MT. Although there are no asterisked passages which usually would bring about changes in the strophic structure of the translation, there still seem to be differences with different divisions of the Hebrew text (cf. Appendix II). Thus, special care needs to be taken in the critical analysis of those strophes where the strophe division does not match with Hebrew at all or very few think that it does. There is no regular length to the strophes, especially in ch. 4; in ch. 5, strophes of three bicola are often found.

Although **the Hebrew text** of chs. 4–5 is thought to have been in the original Job-poem, there seems to be a general consensus of redaction critics after Markus Witte that Eliphaz’ vision description in 4:12–21 was added later to the speech. Vv. 5:5, either fully or partly, and 5:22 are also considered to be secondary by several scholars. Specifics of smaller additions are discussed in relevant parts of the commentary; for fuller details on each scholar’s theories, see the introduction to this dissertation and Appendix I.

According to Markus Witte, Job 4–5 belonged, in large parts, to the original Job-poem (“Hiobdichtung A”): 4:1–11; 5:1–5a, c, 6–9, 11–21, 23–27. In the second stage of development (“Hiobdichtung B,” poem and prose were still separate), vv. 4:12–21 (Eliphaz’ vision) were added by the lowliness redactor (along with 15:11–16 and ch. 25). Next, in the book redaction, the introductory formula in 4:1 was added. In the final stage (stage 7) of development, among the additions of uncertain origin and glosses, vv. 5:5b, 10, 22 were added. Witte considers the speech unified in terms of composition and theme; however, vv. 4:12–21 do not fit in terms of language, style, and content (the idea of the fundamental corruption of man); these verses are not colometrically harmonious, and they break the strophic pattern of the speech.¹³¹

According to Urmes Nõmmik’s theory, this speech belonged to the original poem of Job. Some passages of it, however, were added later. To the original form of the speech (the poem that first appears among sources) in five strophes (4:2–6, 4:7–11, 5:1–2+6–7, 5:8+18–21, 23–27) were later added (in assumed chronological order) the prose introduction in 4:1 (first layer of redactions); 4:12–20b and 21 (sixth layer of redactions, the so-called lowliness redaction; it contradicts Eliphaz’ views in his original speeches), and 5:9–10 (a late *Fortschreibung* that relies on the book editor and 9:10, i.e. the first stage of redactions), 5:11–17 (a late *Fortschreibung* on justice), 5:(3)4–5 (a gloss), 5:22 (a gloss). Nõmmik thinks that vv. 4:12–21 were added later in the lowliness redaction because this section emphasises the fundamental corruptness of man as compared to God. In agreement with Witte, he also mentions colometric differences with the rest of the speech and points out that tricola were not probably present in the original layer of the Job-poem and thus indicate a later addition. Further, the addition makes the beginning a simple w-conjunction rather than an emphatic particle. He also notes that curiously there are no lexical repetitions in the whole of the addition.¹³²

Jürgen van Oorschot thinks that this speech belonged to the original poetic dialogue of Job almost wholly. In his five-stage redaction model, he places 4:12–21 in the last stage, added by the lowliness redactor.¹³³

Wolf-Dieter Syring also agrees that this speech was in the original poem. In the first redaction, the introductory 4:1 was added. In stage four of the development of the book (third stage of editing, “Anthropologische Bearbeitung”)

¹³¹ Witte 1994a, 74, 169–71, 191–2; 2021, 57–9.

¹³² Nõmmik 2010, 24–5; 2013, 27–9, 39, 143–53; 2014a, 286; 2025; 2026.

¹³³ van Oorschot 2007, 171–84.

Eliphaz' vision in vv. 4:12–21 was added along with 15:11–16 and 25:1–6; he largely follows Witte in his explanations.¹³⁴

Otto Kaiser believes that the original poem consisted of 4:2–11; 5:1–2, 6–8, 18–21, 23–27. The introductory formula in 4:1 was added by the book redactor. The lowliness redactor added vv. 4:12–16a, b, 17–19a, b, 20–21. Even later, the righteousness redactor added vv. 5:3–5b, 9–17. Finally, glosses in vv. 4:16c, 19c, 5:10, and 22 were added.¹³⁵

Jacques Vermeylen sees the oldest layer (“*rédaction* I”) to be 4:2–11 and 5:2, 8–16. In *rédaction* III, 4:12–21, 5:3–7 (5:5b–7), and 5:17–27 were inserted. The vision narrative disrupts the topic of God repressing evildoers, also making Job seem more guilty (especially v. 17). The addition is coloured with “théologie anti-humaniste” (also found in the Sirach-school), quite similar to other secondary passages like 15:14–16 and 25:2–6. The verses target man in general but more specifically the Hellenised one. Vermeylen also sees similarities with Elihu speeches. Although there are some inconsistencies, he finds that *rédaction* III fits the ideas presented in these verses the best. In 5:17–27, he sees the characteristics of the anti-humanist Sirach-school, for example the expression of the happiness, blessedness (אשרי) is typical of this school. All in all, the message of the final happiness is what the second part of the prose epilogue (41:10–13.16b–17) and Elihu (33:19–22) tell. Further, the word אנוש in v. 17 also appeared in 4:17. The whole of v. 17 is parallel to Prov 3:11–12 (from the Hellenistic period) and Job 33:19 (*rédaction* III). He sees parallels with Prov 30:15–33 and 6:16–19 due to the number mentioned (six and seven) in v. 19. Without the added verses the speech originally ended similarly to the other friends' speeches, in vv. 15–16. In *rédaction* IV, 5:1 was added.¹³⁶

I: 4:2–5

Style

The first strophe of the speech is made up of four bicola in vv. 4:2–5. The last colon, however, is considerably shorter than the others in Greek, and thus can be a structural way of marking the end of the strophe. Notably, the last verse in Hebrew displays colometric imbalance (17 + 12 consonants). Although several words in this strophe can function as transition markers, the one that actually marks the beginning of the speech (and several strophes in the speech) is the yes-no interrogative מִלֵּךְ, reflecting the -ה in Hebrew. The end of the strophe is marked with the temporal expression עַתָּה וְעַתָּה “and now,” which reflects the Hebrew כִּי עַתָּה “but now.”

The beginning of the speech and the strophe is also marked with non-parallelism, when compared to the rest of the strophe: v. 3 has a partial chiasmus in Greek (xABC/xC'B') and Hebrew (xAB/xB'A'); v. 4 has a partial chiasmus in Greek (ABC/A'C'B') but a partial symmetry in Hebrew (ABC/xA'B'); and

¹³⁴ Syring 2004, 147, 165–6, 168–73.

¹³⁵ Kaiser 2006, 125.

¹³⁶ Vermeylen 2015, 154–9, 180–2, 329, 349.

v. 5 has a (partial) symmetry in Greek (xABC/xA'B'DE) and Hebrew (xABxA'/A'B'xA'').

There are two lexical repetitions in Greek: *ῥημάτων/ῥήμασιν* (“of words/with words”) in 2b/4a, which reflects the repetition of *במלין/מליך* (“from/with words, speaking” and “your words, speaking”) in Hebrew; and *ἀσθενοῦς/ἀσθενοῦντάς* (“of the weak one/the weak”) in 3b/4a, which is independent from the Hebrew. In Hebrew, the strophe is framed with the repeated phrase *אלריך תלאה/אלריך ותלא* (“to you, you are weary”) in 2a and 5a.

In the Hebrew text, a rare word has been used in 3b, namely the adjective *רפות* (“weak”; 4x, Job: 1). In 2b/4a, the noun *מלה* “word, speech, utterance” is considered (in BDB) poetic, and it is especially prevalent in Job.

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 2a*, the adverb *πολλάκις* “often” is added for emphasis. The two-word phrase *הנסה דבר* “he tries a word” is shortened into *λελάληται* “it has been told/spoken.” *In 3b*, the Hebrew *וידיים רפות תחזק* “and you have strengthened weak hands” has been paraphrased into *καὶ χεῖρας ἀσθενοῦς παρεκάλεσας* “and you have comforted the hands of the weak”. Since the beginning of the speech has different words concerning “speaking,” *καλέω* is used in a colon where Hebrew has no words related to speaking. *In 4a*, the (collective) singular *כושל* “the person who stumbles, is weak” is translated into plural *ἀσθενοῦντάς* “those who are weakened” while the phrase *מליך יקימון* “your words raise” has been paraphrased into *ἐξανέστησας ῥήμασιν* “you have raised with words”. *In 4b*, the Hebrew *וברכים כרעות תאמץ* “and you strengthen feeble knees” has been paraphrased into *γόνασιν τε ἀδυνατοῦσιν θάρσος περιέθηκας* “and you have put courage around feeble knees”, changing syntax but also emphasising the verb. In both cola, the imperfective has been translated with the perfective. *In 5b*, the pronoun *σύ* “you” is added to the emphatic first position.

Reading or vocalising the consonantal text differently than the later Masoretes. *In v. 2a*, *תלאה*, vocalised as the second person singular verb “you are weary, impatient” by the Masoretes was understood as the noun *תְּלָאָה* “hardship” and translated accordingly with the prepositional phrase *ἐν κόπῳ* “in weariness, tiredness”. *In v. 2b*, the infinitive construct *ועצר* “and the restraining of” is possibly read as the adjective *ועָרַץ* “and dreadful” (without the *mater*; so Dhorme¹³⁷) and translated with *ισχύν δὲ* “the force of”. Thus, the question “who has the ability of restraining (your) words” is paraphrased into *ισχύν δὲ ῥημάτων σου τίς ὑποίσει;* “but who shall endure the force of your words?”, where the clarifying pronoun *σου* is added.¹³⁸ *In v. 3a*, where the Hebrew interjection *הנה* “behold” is possibly read as *הן* and thus translated with the conditional *εἰ γὰρ σὺ* “if for you”¹³⁹, and

¹³⁷ Dhorme 1967, 42.

¹³⁸ Vg has expanded the “speech” as well and translates *sed conceptum sermonem tenere quis possit* “but who can withhold the words that have been conceived?”. A different reading of *ועצר* cannot be ruled out here, either.

¹³⁹ Cf. also Dhorme 1967, 43.

in v. 5a, where וְתָלַא, vocalised as the second person singular verb (“you are weary”, although this time without the final ה) was once again read as the noun תְּלָא “hardship” and translated with πόνος “distress”¹⁴⁰. Orlinsky has suggested that the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Greek translation might have been slightly different from the MT in v. 5, namely actually having the noun תְּלָא in 5a and the conjunction -וְ in the beginning of 5b (corresponding to the καὶ in OG 5a)¹⁴¹. However, simple reading variations by the translator explain the differences just as well.

II: 4:6–9

Style

The second strophe of the speech in verses 6–9 is made up of four bicola. Like the previous one, this also begins with a marked yes-no question πότερον οὐχ in Greek, reflecting the הלא in Hebrew.

Similarly to the previous strophe, the beginning is marked with non-parallelism again, this time only in Greek while Hebrew has a regular xOxO pattern¹⁴²: v. 7 has a partial symmetry in Greek (xABC/xB'C'D'), reflecting the symmetry in the Hebrew (xABC/xA'B'C'); v. 8 has a partial symmetry in Greek (ABCD/C'D'EFG); and v. 9 has a symmetry in both Greek (ABC/A'B'C') and Hebrew (ABC/xA'B'C').

The strophe ends with the repetition-initial of the preposition “from” ἀπὸ in Greek, reflecting the repetition of מ in Hebrew. Besides that, the verb “to be” is repeated in 6a/7a: ἐστίν “it is” and ὢν “being”. Further, the verb “to perish” is repeated (end-repetition) thrice within the strophe: in 7ab/9a ἀπώλετο/ἀπώλοντο/ἀπολοῦνται (“he perished”, “they perished”, “they will perish”); of these 7a/9a reflect the Hebrew יאבד/אבד (“he perished”, “they perish”).

Some rare words have been used: in 6b, the noun ἡ ἀκακία “guilelessness, innocence” (23x, LXX: 14; OG Job: 4); in 7b, the adjective ὀλόρριζος, “with the entire root” (3x, LXX: 2, OG Job: 1, Prov: 1¹⁴³); in 8a, the verb ἀροτριάω “to plough” (21x, LXX: 15, OG Job: 2, but only once in the poetic part¹⁴⁴).

In the Hebrew text, a couple of marked words have been used as well: in 6a, the noun כְּסִלָּה (כְּסִלָּה “confidence”; rare (2x, Job: 1, Ps: 1) and poetic); and in 7b, the interrogative וַאֲיפֹה “where?” (10x, Job: 2).

¹⁴⁰ Orlinsky 1964, 58–9; Dhorme 1967, 44. Vg double-translates: *venit super te plaga et defecisti*, “the scourge is come upon thee and thou faintest”.

¹⁴¹ Orlinsky 1964, 58–9.

¹⁴² x marks the absence and O the existence of a parallelistic structure.

¹⁴³ Cf. also Mangin 2005, 476, 546.

¹⁴⁴ Cf. also Mangin 2005, 498.

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 6a*, the very rare word כסלתך “your confidence; folly, stupidity”¹⁴⁵ is translated with the phrase ἐστὶν ἐν ἀφροσύνῃ “it is in folly”, omitting the suffix but also adding a verb for clarity. *In 6b*, the conjunction καὶ “and” is added. The plural דרכיך “of your ways” is translated with the singular τῆς ὁδοῦ σου “of your way.” *In 7a*, the particle οὖν “so then” is added for emphasis. The singular masculine participle in the present tense of the verb “to be” ὢν is the result of changing the הוּא in Hebrew into a “to be” verb, which is a common practice of the translator; this choice also creates a lexical repetition with the ἐστὶν in 6a. *In 7b*, the interrogative ואיפה “and where” is translated as ἢ πότε “or when” which is more logical in the context. The verb נכחדו “they were destroyed, cut off” is emphasised into δλόρριζοι ἀπώλοντο “they perished with the entire root” (δλόρριζοι being an addition), thus creating an end-repetition with the previous colon. It is a unique equivalence, but not inappropriate in the context. *In 8a*, the Hebrew כאשר “like what” is Hellenised into καθ’ ὃν τρόπον “in that manner”. The common singular און “wickedness, iniquity” is translated with the plural τὰ ἄτοπα “wicked things, unnatural things.” The translator has inverted v. 8b in a sense: in Hebrew, it is iniquity (און in 8a) and trouble (עמל) that are sowed, and the same is reaped (יקצרהו) “they reap it”), whereas, in Greek, it is the wrongs (αὐτὰ “these”, referencing 8a) that are sowed and torments (ὀδύνας; sg. -> pl.) that are reaped (θεριοῦσιν ἑαυτοῖς “they will reap for themselves”). *In 9b*, the passive γαλὶ “they are consumed” has been translated as explicitly passive in Greek ἀφανισθήσονται “they shall be consumed”, thus keeping the ἀπὸ construction more logical and also bringing it closer to the first colon, where the verb is in middle voice.

Changes regarding religion or religious culture and law. *In 9a*, מנשמת “from the breath of (God)” has been translated as ἀπὸ προστάγματος “from the command of (God)”. Dhorme and Fohrer think this is in order to avoid anthropomorphism¹⁴⁶, however, this is not done in the second colon. The translation choice makes God’s involvement more active and stronger.

III: 4:10–12b

Style

The third strophe is in vv. 10–12b and is made up of three bicola. V. 12 is a tricolon, of which the first two cola look to be a conclusion to this strophe (note also the conclusive conditional sentence εἰ δέ ... ἔν) while the last colon of the verse actually begins a new strophe with a yes-no question. In comparison, the Hebrew has separate strophes in vv. 10–11 and vv. 12–16 (possibly divided into

¹⁴⁵ The word or the verse containing כסלתך is untranslated (15:27) or rewritten (8:14) elsewhere in Job; however, in 31:24 it is understood.

¹⁴⁶ Fohrer 1963, 56; Dhorme 1967, 46.

two sub-strophes). It has to be noted that v. 12 in Hebrew displays slight colometrical imbalance (11 + 15 syllables).

The strophe begins with a symmetric sentence in v. 10 (ABA'B'/A'B'C), which reflects the same symmetry in the Hebrew text (ABxA'B'/xA'B'C).

The only lexical repetition in the strophe is in 10a/11b of λέοντος/λεόντων “of the lion/of the lions”, Hebrew uses synonyms instead.

The Greek translator has used some marked vocabulary, twice reflecting a rare word in Hebrew: in 10a, the noun σθένος “strength” (reflects a rare word in Hebrew; poetic; it is used in Greek literature (epic poetry, tragedy, hymns, treaties), Job (thrice), PsSol 17:14, and 3 Macc. 2:2¹⁴⁷); in 10b, the noun γαυρίαμα “arrogance” (considered literary Koine¹⁴⁸; it is also rare: 6x, LXX: 6, OG Job: 2); in 11a, the *hapax* noun μυρμηκολέων “ant-lion? spotted lion?”¹⁴⁹ (reflects a rare word in Hebrew); and the verb ὤλετο (ὄλλυμι “to perish”; poetic according to Mangin¹⁵⁰ and LSJ but also used in late prose).

In the Hebrew text, several marked words have been used: in 10a, the noun שאגה (שאגה “roaring”; 7x, Job: 2, Ps: 2), and the noun שחל “lion” (7x, Job: 3, Ps: 1, Prov: 1; BDB categorises it under poetic words); in 10b, the *hapax* verb נתעו (נתעו “to break”); in 11a, the noun ליש “lion” (3x, Job: 1, Prov: 1), and the negation בלי “without” (categorised under poetic words in BDB, although it is not absent in prose); finally, in 12b, the noun שמש “whisper” (2x, Job: 2).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 10a*, instead of a synonym for lion (שחל), the Greek translator uses λεαίνης “of the lioness”¹⁵¹. *In 11a*, מבלי טרף “due to lack of” has been translated as παρὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν “due to not having”¹⁵². The common singular לביא “of the lion” is translated into plural λεόντων “of lions,” in parallel with 10b, where the plural of the animal follows that in singular. *In 11b*, the Hebrew יתפרדו “they are separated, scattered” is translated with emphasis as ἑλπιον ἀλλήλους “they left each other”.

Utilising the context or the translator's previous knowledge for the meaning of unknown words. *In 10b*, γαυρίαμα δὲ δρακόντων ἐσβέσθη “and the pride of dragons was extinguished” is used to translate the Hebrew ושני כפירים נתעו “and the teeth of the young lions are broken”. For some reason, γαυρίαμα “pride” has been used instead of a direct translation of ושני “teeth” (Ziegler and LXX.D consider it an *abstractum pro concreto*¹⁵³); this noun has not usually caused trouble for the Greek translator. The parallelism between strength and pride is surely one

¹⁴⁷ Mangin 2005, 475, 564; Dhont 2018a, 145.

¹⁴⁸ Mangin 2005, 502.

¹⁴⁹ On the translation and other issues related to μυρμηκολέων, see for example Mangin 2005, 285, 452–5, 543; Beeckman 2024, 226–7.

¹⁵⁰ Mangin 2005, 546.

¹⁵¹ Cf. also Vulgate with *leaenae*.

¹⁵² παρὰ/διὰ τὸ + infinitive is a common translation equivalent of מבלי in the LXX; therefore, it will only be discussed if the translation brings in a thematic difference as well as the syntactic. Cf. Vg *eo quod non haberet*.

¹⁵³ Ziegler 1971, 12; Kepper and Witte 2011, 2076.

of the motivations for this choice. The noun כפירים “of the young lions” has been translated as δρακόντων “of dragons,” just as in 38:39. Beeckman proposes that the translator did not know the Hebrew word and chose something else that could be appropriate; since “lion” and “dragon” appear together in literature and the Greek Bible, elsewhere, the choice was clear¹⁵⁴. The *hapax* נתעו (possibly Aramaic; assumed to mean “to break”) “they (teeth) were broken” has been translated as ἐσβέσθη “it was extinguished, quenched”¹⁵⁵. Since the word for “teeth” was not translated literally, it may have caused or motivated the change of the verb as well. **In 11a**, again, the synonym for the very rare ליש “lion” has been changed into something else, this time an unknown animal, possibly the antlion, μυρμηκολέων¹⁵⁶.

Reading or vocalising the consonantal text differently than the later Masorettes. **In 11a**, אבד, vocalised as a participle, is understood as a perfect form and translated with ὤλετο “it has perished”.

In 10a, σθένος “strength” translates the rare noun שאגה “roar”; there has been speculation that this is due to later Greek manuscript corruption and originally it read στόνος “groaning” (supported by Minuscel 68 with σθόνος)¹⁵⁷.

The Greek 12ab, εἰ δέ τι ῥῆμα ἀληθινὸν ἐγεγόνει ἐν λόγοις σου οὐθὲν ἄν σοι τούτων κακὸν ἀπήντησεν “But if there had been anything truthful in your words, nothing bad in them would have met you” (colon c will be discussed with the next strophe) does not seem to have an origin, except for ῥῆμα “word”, in the Hebrew text, ואל דבר יגב ותקח אזני שמע מנהו, “Now a word came stealing to me; my ear received the whisper of it”. However, Dhorme has explained that the differences are mainly due to difficult readings in the Hebrew. He posits that the beginning εἰ δέ (“and if”) is due to reading ואל as אלי (“perhaps”). Secondly, ἀληθινὸν “truthful” is a mistake on the Greek side and is supposedly caused by a dittography of the last letter (α) of ῥῆμα and should be λήθινον (“secret”) instead, interpreting thus גנב “to steal.” Next, οὐθὲν ... κακὸν (“nothing ... bad”) would be due to a reading of שמע מנהו¹⁵⁸. As already mentioned in the introduction, the whole of the vision narrative is thought to be secondary and not original to the poem. V. 12 has a different colometric pattern than the rest and therefore may be a later addition, according to Witte; Nömmik adds that the simple waw-conjunction instead of an emphatic particle at the beginning of the strophe is unusual¹⁵⁹. He also notes that curiously there are no lexical repetitions in the whole of the

¹⁵⁴ Beeckman 2024, 223–4. Cf. also Dhont 2018b, 621–2.

¹⁵⁵ Beeckman 2024, 175–6. discusses this in detail and considers it “an adequate rendering”.

¹⁵⁶ In contrast, P has used “lexical levelling” and has translated all five different terms for lions with one. See Szpek 1992, 39–40. Vg opts for a more suitable synonym for lion, *tigris* “tiger”. This suggests that the rare Hebrew word was not exactly known to the translators.

¹⁵⁷ Ziegler 1982, 228; Kepper and Witte 2011, 2076; Seow 2013, 396.

¹⁵⁸ Dhorme 1967, 48. Cf. also Orlinsky 1962, 129. Vg has also slightly extended the verse, probably in order to arrive at a more understandable sentence: *porro ad me dictum est verbum absconditum et quasi furtive susceptum auris mea venas susurri eius* “Now there was a word spoken to me in private, and my ears by stealth, as it were, received the veins of its whisper.” According to Szpek 1992, 173, P and 11Q10 have also recognised, like Vg, that שמע refers to a small sound. She translates P: “and unto me a word was stolen, and my ear received [something] like a small [portion] of it”; and 11Q10: “a part of what had reached”.

¹⁵⁹ In Hebrew, a new strophe begins with v. 12.

addition.¹⁶⁰ It is not a surprise that the translator did not recognise this verse in its entirety to be the beginning of the strophe. We might hypothesise that if the vision narrative was added later (and indeed very late if we follow Nõmmik), it was integrated badly into the main text and the following scribes brought in further errors. The translator did not recognise most of this verse but felt the need to add a conclusion to the strophe. From דבר, and possibly other words in 12a, in a reading that we cannot reconstruct, the translator composed two cola.

IV: 4:12c–16

Style

The fourth strophe of the speech is made up of vv. 12c–16, consisting of a *monocolon*, three *bicola* and a *tricolon* in Greek. In Hebrew, this strophe consists of three *bicola* and a *tricolon* (vv. 12–16). Thus, in Greek, the beginning is marked with a *monocolon* and the end with a *tricolon*, while in Hebrew, the end of the strophe is marked with a *tricolon*.

Again, the strophe begins with a yes-no question, this time only in Greek (marked with *πότερον οὐ*); the strophe ends with the emphasised adversative *ἀλλ’ ἢ* “but” again independently of Hebrew. Moreover, in Greek, the strophe ends with a partial symmetry in 16ab (ABC/A’B’C’DE).

In both languages, only one meaningful lexical repetition occurs: in Greek, in v. 13, φόβος “fear” is used once in both cola of the verse. This partly reflects the enveloping root-repetition of פחד “dread” and הפחיד “it causes dread” in Hebrew v. 14.

The Greek translator has used a couple of words that can be considered marked: in 14b, the verb *συνέσεισεν* “it/they shook” (*συνσείω*; 11x, LXX: 6, OG Job: 1); Mangin considers the noun *αὔρα* “a breeze” in 16c poetic and says it is rare but not absent in prose authors¹⁶¹.

In Hebrew, quite a large amount of marked vocabulary has been used: in 12b, the noun שמך “whisper” (Job: 2); in 13a, the nouns בשעפים (שעפים “disquietings”; Job: 2), and מחזיונות (חזיון “vision”; 9x, Job: 4); in 13b, the noun תרדמה “deep sleep” (7x, Job: 2, Prov: 1); in 14a, the noun ורעדה (רעדה “trembling”; 6x, Job: 1, Ps: 3, Ex 15: 1); in 15a, the verb יחלף (חלף “it passed by” is considered mostly poetic by BDB; in 15b, the verb תסמר (סמר “to bristle up, shiver”; 2x, Job: 1, Ps: 1), and the noun שערת (שערה “hair”; 7x, Job: 1, Ps: 2); in 16b, the noun תמונה “likeness” (10x, Job: 1, Ps: 1); and finally in 16c, the noun דממה “silence” (3x, Job: 1, Ps: 1).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. In 12c, *πότερον οὐ δέξεται μου τὸ οὖς ἐξάίσια παρ’ αὐτοῦ* “Will my ear not receive extraordinary things from him?” which translates Hebrew 12b, ותקח אזני שמך מנהו “my ear received the

¹⁶⁰ Nõmmik 2010, 24–5; 2013, 39, 144, 147–8; Witte 2021, 53–4, 135–6; Nõmmik 2026, 13–5.

¹⁶¹ Mangin 2005, 499.

whisper of it”, the interrogative *πότερον οὐ* “shall not” is added independently, as the translator already knew that yes-no questions are frequently used to mark the beginning of strophes. As the Hebrew had no such interrogative or question here, the translator felt the need to add it. The imperfect ותקח “and it receives,” is here translated with the future *δέξεται* “it will receive,” omitting or not reading the conjunction. Contextually, a past tense would make more sense here and thus the future seems out of place. **In 14b**, the noun ורב “and an abundance, multitude” is translated with the adverb *καὶ μεγάλως* “and greatly”. **V. 15b** has been paraphrased: תסמר בשער בשרי “the hair of my flesh bristles/stands up” is translated as *ἔφριξαν δέ μου τρίχες καὶ σάρκες* “my hairs and flesh bristled up”; both hair and flesh have been used in the plural in the Greek translation and separately (omitting the construct chain), which also required the changed of the verb into plural (Hebrew imperfect translated into aorist). **In 16a**, the verb יעמד “it stands, arises” is translated into first person singular *ἀνέστην* “I stood up”¹⁶², and **in 16b**, מראהו “its appearance” (from MT 16a) is translated as *εἶδον* “I saw”, omitting the suffix; Seow suggests that the Greek originally read *εἶδος* “shape, form” but got corrupt over time¹⁶³; however, manuscript evidence does not support that. In Hebrew, there was a form before the speaker’s eyes, whereas in the OG and the P, this is changed into the opposite: the speaker heard a voice and did not see any form before his eyes (*καὶ οὐκ ἤν μορφῇ* and *לֹא־בִּלְאִי*; the negation is added by the translators), therefore Eliphaz heard an audition instead of seeing a vision¹⁶⁴. In 16c, *ἀλλ’ ἢ* “but instead” is added for contrast.

Utilising the context or the translator's previous knowledge for the meaning of unknown words. **In 12c** (Hebrew 12b), the very rare שמץ “whisper” is translated as *ἐξαισία* “portentous; extraordinary things”; this word occurs twice in Job, both times translated differently. **In 13a**, another very rare noun בשעפים “amid disquietings” is translated as the subject of the clause, φόβος “fear” (singular, although some manuscripts attest the plural)¹⁶⁵. Another rare noun מחזינות “from visions” (plural) is replaced with the second subject, ἡχώ “sound” (singular), לילה “of night” (noun) is translated into an adjective νυκτερινή “of the night” corresponding with “sound.” **In 13b**, yet another rare noun תרדמה “deep sleep” is also translated with φόβος “fear” in OG Job, both in here and in the similar 33:15¹⁶⁶. Thus, a repetition is created but also closer affinity with the shuddering and trembling mentioned in the next verse. **In 15a**, the translation of the verb יחלי “it glided past” as *ἐπῆλθεν* “it came upon” is unique in the LXX. It seems to be a contextual and general choice, as the Hebrew was understood to relay motion (possibly the verb הלך “to walk” was read and understood). In 16c, דממה “whisper; silence”, a rare word, is translated as *αὔραν* “a breeze” (cf. Vg *aurae lenis* “gentle wind”).

¹⁶² So also P with *מַחֲמֵם* and Aquila with *ἔστην*.

¹⁶³ Seow 2013, 402–3.

¹⁶⁴ Cf. also Gehman 1949, 238.

¹⁶⁵ Vg agrees more with the OG (*in horrore*) than with the Hebrew.

¹⁶⁶ The other times תרדמה appears, it is translated as *ἐκστασις* (“displacement, change; amazement”; Gen 2:21, 15:12), *θάμβος* (“amazement; terror”; 1Sam 26:12), *κατάνυξις* (“stupefaction, slumber”; Isa 29:10), and *δειλία* (“timidity, cowardice”; Prov 19:15).

The whole vision narrative is considered a later addition to the book of Job; see the introduction for more details. Witte and Nömmik comment that vv. 12 and 13 are different colometrically from the previous ones: v. 12 is too short (first colon 11 consonants and the second 15) and v. 13 too long (17 and 16 consonants). Kaiser thinks that v. 16c is a later gloss.¹⁶⁷ These verses, although less so v. 16c, are also the ones where the translation differs the most from the Hebrew text, therefore textual corruption that was continued in different manuscripts, including the *Vorlage* of the translation, cannot be ruled out. The translator made efforts to smooth out the transition between two strophes, constructing a conclusion to the third strophe and an introduction to the fourth strophe from Hebrew v. 12. The translator emphasises the element of fear and the fact that the “vision” is only auditory.

V: 4:17–21

Style

Verses 17–21 form a longer strophe consisting of two bicola, a tricolon and another two bicola (a symmetric BBTBB structure) in both languages. A division into two sub-strophes in vv. 17–19 and 20–21 is also possible.

Yet again, the strophe begins with a yes-no question, this time in both languages: marked with $\neg$ in Hebrew and $\mu\eta$ in Greek. Additionally, the Greek has a short added rhetorical question Τί γάρ; “What?” before it whereas the Hebrew strophe ends with another question (marked with הלא).

In Greek 4:19c, the middle verse of the strophe (or the final verse of the sub-strophe), a simile has been created: $\text{ἐπαισεν αὐτοὺς σητὸς τρόπον}$ “he struck them like a moth!” Although the Hebrew $\text{יִדְכְּאוּם לִפְנֵי עַשׂ}$ is usually translated into English as a simile as well, the more literal translation is “they are crushed before the moth”¹⁶⁸.

The strophe begins with parallelistic structures in the first two verses in both languages: in v. 17, the partial chiasmus in Greek (xABCD/E'B'C') reflects the partial chiasmus in Hebrew (xABC/xB'C'A'), and in v. 18, the partial symmetry in Greek (xAB/A'B') reflects the partial symmetry in Hebrew (xAB/xA'B'C). Hebrew has another partial symmetry in v. 20 (BC/AB'C'), which is not reflected in the Greek translation.

There are several lexical repetitions present in the Greek text: the verb εἰμί “to be” is repeated three times: ἔσται in 17a, ἐσμεν in 19b, and εἰσὶν in 20a; in 19a, a root repetition appears: $\text{τοὺς δὲ κατοικοῦντας οἰκίας}$ “those that inhabit houses”; another root repetition appears in 19ab: the adjective πηλίνας “of clay” and the noun πηλοῦ “of clay”; finally, two pairs of repetitions appear at the end of the strophe in 20b/21b: the phrase $\text{παρὰ τὸ μὴ} + \text{infinitive}$ “because of not + infinitive” and the verb ἀπώλοντο “they perished”. In Hebrew, the verb שׁוּם “to

¹⁶⁷ Kaiser 2006, 13, 125; Nömmik 2010, 24–5; Witte 2021, 135.

¹⁶⁸ See a short summary of the problem in Dhont 2018a, 100–1.

put, set” is repeated twice, in 18b/20b: as an imperfective ישים “he puts” and as a hiphil participle משיים “considering, regarding”.

The translator has used some marked vocabulary: in 17a, the poetic, even Homeric (reflects a poetic word in Hebrew), noun βροτὸς “mortal man”¹⁶⁹; in 17b, the adjective ἄμεμπτος “blameless” (43x, LXX: 16, OG Job: 11); in 19a, the adjective πηλίνας “of clay” (πήλινος, η, ον; 10x, LXX: 5, OG Job: 2); in 19c, the noun σῆς, -οῦς, ὁ “moth” (49x, LXX: 14, OG Job: 3); in 20a, the rare adverb πρωίθεν “from morning” (with the redundant preposition ἀπὸ “from”; 10x, LXX: 10, OG Job: 1); and finally in 21a, the verb ἐνεφύσησεν “he breathed in/on” (ἐμφυσάω; 47x, LXX: 9, OG Job: 1).

In Hebrew, several marked words can be observed: in 17a, the noun אנוש “man” (reflected in Greek), and in 17b, the noun גבר “man” are considered mostly poetic in BDB; in 18b, the *hapax* noun תהלה “error”; in 19c, the verb ידכאום “they are crushed” (דכא; considered poetic by BDB), and the rare noun עש “moth” (7x, Job: 3, Ps: 1); in 20b, the adverb מבלי “without” (considered mainly poetic by BDB); finally, in 21a, the noun יתרם (יתר “cord”; 6x, Job: 2, Ps: 1).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 17a*, the translator adds the rhetorical question τί γάρ; “So what?” to the beginning of the strophe. The Hebrew צדק “he is just” is translated into two-word phrase in Greek: καθαρὸς ἔσται “will/can he be pure.” *In 17b*, the verb יטהר “he is pure” is translated into an adjective ἄμεμπτος “blameless” corresponding to the verb ἔσται in 17a, resulting in an ellipsis; the equivalence is unique but not improper in the context. Rather, it looks that the translator has switched the order of these words, possibly for stylistic reasons, creating an α alliteration in the second colon. *In 19c*, the phrase עש לפני “before the moth” is translated with σὴτος τρόπον “like a moth”, clarifying the message but also creating almost a simile at the end of the sub-strophe. *In 20a*, יכתו “they are beaten, destroyed” is paraphrased into οὐκέτι εἰσὶν “they no longer exist”, again clarifying and intensifying, but also creating a lexical repetition. *In 21b*, ימותו ולא בחכמה “and they die and not with wisdom” is paraphrased into ἀπώλοντο παρὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν αὐτοὺς σοφίαν “they perished because they did not possess wisdom”. Dhont considers both ἀπώλοντο and παρὰ τὸ μὴ as stylistically motivated translation choices: the former is a unique equivalence, and the latter is influenced by 20b¹⁷⁰. Both choices create repetitions in the Greek. Heater makes the suggestion that ימותו is translated twice in v. 21, firstly as ἐξηράνθησαν and then as ἀπώλοντο¹⁷¹. This helps to strengthen the claim that the translator paraphrased and interpolated intentionally.

Changes regarding religion or religious culture and law. *In 18b*, ישים “he puts, sets” is translated with the more specific ἐπενόησεν “he observed”¹⁷² and the *hapax* תהלה (assumed to mean “error”) is translated as σκολιόν “crooked, unjust,

¹⁶⁹ Cf. LSJ and Mangin 2005, 501.

¹⁷⁰ Dhont 2018a, 261.

¹⁷¹ Heater 1982, 47.

¹⁷² Similarly, Vg translates with *repperit* “he found”.

unrighteous”¹⁷³. These translation choices tone down God’s action. *In 19b*, אֲשֶׁר בְּעַפְרֵי יִסּוּדָם “whose foundation is in the dust” is interpreted or paraphrased and extended into ἐξ ὧν καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ πηλοῦ ἐσμὲν “being from them (“from whom”¹⁷⁴), we ourselves too are of the same clay”, suggesting that the translator understood the foundations mentioned to be those of people not houses. Dhorme considers this translation a result of poor understanding of the Hebrew¹⁷⁵ and Seow thinks that the Hebrew verb was misread as יִסְדְּנוּ “we establish”¹⁷⁶, whereas Heater thinks that the translator had no problem understanding and the translation is rather an intentional paraphrase or amplification (a “midrash”) and inspired by other passages in Job (10:9a, 30:19, and 33:6; of these, Heater considers 33:6 as “the catalyst”)¹⁷⁷. This translation could as well be inspired by these passages, although it has to be noted that at least in 30:19 and 33:6 the Greek translation is not literal and exhibits paraphrases. *In 21a*, the translator adds the whole colon ἐνεφύσησεν γὰρ αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐξηράνθησαν “for he breathed on them and they perished” to replace the Hebrew הִלָּא נִסְעָ יִתְרָם בָּם “their tent-cord is plucked up within them”). It is agreed that the Greek is with minor changes actually taken from Isa 40:24b, whose context is similar¹⁷⁸. Fernández Marcos explains that the translator substituted the image for a more understandable one (for a Hellenistic reader): “the metaphor of the removal of the tent cord as sign of death is substituted in Greek by the blowing out of life”¹⁷⁹. Additionally, the direct action and role of God in killing man is brought in.¹⁸⁰

Reading or vocalising the consonantal text differently than the later Masoretes. *In 17b*, מַעֲשָׂו “from/before his maker” is translated as ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ “from/in his actions”, which Dhorme assumes is due to reading a passive participle (he also deems this translation nonsensical)¹⁸¹. As a result, the theology is skewed in the translation as well—a human cannot be pure no matter how they act. *In 20b*, the Hebrew מְשִׁים לְנֶצַח יִאֲבְדוּ “without the one who sets (who pays attention?), they perish for forever” is translated with παρὰ τὸ μὴ δύνασθαι αὐτοὺς ἑαυτοῖς βοηθῆσαι ἀπώλονται “because they were not able to help themselves, they perished”. Dhorme posits that the translator read מוֹשִׁיעַ “saviour” instead of מְשִׁים “considering; setting,” thus translating βοηθῆσαι “to help”¹⁸². Gard sees here an intentional paraphrase so that the possibility of future life

¹⁷³ Also discussed in Beeckman 2024, 176–7. Cf. Vg *pravitatem* “wickedness”. In P, this is translated with אֲמַצְמִי “amazement, astonishment”, see Szpek 1992, 291.

¹⁷⁴ Not only is the relative particle considered prosaic rather than poetic, but it is also usually not used in the oldest layers of the Job-poem. See Nömmik 2026, 15.

¹⁷⁵ Dhorme 1967, 53.

¹⁷⁶ Seow 2013, 406.

¹⁷⁷ Heater 1982, 45–6.

¹⁷⁸ Dhorme 1967, 55; Heater 1982, 46–7.

¹⁷⁹ Fernández Marcos 1994, 259.

¹⁸⁰ The Vg translates *qui autem reliqui fuerint auferentur ex eis* “And they that shall be left, shall be taken away from them”, due to associating יִתְרָם with the verb יָתַר “to remain”. So also Theodotion: συνεξῆρπεν τὸ ὑπόλειμμα αὐτῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς “what is remaining in them, rises away/he raises away”.

¹⁸¹ Dhorme 1967, 52.

¹⁸² Dhorme 1967, 54.

cannot be excluded¹⁸³. Although the whole vision narrative is considered a later addition to the book of Job, Nõmmik considers v. 20b an even later gloss or commentary¹⁸⁴. If the addition is late enough, it might not have been integrated into the *Vorlage* manuscript well enough, triggering different readings.

Vorlage different than the later MT. **In 19c**, יִדְכֹּאֲמוּם “they are crushed” is translated into third person singular in aorist, ἔπαισεν αὐτοὺς “He (the Lord) struck them”. Seow says that several witnesses seem to attest to the reading יִדְכֹּאֲמוּם “he crushes them” instead, i.e. without the *mater*¹⁸⁵. Again, although the whole vision narrative is considered a later addition to the book, Fohrer and Kaiser think that 4:19c is an even later gloss¹⁸⁶, which could account for a difference in using and not using a *mater* and thus resulting in a difference in the OG.

VI: 5:1–2

Style

Verses 5:1–2 form a strophe consisting of two bicola. The strophe begins with an imperative: ἐπικάλεσαι δέ “but call!” in Greek, which reflects the Hebrew קרא נא “call now!” The strophe ends with a symmetry in v. 2 that the Greek translator reflects (xABC/A'B'C') from Hebrew (xABC/xA'B'C'). There are no important lexical repetitions in either language, nor is there any rare or markedly poetic vocabulary.

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. **In 1a**, the question הֲיִשׁ “is there” is paraphrased into εἴ τις “if anyone”¹⁸⁷, creating better symmetry with the following colon. The participle ἁποκρίσας “answering you” is translated with the finite form in future σοι ὑπακούσεται “he will listen, answer to you.” **In 1b**, the phrase וְאֵלֵי “and to whom” is paraphrased into εἴ τινα “or if (you will see) any”. To this is added ἀγγέλων “of the angels” that expands and clarifies the “holy ones” (ἁγίων). **In 2a**, the conjunction καὶ is added to the beginning of the colon; thus, every colon in this strophe has a conjunction.

Although Vermeylen assigns v. 1 to *rédacteur* IV, after 4:12–21 (added by *rédacteur* III),¹⁸⁸ nothing in the text points to the translator being disturbed by it or noticing it.

¹⁸³ Gard 1954, 139–40.

¹⁸⁴ Nõmmik 2025.

¹⁸⁵ Seow 2011, 66. In this case, Vg rather agrees with the MT, translating *consumentur* “they are consumed”.

¹⁸⁶ Fohrer 1963, 57, 128, 131; Kaiser 2006, 13, 125.

¹⁸⁷ So also Vg: *si est qui*.

¹⁸⁸ Vermeylen 2015, 155, 154–9. He says that this verse reads like an unexpected supplement since it assumes that an intercessor would be useless, whereas in *redaction* III, God’s mediation is of use. Instead of “angels” (like in v. 4:18), the verse speaks of “the holy ones” or

VII: 5:3–5

Style

Verses 3–5 form a strophe consisting of one bicolon and *two tricola* in Greek¹⁸⁹, but two bicola and a tricolon in Hebrew. The second bicolon of v. 4 in Hebrew is out of balance and could be seen as a tricolon as well (13 + 18 or 13 + 10 + 8 consonants). Thus, the strophe is structurally more marked in Hebrew this time. The strophe begins with the emphasised personal pronoun “I” in the first position in both languages: אֲנִי in Hebrew and ἐγὼ δὲ in Greek.

The only parallelistic structure appears in Greek 5a, namely the intra-colon symmetry AxBCB’C’. The only lexical repetition is also in Greek, in 4b/5b of the verb εἰμί “to be” (ἔσται/ἔσονται).

The translator has used a couple of rare words: in 4b, the verb κολαβρισθείσαν “may they be derided” (κολαβρίζω; appears only here in Job in the centuries BC); and in 5c, the verb ἐκσιφωνισθείη “may it be drained” (ἐκσιφωνίζω; seems to reflect a rare verb in Hebrew; also a *hapax legomenon*, derived from a simplex-verb¹⁹⁰).

A couple of marked Hebrew words have been used: in 3a, the participle משריש of the verb שרש “to uproot” (8x, Job: 3, Ps: 2); in 4b, the verb וידכאו “they are crushed” (דכא; considered poetic by BDB); in 5b, the noun מצנים (צן “thorn”; 2x, Job: 1, Prov: 1); finally, in 5c, the verb ושא (שא “to long for”; 8x, Job: 3, Ps: 1), and the noun צמים “snare” (Job: 2).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 3a*, the common singular noun אִוִּיל “the fool” is translated with the plural ἄφρονες “the foolish ones”. In connection, the singular participle משריש “taking root” has been translated into a two-word phrase of the same meaning, except in the plural, consisting of a noun and participle: ῥίζαν βάλλοντας “taking root.” *In 3b*, the conjunction ἀλλ’ “but” is added to the beginning of the colon. *In 4a*, the verb ירחקו “they are far, distant” is translated into another two-word phrase, consisting of an adverb and a verb in optative: πόρρω γένοιντο “may they be far”. Although the translator removes the mention of “cursing” in 3b, they nevertheless translate the rest of the strophe in optatives that relay curses against fools. *In 4b*, וידכאו “they are crushed” is again translated into optative and the meaning is also changed: κολαβρισθείσαν “may they be derided”; this looks to be an intentional change as the verb is translated quite appropriately in 4:19. The common singular בשער “at the gate” is translated with the plural ἐπὶ θύραις “at the doors/gates”. The translator adds ἡσσόνων “of the lesser ones,” describing the doors/gates, to more emphasise the lousy and poor

“saints” which Vermeylen links with the Israelite community who remained faithful as opposed to the ungodly (Antiochos IV and his Judean allies). Thus, it must be later than *rédaction* III. V. 2 follows 4:10–11 naturally. Interestingly enough, the Greek translator does add the “angels”, possibly to correspond with 4:18.

¹⁸⁹ LXX^{ZI} formats as two bicola and a tricolon.

¹⁹⁰ Cf. also Mangin 2005, 511.

future situation of the fools.¹⁹¹ To match the optatives, וַאֲנִי is translated with future (καὶ οὐκ ἔσται). **In 5a**, the translator adds γὰρ “for” to create an explanation in this colon. **In 5b**, the translator adds the pronoun αὐτοὶ “they”, corresponding to the added pronoun ἐκεῖνοι in 5a.

Reading or vocalising the consonantal text differently than the later Masorètes. **In 3b**, The verb וַאֲקוּב “I cursed” has been changed into third person singular passive ἐβρώθη “it was devoured”. Dhorme and Habel suggest that the translator read it as such, וַיִּקֹּב, a third person passive¹⁹². Muraoka, however, suggests that the Greek translator understood here the root נקב “to pierce, bore” instead of קבב “to curse”¹⁹³. **In 5a**, the translation ἐκεῖνοι συνήγαγον “they gathered” (ἐκεῖνοι is an addition) could be due to reading the verb קצרו “they harvested” instead of the noun with a suffix קצירו “his harvest”; Nömmik and Seow suggest reading the MT as such as well¹⁹⁴. **In 5b**, the verb יקחהו “he takes it out” has been changed into a two-word phrase consisting of an adjective and the verb “to be” in third person plural future: οὐκ ἐξάιρετοῖ ἐσονται “they will not be taken out”. οὐκ is a result of vocalising the Hebrew as אַל rather than the preposition אֶל, like it is in the MT, while the plural could be due to reading יקחו “they take,” especially since the suffix is not translated.¹⁹⁵ **In 5c**, ושאַר “he will long for” has been read as or associated with ושאב “he will draw water” and thus translated as ἐκσιφωτισθείη “may it be drained, siphoned out”, again in the optative. Vg translates the verb in accordance with the subject *sitientes* “the thirsty” as *ebibent* “they will drink up.” P translator has, according to Szpek, generalised here and translated with וַיִּשְׁאֵב “he will devour”¹⁹⁶.

Translator's limited vocabulary. **In 5c**, the translator omits צמים “snares”; the word is not translated the only other time it is used in Job, in 18:9b, where the whole colon is left untranslated. In the Vg, the word has been understood to be צמא “thirsty.” The Greek translator, however, did not recognise or want to translate the previous “hungry” in 5a, therefore, understanding either “snares” or “the thirsty” here would not have made sense in their mind.

Possibly ideological or personal changes. **In 5a**, the subject רעב “the hungry” (singular) in Hebrew has become δίκαιοι “the just” (plural) in Greek; the Hebrew word is not unknown to the translator. If the previous are curses against fools, then this is as well. If they ever should gather anything from their fields, the righteous people will consume the crops. Why the translator does not want the hungry people to receive the food, is unclear.

Vorlage different than the later MT. **In 5b**, ἐκ κακῶν “out of bad things” could be the result of the translator reading מצרים “out of tight situations” instead of

¹⁹¹ Orlinsky 1958, 266 thinks that the translator did not understand בשער as “public meeting space” and thus felt the need to explain more.

¹⁹² Dhorme 1967, 58; Habel 1985, 117.

¹⁹³ Muraoka 2010, 22.

¹⁹⁴ Dhorme 1967, 59; Hartley 1988, 116; Nömmik 2010, 27; Seow 2011, 66; 2013, 432; Witte 2021, 131.

¹⁹⁵ Szpek 1992, 291 notes the P translator used contextual translation “due to a *hapax legomenon* or rare term” and thus used يصبغون “they will be poured out”.

¹⁹⁶ Szpek 1992, 283.

מצנים “out of thorns”; Beeckman also argues for contextual suitability, as the usual translation equivalent for צר is ἐχθρός “adversary”¹⁹⁷. Vg has a difference here as well and translates *ipsum rapiet armatus* “the armed man shall take him by violence;” “armed men” are also found in Aquila’s and Symmachus’ translations. Thus, these versions also read the consonantal text like the Greek translator, מצרים instead of מצנים and associated it with the typical meaning of “enemy.” From this, we can conclude, that the *Vorlage* of the OG and at least some of the pre-MT actually had this consonantal difference. The Hebrew of this colon and the whole verse is problematic, however.

Nömmik deems vv. (3)4–5 and Vermeylen vv. 3–7 as a later commentary or gloss; Kaiser thinks that vv. 3–5b were added by the righteousness editor and 5c is a gloss while Fohrer and Witte think that 4b is partly (ואין מציל) is a gloss to v. 5, because it makes the verse too long and is also not translated in 4QTgJob) and 5:5b is fully a later commentary or gloss. For Nömmik, the explanation lies in the fact that the strophe’s message and original form have been obscured and corrupted due to later rewritings. The verses are also, in his opinion, difficult text-critically. For example, the phrase אני ראיתי in 3a is repeated from 4:8 and uses the pronoun אני which in the original Job-poem was only used in Job’s speeches. He deems these verses a commentary for לאויל in 5:2. In 5:5 he suggests numerous changes in order to make the verse understandable. The tricolon in v. 5, the relative particle, and colometric imbalance are also indicators of later redactions according to him. Vermeylen assigns vv. 3–5 to *réducteur* III, although with no certainty. He says that 3a is inspired by 4:8 (ראיתי) and 5:2 (לאויל), whereas אני anticipates 5:8. V. 5b has some similarities with 24.6 (*réduction* III).¹⁹⁸ The readings in the *Vorlage* and the MT seem to be slightly different in v. 5. One of the different readings in 5b could be connected with a pre-MT variation since several versions translate similarly. Other readings and translations may be down to the OG translator himself, who tried to make the strophe as clear as possible.

VIII: 5:6–7

Style

Verses 5:6–7 form a strophe consisting of two bicola¹⁹⁹. In Greek, the strophe is marked in the beginning with the particle γάρ “for” and in the end with the adversative ἀλλὰ “but.” In Hebrew, both verses of the strophe are marked with כי “for;” since the neighbouring strophes do not have this particle at the beginning of cola or verses, this strophe is distinct.

The strophe begins with a partial chiasmus in both languages (xABC/xB’A’C’). The beginning also has marked vocabulary in Greek: in 6b, the non-contracted

¹⁹⁷ Cf. also Dhorme 1967, 59; Beeckman 2020, 31.

¹⁹⁸ Fohrer 1963, 57, 128, 132; Kaiser 2006, 13, 125; Nömmik 2010, 26–8; 2013, 27–9, 143–5, 149; 2014a, 286; Vermeylen 2015, 154–9, 329; Witte 2021, 131, 136; Nömmik 2025.

¹⁹⁹ This strophe and the translation and stylistic choices made by the translator are very thoroughly discussed also in Dhont 2018a, 262–6.

form ἐξ ὀρέων “from mountains” instead of the Attic/Koine ὀρῶν²⁰⁰, and the verb ἀναβλαστήσει “it will sprout” (ἀναβλαστάνω; 31x, OG Job: 2). In contrast, the end of the strophe is marked with a rare word in Hebrew, namely the noun רשף “flame, spark” (7x, Job: 2, Ps: 1).

In Hebrew, the strophe has two distinct lexical repetitions. Firstly, the explanatory particle כִּי “for” is used in the beginning of 6a/7a. Secondly, in 6b/7a, there is the repetition of the noun עַמְלָה/לְעַמְלָה (“trouble” and “to/for trouble”). The Greek translator has used a similar repetition; however, due to translation choices, the result is an end-repetition in 6a/7a (κόπος/κόπω “hardship” and “to hardship”). Thus, the Hebrew repetition is translated with variation, but synonyms have been translated with repetition; in both languages, the repetition illustrates the topic of the strophe.

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 7a*, the Hebrew יוֹלֵד “he was born” is translated with the present tense γεννᾶται “he is conceived, begotten = is born”, a common translation equivalent in Job. Dhorme suggests that the translator vocalised יוֹלֵד instead²⁰¹. Seow, however, comments that many manuscripts have the reading יָלַד (i.e., without the *mater*), so that vocalising יָלַד (*qal/hophal* passive) or even יָלַד (*hiphil*) “he begets” is possible²⁰². *In 7b*, the verb גִּבְיָהוּ “they fly upward, they raise themselves” has been changed into τὰ ὑψηλὰ “the high places, the heights”, whereas the infinitive (according to MT) עוֹף “to fly” has been translated with a third person plural verb πέτονται “they fly” (probably not the other way around because these Greek roots are the common translation equivalents for the Hebrew ones). In the context of these verbal forms, translating with “the vulture’s young” and opting for “mountains” instead of “ground” make sense.

Utilising the context or the translator's previous knowledge for the meaning of unknown words. *In 6b*, וּמֵאֲדָמָה “from the soil, ground” has been translated with ἐξ ὀρέων “from mountains” in Greek. Dhorme posits that a reading of מֵהָרִים might have been possible²⁰³. The change to “mountains,” however, would fit with v. 7b. There, וּבְנֵי רֶשֶׁף “sons of sparks (?); sons of Resheph (?)” has been interpreted as νεοσσοὶ γυπὸς²⁰⁴ “the vulture’s young.” Fernández Marcos thinks it is probably a “translation of perplexity²⁰⁵.” Other versions interpret this phrase as a bird as well: the Vg opted for *avis* “bird;” Aquila for υἱοὶ πτεγνοῦ “sons of a winged one (a bird),” Symmachus for τὰ τέκνα πετεινῶν “babies of the winged ones (birds),” and P for חֲסִידֵי חֲפָץ “offspring of birds”²⁰⁶.

²⁰⁰ Mangin 2005, 548. He also points out that the other time this non-contracted form is used in the LXX is in Gen 8:5 (τῶν ὀρέων).

²⁰¹ Dhorme 1967, 61.

²⁰² Seow 2011, 77–8.

²⁰³ Dhorme 1967, 61.

²⁰⁴ רֶשֶׁף has been interpreted as a bird (ὄρνειον) also in Deut 32:24, for example.

²⁰⁵ Fernández Marcos 1994, 258.

²⁰⁶ See also longer discussion on the possible meaning of the Hebrew in Dhorme 1967, 61–2.

Vermeylen assigns vv. 3–7 also *rédauteur* III. The pessimistic anthropology targeted against the Hellenised man expressed here is similar to that of 4:17, 15:14–16, and 25:2–6, all from *rédauction* III.²⁰⁷ The translator did not object to the topic in these verses and made their usual stylistic changes and relied on the context for difficult words.

IX: 5:8–10

Style

Verses 8–10 form a strophe consisting of three bicola. The strophe begins with emphatic particles and personal pronouns in both languages: οὐ μὲν δὲ ἀλλὰ ἐγὼ “nonetheless, I” in Greek, reflecting the Hebrew אֲנִי אִלֵּם “as for me; but indeed I.”

The whole of the strophe has parallelistic structures: in v. 8, the Greek partial chiasmus (xABC/C'B') reflects the Hebrew partial chiasmus (xABC/xC'B'(D)); in v. 9, the Greek partial symmetry (ABxB'/B''B'''C) partially reflects the Hebrew (ABxB'/B''C); and in v. 10, the Greek symmetry (ABC/A'B'C') reflects the Hebrew symmetry (xABC/xA'B'C').

There is an independent repetition in Greek 8ab: κυρίου/κύριον “(of) the Lord” and “the Lord”. In Hebrew, throughout, prepositions and adverbial nouns are used in pairs. Thus, לְ “to, towards” in 8ab, אִין “without” in 9ab, and עַל פְּנֵי “on the face of” in 10ab. Only the last one is reflected in the Greek translation with ἐπὶ “on.”

The Greek translator has used a rare word in 9a, the adjective ἀνεξιχνίαστα “inscrutable, unsearchable” (LXX: 4, OG Job: 3). In Hebrew, two marked words have been used, namely in 8b, the noun דְּבַרְתִּי (דְּבָרָה “cause”; 7x, Job: 1, Ps: 1).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 8a*, the Hebrew אִלֵּם “but” has been extended into οὐ μὲν δὲ ἀλλὰ “nonetheless”, but this is not unusual and has been done also in 13:3. *In 8b*, the Hebrew וְאֵל אֱלֹהִים “and to God” is translated with κύριον δὲ τὸν πάντων δεσπότην “the Lord, the master of all”, understanding both to be the divine name²⁰⁸. After a thorough study of this verse (and others, where God is mentioned), Orlinsky concluded that the translator translated what they saw, namely שְׁדִי instead of אֱלֹהִים; in his opinion the latter was accidentally added to the text much later (scribal error due to repeating consonants)²⁰⁹; Nömmik also says that אֱלֹהִים is rarely encountered in the speeches of Job’s friends²¹⁰. The phrase אֲשִׁים דְּבַרְתִּי “I would bring my cause” has been interpreted as ἐπικαλέσσομαι “I will call on (as witness);” this verb parallels well with the δεηθῆσομαι in 8a. *In 9a*, the phrase וְאִין חֶקֶר “and (with) no searching” is

²⁰⁷ Vermeylen 2015, 157, 154–9.

²⁰⁸ Cf. also Dhorme 1967, 63.

²⁰⁹ Orlinsky 1935a; 1964, 61–4.

²¹⁰ Nömmik 2010, 28.

translated with the compound ἀνεξιχνίαστα “unsearchable things, untraceable things”. The translator extends v. 9b with ἑνδοξά “glorious things”, creating a closer symmetry with 9a, where two characteristics are mentioned as well. Dhont has demonstrated that ἑνδοξά τε καὶ ἐψαίσια is a double translation of the Hebrew נפלאות “marvellous things” not only here, but in 9:10 as well²¹¹. The phrase עד אין מספר “up to no number” is translated with ὧν οὐκ ἔστιν ἀριθμός “of which there is no number.” In 10b, the translator has opted for a synonym for “earth” (τὴν ὑπ’ οὐρανόν “what is under heaven”) instead of the plural חוצות “outside areas; open fields”; the word is only once translated in OG Job, with ἔξω “outside”. Therefore, in this context, the synonym for earth made more sense to the translator and completed the symmetry.

Witte, Kaiser, and Fohrer deem v. 10 a secondary gloss. Witte explains that v. 10 syntactically interrupts the connected vv. 9 and 11 and is a hymnal explication. According to Nömmik, vv. 9–10 are a late *Fortschreibung* or gloss that relies on the book editor and on v. 9:10.²¹² The translator did not object to the form or topic of these verses.

X: 5:11–13

Style

Verses 11–13 form a strophe consisting of three bicola. The beginning of the strophe is marked with a partial chiasmus in Greek (ABC/xB’A’) and in Hebrew (ABC/xB’A’C’).

In Greek, the strophe is framed with the repetition of ἐξ: ἐξεγείροντα in 11b and ἐξέστησεν in 13b. Other repetitions in the strophe are the following: independent repetition of τὸν ποιοῦντα/ ποιήσουσιν “who does”/“they are doing” in 11a/12b, and another independent repetition of the noun βουλὰς/βουλὴν “the plans”/“the scheming, the plan” in 12a/13b.

In Greek, the end of the strophe is marked with a rare adjective πολυπλόκων “of the wily, crafty” (πολυπλοκος, -ον; 21x, LXX: 4, OG Job: 1).

In Hebrew, several marked words have been used: in 11a, the noun למרום “up high; to an elevated place” (מרום; considered poetic by BDB); in 12a, the noun מחשבות “the devices” (מחשבה; also considered poetic by BDB); in 13a, the infinitive בערמם of the verb ערם “to be shrewd” (6x, Job: 1, Ps: 1, Prov: 1); and in 13b, the participle נפתלים of the verb פתל “to twist” (5x, Job: 1, Ps: 1, Prov: 1).

Text

Utilising the context or the translator's previous knowledge for the meaning of unknown words. In 11b, וקדרים “those who are dark, mourning” is translated with ἀπολωλότας “those that have perished” (or maybe “those who have lost”); the word is translated differently in all of its occurrences in Job, according to the

²¹¹ Dhont 2016b, 482–3.

²¹² Fohrer 1963, 57, 128, 132; Witte 1994a, 72; Kaiser 2006, 14, 125; Nömmik 2010, 28–32; Witte 2021, 131, 136; Nömmik 2025.

context²¹³. *In 12a*, the participle מפר “breaking, frustrating” is translated with the participle διαλλάσσοντα “changing, altering”; this is a unique equivalence²¹⁴. *In 12b*, תושיה “wisdom; success” is translated with ἀληθές “truth”²¹⁵. The equivalence is again unique; the word is translated differently in each of its occurrences in Job²¹⁶. *In 13b*, the passive (*niphal*) נמהרה “she/it is hurried” is changed into an active aorist verb in third person singular: ἐξέστησεν “He (God) displaced, changed; got rid of”. The equivalence is unique.

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 11b*, the finite שגבו “they are lifted/high” is changed into a participle ἐξεγείροντα “lifting”²¹⁷. Gehman sees this as a theologically motivated paraphrase; Gard also sees here a reference to possible resurrection as the participle ἀπολωλότας is in perfect and the other participle refers to God’s action of raising up²¹⁸. The last word, namely the noun ישׁ “safety” is left untranslated. The word is translated in 5:4b, the only other occurrence of it in Job, so it was not unknown to the translator. Leaving it untranslated does not change the overall meaning of the verse, thus it might be intentional. *In 13a*, the Hebrew infinitive phrase בערמם “in their being shrewd” is changed into a noun ἐν τῇ φρονήσει “in cleverness”. *In 13b*, the Hebrew participle נפתלים “of those who are tortuous, twisted” is translated with the adjective πολυπλόκων “of the wily, tortuous”.

Vorlage different than the later MT. Whereas the Hebrew changes from participles to an ל + infinitive construction in 11a (לשום), the Greek translator continues with the participles (τὸν ποιοῦντα). Seow, however, proposes that the change was not so much intentional, as it was the case of a text without the *mater*, i.e. לשם, where the *lamed* is asseverative and left untranslated and שם is a participle form²¹⁹. This could explain the difference, but of course, we cannot rule out intentional change in order to keep the strophe uniform.

According to Nömmik, vv. 11–17 are a late *Fortschreibung* on (social) justice. He considers it a hymn that does not fit into the framework of Eliphaz’ speeches or the other friends’ speeches. He sees several formal and stylistic reasons (such as rhyme and alliteration), as well as colometric imbalance in these verses that suggest a different/late author. He sees similarities in vocabulary with other

²¹³ In 6:16, the participle הקדרים is translated with ἐπιπεπτώκασιν “they have fallen upon, pressed upon”, and in 30:28, the participle קדר is translated with στενών “groaning, moaning”. Quite similarly, P translator has used contextual translation in 5:11b as well; see Szpek 1992, 291.

²¹⁴ διαλλάσσω looks to be a “safe” translation choice when the translator was not quite sure of the meaning of the Hebrew word: in 12:20 and 24, it translates the participle מסיר (סור), but in 36:28f it is part of a longer addition with no source in the Hebrew.

²¹⁵ Vg did not translate directly either and phrased it as *quod coeperunt* “what they had begun”.

²¹⁶ In 6:13, it is translated with βοήθεια “help”; in 11:6, with ἔσται τῶν κατὰ σέ “of what you have, it will be”; in 12:16 with ἰσχύς “strength”; and in 26:3 the translation paraphrases but it seems to be translated with ἐπακολουθήσεις “you will follow”.

²¹⁷ Vg opts for the active, but singular *erigit* “he raises up, comforts”.

²¹⁸ Gehman 1949, 238; Gard 1954, 138.

²¹⁹ Seow 2011, 68–9. The next verse also has a participle form in Hebrew, further corroborating this claim.

additions from the righteousness redactor and therefore the hymn can be assumed to be from this redaction (arguing against Witte who sees more similarities with the majesty redaction). Similarly, Kaiser assigns vv. 9–17 to the righteousness redaction.²²⁰ From the viewpoint of the Greek translation and its *Vorlage*, the beginning of the addition might have been initially different (a word without a mater), bringing in a slight syntactic change in the translation. Other differences are more due to stylistic and syntactic reasons, but also due to the translator not knowing some of the vocabulary and resorting to contextual translation. Overall, the translator did not find the topic or form of these verses to be objectionable.

XI: 5:14–16

Style

Verses 14–16 form a strophe consisting of three bicola. V. 14 with its simile (that also has a temporal expressions) starts the strophe. The Hebrew יומם יפגשו חשך and וכלילה ימשו בצהרים “They meet with darkness in the daytime, and grope at noonday as in the night” is reflected with some changes as ἡμέρας συναντῆσεται αὐτοῖς σκότος, τὸ δὲ μεσημβρινὸν ψηλαφήσαισαν ἴσα νυκτί. “In the daytime, darkness will meet them, and may they grope at noonday as in the night.”

In Greek, the beginning of the strophe is also marked with a relatively rare verb in 14b, ψηλαφήσαισαν “may they grope” (ψηλαφάω; 43x, LXX: 16, OG Job: 2). Some marked Hebrew words have been used in the strophe: in 14b, the verb ימשו (משש “to feel”; 9x, Job: 2); in 15b, the adjective אביון “needy” (considered poetic by BDB); in 16a, the adjective לדל “for the poor” (לדל; according to BDB, it is used more in poetry and wisdom literature than elsewhere); in 16b, the verb קפצה (קפץ “to gather”; 7x, Job: 2, Ps: 2).

In Hebrew, the strophe begins with a partial chiasmus (ABC/D’B’A’) that is not reflected in the Greek translation.

Further, in Hebrew, there is the repetition of מפהם/פיה “of their mouth”/“its mouth” in 15a/16b. This is not reflected by the translator but there is an independent repetition in 15b/16a, namely that of the adjective ἀδύνατος/ἀδυνάτω “the powerless”/“(for) the powerless”.

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. **In 14a**, יפגשו “they meet with” is paraphrased into συναντῆσεται αὐτοῖς “it meets them”. **In 14b**, to match with the future tense used in 14a, the translator uses aorist optative ψηλαφήσαισαν “may they grope”. **In 15b**, חזק “of the mighty” has been slightly changed into δυνάστου “of the master, ruler” and the noun אביון “the poor, needy” is slightly changed to ἀδύνατος “the powerless”²²¹, creating a wordplay. The translator adds the verb ἐξέλθοι “may he leave,” creating a stronger correspondence with the first

²²⁰ Kaiser 2006, 125; Nömmik 2010, 28–32; 2025.

²²¹ This word is used as the corresponding translation two more times in the LXX, both in Job (24:4 and 29:16).

colon. *In 16a*, again, the translator has used optative to create more unity: εἴη δὲ “let it be, may it be”, translating the ותהי “and she (hope) is”. The Hebrew לַדל “for the poor one” is again translated with ἀδυνάτω “for the weak, powerless,” creating a repetition and another wordplay with the previous verse. *In 16b*, ועלתה “and injustice” is changed into ἀδίκου δὲ “and of the unjust”, corresponding with the different types of persons mentioned previously. Finally, קפצה “she shuts” is changed into another optative ἐμφραχθείη “may it be shut.”

Later Greek manuscript corruption? *V. 15a* has been paraphrased from וישע מפייהם מחרב “and he saves from sword from/of their mouth” into ἀπόλουντο δὲ ἐν πολέμῳ “and may they perish in war”. Dhorme thinks that the translator read ויגוע “and he dies, expires” instead of וישע “and he saves”²²²; however, Seow, suggests a possible corruption in the Greek text which originally may have read ἀπολύουντο “may they be released, delivered”²²³. מחרב “from the sword” is paraphrased as ἐν πολέμῳ “in war”. The translator omits מפייהם “of/from their mouth,” which makes the symmetry with the next colon weaker but the message clearer. Therefore, this colon attests to differences due to stylistic choices of the translator but also later corruption in the Greek manuscripts.

According to Nömmik, vv. 11–17 are a late *Fortschreibung* on (social) justice. Similarly, Kaiser assigns vv. 9–17 to the righteousness redaction.²²⁴ Nothing in the translation suggests that this supposed addition was in any way noticeable or objectionable to the translator.

XII: 5:17–19

Style

Verses 17–19 form a strophe consisting again of three bicola. The strophe begins with a transition marker in Hebrew, namely the interjection הנה “behold!” which surprisingly is not reflected in the translation.

In Greek, the strophe is framed with marked vocabulary: in 17b, the noun νοουθέτημα “admonition” (considered potentially poetic²²⁵; 6x, OG Job: 1) and the verb μὴ ἀπαναίνου “do not reject” (ἀπαναίνομαι; considered mainly poetic, although occurring in some prose authors²²⁶; 15x, LXX: 5, OG Job: 1); and in 19a, the numeral adverb ἑξάκις “six times” (20x, LXX: 3, OG Job: 1).

A couple of marked Hebrew words are used throughout the strophe: in 18a, the verb יכאִיב (כאב “to pain”; 8x, Job: 2, Ps: 1, Prov: 1); in 17a, the noun אנוש “man, mortal” (considered mostly poetic by BDB); and in 18b, the verb ימחץ “he strikes” (מחץ; also considered poetic by BDB).

The beginning of the strophe is marked with non-parallelism in both languages: in v. 18, the Greek has a partial chiasmus (ABxC/B’xA’C’) whereas Hebrew has a partial symmetry (xABD/B’xCD’) and in v. 19, both have a number

²²² Dhorme 1967, 66.

²²³ Seow 2011, 69; 2013, 441.

²²⁴ Kaiser 2006, 125; Nömmik 2010, 28–32; 2025.

²²⁵ Mangin 2005, 545.

²²⁶ Mangin 2005, 493.

parallelism (n/n+1); more specifically, in Greek, the structure is ABC/A'C'D, reflecting the Hebrew ABC/xA'C'D.

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 17a*, the plural אשרי “blessed ones” is translated with the singular μακάριος “blessed”, because אנוש that it describes is also singular (common singular). *In 18a*, the finite verb יכאיב “He hurts” is changed into a two-word phrase consisting of an infinitive + finite verb ἀλγεῖν ποιεῖ “He makes to hurt”. *In 19a*, בשש צרות “from six troubles” is changed into ἐξάκις ἐξ ἀναγκῶν “six times from troubles”.

Vorlage different than the later MT. *In 17a*, the translator omits a significant transition marker, the interjection הנה “behold!”. In most cases, this interjection is translated appropriately in OG Job. In fact, it is unusual for the OG translator to omit a significant transition marker in the beginning of a strophe. Perhaps it was added later by a scribe or redactor. The previous word ends with the suffix ה which is also not translated; OG, Vg, and P translators either skipped over these three or four consonants or they were simply missing in the *Vorlage*/pre-MT. Clines says that there are some Hebrew manuscripts where they are missing; however, he insists that despite that, the MT should not be emended²²⁷. *In 18b*, the singular וידו “and his hand” is translated with the plural καὶ αἱ χεῖρες αὐτοῦ “and his hands” (cf. P ,מַשְׁכָּחָה, Vg *manus eius sanabunt*), which is not a usual translation choice in Job. Thus, the pre-MT manuscripts may have had the plural here, which corresponds to the qere (וידיו)²²⁸.

Utilising the context or the translator’s previous knowledge for the meaning of unknown words. *In 18a*, ויחבש “and He binds up” is translated with πάλιν ἀποκαθίστησιν “He restores again”; the verb is translated differently each time it occurs in Job.

According to Nömmik’s latest theory, vv. 11–17 is a late *Fortschreibung* on (social) justice. In an earlier iteration of his redaction theory, he hypothesised that after the hymn in vv. 9–16 was added, v. 17 was added even later as an introduction to vv. 18–21. The verse is too long and creates a colometrical imbalance²²⁹. Based on the ancient translations, including OG, pre-MT manuscripts may have had v. 17 in a shorter form, without the interjection.

XIII: 5:20–23

Style

Verses 20–23 form a strophe consisting of a *tricolon*, *bicolon*, and a *tricolon* in Greek but four *bicola* in Hebrew. The last verse of Hebrew is slightly longer than the previous ones with 17 + 15 consonants. Thus, the Greek strophe is framed with

²²⁷ Clines 2015, 117.

²²⁸ Cf. also Nömmik 2010, 32; Clines 2015, 117.

²²⁹ Nömmik 2010, 28–32; 2025.

tricola. In both Hebrew and Greek, the end is marked with the causal “for” (כי and γὰρ).

The Hebrew strophe is framed with (partial) symmetries (in v. 20 ABC/xA'C' and in v. 23 xAB/xA'B'); but in Greek, the strophe begins with a partial chiasmus (ABC/A'C'B'/C'B'').

In Greek, the end of the strophe is marked with the rare verb εἰρηνεύουσιν “they shall be at peace” in v. 23 (εἰρηνεύω; 28x, LXX: 19, OG Job: 5). A couple of marked Hebrew words appear in this strophe: in 21a, the noun בשוט (שוט “whip”; 10x, Job: 2, Prov: 1); and in 22a, the noun ולכפן (כפן “famine”; Job: 2).

There are several lexical repetitions throughout the strophe. Firstly, the repetition of οὐ μὴ φοβηθῇς “you shall not fear” in 21b/22b, reflecting the repetition of ולא תירא and אל תירא in Hebrew 21b/22b. Secondly, the repetition of θηρίων ἀγρίων and θῆρες ἄγριοι “wild animals” in 22b/23b, reflecting the repetition of ומחית הארץ “animals of the earth” and וחית השדה “the wild animals” in Hebrew 22b/23b. In Hebrew, the noun השדה “of the field” is repeated in 23ab.

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 20a*, the perfect פדך “he ransomed, rescued you” is translated with the future tense ῥύσεται σε “he will rescue, deliver you”, because the context requires it. *In 20b*, the dual מידי חרב “from the hands of the sword” is translated with the singular ἐκ χειρὸς σιδήρου “from the hand of iron (=of the sword)”; again, this is due to context, because everything else is also in singular. Further, the Hebraism has been kept in the translation (cf. 15:22b). The translator adds the phrase λύσει σε “He will free you,” to make the cola in v. 20 more balanced²³⁰; this also creates some assonance with the first colon. *In 22b*, the (common) singular ומחית הארץ “of the beast(s) of the earth” is translated with the plural ἀπὸ δὲ θηρίων ἀγρίων “(be afraid) of wild beasts”. Orlinsky has suggested that the Hebrew *Vorlage* in 22b may have had השדה instead of הארץ; however, he does not consider it the original Hebrew and thus the preserved MT is closer to it²³¹. *In v. 23*, similarly to 22b, the singular וחית השדה “and the beast(s) of the field” is translated with the plural θῆρες ἄγριοι “the wild beasts” (“and” is omitted).

Changes regarding religion or religious culture and law. *In 21a*, the passive תחבא “you are hidden” is translated with the active σε κρύψει “He will hide you”, making God’s action more explicit. *V. 23* consists of a single colon in Greek. Hebrew 23a כי עם אבני השדה בריתך “for you shall be in league with the stones of the field” has not been translated, except the first word. The Greek corresponds to the Hebrew 23b, except for γὰρ which corresponds to the כי in MT 23a. Gorea posits that the translator did not translate due to the difficulty of the expression “you shall be in league with the stones of the field”²³²; it is plausible, as for example, ברית appears several times in Job but is translated only once (in 40:28).

²³⁰ So also Dhont 2018a, 36.

²³¹ Orlinsky 1964, 64–6.

²³² Gorea 2007, 15–7.

Gehman connects the nontranslation with theology and says that the colon “was omitted because that would lower the idea of the divine covenant”²³³.

Utilising the context or the translator's previous knowledge for the meaning of unknown words. *In 21b*, מִשָּׁד כִּי יבֹא “of destruction when it comes” is translated with a more general ἀπὸ κακῶν ἐρχομένων “of the bad things that come”. In the next colon, v. 22a, the same word and a very rare word in the phrase לְשָׁד וּלְכַפֵּן “at destruction and famine” has been translated with ἀδίκων καὶ ἀνόμων “at the unjust and lawless”. Dhorme suggests that the translator interpreted the Hebrew words as the Aramaic words שָׁדָד and כַּפָּר here²³⁴.

Vorlage different than the later MT. *In 21a*, instead of the Masoretic בְּשׁוֹט, the *Vorlage* and pre-MT manuscripts probably read as מְשׁוֹט and was thus translated with ἀπὸ μάστιγος γλώσσης “from the tongue-lashing” (cf. Vg *a flagello linguae* and P ܡܫܘܬ ܠܥܝܢܐ). In the context of the strophe, the *mem*-preposition suits better, as it is used in preceding and succeeding cola. Witte suggests reading the Hebrew accordingly and Clines does not oppose but deems both readings possible²³⁵.

V. 22 is deemed a later commentary or gloss by Witte, Nömmik, Kaiser, and Fohrer. Witte explains that it does not fit in for several reasons: parallelism with v. 21, a different preposition in the beginning compared to the previous verses, and the Aramaic word כַּפֵּן which occurs only here and in 30:3. According to Nömmik it is a thematically superfluous gloss, and has several words in common with v. 23; the word כַּפֵּן is also considered a rare Aramaism, therefore might be later.²³⁶ The translator did not know the meaning of some of the words in this verse, including the Aramaism, but otherwise did not run into any difficulties, and made efforts to make the strophe sensible and stylistically coherent.

XIV: 5:24–26

Style

Verses 24–26 form a strophe consisting of three bicola. The beginning is marked with the adverb εἶτα “then” in Greek. In the last verse of the strophe, Hebrew has very rare words: in 26a, the noun בַּלַּח (בלח “vigour”; Job: 2); and in 26b, the noun גְּדִישׁ “stack” (גדש, Job: 1).

Parallelistic structures are present in all verses of the Greek, while in Hebrew, the beginning of the strophe is marked with non-parallelism: in v. 24, Greek has a partial chiasmus (xABCD/D'C'); in v. 25, the Greek partial chiasmus (ABCD/D'C') reflects the Hebrew partial chiasmus (xAxBC/xC'B'); and in v. 26, Greek has a partial symmetry (ABCD/xC'D'), just as does Hebrew (ACD/xA'BC').

²³³ Gehman 1949, 238.

²³⁴ Dhorme 1967, 70.

²³⁵ Clines 2015, 117; Witte 2021, 132.

²³⁶ Fohrer 1963, 57, 129, 133; Witte 1994a, 73; Kaiser 2006, 14, 125; Nömmik 2010, 32–3; 2013, 27–9, 143–5, 153; 2014a, 286; Witte 2021, 132, 136; Nömmik 2025.

The phrase “you shall know” is repeated in 24a/25a in both languages: וידעת כי רב זרעך in Hebrew and γνώση ὅτι in Greek.

There are several uses of marked vocabulary in the OG translation: in 24a, the verb εἰρηνεύσει “it will be at peace” (28x, LXX: 19, OG Job: 5); in 25b, the noun τὸ παμβότανον “all the herbage” (a *hapax legomenon*²³⁷, categorised under “newly formed compounds”²³⁸); in 26a, the adjective ὥριμος “ripe” (7x, LXX: 2, OG Job: 1); and in 26b, the noun θημωνιὰ “a heap” (LXX: 8, OG Job: 1) and the verb (participle) συγκομισθεῖσα “gathered” (29x, OG Job: 1).

Vv. 25 and 26 have similes in both languages. There are differences in the Greek translation, where the translator has made an effort to make the second simile fuller.

γνώση δὲ ὅτι πολὺ τὸ σπέρμα σου,	וידעת כי רב זרעך
τὰ δὲ τέκνα σου ἔσται ὥσπερ τὸ παμβότανον	וצאצאיך כעשב הארץ:
τοῦ ἀγροῦ.	
ἐλεύση δὲ ἐν τάφῳ ὥσπερ σῖτος ὥριμος κατὰ	תבוא בכלח אלי קבר
καιρὸν θερίζομενος	
ἢ ὥσπερ θημωνιὰ ἄλωνος καθ' ὥραν	בעלות גדיש בעתו:
συγκομισθεῖσα.	
“And you shall know that your descendants will be many, and your offspring shall be as the grass of the field. / And you shall come to your grave like ripe grain, harvested at the right time, or as a heap on the threshing floor, gathered in its season.”	“You shall know that your descendants will be many, and your offspring like the grass of the earth. / You shall come to your grave in ripe old age, as a shock of grain comes up to the threshing floor in its season.”

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. **In 24a**, εἶτα “then” is added as a transition marker for the beginning of the strophe. אהלך “your tent” has been translated with σου ὁ οἶκος “your house” to match the cityscape of Alexandria better²³⁹. **In 24b**, the phrase ולא תחטא “and you will not sin, miss anything” is understood as referring to a feminine subject (the tent) not the second person singular and translated with οὐ μὴ ἀμάρτη “it (the livelihood of your tent) shall not miss, sin”. **In 25b**, כעשב “like grass” is translated with ὥσπερ τὸ παμβότανον “all the herbage”. Beekman categorises this under “non-adequate” renderings of Hebrew at first, but only on the basis that the translator could have chosen a more common equivalent (χόρτος); he considers this rendering a stylistic choice due to the resulting πολὺ/παμ- parallelism in v. 25²⁴⁰. The translator also adds ἔσται

²³⁷ Cf. also Mangin 2005, 549.

²³⁸ Dhont 2018a, 147.

²³⁹ See theories about the translator being a city-dweller, e.g., Cox 2023, 246.

²⁴⁰ Beekman 2020, 32; 2024, 249–50.

“shall be” to strictly convey future (it is singular, thus one of the few cases of *schema attikon* in Job²⁴¹). The second part of **v. 26a** in Greek corresponds to Hebrew 26b; thus, 26b is translated twice. σῖτος “grain” is added to create a fuller symmetry. The infinitive בעלות “to be brought” has been changed into a participle conveying more strictly the harvesting of grain: θερίζόμενος “being harvested.” **In 26b**, גדיש “the stack (of grain)” has been expanded into θημωνιὰ ἄλωνος “a heap of the threshing floor”. Again, the infinitive בעלות “to be brought” has been changed into a participle conveying more strictly the gathering of grain, this time συγχομισθεῖσα “gathered.”

Vorlage different than the later MT. **In 24a**, the noun שלום “peace” is translated with a verb in future tense εἰρηνεύσει “it will be at peace”, due to having ושלם (*waw* + perfect) in the *Vorlage* instead. Although simple metathesis could also explain this translation, similar occurrences of the verb-form in 15:21b, 21:9a, and 25:2b would suggest otherwise.

Reading or vocalising the consonantal text differently than the later Masoretes. **In 24b**, ופקדת נוך “you shall inspect your fold” has been read as ופקדת נוך “the goods of your fold” and thus translated as ἡ δὲ δίαίτα τῆς σκηνῆς σου “the livelihood of your tent”²⁴².

Translator’s limited vocabulary. **In 26a**, the translator has omitted בכלח “in vigour”; the word occurs only twice and is also left untranslated in 30:2 (the whole verse is untransalted), suggesting that the translator did not know what it meant.

XV: 5:27

Style

Verse 27 is a concluding strophe consisting of a *tricolon* in Greek and a *bicolon* in Hebrew. The verse in Hebrew displays colometrical imbalance with 17 + 13 consonants. In this way, the end of the speech in Greek is marked structurally. The first two cola of Greek are in partial symmetry (ABDE/B’CD’E’).

The speech ends with transition markers, namely the interjection “look!” in both languages: הנה in Hebrew and ἰδοὺ in Greek. Additionally, the Hebrew has two imperatives שמענה “hear!” and דע “know!” while Greek has an emphasised imperative σὺ δὲ γνῶθι “but do know!”.

In this short strophe, Greek has some marked vocabulary: in 27a, the verb ἐξιχνιάσαμεν “we traced” (LXX: 16, OG Job: 6); and in 27c, the phrase σὺ δὲ γνῶθι σεαυτῷ εἰ “but do know for yourself whether” is considered Homeric by Mangin²⁴³.

²⁴¹ Mangin 2005, 630.

²⁴² Dhorme 1967, 72.

²⁴³ Mangin 2005, 503.

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics, although partially vocalising the consonantal text differently than the later Masoretes. *In 27b*, ταῦτά ἐστιν ἃ ἀκηκόαμεν “these are the things we have heard” reflects in an extended manner the pronoun זה “this” (f.) in Hebrew 27a and the imperative שמענה “hear that!”, which has been vocalised as the first-person plural “we have heard” (שמענו)²⁴⁴. In agreement with several versions²⁴⁵, Nömmik suggests vocalising the MT like this as well²⁴⁶. *In 27c*, εἴ τι ἔπραξας “if you have done anything” is added to the imperative “know!”, as a clarification or explanation²⁴⁷.

²⁴⁴ Cf. also Dhorme 1967, 73.

²⁴⁵ So also P .

²⁴⁶ Nömmik 2010, 33.

²⁴⁷ Cf. Cox 2016a, 65.

JOB 8

Introduction

Job 8 contains Baldad's first speech: *Baldad reproaches Job and exhorts him to pray to God and act like the ancestors did. He gives examples and illustrations on what happens to an impious person and how God always acts justly.*

The OG translation of Job 8 divides into seven strophes:

I (8:2–4, 3B) *Address and admonition/reproach.*

II (8:5–7, 1M1T²⁴⁸1B) *Exhorting Job to pray to God.*

III (8:8–10, 3B) *Job should consult our ancestors.*

IV (8:11–13, 3B) *Plant metaphor/proverb about what happens without God (likened to water, drink).*

V (8:14–15, 2B) *Illustration about what happens to an impious person: his house will not stay.*

VI (8:16–19, 4B) *Illustration about what happens to an impious person: he himself will not be able to stay anywhere.*

VII (8:20–22, 3B) *Conclusion: God will always act justly with the blameless and the impious.*

As a **keyword**, “the Lord” is repeated four times throughout the speech (ἰς and κύριος) in 8:3, 5, 13, 20 and “the Almighty” twice (ἰσχυς and ὁ τὰ πάντα ποιήσας and παντοκράτωρ) in 8:3, 5 in both languages, i.e. the Greek translator reflects all uses of theonyms. The translator adds a keyword to the speech on their own, namely ἀσεβής “the impious” (vv. 13, 19, 20, 22) and its antonym ἀληθινός “the sincere” (vv. 6, 21), using semantic levelling for several Hebrew words or completely on their own.

Like the previous speech under analysis (Job 4–5), **the Greek text** of Job 8 does not contain any asterisked passages. Although the strophe length is not uniform in this speech, the strophes do not exceed four bicola in length, and the speech as a whole has quite a symmetric structure: the first and last strophes are three bicola, the middle one has two, and the two strophes surrounding it also have three bicola. The second and sixth strophes are those that break this pattern. Whether and how much different stylistic features help with delimiting these strophes is described below and in Appendix III. There is not a single strophe in this speech where at least two other scholars do not see the same strophe division for the Hebrew text (cf. Appendix II). Despite these agreements, more care needs to be taken in the critical analysis of those few strophes where the Greek strophe division has fewer agreements with Hebrew strophe division or where secondary additions to the speech are suspected.

²⁴⁸ A bicolon in LXX^{Zi} and codices.

The Hebrew text of Job 8 is considered to be in the original Job-poem, but several scholars think that 6b and 15 were later glosses. Other opinions on secondary verses differ. More specifically, according to Witte, Job 8 belonged almost fully to the original poem of Job, with the exception of v. 8:1, added by the book redactor, and v. 6b, which is a later gloss²⁴⁹. Kaiser and Nömmik see more passages as secondary: the prose introduction in 8:1 by the book editor early on and later glosses vv. 6a (Kaiser) / 6b (Nömmik), 9, and 15.²⁵⁰ The largest amount of secondary verses is proposed by Vermeylen: in *rédaction* III, vv. 4, 6a, 9, 11–12, 15 were inserted.²⁵¹ The whole speech is seen as original to the Job-poem by van Oorschot and Syring (except the prose introduction in 8:1, added in the first redaction)²⁵².

I: 8:2–4

Style

Verses 2–4 form an introductory strophe consisting of three bicola. The beginning of the speech and the strophe is embellished with marked vocabulary in both languages: in Hebrew 2a, the verb מלל “to speak” (Aramaic); 9x, Job: 2, Ps: 1); in 2b, the adjective כביר “mighty” (10x, Job: 6; BDB considers it a poetic word), and the noun אמרי “the words” (אמר; classified under poetic and exalted style in BDB). The Greek translator has used a *hapax*/neologism, namely πολυρῆμον “talkative, wordy” in 2b²⁵³. The strophe/speech also begins with a marked question: עד אן “how long?” in Hebrew and Μέχρι τίνος “how long?” in Greek.

In v. 3, the middle of the strophe, the Greek partial symmetry xABC/xA'B'D basically reflects the partial symmetry in Hebrew (xABC/xA'B'C').

Lexical repetitions appear twice in Hebrew: the repetition of יעות “he perverts” in 3ab, and the repetition of אם in 3b/4a, although in different meanings (“or” and “if”). The Greek translator does not reflect these, but adds a root-repetition related to יעות, namely ἀδυναήσει “he will act unjustly” and τὸ δίκαιον “what is right, just” in 3ab, i.e. the middle of the strophe.

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. **In 2a**, the Hebrew question עד אן “until when?” has been properly Hellenised into Μέχρι τίνος “until what (when)?”. **In 2b**, the ורוח כביר אמרי פיד “and the words of your mouth are a great wind” is translated with combining “great” and “words”²⁵⁴ into πολυρῆμον “wordy

²⁴⁹ Witte 1994a, 191–2; 2021, 57–9, 179, 181.

²⁵⁰ Kaiser 2006, 125; Nömmik 2010, 85; 2013, 27–9, 161–4; 2025.

²⁵¹ Vermeylen 2015, 159–60, 180–2, 329.

²⁵² Syring 2004, 168–73; van Oorschot 2007, 171–84.

²⁵³ Dhont 2018a, 164. Regarding the alliteration of *p* in 2b, Dhont mentions that the translation choice “talkative” is unique to Job. It could have been translated this way particularly to add alliteration, maybe even “to compensate for the loss of sound effect” in Hebrew 2a (תמללי-אלה).

²⁵⁴ Cf. also Dhorme 1967, 112.

(lit. with many words, much-speaking)” and thus arriving at πνεῦμα πολυρῆμον τοῦ στόματός σου “wordy wind of your mouth”. The conjunction “and” at the beginning of the colon is not translated. While the Hebrew repeats the verb יָעוֹר “he perverts” in **3a and b**, the Greek uses two different verbs, ἀδικήσῃ “he will act unjustly” and ταραξεί “he will trouble, disturb”. Dhorme proposes reading/emending the repeating verb in Hebrew v. 3 based on the versions²⁵⁵; how warranted that is, is questionable since the OG translator is not a stranger to introducing variation instead of repetition to the text²⁵⁶. In **4b**, the suffix ׁ- “them” in וְשִׁלְחֵם is not translated in Greek, as the object of the verb is understandable from the rest of the verse.

Changes regarding religion or religious culture and law. In **3a**, the Hebrew noun מִשְׁפָּט “justice” is translated with a participle κρίνων “judging, when he judges”. Thus, the meaning is slightly skewed, as God’s judging process is made more explicit in Greek. The epithet/name ὁ τὰ πάντα ποιήσας “He who does everything” in **3b** is the only time in Job that this phrase is used as a translation for שָׂדִי. The usual translations are either ὁ κύριος or ὁ παντοκράτωρ.²⁵⁷

Vermeulen thinks that v. 4 interrupts the train of thought and is not necessary for the coherence of the text but rather illustrates v. 3 (based on 1:5, 18). It emphasises that Job is guilty and thus is seemingly from an editor that is hostile towards Job, like *rédacteur* III who added 4:12–5:1 and 5:17–27.²⁵⁸ The translator translated the verse almost word for word and found nothing in it to object to.

II: 8:5–7

Style

Verses 5–7 form a strophe that is made up of a *monocolon*, a tricolon²⁵⁹ and a bicolon in Greek, but a bicolon, tricolon, and another bicolon in Hebrew. Thus, the beginning of the strophe is more marked structurally in Greek, but in Hebrew, it is the middle that is marked. The strophe begins with an emphasised personal pronoun and an imperative σὺ δὲ ὄρθριζε “but you, quickly approach!” in Greek, reflecting the emphasised pronoun in Hebrew (אם אתה “if you”).

In Hebrew, the strophe is framed with parallelistic structures: in v. 5, a partial chiasmus (xABC/xC’B’) and in v. 7, a partial symmetry (xABC/B’C’); the latter is reflected in Greek (AxBC/B’C’), i.e., the end of the strophe is marked (although note that the next strophe begins with a parallelistic structure).

The end of the strophe stands out with marked vocabulary in both languages. In Hebrew 7a, the noun מַצְעָר “little thing” (5x, Job: 1); and in 7b, the verb יִשְׁגֶּה “to increase”; 3x, Job: 1, Ps: 2). The Greek translator has used a rare adjective in 7b, namely ἀμύθητα “unquantifiably many, much” (ἀμύθητος, -ον; 29x, LXX: 5, OG Job: 3).

²⁵⁵ Dhorme 1967, 112–3.

²⁵⁶ Cf. also Clines 2015, 198.

²⁵⁷ Cf. also, for example, Kepper and Witte 2011, 2082.

²⁵⁸ Vermeulen 2015, 159–60.

²⁵⁹ LXX^{Zi} formats the verse as a bicolon but it clearly corresponds to the Hebrew tricolon.

There are more lexical repetitions in Hebrew than in Greek: the conditional particle אם “if” in 5a/6a; the personal pronoun אתה “you” in 5a/6a; and the preposition אל “to” in 5ab. However, in Greek, the repetitions are more substantial: the verb “to be” in 6a/7a (εἶ/ἔσται) and a root-repetition in 5/6b (δεόμενος/δεήσεως).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. Although the meanings of תשחרר “you seek early, you look for” and ὀρθρίζε “rise early!” in v. 5 are different, ὀρθρίζω is the equivalent for שחרר in the LXX several times, especially in Job and Psalms²⁶⁰. אל אל ואל שדי “for God and for the Almighty” is translated only partly as πρὸς κύριον παντοκράτορα “the Lord Almighty”, suggesting that the translator joined the two phrases into one²⁶¹, either deliberately, to create a monocolon at the beginning of the strophe or due to the simple fact that the consonants אל appear three times in a row and it would be easy to miss one of them. The finite verb תתחנן “you seek favour” changed into a participle δεόμενος “praying.” Again, this seems an intentional way of shortening the bicolon (in chiasmus) into a longer monocolon that marks the beginning of the strophe. In 6a, אתה “you” is changed into a verb εἶ “you are”, although Dhorme is of the opinion that the Greek translator omitted the pronoun²⁶². This can be argued with, since replacing a pronoun with a corresponding form of the verb “to be” is common enough in Job. In 6b, the Hebrew כי עתה יעיר עליך ושלם “surely then he will rouse himself for you” is paraphrased into δεήσεως ἐπακούσεται σου “he will hear your entreaty”. This entails omitting the phrase כי עתה and paraphrasing the rest. This is one of the two times that the translator leaves כי עתה untranslated. If it was in the Vorlage, the translator thought it completely unsuitable in the middle of the verse and omitted it, while adjusting the rest of the colon. Dhorme is of the opinion that the translator read יעתר (“he is entreated”) instead of יעיר in the MT. Orlinsky, on the other hand, thinks that the translator took the context into account and produced a translation that is more precise in meaning. Clines thinks that the translator is avoiding anthropomorphism.²⁶³ Whatever the reason, the result of the paraphrase creates a root-repetition with δεόμενος in v. 5. In 6c, the Hebrew נות צדקך “the place/abode of your righteousness” is paraphrased into σοι δίαιταν δικαιοσύνης “way of life/dwelling of righteousness to you”. In 7a, the particle οὖν “then, therefore” is added to act as a transition marker at the end of the strophe. The singular ראשיתך מצער “your beginning (will be) little” is translated with the plural τὰ μὲν πρῶτά σου ὀλίγα “your first things = your beginning will be little/small.” In 7b, again, the singular ואחריתך “and your end” is translated with the plural τὰ δὲ ἔσχατά σου “your final things = your end” and the phrase ישגה מאד “(it) will increase much” is changed into a plural adjective ἀμύθητα “(they

²⁶⁰ Vg approaches in the same way and translates *diluculo consurrexeris* “thou wilt arise early”.

²⁶¹ Cf. e.g., Mangin 2005, 49–51.

²⁶² Dhorme 1967, 114.

²⁶³ Orlinsky 1958, 256–7; Dhorme 1967, 114; Clines 2015, 198.

are) unspeakably many, great”. The disjunction between the two cola in v. 7 is made explicit in Greek with the $\mu\epsilon\acute{\nu}\nu \dots \delta\epsilon$ construction.

V. 6 in the MT is a tricolon. Scholars think that one of the cola in it must be secondary. Dhorme, Kaiser, Vermeylen, and Fohrer deem 6a as secondary, Dhorme says that the first colon “is alien to the main theme”. Vermeylen thinks that it is a later addition because it interrupts the poetic structure and the order of the sentence (6bc being linked to v. 5). It is also analogous to 22:24–25 which is an addition from the Hellenistic period. In short, he thinks that vv. 5–6 without our current 6a offer a coherent reading. Witte and Nömmik, on the other hand, see 6b as a later commentary or gloss. They reason this with the fact that it is missing in one Hebrew manuscript (Hs^{K18}). Nömmik also mentions that 6b is disruptive in this verse (a conditional clause) and in the context of the previous conditional clauses; additionally, כִּי עֵתָּה at the beginning of the colon is not common in Baldad speeches and the verb יַעִיר is not common to friends’ speeches.²⁶⁴ From the standpoint of the OG, the translator objected to כִּי עֵתָּה being in the middle of a verse, omitted it and paraphrased the rest of 6b. If 6b was a later addition, part of it disturbed the translator so much that they had no choice but to omit it.

III: 8:8–10

Style

Verses 8–10 form a strophe consisting of three bicola. The beginning of the strophe is marked with partial symmetry where the Greek symmetry $AxBC/A'B'C'$ reflects the Hebrew symmetry $xAB/xA'B'$ and imperatives $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\rho\omega\tau\eta\sigma\omicron\nu \gamma\acute{\alpha\rho}$ “for inquire” in 8a and $\epsilon\acute{\xi}\iota\chi\nu\lambda\alpha\sigma\sigma\omicron\nu \delta\epsilon$ “and track” in 8b, which also reflect the Hebrew כִּי שֶׁאֵל נָא “for inquire now” and וְכֹנֵן “and consider”. The strophe ends with a marked question “will not?” in both languages (הֲלֹא and οὐχ). In Hebrew, the end of the strophe is additionally marked with a poetic (according to BDB) word: the noun מִלִּים (מלה) “words.”

In Hebrew, the particle כִּי “for” is repeated three times (in 8a/9ab); all three are reflected in Greek, with an additional repetition of the verb “to be” in 9ab ($\gamma\acute{\alpha\rho} \epsilon\sigma\mu\epsilon\nu/\gamma\acute{\alpha\rho} \epsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon$). There is also an independent root-repetition in 8ab: $\gamma\epsilon\nu\epsilon\alpha\nu$ “generation” and $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ “line, generation”, both derived from the verb $\gamma\acute{\iota}\gamma\omicron\nu\mu\alpha\iota$.

The translator has used a couple of relatively rare words: in 8b, the verb $\epsilon\acute{\xi}\iota\chi\nu\lambda\alpha\zeta\omega$ (“to track out”; LXX: 16, OG Job: 6)²⁶⁵; and in 9a, the adjective $\chi\theta\iota\zeta\omicron\iota$ “of yesterday” ($\chi\theta\iota\zeta\omicron\varsigma$, -ή, -όν; 23x, OG Job: 1).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *V. 8b* has been paraphrased from $\text{וְכֹנֵן לַחֲקֹר אֲבוֹתָם}$ “and consider what their ancestors have found” into $\epsilon\acute{\xi}\iota\chi\nu\lambda\alpha\sigma\sigma\omicron\nu$

²⁶⁴ Fohrer 1963, 57, 183, 184; Dhorme 1967, 114–5; Kaiser 2006, 18, 125; Nömmik 2010, 57; 2013, 162; Vermeylen 2015, 159–60, 329; Witte 2021, 179, 181; Nömmik 2025.

²⁶⁵ Cf. also Mangin 2005, 517.

δὲ κατὰ γένος πατέρων “and track it through a line of ancestors”.²⁶⁶ The suffix in “their fathers” is not translated. Whether לַחֲקֹר is left untranslated or assimilated into the verb ἐξιχνίασον, is hard to say for certain. The paraphrase creates a root-repetition with the first colon. **In 9a**, the common singular noun תָּמוּל “(from) yesterday” is appropriately translated with the plural adjective χθιζοὶ “of yesterday” (corresponding to “we are”), a *hapax legomenon* in the LXX. The pronoun אֲנַחְנוּ “we” is due to a common practice of the translator changed into the verb ἐσμεν “we are”.²⁶⁷ **In 9b**, the Hebrew יָמֵינוּ “our days” is changed into ἡμῶν ὁ βίος “our life” (also a common technique used by the translator²⁶⁸). The copula ἐστὶν “it is” is added, to increase symmetry with the first colon and to create a lexical repetition. This is very similar to how a repetition was created in the previous strophe as well. **In 10a**, the more general לֵךְ יֹאמְרוּ “they say to you” is translated with the more specific ἀναγγελοῦσιν “they will declare”, omitting the prepositional phrase. The conjunction καὶ “and” is added between the two verbs (διδάξουσιν καὶ ἀναγγελοῦσιν). **In 10b**, the suffix מֵ- “their” in וּמִלִּבָּם “and out of their heart” is not translated, as it is not strictly necessary for understanding.

Nömmik, Kaiser and Vermeylen see v. 9 as a later commentary on v. 8 or a gloss, whereas Witte thinks that despite the colometric irregularity it is original. Nömmik categorises it as an antithetical reinterpretation of v. 8; the verse is disruptive with its double כִּי and is colometrically a bit too long. Vermeylen thinks that topic-wise (human life is short, man knows nothing) it aligns with *rédaction* III.²⁶⁹ Thematically and rhetorically, however, the transition ancestors-us-ancestors is sensible. In the Greek translation, nothing points to the translator struggling in this verse, not in topic nor in form.

IV: 8:11–13

Style

Verses 11–13 form a strophe consisting of three bicola. The strophe begins with a yes-no question (marked with -הָ in Hebrew and μὴ in Greek), symmetry (Greek xABC/xA'B'C' and Hebrew xABC/A'B'C'), as well as a lexical repetition (the preposition ἄνευ “without” in 11ab) and rare vocabulary in Greek v. 11 (πάπυρος “papyrus” which reflects a rare word in Hebrew; 13x, LXX: 3, OG Job: 2; and βούτομον “sedge” which also reflects a rare word in Hebrew; 14x, OG Job: 2).

The strophe ends with the adverb כֵּן “such” in Hebrew and with the slightly more emphasised οὕτως τοίνυν “such indeed” in Greek; these refer back to the imagery and illustration in this strophe.

The Greek has an additional root-repetition in 11b/12b: ἄνευ πότου “without drink” and πρὸ τοῦ πιεῖν “before/in preference to drinking”.

²⁶⁶ Cf. also Dhorme 1967, 116.

²⁶⁷ Dhont 2018, 117 considers ἐσμεν an addition.

²⁶⁸ Cf. also Dhont 2018a, 198, 216.

²⁶⁹ Kaiser 2006, 19, 125; Nömmik 2010, 57–8; 2013, 163; Vermeylen 2015, 159–60, 329; Witte 2021, 179, 181; Nömmik 2025.

Hebrew has marked words in the first three cola: in 11a, the verb **הִגָּאָה** (גָּאָה) “to rise up”; 7x, Job: 2), the noun **גִּמְאָ** “reed” (Egyptian loan-word; 4x, Job: 1), and the noun **בְּצָה** “swamps, marshes” (3x, Job: 2); in 11b, the *hapax* verb **יִשְׁגָּה** (שָׁגָה “to grow”), the noun **אֲחוֹ** “meadow; rushes, reed” (Egyptian loan-word; 3x, Job: 1), and the negation **בְּלִי** “without” (considered chiefly poetic by BDB); finally, in 12a, the noun **בְּאֵבוֹ** (אֵב “greenery”; 5x, Job: 1), and the verb **יִקְטֹף** (קָטַף “to pluck”; 6x, Job: 2).

Text

Utilising the context or the translator's previous knowledge for the meaning of unknown words. The Hebrew botanical vocabulary used in this strophe is mostly rare. The translator recognised the context and sometimes even used more specific vocabulary accordingly. *In 11a*, the Hebrew rare verb **יִגָּאָה** “it rises, grows up” is translated with a more specific verb, used very often when referring to plants and trees, namely **θάλλει** “it grows, sprouts, thrives”. The noun **גִּמְאָ** appears only four times in the HB, each time translated differently, here with **πάπυρος** “papyrus,” suiting the context. The phrase with a rare noun **בְּלֹא בְּצָה** “where there is no swamp, marsh (?)” is translated as **ἀνευ ὕδατος** “without water”²⁷⁰. *In 11b*, the phrase **יִשְׁגָּה אֲחוֹ** “reeds (?) grow/flourish (?)” consisting of a *hapax* verb and a rare noun is translated with **ὑψωθήσεται βούτομον** “sedge will be raised, become tall”²⁷¹. *In 12a*, the rare noun **בְּאֵבוֹ** “in its greenery” is translated with **ἐπὶ ῥίζης** “on, upon root”, without the suffix. The rare verb **לֹא יִקְטֹף** “it is not plucked” is translated with **καὶ οὐ μὴ θερισθῇ** “and it has not been reaped, harvested, cut off” (this is a unique equivalence). The translator has tried to make sense of v. *12b*, where the Hebrew **יִבֹשׁ כָּל חֲצִיר יִבֹשׁ** “and before any plant they wither” has been translated as **πρὸ τοῦ πιεῖν πᾶσα βοτάνη οὐχὶ ξηραίνεται** “no plant becomes dry in preference to drinking”. The conjunction **וְ** is not translated, but the translator has added **τοῦ πιεῖν** “of drinking” (cf. also the translation choice in 11b, effectively creating a root-repetition and stronger correspondence between the verses) to **πρὸ** “before, instead of, in preference to” and negated the verb **ξηραίνεται** with **οὐχὶ** “not”. The meaning of the Greek is essentially “When (the plant) is still on the root and has not been cut down, it does not wither instead of drinking.” The Hebrew, in contrast, seems to mean “While it is still green it is not plucked, it withers before all grass.” As water has been mentioned in v. 11, drinking is a sensible continuation.

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 11b*, the conjunction **וְ** “or” is added to the beginning of the colon. The Hebrew **מִיָּם** “water” is changed into **πότου** “drinking.” This seems to be a unique equivalent in the LXX; cf. 11a, where “water” is already used in Greek. *In 12a*, the Hebrew phrase **עַדְנִי** “while it” is changed into an adverb + participle construction **ἔτι ὃν** “while it is” (neutrum,

²⁷⁰ Vg translates with *absque humore* “without moisture”, thus also relying on the context.

²⁷¹ Beeckman 2020, 32–3; 2024, 250 categorises this under “non-adequate renderings” at first, but his analysis concludes on the fact that it is indeed an adequate rendering, albeit more specific than the Hebrew. P also translates with a “more semantically complex and contextually appropriate verb”, namely “to sprout up”. See Szpek 1992, 183.

corresponding to βούτομον; note the common technique of translating pronouns with the verb “to-be”). *In 13a*, כן “such” is expanded and emphasised into οὕτως τοίγυν εἶσται “such indeed will be”. *In 13b*, the particle γὰρ “for” is added, or more specifically it replaces the -ו in Hebrew, to make the second colon explicitly inferential in Greek.

Reading, vocalising, or understanding the consonantal text differently than the later Masoretes. One difference *in 13a*, namely τὰ ἔσχατα “the final things” is possibly a result of reading the Hebrew as אחרון “coming after, behind” or more likely, it has been suggested, as אחרית “end, edge”²⁷². Either way, the Greek translator uses a typical neutrum plural translation for the common singular.

Vermeylen thinks that vv. 11–12 are a later addition, namely from *rédaction* III. The image they convey does not fit well with the surrounding verses and ideas but rather with 4:18–21 which were added by *rédacteur* III. He also sees similarities with Isa 40:6–8.²⁷³ Although in general, the assessment that the verses are later just on the basis that they “do not fit well”, cannot be agreed with, in this case the translator did run into some difficulties in v. 12 which is changed quite a bit, in order to make it sensible in this strophe.

V: 8:14–15

Style

Verses 14–15 form a strophe that consists of two bicola. The beginning is marked with γὰρ “for” in Greek. Both verses of the strophe have symmetry: in v. 14, Hebrew symmetry (xAB/xA'B') is translated into symmetry (AxBCD/A'B'C'D') and in v. 15, Hebrew symmetry (ABC/A'B'C') is translated into partial symmetry (xABCD/A'B'D').

In Hebrew, the first verse has two very rare words: in 14a, the *hapax* verb יקוט “to cut off” and in 14b, the noun עכביש “spider” (2x, Job: 1).

There are two lexical repetitions in Hebrew. Firstly, the noun “house” (ובית in 14b, ביתו in 15a). A similar repetition can be found in Greek as well, namely the triple root-repetition of ἀοικητος “uninhabited” and ὁ οἶκος “the house” in 14a, and τῇ οἰκίαν “the house” in 15a. Secondly, the negation ולא in 15ab, reflected in Greek with οὐ μὴ.

Text

Reading, vocalising, or understanding the consonantal text differently than the later Masoretes. *V. 14*, אשר יקוט כסלו ובית עכביש מבטחו “his confidence is cut off and the house of a spider is his trust” is translated as ἀοικητος γὰρ αὐτοῦ ἔσται ὁ οἶκος ἀράχνη δὲ αὐτοῦ ἀποβήσεται ἡ σαγή “for his house will be uninhabited, and his tent will prove to be a spider’s web”. Firstly, the relative particle אשר is replaced with γὰρ “for.” Then, יקוט כסלו “his confidence is cut off,” trust and

²⁷² Dhorme 1967, 119; Muraoka 2010, 51; Nömmik 2010, 58; Kepper and Witte 2011; Witte 2021, 179.

²⁷³ Vermeylen 2015, 159–60, 329.

confidence being related to one having a place to stay and call home, is paraphrased into the adjective ἀσκήτος “uninhabited”²⁷⁴. A second possibility is that since the words are rare, the translation is a contextual guess based on the בית “house” and second colon where “the house of a spider” is mentioned. Thus, ἡ σκηνή could be the result of possibly reading מבית(ה) “from his house” or בבית(ה) “in his house” instead of מבטחו “his trust,” or uses a synonym for trust, just like in 14a.²⁷⁵ In any case, the words ἔσται “it will be” and ἀποβήσεται “it will turn out” are additions to give both clauses copulas and the message in Greek is very clear. The phrase אשר יקוט is thought to be a product of textual corruption by some²⁷⁶; however, all signs point to the the *Vorlage* of OG being the same or almost the same as the MT.

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. The Hebrew v. 15a is usually understood as a conditional (although not marked for it), and the Greek translator does add εἰ “if” to the beginning. The equivalence of ישען על “he leans upon” and ὑπερείσῃ “he would prop up, support” is unique, but translates both elements; this does not change the overall message. The negation ולא in 15a and b is emphasised with the combination οὐ μὴ and aorist subjunctive. In 15b, the phrase יחזיק בו “he lays hold of it” is translated into a genitive absolute ἐπιλαβομένου αὐτοῦ “when he lays hold”, leaving בו is left untranslated. The equivalence between יקום “it stands” and ὑπομείνῃ “it remains” is unique; however, the overall meaning of the colon and the verse remains; further, alliteration with the ὑπερείσῃ in 15a is created.

Nömmik, Kaiser, and Vermeylen do not see v. 15 as being part of the original, oldest poem, and think it is a later commentary to v. 14 or gloss. Nömmik explains that as it is syntactically so different from vv. 14 and 16, it seems like a foreign body; it is also colometrically too long and has similarities with the righteousness redaction. According to Vermeylen, v. 15 could be a commentary on v. 14 because the verb ישען is used in parallel with יקום also in 24:22–23 which was added in *rédaction* III. Witte claims that although the verse is colometrically different from the rest, it is still original.²⁷⁷ Just the phrase על ביתו “against its house” in 15a is considered a gloss by some because it makes the colon too long²⁷⁸. The

²⁷⁴ Beeckman proposes a different solution to the translation of the *hapax* יקוט: “... with regard to our *hapax*, we can conclude that the LXX translator skipped over the *hapax*. Not necessarily because he did not know the word in question, but in order to enhance the image regarding the house of the impious in vv. 14–15 and to create a more coherent textual unity.” See Beeckman 2024, 188–9.

²⁷⁵ P translator also translated the Hebrew מבטחו “his confidence” with “his house” (ביתו in Peshitta). See Szpek 1992, 38–9, 295.

²⁷⁶ BHS proposes two possible reconstructions: קרי קיט “webs, threads of summer” or קשרי “bands of summer”; cf also Witte 2021, 180. and Nömmik 2010, 55–8. Terrien 1963, 91 has proposed that the original reading was קשרי קיט “the sons of summer”. Dhorme 1967, 120–1, earlier, had proposed ילקוט “shepherd’s bag”, as something empty and unstable, being parallel with the spider’s house. Seow 2013, 534 denounces the emendations, finding the MT acceptable. These emendations would not be relevant to the OG translation, as the translator has constructed a clear verse from a slightly obscure one.

²⁷⁷ Kaiser 2006, 19, 125; Nömmik 2010, 58; 2013, 163; Vermeylen 2015, 159–60; Witte 2021, 180–1; Nömmik 2025.

²⁷⁸ BHS, Hartley 1988, 159.

translator connected the verse with the previous ones by making it into a conditional clause, thus noticing the syntactic issue leaving the transition between verses abrupt.

VI: 8:16–19

Style

Verses 16–19 form a strophe that consists of four bicola. In Greek, the strophe is framed with transition markers, namely γάρ “for” in the beginning and ὅτι “because” in the end. In Hebrew, only the end is marked with the interjection הן “look!”.

In Hebrew, the first half of the strophe is marked with a chiasmus in v. 16 (ABC/xC'B'A') and a partial symmetry in v. 17 (ABC/A'C'); the Greek translator only reflects the symmetry in v. 17 (AB/A'B').

In Hebrew, the strophe is framed with the repetition of the pronoun הוּא and another repetition is that of the preposition על “on, upon” in 16b/17a. The Greek translation has an independent repetition of the adjectival pronoun τοιοῦτος “such as this” (τοιαῦτα in 18b and ταύτη in 19a).

Marked vocabulary is used in Greek: in 16b, the noun σαπρίας “rotten” (σαπρία, -ας, ἡ; 13x, LXX: 10, OG Job: 6); and the noun ὁ ῥάδαμνος “the branch” (*hapax legomenon*, appearing a couple of times in OG Job: 8:16b, 14:7c, 15:32b, 40:22b²⁷⁹); in 17b, the noun χαλίκων “small stones, pebbles” (χάλιξ, -ικος, ὁ, ἡ; 7x, LXX: 2, OG Job: 1, ※: 1); and in 19b, the verb ἀναβλαστήσει “to emerge” (ἀναβλαστάνω; 31x, OG Job: 2).

Several marked Hebrew words have been used: in 16a, the *hapax* adjective רטב “fresh”; in 16b, the noun יִנְקָה (יִנְקָה) “shoot”; 6x, Job: 3, Ps: 1); in 17a, the verb יִסְבֹּכוּ (סָבַךְ “to interweave”; 2x, Job: 1); and finally, in 17b, the verb יִחַזֵּה “he sees, beholds” (יָחַז; considered mainly poetic by BDB).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. **In 16a**, the translator adds γάρ “for”, to continue the inferentiality started in the previous strophe (vv. 13–19 can be understood as a long strophe that is divided into two shorter ones). The pronoun הוּא “he” is translated as the verb ἐστίν “he is”²⁸⁰. **In 16b**, the phrase ἐκ σαπρίας αὐτοῦ “out of its rottenness” seemingly translates or replaces עַל גַּן הוּא “over his garden”. Orlinsky, and later Muraoka, suggest that the Greek text itself has gotten corrupt here and originally ἐκ πρασίας αὐτοῦ “out of its garden-plot” was written²⁸¹. This would suggest a translation that originally was very faithful but got corrupt over time. LXX.D, however, disagrees and says that the image in

²⁷⁹ Mangin 2005, 562. Even its traditional form ῥόδαμνος, -ου, ὁ appears 11 times (including the times it is parsed as ὁ ῥάδαμνος by TLG).

²⁸⁰ Dhont considers ἐστίν an addition but does not mention that the pronoun הוּא is untranslated, see Dhont 2018a, 117.

²⁸¹ Orlinsky 1935b, 134–5; 1962, 133; Muraoka 2010, 100.

Greek makes sense²⁸². *In 17a*, the Hebrew על גל שרשיו “on a heap his roots” paraphrased into ἐπὶ συναγωγῇ λίθων “on a gathering/heap of stones”²⁸³ (stones are also mentioned in the next colon). *V. 18a + half of 18b*, אם יבלענו ממקומו וכחש בו, “if he is swallowed up from his place” is translated with ἐὰν καταπίη ὁ τόπος ψεύσεται αὐτόν “if it swallows up (him), the place will deny him”. The suffix -נו “him” in יבלענו is not translated. The Hebrew phrase ממקומו “from his place” changed into the subject of the clause, ὁ τόπος “the place.” The conjunction -ו “and” in וכחש is not translated and the verb is used in the first colon. *In 19a*, ὅτι “because” translates the Hebrew הן “if; look”, which is an unusual equivalence²⁸⁴, but makes sense at the front of a concluding colon of the strophe. *In 19b*, the verb יצמחו “they will spring up” is translated with the singular ἀναβλαστήσει “it will sprout up” (Nömmik and Witte suggest reading the Hebrew as the singular יצמח as well²⁸⁵). This is because the noun אחר “others” is considered a common singular that is the subject of a plural verb; the Greek translator chose to translate both in singular.

Reading, vocalising, or understanding the consonantal text differently than the later Masoretes. *In 18b*, the Hebrew לֹא רִאִיתִךָ “I have not seen you” is translated with οὐχ ἑώρακας τοιαῦτα “you have not seen”. Dhorme is of the opinion that the translator read כֵּן רִאִיתָ, while Seow suggests that the translator read לֹא רִאִיתָ כֵּן “you have not seen thus”²⁸⁶. The strophe division on the minor level in the verse is different in Hebrew and Greek: “If he swallows him up from his place, it deceives him: ‘I have not seen you’” in Hebrew, but “If it swallows up, the place lies to/deceives him; you have not seen such things!” in Greek. *In 19a*, the phrase ὅτι καταστροφή ἀσεβοῦς τοιαύτη “because such is the overdoing, ruin of the impious” basically replaces the Hebrew הֵן הוּא מְשׁוֹשׁ דְּרָכּוֹ “see, this is the joy of his way”. καταστροφή “lit. overturning” could be the result of reading מְשׁוֹב “bringing back, taking back,” for example. Then, ἀσεβοῦς could be categorised as an addition as the word is used as a translation equivalent for several different words in this strophe and repeats throughout. Heater suggests that the source and inspiration for this colon (more specifically just the ἀσεβοῦς, which always occurs with καταστροφή in Job) in Greek is 8:13b which coincidentally is the beginning of the previous strophe. Additionally, similar topics are mentioned in 15:20a and 21c, 21:16b–17b (both words used), 27:7a–8a (again, both words used). The impulse for using καταστροφή is in his opinion, firstly due to ἀσεβής in the Sodom and Gomorrah story, and the actual word καταστροφή is taken from Gen 19:29b. He also raises the possibility that the translator read מְשׁוּאָה (“devastation”) instead of מְשׁוֹשׁ, which does not fit the context as well.²⁸⁷ Seow suggests that translator may have associated the word with מָסַח “to melt, dissolve” and translated accordingly; Clines suggests reading the Hebrew this way as well, if

²⁸² Kepper and Witte 2011, 2083.

²⁸³ Vg similarly with *super acervum pertrorum* “upon a heap of stones” but also keeps *radices*.

²⁸⁴ Cf. also Cox 2005, 44–5.

²⁸⁵ Nömmik 2010, 59; Witte 2021, 180.

²⁸⁶ Dhorme 1967, 123; Seow 2013, 536.

²⁸⁷ Heater 1982, 51–2.

the current MT is not ironic²⁸⁸. Dhorme on the other hand thinks that καταστροφή is a paraphrase of מְשׁוֹשׁ דָּרְכוֹ in the MT, especially if interpreting it ironically²⁸⁹.

Vorlage different than the later MT. *In 17a*, the plural verb יִסְכְּבוּ “they inter-weave” is possibly read as יִשְׁכְּבוּ “they lay down”²⁹⁰ and thus translated with κοιμᾶται “he goes to sleep” (cf. P سَجَّحَ “they lean, rest over”²⁹¹, suggesting that possibly several pre-MT manuscripts had this reading and this was not an individual “misreading”). *In 17b*, בֵּית “house” is translated with ἐν δὲ μέσῳ “in the middle”, possibly due to reading בֵּין “between” instead, cf. also Vg *inter*, or understanding the word as a preposition²⁹². The strophe uses several phrases and words that denote positions, thus בֵּין is a very probable reading. Further, יֵחֹז “he sees” is read or actually written as יֵחִיָּה and translated into ζήσεται “he will live;” cf. again the Vg with *commorabitur* “he shall abide”²⁹³. With the support of the Greek translation, Dhorme suggests emending the text to יֵחִיָּה “he lives.” Seow, however, maintains that since MT has *lectio difficilior*, it should not be emended²⁹⁴. Witte and Nömmik suggest reading יֵאָחֵז (or יֵחֹז, from אָחֵז) “he holds, grasps;” Witte suggests reading either בֵּין “between” or prepositional בֵּית “between” (similar to Syriac *bjt*) instead of “house” whereas Nömmik supports the former option.²⁹⁵

VII: 8:20–22

Style

Verses 20–22 form the concluding strophe to the speech, consisting of three bicola. In Greek, the strophe is framed with the repetition of ἀσεβοῦς “of the impious” (singular genitive) in 20b/22b. The beginning is marked with the interjection ἦ “look!” in Hebrew and with the particle γάρ “for” in Greek.

The end of the strophe and speech is marked with non-parallelism: in v. 20, the Greek has a partial chiasmus (A_xBC/C_xB_x), whereas the Hebrew has a partial (antithetical?) symmetry (xABC/xB_xC_x); and in v. 21, there is a partial symmetry in Greek (ABC/A_xC_x) and a partial chiasmus in Hebrew (xABC/xC_xB_x).

Some marked vocabulary has been used in Greek: in 20a, the verb ἀποποιήσεται “he will not reject” (ἀποποιέω; 7x, OG Job: 6), and the adjective τὸν ἄκακον “the blameless person” (ἄκακος, -ον; 39x, LXX: 17, OG Job: 3); in 21b, the noun ἐξομολογήσεως “confession (?)” (ἐξομολόγησις, -εως, ἡ; 29x, LXX: 28, OG Job: 1).

²⁸⁸ Seow 2013, 536; Clines 2015, 200. According to Szpek 1992, 276, P translator was troubled with מְשׁוֹשׁ as well and confused it with מִשְׁשׁ “to feel, grope” and thus translated with כִּי “to examine”.

²⁸⁹ Dhorme 1967, 123.

²⁹⁰ Cf. also Dhorme 1967, 122 who suggests that the translator read it in singular.

²⁹¹ Szpek 1992, 170.

²⁹² Cf. also Seow 2013, 535.

²⁹³ Cf. also Dhorme 1967, 122.

²⁹⁴ Seow 2013, 535.

²⁹⁵ Nömmik 2010, 59; Witte 2021, 180.

Text

Changes regarding religion or religious culture and law. *In 20b*, the phrase $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\nu \delta\tilde{\omega}\rho\omicron\nu$ “every (any) gift” seems to make very explicit what the Hebrew בִּיד “of, with the hand” means: if someone’s hand is grasped, or held, it is with the intention of receiving something, thus it is translated “he will not take/receive any gift”. It has been suggested that the translator shifted to a cultic level, “gift” being then a “sacrificial offering”²⁹⁶. The plural participle מְרַעִים “of those who are evil” is translated with a more religious word, namely the singular adjective ἀσεβοῦς “of the impious.” This is not a usual equivalent but not incorrect either. Moreover, using ἀσεβοῦς creates a framing repetition to this strophe and overall coherence with the previous strophes. *In 21a*, the Hebrew פִּיךָ “your mouth” is changed into ἀληθινῶν δὲ στόμα “the mouth of the true ones”. This choice was intentional, according to Heater, because the translator needed an opposite for the ἀσεβεῖς that could also operate as a descriptor for Job himself (ἀληθινός is used several times to describe Job); thus, the translator turned to third person plural instead of “you” in the rest of the strophe as well²⁹⁷. Additionally, this translation choice puts the “righteous people” in the middle of the strophe, and deals with the “impious people” in the framing parts. In Dhont’s opinion, “the Greek generalizes the statement by talking about ... “the mouth of the sincere.””²⁹⁸.

Orlinsky has suggested that in 20b, the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the translation read מְרַשְׁעִים instead of מְרַעִים because the current equivalence is not found elsewhere in Job. Secondly, instead of יִחְזִיק בִּיד, he suggests that the *Vorlage* read יִקַּח זֶבֶד where יִקַּח would account for δέξεται and זֶבֶד for δῶρον. However, neither of the *Vorlagen* is original, in his opinion, and thus the MT preserves the better text.²⁹⁹ His first suggestion is not to be accepted, as the translator has especially shown in this speech, that ἀσεβοῦς renders several different words in Hebrew, bringing the whole together more. Not to mention the fact that the translator has unique equivalences elsewhere and that does not mean that the Hebrew text was different than the current MT. His second suggestion can be rejected as well, on the ground that the translator probably paraphrased to make God’s rejection of the impious more explicit.

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 20a*, the negation לֹא has been strengthened to οὐ μὴ in Greek. Based on the changes made in 21a, the translator now, *in 21b*, changes וּשְׂפָתֶיךָ “your lips” into τὰ δὲ χεῖλῃ αὐτῶν “their lips”. *In 22a*, the participle שֹׂנְאֶיךָ “those who hate you” is suitably changed into the noun phrase οἱ δὲ ἐχθροὶ αὐτῶν “their enemies”. *In 22b*, the plural רְשָׁעִים “of the wicked” is translated with the singular ἀσεβοῦς “of an impious person” (the singular is almost always used in the Greek, especially in this speech previously). The phrase אִינֶנּוּ “lit. none of it” is changed into οὐκ ἔσται “it will not exist.”

Reading, vocalising, or understanding the consonantal text differently than the later Masoretes. *In 21a*, the preposition עַד “until” (so MT) is probably vocalised

²⁹⁶ Gehman 1949, 237; Kepper and Witte 2011, 2083; Witte 2021, 186.

²⁹⁷ Heater 1982, 52–3. Similarly iterated earlier by Orlinsky 1958, 267.

²⁹⁸ Dhont 2018a, 101.

²⁹⁹ Orlinsky 1964, 66–9.

עַד “once again” and translated with δεῖ³⁰⁰; Dhorme, Seow, Clines, BHS, Habel, and Nömmik suggest emending the MT accordingly³⁰¹. *In 21b*, the Greek ἐξομολογήσεως “of admission, confession” could be the result of reading תודה “confession, thanksgiving” instead of תרועה “shout (of joy)”; this is an equivalent used in the LXX elsewhere, although in different contexts.

Vorlage different than the later MT. *In 20a*, the Hebrew הן “behold” has been changed to γὰρ “for”, or the interjection was not there in the first place. The previous strophes all start with the particle γὰρ, independently from the Hebrew. הן is a transition marker and emphatic word that is not often left simply untranslated, especially so in the beginning of a strophe. Additionally, Vg and P omit הן as well; thus, some pre-MT manuscripts may have missed this particle altogether.

³⁰⁰ Dhorme 1967, 124–5.

³⁰¹ Dhorme 1967, 124–5; Habel 1985, 169; Nömmik 2010, 59; Seow 2013, 537; Clines 2015, 200.

JOB 12-14

Introduction

Job 12-14 contains Job's third reply: *Job justifies himself and tells his friends that they are like him, if not worse. Everything is in God's hands; He is extremely powerful. Direct address and accusation to God who has opposed and harmed Job and who has created mortal to be short-lived but will not let him live in peace.*

The OG translation of Job 12-14 seems to divide into 24 strophes:

I (12:2-3, 1T) *Address to friends: justification, making himself equal to his friends.*

II (12:4-6, 2T) *A blameless man has suffered; let the wicked not be hopeful.*

III (12:7-10, 1T1B) *Confirm with nature that everything is in God's hands.*

IV (12:11-13, 3B) *Proverbs about the mind and wisdom: these are with God.*

V (12:14-16, 3B) *Strength and power to destroy are with God.*

VI (12:17-19, 1B1T) *God's power against the mighty people of the earth.*

VII (12:20-22, 1T1B) *God's power to bring to light the dark side of people.*

VIII (12:24-25, 2B) *God's power against rulers.*

IX (13:1-3, 3B) *A new address and a new justification (parallel to strophe I).*

X (13:4-6, 3B) *Exhorting his friends to be quiet and listen.*

XI (13:7-10a, 2B1T) *Are you not the same or even worse? God will convict you, too!*

XII (13:10b-12, 1T1B) *Your words are useless, fear of God should still be with you.*

XIII (13:13-16, 1M3B) *Be quiet! I will argue my case against God.*

XIV (13:17-19, 2B1M) *Hear my words! I am just!*

XV (13:20-23, 1T2B) *To God: Stop harassing me and tell me my sins!*

XVI (13:24-25, 2B) *To God: Why do You oppose me?*

XVII (13:26-27, 1B1T) *To God: You have harmed me!*

XVIII (13:28-14:4, 4B1M) *The short life and decay of a mortal: You judge someone like that.*

XIX (14:5-6, 1T1B) *You have set a short life for a mortal so let him be!*

XX (14:7-9, 1T2B) *A tree can resurrect.*

XXI (14:10-12, 3B) *But a man cannot resurrect, death is the end.*

XXII (14:13-14, 2T) *I wish You had killed me and then kept me in Hades (?). If resurrection were possible, I would wait.*

XXIII (14:15-17, 3B) *Do not reject what You have done to me, You have kept track of every transgression.*

XXIV (14:20-22, 3B) *You have neglected and killed someone (a mortal), he suffered.*

Some **keywords** repeat in the speech, although not always in each chapter. For example, “human” is used as אִישׁ in 12:10, 14 and 14:12, as אָדָם in 14:1, 10, גִּבּוֹר in 14:14, and אָנוּשׁ in 13:9 and 14:19. In Greek, these are ἄνθρωπος in 12:2, 10, 14 and 14:12, 14, ἀνὴρ in 12:4 and 14:10, and βροτὸς in 14:1. Not all verses are translated or translated directly. The God-name is repeated in the first two chapters, as אֱל in 12:6 and 13:3, 7, 8, as אֱלֹהֵי in 12:4.6, and שְׁדֵי in 13:3, reflected in Greek only with κύριος in 12:6 and 13:3, 7. In both languages, the theme of “knowledge” is used: as דַּעַת 13:2, יָדַע in 12:9, 13:2, 18, 23, and 14:21, תְּבוּנָה in 12:12, 13, and חִכְמָה in 12:2, 12, 13, and 13:5; reflected in Greek with σοφία in 12:2, 12, 13, ἐπιστήμη in 12:12, 16, σύνεσις in 12:13, 16, 20, γινώσκω in 12:9, 20, οἶδα in 12:24, 13:2, 18, and 14:21, ἐπίσταμαι in 13:2. As a final small example, בָּשָׂר “flesh” is repeated in 12:10, 13:14, and 14:22, reflected only in 13:14 and 14:22 with σὰρξ.

This is the first speech under analysis that contains asterisked material in **the Greek text**, namely vv. 12:8b, 9, 18b, 21a³⁰², 23; 13:19b, 20b; and 14:12c, 18, 19. All these verses can possibly influence the strophic structure of the OG translation.

The strophes in this speech are not of uniform length; however, strophes with three bicola appear often. Overall, five to six cola is the most common length of strophes in this speech, occurring 16 times. There are a couple of strophes in Greek that do not align with the proposed divisions of the Hebrew text (cf. #Appendix II). Special care needs to be taken in the critical analysis of these strophes in particular.

As for **the Hebrew text**, according to Witte, Job 12–14* was partly in the original Job-poem. In the book redaction, the introductory 12:1 was added. In the fifth stage of literary growth (the majesty redaction), 12:7–13:2 was added: vv. 12:7–10, 11, 12–25 were added as an independent hymn, concluding with v. 13:2b. This large addition emphasises Job’s wisdom, makes him someone who teaches his friends, and softens Job’s accusations against God. Vv. 12:4–6 are even later, from the righteousness redaction (stage 6 of literary growth); although he leaves open the possibility of them being original to the poem. With these verses the gloss 13:28b, and the additions 14:1a* and 14:3, 4, 5b were added, or they are from the last stage of development (stage 7). In the last stage of development, vv. 12:7a*; 13:17, 27b (questionable), 28; 14:1a*, 3–4, 5c, 7c, 12b (possibly righteousness redaction), 14a were added as glosses. Both 14:13b and 19b have lost a colon in time. In 13:27, one colon is secondary, most likely 27b.³⁰³

Nömmik thinks that originally, among the “sources,” the earliest which he calls “The Poem/Dialogue of Job,” the speech consisted of vv. 12:2–3b; 13:5–8, 13–16, 18–27b; and 14:13a–b, 15–17. In the first stage of redactions, done by the book editor (also called the fear-of-God or majesty redaction), the speech was extended with vv. 12:7–8, 10–25 and 13:1–2, which emphasise God’s might and

³⁰² The whole v. 21 is asterisked in LXX^{Zi} but not in Rahlfs’. Several scholars agree that 21b is indeed from the hand of the OG translator. See, for example Pietersma 1985, 311; Gentry 1995; Mangin 2005, 212–5.

³⁰³ Witte 2021, 57–9, 226–8, 233.

soften Job's attitude towards God and justice. The book editor also added the prose introduction in 12:1. The extrapolation in vv. 13:9–12 may have been added by the same editor. The attitude in these verses is even more critical towards Job's friends. In the fifth layer of redactions (the transience redactions) vv. 14:1–2 and 5–10* were added. A late *Fortschreibung* that relies on the transience redactions and on v. 8:13b is in vv. 14:18–22. Further glosses that cannot be dated exactly are 12:3c–6*, 9; 13:3–4, 17, 27c, 28; and 14:3, 4, 11–12* (11+12b and 12a+c), 13c, 14.³⁰⁴

According to Kaiser, this speech originally consisted of 12:2–3b; 13:3, 5–27a, c; 14:1–3, 5–7b, 8–12a, c, 13a–c[+d]³⁰⁵, 14b–19c[+d], 20–22. The book editor added the introductory verse 12:1. The majesty redactor (*Majestättsbearbeiter*) added vv. 12:4–13:2 and vv. 12:3c, 6c; 13:4, 27b, 28; and 14:4, 7c, 14a are later glosses while 14:12b is possibly an eschatological gloss.³⁰⁶

Syring thinks that this speech was partly already there in the original poem. In the first redaction, the introductory 12:1 was added. Very late, in what he considers, following Witte, the last big stage of editing, namely theological redaction(s) regarding God's majesty, justice, and creative power, vv. 12:7–13:2 were added.³⁰⁷

Van Oorschot also thinks that vv. 12:7–13:2 were added later, namely in the fear-of-God redaction, in the early stages of the growth of Job. In the righteousness redaction vv. 12:4–6 were added.³⁰⁸

Vermeulen considers the possibility that 12:3b–13:2 are secondary. In its first form, this speech consisted of vv. 12:2–3a and 13:3–8, 11–14 (*rédaction* I of the book of Job). *Rédaction* II intended to make the text more “orthodox” and thus vv. 12:13, 16–25; 13:1–2, 16, 20–27; and 14:3b, 13, 14aβ–17 were added. In *rédaction* III, further material was added: vv. 12:3b–12, 14–15; 13:9–10, 15, 17–19; 13:28–14:3a, 4–6, 18–22. In the final, fourth *rédaction*, vv. 14:7–12 were added to the speech.

Following are his thoughts on some of the bigger secondary additions. The section 12:13–25 is a hymn to wisdom that was added later in *rédaction* II, having commonalities with 26:5–14 which is also from *rédaction* II. The hymn acts, according to him, as a commentary on v. 2 which is in the original speech. In this section, vv. 14–15 might be an even later addition from *rédaction* III. This is because these verses begin with the interjection ין (a marker of *rédaction* III), v. 16 seems to be a continuation of v. 13 (thus 14–15 are an extension for 13). Vv. 13:20–27 are from *rédaction* II. The section addresses God in second person but without an introduction; he relates it, then, to ch. 7, also from *rédaction* II. He also mentions that unlike the Job of *rédaction* I who accused God of atrocities, the Job of *rédaction* II wants God to exercise justice. Job acknowledges that he might have sinned and had faults in his youth. All this he relates to *rédaction* II.

³⁰⁴ Nömmik 2025.

³⁰⁵ In square brackets are the cola that he thinks to have been lost in transmission.

³⁰⁶ Kaiser 2006, 125–6.

³⁰⁷ Syring 2004, 154–68.

³⁰⁸ van Oorschot 2007.

Vv. 13:28–14:22* are a work of *rédacteur* III and IV, related to the Sirach-school. He identifies antihumanist trends, especially in 13:28 (man is rotten), 14:4 (man is impure), 13:28 and 14:1–2 (life is short), 14:5–6 (death is planned by God), 14:7–12 (no return from death). Since the content of 3a reminds him of Ps 144:3–4 (which is from the school of Sirach) with its astonishment that God is concerned about a vile being, it is deemed to be from *rédaction* III. In v. 4 he sees agreement with 4:17; 15:15–16 and 25:3–6 which are all from *rédaction* III.³⁰⁹

I: 12:2–3

Style

Verses 2–3 form a short introductory strophe, made up of a *tricolon* in Greek (a bicolon + tricolon in Hebrew).

The strophe/speech begins with an emphatic adverb and causal **כי אמנם** “no doubt that” in Hebrew (the adverb **אמנם** “truly” is rare; 9x, Job: 6) and the sequential **Εἴτα** “so, then” in Greek; Greek additionally has a yes-no question marked with **ἤ** in the second colon.

The strophe ends with a rhetorical question in 3c in Hebrew (**ואת מי אין כמו אלה** “Who does not know such things as these?”). In Greek, the strophe ends in 3a with the crasis **καὶ ἐμοὶ** (**καὶ ἐμοὶ**) “as for me”³¹⁰.

Lexical repetitions appear only in Greek, where the pronoun “you” (pl.) is used in all three cola: **ὕμεις** in 2a, **ὕμῶν** in 2b, and **ὕμᾱς** in 3; and the verb “to be” (**ἐσσε/ἐσστιν**) in 2a/3.

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. **In 2a**, the Hebrew **כי אמנם** “for truly” is translated as **Εἴτα** “so; then”. The “to-be” verb in second person plural **ἐσσε** is added to the pronoun for emphasis. The collective singular **עם** “people” is translated with the plural **ἄνθρωποι** “human beings, people.” Depending on how the Greek is read, the Hebrew **ו** “and” **in 2b** is either translated as the conjunction **ἤ** “or” or the interrogative **ἤ** “will?”. In Greek, **v. 3** consists of a simple monocolon but of a tricolon in Hebrew. What corresponds to the MT 3a is translated quite literally, only the “to-be” verb **ἐσστιν** is added by the translator, creating a repetition.

Problems with the *Vorlage* manuscript. Hebrew **v. 3bc** (**לֹא נָפַל אֲנֹכִי מִכֶּם וְאַתָּה מִי אֵין כְּמוֹ אֱלֹהִים** “I am not inferior to you. Who does not know such things as these?”) is not translated by the Greek translator. These cola do not contain rare or difficult vocabulary, so the reasons for omission must be elsewhere. The question (3c) is translated in v. 4 in P. Kaiser and Nömmik consider v. 3c a gloss that cannot be dated exactly; Nömmik actually considers vv. 3c–6* as a whole a gloss (“text corrupt, grown in several steps”). Witte, however, thinks that the addition (vv. 3c–6 or 4–6) may be from the righteousness redaction (stage 6 of

³⁰⁹ Vermeylen 2015, 116–23, 180–2, 270–80.

³¹⁰ It has been noted that crasis is used more in poetry than in prose. See, for example, Weir-Smyth §62–63.

literary growth); although he leaves open the possibility of being original to the poem. Vermeylen says that vv. 3b–4 disrupt the regular rhythm of the speech and that this seems to mark editorial intervention.³¹¹ Perhaps, already the pre-MT manuscripts, including the OG *Vorlage* were corrupt here or had the cola missing. V. 3b might have been objectionable to the translator for suggesting that Job can fall below his friends.

II: 12:4–6

Style

Verses 4–6 form a strophe made up of two *tricola* in Greek, whereas the Hebrew strophe has a symmetric tricolon-bicolon-tricolon structure. In Greek, the strophe is framed with particles and adverbs: γὰρ “for in the first two cola and οὐ μὲν δὲ ἀλλὰ “nonetheless” at the beginning of the second verse (but also the relative ὅσοι “who all” and ὥς “as” in the next cola). V. 5 is in partial chiasmus in the Greek translation (ABCD/EC'D'). In Hebrew, the very last cola is a relative clause, marked with לְאִשָּׁר “for whom”.

In Hebrew, the strophe is framed with the repetition of אֱלֹהִים “God” in 4b/6c which is not reflected in Greek. There is another lexical repetition in Hebrew: the noun “laughter” in 4a and c; however, the first one in defective form (שָׁחַק) and the second in plene (שְׁחֻק); this repetition is not reflected in Greek. However, the Greek translation does have two independent and separate repetitions in each of the two verses, although less substantial: the particle γὰρ “for” is used in two consecutive cola (4/5a) in the first verse and the verb “to be” is repeated three times (ὦν and ἔσθαι in 6a, ἔσται in 6c) in the second verse.

The Greek translation has some marked vocabulary: in v. 4, the adjective ἄμεμπτος “blameless” (43x, LXX: 16, OG: Job 11), and the *hapax* noun χλεύασμα “laughingstock”; in 5a, the adjective τακτὸν “prepared” (τακτός, -ή, -όν; 39x, OG Job: 1); in 5b, the verb ἐκπορθεῖσθαι “be plundered” (ἐκπορθέω; 29x, LXX: 3, OG Job: 1); and in 6c, the *hapax* noun ἑτασις “scrutiny” (three occurrences in Job: 10:17a, 12:6c, and 31:14a³¹²).

Numerous marked Hebrew words have been used as well: in 5a, the noun לִפִּיד (פִּיד “disaster”; 4x, Job: 3, Prov: 1), the *hapax* noun לַעֲשׂוֹת (עֲשׂוֹת “thought”), and the adjective שְׁאֵן “secure” (10x, Job:1, Ps: 1); in 5b, the *hapax* noun נִבּוֹן “a blow”, and the participle לְמוֹעֵד of the verb מָעַד “to slip” (7x, Job:1, Ps: 4, Prov: 1); in 6a, the verb יִשְׁלִי (שָׁלָה “to prosper”; 6x, Job: 2, Ps: 1); and in 6b, the *hapax* noun וּבִטְחוֹת (בִּטְחוֹת “security”).

³¹¹ Kaiser 2006, 25, 126; Vermeylen 2015, 117; Witte 2021, 57–9, 226–8, 233; Nömmik 2025.

³¹² Cf. also Mangin 2005, 521.

Text

Problems in the *Vorlage* manuscript. In Hebrew, v. 4 is a tricolon whereas in the OG we see a monocolon, which combines Hebrew 4c and 4a³¹³, more specifically אהיה ... שחוק “I am a laughingstock” from 4a and שחוק צדיק תמים “a just and blameless man is a laughingstock” from 4c. Thus, δίκαιος γὰρ ἀνὴρ “for a just man” corresponds to צדיק “just” (γὰρ ἀνὴρ is an addition), καὶ ἄμμεμπτος “and blameless” corresponds to תמים “blameless” (καὶ is an addition); ἐγενήθη “has become” correspond to אהיה “I was, I became”, but the translator has either changed the person from first person singular to third person singular³¹⁴ or read it as such and Witte even suggests reading the Hebrew as יהיה, in agreement with Greek and Syriac³¹⁵; finally εἰς χλεύασμα “into laughter, laughingstock” corresponds to both שחוק and שחוק “laughingstock”. The middle, 4b, could then have been missed since the two cola begin with the same word³¹⁶. Thus, 4a partly and 4b fully are untranslated. Kaiser claims that 4c is a gloss³¹⁷; this is not visible from the OG translation and rather, the first two cola are more problematic in terms of what and how is reflected. P deviates from the MT in this verse as well.

V. 5a is in large part paraphrased both in the OG, but also in the Vg³¹⁸. Once again, the main reason behind the differences seems to be the Hebrew text itself, almost fully made up of rare words and possibly a bad manuscript, as the versification again differs between Hebrew and Greek. Thus, in 5a, εἰς χρόνον γὰρ τακτὸν “for a set time” corresponds to לעשותות which was read as לעתות “for times”³¹⁹. The other words in Hebrew 5a are not translated. ἡτοίμαστο πεσεῖν ὑπὸ ἄλλους “he had been prepared to fall under others” paraphrases Hebrew 5b נכון רגל למועדי רגל³²⁰ “but it is ready for those whose feet are unstable”. More specifically, ἡτοίμαστο “he had been prepared” translates the noun נכון “(is) ready, prepared” and רגל למועדי רגל “for those whose legs slip, shake” is paraphrased and extended into πεσεῖν ὑπὸ ἄλλους “to fall under others”³²¹; where ὑπὸ ἄλλους is added, possibly to create greater symmetry with Greek 5b. There has been conjecture that it is εἰς χρόνον γὰρ τακτὸν “appointed time” that reflects the MT מועדי רגל “for those whose legs slip, shake”³²².

Greek v. 5b seems to translate Hebrew 6a. οἴκους τε αὐτοῦ “and his houses” translates אהלים “tents” (τε αὐτοῦ is an addition); the Hebrew ישרו ... לשליו “they prosper for those who destroy, plunder” is translated with ἐκπορθεῖσθαι ὑπὸ ἀνόμων “to be plundered by the lawless” (governed by ἡτοίμαστο in 5a), where

³¹³ Beeckman 2022a, 23–5; 2024, 314–5. concludes that only 4c is translated and 4a was ignored.

³¹⁴ Similar translation choice in P, cf. Szpek 1992, 71–2.

³¹⁵ Witte 2021, 220.

³¹⁶ Cf. also Dhorme 1967, 169.

³¹⁷ Kaiser 2006, 25; not mentioned on p. 126, though.

³¹⁸ Vg translates v. 5 as *lampas contempta apud cogitationes divitum parata ad tempus statutum* “the lamp despised in the thoughts of the rich is ready for the time appointed”.

³¹⁹ Dhorme 1967, 169–70.

³²⁰ 4 Mss have למעדי instead, according Seow 2011, 65.

³²¹ Cf. also Dhorme 1967, 169.

³²² Muraoka 2010, 115, 128.

the verb would have been associated with the root שלל “to spoil, plunder”³²³. Thus, the translator could have understood something along the lines of “houses are plundered by those who destroy” and paraphrased in Greek into “(he had been prepared) ... that his houses be plundered by the lawless.”

We see similar problems in v. 6 of Greek, where the translator seems to have tried to create meaningful clauses out of the words they could make out. Fernández Marcos sees verses 3–6 as an instance “of meaningful achievements in Greek compared with the Hebrew”³²⁴.

Greek v. 6a translates only the ובטחות in MT 6b although probably read as an imperative וּבְטַח “and trust!”, and the translator adds the rest themselves: οὐ μὴν δὲ ἀλλὰ μηδεὶς πεποιθέτω πονηρὸς ὢν ἀθῶος ἔσεσθαι “Nonetheless, let the wicked not trust that he will be guiltless”. **In 6b**, the Hebrew participial phrase למרגיזי אל “to those who provoke God” is translated as a relative clause with a finite verb, ὅσοι παροργίζουσιν τὸν κύριον “those who provoke the Lord”. **The Greek 6c** (ὡς οὐχὶ καὶ ἔτασις αὐτῶν ἔσται “as if indeed there will be no scrutiny for them”) has no discernible correspondence with the current MT (לְאִשֶּׁר הֵבִיא אֱלֹהֵי בִידוֹ) “who bring their god in their hands”³²⁵.

Beeckman thinks that the minuses and differences in v. 6 are due to a differing *Vorlage*. He bases this conclusion on the fact that the MT seems to be corrupted and that the divine names אל, אֱלֹהִים, and אֱלֹהִים do not usually occur together in one verse in Job.³²⁶

According to Nömmik, vv. 12:3c–6* are glosses that cannot be dated exactly. Witte, however, thinks that vv. 3c–6 or 4–6 may be from the righteousness redaction (stage 6 of literary growth); the majesty redactor who added 12:7–25 did not have knowledge of these yet. Following him, van Oorschot places vv. 4–6 in the righteousness redaction. The theme corresponds to the insertion of vv. 13–25 in ch. 24. He leaves open the possibility of them being original to the poem. Vermeylen thinks that vv. 3b–4 and 6 disrupt the regular rhythm of the speech and that this seems to mark editorial intervention. Kaiser sees vv. 4c and 6c as glosses.³²⁷ As can be seen from the differences between the OG (and P and Vg) and the later MT, the *Vorlage* that the translator used was either in very bad condition or the later additions had not been incorporated by copyists very well in these verses. Just like in the previous strophe with v. 3, there is a possibility that the *Vorlage*, at the time of the OG translation process, was actually different than the later MT. 4c being a suspected gloss is not visible from the OG trans-

³²³ Cf. also Dhorme 1967, 170–1. יְשַׁלֵּי also confused the P translator, and they understood either the root שלל “to draw out” or שלל “spoil, plunder”. Either way, the P translates here with יִסָּר “they will/shall be removed”. See Szpek 1992, 277.

³²⁴ Fernández Marcos 1994, 262.

³²⁵ Vg has not struggled as much with this verse as with the previous one; 6c is translated as *cum ipse dederit omnia in manibus eorum* “whereas it is he (God) that hath given all into their hands”. P interprets as יְהוָה לֹא בְיָדָם “because God is not in their heart”.

³²⁶ Beeckman 2022a, 25–7; 2024, 315–7.

³²⁷ Witte 1994a, 188; Kaiser 2006, 25, 126; van Oorschot 2007; Vermeylen 2015, 117; Witte 2021, 57–9, 226–8, 233; Nömmik 2025.

lation and rather, the first two cola are more problematic in terms of what and how is reflected.

III: 12:7–10

Style

Verses 7–10 form a strophe made up of a *tricolon* and a *bicolon* in Greek, but four *bicola* in Hebrew. The strophe begins with emphasised imperatives: וְאִלֵּם שְׂאֵל נָא “but indeed, ask!” in Hebrew and ἀλλὰ δὴ ἐπερώτησον “but, do ask!” in Greek; the strophe ends with a question marked with εἰ μὴ “is not?” in Greek but with a relative clause in Hebrew (marked with אשר).

Three out of four verses in Hebrew have a parallelistic structure, while in Greek, all verses have one: in v. 7, the Greek partial symmetry (xABCDE/B'C'D'E') basically reflects the Hebrew (xABC/xB'C'); in v. 8, there is a (partial) chiasmus in Hebrew (xAB/xB'A') and in Greek, vv. 7–8a are all partially symmetric with each other (xABC/B'C'/A'B'C'); and in v. 10 the Greek reflects the Hebrew (xABC/xB'C').

The Hebrew of this strophe has several lexical repetitions: the verb וְתִרְךְ “she will teach you” in 7a/8a; the noun כָּל “all” in 9a/10ab; the noun יָד “hand” in 9b (יָד) and 10a (בְּיָדוֹ). In Greek, the repetitions are again different in the two verses of the strophe: the phrase εἰς σοι “if to you” is repeated three times in 7ab/8a, and πάντων/παντὸς “of all (pl.)” and “of every (sg.)” in 10ab reflects the Hebrew.

Marked vocabulary appears once in both languages: in Hebrew 8a, the verb שִׁח “ask!” (considered poetic by BDB, when it is in the sense of “talk”); and in Greek 8a, the verb ἐκδιηγέσθαι “tell in detail” (ἐκδιηγέομαι; 17x, LXX: 14, OG Job: 1).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. In 7a, וְתִרְךְ “and it will teach you” has been expanded into εἰς σοι εἰπωσιν “if they should speak to you”. In 7b, the common singular עוֹף “bird” is translated with the plural πετεινὰ “birds”, and to match that, וְיִגַּד לְךָ “and he will speak to you” is translated with εἰς σοι ἀπαγγείλωσιν “if they should declare to you”. In 8a, the conjunction או “or” is translated with the simple δὲ “and”. The imperative ἐκδιηγέσθαι “tell in detail” seemingly translates the Hebrew שִׁח “ask, talk!”. Usually, it is translated with the simplex διηγέομαι, whereas ἐκδιηγέομαι represents סִפֵּר, found here in Hebrew 8b, although in third personal plural.³²⁸ The rest of v. 8b is untranslated. Thus, the translator shortened this verse intentionally and translated with a verb that corresponds to both of the verbs in Hebrew. Yet again, the Hebrew וְתִרְךְ “and it will teach you” is translated with the same construction as in v. 7, although the repetition is not reflected, εἰς σοι φράσῃ “if it should expound to you”. Thus, the translator shortened vv. 7 and 8 into a *tricolon*, using a repeating formula (εἰς σοι). According to Nömmik, vv. 7–8 (along with 10–25 and 13:1–2) were added

³²⁸ See also discussion in Gorea 2007, 25–6.

in the first layer of redactions by the book editor. In these verses, God's might is emphasised, these "try to soften Job's brusque words towards God and controversial talk about justice." Witte considers 7a partly a later gloss.³²⁹ *In 10a*, the relative particle אשר is replaced with an interrogative εἰ μὴ "is not?" in Greek, marking the end of the strophe, but also taking into account the fact that vv. 7 and 8 urged to ask something from different creatures. The collective singular כל חי "of every living thing" is translated into plural πάντων τῶν ζώντων "of all livings things." *In 10b*, בשר "flesh" in the phrase כל בשר איש "of all the flesh of man"³³⁰ is not translated, probably to have a closer lexical symmetry with 10a.

Vorlage different than the later MT. V. 9 (מי לא ידע בכל אלה כי יד יהוה עשתה זאת "Who among all these does not know that the hand of YHWH has done this?") is not translated. Gorea sees the nontranslation to be due to redundancy, especially with v. 10³³¹. The verse contains the theonym יהוה, the only time it is used in the poetic part of Job, excepting the introductory verses³³²; as such, Nömmik considers the verse, Vermeylen only 9b, to be a later gloss that cannot be dated; Syring considers the verse, after Kautzsch, a later copyist's oversight.³³³ If the gloss is indeed very late, it might have been missing from the *Vorlage*, especially since besides redundancy, nothing else in the text points to it being too difficult or unacceptable for the translator. The translator seldom leaves the God-name untranslated³³⁴. It looks as if the translator only omitted v. 8b, shortening two verses into a tricolon and then changing v. 10 slightly, formulating the question that needs to be asked from the creatures. In short, the translator only operated with vv. 7, 8, and 10; there is not trace of v. 9.

IV: 12:11–13

Style

Verses 11–13 form a strophe of three bicola. The strophe begins with a marked question הלא "does not?" in Hebrew and the particle γάρ "for" in 11a and a rare word in Greek 11b (the noun λάρυγξ "the throat"; 30x, LXX: 17, OG Job: 2, ※: 3). The first verse of Greek also has the classical μέν ... δέ construction which is not so prevalent in the LXX.

All verses in the strophe have (partial) symmetry: in v. 11, a partial symmetry in both Greek (AxB'C/A'B'C') and Hebrew (xABC/xA'B'C'); in v. 12, full symmetry in Greek (ABC/A'B'C') and in Hebrew (AB/xA'B'); and in v. 13, full symmetry in Greek and in Hebrew (ABxB'/A'B'xB'').

In Hebrew, the noun חכמה "wisdom" is repeated in 12a/13a; the Greek translator reflects this with σοφία. Additionally, the phrase ἐν πολλῷ "with much" is

³²⁹ Witte 2021, 220, 226–8; Nömmik 2025.

³³⁰ Legacy Standard Bible translation.

³³¹ Gorea 2007, 25–6.

³³² See discussions in, for example, Driver and Gray 1921, xxxv–l; Mangin 2005, 26–8.

³³³ Syring 2004, 101; Vermeylen 2015, 117; Nömmik 2025.

³³⁴ Mangin 2005, 49–50. Cf. also Beeckman 2024, 310, who has counted 13 omissions of the divine name in OG Job.

used in both cola of v. 12. There is also some marked vocabulary in Hebrew: in v. 11, the nouns מִלִּין (מִלָּה) “words” and חַךְ “palate” are considered (chiefly) poetic by BDB; and in 12a, the adjective בִּישִׁישִׁים (יֵשִׁישׁ “aged”; Job: 4, all in the dialogue parts).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 11a*, the interrogative הֲלֵא “does not?” is not translated; a question is turned into an assertion³³⁵, with the particle γάρ “for” added. אוֹן “ear” is translated as νοῦς “mind”, however manuscript error can play a role here, since Greek for “ear” is οὖς³³⁶. Ziegler and LXX.D suggest that this translation is an *abstractum pro concreto*, but LXX.D does not deny the possibility of manuscript error. The verb “to test, try” works well with both “mind” and “ear.” *In 11b*, the Hebrew noun חַךְ “palate” is translated as λάρυγξ “larynx, throat”³³⁷ and the common singular אִכְל “food” is translated with a plural σῖτα “food”. *In 12a*, בִּישִׁישִׁים “with the aged (men)” is interpreted in Greek as ἐν πολλῷ χρόνῳ “with much time” and *in 12b*, the phrase יָמִים וָאֶרֶךְ “the length of days” is interpreted in Greek as ἐν δὲ πολλῷ βίῳ “with much living”, creating a repetition. *In 13b*, תְּבוּנָה “understanding” is not translated the same as in 12b but as σύνεσις “understanding”, choosing variation instead of repetition. This choice brings in a repetition with the end of the next strophe.

According to Vermeylen, v. 11 corresponds word for word to 34:3 which he considers to be from *rédaction* III. V. 12 may be inspired by v. 20 and it contrasts with v. 13 (wisdom of God). With irregularities in vv. 3b–12, Vermeylen assigns the section to *rédaction* III.³³⁸ The translator did not object to the topic in this verse; however, the form is changed a bit.

V: 12:14–16

Style

Verses 14–16 form a strophe made up of three bicola. This strophe is a counterpart to the previous one, being three bicola, wholly in partial symmetry (in v. 14, the Greek xACD/xA'B'C'D and Hebrew xAC/A'BC'; in v. 15, the Greek xABCD/xA'C'D'E' and Hebrew xABC/xA'C'D; and in v. 16, the Greek and Hebrew ABxB'/A'B''xB''), and having the same end-formula (“with him are ...”).

Marked vocabulary marks the end of the strophe in Hebrew (in 16a, the noun עָז “strength”, which is considered mainly poetic by BDB; and in 16b, the participle of the verb שָׁג “to go astray”, 4x, Job: 1, Ps: 1) and the middle of the strophe in Greek (in 15b, the verb ἐπαφῆ “he lets loose” (ἐπαφίημι), 40x, LXX:

³³⁵ Cf. also Orlinsky 1958, 244–5.

³³⁶ Cf. also Orlinsky 1962, 133, 148; Dhorme 1967, 172.

³³⁷ This is a common equivalent in the LXX of the poetic books.

³³⁸ Vermeylen 2015, 116–23, 279.

4, OG Job: 3). Additionally, the last colon of the strophe in Hebrew has a root-repetition, namely the participles שגג (“to go astray”) and ומשגה (“to wander”).

In Hebrew, the conditional הן “if” is repeated in 14a/15a; however, the corresponding conditional ἐάν “if” in Greek is used four times, in every colon of vv. 14 and 15. This distinguishes this strophe from the previous, especially considering the sort of formula in the last verse which is almost identical to that in the previous strophe. In Hebrew, ולא “and not” is used twice in v. 14. The Greek translator does not reflect this verse word-for-word and repeats τίς “who?” instead.

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. In 14a, ולא יבנה “and it is not rebuilt” (in niph'al) is translated as a question: τίς οἰκοδομήσει “who will rebuild?”. The conditional ἐάν “if” is added to v. 14b. The singular איש “man, someone” is translated into plural ἀνθρώπων “people.” The phrase ולא יפתח “and it is not opened” (in niph'al) is again translated as a question, τίς ἀνοίξει “who will open?”.³³⁹ In 15a, ויבשו “and they dry up” is translated as the causal ξηρανεῖ τὴν γῆν “He (God) will dry up the earth”; the object “the earth” is translated from the end of 15b. Again, the conditional ἐάν “if” is added to 15b (also in P, as in v. 14³⁴⁰). The pronominal suffix -ם “them” of the verb וישלחם “and he sends them” is not translated. The phrase ויהפכו ארץ “they overturn the land” is paraphrased into ἀπόλεσεν αὐτὴν καταστρέψας “he has destroyed it by throwing it upside down”: since “the earth” was already translated in the previous colon, it is now replaced with the pronoun αὐτήν “it.”

Utilising the context or the translator's previous knowledge for the meaning of unknown words. In 16a, ותושיה “and wisdom” is replaced with καὶ ἰσχύς “and power”; the translator translates this word differently almost every time, thus it can be concluded that they did not know the word and used contextual clues instead. In 16b, the rare words שגג ומשגה “the deceived and the deceiver” are replaced with ἐπιστήμη καὶ σύνεσις “knowledge and understanding”. Fernández Marcos calls this a “guess-translation” but also claims that the Greek translator likes to emphasise God as “a master of understanding and knowing,” in contrast to Job himself³⁴¹. The translation could be contextual but also stylistic in nature, as it creates a repetition with the last word of the previous strophe³⁴² and overall fits the theme of the previous strophes.

³³⁹ According to Szpek 1992, 90–1, 214–5., P translates the same way, probably directly influenced by the Greek: הַיּוֹם אִם יִהְיֶה כֵּן וְאִם יִשָּׁט כֵּן הָאִישׁ אִם יִפְתָּח וְאִם יִסָּגֵר הָאִישׁ אִם יִשָּׁט וְאִם יִהְיֶה כֵּן הַיּוֹם “Behold, if (he) demolishes, who can rebuild? And if (he) shuts (the door) in the face of a man, who can open?”. Hartley 1988, 210, on the other hand, thinks that their *Vorlage* actually had the interrogative מִי or at least they read it.

³⁴⁰ Szpek 1992, 220–1.

³⁴¹ Fernández Marcos 1994, 259–60.

³⁴² Vg has the “knowledge” aspect as well, although still translating the Hebrew: *ipse novit et decipientem et eum qui decipitur* “he knoweth both the deceivers and him that is deceived”.

VI: 12:17–19

Style

Verses 17–19 form a strophe made up of a bicolon and *tricolon* in Greek, but three bicola in the Hebrew. In Hebrew, the repetition of the phrase מוֹלִיךְ ... שׁוֹלֵל “he leads away ... stripped” in 17a/19a frames the strophe. This is only partly reflected in Greek with the repetition of αἰχμαλώτους “captives” but additionally δὲ γῆς “(and) of the earth” is repeated in 17b/19b.

A couple of rare Hebrew words have been used only in the frames of the strophe (first and third colon): in 17a and 19a, the adjective שׁוֹלֵל “barefoot” (3x, Job: 2); in 17b, the verb יְהוֹלֵל (הָלַל “to be foolish”; 10x, Job: 1, Ps: 3); and in 19b, the verb יִסְלֵי (סָלַח “to pervert”; 7x, Job: 1, Prov: 4).

In Greek, there is one rare word right in the middle of the strophe in 18a: the verb καθιζάνων “seating” (καθίζανω; 22x, LXX: 2, OG Job: 1, Prov: 1).

There are partial chiasmi in all verses of the Hebrew: in v. 17 (ABC/xB'A'), in verse 18 (AB/xB'A'C), and in v. 19 (ABC/xB'A').

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. In 17a, the participle יוֹעֲצִים “those who counsel” is translated with the noun βουλευτὰς “counsellors, members of the council”. In both vv. 17a and 19a, the adjective שׁוֹלֵל “stripped, barefoot” (common singular) is translated with the plural αἰχμαλώτους “captives, prisoners”. The nakedness in Hebrew should refer to captivity as well. In 17b and 19b, the Greek translator adds γῆς “of the earth” to describe the judges and the mighty ones: κριτὰς δὲ γῆς and δυνάστας δὲ γῆς (possible influence of the last strophe of ch. 12). The imperfective יְהוֹלֵל “he makes fools of” is translated with the aorist ἐξέστησεν “he drove mad.” In 19a, the translator has ignored the repetition of מוֹלִיךְ “leading” and has used a synonym ἐξαποστέλλων “sending away”. In 19b, the imperfective יִסְלֵי “he overthrows” is translated with aorist κατέστρεψεν “he overthrew” (just like in 17b).

Reading, vocalising, or understanding the consonantal text differently than the later Masoretes. In v. 18 מוֹסֵר מַלְכִּים פֶּתַח וַיֹּאסֶר אֶזְרוֹר בַּמִּתְנִיָּהּ “He looses the sash of kings and binds a waistcloth on their loins”), only מַלְכִּים “kings” is directly translated (βασιλεῖς “kings”). In Greek, the verse reads καθιζάνων βασιλεῖς ἐπὶ θρόνους “seating kings upon thrones,” of which καθιζάνων “seating” could be the result of reading מוֹשִׁיב “seating, causing to sit”³⁴³ or מְשַׁב (a variant of מוֹסֵר “the one who removes”)³⁴⁴ instead of מוֹסֵר “bonds.” The phrase ἐπὶ θρόνους “upon thrones” would then be a logical addition to complete the clause. In general, the shorter Greek verse is clearer and more straightforward. Gorea also hypothesises that the two cola might have seemed contradictory and that the translator left the second untranslated³⁴⁵.

³⁴³ Dhorme 1967, 176.

³⁴⁴ Seow 2011, 66.

³⁴⁵ Gorea 2007, 26–9.

VII: 12:20–22

Style

Verses 20–22 make up a strophe of a *tricolon* and a *bicolon* in Greek, but three *bicola* in Hebrew. The strophe is framed with parallelistic structures in Hebrew: v. 20 has a partial chiasmus (ABC/xB'C'A') and v. 22 has a partial symmetry (ABC/xA'B').

There is some marked vocabulary in Hebrew: in 21a, the noun בוז “contempt” (considered by BDB to be especially characteristic to wisdom literature and poetry); in 21b, the noun ומזיח (מזיח “belt”; 3x, Job: 1, Ps: 1); and in 22b, the noun צלמות “shadow of death” (considered poetic by BDB).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 20a*, the Greek participle διαλλάσσω “disrupting, changing” translates the Hebrew participle מסיר “depriving” only in this speech of Job; elsewhere in Job and LXX, the translation equivalents are different. The Hebrew common singular שפה “lips” is translated according to Greek sense into plural χείλη “lips.” The participle לנאמנים “of those who are trusted” is translated with the adjective πιστῶν “of the trustworthy.” *In 20b*, the Hebrew noun טעם “taste, judgment” is translated as στυγεῖν “understanding”; although it is not a common equivalent, it creates a lexical connection with some previous strophes (IV and V).

Problems with the Vorlage manuscript. *In 20b*, in terms of position, ἔγνων “he understood, found out” corresponds to the Hebrew יקה “he takes away”. However, this would then be a complete rewriting, as the meaning changes significantly. *V. 21a* and the first word of 21b, שופך בוז על נדיבים ומזיח “He pours contempt on princes and the belt” are untranslated³⁴⁶. *In 21b*, again in terms of position, ταπεινοὺς “the humble ones” seems to correspond to the Hebrew אפיקים “the mighty ones” (opposite)³⁴⁷. The Greek ἰάσατο “he healed” is an acceptable equivalent to the Hebrew רפה “he loosens,” because the verb רפא carries the meaning of “to heal, become fresh.” Vg does not translate directly either and has *et eos qui oppressi fuerant relevans* “and (he) relieveth them that were oppressed.” Therefore, we might conclude that starting from the end of 20b up to the last word of 21b might have been difficult to read or corrupted in the *Vorlage* manuscript, possibly in several pre-MT manuscripts (Vg).

³⁴⁶ 21b is asterisked in LXX^{Z1}; however, the general consensus is that it is OG, see, e.g. Dhorme 1967, 178; Pietersma 1985; Gentry 1995. There are some, who oppose; see, e.g., Gorea 2007, 26–31, who says that the verse is untranslated entirely because it essentially repeats the message of v. 18 and because the Hebrew is ambiguous.

³⁴⁷ Note, how Cox 2016a, 66 considers this word as an addition that completes the line.

VIII: 12:24–25

Style

Verses 24–25 form a strophe of two bicola in Greek. In Hebrew, the strophe begins with v. 23 (not translated in OG) and has three bicola. The beginning of the strophe is marked with a repetition of לגוים “(to) the nations” and symmetry in Hebrew v. 23 (ABC/A'B'C'). The end of the strophe is marked with a simile in 25b: ויתעם כשכור “he makes them stagger like a drunkard” in Hebrew and πλανηθείσαν δὲ ὥσπερ ὁ μεθύων “and may they wander about like a drunkard” in Greek.

Moreover, rare vocabulary frames the strophe in Hebrew and marks the end of the strophe in Greek: in 23a, the participle משגיא of the verb שגא “to grow great” (5x, Job: 2); in 23b, the qal participle of the verb שטח “to spread” (6x, Job: 1, Ps: 1); and in 25a, the verb ימששו (משש “to feel”; 9x, Job: 2); in Greek 25a, the verb ψηλαφῆσαισαν “may they grope” (ψηλαφάω, reflects the rare verb in Hebrew; 43x, LXX: 16, OG Job: 2).

Additionally, the verb ויתעם “he makes them wander” is repeated in 24b/25b. This is reflected in Greek with the repetition of ἐπλάνησεν “he made to wander” (24b) and πλανηθείσαν “may they wander” (25b).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. The translator has left v. 23, He makes nations great, then destroys them; he enlarges nations, then leads them away” untranslated³⁴⁸. Gorea hypothesises, that this is not due to difficult Hebrew, but more ideological in nature, although it is hard to pinpoint the exact reason (erasing possible sanctions for leaders or lessening dangers, being too sensitive to the fatalism or being too sensitive to the feelings of the sponsors of the translation etc.). In any case, leaving out vv. 18, 21, and 23 either partly or fully is in her opinion a conscious action by the translator in order to make the text smoother as well.³⁴⁹ LXX.D suggests that the shortening was due to stylistic concerns³⁵⁰. In 24a, just like in 20a, the Hebrew participle מסיר “he strips” is translated with the participle διαλλάσσω “changing”, which is the equivalence only in this speech of Job. The common singular לב “heart” is translated with the plural καρδίας “hearts.” The Hebrew עם “people” (“leaders of the people of the earth”) is left untranslated. Dhorme claims that the word was not supposed to be in v. 24 and was accidentally placed there due to the influence of v. 23. Thus, it should also be omitted from the MT.³⁵¹ Witte also considers it a later gloss³⁵². However, the translator might have simply omitted the redundant word, as it is a common strategy they used. V. 24b is paraphrased from ויתעם בתהו לא דרך “and he makes them wander in a pathless waste” into

³⁴⁸ Rahlfs considers 12:23b OG, however, see Gentry 1995, 22–4, who does not.

³⁴⁹ Gorea 2007, 26–32.

³⁵⁰ Kepper and Witte 2011, 2088.

³⁵¹ Dhorme 1967, 179–80.

³⁵² Witte 2021, 222.

ἐπλάνησεν δὲ αὐτοὺς ὁδῶ ἣ οὐκ ᾔδεισαν “he made them wander by a way they did not know”. *In 25a*, the imperfective ימשכו “they grope about” is translated with an optative ψηλαφήσασιν “may they grope” and *in 25b*, the hiphil ויתעם “he causes them to wander, stagger”, avoiding direct repetition with 24b, is translated with a passive optative πλανηθείσιν “may they wander”. The latter change is seen as theological by some, removing the suggestion that God is the one who causes the wandering about³⁵³, which leads to the questions, why this was not done in 24b, while others think that the translator read ויתען (the *niphal* form)³⁵⁴. Considering the parallel with the verb in 25a, intentional change is most likely.

IX: 13:1–3

Style

Verses 1–3 form a strophe made up of three bicola. The strophe is framed with parallelistic structures in both languages: it begins with partial symmetry (Greek xABC/xB'C' and Hebrew xABC/B'C'xDE) and ends with a partial chiasmus (Greek xABC/C'B'D and Hebrew xABC/xC'B'D). The strophe begins with the interjection “look!” (הן in Hebrew and ἰδοὺ in Greek) and ends with the emphatic אני אולם “but I” in Hebrew and οὐ μὴν δὲ ἀλλ’ ἐγὼ “nonetheless, I” in Greek.

In Hebrew 2a, there is a root repetition in the phrase ידעתכם כדעתכם “as/like your knowledge, I know”; the personal pronoun אני “I” is repeated in 2a/3a; and the preposition אל “to” is repeated in 3ab. These are not reflected in Greek. However, there is a very noticeable repetition of the conjunction καὶ “and” in 1b/2a/2b and plural “you” is repeated in 2ab (ὁμεῖς/ὁμῶν).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 1a*, the Hebrew noun כל “all this” has been translated with the pronoun ταῦτα “these things”. *In 1b*, the conjunction καὶ “and” is added to the beginning while the second half of 1b, ותבן לה “she/it understood it”, is left untranslated. This omission makes the cola of v. 1 more balanced. *In 2a*, the order of the two phrases has been changed, and the clause is paraphrased a little from אני גם ידעתכם כדעתכם “like your knowledge, I as well know” into καὶ οἶδα ὅσα καὶ ὁμεῖς ἐπίστασθε “and I know what you too understand”. The translator has avoided repetition, omitted the pronoun אני “I” but added the pronoun ὁμεῖς “you.” *In 2b*, the participle לא נפל “not falling short, being inferior” has been interpreted as οὐκ ἀσυνετώτερός “no less intelligent”. Orlinsky deems this idiomatic Greek³⁵⁵. The Hebrew personal pronoun אנכי “I” is translated as the verb εἰμι “I am.” *In 3a*, the Hebrew אולם “but” has been in Greek translated with οὐ μὴν δὲ ἀλλ’ “nonetheless”, but this is not unusual and has been done also in 5:8. *In 3b*, the infinitive והוכח “and to rebuke, argue my case” is translated into first person singular ἐλέγξω δὲ “and I will argue my case”.

³⁵³ Gehman 1949, 236; Gray 1974, 341.

³⁵⁴ Clines 2015, 281.

³⁵⁵ Orlinsky 1958, 248, 250.

Changes regarding religion or religious culture and law. *In 3b*, the phrase לַאֱלֹהִים “to God” is paraphrased as ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ “before him”. This is a rarer occasion, since more often, לַאֱלֹהִים is translated directly as κύριος in the OG³⁵⁶. Finally, the first person singular אֶחָדָה “I desire (to argue my case with God)” is translated as εἰάν βούληται “if he (God) wishes;” Gehman, Dhorme and LXX.D consider this correction theological³⁵⁷.

Nömmik categorises vv. 1–2 in the earliest redaction of Job, done by the book editor. Vv. 3–4 are glosses that he says cannot be dated exactly. Vermeylen places vv. 1–2 to *rédaction* II.³⁵⁸ The translator did not face any textual or thematic struggles in these verses.

X: 13:4–6

Style

Verses 4–6 make up a strophe made up of three bicola. The strophe begins with the emphatic adverb וְאַחֲרָיו “but indeed” in Hebrew and with the emphasised personal pronoun ὑμεῖς δέ “but you” in Greek. The strophe ends in v. 6 with enveloping imperatives: שִׁמְעוּ נָא “hear now!” and הִקְשִׁיבוּ “listen!” in Hebrew, ἀκούσατε “hear!” and προσέχετε “give heed!” in Greek.

In Greek, the strophe has a parallelistic structure in every verse: in v. 4, a partial chiasmus (ABCD/xC'D'A'; reflecting Hebrew); in v. 5, a partial symmetry (ABC/xA'B'D); and in v. 6, a partial chiasmus (ABC/B'C'A'; reflecting Hebrew).

The Greek has some independent repetitions: the verb “to be” is repeated in 4a/5a (ἐστε “you are” and εἴη “oh that it would be”); the plural “you” is repeated in 4a/5a/5b (ὕμεις/ὕμῃν/ὕμῃν); and the conjunction καὶ “and” is repeated in 4b/5b.

There is also some marked vocabulary in Greek: in 4b, the noun ἰατὰ “healer” (ἰατήρ, -οῦ, ὁ; 6x, OG Job: 1); and in 5a, the verb κωφεῦσαι “to be quiet” (κωφεύω; 14x, LXX: 13, OG Job: 3, ※: 3).

In Hebrew, the marked words, repetitions, and parallelism are in structural positions. The beginning of the strophe is marked with an elevated word (in 4a, the participle טָפַל of the verb טָפַל “to smear”, 3x, Job: 2, Ps: 1); and the middle with a repetition in 5a (an infinitive absolute + finite form construction: הִחַרְשׁ תִּחְרִישׁוּ “you would keep completely quiet”). In Hebrew, the strophe is also framed with chiasmi (xAB/B'A' in the beginning and AB/xB'A' in the end).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 4a*, the translator added the copula ἐστε “you are” to the pronoun ὑμεῖς. The common singular noun שקר “of deception, lies” is translated with the plural adjective ἄδικοι “unjust, harmful.” *In 4b*, the conjunction καὶ is added to the beginning. The Hebrew participle רָפָא

³⁵⁶ Mangin 2005, 49–50.

³⁵⁷ Gehman 1949, 233; Dhorme 1967, 182; Kepper and Witte 2011, 2088.

³⁵⁸ Vermeylen 2015, 123; Nömmik 2025.

“the ones who heal” is translated with the noun (a neologism?³⁵⁹) ἰαταὶ “healers.” The Hebrew noun אֵלִל “of worthlessness” is generalised with the adjective κακῶν “of bad things/people”³⁶⁰. כלכם “all of you” is translated with just πάντες “all”, but since it is in the nominative plural case, it is easily connected with ἰαταὶ and ὑμεῖς from the beginning of 4a, and the repetition of the pronoun is not necessary. **In 5a**, the rhetorical מי יתן החרש תחרישון “(who would give) oh that you would keep silent!” is translated with εἴη δὲ ὑμῖν κωφεῦσαι “oh that (there) would be being silent for you!”. ὑμῖν also helps to create a fuller symmetry with 5b. **V. 5b**, ותהי לכם לחכמה “and that will for you as/for wisdom” is translated with καὶ ἀποβήσεται³⁶¹ ὑμῖν εἰς σοφίαν “and will turn out to be wisdom for you”, altering the syntax ever so slightly. **In 6a**, τοῦ στόματός “(the reasoning) of my mouth”, is an addition, likely for stylistic reasons, to create a fuller parallelism with 6b³⁶². Orlinsky, and later Witte, however, think that on the grounds of parallelism, the Hebrew (including the *Vorlage*) originally did read תוכחת פי instead of תוכחת³⁶³ and that the MT should be emended, to account both for the Greek translation and for Hebrew style (meter, word-pairs, parallelism)³⁶⁴. Since other ancient versions do not attest to this reading, not even the later Vg, an intentional addition is most likely. **In 6b**, the plural ורבות “and strifes, pleadings” is translated with the singular κρίσιν δὲ “and the argument”.

Vorlage different than the later MT. **In 4a**, the first word, וְאֹלֵם “but”, is not translated in the usual way but with the simple δέ “and; but”. Orlinsky has found, that since the Greek translator always translated אֹלֵם strongly and not with just δέ or καί, it must have been missing in the *Vorlage*; additionally, he considered the *Vorlage* preferable to the MT³⁶⁵, suggesting an opportunity to emend it. Vg does not translate the second וְאֹלֵם either (but like OG, translates in v. 3), thus we may assume that in some pre-MT manuscripts, the word was missing, while in others, it had crept in.

Utilising the context or the translator's previous knowledge for the meaning of unknown words. **In 4a**, it is unclear, how the translator arrived at ἰατροὶ “physicians” since it does not correspond to the Hebrew טפלי (“smearer”) or a similar consonant combination. The Hebrew verb here is very rare (3x), thus it is probable that the translator chose a word that creates parallelism with 4b: ἰατροὶ and ἰαταὶ.³⁶⁶

Kaiser thinks that v. 4 is a gloss, whereas according to Nömmik, vv. 3–4 are a further gloss that cannot be dated exactly³⁶⁷. Based on the Greek translation, we

³⁵⁹ cf. also Mangin 2005, 308.

³⁶⁰ Szpek 1992, 284: the P translator has generalised the translation of this noun as well; thus, it reads כלם חסר “nothing (not something)”.

³⁶¹ Cf. also Orlinsky 1937a, 362.

³⁶² Cf. also Cox 2016a, 66.

³⁶³ According to Seow 2011, 65 one Ms reads תוכחתי.

³⁶⁴ Orlinsky 1964, 70–1; Witte 2021, 222.

³⁶⁵ Orlinsky 1964, 70.

³⁶⁶ Szpek 1992, 291: P translator struggled due to the rare term as well and used contextual translation: מחלל “speakers”.

³⁶⁷ Kaiser 2006, 26, 126; Nömmik 2025.

can only make assumptions on v. 4a, where the first word might have not yet been there in the *Vorlage* (or some pre-MT manuscripts) and could have been added later, whether by careless scribes or a later redactor. The translator did not object to the topic of these verses.

XI: 13:7–10a

Style

Verses 7–10a make up a strophe of two bicola and a tricolon. The beginning of the strophe is marked with (partial) symmetry: xAB/A'B'C in Greek and xABC/xA'B'C' in Hebrew and additionally with a marked question *πότερον οὐκ* “is it not?” in Greek. The Hebrew has marked questions throughout, thus none of them acts as a transition marker, especially since the next strophe has similar marked questions. The end is marked with the conditional and causal *εἰ γὰρ* “for if” in Greek.

In Greek, one rare word is used in 9a, namely the verb *ἐξίχνισεν* “he traced” (*ἐξίχνισεν*; 16x, LXX: 16, OG Job: 6).

The Hebrew strophe has several uses of marked vocabulary: in 7b, the noun *רמיה* “deceit” (10x, Job: 2, Ps: 2); in 9b, two different forms of the verb *תלל* “to deceive” (*תהתלו* and *בהתל*; 9x, Job: 2) and the noun *באנוש* (*אנוש*) “man” (considered mostly poetic by BDB).

There are also several lexical repetitions in Hebrew; the interrogative particle *-ה* in 7a/8a/9a; the conjunction-particle *אם* “or” in 8b/9b; the phrase *לאל* “for God” in 7a/8b; the verb *תדברו* “you (pl.) speak” in 7ab; the second person plural object *אתכם* “you” in 9a/10a; the verb *תלל* “to deceive” twice in verse 9b (infinitive construct *התל* and second person plural *תהתלו*); and finally in 10a, there is another infinite absolute + finite (third person singular) construction: *הוכח יוכיח* “he will surely rebuke”.

The Greek translator reflects the repetition of the second person plural pronoun and adds another one (8b/9a/10a: *ὑμεῖς/ὑμεῖς/ὑμεῖς*). The preposition *ἐναντι* “before” is used twice in v. 7.

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 8a*, the Hebrew expression *הפניו תשאן* “do you lift up his face?” (“do you show partiality to him, respect him?”) has been translated idiomatically with *ἢ ὑποστελεῖσθε* “will you shrink back in awe? will you hold in undue awe?”³⁶⁸. *In 8b*, The Hebrew verb *תריבון* “are you conducting a case? are you making a complaint?” has been turned into *ὑμεῖς δὲ αὐτοὶ κριταὶ γένησθε* “you yourselves become judges!” in the Greek translation. The emphatic *ὑμεῖς ... αὐτοὶ* “you yourselves” are additions, also creating a lexical repetition in the strophe. Gehman sees the paraphrase of v. 8 as

³⁶⁸ See Mangum 2018 for an overview of how the Hebrew idiom is translated in the LXX Job (that is, including the asterisked parts). According to Muraoka 2010, 122, the equivalence is not unique.

theological since the idea of his friends acting as judges between him and God is offensive³⁶⁹. *In 9a*, the emphatic particle γε “at any rate, at least, indeed” has been added but the interrogative particle -ה has not been translated, turning the question into a statement. *In 10a*, the Hebrew root repetition הוכח יוכיח “he will surely rebuke” consisting of an infinitive absolute and imperfective third singular masculine, has been paraphrased into οὐθὲν ἤττον ἐλέγξει “nonetheless, he will convict/rebuke”.

Reading, vocalising, or understanding the consonantal text differently than the later Masoretes. *In 7a*, the Hebrew הלא “(whether) for God?” has become πότερον οὐκ ἔναντι κυρίου “are you not before the Lord?”; Dhorme suggests that the translator read הלא לא instead³⁷⁰. The noun/adverb עולה “false, falsely” at the end of the colon is not translated, thus turning the full symmetry into a partial one. The word might have been missed due to the repeating lamedhs and alephs. The beginning of *v. 8b*, the phrase אם לא “or for God/to God” has not been translated, which is relatively rare in OG Job³⁷¹. This might be a case of the translator’s eye skipping over the words since *v. 7* already had them.

Differences that are harder to explain. *V. 9b*, אם כהתל באנוש תהתלו בו “or can you deceive him as one person deceives another?” has turned into εἰ γὰρ τὰ πάντα ποιοῦντες προστεθήσεσθε αὐτῷ “for if, in doing everything you can, you will ‘join yourselves to him’” in Greek. It is hard to see anything in the Hebrew that could have prompted this. The rewriting could be theologically motivated, as deceiving God could have been too strong of an expression for the translator³⁷². Cox has said that here the Greek translator actually cites the Greek Deut 13:4 instead of translating but considers the phrase τὰ πάντα ποιοῦντες an emphatic addition³⁷³.

According to Nömmik, vv. 9–12 may have been added in the first layer of redactions by the book editor (who also added 12:7–8, 10–25, and 13:1–2, where God’s might is emphasised). The attitude in these verses is even more critical towards Job’s friends. Vermeulen deems vv. 9–10 later (*redaction* III), because thematically they do not fit: vv. 3–8 deal with reproaches against friends for being God’s advocates whereas vv. 9–10 promises condemnation from God. Furthermore, he thinks that vv. 9–10 anticipate 42:7–9 which are from *redaction* II.³⁷⁴ In this strophe, *v. 9b* either caused difficulties for the translator or they found it too offensive to translate.

³⁶⁹ Gehman 1949, 233.

³⁷⁰ Dhorme 1967, 184.

³⁷¹ Mangin 2005, 49–50. Cf. also Beeckman 2024, 310, who has counted 13 omissions of the divine name in OG Job.

³⁷² Cf. Gehman 1949, 233.

³⁷³ Cox 2014, 460; 2016a, 66; 2017, 178.

³⁷⁴ Vermeulen 2015, 119–20, 116–23; Nömmik 2025.

XII: 13:10b–12

Style

Verses 10b–12 make up a strophe of a tricolon and a bicolon. The beginning of the strophe in 10b is marked with the conditional εἰ δὲ καὶ “and even if”, reflecting the Hebrew אם “if”, and 11a the marked yes-no question πότερον οὐχί, reflecting the Hebrew אלה “will not?”.

In v. 11, there is a partial symmetry in Greek (xABCD/A'B'C'D') and full symmetry in Hebrew (xABC/xA'B'C') and in v. 12 there is a chiasmus in Hebrew (AB/B'A').

There are two lexical repetitions in Hebrew: a root repetition in 10b/11a (the verb תשאן “you lift, elevate” and the noun שאתו “his elevation”) and גב “shield” is used twice in 12b. The only lexical repetition in Greek is that of the second person plural pronoun: ὑμεῖς in 11a, ὑμῖν in 11b, and ὑμῶν in 12a, just like in the previous strophe.

There is one poetic (according to BDD) word in Hebrew, namely the piel form of בעת, namely תבעת “it terrifies.”

In Greek, only v. 11b has no marked vocabulary: in 10b, the adverb κρυφῇ “secretly” (24x, LXX: 6, OG Job: 1); in 11a, the verb στροβήσει “it will disturb” (στροβέω; considered mainly poetic³⁷⁵, also rare, 21x, OG Job: 4); in 12a, the noun τὸ γαυρίαμα “arrogance” (literary koine³⁷⁶; also rare, 6x, LXX: 6, OG Job: 2); and in 12b, the adjective πήλινον “of clay” (πήλινος, -η, -ον; 10x, LXX: 5, OG Job: 2).

The strophe ends with a marked simile in Greek 12a: ἀποβήσεται δὲ ὑμῶν τὸ γαυρίαμα ἴσα σποδῶ “but your arrogance will turn out to be like ashes”.

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 10b*, the conditional אם “if” has been extended into εἰ δὲ καὶ “and if too”. The Hebrew idiomatic expression פנים תשאן “you lift faces ~ you show partiality” has been translated as πρόσωπα θαυμάσεσθε “lit. you admire/worship faces, marvel at faces” (this is a stereotypical rendering in the LXX; but cf. 8a, where it is translated colloquially³⁷⁷). *In 11a*, the Hebrew שאתו “his exaltation, loftiness” is translated as δεινὰ αὐτοῦ “his terrors; his wonders, marvels, mighty things”. Although this is not a translation equivalent seen anywhere else in the LXX, it is not unsuitable or wrong; it also creates a stronger parallel with 11b.³⁷⁸ The verb תבעת “it terrifies, overwhelms” is translated with στροβήσει “it will whirl about, it will distress” (the verb has been translated like this elsewhere). *In 11b*, the Hebrew ופחדו “his fear” has been specified and translated as φόβος δὲ παρ’ αὐτοῦ “fear from him”. *In 12a*, the translator has added the verb ἀποβήσεται “it will turn out to be, it will become”;

³⁷⁵ Mangin 2005, 567.

³⁷⁶ Mangin 2005, 502.

³⁷⁷ Cf. Mangum 2018, for how the expression is translated in the LXX and in Job more specifically.

³⁷⁸ P interprets similarly with פחדו “his fear”; cf. also Szpek 1992, 191.

making explicit what is meant in Hebrew where there is no copula or any other verb³⁷⁹.

Reading, vocalising, or understanding the consonantal text differently than the later Masoretes. *In 12a*, the Hebrew noun זכרניכם “your reminders” is translated as ὑμῶν τὸ γαυράμα “your arrogance, exultation”. According to Muraoka, the Greek translator understood the Hebrew root to be זדון ‘arrogance, impudence’³⁸⁰. The Hebrew משלי אפר that is usually translated as “proverbs of ashes” has been read as a comparison (possibly without the yodh), and translated into ἴσα σποδῶ “like ashes, embers.” *In 12b*, the Hebrew לגבי חמר גביכם “like shields of clay (are) your shields” has been reduced to τὸ δὲ σῶμα πῆλινον “body of clay”; the shorter colon marks the end of the strophe nicely. The Hebrew גב “shield” could have been associated with גף or late Hebrew גוף “body”³⁸¹.

According to Nömmik, vv. 9–12 may have been added in the first layer of redactions by the book editor. Vermeylen deems vv. 9–10 later, because thematically they do not fit (vv. 3–8 deal with reproaches against friends for being God’s advocates whereas vv. 9–10 promise condemnation from God). Furthermore, he thinks that vv. 9–10 anticipate 42:7–9 which are from *rédaction* II. Additionally, v. 10 repeats the “lift your face” expression from v. 8 (and is also seen in 42:8 and 9). For these reasons and that vv. 9–10 also anticipate parts of Elihu’s speech (32), he places them in *rédaction* III.³⁸² As the last paragraph of textual analysis shows, the translator read the consonantal text differently than the other ancients several times, pointing to possibly a bad handwriting in the *Vorlage*.

XIII: 13:13–16

Style

Verses 13–16 make up a strophe consisting of a *monocolon* and three *bicola* in Greek, and four *bicola* in Hebrew. The strophe begins with imperatives: החרישו ממני “let me have silence!” in Hebrew and κωφεύσατε, ἵνα “Be quiet! so that ...” in Greek. In Greek, the very first word of the strophe is rare: the verb κωφεύσατε “be quiet!” (κωφεύω; 14x, all in the 3rd century BCE; LXX: 13; OG Job: 3, asterisked: 3).

The strophe ends with the emphatic adverb גם “also” (16a) and a causal/explicative כי “that” (16b) in Hebrew. In Greek, the strophe ends with a causal γὰρ “for” in 16b.

In v. 14, there is a partial chiasmus in both Greek (ABC/B’A’C’) and Hebrew (xABC/xB’A’C’).

Hebrew has several lexical repetitions, including those of prepositions and other function words; more noticeable are the following: the preposition על “on” in 13b/14a (in the interrogative על מה “why?”) (reflected in Greek with ἀνα- in

³⁷⁹ Cf. also Orlinsky 1937a, 362. Cox 2016a, 66 considers this an addition for stylistic improvement.

³⁸⁰ Muraoka 2010, 24.

³⁸¹ Cf. also Kepper and Witte 2011, 2088; Clines 2015, 282.

³⁸² Vermeylen 2015, 119–20, 116–23; Nömmik 2025.

the compound verbs of verse 13/14a); the interrogative מה “what?” in 13b/14a (although in different contexts); the negative אֵל in 15a/16b; the expression פָּנָיו “his face” as אֶל פָּנָיו “to his face” in 15b and לִפְנָיו “before him” in 16b (reflected in Greek with the repetition of ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ “before him”). Additionally, the phrase λαλήσω καὶ “I will speak and ...” is repeated in Greek 13/15b.

A marked Hebrew word has been used in 15a: the verb יִקְטֹלני (קָטַל “to slay”; 10x, Job: 2, Ps: 1).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. From Hebrew v. **13a**, the מִמֶּנִּי “from me” is not translated. The Hebrew cohortative וְאִדְבַּרְהָ אֲנִי “and I may/will speak” is translated with ἵνα λαλήσω “so that I may speak”³⁸³, omitting the personal pronoun “I” (it has been suggested that the pronoun is a later gloss³⁸⁴). **In 14a**, the Hebrew imperfective אֲשֹׁא “I lift, take” has been translated with the aorist participle ἀναλαβὼν “having taken”. As usual, the singular בִּשְׂרִי “my flesh” has been translated into plural τὰς σάρκας μου “my fleshs.” The phrase בִּשְׁנֵי “in my teeth” is translated with τοῖς ὀδοῦσιν “in teeth,” without the preposition and the suffix, as they are not strictly needed in Greek. **In 14b**, the phrase בְּכַף “in my hand” is translated with ἐν χειρὶ “in hand”, again omitting the suffix but keeping the preposition. **In 15a**, the verb יִקְטֹלני “he kills me” is translated with με χειρῶσεται ὁ δυνάστης “the mighty one lays hands on me”, creating a root repetition with 14b. LXX.D has suggested that the next word, אֵל could have been read as אֱל “God”³⁸⁵. Gehman finds the paraphrase in v. 15 theological in nature, as implying that God slays was not acceptable for the translator³⁸⁶. These suggestions can be rejected. The subject seems to have been added simply because it was needed here³⁸⁷; ὁ δυνάστης does not refer to God in OG Job, but an oppressor. Job is stating that however overpowering his oppressor is, he will have a case against him. **In 15b**, the conjunction καὶ “and” is added between two verbs. **In 16a**, the verb ἀποβήσεται “it will turn out to be” has been added; Orlinsky considers (based on translation choices elsewhere in Job, and in this speech) this not an addition strictly since it “reproduces exactly the force of the copula understood along with the preposition לִי”³⁸⁸. This might be argued with since correspondence also exists here between the preposition in Hebrew and the preposition (εἰς) in Greek. **In 16b**, the Hebrew חֲנֹף “godless, profane” has been interpreted as δόλος “deceit”.

Reading, vocalising, or understanding the consonantal text differently than the later Masoretes. The Hebrew v. **13b** phrase וְיַעֲבֵר עָלַי מָה “and let come on me what may” has been replaced with καὶ ἀναπαύσωμαι θυμοῦ “and (so that) I can be relieved of rage”. Muraoka theorises that at least θυμοῦ could be the result of

³⁸³ Cf. also Vg *ut*.

³⁸⁴ Nömmik 2013, 178.

³⁸⁵ Kepper and Witte 2011, 2088.

³⁸⁶ Gehman 1949, 235.

³⁸⁷ See Cox 2016a, 66, for whom it is a clarifying addition.

³⁸⁸ Orlinsky 1937a, 362–3.

reading חמה “anger” in the Hebrew³⁸⁹, Dhorme thinks that the whole Greek phrase translates it³⁹⁰. In 14a, the repeating על מה “upon which” in Hebrew has not been translated into Greek this time either. Orlinsky, Dhorme, Terrien and Witte suggest omitting it from the Hebrew text as well, as it was placed here due to dittography (Masoretes have marked it) and now disrupts the continuity and metre; Orlinsky, Dhorme, and Witte say that the phrase did not exist in the *Vorlage* either³⁹¹. Since the end of 13b was probably read differently, it is not impossible that the translator unintentionally skipped over this phrase. In 15b, the Hebrew דרכי “my ways, roads” has been translated with λαλήσω “I will speak”, due to reading אדבר “I (will) speak”³⁹², which repeats twice in ch. 13.

Vorlage different than the later MT. In 15a, ἐπεὶ καὶ ἤρκαται “inasmuch as he has begun” could be a paraphrase from reading the Hebrew as לוֹ הָחֵל “for him there is a beginning” instead of לֹא אִיחָל (*qere* לוֹ and the *hiphil* infinitive of the verb חָלַל); Dhorme thinks that the translator may have read לוֹ “if only”³⁹³. Thus, the *ketiv* is “I will not wait” or “I will not hope” but the *qere* would mean “I will hope for him.” Cf. Aquila αὐτὸν περιμενῶ “I will wait for him,” P כִּסְרָא חֲסִידָא חֲסִידָא “I wait for him alone,” Vg *in ipso sperabo* “I will trust in him.” Therefore, it seems reasonable to assume that the difference in 15a is due to a *Vorlage* and even several pre-MT manuscripts that are slightly different than the later MT.

V. 15 begins with the particle הֵן, which according to Vermeylen, marks often additions from *rédaction* III (9:11, 12; 12:14, 15; 4:18). He rejects the *qere* reading of לוֹ “for him” here, since it seems like a *lectio facilior*. Instead, he says that if we stick with the MT, the text makes sense as coming from *rédacteur* III who sees Job as a Hellenised Jew. V. 16 is, in his opinion, from *rédaction* II. This is largely due to the pronoun הוּא in 16a, which usually refers to a person (not an impersonal this/that) and the phrase לִי לִישׁוּעָה “for me for/to salvation” which expresses usually deliverance by God (e.g., Ex 15:2; Is 12:2; Ps 118:14, 21). The other half of the verse gives a contrast (fate of the impious) which he thinks does not correspond to the usual *rédaction* I perspectives of Job’s speeches.³⁹⁴ If v. 15 was a later addition, the translator felt the need to smooth it out a bit and namely add a subject to the clause, as it was missing. Further, while Vermeylen rejects the *qere* reading, the ancients saw it and translated it, resulting in differences. V. 16 caused no issues for the translator, but they did add a verb to the clause for balance.

³⁸⁹ Muraoka 2010, 57.

³⁹⁰ Dhorme 1967, 186.

³⁹¹ Terrien 1963, 115; Orlinsky 1964, 71; Dhorme 1967, 187; Witte 2021, 223.

³⁹² Cf. also Dhorme 1967, 187.

³⁹³ Dhorme 1967, 187.

³⁹⁴ Vermeylen 2015, 119–20, 116–23, 279–80.

XIV: 13:17–19

Style

Verses 17–19 make up a strophe of two bicola and a *monocolon* in Greek, marking the end structurally, but three bicola in Hebrew. The strophe begins with the emphasised imperative, with the root-repetition שמעו שמעו “listen carefully!” in Hebrew and the double-imperative ἀκούσατε ἀκούσατε “hear, hear!” in Greek. The beginning of the strophe also has marked vocabulary in Hebrew: in 17a, the noun מלתי “my words” (מלה; considered poetic by BDB); and in 17b, the noun ואחותי (אחותה “declaration”; 2x, Job: 1). The strophe ends with who-questions, marked with מי in Hebrew and τίς γάρ (“for who?”) in Greek. Additionally, the last colon of the strophe in Hebrew has a causal-temporal expression כי עתה “for then.”

In Greek, the verb “to hear” is additionally repeated in a genitive absolute construction in 17b (ἀκουόντων); the causal particle γάρ “for” in 17b/19a; the personal pronoun ἐγώ “I” is repeated in 18ab; and finally, the verb “to be” is repeated in 18a (εἶμι) and 19a (ἔστιν).

The only other repetition in Hebrew is that of the particle כי “for” in 18b/19b, in different meanings.

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 17a*, the imperative and infinitive absolute combination שמעו שמעו “listen carefully!” has been translated with the double imperative ἀκούσατε ἀκούσατε “hear, hear!” The Hebrew מלתי “my speech” is translated with the plural τὰ ῥήματά μου “my words.” *In 18a*, the Hebrew ערכתי משפט “I have prepared my case” has been paraphrased into ἐγὼ εἰγγύς εἰμι τοῦ κρίματός μου “I am near to my trial”³⁹⁵; ἐγὼ is an addition to create an emphatic repetition with 18b while the pronoun μου “my” has been added to “trial, judgment” for clarification and emphasis³⁹⁶. Dhorme, however, thinks that the translator read קרבתִי “I have brought near” instead³⁹⁷. *In 18b*, The Hebrew verb אצדק “I am right, justified” is extended into δίκαιος ἀναφανοῦμαι “I will be shown to be in the right”. *In 19a*, the Hebrew מי הוא “who (is) he?” is appropriately translated with τίς γάρ ἐστιν “for who is?”, adding the particle “for”. The imperfective יריב “he contends, conducts a case against” is translated with the participle ὁ κριθισόμενός “he who will dispute, contend,” because the finite ἐστιν was already used. *V. 19b*, כי עתה אחריש ואנוע “for then I would be silent and die” has not been translated. Gorea hypothesises that the translator did not think it to be essential; Gard sees the reason for omission the fact that the Hebrew makes Job seem “too fatalistic”³⁹⁸. Indeed, in this context, Job fighting his case, the fatalistic nature might have disturbed the translator, and they decided to omit

³⁹⁵ Vg paraphrases with *si fuero iudicatus* “if I shall be judged”.

³⁹⁶ Cf. also Cox 2016a, 66.

³⁹⁷ Dhorme 1967, 188.

³⁹⁸ Gard 1953, 185; Gorea 2007, 32–4.

it instead of paraphrasing. As a result, the end of the strophe is marked with a monocolon.

Reading, vocalising, or understanding the consonantal text differently than the later Masoretes. In 17b, the Hebrew noun וְאִחוּתִי “and my declaration” was read and understood as a first-person singular verb (waw + perfective) and translated with the future ἀναγγεῖλῶ γάρ “for I will declare”. The second phrase, בְּאָזְנֶיכֶם “in your ears” has been read/understood as an infinitive phrase (the verb אָזַן “to hear”) and thus appropriately translated with the genitive absolute ὑμῶν ἀκουόντων “while you listen.” According to Witte and Nömmik, v. 17 is a gloss that cannot be dated exactly³⁹⁹. The consonantal text allows for the readings that the translator made; thus, it can be concluded that if the verse is a gloss, its form or theme did not trouble the translator.

Vv. 17–19 are, in Vermeylen’s opinion, from *rédaction* III or perhaps even *rédaction* IV. V. 17a is identical to 21:2 (possibly a model for it), and the phrase שמעו שמעו is also found in Elihu’s 37:2 (from *rédaction* IV). In 17b, the corresponding verb חוה of the *hapax* אָחוּה is an Aramaism used in newer texts of the HB (Ps 19:3 but also Job 32:6b from *rédaction* IV). V. 18 begins with הִנֵּה נָא which, according to him, is only used in *rédaction* III (33:2) and IV (40:15.16). He says that based on vocabulary and attitude, vv. 18–19 could belong to *rédaction* I (e.g., 6:29–30) but also *rédaction* III (11:4 and 33:8–9), but favours *rédaction* III, due to v. 17 being later as well.⁴⁰⁰ Based on the OG translation, the secondarity of these verses cannot be confirmed nor rejected. The translator objected to v. 19b in the context and decided to omit it, resulting in a structurally marked end to the strophe.

XV: 13:20–23

Style

Verses 20–23 make up a strophe that consists of a *tricolon* and two *bicola* in Greek, marking the beginning of the strophe structurally, but four *bicola* in Hebrew. In Hebrew, the strophe begins with the emphatic/restrictive adverb אָךְ “surely/only.” The last verse of the strophe has a marked question and an imperative: כַּמָּה “how many?” and הִדְיעֵנִי “make me know!” in Hebrew, πόσαι “how many?” and διδάξόν με “teach me!” in Greek.

In v. 22, the Greek has symmetry (xABCD/xA'B'C'D'), whereas the Hebrew has a partial symmetry (xAxBC/xA'xC').

In Hebrew, there are a couple of repetitions (besides smaller function words): the negation אֵל “not” in 20a/21b; and in 23ab, וְחַטָּאוֹת “and my sins” and וְחַטָּאתִי “and my sin”. These are not reflected in Greek. However, the phrase ἐγὼ δέ σοι “and I to you” is repeated in 22ab and the plural εἰσὶν “they are” in 23ab.

There is some marked vocabulary: in Hebrew 21b, the noun וְאִמְתָּךְ (אִמָּה) “dread of you” and the piel-form of תַּבְעַתְנִי (בַּעַת) “it terrifies” (considered mostly

³⁹⁹ Witte 2021, 57–9, 227; Nömmik 2025.

⁴⁰⁰ Vermeylen 2015, 119–20, 116–23.

poetic by BDB); in Greek 20a, the dual form *δυεῖν* (could indicate a higher register⁴⁰¹); and in 22b, the noun *ἀνταπόκρισιν* “a response” (*ἀνταπόκρισις*, -εως, ἡ; occurs only 2x, both in OG Job).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 20a*, the adverb *γὰρ* “surely” has been translated in an unmarked way, with the simple *δέ* “and”. The Hebrew *אל תעש* “do not do, make” has been changed into *χρήση* “you shall allow” (a common equivalent), i.e. omitting the negation, which makes sense in the context. *V. 20b*, *אז מפניך לא אסתר* “then I will not hide myself from your face” has been left untranslated; Gorea hypothesises that the translator did not think it to be essential⁴⁰². Indeed, the succeeding imperatives gain more weight without this statement before them. Job does not often refer to himself hiding from God, thus even in theme, it was deemed uncharacteristic. Although the resulting tricolon would be more marked in the beginning of the strophe any other time, in here, the previous strophe ended with a monocolon, thus lessening the effect. *In 21a*, the personal suffix *ך*- in *כפך* “my palm, hand” has not been translated, as it is not strictly necessary. *In 21b*, the Hebrew *אל תבעתני* “let it not terrify me” has been paraphrased as *μή με καταπλησσέτω* “may it not strike me down”. *In 22a*, the imperative *קרא* “and call!” is translated with the future indicative *καλέσεις* “and then you shall call”. Some say that this translation is theological in nature, removing the imperative when addressing God⁴⁰³. However, it is quite a common technique used in the LXX. The clarifying pronoun *σοι* “to you” has been added to *ὑπακούσομαι* “I will answer.” *In 23a*, the translator has added *εἰσὶν* “(they) are” after the interrogative. The Hebrew *לי עונות וחטאות* “for me iniquities and sins” has been paraphrased as *αἱ ἁμαρτίαι μου καὶ αἱ ἀνομίαι μου* “my sins and my acts of lawlessness.” *In 23b*, the Hebrew *פשעי וחטאתי* “my transgression and my sin” has been replaced with *τίνες εἰσὶν* “what they are”, avoiding repetition but also marking the end of the strophe with a shorter colon (just like the first verse with its several omissions).

Changes regarding religion or religious culture and law. *In 22b*, strangely enough, the Hebrew first person imperfective *אדבר* “I speak” is translated into second person future *λαλήσεις* “you shall speak”, making the *ἢ* “or” (directly translated) quite redundant and meaningless in Greek. In relation, the Hebrew *והשיבני* “and you will reply to me” has been changed into *ἐγὼ δέ σοι δώσω ἀνταπόκρισιν* “and I will give you a response;” this creates a repetition with the previous colon as well. Therefore, instead of the inverted phrase, like in Hebrew, the Greek has the exact same thing said twice but connected with the awkward

⁴⁰¹ Mangin 2005, 635; Dhont 2018a, 144–5.

⁴⁰² Gorea 2007, 32–4.

⁴⁰³ Gray 1974, 341.

“or.” Gehman sees the reasoning behind this translation as theological: the possibility of Job initiating the conversation with God is removed⁴⁰⁴.

XVI: 13:24–25

Style

The strophe in vv. 24–25 consists of two bicola. The strophe begins with why-questions: למה in Hebrew and διὰ τί in Greek. In v. 25, the Greek (xA'BCD/xA'B'C'D') and the Hebrew (xABC/xA'B'C') have symmetry and the Greek has a simile: ἢ ὡς φύλλον κινούμενον ὑπὸ ἀνέμου εὐλαβηθήσῃ ἢ ὡς χόρτω φερομένῳ ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἀντίκεισάι μοι; “Will you be wary of one that is like a windblown leaf or do you oppose me, one like windborne grass?”. A couple of rare Hebrew words have been used: in 25a, the niphal participle of the verb נָדַח “to drive” (9x, Job: 2, Ps: 2, Prov: 1); and in 25b, the adjective יבש “dry” (9x, Job: 1).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 24a*, the Hebrew object פָּנֶיךָ “your face” has been replaced with ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ “from me”⁴⁰⁵, but the meaning of the question remains essentially the same. *In 25a*, the comparison marker ὡς “like” and the phrase ὑπὸ ἀνέμου “by the wind” are added (so also Vg *vento*). *In 25b*, the Hebrew object קש “chaff” has been translated as χόρτω “grass”⁴⁰⁶. Again, the comparison marker ὡς “like” and the phrase ὑπὸ πνεύματος “by the breeze” are added. The adjective יבש “dry” has been changed into φερομένῳ (ὑπὸ πνεύματος) “being carried (by the breeze),” to create symmetry with the previous colon. Heater considers ὑπὸ ἀνέμου and φερομένῳ ὑπὸ πνεύματος to be anaphoric translations that may be inspired by Isa 29:5b and Jer 13:24, but also Lev 26:36, Wis 5:14a. He sees the motivation behind these expansions as stylistic and sees a possibility of natural collocation—these words are often used together, especially in the Alexandrian context.⁴⁰⁷

Changes regarding religion or religious culture and law. *In 25a*, the verb תַּעֲרֹץ “you (God) terrify” has been translated as εὐλαβηθήσῃ “you (God) are cautious of”. *In 25b*, the verb תִּרְדֹּךָ “you (God) pursue” has been changed into ἀντίκεισάι μοι “you (God) oppose me”. Gehman sees the paraphrase of v. 25 as theological, because God is now represented as softer and not as harsh as in the MT⁴⁰⁸. In a way, the Greek could be seen as lightly mocking towards God: why would God be afraid of Job who likens himself to a leaf and to grass.

⁴⁰⁴ Gehman 1949, 232.

⁴⁰⁵ Cox 2016a, 66. considers this a personalising addition.

⁴⁰⁶ Cox’s opinion in Cox 2016a, 66 that the word is an addition in order to “provide a parallel for 25a” cannot be agreed with; it can be assumed that this entry has a typo, and the rest of the colon was meant instead.

⁴⁰⁷ Heater 1982, 59–60.

⁴⁰⁸ Gehman 1949, 236.

XVII: 13:26–27

Style

This strophe in vv. 26–27 consists of a bicolon and a tricolon structure in both languages. The strophe begins with כִּי “for” in Hebrew and ὅτι “because” in Greek. In the second verse of the strophe, in 27a.c, the noun רגלי “my feet” is repeated. The Greek translation reflects this with slight changes: 27a has μου τὸν πόδα “my foot” while 27c has τῶν ποδῶν μου “my feet”. Several marked Hebrew words have been used in this strophe: in 26a, the adjective מררה (מרה “bitter”; 4x, Job: 3); in 27a, the noun בסד (סד “stocks”; Job: 2); in 27b, the noun ארחותי “my paths” (ארח; considered mostly poetic by BDB); in 27c, the verb תתחקה (חקה “to engrave”; 4x, Job: 1). In Greek, one rare word has been used: in 27a, the noun αωλύματι “a hobble” (αώλυμα, -ματος, τό; 26x, Job: 1).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 26a*, the Hebrew imperfective תכתב “you write” has been translated into the aorist κατέγραψας “you have written against”. The expressive but very rare מררות “bitter things” has been translated with the common κακά “bad things,” possibly to enhance alliteration⁴⁰⁹. *In 26b*, the hiphil תורישני “you cause me to possess” has been translated with περιέθηκας μοι “you have surrounded me; you have put around me”. The personal suffix י- “my” after נעורי “youth” has been omitted. *In 27a*, the imperfective ותשם “and you set” has been translated with the aorist ἔθου δέ “and you have set, put”. The Hebrew בסד “in stocks (?)” has been translated with ἐν αωλύματι “in a hindrance, an impediment.” The Hebrew dual רגלי “my feet” has been translated into the singular μου τὸν πόδα “my foot.” *In 27b*, the imperfective ותשמור “and you watch, guard” has again been translated into aorist ἐφύλαξας δέ “and you have guarded, watched over”. The Hebrew ארחותי “my ways, paths” has been translated as μου ... τὰ ἔργα “my actions”⁴¹⁰. Witte and Kaiser consider 27b a gloss⁴¹¹; the translator did not notice anything irregular here.

Utilising the context or the translator's previous knowledge for the meaning of unknown words. *In 27c*, the Hebrew על שרשי רגלי תתחקה “you set a bound on the roots of my feet” has been translated as εἰς δὲ ῥίζας τῶν ποδῶν μου ἀφίκου “and you reached to the roots of my feet”; this time the dual “feet” is translated with plural. The rare verb translation looks to be contextual; cf. also P with הִבֵּיתִי “you have seen”⁴¹² and Vg with *considerasti* “thou hast considered.” Nömmik thinks that v. 27c is a gloss that cannot be dated exactly⁴¹³. The translator did not object to the form nor the topic of this verse. Thus, if it is a gloss, it was unnoticed by the translator.

⁴⁰⁹ κατέγραψας κατ' ἐμοῦ κακά.

⁴¹⁰ Kepper and Witte 2011, 2089: “Beispiel für die ethisierende Wiedergabe”.

⁴¹¹ Kaiser 2006, 28, 126; Witte 2021, 57–9, 227–8.

⁴¹² Szpek 1992, 291, 296.

⁴¹³ Nömmik 2025.

XVIII: 13:28–14:4

Style

This strophe in vv. 13:28–14:4 is made up of four bicola and a *monocolon* in Greek, marking the end of the strophe structurally, but five bicola in Hebrew. The strophe begins with a relative clause (marked with δ) in Greek and with the pronoun והוא “and he” in the emphatic first position in Hebrew; the strophe ends with interrogative מי יתן “who can give (bring)?” in Hebrew and τίς γὰρ “for who ...?” in Greek.

The first three verses of the strophe consist of an extended simile in both languages:

13:28a	והוא כרקב יבלה	δ παλαιούται ἴσα ἀσκῶ
13:28b	כבגד אכלו עש:	ἢ ὥσπερ ἱμάτιον σητόβρωτον,
14:1a	אדם ילוד אשה	βροτὸς γὰρ γεννητὸς γυναικὸς
14:1b	קצר ימים ושבע רגז:	ὀλιγόβιος καὶ πλήρης ὀργῆς
14:2a	כצִיץ יצא וימל	ἢ ὥσπερ ἄνθος ἀνθῆσαν ἐξέπεσεν,
14:2b	ויברח כצל ולא יעמוד:	ἀπέδρα δὲ ὥσπερ σκιά καὶ οὐ μὴ στῇ. “One wastes away like a rotten thing, like a garment that is moth-eaten, a mortal, born of woman, few of days and full of trouble, comes up like a flower and withers, flees like a shadow and does not last.” “A worn out thing, like a skin, or like a moth-eaten garment, for a mortal, born of woman, is short-lived and full of aggravation or, like a flower that has bloomed, falls off, and flees like a shadow and will not halt.”

In both languages, the strophe has marked vocabulary. In Hebrew these are: in 13:28a, the noun כרקב (רקב “rotteness”; 5x, Job: 1, Prov: 2); in 28b, the noun עש “moth” (7x, Job: 3, Ps: 1); in 14:1b, the adjective קצר (“short”; 5x, Job: 1, Prov: 2), the adjective ושבע (שבע “sated”; 10x, Job: 3, Prov: 2), and the noun רגז “turmoil” (7x, Job: 5); and finally, in 2a, the verb וימל (מלל “to languish”; 4x, Job: 3, Ps: 1).

In Greek, these are: in 13:28b, the adjective σητόβρωτον “moth-eaten” (a newly formed compound⁴¹⁴, appears only here and one other time in the 2nd century BCE); in 14:1a, the poetic, even Homeric, noun βροτὸς “mortal man”⁴¹⁵,

⁴¹⁴ Dhont 2018a, 147.

⁴¹⁵ Cf. LSJ and Mangin 2005, 501.

and the adjective γεννητός “begotten” (47x, OG Job: 5); and in 1b, the adjective ὀλιγόβιος “short-lived” (4x, OG Job: 2).

Both Hebrew (ABC/xB’A’C’) and Greek (xAB/B’A’C) have a partial chiasmus in v. 14:2. In Greek, there is also a root-repetition in 2a: ἄνθος ἀνθῆσαν “a flower that has bloomed” and the verb “to make” is repeated in 3ab (ἐποίησω and ἐποίησας).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 13:28a*, the Hebrew והוא “and he/it” is for some reason replaced with the neutrum relative pronoun ὃ “which, that.” *In 28b*, the conjunction ἢ “or” has been added. The Hebrew phrase אכלו עץ “moth eats him” is changed into the adjective σητόβρωτον “moth-eaten.” *In 14:1a*, the particle γὰρ “for” is added. *In 1b*, the Hebrew construct chain קצר ימים “few of days” is translated with the adjective ὀλιγόβιος “short-lived”. *In 2a*, the conjunction ἢ “or” is added to the beginning of the colon. The Hebrew verb וימל “it withered, languished” is translated with ἐξέπεσεν “it fell off.” Heater sees the likely influence for this in Isa 40:7⁴¹⁶, whereas Dhorme raises the possibility that the translator read ויבל “it withered, dropped,” but he does not deny the influence of Isa or other parallel passages⁴¹⁷. *In 2b*, the Hebrew imperfective ולא יעמוד “and it does not stay” is translated with the καὶ οὐ μὴ στή “and it will not stay at all”. *In 3a*, the Hebrew פקחת עיניך “you opened your eyes (upon this)” has been paraphrased into λόγον ἐποίησω “you took into account”. According to Gehman, the change is theological (God cannot open his eye)⁴¹⁸; according to Orlinsky, the Greek correctly reproduces the idea of the Hebrew⁴¹⁹, whereas Dhorme once again tries to give a reading that produced the translation, namely פקחתי עיני and that “not open the eye” was understood as “not esteeming”⁴²⁰. *In 3b*, the Hebrew תביא “you carry in, bring in” has been translated periphrastically as ἐποίησας εἰσελθεῖν “you made (someone) enter, go in”, creating a lexical repetition with 3a. The Hebrew עמך “with you” has been translated as ἐνώπιόν σου “before, in front of you.” *In v. 4*, the Hebrew מי יתן טהור “who can give a pure thing?” is paraphrased into τίς γὰρ καθαρὸς ἔσται “for who can be pure?” (“for” is an addition). Next, the conjunction ἀλλ’ “but” is added to οὐθείς “no one.”

Reading, vocalising, or understanding the consonantal text differently than the later Masoretes. *In 13:28a*, the Hebrew comparison כרקב “like rottenness, decay” has been translated with ἴσα ἀσκαῶ “like skin, hide,” Terrien and Clines agreeably suggest that the translator vocalised as רֶקֶב “wineskin” and Clines suggests that the MT should be emended accordingly⁴²¹. This vocalisation brings the topic closer to the second colon, where a “moth-eaten garment” is mentioned. *In 14:2a*,

⁴¹⁶ Heater 1982, 60. Isa 40:7: ἐξηράνθη ὁ χόρτος καὶ τὸ ἄνθος ἐξέπεσεν “the grass withers and the blossom falls”.

⁴¹⁷ Dhorme 1967, 194.

⁴¹⁸ Gehman 1949, 237.

⁴¹⁹ Orlinsky 1959, 165.

⁴²⁰ Dhorme 1967, 195–6.

⁴²¹ Terrien 1963, 119; Clines 2015, 283.

the Hebrew verb יצא “it came out” is translated with the aorist participle ἀνθῆσαν “having blossomed, bloomed.” Contextually, it makes sense⁴²²; this could also be the result of connecting the Hebrew consonants with blossoming and blooming (e.g., ציץ “it blooms”). In 3a, the Hebrew יה על זה “also, upon this” is translated with οὐχὶ καὶ τούτου “lit. and of it/him (did you) not”. Here, the negative might be the result of reading (hearing?) the Hebrew as לא “not.”

Vorlage different than the later MT. In 3b, what is in the MT the Hebrew object indicator with the first person suffix ואיתי “and me” probably had the third person singular suffix ואתו in the *Vorlage* and several pre-MT manuscripts and was thus translated as καὶ τοῦτον “and him” (also P אלא, Vg *eum*); Dhorme and Hartley want to emend the MT accordingly.⁴²³ Although both readings can make sense in the strophe, the versions are more united in not bringing Job into the conversation about the short-lived nature of man that is expressed in this and the surrounding strophes.

Witte, Kaiser, Vermeylen, and Nömmik think that v. 13:28 is a gloss or a secondary addition, that is to be understood as a postscript to vv. 14:1–2 (also a later addition according to Nömmik). According to Vermeylen, vv. 13:28–14:3a, 4–6 are the work of *rédacteur* III, related to the Sirach-school. He identifies antihumanist trends, especially in 13:28 (man is rotten), 14:4 (man is impure), 13:28 and 14:1–2 (life is short), 14:5–6 (death is planned by God). V. 3b is slightly older, from *rédaction* II.⁴²⁴ This is why v. 28 seems to belong to the same strophe with the beginning of ch. 14. Although Greek 13:28 begins with a slightly awkward relative pronoun, it does fit together more with ch. 14 than 13. Besides a different vocalisation and some stylistic nuances, the translator did not change much or struggle with the verse, thus it was integrated to the body of the text well.

According to Nömmik, vv. 14:1–2 and 5–10* were added in the fifth layer of redactions (the transience redactions). Vv. 3 (influenced also by 22:4b) and 4 are glosses that cannot be dated, because they only complement the previous ones and disrupt the connection between vv. 2 and 5; v. 4 is also too short and is missing in one Hebrew manuscript according to BHS. He sees the whole of vv. 1–10 as an autonomous poem, more specifically a poem of two strophes, focused on transience. Witte and Kaiser consider only v. 4 secondary: it is an unpoetic (prosaic) question and does not form a real bicolon.⁴²⁵ V. 3 was slightly different in pre-MT manuscripts, including the OG *Vorlage*. Everything else was formally and thematically acceptable to the OG translator, who made their usual changes in this strophe.

⁴²² Orlinsky, ‘Studies in the Septuagint of the Book of Job: Chapter II’, 248, 250, sees this as turning the Hebrew into idiomatic Greek.

⁴²³ Dhorme 1967, 195–6; Hartley 1988, 229.

⁴²⁴ Witte 1994a, 94–5; Kaiser 2006, 28, 126; Vermeylen 2015, 116–23; Witte 2021, 57–9, 227; Nömmik 2025.

⁴²⁵ Witte 1994a, 95; Kaiser 2006, 28, 126; Nömmik 2013, 179; Witte 2021, 240; Nömmik 2025; 2026.

XIX: 14:5–6

Style

This strophe in vv. 5–6 is made up of a tricolon and a bicolon, the beginning is thus marked structurally. The beginning is also marked with conditionals in 5a: ׀א “if” in Hebrew and ἐὰν καὶ “and if” in Greek, and additionally with a symmetry (xABC/A'B'C') and a rare word in Greek (in 5b, the adjective ἀριθμητοὶ “counted” (ἀριθμητός, -ή, -όν), 31x, OG Job: 4).

The strophe ends with imperatives in 6a (שעה “look away!” in Hebrew and ἀπόστα “stay away!” in Greek) and with a simile in 6b (עד ירצה כשכיר יומו: “that they may enjoy, like labourers, their days” in Hebrew and καὶ εὐδοκῆσθαι τὸν βίον ὥσπερ ὁ μισθωτός “and enjoy life, like a wage earner!” in Greek). Lexical repetitions frame the strophe in both languages: ימיו “their days” (5a) and יומו “his day” (6b) in Hebrew, reflected by the Greek translator with the repetition of ὁ βίος αὐτοῦ “his life” and τὸν βίον “life”.

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 5a*, the Hebrew phrase חרוצים ימיו “his days are determined” has been paraphrased into a stricter καὶ μία ἡμέρα ὁ βίος αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς “and his life on the earth be but one day”. Heater claims that the addition (ὁ βίος ... ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς) originates from 7:1a due to the use of ימיו in Hebrew in both while Cox considers ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς as an addition that emphasises mortality. Dhorme wants to see an alternative reading יום “one day” to account for καὶ μία ἡμέρα⁴²⁶. *In 5b*, the Hebrew מספר חדשיו “number of his months” is paraphrased into ἀριθμητοὶ δὲ μῆνες αὐτοῦ “his months (can be) counted, easily numbered”. *In 5c*, the Hebrew חקו עשית⁴²⁷ “you made his limit, his lot” is changed into εἰς χρόνον ἔθου “you placed for a time, period”. *In 6a*, the Hebrew שעה “look away!” has been translated with ἀπόστα “keep out of the way, stay away!”. The Hebrew ויחדל “and he ceases, stops” is changed into ἵνα ἡσυχάσῃ “so that he can be at rest.” *In 6b*, the Hebrew preposition עד “until” is replaced with the simple conjunction καὶ “and”. The imperfective ירצה “he is pleased with” is translated into the aorist subjunctive εὐδοκῆσθαι “he can be pleased with” due to the ἵνα in 6a. The Hebrew יומו “his day” is translated with τὸν βίον “life,” omitting the suffix.

Reading, vocalising, or understanding the consonantal text differently than the later Masoretes. *In 5b*, the Hebrew אִתְּךָ “with you” is translated with παρ’ αὐτοῦ “by him”; Dhorme suggests that the translator read אִתּוֹ instead⁴²⁸.

According to Nömmik, in the fifth layer of redactions (the transience redactions) vv. 14:1–2 and 5–10* were added; Witte considers v. 5c as a gloss. According to Vermeylen, vv. 13:28–14:3a, 4–6 are the work of *rédauteur* III, related to the Sirach-school. He identifies antihumanist trends, especially in 13:28 (man is rotten), 14:4 (man is impure), 13:28 and 14:1–2 (life is short), 14:5–6

⁴²⁶ Dhorme 1967, 196; Heater 1982, 61; Cox 2016a, 66.

⁴²⁷ חקו עשית.

⁴²⁸ Dhorme 1967, 196.

(death is planned by God).⁴²⁹ The translator did not find anything objectionable in this strophe, neither in form nor in topic, and the changes are typical and mostly stylistic.

XX: 14:7–9

Style

This strophe in vv. 7–9 is made up of a tricolon and two bicola, thus the beginning is once again marked structurally. The strophe begins in 7a with the transition markers כִּי וְשֵׁי and ἔστιν γὰρ “for there is”. The middle of the strophe in v. 8 is marked with a partial chiasmus in both Greek (xABCD/B’A’C’) and Hebrew (xABC/xB’A’C’).

V. 8 has a simile in both languages: אִם יִקֵּן בְּאַרְץ שְׂרָשׁוֹ וּבַעֲפָר יָמוּת גִּזְעוֹ “yet at the scent of water it will bud and put forth branches like a young plant” in Hebrew and ἀπὸ ὁσμῆς ὕδατος ἀνθήσει, ποιήσει δὲ θερισμὸν ὥσπερ νεόφυτον “at the scent of water it will blossom and produce a crop like one newly planted” in Greek.

The only lexical repetition in Hebrew is that of the conditional אִם “if” in 7b/8a; this is reflected in the Greek translation with the repetition of ἐὰν “if”. The causal γὰρ “for” is repeated three times in Greek (7a/7b/8a). In addition, the strophe is framed with the repetition of ἐπανθήσει “it will flower again” in 7b and ἀνθήσει “it will flower” in 9a.

Several marked Hebrew words have been used in this strophe: in 7b, the verb יְחַלֵּף “it will sprout (again)” (חלף; considered poetic (?) by BDB); in 7c, the noun וַיִּנְקֶתוּ (וַיִּנְקֶת) “shoot”; 6x, Job: 3, Ps: 1); in 8b, the noun גִּזְעוֹ (גֶּזַע) “stem, trunk”; 3x, Job: 1); lastly, in 9b, the noun קִצִּיר “foliage” (5x, Job: 3, Ps: 1), and the noun נִטָּע (“plantation”; 4x, Job: 1).

Marked vocabulary is used in Greek as well: in 7b, the verb ἐπανθήσει “it will flower again” (ἐπανθέω; 22x, OG Job: 1); in 7c, the *hapax* noun ὁ ῥάδαμνος “the branch” (appearing a couple of times in OG Job: 8:16b, 14:7c, 15:32b, 40:22b⁴³⁰); in 9b, the noun θερισμὸν “a crop” (θερισμός, -οῦ, ὁ; 46x, LXX: 35, OG Job: 1, ※: 2) and the adjective νεόφυτον “newly planted” (νεόφυτος, -ον; 7x, LXX: 5, OG Job: 1).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 7b*, the particle γὰρ “for” is added. The conjunction וְעוֹד “and again” is translated with the simple ἔτι “yet, again.” The Hebrew verb יְחַלֵּף “it renews, it shows newness” is translated with ἐπανθήσει “it will bloom, flower.” *In 8a*, the particle γὰρ “for” is again added. *In 8b*, the Hebrew phrase בַּעֲפָר “in the dust, soil” has been translated as ἐν πέτρᾳ “in the rock”, due to the translator understanding that the plant will die if the ground

⁴²⁹ Nömmik 2013, 179; Vermeulen 2015, 116–23; Witte 2021, 57–9, 227; Nömmik 2025; 2026.

⁴³⁰ Cf. also Mangin 2005, 562. Cox 2023, 248–9. considers the word to be specific to Alexandria, as its cognates have been used by Alexandrian writers.

is rocky. **In 9a**, the verb פָּרַח “it shows buds or sprouts” is translated with ἀνθήσει “it will bloom, flower”, creating a framing repetition to the strophe.

Utilising the context or the translator's previous knowledge for the meaning of unknown words. **In 9b**, the rare noun קִצִּיר “foliage, branches” is translated with θερισμὸν “harvest, crop”.

According to Nömmik, in the fifth layer of redactions (the transience redactions) vv. 14:1–2 and 5–10* were added. Him, Witte, and Kaiser think that v. 7c is a later gloss that complements the original bicolon. Vermeylen assigns vv. 7–12 to the last editor in *rédaction* IV.⁴³¹ The translator found the form and topic completely acceptable and translated this colon literally. If a bigger section was a late addition, it was again integrated so well in terms of topic and form that the translator only made minor stylistic and syntactic changes.

XXI: 14:10–12

Style

This strophe in vv. 10–12 is made up of three bicola in Greek, but two bicola and a tricolon in Hebrew. Therefore, in Hebrew, the end is marked structurally. The end of the strophe in 12b is marked with temporals עַד and ἕως ἄν “until”.

The end is also marked with non-parallelism, as v. 10 has a partial chiasmus in both Greek (ABC/B'A'C') and Hebrew (xABC/xB'A'C'), and v. 11 also has a partial chiasmus in Greek (AxB/C'A'B') and Hebrew (ABC/xB'A'D).

In Greek, the strophe is framed with marked vocabulary: in 10b, the poetic, even Homeric, noun βροτὸς “mortal man”⁴³²; and in 12b, the verb συρραφῆ “to be stitched” (συρράπτω; 19x, LXX: 2, OG Job: 1).

Some marked vocabulary has been used in Hebrew as well: in 10a, the verb ויחלש (חלש “to weaken”; 3x, Job: 1); in 10a, the noun גֶּבֶר “man” (considered chiefly poetic by BDB); and in 11a, the verb אָזְלוּ “they fail, are used up” (אָזַל; considered mostly poetic by BDB).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. **In 10a**, the imperfective יָמוּת “he dies” is translated with the aorist participle τελευτήσας “having died”. **In 10b**, the Hebrew ויָגוּעַ “he perished, died” is translated with the aorist participle πεσών “having fallen”. **In 11a**, the Hebrew phrase יָם מִיָּם מִנִּי יָם “the waters have gone away from the sea/lake” is paraphrased into χρόνῳ γὰρ σπανίζεται θάλασσα “for with time the sea is used up”; “waters” are omitted while “with time” is added. **In 11b**, the Hebrew ויִבֶּשׁ ויִחָרֵב “it wastes away and will dry up” has been translated with ἐρημωθεὶς ἐξηράνθη “having been laid waste, it has been dried up”. In both cola of v. 11, the tense is changed into past. **In 12a**, the Hebrew perfective שָׁכַב “he has laid down” translated with the aorist participle κοιμηθεὶς “having fallen

⁴³¹ Kaiser 2006, 28, 126; Vermeylen 2015, 347–8; Witte 2021, 57–9, 227; Nömmik 2025; 2026.

⁴³² Cf. LSJ and Mangin 2005, 501.

asleep, having been laid down”. The conjunction ו- “and” before the next verb is not translated, due to the syntactic change.

Utilising the context or the translator’s previous knowledge for the meaning of unknown words. *In 10a*, the very rare verb ויחלש “he weakened” is translated with ὤχετο “he has gone, departed”⁴³³.

Reading, vocalising, or understanding the consonantal text differently than the later Masoretes. *In 10b*, the Hebrew rhetorical ויחלש “where are they?” is translated with οὐκέτι ἔστιν “he is/exists no more”, probably due to reading and vocalising the Hebrew as ויחלש “and (it/there is) nothing”⁴³⁴. The overall meaning remains.

Changes regarding religion or religious culture and law. *In 12b*, The Hebrew לא יקיצו עד בלתי שמים לא יקיצו “until the heavens are no more, they will not awake” is translated with ἕως ἃν ὁ οὐρανὸς οὐ μὴ συρραφῇ “until the sky is cannot/shall not be sewn together”. Mangin has commented that the phrase is a hyperbole that evokes the impossible and is specific to Greek⁴³⁵. This statement can be agreed with, especially in the context of leaving out 12c. Dhorme’s idea that the Greek translates the infinitive בלתי “to be worn out” and not לא יקיצו is questionable; he even suggests emending the Hebrew text accordingly.⁴³⁶ It’s more reasonable to assume that the translator simply understood בלתי as a negation. Hebrew v. 12c ולא יערו משנתם “and they will not be roused out of their sleep” has been left untranslated completely. Perhaps the translator did not understand or like the idea of heavens waking up (as the plural would rather refer to that) and it has been removed from v. 12 entirely. Thus, v. 12 in Greek now says that a human will never rise again after dying, unless the sky suddenly falls apart. However, Orlinsky came to the conclusion that 12c was a gloss to explain לא יקיצו in 12b, and that it was missing from the Greek translator’s *Vorlage*. Similarly, according to Nömmik, v. 10 is part of larger addition made by the transience redactor and vv. 11–12* (11+12b and 12a+c) are glosses that cannot be dated exactly. Witte and Kaiser consider only 12b to be an eschatological gloss, although Witte entertains the possibility of it being added in the righteousness redaction. Vermeylen assigns vv. 7–12 to the last editor in *redaction* IV.⁴³⁷ Whenever v. 12 was added to the Hebrew text, we can assume it was in the OG *Vorlage* and the second and third cola were found objectionable by the translator. The verse was rewritten to make explicit the impossibility of a human being able to rise after death.

⁴³³ Cf. also Vg with (*fuerit*) *nudatus* “(he shall be) stripped”.

⁴³⁴ Cf. also Orlinsky 1958, 247–8. But see Cook 2011, 332–3, who has proposed that the translator may have wanted to remove the notion of life after death.

⁴³⁵ Mangin 2005, 312.

⁴³⁶ Dhorme 1967, 200–1.

⁴³⁷ Orlinsky 1937b; Kaiser 2006, 29, 126; Vermeylen 2015, 348; Witte 2021, 57–9, 227, 242–3; Nömmik 2025.

XXII: 14:13-14

Style

This strophe in vv. 13–14 consists of two tricola. It begins in 13a with מי יתן “oh that!” (“who could give?”) in Hebrew and the equivalent εἰ γὰρ ὄφελον “oh that!” in Greek. The second/last tricolon of the strophe also with conditionals אם in Hebrew and ἐὰν γὰρ in Greek. The preposition עד “until” is repeated in 13b/14c and this is reflected in Greek with ἕως ἄν, effectively framing the strophe. In Hebrew 14a, the noun גבר “man”, considered chiefly poetic by BDB, is used.

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 13a*, the Hebrew question מי יתן “who could give?” has been Hellenised into εἰ γὰρ ὄφελον “for oh that, if only”. The Hebrew imperfective תצפני “you (would) hide me” has been translated with the aorist (dependent on the conditional) με ἐφύλαξας “you had kept, maintained me”⁴³⁸. *In 13b*, for the same reason, the Hebrew imperfective תסתירני “you (would) hide, conceal me” has been translated with the aorist ἔκρυψας ... με “you had hidden me”. The Hebrew infinitive phrase עד שוב “until returning, turning back” has been translated with the finite aorist ἕως ἄν παύσηται “until it has/had ceased.” *In 13c*, the conjunction καὶ “and” has been added to the beginning of the colon. The Hebrew imperfective תשית “you set, appoint” has been again translated with the aorist subjunctive τάξῃ “you had set, appointed,” dependant on the conditional in the first colon. The more specific Hebrew חק “limit, prescription” has been translated with the more general χρόνον “time”⁴³⁹, similarly also in 14:5c. The Hebrew ותזכרני “and you (would) remember me” has been paraphrased into ἐν ᾧ μνηίαν μου ποιήσῃ “in which you would make remembrance of me.” *In 14a*, the causal γὰρ “for” has been added. *In 14c*, the verb ὑπομενῶ “I will remain, endure” translates the last word of Hebrew 14b, the verb אֵיחַל “I wait”. The Hebrew עד בוא חליפתי “until the coming of my change, relief” has been paraphrased into ἕως ἄν πάλιν γένωμαι “until I have been born again.”

Changes regarding religion or religious culture and law. *In 14a*, the interrogative -ה before the final verb היחיה has not been translated, turning the second part of the colon into a possible apodosis (“if a man dies, he will live”). Gehman and Gard see this translation choice as theological and affirming future life and Fernández Marcos also affirms that the Greek translator turns questions directed to God “into generic statements on the human condition.” Cox, on the other hand, translates the second part of the colon as a question in NETS.⁴⁴⁰

Reading, vocalising, or understanding the consonantal text differently than the later Masoretes. *In 14b*, the Hebrew phrase כָּל יְמֵי עַבְדִּי “all the days of my service” has been paraphrased into συντελέσας ἡμέρας τοῦ βίου αὐτοῦ “having

⁴³⁸ Similarly, Vg with *protegas me* “thou mayst protect me”.

⁴³⁹ So also Vg with *tempus*.

⁴⁴⁰ Gehman 1949, 238; Gard 1954, 137–8; Fernández Marcos 1994, 265.

completed the days of his life”⁴⁴¹. Orlinsky and Dhorme suggest that the noun was read as צבאו instead and then “his service” could have been paraphrased to τοῦ βίου αὐτοῦ “his life.” The noun כל “all” could have been read, as also Orlinsky and Gard suggest, as בלה “he finished” in Hebrew and thus translated with συντελέσας. Orlinsky has even concluded that the *Vorlage* was a bit different from the later MT (יהיה instead of היחיה; בלה instead of כל; צבאו instead of צבאי). Cox has suggested that the verb is either an addition that completes the line or a double translation of היחיה in 14a.⁴⁴² In this matter, Orlinsky, Gard, and Dhorme posit the most reasonable explanations.

Nömmik considers vv. 13c and 14 as glosses, while Witte and Kaiser see only 14a as a gloss. According to Vermeylen, vv. 13–17 come mostly from the hand of *rédacteur* II. However, 14a is even later and comes from *rédacteur* III because it corresponds in terms of vocabulary and content to 14:10 but also disrupts the rhythm of the speech. He finds that the appeal to God for mercy from his wrath in v. 13 does not fit with Job’s thoughts elsewhere.⁴⁴³ Although the translator read the consonantal text slightly differently in v. 14b, the rest was acceptable in form and topic and typical stylistic changes were made in the strophe.

XXIII: 14:15–17

Style

The strophe in vv. 15–17 is made up of three bicola. The strophe begins with a transition marker in Greek, namely the temporal/sequential adverb εἴτα “then” in 15a, while both Hebrew and Greek have an emphatic personal pronoun: ואנכי and ἐγὼ δέ “and I”.

The beginning of the strophe in Hebrew is marked with non-parallelism, whereas v. 16 has a chiasmus (xAB/B’A’) and v. 17 has a partial symmetry (ABC/xA’C’). In both languages, the strophe is framed with elevated vocabulary. In Hebrew, these are: in 15b, the verb תבסף (בסף “to long for”; 6x, Job: 1, Ps: 2); in 17a, the noun בצרור (צרור “bundle, bag”; 7x, Job:1, Prov: 1); in 17b, the verb ותטפל (טפל “to smear”; 3x, Job: 2, Ps: 1). In Greek, these are: in 15b, the verb μὴ ἀποποιεῖς “do not reject” (7x, OG Job: 6) and in 17a, the noun βαλλαντίω “a pouch” (βαλλάντιον, -ου, τό; 38x, LXX: 4, OG Job: 1).

The only repetition in this strophe is that of the preposition על “over” in 16/17b, which is reflected by the translator with παρέλθῃ and παρέβῃ.

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. In 15a, the adverb εἴτα “then” probably translates כי עתה from 16a. A transition marker like this makes sense at the beginning of the strophe rather than in the middle of it. V. 15b has been

⁴⁴¹ The P translator used contextual translation: מלוא ילדותו “his youth”. Additionally, the verb is translated into third person. See Szpek 1992, 17–8, 181–2, 291.

⁴⁴² Gard 1954, 138; Orlinsky 1961, 245–6; Dhorme 1967, 201–2; Cox 2016a, 66–7.

⁴⁴³ Kaiser 2006, 29; Vermeylen 2015, 122–3, 116–23; Witte 2021, 57–9, 227, 244; Nömmik 2025.

paraphrased from *למעשה ידיך תבסך* “you would long for the work of your hands” into *τὰ δὲ ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν σου μὴ ἀποποιεῖς* “do not reject the works of your hands”, changing the syntax and turning a positive into a negative, but keeping the meaning. LXX.D proposes that the Greek translates *לֹא תבסך*, as the niph'al of *בסך* has the meaning of “to be ashamed”⁴⁴⁴; however, the translator is not a stranger to conveying the same message with a negated antonym. *In 16a*, the phrase *צעדי תספור* “you would number my steps” has been paraphrased into the past tense *ἡρίθμησας μου δὲ τὰ ἐπιτηδεύματα* “you tabulated my pursuits”; LXX.D considers this and ethisising rendering⁴⁴⁵. *In 17a*, the passive phrase *חתם בצרור פשעי* “my transgression would be sealed up in a bag” has been translated with the active *ἐσφράγισας δέ μου τὰς ἀνομίας ἐν βαλλαντίῳ* “you sealed up my lawless acts in a pouch”.

Reading, vocalising, or understanding the consonantal text differently than the later Masoretes. *V. 16b* is paraphrased from *לֹא תשמור על חטאתי* “you would not keep watch over my sin” into *καὶ οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ σε οὐδὲν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν μου* “and not one of my sins can pass by you”. Dhorme suggests that the translator read *לְךָ תעבור* for *על תשמור* in the Hebrew⁴⁴⁶; however, this is questionable when taking into account the rest of the translation of this colon. Gard supposes an intentional paraphrase to portray God as more omniscient and caring⁴⁴⁷. *οὐδὲν* could be the result of due to reading (hearing?) *על* “upon” as the negative *אֵל*, while Cox considers it an emphatic addition⁴⁴⁸.

Utilising the context or the translator's previous knowledge for the meaning of unknown words. *In 17b*, the phrase with a very rare verb *עֹנִי עֹנִי* “you covered over my iniquity” has been translated with *ἐπεσημήνω δέ εἴ τι ἄκων παρέβην* “you have marked down if I had inadvertently transgressed”⁴⁴⁹. Gehman considers the paraphrase of 17b theological in nature⁴⁵⁰.

According to Vermeylen, vv. 13–17 come mostly from the hand of *rédacteur* II.⁴⁵¹ The issues that the translator faced here are more to do with reading and vocalising or not knowing certain words. It is unlikely that an early redaction was still noticeably badly integrated by the time of translation.

XXIV: 14:20–22

Style

The final strophe of the speech in vv. 20–22 consists of three bicola in Greek. The Hebrew has an additional strophe of a bicolon and tricolon before this strophe in vv. 18–19. In v. 18, the beginning of the strophe in Hebrew, is marked with the

⁴⁴⁴ Kepper and Witte 2011, 2090.

⁴⁴⁵ Kepper and Witte 2011, 2090.

⁴⁴⁶ Dhorme 1967, 203.

⁴⁴⁷ Gard 1953, 184.

⁴⁴⁸ Cox 2016a, 67.

⁴⁴⁹ The P translator used contextual translation for the verb as well: *הסר* “remove!”. See Szpek 1992, 292.

⁴⁵⁰ Gehman 1949, 237–8.

⁴⁵¹ Vermeylen 2015, 122–3, 116–23.

strong adversative וואלם “but indeed” which acts as a transition marker. The beginning of the strophe in Greek has an epic ionic aorist ὤσας instead of the Attic ἔωσας⁴⁵².

In both languages, the beginning of strophes is marked with non-parallelism. In the first Hebrew strophe, in 19ab, there is a partial chiasmus in Hebrew (ABC/B'C'A'), and colon c is partly symmetric with the first colon and partly chiasmic with the second colon (xA'B'), while v. 18 has no parallelistic structure. In the Greek strophe and in the second strophe of Hebrew, in v. 21, the partial symmetry in Greek (ABCD/xA'B'D') reflects Hebrew (ABC/XA'C') and v. 22 has a partial symmetry in both Greek (xAB/A'B') and Hebrew (xABC/xA'B'C').

The strophe ends with transition markers in v. 22: the emphatic adverb אך “indeed, surely” in Hebrew and the emphatic ἀλλ' ἦ “ah, but” in Greek. The only lexical repetition is in Hebrew 22ab of עליו “for them(selves)”, marking the end of the strophe and speech.

Quite a lot of marked Hebrew words have been used: in 18b, the verb עתק (עתק “to proceed”; 9x, Job: 5, Ps: 1, Prov: 1); in 19a, the verb שחקו (שחק “to beat”; 4x, Job: 1, Ps: 1); in 19b, the *hapax* noun ספיחיה (ספיח “outpouring”); in 19c, the noun אנוש “man” (considered mostly poetic by BDB); in 20a, the verb תתקפרו (תקף “to prevail”; 4x, Job: 2); in 21b, the verb ויצערו (צער “to be little”; 3x, Job: 1); in 22a, the verb יכאב (כאב “to pain”; 8x, Job: 2, Ps: 1, Prov: 1); and finally in 22b, the verb תאבל “it mourns” (אבל; considered to be poetic and of higher style in BDB).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. **In 20a**, the imperfective verb ותשלחו “and you send him away” has been paraphrased with the aorist καὶ ὤχρετο “and he was gone”, influenced by the contextual translation of the first verb of this colon. **In 20b**, The Hebrew imperfective ותשלחו “and you send him away” has been translated with the aorist καὶ ἐξάπεσταιλας “and you sent away” without the suffix. Cox claims that the translator is actually citing the Greek Leviticus here (17:10, 20:3, 5, 6, 26:17) instead of translating⁴⁵³. **In 22a**, the Hebrew אך “but; surely” has been translated with ἀλλ' ἦ “ah, but”. The Hebrew בשרו “his flesh” has been, as usual, translated with the plural αἱ σάρκες αὐτοῦ “his fleshs.” The imperfective יכאב עליו “he is in pain in/upon himself” has been translated with the aorist ἤλγησαν “they have been in pain.” **In 22b**, the Hebrew imperfective עליו תאבל “it (his soul) is mourning on/for itself” has been translated with the aorist ἐπένθησεν “it has been mourning”. Both Gehman and Gard see the changing of verbal tenses as theological since bodily pain should not be suffered from in Sheol. Therefore, these sufferings happen on earth but not after death.⁴⁵⁴

Reading, vocalising, or understanding the consonantal text differently than the later Masoretes. **In 20b**, the piel participle משנה פניו “changing his face” has been

⁴⁵² Mangin 2005, 583.

⁴⁵³ Cox 2014, 460–1.

⁴⁵⁴ Gehman 1949, 239; Gard 1954, 142.

translated with the aorist ἐπέστησας αὐτῷ τὸ πρόσωπον “you set your face against him”, possibly due to reading the second person singular in the imperfect. *In 21a*, the Hebrew בניו כבדו “his sons are honourable, honoured” has been translated with πολλῶν δὲ γενομένων τῶν υἱῶν αὐτοῦ “and though his sons have become many”, probably due to having in mind the verb כבד “to be abundant, numerous” and due to the parallelism with the next colon. Due to the genitive absolute, the conjunction ו- “and” in ולא ידע “and he does not know” is no longer necessary and is not translated. Not wanting to use another genitive absolute, *v. 21b* is turned into a conditional clause with ἐὰν “if” added. The Hebrew ויצערו “and they grow small, insignificant” has been translated, in parallelism with the previous colon and due to having in mind the adjective זעיר “small,” with the phrase ὀλίγοι γίνονται “they become few.” The Hebrew phrase ולא יבין למו “and he does not understand it” is shortened into οὐκ ἐπίσταται “he is not aware” in Greek.

Utilising the context or the translator's previous knowledge for the meaning of unknown words. *In 20a*, the rare verb in imperfective תתקפרו “you prevail over him, you overpower him” has been translated with the aorist ὥσας αὐτὸν “you have pushed him aside”.

Vorlage different than the later MT? *Vv. 18* ואולם הר נופל וצור יבול וצור יעתק ממקמו “But the mountain falls and crumbles away and the rock is removed from its place” and *19* ואבנים שחקו מים תשטף ספיחיה עפר ארץ ותקות אנוש האבדת “the waters wear away the stones, the torrents wash away the soil of the earth, so you destroy the hope of mortals” have been left untranslated. Cook has commented on how these untranslated verses are similar to those in ch. 28, in that they contain natural phenomena that the translator avoids relating in Greek⁴⁵⁵. As mentioned in the discussion of *v. 13:4*, the translator always translates ואולם strongly. Further, there is no trace of either verse in the Greek translation of the surrounding verses. These verses have a couple of rare words but not enough that the translator could not have worked out the context. According to Nömmik, vv. 18–22 are a late *Fortschreibung* that relies on the transience redaction and *v. 19c* relies also on *v. 8:13b*. Vermeylen also sees these verses being later, namely from *rédaction III*. As reasons he gives: the verses emphasise the insignificance of man, addressing God with “you” (vv. 19 and 20 in comparison with 3:5–6), little connection thematically with vv. 13–17 (*rédaction II*, except 14a which is also from *rédaction III*).⁴⁵⁶ In some of the other verses the consonantal text was read or vocalised differently than the later Masoretes did. Based on only Greek, we might then assume that vv. 18–19 were not added at the same time as vv. 20–22. Seeing how the speech has imagery in previous strophes, we cannot confidently say that the translator did not omit this particular one because it seemed redundant, but we also cannot say that a later redactor did not intend to add further imagery to the speech. The translator in general is not opposed to plant and nature imagery. Thus, we cannot identify anything in these verses that, besides redundancy, could have prompted an intentional omission. Although with no confidence, an assumption can be made that these verses were possibly missing

⁴⁵⁵ Cook 2011, 332.

⁴⁵⁶ Vermeylen 2015, 116–23; Nömmik 2025.

in the *Vorlage*. The OG cannot give us a clear answer on the growth of the Hebrew text nor the *Vorlage* of the OG, but it can inform us on how the omission fits into the general context of omissions in the OG translation and thus, redaction critics can take into account the possibility of vv. 18–19 being so late that they were not yet in the *Vorlage*, when creating and adjusting their models.

JOB 15

Introduction

Job 15 contains the second speech of Eliphaz: *Job has been saying useless words to his friends and to God. You have not been punished yet. No one is blameless, not the mortals, not the angels. The state of the impious and curses against the impious person.*

The Greek translation of Job 15 divides into 10 strophes:

I (15:2–3, 2B) *Addressing Job: a wise man would not answer with useless words.*

II (15:4–6, 3B) *You, however, have addressed God with useless words.*

III (15:7–9, 3B) *Are you old enough to know something we do not?*

IV (15:11–13, 3B) *You have not yet been punished for what you have done and said to God.*

V (15:14–16, 3B) *A mortal cannot be pure or blameless, even angels are not!*

VI (15:17–19, 3B) *I will now tell you what I have heard from the sages.*

VII (15:20–21, 1B1T) *The impious person lives in anxiety and fear.*

VIII (15:22–26a, 3B1M1T) *The impious person will be afflicted because he defies God.*

IX (15:28–30a, 4B) *Curses against the impious: homelessness and no wealth.*

X (15:30b–33, 4B) *Curses against the impious: shortlived and weak.*

XI (15:34–35, 1B1T) *Conclusion: the impious will suffer and die.*

Some **keywords** are present, for example κύριος is repeated in vv. 4, 8, 13, and twice in 25; this reflects the Hebrew אל in 15:4, 13, 25 (not translated in v. 11), אלה in 15:8, and שדי in 15:25 (παντοκράτωρ in Greek). In Hebrew, דבר “word” is repeated in vv. 3 and 11; the Greek translator, however, has made this into a keyword of the first half of the speech, repeating ῥῆμα in vv. 3, 4, 5 (2x), 13. In the first half of the speech, “human” is used as אדם in v. 7, אנוש and אשה in v. 14, and איש in v. 16. In Greek, these are ἄνθρωπος in v. 7, βροτός and γυνή in v. 14, and ἀνὴρ in v. 16.

The Greek text of this speech has some asterisked verses: 15:10, 26b, 27. Like in previous speeches, the length of these strophes is not uniform. However, the first half of the speech has a very regular length, having a shorter introductory strophe (2 bicola) and six strophes that are mostly 3 bicola in length. After that, the strophes are more irregular and longer. Seeing how the end of the speech also has asterisked verses and that there is less correspondence to several strophic divisions of the Hebrew text as proposed by scholars (see Appendix II), special care needs to be taken in the critical analysis them.

The Hebrew text of this speech is considered to be part of the original Job-poem, with some later additions. Vv. 15:11–16 are thought to be a later addition, for example from the lowliness redaction, by several scholars. Vv. 18–19 are also considered later by many, and vv. 24, 28, and 31 are thought to be either fully or partly glosses.

More specifically, according to Witte, the speech belongs almost fully to the older layers of Job: vv. 1–10, 17, 20–28a, 29, 30a^{bb}, 32–35 were original. Vv. 11–16 are slightly later than the rest (*Hiobdichtung B* which is an addition to *Hiobdichtung A*), added by the lowliness redactor (along with 4:12–21 and ch. 25). Vv. 18–19, 24c*, 28c, 30a, 31 are later glosses that cannot be accurately dated or put into order.⁴⁵⁷

Nömmik thinks that originally, in the source layer “The Poem/Dialogue of Job,” the speech consisted of vv. 2–10, 17, 20–24b, 25–28b, 29, 30b–c, 32–35. The book editor added 15:1 in the first redaction of Job. The lowliness redactor (sixth stage of redactions) added vv. 11–16 as a short poem. Further glosses that he says cannot be dated exactly are 18–19, 24c, 28c, 30a, 31.⁴⁵⁸

Van Oorschot recognises vv. 11–16 to be from the lowliness redaction as well, which in his model is the last stage of identifiable editing.⁴⁵⁹

Syring sees Job 15 largely as part of the original poem. In the first bigger redaction, the introductory 15:1 was added. Vv. 15:11–16 were added in the anthropological redaction (*Anthropologische Bearbeitung*; third stage of editing out of four) some time later, along with 4:12–21 and 25:1–6, largely following Witte in his explanations.⁴⁶⁰

According to Kaiser, vv. 2–10, 17, 20–24b, 26–28b, 29, 30bc, 32–35 were part of the original speech. The introductory v. 15:1 was added by the book editor. Vv. 11–16 were added by the lowliness redactor (*Niedrigkeitsbearbeiter*) and vv. 18–19, 24c–25, 28c, 30a, 31 are later glosses.⁴⁶¹

Vermeylen thinks that the oldest layer of this speech (*rédaction I*) consisted of vv. 8–10, 20–28a, 29, 30a^{bb}, 32–35. The other verses, 2–7, 11–19, 28b, 31, were added later in *rédaction III*. Finally, 30aa is a later marginal gloss.⁴⁶²

I: 15:2–3

Style

The first strophe of the speech in vv. 15:2–3 consists of two bicola. The strophe begins with the yes-no interrogative $\text{-}\eta$ in Hebrew and $\Pi\acute{o}\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu$ in Greek. The strophe ends with partial symmetry in both languages: the Greek ABC/B'C' reflects the Hebrew ABC/xB'C'. The end of the strophe in 3b is also marked with

⁴⁵⁷ Witte 1994a, 169–71, 191–2; 2021, 57–9, 246–8, 250.

⁴⁵⁸ Nömmik 2013, 181–5; 2025.

⁴⁵⁹ van Oorschot 2007, 171–84.

⁴⁶⁰ Syring 2004, 147, 165–6, 168–73.

⁴⁶¹ Kaiser 2006, 125–6.

⁴⁶² Vermeylen 2015, 162–8, 180–2, 328.

elevated vocabulary in Hebrew: the noun מלים (מלה) “words” is considered poetic by BDB.

Both Hebrew and Greek have lexical repetitions and symmetry in v. 3, but the Greek is fuller, since both cola have the preposition ἐν “with” and the relative pronoun οἷς “for which, in which” in addition to the negative present in both languages (in 3ab): the repeated Hebrew negative לא is reflected in Greek with οἷς οὐ/οἷς οὐδέν.

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 2b*, the suffix ו- “his” in בטנו “his belly” is not translated, as it is not strictly needed. *In 3a*, the infinite absolute phrase הוכח בדבר “to argue with talking” is translated with a participle phrase ἐλέγχων ἐν ῥήμασιν “arguing with statements”, creating a fuller symmetry with λόγοις in 3b. The phrase לא יסבון “it is not useful” is translated with οἷς οὐ δεῖ “which are not needed”⁴⁶³. *In 3b*, the conjunction ו- “and” is not translated. Although the Hebrew does not repeat the preposition ב- “with,” the Greek does: ἐν λόγοις “with words.” The phrase לא יועיל בם “with which (them) he does not gain, profit” is translated with οἷς οὐδέν ὄφελος “with which (there is) no benefit”⁴⁶⁴.

Utilising the context or the translator's previous knowledge for the meaning of unknown words. *In 2b*, the Hebrew קדים “the east wind” is translated as πόνον “trouble; ache”; Dhorme considers this to be “in accordance with the effects of the east wind”, whereas Cox suggests that the translation choice was for the audience’s benefit (in Alexandria, the east wind was not disliked)⁴⁶⁵. This translation, however, loses the parallelism of קדים-רוח that is present in Hebrew. Orlinsky suggests that the text has gotten corrupt and that originally it was translated correctly as νότον (“wind”)⁴⁶⁶. However, P and Vg translate similarly (סחב “anger” and ardore “with burning heat.” Perhaps, the translators wanted to make explicit what wind in the belly means.

Differences that are harder to explain. *In v. 2*, the imperfective verbs of the Hebrew text (ענה “he answers” and וימלא “and he fills”) are translated into future (ἀπόκρισιν δώσει “he will give an answer”) and aorist (καὶ ἐνέπλησεν “he has filled”), making the beginning of the speech jagged.

Vermeylen thinks that vv. 2–7 may be a later addition from *rédaction* III. Firstly, because Eliphaz starts responding to Job’s original speech from v. 7, and vv. 2–6 are not strictly necessary. He also says that these verses are directly inspired by the rest of the text. For example, דעת and החכם in v. 2 are also present in vv. 8 and 9, respectively. The form ותגרע in 4b is also present in 8b, however

⁴⁶³ Heater 1982, 136 has reached the conclusion that the word סבן always troubled the translator and it was mishandled “in each of its six occurrences in Job”, including here.

⁴⁶⁴ Dhorme 1967, 208 is of the opinion that the translator omitted בם in 3b, but οἷς is an appropriate translation of it.

⁴⁶⁵ Dhorme 1967, 208; Cox 2023, 249.

⁴⁶⁶ “The manner of corruption was probably ΝΟΤΟς > ΝΟΠΙΟς > ΠΟΝΟς” or “ΝΟΤΟς > ΤΟΝΟς > ΠΟΝΟς”; see Orlinsky 1935b, 135–7; 1962, 134.

in different meanings; furthermore, the form is not attested elsewhere in HB. He concludes that the theme of vv. 2–6 correspond with the anti-Hellenist Sirach-school and thus were added in *rédaction* III or possibly IV.⁴⁶⁷ If this section is a later addition, it was integrated into the text well enough to not disturb the OG translator.

II: 15:4–6

Style

This strophe in vv. 4–6 is made up of three bicola. The beginning of the strophe is marked with οὐ καὶ σὺ “have you not as well” and אַךְ אַתָּה “but you,” with the pronoun in the emphatic position. In both languages, the strophe is framed with parallelistic structures: in v. 4, the Greek partial symmetry (ABC/B’C’D’) reflects the Hebrew partial symmetry (xABC/xB’C’D’), and in v. 6, the Greek partial chiasmus (ABC/B’A’) reflects the Hebrew partial chiasmus (ABC/xB’A’).

In terms of lexical repetitions, Hebrew has only one: פִּי “your mouth” in 5a/6a. In the Greek translation, this repetition is reflected (στόματός σου and τὸ σὸν στόμα). Additionally, the triple repetition of “words, statements” in 4b/5a/5b can be observed: ῥήματα, ῥήμασιν, and ῥήματα.

A couple of marked Hebrew words have been used: in 4b, the noun שיחה “meditation” (3x, Job: 1, Ps: 2); and in 5a, the verb יָלַף (אָלַף “to teach/learn”; 4x, Job: 3, Prov: 1). The Greek has a rare word as well: in 4a, the verb ἀπεποιήσω “you have set aside” (7x, OG Job: 6).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 4a*, the imperfective תִּפְרַח “you frustrate” is translated with a negation and aorist combination οὐ ... ἀπεποιήσω “did you not reject” in Greek, turning the direct accusation into an accusing question. *In 4b*, the Hebrew imperfective וְתִגְרַע “and you hinder” is translated with the aorist συνετελέσω δὲ “and you finished”. *In 5a*, the particle כִּי “for” is not translated. The Hebrew imperfective יָלַף עֲוֹנְךָ פִּי “your iniquity teaches your mouth” is paraphrased and clarified into ἔνοχος εἰ ῥήμασιν στόματός σου “you are guilty by the statements of your mouth;” Dhorme claims that only ἔνοχος εἰ corresponds to the יָלַף עֲוֹנְךָ in Hebrew⁴⁶⁸. *In 5b*, the verb וּתְבַחֵר “and you choose” is slightly changed into οὐδὲ διέκρινας “you did (not) discern”. *In 6a*, the meaning of Hebrew יְרִשִׁיעַ “it condemns you” is slightly altered and translated as ἐλέγξει σε “may it refute you”.

Reading or vocalising the consonantal text differently than the later Masoretes. In 5b, the Hebrew לְשׁוֹן עֲרוּמִים “the tongue (talking) of the crafty” is translated with ῥήματα δυναστῶν “statements of the mighty”, due to reading עֲרִיצִים “of awe-inspiring, terror-striking people”, of which δυνάστης is an equivalent elsewhere. The translation creates a repetition.

⁴⁶⁷ Vermeylen 2015, 162–5, 162–8.

⁴⁶⁸ Dhorme 1967, 209.

Utilising the context or the translator's previous knowledge for the meaning of unknown words. In 4b, the very rare שיחה "meditation" is translated with ῥήματα τοιαῦτα "such words, statements", creating a repetition with 5a/5b⁴⁶⁹.

Later Greek manuscript corruption. In 5b, the conjunction -ו "and" is translated with the negative οὐδὲ "and not". Orlinsky has worked out that it came to be in the text due to dittography. The previous word ends with -ου (σου) whereas the next word begins with δι-. Thus, as a result of the text being copied, οὐδὲ came to be inserted into it.⁴⁷⁰

Vermeylen thinks that vv. 2–7 may be a later addition from *rédaction* III. Firstly, because Eliphaz starts responding to Job's original speech from v. 7, and vv. 2–6 are not strictly necessary. He also says that these verses are directly inspired by the rest of the text. For example, the form ותגרע in 4b is also present in 8b, however in different meanings; furthermore, the form is not attested elsewhere in HB. He suggests that due to this parallel between the two verses, wisdom (חכמה in 8b) is interpreted as "meditation on the law" (שיחה in 4b), in other words "fear of God" (יראה in 4a). According to him, identifying wisdom as the fear of God is a characteristic of the Sirach-school. Further, the verb יאִלֵּךְ appears in piel form only in v. 5 and in the Elihu speeches (33:33 and 35:11) which are from *rédaction* IV. He concludes that the theme of vv. 2–6 corresponds with the anti-Hellenist Sirach-school and thus were added in *rédaction* III or possibly IV.⁴⁷¹ If this section indeed is a later addition to the Hebrew, it was integrated well enough to not disturb the OG translator.

III: 15:7–9

Style

This strophe in vv. 7–9 is made up of three bicola in Greek but four bicola in Hebrew, as v. 10 is asterisked and thus not part of the OG translation.

The strophe is framed with transition markers. In Hebrew, the strophe begins with the yes-no interrogative ה and ends with the adverb גם "also" used twice in v. 10. In Greek, the strophe begins firstly with the added rhetorical question τί γάρ; "what?" and then the interrogative μὴ. The strophe ends in v. 9 with τί-questions in Greek. It has to be noted, however, that v. 8 also has marked questions in both languages.

Hebrew has four repetitions: question particle -ה in 7a/8a, ידעת and נדע ("you know" and "we know") in 9a, the negative ולא in 9ab, and the adverb גם ("also") twice in 10a. The Greek translator has reflected the repetition in 9a (οἶδας "you know" and οἶδμεν "we know") and the negatives in 9ab (οὐκ and οὐχί). Additionally, the interrogative τί "what?" is repeated in 7a/9a/9b, and the relative pronoun ὃ in 9ab.

In Hebrew, the end of the strophe is marked with vocabulary: in 10a, the participle שב of the verb שיב "to be grey" (7x, Job: 1), and the adjective שיש

⁴⁶⁹ P has translated similarly with דבר "speech", see, for example, Szpek 1992, 284.

⁴⁷⁰ Orlinsky 1935b, 137–8; 1962, 134–5.

⁴⁷¹ Vermeylen 2015, 162–5, 162–8.

“aged” (Job: 4); in 10b, the adjective כביר “mighty” (10x, Job: 6; BDB considers it poetic).

In Greek, the whole strophe has parallelistic structures, whereas Hebrew has a OxOx pattern. Vv. 7 and 9 exhibit partial symmetry in both languages: in v. 7, the Greek partial symmetry (AxB'CD/xB'C'D') reflects the Hebrew symmetry (xAB/xA'B'); and in v. 9, the symmetry in Greek is fuller (xABC/xA'B'C') compared to the Hebrew (xAB/A'B'). Greek additionally has a partial chiasmus in v. 8 (xABC/C'A').

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 7a*, the short rhetorical question τί ἄρα; “for, what?” is added. The Hebrew phrase ראשון אדם “first person” is translated as πρῶτος ἀνθρώπων “first of the people.” *In 7b*, the Hebrew noun גבעות “the hills” is changed into θινῶν “heaps, sandbanks, dunes”, placing it in an Egyptian context⁴⁷². The Hebrew verb חוללה “you were birthed” is translated as ἐπάγης “you were fit, made solid/firm, fixed;” Dhorme refers to how the foetus is formed and also references Job 10:10⁴⁷³. *In 8a*, the Hebrew הבסוד “in the counsel/council” is translated as σύνταγμα “arrangement, plan” (as Greek does not require a preposition for showing the object of listening, the -ב is not translated); this equivalence is unique, but not unsuitable in the context. Gehman sees this translation motivated by theology: Job cannot have been physically at God’s council⁴⁷⁴. The imperfective תשמע “you listen” is translated with the perfective ἀκήκοας “you have listened, heard.” *In 8b*, the Hebrew ותגרע אליך ותגרע חכמה “and do you limit wisdom to yourself” is paraphrased into εἰς δὲ σὲ ἀφίκετο σοφία “has wisdom reached you?”⁴⁷⁵. *In 9a*, the particle γὰρ “for” is added. The negation ולא “and not” is translated with the relative pronoun ὃ οὐκ “which/that not.” *In 9b*, the Hebrew phrase ולא עמנו הוא “and it is not with us” is paraphrased into ὃ οὐχὶ καὶ ἡμεῖς “that/which we do not as well”, creating a closer symmetry in the verse.

Problems with the Vorlage manuscript? *V. 10*, גם שב גם ישיש בנו כביר מאביך “The gray-haired and the aged are on our side, those older than your father” is untranslated (asterisked) and thus not part of the OG. Gorea posits that the translator left it out due to it not being essential⁴⁷⁶; not understanding the Hebrew is unlikely because the words are translated well in other passages. Considering also how the next verse is largely paraphrased or even rewritten, we can assume that maybe the *Vorlage* was either damaged or written badly in this section.

⁴⁷² Cox 2023, 249.

⁴⁷³ Dhorme 1967, 210.

⁴⁷⁴ Gehman 1949, 232.

⁴⁷⁵ Orlinsky 1958, 253–4. also considers this a conscious paraphrase and sees no need for finding a different Hebrew text. There are paraphrases in P (וְהָיָה לְךָ חָכְמָה כְּחָכְמָתִי “and has wisdom been revealed to you?”) and Vg as well (*et inferior te erit eius sapientia* “and shall his wisdom be inferior to thee?”); however, as with Greek, the reasons are probably not textual.

⁴⁷⁶ Gorea 2007, 40–1.

Vermeylen thinks that vv. 2–7 may be a later addition from *rédaction* III. Eliphaz starts responding to Job’s original speech from v. 7 and vv. 2–6 are not strictly necessary. He also says that these verses are directly inspired by the rest of the text (for example v. 8b). According to him, identifying wisdom as the fear of God is characteristic of the Sirach-school. Further, the verb יִאֲלֶה appears in piel form only in v. 5 and in the Elihu speeches (33:33 and 35:11) which are from *rédaction* IV. He concludes that the theme of vv. 2–6 corresponds with the anti-Hellenist Sirach-school and thus were added in *rédaction* III or possibly IV. He thinks that v. 7 is not strictly necessary and does not aid in coherence. He again finds parallels with Sirach 49:16; the second colon alludes to Prov 8:22–31. The verse denounces Job’s wisdom and reproaches him which Vermeylen links with the same *rédacteur* III who added vv. 2–6. Vv. 8–10 are from *rédaction* I.⁴⁷⁷ If indeed v. 7 is later, it was well integrated into the text by the time the manuscript of the *Vorlage* reached the OG translator. The topic did not cause any issues for the translator either.

IV: 15:11–13

Style

This strophe in vv. 11–13 is made up of three bicola. The strophe starts with a marked yes-no question in Hebrew (-ה), and a rare word in 11b in Greek (the adverb ὑπερβαλλόντως “extravagantly”, 26x, OG Job: 1). The particles כִּי “so that” in Hebrew and ὅτι “that” in Greek 13a could be considered transition markers that signal the end of this chain of thought.

The middle of the strophe, v. 12, is written in symmetry in both Hebrew and Greek (xAB/xA'B').

In this strophe, Hebrew has two lexical repetitions, one, אֱל “God” in 11a/13a, framing the strophe, and the other, interrogative מַה “why?” in 12ab in the middle of the strophe. The Greek translation only reflects the repetition in 12ab (τί “what?”) and does not add any repetitions.

A couple of marked Hebrew words have been used: in 11a, the noun תְּנַחֲמוֹת “consolation”; 5x, Job: 2, Ps: 1); in 11b, the noun לֵאט (אט “gentleness”; 5x, Job: 1); in 12b, the *hapax* verb יִרְזַמֵּן (רזם “to flash”); and in 13b, the noun מִלִּין “words” (מלה; considered poetic by BDB).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 12a*, the Hebrew יִקַּח “it takes you” is changed into (Dhorme: “paraphrased”⁴⁷⁸) ἐτόλμησεν “it dared”, with the suffix omitted. *In 13a*, the Hebrew verb תָּשִׁיב “you turn back” is translated as ἑρρηξας “you have let loose”. Orlinsky considers this consciously translating into idiomatic Greek⁴⁷⁹. The noun רוּחַ “your spirit” has been translated with a

⁴⁷⁷ Vermeylen 2015, 165–6, 162–8.

⁴⁷⁸ Dhorme 1967, 212.

⁴⁷⁹ Orlinsky 1958, 248, 250.

interpreted like this as well and used יִרְוֹמוֹן “you exalt”⁴⁸⁵. Vg translates *quasi magna cogitans adtonitos habes oculos* “and why dost thou stare with thy eyes, as if they were thinking great things?” Thus, some of the pre-MT manuscripts might have read יִרְוֹמוֹן, which was interpreted slightly differently by the translators.

Vv. 11–16 may be secondary to the Hebrew text and namely originate from the lowliness redaction (Syring: anthropological editing). Witte points out the motif of lowliness, and colometric inconsistencies, as well as several rare words that might suggest the secondary nature of these verses. Nömmik notes that the lowliness additions rely on the transience redaction and that this section is added strategically to the middle of the speech. According to Vermeylen, vv. 11–13 are hostile towards Job in the same way that vv. 2–7 are, thus coming from the same *rédacteur* III⁴⁸⁶. In the first two verses, several versions including the OG differ greatly from the received MT, suggesting problems with the pre-MT manuscripts, especially in v. 11, the supposed beginning of the addition.

V: 15:14–16

Style

This strophe in vv. 14–16 is made up of three bicola. The strophe is framed with transition markers in both languages: in the beginning, there are the interrogatives מה “what?” in Hebrew and τίς γάρ “for, who?” in Greek, and in the end, there is the expression אַךְ כִּי “how much less” in Hebrew and the poetic interjection ἔα δὲ in Greek.

In Greek, the strophe is also framed with marked vocabulary: in 14a, the poetic, even Homeric, noun βροτὸς “mortal man”⁴⁸⁷; and the adjective ἄμεμπτος “blameless” (43x, LXX: 16, OG Job: 11); in 14b, the adjective γεννητός “begotten” (47x, OG Job: 5); and finally, in 16a, the interjection ἔα “alas!” is also considered poetic (rarely used in prose)⁴⁸⁸.

The end of the strophe is marked firstly with non-parallelism: there is a chiasmus in v. 14 (the Hebrew xAB/B'A' and Greek xAxB/xB'A') and (partial) symmetry in v. 15 (the Hebrew xAB/xA'B' and Greek xAB/A'B'C). Secondly, the end is marked with a simile in v. 16: the Hebrew reads אַךְ כִּי נִתְעַב וְנֹאֲלָה אִישׁ שְׁתֵּה כַּמִּים עוֹלָה “how much less one who is abominable and corrupt, one who drinks iniquity like water!” while the Greek reads ἔα δὲ ἐβδελυγμένος καὶ ἀκάθαρτος, ἀνὴρ πίνων ἀδικίας ἴσα ποτῶ. “But aha, abominable and impure, a man drinking injustices like a drink!”

The Hebrew has two distinct lexical repetitions: כִּי “that, for” in 14ab/16a, and יֹזֵב “he is clean”/זָכוּ “they are clean” in 14a/15b. The Greek translator does not reflect these; however, the repetition of the verb “to be,” ἔσται/ἐσόμενος, in 14ab

⁴⁸⁵ Szpek 1992, 296.

⁴⁸⁶ Witte 1994a, 75–6; Syring 2004, 168–73; Kaiser 2006, 125–7; van Oorschot 2007, 171–84; Vermeylen 2015, 166, 162–8; Witte 2021, 253–6; Nömmik 2025.

⁴⁸⁷ Cf. LSJ and Mangin 2005, 501.

⁴⁸⁸ Mangin 2005, 509.

is added. Furthermore, the translator has used three pairs of root repetition, independently of the Hebrew: *δίκαιος/ἀδικίας* (“just”/“injustices”) in 14b/16b, *οὐ καθαρὸς/ἀκάθαρτος* (“not pure”/“impure”) in 15b/16a, and *πίνων ... ποτῶ* “drinking ... a drink” in 16b.

A couple of marked Hebrew words have been used in the strophe: in 14a, the noun *אנוש* “man” (considered mostly poetic by BDB), and the verb *זכה* (“to be clean”; 8x, Job: 2, Ps: 3, Prov: 1); in 15b, the verb *זכו* (“to be pure, clean”; 4x, Job: 3); and in 16a, the participle *ונאלח* of the verb *אלח* “to corrupt” (3x, Job: 1, Ps: 2).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 14a*, the Hebrew *מה אנוש* “what is mortal” has been translated with *τίς γὰρ ὢν βροτός* “for who, being mortal”. The Hebrew verb *זכה* “he is clean” is translated periphrastically with *ἔσται ἄμεμπτος* “he will be blameless.” *In 14b*, the Hebrew verb *יָצַדֵּק* “he is righteous” is again translated periphrastically with *ἐσόμενος δίκαιος* “being righteous”, creating a repetition that marks the beginning of the strophe. *In 15b*, *לֹא זָכוּ* “they are not pure, clean” is translated with the adjective *οὐ καθαρὸς* “not pure” (in singular, because “heaven” is translated into singular in Greek). The Hebrew *בְּעֵינָיו* “in his eyes” (often with prepositional function⁴⁸⁹) is translated as *ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ* “before him;” however, this is a common equivalent used by the Greek translator⁴⁹⁰. *In 16a*, *אֵף כִּי* “yea, indeed” is translated with the interjection *ἔα δὲ* “but aha! but alas!”. The niph'al participle of the very rare *ונאלח* “and being corrupt” is translated with the adjective *καὶ ἀκάθαρτος* “and impure.” *In 16b*, the comparison *כַּמִּים* “like water” is translated with *ἴσα ποτῶ* “like a drink”, creating a root-repetition.

Vorlage different than the later MT. *In 15a*, the singular *בְּקִדְשׁוֹ* “in his holy one”⁴⁹¹ is translated with the plural *κατὰ ἁγίων* “in holy ones” (cf. also P, *בְּחַדְשֵׁי* and Vg *inter sanctos eius*) but omitting the suffix. The translator is no stranger to changing a singular into plural or vice versa; however, since several versions translate to plural, we may assume that the pre-MT manuscripts read *בְּקִדְשׁוֹ* (the *qere*).

Reading, vocalising, or understanding the consonantal text differently than the later Masoretes. *In 14a*, the interrogative *מה* “what?” seems to have been read or interpreted as *מי* “who?” and thus translated with *τίς* “who?”.

Vv. 11–16 are considered secondary and namely originating from the lowliness redaction (Syring: the anthropological editing). Vv. 14–16 correspond almost word-for-word with additions from the same redactions, namely in 4:12–21 and 25. Nõmmik notes that elements of vocabulary also point to a later origin: Aramaism, rare words, overuse of certain particles and conjunctions, and words that are not usually seen in the friends’ speeches. Vermeylen assigns vv. 14–16

⁴⁸⁹ Orlinsky 1959, 164.

⁴⁹⁰ See, for example, Dhont 2018a, 34–6.

⁴⁹¹ *Qere* *בְּקִדְשׁוֹ*.

to the same *rédacteur* III who added vv. 2–7 and 11–13, due to anti-humanist and vocabulary similarities with 4:17 (*rédaction* III) and mentioning of “the holy ones” (שׁוֹ בְּקִדְשׁוֹ like in 5:1 which comes from *rédaction* III).⁴⁹² The translator did not object to anything in these verses. The pre-MT manuscripts may have had a different reading in 15a, but everything else is explained by the OG translator’s usual techniques.

VI: 15:17–19

Style

This strophe in vv. 17–19 is made up of three bicola. The strophe begins with imperatives (שְׁמַע לִי “listen to me” and ἀκούέ μου “hear me”). Marked vocabulary marks the beginning of the strophe in Hebrew (in 17a and b, the verb חוה, repeated in forms אֶחֱוֶה “I will show you” and חִזִּיתִי “I have seen”, is considered poetic and late by BDB) but the end in Greek (in 19b, the adjective ἀλλογενής “alien, of another race”, LXX: 47, OG Job: 2).

The Hebrew has one other distinct lexical repetition, namely of the negation וְלֹא in 18b/19b. The Greek translator has reflected this repetition (καὶ οὐκ) and added several others independently: the phrase ἀναγγεῖλῶ σοι “I will declare to you” in 17ab (in 17b, σοι is an addition); in 17b/18a, both זֶה and אֲשֶׁר are translated with the relative pronoun ὃ.

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 17b*, the Hebrew וְזֶה “and what” is translated with ὃ δὲ “so the things”. The Hebrew verb וְאֶסְפְּרָה “and I declare” is translated with ἀναγγεῖλῶ σοι “I will declare to you” (omitting the conjunction but adding the indirect object), creating an enveloping repetition with the first colon. *In 18b*, the phrase מֵאֲבוֹתָם “from their fathers” is translated without the preposition because it is not needed in Greek.

V. 17 is colometrically out of balance and thus Witte assumes that it is not in its original form in the MT; it also interrupts the chain of questions. According to him and Kaiser, vv. 18–19 are a gloss. Vermeylen also thinks that vv. 17–19 are later, namely from the hands of *rédacteur* III. In *rédaction* I (vv. 9–10), the forms were first person plural (“we”), whereas in v. 17, it is now “I”. He finds several points of similarities with Sirach, for example the Aramaic verb אֶחֱוֶה in v. 17 that also appears in Sirach 16:25 and Ps 19:3; in Job in vv. 32:6b, 10, 17, and 36:2 (related noun also in 13:17) that come from *rédaction* III. He compares v. 18 to Sirach 8:9 and v. 19 to Sirach 9:8–9 (but also Prov 2:16–19; 5:1–20; 6:20–35; 7:1–27).⁴⁹³ Nömmik considers vv. 18–19 a gloss that cannot be dated exactly. They do not fit thematically, v. 18 begins with the unpoetic relative particle אֲשֶׁר, and the sound repetitions in these verses are different from the rest. The

⁴⁹² Witte 1994a, 75–6; Syring 2004, 168–73; Kaiser 2006, 125–7; van Oorschot 2007, 171–84; Nömmik 2010, 38–9; Vermeylen 2015, 162–8; Witte 2021, 253–6; Nömmik 2025.

⁴⁹³ Kaiser 2006, 31, 126; Vermeylen 2015, 166–7, 162–8; Witte 2021, 250, 253.

vocabulary used has connections with both the majesty and righteousness redactions.⁴⁹⁴ If these verses in this strophe were indeed later additions to the Hebrew text, they were integrated so well that the translator had no textual or thematical difficulties or problems here.

VII: 15:20–21

Style

This strophe in vv. 20–21 is made up of two bicola in Hebrew but a bicolon and a *tricolon* in Greek, marking the end structurally. In both languages, the strophe ends with a temporal clause in 21b (ב- “in” in Hebrew and ὅταν “when” in Greek). The Greek translation has a rare word in both verses: in 20b, the adjective ἀριθμητὰ “numbered” (ἀριθμητός, -ή, -όν; 31x, OG Job: 4); and in 21b, the verb εἰρηγεύειν “to be at peace” (28x, LXX: 19, OG Job: 5).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 20a*, the Hebrew plural ימי “days” is translated as ὁ βίος “the life”, a fairly common equivalent in Job. The phrase הוא מתחולל “he (is) writhing, suffering” is translated with ἐν φροντίδι “in anxiety, in worry.” *In 20b*, the phrase ומספר שנים נצפנו “and the number of years are stored up” is translated with ἔτη δὲ ἀριθμητὰ δεδομένα “and the years given can be counted”. 20b is problematic according to Nömmik: it is colometrically too long, perhaps originally it consisted of only three words or was otherwise shorter⁴⁹⁵; if that is true, the colon was already long by the time of the *Vorlage* of this translation. *In 21a*, the phrase קול פחדים “the sound of terrors” is shortened into ὁ φόβος αὐτοῦ “his fear”. *V. 21c* translates the rest of Hebrew 21b: the participle שודד “the one who destroys” is translated with the noun αὐτοῦ ἡ καταστροφή “his destruction” and the verb יבואנו “it comes to him” is translated as ἔξει “it comes”, connecting the suffix with the noun, not the verb.

Vorlage different than the later MT. *In 21b*, the Hebrew בשלום “in peace” is extended into ὅταν δοκῇ ἡ εἰρηγεύειν “when he thinks he is already in peace”, due to reading בשלם (infinitive) in the *Vorlage* (see also 5:24a, 21:9a, 25:2b). Due to the extension, the Greek now has three cola of which the last, v. 21c translates the rest of Hebrew 21b.

VIII: 15:22–26a

Style

This strophe in vv. 22–26a is made up of six bicola in Hebrew but three bicola, a monocolon, and a *tricolon* (23c/24a + 24b + 25ab/26a) in Greek. The Greek strophe begins with an imperative in 22a (μὴ πιστεύτω “let him not believe”).

⁴⁹⁴ Nömmik 2013, 181–5; 2014a, 39–40; 2025.

⁴⁹⁵ Nömmik 2010, 40.

In both languages, there is some elevated vocabulary. In Hebrew, these are: in 24a, the piel of the verb בעתהו (יבעתהו) “they terrify”; considered mostly poetic by BDB and the noun ומצוקה (מצוקה) “distress”; 7x, Job: 1, Ps: 5); in 24b, the verb ותקפהו (תקה) “to prevail”; 4x, Job: 2), the adjective עתיד “ready” (6x, Job: 2), and the *hapax* noun לכידור (כידור) “battle”; in 26b, the noun בעבי (עבי) “thickness”; 5x, Job: 1); and finally in 27b, the *hapax* noun פימה “excess fat”.

In Greek, these are: in 23c, the verb στροβήσει “it will whirl around” (στροβέω; considered mainly poetic⁴⁹⁶; 21x, OG Job: 4); in 24b, the noun πρωτοστάτης “in the front rank” (18x, OG Job: 1); and in 25b, the *hapax* verb ἐτραχηλίσεν “he stiffened” (τραχηλιάω)⁴⁹⁷.

The middle of the strophe in Hebrew v. 24 and in Greek 24b has a simile but with major differences. While the Hebrew reads יבעתהו צר ומצוקה תתקפהו כמלך עתיד לכידור “distress and anguish terrify them; they prevail against them like a king prepared for battle,” the Greek reads ὥσπερ στρατηγὸς πρωτοστάτης πίπτων “(he will be) like a general in the front rank falling.”

Greek displays a symmetric structure in 22b/23a (AxB C/A'B'C') and a partially symmetric structure in 23c/24a (ABCD/A'xA'' B'D'). The Greek translator has reflected the partial chiasmus in v. 25 but extended it into the third colon of the tricolon (xABC/C'A'/A'C'B').

In Hebrew, parallelistic structures are in vv. 25 (partial chiasmus xABC/xB'A') and 27 (partial chiasmus xABC/xA'C'B').

The Hebrew text has lexical repetitions: חשך “darkness” in 22a/23b; the personal pronoun הוא “he” in 22b/23a; ידו/בידו “in his hand”/“his hand” in 23b/25a; in vv. 25ab/26a, the preposition אל “towards” is used once in each colon.

The Greek translator reflects the repetition of חשך, but in 22a/23c with σκότους/σκοτεινή (“darkness”/“dark”). The pronoun repetition is not reflected; however, an independent root-repetition is created in 23b/24b: πτώμα/πίπτων (“fallen body, carcass”/“falling”). The preposition repetition in 25/26a is again reflected, although with a slight variation (ἐναντίον/ἐναντι/ἐναντίον “before, in front of”). Independently, the repetition of τοῦ κυρίου/κυρίου “of the Lord” is created in v. 25.

Text

Reading, vocalising, or understanding the consonantal text differently than the later Masoretes. In 22a, the Hebrew indicative לא יאמין “he does not believe” is translated with the imperative μὴ πιστευέτω “let him not believe”; Dhorme suggests that the translator read אל instead of לא, like it is in v. 31⁴⁹⁸. In 22b, the passive participle⁴⁹⁹ וצפו הוא “he is being watched” is translated as ἐντέταλται γὰρ ἤδη “for he has already been allocated”; this might be due to reading (hearing?) וצוה “and he was commanded”⁵⁰⁰. Possibly being influenced by 22b, in 23a, the

⁴⁹⁶ Mangin 2005, 567.

⁴⁹⁷ Cf. also Mangin 2005, 574.

⁴⁹⁸ Dhorme 1967, 216.

⁴⁹⁹ וצפוי Qere.

⁵⁰⁰ Cf. also Dhorme 1967, 217.

participle נָדָד הוּא “he wanders” is translated as κατατέταται δὲ “and he has been appointed”; the root could have been understood as יָדָה “to throw” and thus “he is thrown”⁵⁰¹ or read as the participle נָדָד (from יָדָד “to cast a lot”)⁵⁰² or as the participle נָעַד (from יָעַד, “having an appointment”)⁵⁰³. Orlinsky has suggested that the actual *Vorlage* of the translation read נָעַד. He explained that this is palaeographically possible and that the Hebrew-Greek equivalence can be observed elsewhere in the LXX.⁵⁰⁴ The Hebrew אֵי, which is usually translated as “where is it?”, has been translated as γυψίν “for vultures.” This seems to be the result of vocalising the word as אֵיָה (assumed to mean “falcon, hawk”) instead⁵⁰⁵, although it has been translated into plural. Some suggest reading the Hebrew accordingly as well⁵⁰⁶. *In 23b*, the phrase εἰς πτώμα “as a fallen body, corpse” could be the result of reading בְּיָדוֹ “in his hand” as either בְּאֵיד “in calamity”, like in 18:12, or בְּפִיד “in disaster” or פִּידוֹ “his disaster”, like in 31:29. Hartley supports the latter version; Dhorme and Habel suggest reading פִּידוֹ.⁵⁰⁷ Either way, this results in better harmony with the “vultures” in the first colon of the verse. *In 23c*, the verb αὐτὸν στροβήσει “it whirls him around” (but also metaphorically “it distracts, distresses”) translates the first word of Hebrew 24a, יַבְעִתְהוּ “they overwhelm him”⁵⁰⁸; Witte thinks that the translator vocalised the verb as יַבְעִתְהוּ⁵⁰⁹ (cf. also the translation of the verb of Hebrew 24b). *In 24a*, the Greek αὐτὸν καθέξει translates the first word of MT 24b, תִּתְקַפֶּהוּ “it prevails against him”, dividing the cola in the verse differently. *In 25b*, the translator added κυρίου “the Lord”. This is quite likely due to dittography, reading the consonants אָל twice⁵¹⁰, especially since in 25a they appear twice next to each other as well. Dhont raises the possibility of double translation⁵¹¹. παντοκράτορ is not considered an addition, since when a God-name appears in two cola, and the first is translated as κύριος, the second (שָׁדִי) is translated as παντοκράτωρ⁵¹². Comparable is Job 8:5 where πρὸς κύριον παντοκράτορα is used to translate שָׁדִי וְאֵל אֵל וְאֵל.

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 22b*, the Hebrew אֵלֵי חֶרֶב “for the sword” is extended into εἰς χεῖρας σιδήρου “to the hands of iron/sword” (the influence of 5:20b is likely⁵¹³). Dhont considers χεῖρας as a pure addition (a plus) while Cox sees it as a Hebraism⁵¹⁴. The addition does create a repetition

⁵⁰¹ Cf. also Hartley 1988, 249.

⁵⁰² Nömmik 2010, 40.

⁵⁰³ Ziegler 1971, 10.

⁵⁰⁴ Orlinsky 1964, 71–3.

⁵⁰⁵ Cf. also Dhorme 1967, 217; Nömmik 2010, 40.

⁵⁰⁶ Terrien 1963, 128; Dhorme 1967, 217–8; Habel 1985, 247; Witte 1994a, 247.

⁵⁰⁷ Dhorme 1967, 217–8; Habel 1985, 247; Hartley 1988, 249; Lust et al. 2003, s.v. πτώμα; Kepper and Witte 2011, 2091.

⁵⁰⁸ According to Muraoka 2010, 110, this translation equivalent occurs four times in LXX.

⁵⁰⁹ Dhorme 1967, 218–9; Witte 2021, 247.

⁵¹⁰ Cf. also Beekman 2022b, 9–10; 2024, 299–300.

⁵¹¹ Dhont 2018a, 236.

⁵¹² Orlinsky 1935a, 276.

⁵¹³ Cf. also Dhorme 1967, 217.

⁵¹⁴ Cox 2016a, 67; Dhont 2018a, 97.

with 25a. **In 23a**, the phrase ללחם “for bread” is translated with the plural εἰς ὅττα “for food”. **In 23b**, the Greek ἐν ἑαυτῷ “within himself” is an addition to emphasise “he knows”. **In 23c**, the phrase יום חשך “day of darkness” from MT 23b is translated as ἡμέρα ... σκοτεινῇ “dark day”; some suggest actually emending the MT accordingly and moving the phrase⁵¹⁵. **In 25a**, the Hebrew phrase נטה ידו “he stretched out his hand” is translated with ἤρκεν χεῖρας “he raised (his) hands”. **In 26a**, the imperfective ירוץ “he runs” is translated with the aorist ἔδραμεν “he ran”, while בצוואר “lit. with neck” is translated as ὕβρει “with hybris, insolence”; the translator already used the “neck”-root to translate יתגבר as ἐτραχηλίασεν in 25b, so this translation could have been to avoid a repetition. Ziegler and LXX.D claim that it is an *abstractum pro concreto*⁵¹⁶. **Vv. 26b–27b** (26b: בעבי גבי מגניו 27: כי כסה פניו בחלבו ויעש פימה עלי כסל “with a thickly bossed shield; because they have covered their faces with their fat and gathered fat upon their loins”) are not translated (※). Gorea hypothesises that these were left out because they either were seen as a digression and/or unnecessary; LXX.D also sees the gap as more philological and stylistic than, for example, theological⁵¹⁷.

Vorlage different than the later MT. **In 23b**, the third person singular verb μένει “he remains” translates the participle נכון “it is established, stable, fixed”; Seow points out that two Mss actually read נכן, thus understanding a finite form is possible⁵¹⁸. *Maters* missing in the *Vorlage* and thus “changing” the translation are not uncommon.

Utilising the context or the translator's previous knowledge for the meaning of unknown words. **In 24b**, the Hebrew כמלך “like a king” has been translated as ὥσπερ στρατηγὸς “like a general”, possibly due to the battle context and the sword mentioned before. The source of the translation of the second part of 24b, which includes a rare word and a *hapax*, is unclear: while the Hebrew reads עתיד לכידור “ready for battle (?)”, the Greek reads πρωτοστάτης πίπτων “in the front rank, falling”. Dhorme suggests that this is a simple paraphrase. Beeckman argues for contextual translation, because the *hapax* may have proved to be too difficult for the translator; however, the translation also uses a *hapax legomenon*. Cox has suggested wider Alexandrian and Greek military contexts for the translation choices in 24b⁵¹⁹.

From the listed differences it can be argued that the *Vorlage* had such bad handwriting in vv. 23–24 that the translator kept misreading or that it was corrupt. Terrien considers MT corrupt. According to Nömmik, even after rearrangements, the second half of v. 24b is still difficult and stylistically different from the rest; him and Witte consider 24c (the latter part of 24b, כמלך עתיד לכידור) a later insertion that explains vv. 23–24. For Kaiser, vv. 24c and 25 are glosses.⁵²⁰ The

⁵¹⁵ Dhorme 1967, 217–9; Habel 1985, 247; Hartley 1988, 249.

⁵¹⁶ Ziegler 1971, 12; Kepper and Witte 2011, 2091.

⁵¹⁷ Gorea 2007, 41–3; Kepper and Witte 2011, 2091.

⁵¹⁸ Seow 2011, 65.

⁵¹⁹ Dhorme 1967, 219; Cox 2023, 249–50; Beeckman 2024, 249–50.

⁵²⁰ Terrien 1963, 128; Kaiser 2006, 31, 126; Nömmik 2010, 41; 2013, 181–5; Witte 2021, 250; Nömmik 2025.

later additions could have been integrated badly, ending up being also copied badly.

IX: 15:28–30a

Style

This strophe in verses 28–30a is made up of four bicola in Greek, but two tricola in Hebrew. V. 29a, which has 17 consonants in Hebrew, has been made into a bicolon in Greek.

There are parallelistic structures in both languages: in v. 28ab, the Greek symmetry (ABC/A'B'C') reflects the Hebrew partial symmetry (ABC/B'C') and in 29a, the Greek partial symmetry (ABA'B'C) reflects Hebrew (ABA'B'/A'B'). Additionally, independent intra-colon symmetry can be observed in Greek 28c (ABCB'C').

In terms of lexical repetitions, in Hebrew the negation **לֹא** is used five times in 28b–30a; the translator reflects most, except for the first one in 28b. An independent root-repetition is created in 28b: εἰς οἴκους ἀοικήτους “into uninhabited houses”.

Some marked Hebrew words have been used in this strophe: in 28c, the verb התעתדו (עתד “to be ready”; 2x, Job: 1, Prov: 1); and in 29b, the *hapax* noun מנלם (מנלה “gain, wealth”). The Greek translator has used marked vocabulary as well: and in 29a, the verb πλουτισθῇ “he shall become rich” (πλουτίζω; 40x, LXX: 13, OG Job: 1).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 28a*, the Hebrew וישכון “and he dwells” is translated with the aorist optative αὐλισθείη “may he lodge”. The participle נכחדות “hidden, destroyed” is translated with the adjective ἐρήμους “deserted, uninhabited.” *In 28b*, the Hebrew לא ישובו למו “in houses in which they would not go” is paraphrased into εἰσελθοι εἰς οἴκους ἀοικήτους “may he enter into uninhabited houses”⁵²¹, probably for stylistic reasons; the added verb also gives more balance with the first colon. Fernández Marcos considers the translation of 28b an effort to find a meaning, thus one of the “guess- or perplexity-translations” of the Greek translator⁵²². *In 28c*, the Hebrew התעתדו “they were prepared” is translated with ἐκεῖνοι ἡτοίμασαν “they have prepared”. לגלים “(destined) for heaps” is paraphrased for clarity into ἄλλοι ἀποίσονται “others will carry away”. All the negations (**לֹא** + imperfective) *in vv. 29 and 30* are emphasised into οὐτε μὴ, οὐ μὴ, or οὐδὲ μὴ + aorist subjunctive constructions.

Problems with the Vorlage manuscript. *In 29b*, the Hebrew ולא יטה “he will not stretch, strike” is translated with οὐ μὴ βάλη “he shall not cast”, because the *hapax* מנלם “their gain, wealth, possession (?)” is translated with σκιά “shadow”. Dhorme suggests the possibility that the translator read צלמו “his image, shadow”

⁵²¹ Cf. Vg *in domibus desertis* “in deserted houses”.

⁵²² Fernández Marcos 1994, 263–4.

in the Hebrew; both him and Nömmik want to read the MT as such as well⁵²³. P translator read or associated the Hebrew with מלין/מלים and translated ὅλε “words.”⁵²⁴ Since both had trouble reading the text, we may assume that the already the pre-MT was hard to read in this section. Orlinsky, however, suggests corruption in the Greek manuscripts and hypothesises that the original may have been ῥίζαν “root”⁵²⁵ (cf. Vg with its *nec mittet in terra radicem suam* “neither shall he push his root in the earth”). Beeckman argues for contextual translation: 30a has τὸ σκότος, which is semantically and visually linked⁵²⁶. This fits with how the verse structure is seen in this dissertation as well: 29b and 30a form a bicolon, whereas 30bc form another bicolon in a new strophe.

Vv. 28c and 30a are seen as later glosses by several scholars. Nömmik explains that 28c uses the unpoetic relative particle אשר and disrupts the chain of negations while v. 30a repeats earlier ideas, for example from v. 22. Witte considers 28c an explanation to v. 28 and says that 30a is not fitting as it disrupts the strophic structure of bicola; it rather fits with vv. 22a and 23b/24, as it does not contain any plant imagery; Kaiser follows Witte. Vermeylen sees 28c as coming from possibly *rédacteur* III. Since v. 28 is a tricolon and the theme of the first two cola align with the general characteristics of *rédaction* I, he assigns the third colon to an editor. It is a relative clause, starting with אשר, and the expression “to become a heap of stones” appears in Jer 9:10 and 51:37. V. 30 is also a tricolon, thus one of the cola has to be secondary. The first and the third contain יסור, and the first one is very similar to 22a. Thus, he considers it a marginal gloss which links vv. 22 and 30.⁵²⁷ Of these two verses, the Greek translator changes only 28c; however, the change is more a paraphrase than related to difficult text.

X: 15:30b–33

Style

This strophe in vv. 30b–33 is made up of four bicola⁵²⁸. In Hebrew, the end of the strophe is marked with symmetry in v. 33 (ABC/xA'B'C'). The Greek translator has reflected this symmetry (ABC/ A'B') and created a partial chiasmus in 30bc (ABC/B'A') and a partial symmetry in v. 32 (ABC/A'C').

The strophe ends with a double simile in both Hebrew and Greek in v.33, although with slight differences. The Hebrew reads יחמס בגפן בסרו וישלך כזית נצתו “They will shake off their unripe grape, like the vine, and cast off their blossoms, like the olive tree.” The Greek reads τρυγηθείη δὲ ὡς ὄμφαξ πρὸ ὄρας,

⁵²³ Dhorme 1967, 222–3; Nömmik 2010, 42–3.

⁵²⁴ Szpek 1992, 277.

⁵²⁵ Orlinsky 1962, 136–9.

⁵²⁶ Beeckman 2024, 179–80.

⁵²⁷ Kaiser 2006, 31,126; Nömmik 2010, 42–3; 2013, 181–5; Vermeylen 2015, 167–8, 162–8; Witte 2021, 250; Nömmik 2025.

⁵²⁸ Dhont 2018, 282–5 sees vv. 15:30–35 as one unit “on the basis of the translator’s use of repetitions”. She has discussed the unit thoroughly. The verses do make up a consistent thematic unit; however, based on the contents alone, a new botanical metaphor begins in 30b (in Hebrew, 29b could also be considered here based on the vocabulary of “striking root”).

ἐκπέσοι δὲ ὡς ἄνθος ἐλαίας. “But may he be picked like unripe grapes, before his time, and fall off, like an olive blossom.”

The Hebrew has two noticeable lexical repetitions: שׁוּא/בִּשּׁוּ (“in emptiness”/“emptiness”) in v. 31 and the negation לֹא in v. 32. The Greek translator has not reflected these repetitions but has added their own: the framing repetitions of τὸ ἄνθος/ἄνθος “blossom” and ἐκπέσοι/ἐκπέσοι “may it fall off” in 30c/33b (framing the strophe), and the repetition of πρὸ ὥρας “before its time” in 32a/33a.

Many rare Hebrew words have been used: in 30b, the noun יִנְקַת (נוֹקָה) “shoot”; 6x, Job: 3, Ps: 1), and the noun שְׁלֵהֶבֶת (“flame”; 3x, Job: 1); in 31b, the noun תְּמִינָתוֹ (תְּמִינָה) “exchange”; 6x, Job: 3); in 32b, the noun כִּפְּהָ (כֶּפֶה) “branch”; 3x, Job: 1), and the *hapax* verb רָעַנָה (רָעַן “to be fresh”); in 33a, the verb יַחְמֹס (חָמַס “to injure”; 8x, Job: 2, Prov: 1), and the noun בִּסְרוֹ (בֶּסֶר “unripe grape”; 5x, Job: 1); and finally, in 33b, the noun נִצְחָה (נִצָּח “flower”; 2x, Job: 1).

The Greek translator has used some rare vocabulary as well: in 32b, the *hapax* noun ὁ ῥάδαμνος “the branch” (appearing a couple of times in OG Job: 8:16b, 14:7c, 15:32b, 40:22b)⁵²⁹; in 33a, the verb τρυγηθεῖη “may he be picked” (τρυγάω; 47x, LXX: 15, OG Job: 1), as well as the noun ὄμφαξ “unripe grape” (32x, LXX: 6, OG Job: 1).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 30b*, the Hebrew תִּיבֵשׁ “it makes dry, dries up” is translated with the aorist optative μαράναι “may it dry up”. The Greek ἄνεμος “wind” is translated from 30c בָּרוּחַ “by the wind”. *In 31a*, the phrase בִּשּׁוּ נִתְעָה “in emptiness he deceives himself” is replaced with ὅτι ὑπομενεῖ “that he will remain”. Dhorme considers 31a a paraphrase⁵³⁰, which is not unreasonable, as the Greek is very clear and the Hebrew words should not have been unknown to the translator either. *In 31b*, the phrase כִּי שׁוּא תִהְיֶה תְּמִינָתוֹ “for emptiness will be his payment” is paraphrased into κενὰ γὰρ ἀποβήσεται αὐτῷ “for emptiness will turn out for him”. *In 32a*, the Hebrew בְּלֹא יוֹמוֹ “in not its day/time” is translated as πρὸ ὥρας “before (its) time”. *In 33a*, the phrase כַּגֶּפֶן בִּסְרוֹ “like a vine its unripe grape” is shortened into ὡς ὄμφαξ “like an unripe grape”. The phrase πρὸ ὥρας “before (its) time” is added; Orlinsky suggests that it is the result of (vertical) dittography during the copying process and that originally it was translated correctly as ἀμπέλου “of the vine” whereas Beeckman argues for intentional stylistic motivations behind this translation⁵³¹. *In 33b*, the Hebrew imperfective וַיִּשְׁלֵךְ “he throws, casts off” is translated with the aorist optative ἐκπέσοι “may it fall off”. The phrase כִּי־תִצְחָה נִצְחָה “like the olive tree its blossom” is changed into ὡς ἄνθος ἐλαίας “like an olive blossom.”

Utilising the context or the translator’s previous knowledge for the meaning of unknown words. *In 32b*, the Hebrew *hapax* לֹא רָעַנָה “it did not grow fresh,

⁵²⁹ Mangin 2005, 562. Even its traditional form ῥόδαμνος, -ου, ὁ appears 11 times (including the times it is parsed as ὁ ῥάδαμνος by TLG).

⁵³⁰ Dhorme 1967, 224.

⁵³¹ Orlinsky 1935b, 138–40; 1962, 139–40; Beeckman 2020, 36–7.

green (?)” is translated as οὐ μὴ πικράσῃ “it will provide no cover”. The translation probably stems from the simple fact that branches with no leaves do not provide as much cover. Beeckman considers it “an adequate rendering,” especially since in Hos 14:9 a participle of this verb is used to translate the related Hebrew adjective רענן “luxuriant, fresh”⁵³². *In 33a*, the rare יחמס “it treats violently” is translated with the aorist optative τρυγηθελή “may he be gathered, picked”. The P translator used contextual translation as well: יחמס “he will shake off”⁵³³. Dhorme considers 33a a paraphrase⁵³⁴.

Translator’s limited vocabulary. *In 30b*, the very rare noun שלהבת “flame” is not translated.

Problems with the Vorlage. *In 30c*, the Hebrew ויסור “it departs, is removed” is translated with the optative ἐκπέσοι “may it fall off”; Dhorme suggests that the Hebrew could have been read as ויסער “it will be swept away” instead and Nömmik emends the Hebrew accordingly⁵³⁵. The Hebrew פיו “his lip” is translated with αὐτοῦ τὸ ἄνθος “his blossom,” which continues the plant-motif. Dhorme suggests that the translator read פרחו “his flower” instead; Nömmik and Witte emend the Hebrew accordingly⁵³⁶. However, Heater considers 30c to be an anaphoric translation, similar to that in 14:2a (and thus Isa 40:7b), and possibly based on that verse, in order to continue the plant motif and “to provide a parallel to 15:30b”. Due to this intentional change, Heater cautions against emending the Hebrew text, because the translator’s *Vorlage* was likely the same as the current MT.⁵³⁷ Both P and Vg are also different from the MT here. With this mind, it can be suggested that the pre-MT manuscripts were harder to read in this verse and not actually different from the MT.

Reading or vocalising the consonantal text differently than the later Masoretes. *In 32a*, the Greek ἡ τομὴ αὐτοῦ “his stump” stems from reading the rare Hebrew תמורתו at the end of 31b as זמורתו “his vine shoots” and connecting it with v. 32⁵³⁸.

Vorlage different than the later MT. *In 32a*, the Hebrew תמלא “it is completed, paid (?)” is translated as φθαρήσεται “it will be destroyed”. According to Dhorme, this might be due a different *Vorlage*: the “original” might have been תמל from the verb מלל “to languish,” agreeing with Greek, Syriac, and the Vulgate⁵³⁹. The P translation reflects this reading or understanding as well with ܠܡܢ “he has withered.”⁵⁴⁰ Vg has both the completion and perishing: *antequam dies eius impleantur peribit* “before his days be full, he shall perish.” In the context of the dying plant imagery in this strophe, this reading makes sense. Thus, the difference was probably there in several pre-MT manuscripts.

⁵³² Beeckman 2024, 192.

⁵³³ Cf. Szpek 1992, 292.

⁵³⁴ Dhorme 1967, 225.

⁵³⁵ Dhorme 1967, 223; Nömmik 2010, 43.

⁵³⁶ Dhorme 1967, 223; Nömmik 2010, 43; Witte 2021, 248.

⁵³⁷ Heater 1982, 61–2.

⁵³⁸ Dhorme 1967, 224; Hartley 1988, 250; Nömmik 2010, 44; Dhont 2018a, 284.

⁵³⁹ Dhorme 1967, 225.

⁵⁴⁰ Szpek 1992, 277.

V. 31 is considered a gloss by Witte, Kaiser, Nömmik, and Vermeulen. Witte explains that the verse disrupts the strophic structure: according to his theory, the strophes in this speech consist of five bicola each and this verse does not fit into the structure. Nömmik says that the verse seems misplaced, interrupts the plant imagery, and uses structures untypical of the friends' speeches. The vocabulary has similarities with additions from the majesty redaction. Vermeulen also says that it interrupts the flow of the text and the metaphor expressed in vv. 29–30 and 32–33. It could refer to idolatry and Hellenised Jews, thus could have been added by *rédacteur* III.⁵⁴¹ The translator paraphrased the verse, but it does not seem that the paraphrase was motivated by a difficult or badly integrated text or topic that could have been objected with.

XI: 15:34–35

Style

The final strophe of the speech in vv. 34–35 is made up of two bicola in Hebrew but a bicolon and a *tricolon* in Greek, effectively marking the end of the strophe and the speech. The strophe begins with the causal or explanatory particle כִּי “for” in Hebrew and γὰρ “for” in Greek and with with a rare word in both languages: in 34a, a rare Hebrew adjective גַּלְמוּד “solitary” (4x, Job: 3) and in 34b, the Greek *hapax* noun δωροδεκτῶν “of bribe-takers” (δωροδέκτης, -ου, ὁ)⁵⁴². Hebrew has an intra-colon symmetry in 35a (ABxA'B').

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 34b*, the Hebrew וַאֲשֶׁר אֵכֶלָה “and fire consumes the tents of bribery” is paraphrased into πῦρ δὲ καύσει οἴκους δωροδεκτῶν “and fire will burn the houses of bribetakers”⁵⁴³. *In 35a*, the Hebrew הָרָה עֹמֵל וְיֹלֵד אֹן וּבִטְנָם “they conceive mischief and bring forth evil and their belly” (the last word is from Hebrew 35b) is translated as ἐν γαστρὶ δὲ λήμψεται ὀδύνας “and in the stomach he will conceive sorrows”. Greek *v. 35b* paraphrases the end of 35a: וְיֹלֵד אֹן “it births evil” is turned into ἀποβήσεται δὲ αὐτῷ κενά “emptiness will be his lot”. V. 35b could also be considered an addition, inspired by, or directly taken from 31b⁵⁴⁴. Greek *v. 35c* translates MT 35b. The noun וּבִטְנָם “and their belly” is translated again, this time with ἡ δὲ κοιλία αὐτοῦ “his belly.” The verb תָּכִין “it establishes, prepares” is translated with ὑποίσει “it will carry.” Dhorme introduces the theory that ὑποίσει can be attributed

⁵⁴¹ Kaiser 2006, 32, 126; Nömmik 2013, 181–5; Vermeulen 2015, 168, 162–8; Witte 2021, 250; Nömmik 2025.

⁵⁴² Cf. also Mangin 2005, 509; Dhont 2018a, 147–8.

⁵⁴³ See theories about the translator being a city-dweller, e.g., Cox 2023, 246, 250. Vg paraphrases very similarly: *et ignis devorabit tabernacula eorum qui munera libenter accipiunt* “and fire shall devour their tabernacles, who love to take bribes”.

⁵⁴⁴ Cf. also Heater 1982, 62–3. Dhorme 1967, 226–7, however, says it is an interpretation of 31b.

to (mis)reading the Hebrew as תכיל (from כול “to contain”) instead of תכין in the MT.⁵⁴⁵

Reading, vocalising, or understanding the consonantal text differently than the later Masoretes. *In 34a*, the Hebrew noun עדת “congregation, gathering” is translated as μαρτύριον “testimony”; this could be due to reading/understanding the Hebrew as עד “witness” or עדות “testimony”. The rare גלמוד “barren, solitary” is translated with θάνατος “death.” Dhorme suggests that it translates כל מות instead of the MT⁵⁴⁶; this could especially happen if the Hebrew were dictated.

⁵⁴⁵ Dhorme 1967, 226–7.

⁵⁴⁶ Dhorme 1967, 226.

JOB 19

Introduction

Job 19 contains Job's fifth reply: *Job blames his friends for attacking him, because he is not the one at fault, but God is. God has hurt him and destroyed his hope.*

The OG translation of Job 19 divides into 10 strophes:

I (19:2–3, 2B) *Address: why do you attack me? I am not the one at fault, but God is.*

II (19:4–5, 1Te1B) *I indeed have spoken wrong, but only because you reproach me.*

III (19:6–8, 3B) *God has troubled me.*

IV (19:9–12, 4B) *God has destroyed my hope and counted me as an enemy.*

V (19:13–15, 1T2B) *The people near me have abandoned me.*

VI (19:16–18, 3B) *The people near me do not listen to me.*

VII (19:19–20, 2B) *I have become so disgusting the people near me have abhorred me.*

VIII (19:21–24, 2B1T) *Pity me! God has destroyed me. Why are you like Him? I wish I had written proof.*

IX (19:25–27, 1M1B1T) *Only I know that the everlasting God has hurt me.*

X (19:28–29, 2B) *Conclusion: even if you try to appease me, if you are lawless, you will suffer too.*

A few repeating **keywords** in this speech are the God-names אֱלֹהִים in 19:22 and אֱלֹהִים in 19:6, 21, 26, reflected in Greek with κύριος in 19:3, 6, 21, 22, 26; and the verb יָדַע “to know” in 19:6, 13, 25, 29, reflected in Greek with οἶδα in 19:14, 19, 25 and γινώσκω in 19:3, 6, 13, 29.

The Greek text has two asterisked passages: 24a and 28b. Although there are only two asterisked cola, the verse structure is very varied, ranging from monocola to tetracola and having a combination of verse types in one strophe. The first and last strophes of the speech are made up of two bicola, though. There are differences with the strophe division in Hebrew which means that those strophes need to be analysed even more carefully.

Concerning the “originality” of **the Hebrew text** of ch. 19, following are the different theories as to its place in the development of the book as well as its internal development. In general, Job 19 is again thought to have been already in the original Job-poem. Some scholars think that verses 19:12 and 19:28–29 were added later. Opinions on the secondary nature of other verses differ.

More specifically, according to Witte, Job 19 was part of the original Job-poem (“Hiobdichtung A”) almost fully: 19:1–12#, 13–27#. In vv. 12 and 27 a colon might have gone missing over time or was omitted. He distinguishes one

addition, namely 19:28–29, which was added either in stage six as an eschatological gloss or even later, in the final stage (stage seven).⁵⁴⁷

According to Nömmik this speech belonged to the original poem of Job. Some passages of it, however, were added later: prose introduction in 19:1 (the book editor), vv. 10–12 (a late *Fortschreibung*, relying on the transience redaction), vv. 25–27 (a late apocalyptic *Fortschreibung*), and vv. 28–29 (a late eschatological gloss).⁵⁴⁸

Van Oorschot considers the speech to be almost wholly from the original poetic dialogue of Job. Out of his five larger stages of literary growth of Job, he places vv. 19:28f. as stemming from the third editor, the righteousness redactor.⁵⁴⁹

Syring also sees Job 19 in full as part of the original Job-poem (“Ursprüngliche Dichtung”), apart from the prose introduction 19, added in the first redaction.⁵⁵⁰

Kaiser thinks that the original poem had vv. 19:2–12a, c, 13–25ab₁, 27a–c[+d]. The book editor added the introductory 19:1. Later, the righteousness editor added vv. 19:28–29b. Finally, vv. 19:12b is considered a gloss and vv. 19:25b₂–26, 29c are considered eschatological glosses.⁵⁵¹

Vermeylen thinks that at an early stage (*rédaction* I) Job 19 may have consisted of vv. 2–3, 5–6, 8–11, 14, 15b_β, 16, 18–19, 21–22. In *rédaction* II, vv. 4, 7, 13, 17, 20, 23–29 were inserted to show Job as a sick man; orthodox remarks are also characteristic of this redaction. In *rédaction* III, vv. 12 and 15ab_α were added.⁵⁵²

I: 19:2–3

Style

Verses 19:2–3 form the introductory strophe that consists of two bicola. The strophe and consequently the speech begin in 2a with interrogatives in both Greek and Hebrew (ἔως τίνος in Greek and אנה עד “how long” in Hebrew). The Greek also has an independent imperative in the second/last verse (γινώτε μόνον ὅτι “know only that”); the Hebrew, very different from the Greek, has an emphasised pronoun and a numeral (עשר זה “these ten”).

In Greek, the first and last colon have a rare word: in 2a, the adjective ἔγκοπος “wearyed” (partly reflects a rare word in Hebrew; 3x, OG Job: 1); and in 3b, the verb καταλαλεῖτέ “you speak against” (καταλαλέω; 25x, LXX. 13, OG Job: 1).

Several marked Hebrew words have been used as well: in 2a, the verb תגיד (גה “to suffer”; 8x, Job: 1); in 2b, the verb ותדכאונני “you break me in pieces”

⁵⁴⁷ Witte 2021, 57–9, 299, 310, 312–3.

⁵⁴⁸ Nömmik 2013, 27–9, 194–200; 2025.

⁵⁴⁹ van Oorschot 2007, 171–84.

⁵⁵⁰ Syring 2004, 168–73.

⁵⁵¹ Kaiser 2006, 126.

⁵⁵² Vermeylen 2015, 128–31, 180–2, 280, 327.

(דכא) and the noun במלים “with words” (מלה) are considered poetic by BDB; and in 3b, the *hapax* verb תהכרו (הכר “to wrong”)⁵⁵³.

The only lexical repetition in the strophe is in Greek 2a/3a of the verb “to make” ποιήσετε/ἐποίησέν (“you make”/“he has made”). This repetition distinguishes this strophe from the next, where another root/word is repeated.

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 2a*, the Hebrew verb ותדכאנוני “and you (pl.) crush me” is translated with καὶ καθαιρεῖτέ με “and you (pl.) destroy me”, which seems to be a unique equivalence in the LXX, but still in the same semantic field. *In 3b*, the verb תכלימוני “you (pl.) insult, humiliate me” from the end of Hebrew 3a is translated with καταλαλεῖτέ μου “you (pl.) speak against me”, which again is a unique equivalence but not inappropriate. In connection, the phrase לא תבשו “you (pl.) are not ashamed” is translated with the participial phrase οὐκ αἰσχυρόμενοί με “not feeling shame before me” (με “me” is thus an addition).

Reading, vocalising, or understanding the consonantal text differently than the later Masoretes. *In 2a*, the Hebrew verb in *hiphil* תוגיין “you cause sorrow” is translated with a two-word phrase in Greek, ἔγκοπον ποιήσετε “you make tired, wearied”, although Dhorme, Terrien and Seow think that the translator read תגיען (“you make weary, you tire”; root יגע) instead⁵⁵⁴. Still, whatever the cause, this translation (choice) makes the accusation weightier and creates a distinguishing lexical repetition in the strophe. *In 3a*, the Greek γνῶτε μόνον ὅτι ὁ κύριος ἐποίησέν με οὕτως “Know only that the Lord treated me this way” replaces the Hebrew זה עשר פעמים “these ten times”. It seems to be a translation of 6a, with minor differences⁵⁵⁵. Beeckman proposes that the translator wanted to emphasise the fact that God is the guilty party here, not his friends (in contrast to the Hebrew), and is omnipotent⁵⁵⁶. According to Dhorme and Heater, this could also be considered a combination of differences and an addition (anaphoric translation), since the translator could have read עשה זה instead⁵⁵⁷, and thus the lone פעמים was changed into μόνον, to give the clause sense; the rest would have been taken from 6a⁵⁵⁸. Taking into account the context of the speeches between Job and his friends and the first strophes of this speech, it seems most reasonable that the translator read עשה זה and sourced the rest from v. 6. Nömmik proposes that the colon was originally shorter and that either זה or עשר was added later⁵⁵⁹. The length was not an issue for the translator, as the Greek is relatively long as well.

Utilising the context or the translator's previous knowledge for the meaning of unknown words. *In 3b*, the *hapax* verb תהכרו לי “you (pl.) wrong me” is

⁵⁵³ See discussion in Verbeke 2011, 265–6.

⁵⁵⁴ Terrien 1963, 143; Dhorme 1967, 270; Seow 2013, 810.

⁵⁵⁵ Cf. also Kepper and Witte 2011, 2093.

⁵⁵⁶ Beeckman 2022b, 10–1, 18.

⁵⁵⁷ Cf. also Kepper and Witte 2011, 2093.

⁵⁵⁸ Dhorme 1967, 270; Heater 1982, 66–7.

⁵⁵⁹ Nömmik 2013, 195.

translated as ἐπίκεισθέ μοι “you (pl.) press upon me, attack me”; since the Hebrew is a *hapax*, it cannot be said with certainty whether translator knew it or not but it is appropriate in the context. BHS identifies some manuscripts where the underlying root could have been חכר “to oppress” (תחכרו) instead of הכר but both would be *hapax legomena* either way.

II: 19:4–5

Style

Verses 4–5 form a strophe made up of a *tetracolon* and a bicolon in Greek. In Hebrew, the strophe is formed of vv. 4–6, because vv. 5 and 6 make up an if-then construction. The strophe begins with an emphatic combination of interjection and adverb in Hebrew (וַאֲף אַמֵּן “and even if truly”) and a very emphasised admission (וַאֲף אַמֵּן “yes indeed, I truly”) in Greek.

The strophe ends with an interjection and causal particle in Greek 5a (ἔα δὲ ὅτι “but alas, because”; Hebrew again has a conditional and an adverb combination אִם אַמֵּן “if indeed”). The strophe also ends with a partial chiasmus in v. 5 (xAB/B’A’C in Greek, reflecting the Hebrew xAB/xB’A’C). In Greek, the end of the strophe is also marked with elevated vocabulary: in 5a, the interjection ἔα “alas!” (considered poetic and is rarely used in prose⁵⁶⁰); and in 5b, the verb ἐνάλλεσθε “you jump against” (25x, LXX: 6, OG Job: 4).

There are a couple of rare words in Hebrew as well: in 4a/5a, the adverb אַמֵּן “truly” (9x, Job: 6), and in 4b, the *hapax* noun מְשׁוּגָתִי (משוגה “error”).

In Hebrew, there are a couple of lexical repetitions: in 4a/5a, the adverb אַמֵּן “truly” (Greek translator opts for variation); a root-repetition in 4ab (שָׁגַתִּי “I erred” and מְשׁוּגָתִי “my error”); and in 5ab (+6b, which is the last verse of the Hebrew strophe), the prepositional phrase לִי “to me”. The Greek translation reflects the root-repetition in 4ab and additionally in 4d: ἐπλανήθην/πλάνος/πλανᾷται (“I have erred”/“error”/“it errs”). Independently, in 4cd, the repetition of ῥῆμα/τὰ δὲ ῥήματα (“a word”/“words”) is created. The repetition of the prepositional phrase in 5ab is reflected with ἐπ’ ἐμοί/μοι. Thus, in Greek, every pair of cola has a separate repetition. These repetitions in Greek distinguish this strophe from the surrounding ones.

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. **In 4a**, the emphatic phrase וַאֲף אַמֵּן “and though truly” is translated with ναι δὲ ἐπ’ ἀληθείας ἐγὼ “yes indeed, I truly”; this turns the statement into a stronger admission than in Hebrew. **In 4b**, the noun מְשׁוּגָתִי “my error” is a *hapax*, but the translator seems to have recognised the root (used in other passages in Job) and translated accordingly with πλάνος “error”, omitting the suffix “my”⁵⁶¹, as it is not strictly needed in Greek. Two cola were added to the strophe, more specifically to v. 4. Firstly, v. 4c λαλῆσαι ῥῆμα,

⁵⁶⁰ Mangin 2005, 509.

⁵⁶¹ See also discussion in Verbeke 2011, 266–7.

ὁ οὐκ ἔδει “to have spoken a word that was not fitting” and secondly v. 4d τὰ δὲ ῥήματα μου πλανᾶται καὶ οὐκ ἐπὶ καιροῦ “and my words err and are inappropriate”. Dhorme thinks that 4cd was partly taken from 15:3, Eliphaz’ speech, while Cox sees it as a “response-citation” of 15:3. Heater and Cox also propose that since the translator already changed the hesitating, hypothetical statement into an admission of error, they wanted to explain the error more specifically.⁵⁶² In 5a, the emphatic phrase אם אמןם “if indeed” is translated with ἔα δὲ ὅτι “but alas, because”; thus the translator opted for variation instead of repetition. Finally, in 5b, ותוכיחו עלי חרפתי “and you judge my reproach against me” is paraphrased into ἐνάλλεσθε δέ μοι ὀνειδέι “and you jump at me with reproach”, omitting the final suffix, as it is not needed anymore.

Vermeulen thinks that v. 4 was added to the speech by *rédacteur* II, because Job admits his guilt (characteristic of *rédaction* II)⁵⁶³. In the Greek translation, this admission is extended and emphasised even further.

III: 19:6–8

Style

Verses 6–8 form a strophe consisting of three bicola in Greek (in Hebrew, the strophes seem to be in vv. 4–6 and 7–8, because 4–6 constitute an if-then construction). The strophe begins with an emphatic imperative in 6a: γινώτε οὖν ὅτι “know then that” in Greek which reflects the Hebrew כִּי אָפּוּ דַעוּ “know then that” (ends the strophe in Hebrew). The interjection הִן in 7a, beginning the strophe in Hebrew, is reflected with ἰδοὺ “look!”. The end of the strophe is marked with a rare word in Greek: the verb περιωκοδόμημαι “I am hemmed in” (περιοικοδομέω) in 8a (34x, LXX: 4, OG Job: 1). This reflects a rare verb in Hebrew.

A couple of rare Hebrew words have been used in this strophe: in 6b, the noun מצוד (מִצּוּד “net”; 4x, Job: 1, Prov: 1); and in 8a, the verb גָּדַר (“to wall up/off”; 10x, Job: 1).

In v. 7, there is a partial symmetry in both Greek (xABCD/A’C’E; marks the middle of the strophe) and Hebrew (xABC/A’C’; marks the beginning of the strophe).

The only significant repetitions in this strophe are of negations: וְלֹא is repeated in 7a/8a and this is reflected in Greek with καὶ οὐ/καὶ οὐ μὴ and καὶ οὐδαμοῦ in 7b.

Text

Changes regarding religion or religious culture and law. In 6a, עוֹתֵנִי “he perverted me, made me crooked” is changed into ἐστὶν ὁ ταραξίας “he is the one who has troubled, disturbed”, omitting the suffix and softening God’s violence⁵⁶⁴. The same is done in 8a, where אֶרְחִי גָדַר וְלֹא אֶעְבֹּר “he has walled up my way, and I

⁵⁶² Dhorme 1967, 271; Heater 1982, 67; Cox 2016a, 67–8; 2022, 639–40.

⁵⁶³ Vermeulen 2015, 128–31, 280.

⁵⁶⁴ Cf. Gard 1953, 184; Gray 1974, 341.

cannot pass” is paraphrased into κύκλω περιωκοδόμημαι καὶ οὐ μὴ διαβῶ “I am hemmed in all around and absolutely cannot pass through”. Although the speech begins with different accusations against God, some of them are softened or changed from explicit to implicit accusations. However, *in 8b*, נתיבותי “my paths” is changed into πρόσωπόν μου “my face”; misreading of consonants does not seem to have happened here. The translation seems more intense and personal—not only has God hemmed Job in, but he has also put darkness around his face/his person, not only his paths.

Reading, vocalising, or understanding the consonantal text differently than the later Masoretes. *In 6b*, the rare noun ומצודו “and his net (?)” is translated with ὀχύρωμα δὲ αὐτοῦ “and his stronghold, fortress”, reading or understanding the noun as ומצודה “and (his) stronghold” or ומצורו “and his fortification”. *In 7a*, הן אצעק חמס ולא אענה “if I cry out ‘Violence’, I am not answered” is translated with ἰδοὺ γελῶ ὀνείδει καὶ οὐ λαλήσω “look, I laugh at reproach, and I will not speak”, suggesting that the translator read (or heard) אצחק “I laugh”; ὀνείδει “at reproach, blame” reflects the changed syntax due to the reading⁵⁶⁵.

Intentional stylistic, syntactic, or rhetorical changes. Based on reading the noun *in 6b* as “fortress”, הקיף “he surrounded” is changed into ὑψωσεν “he raised up”. *In 7b*, ואין “there is no” is paraphrased into οὐδαμοῦ “nowhere”.

Vermeulen thinks that v. 7 is from *rédaction* II. The verse interrupts Job’s statements about God (vv. 6 and 8–11). The verse also begins with the particle הן which he usually attributes to *rédacteur* III (like in 9:11, 12; 12:14, 15; 13:15). However, based on the content which closer matches to Persian-era Hab 1:2 and Jer 20:8, and in the absence of other clues, he places it in *rédaction* II.⁵⁶⁶ The theme of the verse, whether original or later, did not bother the translator. Some differences are due to reading a word slightly differently, but the overall message remains.

IV: 19:9–12

Style

This strophe in vv. 9–12 consists of four *bicola* in Greek, but three *bicola* and a *tricolon* in Hebrew. Thus, the end of the strophe is structurally marked in Hebrew. The beginning of the strophe in v. 9 is marked with a partial chiasmus in both Greek (ABC/C’A’B’) and Hebrew (ABC/xC’A’B’). In Greek, the end of the strophe in v. 12 is marked with rare words: in 12a, the noun τὰ πειρατήρια “gang of pirates” (13x, LXX: 5, OG Job: 3), and in 12b, the adjective ἐγκάθετοι “lying in ambush” (7x, OG Job: 2).

The only significant repetition is that of the noun סביב “around, round about” in MT 10a/12c. This is reflected in Greek with a root-repetition: κύκλω “on all sides, around” in 10a and ἐκύκλωσαν “they encircled” in 12b.

⁵⁶⁵ Cf. also Dhorme 1967, 272–3; Kepper and Witte 2011, 2093.

⁵⁶⁶ Vermeulen 2015, 128–31, 280.

There is a simile in 10b: ויסע בעץ תקותי “he has uprooted my hope like a tree” in Hebrew and ἐξέκοψεν δὲ ὥσπερ δένδρον τὴν ἐλπίδα μου “and he has cut down my hope like a tree” in Greek.

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 9a*, the suffix in כבודי “my glory” is not translated, as it is not strictly necessary. Since v. 9 is in the past, the translator continues this *in v. 10a* and translates the imperfectives יתצני “he breaks me” into διέσπασέν με “he has torn me” and ואלך “and I go” into καὶ ὥχόμην “and I have gone”. *In 10b*, ויסע “and he pulls out” is slightly changed into ἐξέκοψεν δὲ “and he cut down”, very appropriately in the context of trees. *In 12a*, the imperfective יבאו “they go” is translated with the aorist ἦλθον “they went”. Hebrew vv. *12b and c*, ויסלו עלי דרכם ויחנו סביב לאהלי “and they throw up siegeworks against me and they encamp around my tent” have been paraphrased into ἐπ’ ἐμοὶ ταῖς ὁδοῖς μου ἐκύκλωσάν με ἐγκάθετοι “they encircled me on my paths, lying in ambush”. The verb ויסלו “and they throw up” is not translated, דרכם “their ways” is changed into ταῖς ὁδοῖς μου “my ways,” and the phrase ויחנו סביב לאהלי “and they encamp around my tent” is shortened (Dhorme: summarised⁵⁶⁷) into ἐκύκλωσαν ἐγκάθετοι “they encircled, lying in ambush.” Dhont claims that ἐγκάθετοι translates the phrase סביב לאהלי “around my tent”⁵⁶⁸. A simpler explanation is that the last word of the verse, לאהלי “around my tent” has been left untranslated.

Changes regarding religion or religious culture and law. *In 11a*, the Hebrew ויחר עלי אפו “and he kindles his wrath against me” is paraphrased into δεινῶς δέ μοι ὀργῇ ἐχρήσατο “And he has dealt with me terribly in anger”. The Greek is more intensified and shows God being more aggressive than in the Hebrew text.

Vorlage different than the later MT. *In 11b*, ויחשבני לו כצרו “and he counts me as (one of) his adversaries” is translated with ἡγήσατο δέ με ὥσπερ ἐχθρόν “and he has counted me as an enemy” (cf. Vg *quasi hostem suum* and P *חֶסְבִּי*), suggesting that the singular was present in some pre-MT manuscripts. Thus, Dhorme proposes the emending the MT to כצרו “his adversary”⁵⁶⁹. In the context, the singular makes the most sense as it refers to Job himself (him as an enemy). Whichever the *Vorlage* had, the translator omitted the suffix, as it is not strictly needed in Greek.

V. 12 is seen as a later addition by several scholars, for example Kaiser and Fohrer see 12b as a later gloss. Nömmik believes that vv. 10–12 were not part of the oldest layer of the poem and were added later as a late *Fortschreibung*, more specifically relying on the transience redaction. Alternatively, a colon has gone missing from v. 12 (so Witte). Vermeylen thinks that the whole of v. 12 was added to the speech later, possibly in *rédaction* III. It disrupts the structure (tricolon instead of bicolon). The subject is also different from the surrounding verses (God’s troops vs. God in the rest of the verses). He sees possible inspira-

⁵⁶⁷ Dhorme 1967, 275.

⁵⁶⁸ Dhont 2018a, 290n78.

⁵⁶⁹ Dhorme 1967, 274–5.

tion or influence from 30:12b, the motif of God's troops also from 25:3 (*rédaction* III).⁵⁷⁰ The translator paraphrased and shortened v. 12 but it is hard to say whether there were any textual or thematic difficulties behind their decisions.

V: 19:13–15

Style

Verses 13–15 form a strophe consisting of a *tricolon* and two *bicola* in Greek, but three *bicola* in Hebrew. Thus, the beginning of the strophe is marked structurally in Greek. The middle of the strophe is marked with a partial chiasmus in both Greek and Hebrew (AB/xB'A'). In Greek, the strophe is framed with rare words: in 13c, the adjective *ἀνελεήμονες* “merciless” (*ἀνελεήμων*, -ον; 13x, LXX: 11, OG Job: 1), and in 15b, the adjective *ἀλλογενής* “alien” (LXX: 47, OG Job: 2).

There are a couple of lexical repetitions in Hebrew: the participle of the verb “to know” is repeated in 13b (וידעי “and those who know me”) and 14a (ומידעי “and those that I know”) and there is a root-repetition in 13b/15a (זרו “they have become estranged” and לזר “as a stranger”). Neither are reflected in the Greek translation nor are independent repetitions created either.

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 13b*, the phrase וידעי אך זרו ממני “those who know me are wholly estranged from me” is understood as a comparison and thus translated as *ἐγνώσαν ἀλλοτρίους ἢ ἐμέ* “they recognized strangers rather than me”: the participle וידעי “and those who know me” is translated with the finite *ἐγνώσαν* “they knew, recognised”, not reading the conjunction (Orlinsky thinks that the *Vorlage* read ורעי “and my friends”⁵⁷¹); the Hebrew could have been read as a plural finite form. אך has no equivalent in the translation of this colon. *V. 13c* is a whole colon added by the translator: φίλοι δέ μου ἀνελεήμονες γεγόνασιν “and friends of mine became merciless”. Cox thinks that they double-translated verse 19b⁵⁷²; Dhorme, Hartley and LXX.D think that the translator double translated 13b, namely by reading the plural adjective אכזרי “they are cruel” from the Aramaic verb כזר “to feel loathing; to be cruel” which they translated with *ἀνελεήμονες γεγόνασιν*⁵⁷³. Since the translator could read two different meanings into the verse, they translated them both and in doing that created a *tricolon* to the beginning of the strophe. *In 14a*, חדלו קרובי “my relatives have ceased” is translated with οὐ προσεποιήσαντό με οἱ ἐγγύτατοί μου “those closest to me did not lay claim to me, did not admit affinity with me”. The translation equivalent for the verb is not common; the Hebrew was probably understood as “my relatives have ceased to be as such” and this was transformed. These changes in 14a would mean that the translator wanted to emphasise how willingly

⁵⁷⁰ Fohrer 1963, 58, 306–8; Kaiser 2006, 36, 126; Nömmik 2013, 194–6; Vermeylen 2015, 128–31; Witte 2021, 295; Nömmik 2025.

⁵⁷¹ Orlinsky 1964, 73–4.

⁵⁷² Cox 2016a, 62.

⁵⁷³ Dhorme 1967, 275–6; Hartley 1988, 286; Kepper and Witte 2011, 2094.

close people abandoned him. *In 14b*, the participle ומידעי “and those known to me” is changed and extended into καὶ οἱ εἰδότες μου τὸ ὄνομα “and those who know my name”. *In 15a*, גרי ביתי “dwellers of my house” is changed into γείτονες οἰκίας “neighbours of the house”; Cox considers this choice to be due to the translator’s urban environment of neighbourhoods⁵⁷⁴. The strange לזר תחשבני “you (pl. masculine) count me as a stranger” is left untranslated. *In 15b*, בעיניהם “in their eyes” is translated with ἐναντίον αὐτῶν “before them”; however, this is a common equivalent used by the Greek translator⁵⁷⁵.

Vorlage different than the later MT. *In 13a*, ἀδελφοί μου “my brothers” is the subject of the clause, not the object, like in Hebrew. P and 11Q10 interpret the same way⁵⁷⁶. The translator(s) saw הִרְחִיקוּ “they have removed themselves” (Nömmik and Vermeylen suggest emending the MT accordingly⁵⁷⁷) or, as Orlinsky, suggests רָחֲקוּ “they became distant”⁵⁷⁸, taking the *waw* to be part of the verb and not the conjunction in the next word (וידעי), and translated with third person plural ἀπέστησαν in Greek. Thus, God’s direct action is removed. In the context of the strophe, this reading does not imply that God made Job’s acquaintances distant from him but rather that they themselves all distanced themselves. God’s direct action is mentioned in the previous strophe, but starting from this one, it is about the actions of other people against Job.

Vermeylen thinks that v. 13 was added to the speech in *rédaction* II, to comment on 14a. The estrangement of the brothers corresponds to vv. 6:15–20. He considers most of v. 15 to be from *rédaction* III, since the wording of the rest of v. 15 shows Job as a Hellenised Jew, a foreigner for temple-goers. The word בעיניהם with its plural masculine suffix might have followed v. 14 initially.⁵⁷⁹ The translator divided words differently in v. 13 and double-translated consonants that they could give two different interpretations for. In v. 15, the translator left a phrase of two words untranslated, but it cannot be said with certainty. If these were later additions, the translator, knowingly or not, felt some disturbance and made changes.

VI: 19:16–18

Style

Verses 16–18 form a strophe of three bicola in Greek. In Hebrew, the strophes seem to divide rather between vv. 16–17 and 18–20 (all bicola). In Greek, v. 18 begins with a pronoun that is directly linked to v. 17. In Hebrew, the connection is looser and a new topic on those who despise Job is started. The middle of the

⁵⁷⁴ Cox 2023, 252.

⁵⁷⁵ See, for example, Dhont 2018a, 34–6.

⁵⁷⁶ Dhorme 1967, 275; Shepherd 2004, 166.

⁵⁷⁷ Nömmik 2013, 197; Vermeylen 2015, 128–31, 280. However, some caution against emending. Clines 2015, 429 argues against any emendations to plural here as it forms “a link between the actions of God in vv 7–12 and of Job’s acquaintances in vv 13–19”. Witte 2021, 295 advises keeping the MT reading as well, as the singular would have God as its subject.

⁵⁷⁸ Orlinsky 1964, 73–4.

⁵⁷⁹ Vermeylen 2015, 128–31, 280.

strophe is marked with symmetry in Greek (xAC/A'BC'), but the end of the strophe in Hebrew (AB/xA'B'). The end of the strophe is marked with a temporal adverb *ῥταν* “when” in Greek 18b, while Hebrew has an emphatic adverb *גם* “also” in 18a, marking the beginning of the strophe.

Besides numerous repetitions of prepositions, there is the use of homonyms (root *חנן*) in 16b/17b: *אתחנן* “I implore, seek favour” and *וחנתי* “and I was loathsome (?)”. In Greek, the verb “to call” is repeated in its simplex form *ἐκάλεσα* “I called” (16a) and compound form *προσεκαλούμην* “I kept summoning, calling for” (17b).

A couple of marked Hebrew words have been used: in 16b, the preposition *במו* “with” (9x, Job: 5, Ps: 1); in 17a, the *hapax* verb *זרה* (זור “to be loathsome”); in 17b, the *hapax* verb *וחנתי* (חנן “to be loathsome”); and finally, in 18a (next strophe in Hebrew already), the noun *עויל* (עויל “boy”; Job: 3).

The Greek translation has some marked vocabulary as well: in 16b, the Ionic noncontracted form *ἐδέετο* has been used instead of the contracted Attic *ἐδεῖτο*⁵⁸⁰; in 17b, the noun *παλλακίδων* “of concubines” (*παλλακίς*, -ίδος, ἡ; 28x, OG Job: 1); and in 18a, the verb *ἀπεποιήσαντο* “they rejected” (*ἀποποιέω*; 7x, OG Job: 6).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 16b*, *במו פי אתחנן לו* “I plead with him with my mouth” is paraphrased into *στόμα δέ μου ἐδέετο* “my mouth kept pleading”. *In 17a*, the prepositional phrase *לאשתי* “to my wife” is changed into a direct object *τὴν γυναῖκά μου* “my wife”; this is related to another change in the colon, which could have been due to reading the text differently, double translating the previous colon, or due to contextual translation. *In 17b*, the noun *בטני* “of my womb (mother)” is changed into *παλλακίδων μου* “of my concubines”. Orlinsky explains that the reason for this translation choice is simple: “nothing is mentioned about brothers and sisters of Job;” LXX.D confirms as well that this translation avoids contradiction with the prologue⁵⁸¹. *In 18a*, the article *οἱ* “they”, in the place of a pronoun, is added. This links the verse to v. 17. The adverb *גם* “also” is either omitted or represented by the particle *δέ*. *In 18b*, the conjunction *ῥταν* “when” is added, to make explicit the Hebrew cohortative *אקומה* “(if) I get up” (cf. also Vg *cum* “when”).

Reading or vocalising the consonantal text differently than the later Masoretes. Although the verb *in 17b* is usually understood as a *hapax* *חָנַנִי* “I am loathsome”⁵⁸², in the ancient times, it was read and understood as the common *חָנַן* “to implore, beseech” and translated accordingly as *προσεκαλούμην κολακεύων* “I kept summoning, using flattery”⁵⁸³ (so also Vg with *orabam* “I entreated” and P with *אֶשְׁתַּחֲוֶה* “I implored”⁵⁸⁴).

⁵⁸⁰ Mangin 2005, 504.

⁵⁸¹ Orlinsky 1958, 259; Kepper and Witte 2011, 2094.

⁵⁸² See discussion Verbeke 2011, 269–70.

⁵⁸³ Ziegler 1971, 14 categorises it under pleonastic translations.

⁵⁸⁴ Cf. also Szpek 1992, 278.

Problems with the *Vorlage* manuscript. *In 17a*, the phrase רוחי זרה “my breath was repulsive” is translated with the verb ἠκέτευσεν “I kept imploring”, omitting “my breath”. The *hapax* verb could have been read and vocalised differently, e.g. רוחי זָרַה “my breath scatters” (that is, from talking), or רוחי צִיָּח “my breath cries, is shouting” (so Witte), or רוחי גִּרָה “my breath stands in awe, fears” (from גור “to fear”, so Gray); or it is a double translation of אֶתְחַנֵּן from 16b (so Dhorme).⁵⁸⁵ Although the verb זָרַח is a *hapax*⁵⁸⁶, the translator was familiar with the root (see, e.g., 13b where it is translated; however, in 15a it is left untranslated); still, contextual translation cannot be ruled out. In 11Q10, 17a is preserved and reads רוח המכת לאנתתי “I lowered/bowed (my) spirit before my wife”⁵⁸⁷, differing from the Hebrew, but agreeing more with the Greek. Thus, some ancient translators vocalised or read the text differently, suggesting some readability issues in the pre-MT manuscripts. *In 18a*, the noun עוֹלָמִים “young children” is read as עולמים “eternities” or עולם “eternity” (so Dhorme, LXX.D, and Seow⁵⁸⁸) and thus the translation εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα “for all time, eternity”. The Vg translates *stulti* “fools” reading אֹלִים “fools,” 11Q10 and P translate רשעין and חֹסֵה “the wicked (pl.)” respectively⁵⁸⁹. Thus, it is reasonable to think that this word was written badly or was corrupted in the pre-MT manuscripts.

Vermeulen thinks that v. 17 was added in *rédaction* II because it interrupts the theme of the contempt that Job is subjected to. He compares it to *rédaction* II vv. 2:5–7 (Job’s faltering physical health) and 2:8 (the only other passage that properly mentions Job’s wife).⁵⁹⁰ The translator paraphrased and possibly read and/or vocalised the text differently in this verse. However, based on OG, we cannot assume anything about the secondary nature of the verse.

VII: 19:19–20

Style

Verses 19–20 form a strophe of two bicola in Greek whereas the Hebrew strophe is formed of vv. 18–20. Both of the verses in Greek have a parallelistic structure, while in Hebrew, the middle of the strophe is marked with one: in v. 19, there is a chiasmus both in Greek (AB/B’A’) and in Hebrew (AB/xB’A’), in v. 20, there is a partial chiasmus in Greek (ABC/C’A’B’).

The only significant lexical repetition in this strophe is in Hebrew 20ab, marking the end of the strophe: בְּעוֹרִי “in/to my skin” and בְּעוֹר “in/by the skin”. A lesser repetition is that of בִּי at the end of vv. 18a/b/19b (this is reflected in Greek, but Greek generally has the personal pronoun in every colon at least once). In 19a, the phrase מִתֵּי סוּדִי “men of my circle” is considered poetic by BDB.

⁵⁸⁵ Dhorme 1967, 277; Gray 1974, 374; Witte 2021, 304.

⁵⁸⁶ See discussion in Verbeke 2011, 268–9.

⁵⁸⁷ García Martínez et al. 1998, 91–3.

⁵⁸⁸ Dhorme 1967, 278; Kepper and Witte 2011, 2094; Seow 2011, 66.

⁵⁸⁹ Cf. also García Martínez et al. 1998, 91–3.

⁵⁹⁰ Vermeulen 2015, 128–31, 280.

Text

Utilising the context or the translator's previous knowledge for the meaning of unknown words. In 19a, כל מתי סודי “all the men of my counsel” is translated with οἱ εἰδότες με “those who knew me”. Based on the other occurrences of מתי in Job, it looks like the translator did not know the word and used contextual translation and paraphrase each time. In 20b, the *hapax* verb ואתמלטה “and I escape”⁵⁹¹ is rendered with ἔχεται “it holds, owns”; Cox considers this a verb that completes the sentence while Seow proposes that the translator associated the consonants with מלט “cement”⁵⁹². It is likely that the translator used a general verb that suited the context.

Vorlage different than the later MT. In 20a, ובבשרי דבקה “and in my flesh it cleaves, sticks”, the verb is read as רקבה (from רקב “to rot”) and thus translated ἐσάπησαν αἱ σάρκες μου “my fleshs rotted”⁵⁹³. Cf. Vg *pellī meae consumptis* “the flesh being consumed,” suggesting that some pre-MT manuscripts might have had this reading. Rotting of the flesh and the accompanying smell would explain quite well why some of Job’s acquaintances would abhor him.

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics, although sometimes motivated by the abovementioned factors. In 20b, the common singular עצמי “my bones” (Hebrew 20a) is translated as τὰ δὲ ὀστέα μου “my bones”. The dual שני “my two (rows of) teeth” is translated with plural ἐν ὀδοῦσι “in teeth.” The repeating בעור “in/with skin” is omitted. This changes the meaning of the verse: in Hebrew, the bones stick to skin and flesh, and Job has escaped by the skin of this teeth, whereas in Greek, Job’s flesh rots under his skin and his bones are held in his teeth. The translator, therefore, understood the cola to divide differently in this verse.

With the support of OG translation, Dhorme proposes to change the reading of 20a into בעורי בשרי רקב and 20b into עצמי ואתמלטה בשני instead of the MT. Van der Lugt, on the other hand, supports the reading בעור בשרי “with the skin of my flesh” in 20a. Witte advises removing בשרי for colometric reasons and Fohrer considers ובבשרי a later gloss. Vermeylen thinks that v. 20 was added later to the speech, in *rédaction* II. It is in first person, similar to v. 7. Since the theme is again physical health, it could be a commentary to v. 22. Similarly to v. 17 it corresponds to 2:5–7.⁵⁹⁴ This verse was probably very slightly different in the *Vorlage* of OG; however, the rest of the differences are due to intentional differences and contextual translation. Basing an emendation purely on OG cannot be justified in this case as the other versions agree more with the MT.

⁵⁹¹ See discussion in Verbeke 2011, 270–1.

⁵⁹² Seow 2013, 821; Cox 2016a, 68.

⁵⁹³ Cf. also Dhorme 1967, 279; Cox 2009, 668; Kepper and Witte 2011, 2094. “Flesh” is usually used in the plural in the OG translation.

⁵⁹⁴ Fohrer 1963, 307–8; Dhorme 1967, 279–80; van der Lugt 1995, 218; Vermeylen 2015, 128–31, 280; Witte 2021, 296.

VIII: 19:21–24

Style

Verses 21–24 form a strophe consisting of two bicola and a *tricolon* in Greek, and four bicola in Hebrew. The end of the strophe is thus marked structurally in Greek. The strophe begins with an emphatic imperative and address: חנני חנני רעי אתם “Have pity on me, have pity on me, my friends!” in Hebrew and ἐλεήσατέ με, ἐλεήσατέ με, ὦ φίλοι “Pity me, pity me, o friends!” in Greek. Other transition markers, especially marked questions, are seen in almost every colon in both languages.

In Greek, the end of the strophe is also marked with a partial symmetry in v. 23 (xABC/B’C’DE in Greek and AxCD/A’BD’ in Hebrew). In Greek, v. 24b is partially chiasmic with both 23a and 23b (xABC/B’C’DE/xD’A’). Further, the last verse in Greek has marked vocabulary: in 24b, the verb ἐγγλυφῆναι “to engrave” (ἐγγλύφω; 15x, LXX: 2, OG Job: 1), and in 23a, the potential optative ἂν δῶη is used, which could show an aim at a higher register of Greek⁵⁹⁵.

The strophe begins with an emphatic repetition of the imperative חנני חנני “have pity on me, have pity on me!” in Hebrew and ἐλεήσατέ με, ἐλεήσατέ με “pity me, pity me!” in Greek. In Hebrew, the only other repetition, besides those of prepositions/suffixes, is that of the expression מי יתן “oh that (who can give?)” in 23ab. In Greek, there is the repetition of the causal γὰρ “for” in 21b/23a. Lastly, in 21b/22a, there is the repetition of κυρίου “of the Lord” and ὁ κύριος “the Lord”.

A couple of marked Hebrew words have been used in this strophe: in 23a, the noun מלי (מלה) “my words” is considered poetic by BDB; in 24a, the noun בעט (עט “stylus”; 4x, Job: 1, Ps: 1), and the noun עפרת (עפרת “lead”; 9x, Job: 1).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. **In 21a**, the phrase אתם רעי “you, my friends” is properly Hellenised into a vocative ὦ φίλοι “oh friends!”. **In 21b**, the Hebrew phrase נגעה בי “it has touched me” (perfective and a prepositional phrase) is paraphrased into ἡ ἀψαμένη μου ἐστίν “is the one that has touched me” (participle + to-be and pronoun). **In 22a**, the emphatic καὶ “as well” is added. **In 22b**, the phrase ומבשרי “and of/from my flesh” is translated as ἀπὸ δὲ σαρκῶν μου “and of/from my flesh” and thus is awkward in Greek, as the preposition ἀπὸ is not usually used with the verb ἐμπίπασθε and a simple genitive would suffice. **In 23a**, the particle אפוא “then, now” is translated with the particle γὰρ “for”. The niphil imperfective ויכתבון “and they are written” is translated into the aorist passive infinitive γραφῆναι “to be written,” which is syntactically appropriate with the phrase τίς ἂν δῶη (translated directly). **In 23b**, the repeated מי יתן “who would give” is omitted (so also P⁵⁹⁶, but Vg opts for variation instead of repetition). The hophal verb ויחקו “and they are inscribed” is again translated with an infinitive τεθῆναι δὲ αὐτὰ “them to be put.” The phrase εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα “for eternity”

⁵⁹⁵ Dhont 2018a, 149–51.

⁵⁹⁶ Szpek 1992, 163. She does not mention that the omission is similar to OG.

is taken from Hebrew 24b (לעד). *In 24b*, the conjunction ה “or” is added (so also Vg). The singular בצור “in the rock” is translated into plural ἐν πέτραις “in rocks.” Finally, the niphil imperfective יחצבון “they are engraved” is once again translated with an infinitive ἐγγλῡφῆναι “to be engraved,” making the three cola into a syntactically whole tricolon.

Translator’s limited vocabulary. *V. 24a* with two very rare nouns (בעט ברזל) “with an iron pen and lead”) is not translated (asterisked). As a result, the final verse of the strophe is a tricolon.

According to Vermeylen, vv. 23–24 were added later to the speech which originally ended with vv. 21–22. He finds them comparable to 16:18 (*rédaction* II; Job’s hope in God).⁵⁹⁷ The translator omitted a colon with rare words but otherwise made only stylistic and syntactic changes, thus neither the form nor the topic were disagreeable for them.

IX: 19:25–27

Style

Verses 25–27 make up a strophe of a *monocolon*, bicolon, and tricolon in Greek; but two bicola and a tricolon in Hebrew. Thus, in Hebrew, the end of the strophe is clearly marked while in Greek, the structural framing is a bit more ambiguous.

The strophe begins with an emphatic personal pronoun and verb in first person: ואני ידעתי “and I know” in Hebrew and with a causal and the same verb: οἶδα γὰρ ὅτι “for I know that” in Greek. In the last verse, in 27a, emphasised personal pronouns are used: לִי ... אֲשֶׁר אֲנִי “whom I ... on my side” and ἐγὼ ἐμαυτῷ “things I in myself”. Besides the structural element and transition markers, the end is also marked with a partial symmetry in v. 27ab: Greek ABC/A’B’C’D and Hebrew ABC/xB’C’D.

There are several lexical repetitions in Hebrew: the personal pronoun אני “I” in 25a/27a (essentially frames the strophe); a root-repetition in 25b/26a (ואחרון) “and in the end, and at the last” and ואחר “and after”); the verb אחזה “I see” in 26b/27a.

Greek has a couple of repetitions as well: the causal γὰρ “for” in 25/26b; the phrase μοι συντετέλεσθη “they have been accomplished on me” and μοι συντετέλεσται “they have come for me” in 26b/27c; and in 27ab, the relative pronoun ἃ “which things”. Thus, both have repetitions, however non-overlapping.

The Hebrew has one rare word in 26a, namely the verb נקפו (נקף “to strike”; 3x, Job: 1). In 26b/27a, the verb אחזה (חזה) “I see, behold” is considered mostly poetic by BDB.

The Greek translator has used a couple of marked words: in 26a, the verb ἀναντλοῦν “to endure patiently” is in the same position as a rare verb in Hebrew

⁵⁹⁷ Vermeylen 2015, 128–31, 280.

(ἀνατλάω; 27x, OG Job: 1; it is considered literary Koine⁵⁹⁸); and in 27a, the verb συνεπίσταμαι “to know perfectly well” (11x, OG Job: 2).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. **In v. 25**, ואני ידעתי “and I know”, with the emphatic pronoun, is paraphrased into οἶδα γὰρ ὅτι “for I know that”. The participle גאלי “my redeemer” is paraphrased into ὁ ἐκλύειν με μέλλων “the one who wants to set me free” and ואחרון חיי “is alive and later” in Hebrew v. **25a/b** is changed into ἀέναός ἐστιν “he is everflowing”. **In 26a**, ואחר “and after” is omitted intentionally or accidentally due to it being very similar to ואחרון in the previous colon. ἀναστήσαι⁵⁹⁹ “to raise up” translates יקום “he stands” from 25b⁶⁰⁰, continuing v. 25 (“he who wants to set me free and raise up”). **In 27a**, the verb אחזה “I see” is emphasised into συνεπίσταμαι “I know perfectly”. **In 27b**, the dual+plural ראיני “and my eyes see” is translated with a relative clause and changed into singular ἃ ὁ ὀφθαλμός μου ἑώρακεν “that my eye has seen”. This creates a repetition-initial (ἃ) with 27a.

Utilising the context or the translator's previous knowledge for the meaning of unknown words. **In 26a**, עורי נקפו זאת “they have destroyed this (my) skin”, where the verb is very rare, is translated with τὸ δέρμα μου τὸ ἀνατλῶν ταῦτα “my skin that endures these things”. The P translator understood the consonants to be from the verb נקף “to go around” and thus translated as ܢܩܦܝܢ “they go around.”⁶⁰¹ Vg translates with *russum circumdabor pelle mea* “I shall be clothed again with my skin.” Whether it truly is an error or the rare verb was simply not understood, the translators came up with something suitable for the context.

Problems with the Vorlage manuscript? **In 26b**, the translator used παρὰ γὰρ κυρίου ταῦτά μοι συνετελέσθη “for these things have been accomplished on me by the Lord” to replace the Hebrew ומבשרי אחזה אלוה “In my flesh I will see God”. Dhorme and Terrien posit that the translator read ומשדי “and from Shadday” and Dhorme, Terrien and Seow that they read אלה “these”⁶⁰². This translation connects back to the beginning of the speech (v. 3, v. 6). Both P and Vg deviate from the MT slightly; perhaps, some pre-MT manuscripts had some issues here. **In 27c**, כלו כליתי “my kidneys have failed” could have possibly been read as כול כליתי “all got fulfilled for me” and thus translated πάντα δέ μοι συνετελέσται “and all of them have come an end for me”⁶⁰³. The personal suffix in בחקי “in my bosom” is not translated. Both P and Vg paraphrase a bit, suggesting that perhaps some pre-MT manuscripts were hard to read.

Nömmik thinks that vv. 25–27 were not part of the oldest layer of the poem and that they were a late *Fortschreibung*, related to apocalyptic literature. These

⁵⁹⁸ Mangin 2005, 488.

⁵⁹⁹ LXX^{Z1}: ἀναστήσαι.

⁶⁰⁰ Vg translates 25b as *in novissimo de terra surrecturus sim* “and in the last day I shall rise out of the earth”.

⁶⁰¹ Szpek 1992, 278.

⁶⁰² Terrien 1963, 153; Dhorme 1967, 284–5; Seow 2011, 67.

⁶⁰³ Seow 2013, 827.

verses give a new theological nuance to the speech. The editor who added these verses was already aware of God's speeches and God's verdict at the end of the book. The verses also have similarities with some later added verses in Psalms (49:16 and 73:24–26). Kaiser sees vv. 25b₂–26 (most of 25b, to be precise) as a later eschatological gloss. Fohrer and Witte, however, think that a part of v. 27 could have gone missing, for example a colon from the end. Vermeylen assigns vv. 23–29 to *rédaction* II.⁶⁰⁴ It seems as though the translator, whether due to reading or due to the context of this speech in general, found it necessary to connect vv. 25 and 26 back to vv. 3 and 6, while the end of v. 27 was read differently. Perhaps the Hebrew, possibly added later to the speech, was too optimistic when compared to the beginning of the speech.

X: 19:28–29

Style

Verses 28–29 form the final strophe of the speech, consisting of a bicolon and tricolon in Hebrew, but two bicola in Greek. Thus, the end of the strophe and consequently the speech, is structurally marked in Hebrew. The strophe begins with a conditional in 28a (כי in Hebrew, the particle is repeated in 29b in a causal meaning, and εἰ δὲ καὶ in Greek) and ends with the particle למען “so that” in Hebrew and a temporal καὶ τότε “and then” in Greek.

In Hebrew, there are a couple of lexical repetitions: in 28a/29b, the particle כי “if; for”; and in 29ab, the end-repetition of the noun חרב “sword”. The only significant repetition in Greek is in the first colon (28a), marking the beginning of the strophe: ἐρεῖτε “you will say” and ἐροῦμεν “we will/shall say”.

In 29a, a rare Hebrew word has been used: the verb גורו (גור “to dread”; 10x, Job: 2, Ps: 2). The Greek translator has used a rare word as well: in 29a, the noun ἐπικαλύμματος “of that which is placed over something else and covers it; metaphorically: deception” (29x, LXX: 4, OG Job: 1).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. In 28a, the conditional כי “if” is extended into εἰ δὲ καὶ “and even if”. The question מה נרדף לו “how will we pursue him” is changed into τί ἐροῦμεν ἐναντὶ αὐτοῦ “what will we say in front of him?” V. 28b, ושרש דבר נמצא בי “And the root of the matter is found in me” is not translated. Fohrer thinks that the abridgement is to avoid accusations towards Job. Gorea thinks that the translator got impatient and left the redundant part untranslated⁶⁰⁵. Both opinions can be explained with the translator's overall activities. With the support of the versions, Dhorme and Witte emend the MT בי into בו in 28b. Van der Lugt, however, after rigorous rhetorical analysis claims that MT is correct, and Clines argues also that the MT can be understood without

⁶⁰⁴ Fohrer 1963, 58, 307, 309; Kaiser 2006, 37, 126; Nömmik 2013, 198–9; Vermeylen 2015, 128–31, 180–2, 280, 327; Witte 2021, 297, 299; Nömmik 2025.

⁶⁰⁵ Fohrer 1963, 56, 309; Gorea 2007, 56–7.

emending⁶⁰⁶. *In 29a*, the imperative גורו לכם “be afraid for yourselves!” is paraphrased into εὐλαβήθητε δὴ καὶ ὑμεῖς “and you as well, beware!”. The noun חרב “sword” is changed into ἐπικαλύμματος “cover, veil.” Gorea is of the opinion that ἐπικαλύμματος actually reflects ושרש דבר from the omitted 28b⁶⁰⁷. *In 29b*, the noun חרב עונות “iniquities of the sword” is translated with into ἐπὶ ἀνόμους ἐπελεύσεται “it will come upon the lawless”; the repeating חרב “sword”, which was previously paraphrased, is omitted. *In 29c*, למען “for the purpose of” is changed into καὶ τότε “and then”. The verb תדעון “you will know” is changed into γνώσονται “they will know,” connecting with ἐπὶ ἀνόμους, not with Job’s friends.

Reading, vocalising, or understanding the consonantal text differently than the later Masoretes. *In 29c*, ποῦ ἔστιν αὐτῶν ἡ ὕλη “where is their forest/material” might be the result of reading the Hebrew as שדי “field, land”. LXX.D proposes that the translator understood the Hebrew as consisting of two words: the relative particle ש and די “sufficiency”⁶⁰⁸; however, the relative particle in this form does not appear anywhere else in Job⁶⁰⁹.

These verses are thought to have been a later addition, commentary, or gloss (Nömmik: eschatological gloss). Reasons are seen in breaking of the strophic scheme, new addressing of friends, lexical peculiarities, and eschatology (Kaiser, Witte). Kaiser thinks that especially 29c is an eschatological gloss. Witte thinks that this addition was added either in stage six as an eschatological gloss or even later, in the final stage (stage seven). The verses may belong to the righteousness redaction: they introduce a criminal judgment that is unusual for the speeches of Job but also have similarities with 24:17b–24 (also from righteousness redaction). Similarities are also seen with 12:4–6 and 17:8–10. The eschatology in these verses is not seen in the older stratum of Job, according to Witte. The verses are also not connected to the previous ones as harmoniously as is usual and they disrupt the regular strophic structure of the speech. Witte also adds that several Aramaisms are used. Vermeylen assigns vv. 23–29 to *rédaction II*.⁶¹⁰ The OG translator noticed the peculiarities in these verses and made some adjustments, mostly intentionally.

⁶⁰⁶ Dhorme 1967, 286–7; van der Lugt 1995, 217–29; Clines 2015, 435; Witte 2021, 297.

⁶⁰⁷ Gorea 2007, 56–7.

⁶⁰⁸ Kepper and Witte 2011, 2095.

⁶⁰⁹ Nömmik 2013, 199–200; Seow 2013, 828. Other possibilities are compactly discussed in Verbeke 2011, 271–3.

⁶¹⁰ Witte 1994a, 188–9, 191–2; Kaiser 2006, 38, 126; van Oorschot 2007, 171–84; Nömmik 2013, 199–200; Vermeylen 2015, 128–31, 180–2, 280, 327; Witte 2021, 57–9, 297, 299, 312–3; Nömmik 2025.

JOB 21

Introduction

Job 21 contains Job's sixth reply: *Job wants his friends to listen and to understand that his feelings are legitimate. The impious are prospering but let them be no more! They will suffer and die. My friends have not consoled me at all.*

In the OG translation, Job 21 divides into eight strophes:

I (21:2–3, 2B) *Address: listen to me!*

II (21:4–6, 3B) *Why should I not be disturbed? It is too painful to remember.*

III (21:7–10, 4B) *Why are the impious growing old and prospering?*

IV (21:11–14, 4B) *The impious and their children will be joyful until death, even when they reject God.*

V (21:16–18, 1B1T1B) *They were well off; but no more! The impious shall be put to death!*

VI (21:19–22, 1T1B) *Curses against the impious: God will make it happen.*

VII (21:24–26, 3B) *The impious person(s) will die.*

VIII (21:27, 34, 1M1B) *Conclusion: you, my friends, have not consoled me at all.*

A few examples of repeating **keywords** are the God-names אֱל in 21:14, 22, אֱלֹהִים in 21:9, 19, and שׁוּדִי in 21:15, 20, reflected in Greek with κύριος in 21:9.14.20.22; רשע “wicked” in 21:7, 16, 17, 28, reflected in Greek with ἀσεβής “impious”. In Hebrew, the speech is essentially framed with אָדָם “man” in 21:4, 33, while in Greek only v. 4 is translated.

The **Greek text** has asterisked material, namely vv. 21:15, 19b, 21, 23, 28–33. V. 27 has been preserved as a monocolon. The length of these strophes is again varied, ranging from three cola (the last strophe) up to eight. Still, the speech is framed with shorter strophes, whereas the strophes in between are at least five cola in length. Some strophes of the Greek speech have very little to no commonalities with those in Hebrew in terms of delimitation, thus special care needs to be taken in the critical analysis of those in particular.

The Hebrew text of Job 21 is thought to have been already in the original Job-poem. However, some scholars think that 21:17 (either fully or only 17c), 22, and 33c were later glosses. There is no general consensus on any of these. Again, opinions on the secondary nature of other verses differ.

More specifically, according to Witte, most of Job 21 was part of the original Job-poem (Hiobdichtung A): 21:1–17b, 18–21, 23–34* were original. In his 2021 commentary he categorises vv. 17c, and 33c as glosses and v. 22 as a later addition.⁶¹¹

⁶¹¹ Witte 1994a, 130–8, 169–71, 191–2; 2021, 57–9, 330–3, 335–6.

According to Nömmik's theory, vv. 21:2–15, 17a–b, 18, 27–33b, 34 belonged to the source, to the earliest layer of the speech. In the first stage of redactions, the book editor added 21:1. In the fifth layer of redactions (the transience redactions) vv. 23–26 were added; v. 24 is influenced also by 20:11a, v. 26a by 20:11b, and v. 26 by 7:21c. Vv. 19–22 are a late *Fortschreibung* on justice. Finally, glosses that cannot be dated are vv. 16, 17c, 33c. In its original form, the speech consisted of six strophes, each consisting of four bicola: 21:2–5, 6–9, 10–13, 14–15 + 17–18*, 27–30, 31–34*.⁶¹²

Van Oorschot considers this speech to be wholly from the original poetic dialogue of Job⁶¹³. Syring also thinks that all of Job 21 was part of the original poem, except the prose introduction 21:1, added in the first redaction⁶¹⁴.

Kaiser thinks that the original poem had vv. 21:2–15, 17–21, 23–33b, 34, to which were later added the introductory 21:1 by the book editor and vv. 21:16, 22, 33c as glosses⁶¹⁵.

Vermeylen thinks that the oldest version of Job 21 (*rédaction* I) included vv. 2–3a, 4b–9, 11–14, 22–26, 34. In *rédaction* III, vv. 3b–4, 10, 16–21, 27–33 were added. In *rédaction* IV, 21:15 was inserted.⁶¹⁶

I: 21:2–3

Style

Verses 21:2–3 form an introductory strophe consisting of two bicola. The strophe/speech begins with an intensive imperative in 2a: שמעו שמעו “listen carefully!” in Hebrew and Ἀκούσατε ἀκούσατέ “listen, listen!” in Greek. The strophe also ends with an imperative in 3a: שאוני “bear with me!” in Hebrew and ἄρατέ με “lift me up!” in Greek. It has to be mentioned, that other words and phrases that function as transition markers can be found in this short strophe.

Additionally, in Hebrew 3ab, there is a root-repetition of אדבר “I will speak” and דברי “my speaking”; this is not reflected by the translator, and variation has been opted for.

There are a couple of marked words in Hebrew: in 2a, the noun מלתי (מלה) “my words” is considered poetic by BDB; in 2b, the noun תנחומתיכם (תנחום) “consolation”; 5x, Job: 2, Ps: 1); and in 3b, the verb תלעג (לעג) “you mock on” is also considered poetic by BDB.

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. In 2a, the Hebrew infinite absolute construction שמעו שמעו “listen carefully” has been translated with a double imperative Ἀκούσατε ἀκούσατέ “listen, listen!”. The common singular מלתי “my speech” is translated into plural μου τῶν λόγων “my words” (cf. Vg *sermones*

⁶¹² Nömmik 2013, 27–9, 203–9; 2025; 2026.

⁶¹³ van Oorschot 2007, 171–84.

⁶¹⁴ Syring 2004, 168–73.

⁶¹⁵ Kaiser 2006, 126.

⁶¹⁶ Vermeylen 2015, 131–4, 180–2, 322–3, 348.

meos). **V. 2b**, ותהי זאת תנחומתיכם “and let this be your consolation” is paraphrased into the opposite ἵνα μὴ ᾗ μοι παρ’ ὑμῶν αὕτη ἡ παράκλησις “lest this be a consolation from you for me” and the little that is left of this colon in the 11Q10 also has לִי “for me”⁶¹⁷. Job is denying his friends’ current consolations and tries to convince them. By the MT reading, Job would comfort his friends, not the other way around. **In 3b**, the phrase ואחר “and after” is changed into עִתָּה “then”, while omitting the phrase דברי “my word, speech”, as it is no longer needed.

Vorlage different than the later MT. **In 3b**, the inappropriate second person singular תלעִיג “you mock” is translated with the second person plural οὐ καταγελάσετε “you will not laugh” (cf. Vg; it is likely that 11Q10 had second person plural as well⁶¹⁸). Since Job is conversing with several friends, the plural makes sense in the context. Thus, Witte claims that these versions actually read תלעִיגו (Terrien: that the OG translator read) and he suggests the MT should be emended accordingly⁶¹⁹. Vermeylen thinks that 3b is secondary (*rédaction* III) due to this inconsistency in using the second person (plural in 3a and singular in 3b). Second person singular is also in 12:7–8 and 16:3 which were added by *rédacteur* III.⁶²⁰ However, since some ancient versions have translated the second person plural, seeing it in some pre-MT manuscripts, there is a possibility that the singular is the result of inattentive copyists not a redactor.

II: 21:4–6

Style

Verses 4–6 form a strophe consisting of three bicola. The strophe begins in v. 4 with double questions: האנכי “do I?” (the pronoun is also in the emphatic position) and ואם מדוע “but why?” in Hebrew, and τί γάρ; μὴ “What? Is not?” and ἢ διὰ τί “or why?” in Greek. The strophe ends with a causal in 6a (ואם “and if” in Hebrew, ἐάν τε γάρ “and for if” in Greek). A couple of marked words have been used: in Hebrew 6b, the noun פִּלְצוֹת “shuddering” (4x, Job: 1, Ps: 1); in Greek 4a, the noun ἡ ἐλεγχίς “judgment, questioning” (23x, OG Job: 2: twice in OG Job); and in 5a, the verb εἰσβλέψαντες “observing visually and carefully” (14x, LXX: 3, OG Job: 2).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. **In 4a**, the Hebrew האנכי “Do I?” is translated with τί γάρ; μὴ “So what? Is ...?” (the pronoun is omitted), marking the beginning of the strophe with a marked question. The phrase לאדם “against man” is changed into ἀνθρώπου “of a man.” **In 4b**, the Hebrew ואם מדוע “but why?” is translated with ἢ διὰ τί “or why?”. The phrase לא תקצר רוּחִי “my soul is not impatient, short” is combined into οὐ θυμωθήσομαι “I will not be pro-

⁶¹⁷ See, García Martínez et al. 1998, 96–96.

⁶¹⁸ García Martínez et al. 1998, 96–96.

⁶¹⁹ Terrien 1963, 161; Witte 2021, 330.

⁶²⁰ Vermeylen 2015, 131–4.

voked, angry,” which in itself contains the root θυμός “soul, spirit; rage, anger.” *In 5a*, the Hebrew imperatives פנו אלי והשמו “look at me and be appalled!” are paraphrased into εἰσβλέψαντες εἰς ἐμὲ θαυμάσατε “marvel, looking at me!”. *In 5b*, again, the Hebrew פה על יד ושימו “and lay your hand upon your mouth” (referring to keeping silent) is paraphrased with a participle into χεῖρα θέντες ἐπὶ σιαγόνι “laying your hand on your cheek” (referring to amazement, thus matching with the imperative in 5a). σιαγών “cheek” translates the Hebrew לחי in all other occurrences in the LXX, the equivalence here is unique⁶²¹. *In 6a*, the causal conjunction γὰρ “for” is added. The conjunction ו “and” in ונבהלתי “and I am dismayed” is not translated. *In 6b*, the singular בשרי “my flesh” is, as usual, translated with the plural μου τὰς σάρκας “my fleshs”.

Reading, vocalising, or understanding the consonantal text differently than the later Masoretes. *In 6b*, the singular ואחז “it grasps, takes hold of” is translated with the plural ἔχουσιν “they hold” because the rare Hebrew word פלצות “shuddering” is interpreted contextually as ὀδύνας “pains”.

Vermeylen thinks that since 3b was added later by *rédacteur* III, so must have been 4a, otherwise the regular structure of the speech would be disrupted too much. 4a makes, in his opinion, sense as coming from *rédacteur* III—it rather attacks God. The emphatic אנכי is borrowed from 3a.⁶²² It was already established that the inconsistencies in 3b were due to later copyists not redactors. V. 4a in Greek reflects only stylistic changes, typical for the OG translator. Thus, based on simply the OG translation, Vermeylen’s claim cannot be neither confirmed nor rejected.

III: 21:7–10

Style

Verses 7–10 form a strophe consisting of four bicola. The strophe begins with a why-question in verse 7 (מדוע in Hebrew and διὰ τί in Greek).

In Greek, the beginning of the strophe is marked with non-parallelism, whereas Hebrew displays a xOxO pattern of parallelistic structures: in v. 8, the Greek has symmetry (AB/A'B'), whereas the Hebrew has partial symmetry (ABCD/xA'C'); in v. 9, there is a partial symmetry in Greek (ABCD/C'D'); and finally in v. 10, there is a partial symmetry in Greek (BC/AB'x'C') and a partial chiasmus Hebrew (ABC/B'A'C').

Rare vocabulary frames the strophe in Hebrew (in 7b, the verb עתק “to proceed”; 9x, Job: 5, Ps: 1, Prov: 1), and in 10a, the verb יגעל “to abhor”; 10x, Job: 1)) and marks the end in Greek (in 10a, the *hapax* verb οὐκ ὠμοτόκησεν “it did not suffer miscarriage” (ὠμοτοκέω)).

The strophe ends with the triple repetition of negation in the last three cola (9b, 10ab): ולא in Hebrew and οὐκ in Greek.

⁶²¹ Muraoka 2010, 106.

⁶²² Vermeylen 2015, 131–4.

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. **In 7b**, the phrase עתקו גם גברו חיל “they reach old age and grow mighty in power” is shortened into πεπαλαίωνται δὲ καὶ ἐν πλούτῳ “and they grow old even in wealth”. **In 8a**, זרעם נכון לפניהם, עמם “their offspring are established in front of them with them” is paraphrased into ὁ σπόρος αὐτῶν κατὰ ψυχὴν “their seed is according to their soul (desire?)”. Dhorme and Hartley suggest that the translator actually read לנפשם in the Hebrew; Hartley even says that the *Vorlage* read like that. Witte, with the support of some versions including OG, suggests deleting עמם “with them” from 8a as it is redundant/a duplicate and makes the verse colometrically too long⁶²³. However, this type of paraphrase is not out of character for the translator. **In 8b**, the suffix הם- “their” in לעיניהם is not translated, as it is not strictly necessary in Greek. **In 9b**, the phrase ולא שבט אלוה עליהם “and no rod of God upon them” is paraphrased into μᾶστιξ δὲ παρὰ κυρίου οὐκ ἔστιν ἐπ’ αὐτοῖς “and no scourge from the Lord is upon them”.

Vorlage different than the later MT. **In 9a**, the Hebrew שלום מפחד “they are safe from fear” is paraphrased and extended into εὐθηνουσιν, φόβος δὲ οὐδαμοῦ “they prosper, fear is nowhere” (Vg paraphrases as well: *securae sunt et pacatae* “they are secure and peaceable”). Witte thinks that the noun שלום could be emended, with the support of OG and Vg, into שלמו (verb, third person plural)⁶²⁴. The word was read as a verb also in 5:24a, 15:21b, and 25:2b suggesting that the OG *Vorlage* was different in terms of the placement or existence of the *waw* in the word. Greek **v. 10a** (ἡ βοῦς αὐτῶν οὐκ ὠμοτόκησεν “their cow did not miscarry”) translates Hebrew 10b תפלט פרתו ולא תשכל “their cow calves and never miscarries”) rather than 10a שורו עבר ולא יגעל “their bull breeds and does not fail”); however, the first verb of 10b is omitted. Since the translator already translated “their cow” in 10a, they used a synonym **in 10b**: ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσα “the one who has in stomach = the pregnant one”. Witte proposes that the translator may have read the participle הרז “his pregnant one” (הרה “to be/become pregnant”) instead of the MT פרתו “his cow;” Breeckman also considers the possibility that the translator’s *Vorlage* was similar to 11Q10, which reads הריתהון פל]טה “their pregnant (cow) calves” or “the one of them that is pregnant calves”⁶²⁵. This would explain the translation of both Greek and Aramaic. **In 10b**, Witte and Cox think that the translator might have misread ולא תשכל at the end of 10b, understanding the root כשל “to stumble, stagger” and thus translated with καὶ οὐκ ἔσφαλεν “and she did not falter”⁶²⁶. The translation of ולא תשכל as both οὐκ ὠμοτόκησεν and οὐκ ἔσφαλεν would be understandable as well and corresponds to the translator’s range of strategies. Since the translator for some reason chose to translate 10b twice and chose synonyms for the subjects, it stands to reason that they also chose synonyms for the verbs. However, since what remains of 11Q10 is similar to OG and Vg also translates both cola synonymously and

⁶²³ Dhorme 1967, 310; Hartley 1988, 312; Witte 1994a, 130; 1995, 9.

⁶²⁴ Witte 1995, 9–10.

⁶²⁵ Witte 1995, 10; Breeckman 2024, 228. See also García Martínez et al. 1998, 95–6.

⁶²⁶ Witte 1995, 10–1; Cox 2009, 668; 2015a, 388.

similarly to OG (*bos eorum concepit et non abortit vacca peperit et non est privata fetu suo*, “their cattle have conceived and failed not, their cow has calved and is not deprived of her fruit”), there is a possibility that both cola were more similar to the current MT 10b in some pre-MT manuscripts. These three versions all might have seen the plural suffixes in their *Vorlage*, whereas in the MT, they are in singular. Vermeylen thinks that the change in number (to singular) is a reason to believe that v. 10 was added later to the speech, in *rédaction* III. Reference to the impious in singular characterises also vv. 17–21 which he places in *rédaction* III.⁶²⁷ With this in mind, the argument that later copyists made mistakes, like in v. 3b, rather than a redactor, is sounder. Some pre-MT manuscripts were different in this verse, corroborated by OG, 11Q10, and Vg; namely, they had the plural suffixes and both cola must have been synonymous and more similar to 10b rather than the current 10a.

IV: 21:11–14

Style

Verses 11–14 form a strophe made up of four bicola in Greek. In Hebrew, the strophes seem to rather be in vv. 11–13 and 14–15. Since v. 15 is asterisked (not translated) in Greek, we will discuss this Greek strophe and both Hebrew strophes together. The strophe begins with a simile in 11a: יִשְׁלְחוּ כְּצֹאֵן עֹיִלִּיהֶם “They send out their little ones like a flock” in Hebrew and μένουσιν δὲ ὡς πρόβατα αἰώνια “And they remain as ageless sheep” in Greek.

There is an imperative in v. 14: סֹר “depart! turn aside!” and Ἀπόστα “stay away!”; in Hebrew, this marks the beginning of the second strophe but in Greek it marks the end of the strophe.

In Hebrew, the middle of the first strophe, v. 12, is marked with a partial symmetry (ABxB’/xA’B’’) and the end of the second strophe, v. 15, is marked with a partial chiasmus (ABCD/xA’E’C’D’). The Greek translator has not reflected these but there is a partial chiasmus in v. 13 (ABC/B’A’).

There are no significant lexical repetitions in either language, but the second Hebrew strophe ends with the repetition of כִּי ... מֵה “what ... that” in 15ab (these are also transition markers). The Greek translator has played with roots, however: in 11b, the noun τὰ παῖδια “the children” and the verb προσπαίζουσιν “they play about” are derived from the noun παῖς “child”; and in v. 12, the nouns ψαλτήριον “harp; stringed instrument” and ψαλμός “sound of harp/cithara” are used, both being derived from the verb ψάλλω “to play a stringed instrument with fingers”.

Some marked vocabulary has been used in Hebrew: in 11a, the noun עֹיִלִּיהֶם (עוֹל “boy”; Job: 3); in 11b, the verb יִרְקְדוּן (רָקַד “to skip about”; 9x, Job: 1, Ps: 3); and finally, in 12b, the noun עֹגֶב “pipe” (4x, Job: 2, Ps: 1). The Greek translator has used some rare words as well: in 11b, the verb προσπαίζουσιν “they

⁶²⁷ Vermeylen 2015, 131–4.

pass time pleasantly” (προσπαίζω; reflects the rare verb in Hebrew; 29x, LXX: 2, OG Job: 1); and in 12a, the noun ψαλτήριον “harp” (32x, LXX: 25, OG Job: 1).

Text

Reading, vocalising, or understanding the consonantal text differently than the later Masoretes. *In 11a*, the Hebrew יִשְׁלְחוּ “they send” is translated as μένουσιν “they remain”. It has been suggested that the Greek translator might have read יָחוּ “they waited” instead⁶²⁸. The Hebrew עוֹלִיָּהֶם “their young ones” is read as עוֹלָמִים or עוֹלָם and thus translated with the adjective αἰώνια “ageless, eternal”⁶²⁹. *In 13a*, the Hebrew יִבְלֻ “they become old, grow old” is translated as συνετέλεσαν “they brought to an end, completed”. This might also be due to reading as יָכְלוּ (בלה, see the *qere* יָכְלוּ)⁶³⁰ of which συνετέλεω is a common translation in the LXX. *In 13b*, וּבִרְגַע שְׁאוֹל יִחְתּוּ “and in a moment they descend to Sheol” is translated with ἐν δὲ ἀναπαύσει ἄδου ἐκοιμήθησαν “and they lay down in the repose of Hades”, where וּבִרְגַע שְׁאוֹל was understood as a genitive construct and the verb יִחְתּוּ “they descend”, vocalised as qal in the MT, was possibly vocalised as the *niphal* יִחְתּוּ, and translated ἐκοιμήθησαν “they fell asleep, lay down”. Witte suggests that that this reading should be preferred⁶³¹. Due to translating the verbs in this verse into past, the integrity of the strophe is compromised.

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 11a*, the common singular כְּצֹאן “like a flock” is translated with the plural ὡς πρόβατα “like sheep, flock”. *In 11b*, the Hebrew יִרְקְדוּ “they skip, dance” is interpreted as προσπαίζουσιν “they jest, play”, creating a wordplay in the colon. *In 12a*, the third person plural verb יִשְׂאוּ “they lift up” is translated with the plural aorist participle ἀναλαβόντες “taking up, having taken up”. *In 13a*, the general בְּטוֹב “in good(ness)” is translated with the plural ἐν ἀγαθοῖς “in good things, in wealth”. Hebrew יְמֵיהֶם “their days” is changed into τὸν βίον αὐτῶν “their life.”

Utilising the context or the translator's previous knowledge for the meaning of unknown words. *In 12a*, the instrument כְּתֵף “like a tambourine” is translated as ψαλτήριον “psaltery, harp; some stringed instrument”. Dhorme and Witte suggest that the correct Hebrew form is actually בְּתֵף “with a tambourine”, which is present in several manuscripts and in the versions, and that the text should be emended; Cox, however, says that ψαλτήριον and κιθάρα often occur together in the LXX and therefore the translation choice makes sense, even if the translator did not know the Hebrew word.⁶³² *In 12b*, the instrument עוּגָב “pipe, flute” is translated as ψαλμοῦ (also in 30:31) which could either mean another stringed instrument or the sound of a cithara or harp.

Differences that are harder to explain. *In 14a*, the plural וַיֹּאמְרוּ “they say” is for some reason translated into singular λέγει “he says”, disrupting the unity of this strophe (but not fitting in with the next either, which is in plural again). In

⁶²⁸ Witte 1995, 11.

⁶²⁹ Similarly, Witte 1995, 11.

⁶³⁰ Cf. also Hartley 1988, 312; Witte 1995, 12; 2021, 331.

⁶³¹ Witte 1994a, 331; 1995, 13.

⁶³² Dhorme 1967, 312; Witte 2021, 330; Cox 2023, 252.

connection, the plural ממנו “from us” is changed into ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ “from me.” In 14b, ודעת דרכיך לא הפצנו “We do not desire the knowledge of your ways” is translated with ὁδοῦς σου εἰδέναι οὐ βούλομαι “I do not wish to know your ways”, where the noun ודעת “and the knowledge” is translated with the infinitive εἰδέναι “to know” and the plural הפצנו “we do not desire” is changed into singular οὐ βούλομαι “I do not want, wish”. V. 15, מה שדי כי נעבדנו ומה נועיל כי נפגע בו “What is the Almighty that we should serve him? And what profit do we get if we pray to him?” is left untranslated (asterisked); Fohrer, Gorea, and Witte think that the abridgment was prompted by theological reasons, since the verse is disrespectful towards God⁶³³. Vermeulen thinks that v. 15 was added in *rédaction* IV—it addresses Shadday in third person, the verse is comparable to 34:9 and 35:3 (also from *rédaction* IV).⁶³⁴ If it indeed is a very late addition to the poem, it might have been missing from the *Vorlage*. If it was in the *Vorlage*, the translator noticed that it is out of place and even disrespectful and omitted it. With the current evidence, a definite answer cannot be given.

V: 21:16–18

Style

Verses 16–18 form a strophe consisting of a bicolon, a tricolon, and another bicolon, therefore the middle is marked structurally. The strophe begins in 16a with the causal conjunction γάρ “for” in Greek and the interjection הן in Hebrew. However, both Hebrew and Greek also have strong transition markers in v. 17 (כמה “how often?” and οὐ μὴν δὲ ἀλλὰ καὶ “nonetheless also”).

The strophe ends with a simile in v. 18: יהיו כתבן לפני רוח וכמץ גבתו סופה “How often are they like straw before the wind and like chaff that the storm carries away?” in Hebrew and ἔσονται δὲ ὥσπερ ἄχυρα πρὸ ἀνέμου ἢ ὥσπερ κονιορτός, ὃν ὑφέλατο λαῖλαψ. “And they shall be as chaff before the wind / or as dust that the whirlwind has sucked up.” in Greek. Additionally, the very last word of the strophe in Greek is rare (the noun λαῖλαψ “furious rainstorm,” 35x, LXX: 7, OG Job: 2).

There is a partial chiasmus in Greek in 17bc (AB/B’A’C), which does not reflect the Hebrew, and a partial symmetry in 18ab (ABC/xB’C’), which is a reflection of the partial symmetry in the Hebrew text (ABC/xB’D).

There are a couple of lexical repetitions throughout the strophe: in Hebrew, the noun רשעים “of the wicked” in 16b/17a (reflected in Greek with the repetition of ἀσεβῶν “of the impious”); and additionally in Greek 16a/18a, the verb “to be”, which frames the strophe (ἦν “it was” and ἔσονται “they will be”).

Some marked Hebrew words have been used: in 17a, the verb ידעך (דעך) “it is put out” (considered poetic and characteristic of wisdom literature by BDB); in 17b, the noun אידם (איד) “their calamity” (also considered poetic and charac-

⁶³³ Fohrer 1963, 56; Gorea 2007, 67–71; Witte 2021, 334.

⁶³⁴ Vermeulen 2015, 131–4.

teristic of wisdom literature by BDB); in 17c, the noun חבלי (חבל “pain”; 9x, Job: 2); and in 18b, the noun וכמץ (מוץ “chaff”; 8x, Job: 1, Ps: 2).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 16a*, the Hebrew הן לא בידם “Behold, is not their prosperity in their hand” is paraphrased into ἐν χερσὶν γὰρ ἦν αὐτῶν τὰ ἀγαθὰ “For their good things were in their hands”: the interjection הן “behold” is replaced with γὰρ “for”; the negation is omitted; בידם “in their hand (sg.)” is changed into plural ἐν χερσὶν “in hands”; the verb ἦν “it was (they were)” is added; and the common singular טובם “their goodness” is translated into plural αὐτῶν τὰ ἀγαθὰ “their good things”. *In 17a*, the question כמה “how often” is replaced with an expressive phrase οὐ μὴν δὲ ἀλλὰ καὶ “but in fact even, nevertheless” to negate what was previously said⁶³⁵. *In 17b*, the suffix ם- “their” in אידם “their calamity” is not translated, as it is not needed. *In 18a*, the common singular כתבן “like straw” is translated with the plural (the word is most commonly used in plural in Greek) ὥσπερ ἄχυρα “like chaff”.

Reading or vocalising the consonantal text differently than the later Masoretes. *In 16b*, עצת רשעים רחקה מני “the counsel of the wicked is far from me” is translated with ἔργα δὲ ἀσεβῶν οὐκ ἐφορᾷ “he does not regard the works of the impious”. The paraphrase could be motivated by reading ממנו (so Terrien) or מנו (so Witte) in Hebrew, thus “the counsel of the wicked is far from him.”⁶³⁶ *In 17c*, חבלי יחלק באפו “he distributes pain in his anger” is paraphrased into ὠδῖνες δὲ αὐτοὺς ἔξουσιν ἀπὸ ὀργῆς “and sharp pains shall seize them because of anger”, triggered by reading the preposition ב as מ instead.

Utilising the context or the translator's previous knowledge for the meaning of unknown words. *In 18b*, the rare noun וכמץ “and like chaff” is translated as ὥσπερ κονιορτός “or like a cloud of dust” (Vg *favilla* “cinders, hot ashes”).

Kaiser considers v. 16 a gloss and Witte 17c, since tricola in the middle of a speech are not common in Job. Nömmik and Fohrer think that both vv. 16 and 17c (Fohrer: “17b”) were later commentaries or glosses and thus did not belong to the original, oldest layer of the poem. Nömmik explains that v. 16 seems to make Job more pious and thus contradicts the rest of the speech (the verse would need correction in order to be deemed original). 17c is secondary because it does not match the parallelism, interrupts the flow of questions in vv. 17–18 and makes God the subject. Vermeylen sees more secondary verses here. V. 16 was added by *rédacteur* III, possibly as a commentary to v. 13. V. 16b disrupts the flow and exhibits no parallelism. The phrase “the plans of the wicked” is also seen in Ps 1:1 (coming from the same anti-Hellenistic school as *rédacteur* III) and Job 22:18b (also from *rédaction* III). Further, the verse begins with the particle הן which Vermeylen has attributed to *rédacteur* III elsewhere (9:11–12; 12:14–15; 13:15). He also assigns vv. 17–21 into the hands of *rédacteur* III. Unlike vv. 7–9 and 11–14, these speak of the impious in singular. 17a quotes Baldad’s 18:5 but

⁶³⁵ Cf. also Dhorme 1967, 315; Gorea 2007, 71–2.

⁶³⁶ Terrien 1963, 163; Witte 1994a, 130; 1995, 14; 2021, 331.

also appears in Prov 24:20 (anti-Hellenistic). V. 18 is similar to Ps 1:4 (Sirach-school) in vocabulary and image.⁶³⁷ In v. 16b and 17c, the translator read a word differently and otherwise made quite a number of changes (questions into statements and denies the good future of the impious more strongly). It is clear that the milder treatment of the impious in Hebrew was not preferable to the translator and they felt the need to make stronger statements.

VI: 21:19–22

Style

Verses 19–22 form a strophe consisting of a *tricolon* and a *bicolon* in Greek, but four *bicola* in Hebrew (vv. 19b and 21 are asterisked). Thus, the beginning of the strophe is marked structurally in Greek. The strophe ends with a marked question in 22a (-ה “will?” in Hebrew and *πότερον οὐχὶ* “does/is not?” in Greek). The end is also marked with a partial chiasmus in Greek (xABCxC’/AC’’B’).

Both Hebrew and Greek only have one lexical repetition: in Hebrew 19b/22a, the strophe-framing root-repetition of וידע “and they know” and דעת “knowledge”, and in Greek 20b/22a, the repetition of κυρίου “(from) the Lord” and ὁ κύριός “the Lord”. A couple of marked Hebrew words have been used in this strophe: in 20a, the *hapax* כידו (כיד “ruin, destruction”) and in 21b, the verb חצצו (חצץ “to divide”; 2x, Job: 1, Prov: 1).

Text

Reading, vocalising, or understanding the consonantal text differently than the later Masoretes. *In 19a*, the phrase יצפן לבניו אונו אלוה “God stores up his iniquity for his children” is translated with ἐλπίποι υἱοὺς τὰ ὑπάρχοντα αὐτοῦ “May his possessions fail his sons”. Witte and Beeckman hypothesise that this paraphrasing translation might be based on reading יצפן אל/לא in Hebrew⁶³⁸, although some have not found such a reading plausible⁶³⁹. The phrase לבניו “for his children, sons” is changed into the object of the clause, υἱοὺς “sons.” אונו “his iniquity” is probably understood as און “vigour, wealth” and thus translated as τὰ ὑπάρχοντα αὐτοῦ “his possessions, wealth”⁶⁴⁰. Softening God’s violence is sometimes seen as an intentional theological change⁶⁴¹. *In 22a*, הלאל ילמד דעת “Can anyone teach God knowledge?” is translated with πότερον οὐχὶ ὁ κύριός ἐστιν ὁ διδάσκων σύνεσιν καὶ ἐπιστήμην “Is it not the Lord who teaches understanding and knowledge?”. This can be considered a weakening of an expression that the translator found objectionable (God cannot be taught)⁶⁴². It has been suggested that the Greek πότερον οὐχὶ ὁ κύριός ἐστιν “Is it not the Lord” is the result of

⁶³⁷ Fohrer 1963, 58, 336, 338; Witte 1994a, 134–5; Kaiser 2006, 41, 126; Nömmik 2013, 27–9, 203–9; Vermeulen 2015, 131–4; Witte 2021, 331, 336; Nömmik 2025.

⁶³⁸ Witte 1995, 17; Beeckman 2022b, 27–8; 2024, 317–8.

⁶³⁹ Dhorme 1967, 316.

⁶⁴⁰ Cf. also Witte 1995, 17.

⁶⁴¹ Gray 1974, 341.

⁶⁴² Cf. also Fohrer 1963, 56.

reading the beginning of the verse as הלא אל (“Is it not God”). The translator double-translates דַּעַת as σύνεσιν καὶ ἐπιστήμην.⁶⁴³ Heater sees the sources of this expansion in Job 12:12–13, but even more so in 34:35⁶⁴⁴. Out of these explanations, reading the consonantal text slightly differently than the later Masoretes is most reasonable as that has happened fairly often elsewhere, including in this strophe. *In 22b*, the Hebrew רמים “those who are high” is read as דמים “blood-sheddings” and thus translated with φόνους “murders, slaughters”⁶⁴⁵.

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *V. 19b*, שלם אליו וידע, “let him pay it back to him and he will know” is fully untranslated. The colon has no rare or difficult vocabulary, so the omission may be intentional to make the strophe more concise. *In 20b*, the Hebrew ומהמת שדי ישתה “and let him drink the wrath of God” is paraphrased into ἀπὸ δὲ κυρίου μὴ διασωθείη “let him not be saved from the Lord”. *In 20a*, the singular עינו “his eye” is translated into plural οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτοῦ “his eyes” (but cf. also the *qere* עיניו).

Vorlage different than the later MT. *In 20a*, the Hebrew *hapax* בידו “his misfortune, ruin” is translated with τὴν ἑαυτοῦ σφαγὴν “his own slaughter” (cf. P סבנו “his destruction”⁶⁴⁶, 11Q10 במפלתה “with his destruction”, Vg *interfectionem suam* “his own destruction”). It has been suggested that the versions read פידו “his ruin” and to emend the MT accordingly⁶⁴⁷. In the context of the speech and the strophe, this meaning makes sense.

Differences that are harder to explain. *V. 21*, כי מה חפצו בביתו אחריו ומספר, חדשיו חצצו “For what is his care for his household after him, when the number of his months is cut off” is not translated. The verse has one very rare word at the end, but the rest of the words should not have caused trouble. Gorea thinks that the translator made the omission in order to avoid contradictions with the previous verses⁶⁴⁸. Issues of clarity and understanding cannot be ruled out here, as 11Q10 inserts the explanatory “for God” (צבו לאלהא בביתה) “interest for God in his house”).

Witte and Kaiser see v. 22 as secondary. According to Witte, v. 22 is a rhetorical question that interrupts the train of thought; the verse has an angelological theme similar to the secondary vv. 4:18, 15:15, and 33:23. Furthermore, he thinks that the verse did not belong to the original Greek version as it is identical to 22:2 and because v. 24 seems to be rather a continuation of v. 20, not 22. Nömmik thinks that vv. 19–22 are a late *Fortschreibung* on justice. Concerning v. 22, he explains that by emphasising God’s majesty, it does not match with the context; to fit with the sceptical context, it should be read as irony. Vermeylen assigns vv. 17–21 to the hands of *rédacteur* III. Unlike vv. 7–9 and 11–14, these speak of the impious in singular. The idea that an evil person’s punishment is upon his children, expressed in vv. 19–21 can be found also in 5:4 and

⁶⁴³ Dhorme 1967, 318 on both statements and Cox 2016a, 63–4, 68 on double-translation.

⁶⁴⁴ Heater 1982, 70–1.

⁶⁴⁵ Cf. also Dhorme 1967, 318; Witte 1995, 20; Cox 2009, 668; Muraoka 2010, 125; Kepper and Witte 2011, 2097.

⁶⁴⁶ See also Szpek 1992, 292.

⁶⁴⁷ Dhorme 1967, 317.

⁶⁴⁸ Gorea 2007, 72–3.

20:10 (*rédaction* III). He thinks that v. 22 comes nicely after v. 14 (*rédaction* I).⁶⁴⁹

The translator shortened and changed this strophe considerably, whether intentionally or not remains questionable. In v. 20a, a slightly different pre-MT was available to the ancients. In all verses, we might assume that the *Vorlage* manuscript was difficult to read or the subject matter of the strophe was hard to understand as the translator reads several words differently than the later Masoretes, omits multiple cola, and makes other changes. The meaning of v. 22, especially the first colon, was inverted in translation, making God the teacher. As explained above, a different reading could have been the source for that; however, fixing a question about God on their own is a possibility as well. In short, v. 22, thought to be secondary to the Hebrew text, caused a (theological) change in the translation.

VII: 21:24–26

Style

Verses 24–26 form a strophe made up of three bicola in Greek and four bicola in Hebrew (vv. 23–26, v. 23 is not translated). The strophe begins in Greek v. 24 with a partial symmetry (AB/A'C) which reflects the Hebrew (ABC/xA'B').

In Greek, the strophe is framed with rare words, both reflect rare words in Hebrew: in 24a, the noun τὰ ἔγκατα “intestines” (17x, LXX: 6, OG Job: 2); and in 26b, the noun σαπρία “rotten, decayed state” (13x, LXX: 10, OG Job: 6).

A couple of rare words have been used in Hebrew: in 23b, the *hapax* noun שלאן “quiet, security”, and the adjective ושלו (שלו “at ease, quiet”; 8x, Job: 3, Ps: 1); in 24a, the *hapax* noun עטיניו (עטין “belly”, “bucket?”); in 24b, the *hapax* noun ומה (מה “marrow”); and finally, in 26b, the noun ורמה (רמה “worm”; 7x, Job: 5).

Only Hebrew has significant lexical repetitions: the phrase זה ימות “this (one) dies” in the beginning of 23a/25a; in 23a/24b, בעצם “lit. in bone; in substance, prosperity” and עצמותיו “of his bones”; and in 23b, the root-repetition of the *hapax* noun שלאן “quiet, security”, and the rare adjective ושלו (שלו “at ease, quiet”).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 24a*, the verb מלאו “they are full” is translated with the adjective πλήρης “full”. *In 24b*, the word עצמותיו “his bones” is omitted. Orlinsky finds that “there is no reason in the world why the translator should have omitted” this word. He suggests, based on some manuscript evidence, that the accurate translation τῶν ὀστέων was deleted by scribes due to homoeoteleuton (μυελος δε τῶν ὀστέων αὐτου).⁶⁵⁰ The omission would not be out of character for the translator, especially since μυελός is perfectly under-

⁶⁴⁹ Witte 1994a, 135–6; Kaiser 2006, 41, 126; Nömmik 2013, 207–8; Vermeylen 2015, 131–4, 327; Witte 2021, 332, 334, 342–3; Nömmik 2025.

⁶⁵⁰ Orlinsky 1935b, 140–2; 1962, 142–3.

standable without the added “of bones.” The verb יִשְׁקָה “it is watered” is translated with διαχέεται “it is liquefied, melted, dispersed, dissolved,” according to the context. *In 25b*, the phrase וְלֹא אָכַל בְּטוֹבָה “and he did not eat of good things” is translated with οὐ φαγών οὐδὲν ἀγαθόν “having not eaten anything good”. *In 26b*, the Hebrew ורמה “worm” is translated with σαπρία “decay” (so also in 7:5, 17:14, and 25:6, but not in 24:20).

Differences that are harder to explain. *V. 23*, זה ימות בעצם תמו כלו שלאנן ושלו, “He dies in full prosperity, being wholly at ease and secure” is not translated. The two last words are very rare; however, the rest of the words should not have caused much trouble. This is one of the few cases where an omission by the translator leads to loss of unity and an illogical rendering in Greek. The translator did not make efforts to harmonise the text surrounding the omissions.⁶⁵¹ Fohrer sees the reason for omitting v. 23 as theological⁶⁵². However, taking into account the difficulties in the previous strophe, textual problems in the *Vorlage* manuscript or simply the subject matter of the verse may have been too obscure for the translator. This verse may have been (partly) missing from 11Q10⁶⁵³, giving way to the suspicion that the pre-MT manuscripts may have been different (shorter?).

Reading, vocalising, or understanding the consonantal text differently than the later Masoretes. What in the MT *v. 24a* is vocalised as חֶלֶב “milk” is vocalised as חֶלֶב and translated with στέατος “fat”. So also, Vg *adipe* “with/of fat” and P 𐤁𐤓𐤁𐤏𐤁 “fat”⁶⁵⁴; Witte even suggests emending the Hebrew accordingly⁶⁵⁵. This emendment can be accepted; we have the support of versions and the fact that in the context of eating, the connection between the inwards-fat-marrow is good.

Utilising the context or the translator’s previous knowledge for the meaning of unknown words. *In 24a*, the Hebrew *hapax* עֲטִינִי “his buckets, his bellies (?)” is translated with τὰ ἐξ ἑγκατα αὐτοῦ “his innards, bowels”. Some other versions also translate with a body part: Vg: *viscera* “his innards;” P 𐤁𐤓𐤁𐤏𐤁 “his sides,” and 11Q10 possibly has אבר [והי] “member[s]”⁶⁵⁶. Witte has suggested reading עֲטָמִי “his thighs” instead⁶⁵⁷. If the context is eating and even gluttony, then OG and Vg definitely took it into account with their translation.

According to Nömmik, vv. 23–26 were added in the fifth layer of redactions (the transience redactions), wherein v. 24 was influenced by 20:11a and 26a by 20:11b and v. 26 as a whole by 7:21c⁶⁵⁸. This might have something to do with how this section has been translated, including the rare vocabulary and the omitted verse. The additions may have been integrated badly to the first manu-

⁶⁵¹ Cf. also Gorea 2007, 73.

⁶⁵² Fohrer 1963, 56.

⁶⁵³ Shepherd 2004, 46.

⁶⁵⁴ Szpek 1992, 278.

⁶⁵⁵ Witte 2021, 332.

⁶⁵⁶ Szpek 1992, 185; García Martínez et al. 1998, 96–8.

⁶⁵⁷ Witte 1994a, 130.

⁶⁵⁸ Nömmik 2025.

script and then made even worse by some later scribes who wrote the manuscripts that the OG and 11Q10 translators used.

VIII: 21:27–34

Style

Verses 27 and 34 make up a strophe consisting of a *monocolon* and a *bicolon* in Greek. Since vv. 28–33 are not translated at all⁶⁵⁹, comparison with Hebrew takes into account only vv. 27 and 34. The strophe begins with the interjection הן in Hebrew and an emphatic adverb ὥστε “so” in Greek. The strophe ends with a marked how-question (ואיך in Hebrew and πῶς δὲ “and how?” in Greek). There are no significant lexical repetitions, except for that of the personal pronoun ὑμᾶς/ὁμῶν “you” in 27/34b, framing the strophe.

A couple of marked Hebrew words have been used: in 27a, the noun מחשבותיכם (מחשבה) “your thoughts” is considered poetic and later by BDB; in 27b, the verb תחמסו (חמס “to injure”; 8x, Job: 2, Prov: 1); and in 34b, the noun ותשובתיכם (תשובה) “a turn, recurrence”; 8x, Job: 2).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. V. 27, הן ידעתי מחשבותיכם, “Oh I know your thoughts and your schemes to wrong me” is paraphrased into with ὥστε οἶδα ὑμᾶς ὅτι τόλμῃ ἐπείκεισθέ μοι “So I know you, that you daringly attack me”, making the accusation more intense.

Differences that are harder to explain. V. 23, זה ימות בעצם תמו כלו שלאנן ושלו, “He dies in full prosperity, being wholly at ease and secure” is not translated. The two last words are very rare; however, the rest of the words should not have caused much trouble. This is one of the few cases where an omission by the translator leads to loss of unity and an illogical rendering in Greek. The translator did not make efforts to harmonise the text surrounding the omissions.⁶⁶⁰ Fohrer sees the reason for omitting v. 23 as theological⁶⁶¹. However, taking into account the difficulties in the previous strophe, textual problems in the *Vorlage* manuscript or simply the subject matter of the verse may have been too obscure

⁶⁵⁹ כי תאמרו איה בית־גדיב ואיה אהל משכנות רשעים: הלא שאלתם עוברי דרך ואתתם לא תנכרו: כי ליום איד יחשך רע ליום עברות יובלו: מי־יגיד על־פניו דרכו והוא־עשה מי ישלם־לו: והוא לקברות יובל “For you say, ‘Where is the house of the prince? Where is the tent in which the wicked lived?’ Have you not asked those who travel the roads, and do you not accept their testimony, that the wicked are spared in the day of calamity and are rescued in the day of wrath? Who declares their way to their face, and who repays them for what they have done? When they are carried to the grave, a watch is kept over their tomb. The clods of the valley are sweet to them; everyone will follow after, and those who went before are innumerable”. Vv. 32 and 33 have a couple of rare words: the *hapax* noun גדיש “tomb” in 32b; and in 33a the verb מתקו (מתק “to be sweet”; 6x, Job: 3, Ps: 1, Prov: 1) and the noun רגבי (רגב “clod”; Job: 2).

⁶⁶⁰ Cf. also Gorea 2007, 73.

⁶⁶¹ Fohrer 1963, 56.

for the translator. This verse may have been (partly) missing from 11Q10⁶⁶², giving way to the suspicion that the pre-MT manuscripts may have been different (shorter?).

Vv. 28–33, a total of 13 cola, are asterisked in the Greek text, Dhorme says that happened “due to an accident in the original text” whereas LXX.D assumes stylistic reasons⁶⁶³. Leaving such a large section untranslated simply for stylistic reasons cannot be proven here. This section, with the exception of v. 33c, is thought to have been original to the Job-poem. While vv. 27 and 34 are incorporated and shortened with numerous changes into a monocolon and a bicolon, concluding the speech, there is no trace of vv. 28–33 in the OG text as laid out by Ziegler. The keywords in the missing section have not been avoided by the translator elsewhere, nor are there too many rare words that could have obscured the meaning for the translator. It is as if they were not even there. Furthermore, this section has not survived in 11Q10, which is fragmentary up to v. 27 in column V and then picks up again in column VI with v. 22:3⁶⁶⁴.

Problems with the Vorlage manuscript. V. 34b is completely different in both languages: מַעַל נִשְׂאָר מֵעַל וְתִשְׁבַּחְתֶּם “There is nothing left of your answers but falsehood” in Hebrew, but τὸ δὲ ἐμὲ καταπαύσασθαι ἂφ’ ὑμῶν οὐδέν “And I have no rest at all from you” in Greek. Dhorme and Witte raise the possibility that the Greek καταπαύσασθαι might be the result of associating the Hebrew וְתִשְׁבַּחְתֶּם with the root שָׁבַת “to cease, stop”⁶⁶⁵, giving cause to believe that the waw was read and understood as a *mater lectionis*. ἂφ’ ὑμῶν suggests that מַעַל was read with a suffix as a compound prefix. Similarly, P translated as מִבְּחֵר “before me” due to reading מַעַל in the Hebrew.⁶⁶⁶

According to Witte, Nömmik and Kaiser, v. 33c is a gloss that cannot be dated. Vermeylen thinks that vv. 27–33 were added later to the speech. V. 27 begins with the particle הֵן, which he considers a marker of *réducteur* III. He also gives plenty of explanations for why vv. 28–33 are from the same *réduction* III.⁶⁶⁷ Taking into account all of the differences between Greek and the later MT, the *Vorlage* manuscript must have been either quite damaged or badly written or most of this section in vv. 28–33 happened to be in a spot that was easily missed by the reader. It is not out of the realm of possibility that section simply was not there, as there is no trace of it at all in Greek. In the end, the translator managed to turn vv. 27 and 34 into a very competent conclusion to the speech.

⁶⁶² Shepherd 2004, 46.

⁶⁶³ Dhorme 1967, 321; Kepper and Witte 2011, 2097.

⁶⁶⁴ See García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1999, 1187, CAL.

⁶⁶⁵ Dhorme 1967, 325; Witte 1995, 31.

⁶⁶⁶ Szpek 1992, 273, 275, 278.

⁶⁶⁷ Kaiser 2006, 42, 126; Nömmik 2013, 27–9, 203–9; Vermeylen 2015, 131–4; Witte 2021, 57–9, 334–6; Nömmik 2025.

JOB 25

Introduction

Job 25 contains the third speech of Baldad: *no one is free from God's ambushes, because no one is pure.*

This speech is especially short in both languages but even more so in Greek (v. 6b is asterisked); it divides into two strophes:

I (25:2–3, 2B) *Is there anyone who doubts that God will let brigands have respite?*

II (25:4–6, 2B1M) *A mortal cannot be pure, because God has not made even heaven pure.*

Most scholars, with the exception of Fohrer⁶⁶⁸, think that the whole of Job 25 is secondary. The main opinion, following Witte, is that it was added by the lowliness redactor (*Niedrigkeitsredaktor/Niedrigkeitsbearbeiter*; for Witte this is also the Hiobdichtung B which was the first editing stage of the original poem). Passages dealing with lowliness that were added with or at the same time are 4:12–21 (or 17–21), 15:11–16 (or 14–16); Witte, van Oorschot and Syring also list 40:3–5, and 42:1–6*/2–6*. Job 25 is thought to be quite independent otherwise and poetically condensed, seemingly not a part of a bigger composition. Nömmik sees here an excessive accumulation of sound repetitions and effects (differing from other friends' speeches) and an out of balance colometry. Although using different terminology, Vermeylen thinks that the whole speech is added by *rédacteur* III. The characteristics of this *rédaction* III are pessimistic anthropology (like in 4:2–5:1 and 15:14–16). They also have the same ideas of justice and purity. The speech does not introduce new ideas but only repeats those already heard before.⁶⁶⁹

I: 25:2–3

Style

Verses 2–3 form the first strophe of two bicola. Lexical repetitions are not present in the Hebrew text, whereas in Greek, the phrase *παρ' αὐτοῦ* “with him” is repeated in 2a and 3b, framing the strophe. The Greek strophe begins with the interrogative *τί* “what?” and the causal or explanatory conjunction *γὰρ* “for.” These both could be considered as transition markers that signal the start of a strophe, independently of the Hebrew. The strophe ends with questions marked with interrogatives in both cola of verse 3: *הישׁ* “is there?” and *ועל מי* “and upon

⁶⁶⁸ Fohrer 1963, 41–2, 57–9.

⁶⁶⁹ Witte 1994a, 80, 169–71, 191–2; 1994b; Syring 2004, 147, 166–7, 168–73; Kaiser 2006, 126; van Oorschot 2007, 182–4; Nömmik 2010, 66–8; Vermeylen 2015, 175; Witte 2021, 57–9, 387–92; Nömmik 2025.

whom?" in Hebrew, *מִי גָּר תִּישׁ* "for is there someone?" and *ἐπὶ τίνας* "upon whom?" in Greek.

Some marked vocabulary has been used. In Hebrew, the beginning of the strophe is marked with a poetic (so BDB) word in 3a, namely the noun *בְּמַרְוֵמֵי* (מָרוֹם) "in his heights". In Greek, it is the second/last verse of the strophe that is marked with rare words: in 3a, the nouns *παρέλκυσις* "respite, delay" (LXX: 2, OG Job: 1) and *πειραταῖς* "for brigands" (*πειρατής*, -οῦ, ὁ; 14x, LXX: 3, OG Job: 2); and finally, in 3b, the noun *ἐνεδρα* "ambushes" (*ἐνεδρον*, -ου, τό; LXX: 41, OG Job: 1).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 2a*, the causal *γάρ* "for" is added, the conjunction *-ו* "and" is translated into *ἢ* "or" and *עִמּוֹ* "with him" is changed into *παρ' αὐτοῦ* "from him". *In 2b*, the Hebrew plural *בְּמַרְוֵמֵי* "in his heights" has been translated with the singular superlative adjective *ἐν ὑψίστῳ* "in the highest (of places)". *In 3a*, the question *הֲיֵשׁ* "is there" is in Greek represented by *מִי גָּר תִּישׁ* ("for is there anyone"). Dhorme sees the whole of *מִי גָּר תִּישׁ ὑπολάβοι ὅτι* as a paraphrase of the *הֲיֵשׁ* question⁶⁷⁰. The end of the colon, *לְגִדּוּדָיו* "to/for his armies" is represented by *πειραταῖς* "for brigands" (just like in 19:12a). In 3b, the Hebrew *קוֹם* "it rises" is translated with *ἐπελεύσεται* "it will come upon"; this is not a common equivalent, but the meaning is not changed radically.

Reading, vocalising, or understanding the consonantal text differently than the later Masoretes. *In 2a*, what is usually read as a hiphil infinitive absolute of the verb *מָשַׁל* ("to rule"), *הַמֶּשֶׁל* "dominion, rulership", seems to have been read by the translator as the interrogative particle *-ה* and the noun *מִשְׁל* "proverb; poem" and thus translated as *τί ... προοίμιον* "what ... preamble, exordium, beginning, premonition?"⁶⁷¹. This makes sense on the translator's part because speeches and strophes often begin with questions, although the interrogative particle *-ה* is not translated with *τί* too often. *In 3a*, at first glance, the Hebrew word *מִסְפָּר* "number" has nothing to do with the phrase *ὑπολάβοι ὅτι ἐστὶν παρέλκυσις* "he would think that there is delay". It could be possible that the translator read *מִסְפָּד* "mourning, wailing" instead and thus interpreted the colon as meaning "is there mourning for his armies?." Thus, the translation "is there anyone who thinks that delay exists for brigands?" could be a paraphrase, especially to bring more meaning to the next colon.⁶⁷² *In 3b*, the Hebrew *אוֹרְהוּ* "his light" is translated as *ἐνεδρα παρ' αὐτοῦ* "ambush(es) from him". Dhorme and Hartley agreeably suggest that the translator read *אוֹרְבוּ* (present participle with suffix from verb *אָרַב* "to ambush"). This is especially plausible since the noun *אוֹר* "light" does not appear with the same personal suffix *-הוּ* in any other passage in Job and in the context of the

⁶⁷⁰ Dhorme 1967, 368.

⁶⁷¹ Cf. also Dhorme 1967, 368; Witte 1995, 123; Mangin 2005, 337; Kepper and Witte 2011, 2101. However, see also Cox 2016, 69, who sees the interrogative as an emphatic addition. The noun is usually translated as *παραβολή*, although *παροιμία* and *προοίμιον* (only here and in the prose introductions of 27:1 and 29:1) are also encountered in the LXX.

⁶⁷² Cox 2016, 69 considers the word *παρέλκυσις* as an addition that completes the thought.

verse, “to ambush” is understandable. Dhorme even suggests emending the MT, while Witte disagrees, especially since elements of “light” are mentioned in v. 5 as well. Nömmik, agreeing with Witte’s earlier work, also cautions against a different reading due to the cosmological parallelism.⁶⁷³ Since other versions all read or at least seem to read “light” as well, we can safely assume that the OG translator is alone in interpreting the consonantal text this way. The reading takes into account the context of the verse and does change the character of God slightly.

Vorlage different than the later MT. In 2b, the noun שלום “peace” seems to have been read as שלם “complete, whole” and thus translated with τήν σύμπασαν “the entire (earth)”⁶⁷⁴. This suggests that the specific *Vorlage* manuscript did not have a *mater lectionis* in this word (see similarly 5:24a, 15:21b, 21:9a). Since the Greek adjective is used in the feminine with the article, it refers to ἡ γῆ “the earth.”

II: 25:4–6

Style

The second and last strophe of Job 25 is made up of vv. 4–6, having three bicola in Hebrew, but two bicola and a *monocolon* in Greek, therefore the end of the strophe and the speech is marked structurally.

The beginning of the strophe in v. 4 is marked with a partial symmetry (xABC/xA'B') in Greek (reflects Hebrew). As for Hebrew, the strophe has partial symmetries in all verses: xABCD/xA'B'C' in v. 4, xxAxB/xA'B'C' in v. 5, and xAB/xA'B' in v. 6.

The strophe is framed with transition markers in both languages. Firstly, in v. 4, the Hebrew uses the question particle ומה “and how?” twice. The Greek translator has varied here and translated the first with πῶς γὰρ “for how?” and the second with ἢ τίς “or who?”. At the end of the strophe, the Hebrew uses the phrase כִּי אֵךְ “how much less,” whereas the Greek uses the interjection ἔα “alas!”

Hebrew has a framing repetition of אנוש “mortal” and two additional repetitions, whereas Greek has an independent framing repetition and an additional reflected repetition. In Hebrew, the repetitions are: in v. 4, the question particle ומה “and how?” twice; the noun אנוש “mortal” in 4a/6a; the root-repetition יזכה/זכו “he is pure” (from זכה)/“they are pure” (from זכך) in 4b/5b. In Greek, the root-repetition in Hebrew is reflected with a different root-repetition: in 4b, the verb ἀποκαθαρίσαι (“he could purify”) and in 5b, the adjective καθαρά (“pure”). Independently, the repetition of ἐναντι/ἐναντίον “before” has been added in 4a/5b.

Marked vocabulary has been used in Hebrew: in 4a/6a, the noun אנוש “man” (considered mostly poetic by BDB); in 4b, the verb יזכה (זכה “to be clean”; 8x, Job: 2, Ps: 3, Prov: 1); in 5a, the noun ירח “moon” (also considered quite poetic by BDB) and the *hapax* verb יאהל (אהל “to shine”; translated with a rare verb in

⁶⁷³ Dhorme 1967, 368–9; Hartley 1988, 356; Nömmik 2010, 68; Witte 2021, 389.

⁶⁷⁴ Cf. also Dhorme 1967, 368; Witte 1995, 124; Kepper and Witte 2011, 2101.

Greek as well); in 5b, the verb זכו (זכך “to be clean”; 4x, Job: 3); and finally, in 6a, the noun רמה “worm” (7x, Job: 5).

Marked vocabulary is used in Greek as well: in 4a, the poetic, even Homeric, noun βροτὸς “mortal man”⁶⁷⁵; in 4b, the verb ἀποκαθαρίσαι “he could purify” (ἀποκαθαρίζω; LXX: 2, OG Job: 1; the potential optative form ἂν ἀποκαθαρίσαι may point to higher register of Greek, in the context of Hellenistic literature⁶⁷⁶) and the adjective γεννητός “begotten” (47x, OG Job: 5); in 5a, the verb ἐπιφάσκει “it shines out” (appears only in OG Job: 25:5, 31:26, 41:10); in 6a, the interjection ἔα “alas!” (considered poetic and is rarely used in prose⁶⁷⁷), and the noun σαπρία “rottenness” (13x, LXX: 10, OG Job: 6).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. **In 4a**, the Hebrew conjunction -ו “and” is replaced with the particle γάρ “for”, marking the beginning of a new unit. The verb יצדק “he is righteous” is translated into a to-be verb and adjective construction: ἔσται δίκαιος “he will be just”⁶⁷⁸. The preposition עם is not usually translated with ἐναντι in Greek; however, this is not a problematic equivalence. **In 5b**, the expression בעיניו “in his eyes”, often having a prepositional function⁶⁷⁹, is translated as ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ “before him”; however, this is a common equivalent used by the Greek translator⁶⁸⁰. **In 6a**, אף כי “how much less; surely also” is translated as ἔα δέ “and alas!”, just like in 15:14. Probably for variation, אנוש “mortal” is translated as ἄνθρωπος “human” this time. The Hebrew רמה “worm” is translated as σαπρία “rot” (so also in 7:5, 17:14, and 21:26, but not in 24:20). **V. 6b** is left untranslated⁶⁸¹, possibly since it repeats the message of the first colon and the monocolon that is left marks the end of the strophe and consequently the whole speech.

Reading, vocalising, or understanding the consonantal text differently than the later Masoretes. **In 4b**, the question ומה יזכה “and how can be pure?” with a very rare verb is paraphrased into ἢ τίς ἂν ἀποκαθαρίσαι ἑαυτὸν “or who could purify himself?”. This is probably due to vocalising the verb in *piel* instead of *qal*⁶⁸²; the question particle may have been translated differently to add variation instead of the repetition, although a different reading cannot be ruled out. The result changes the meaning as well – in Greek, the possibility of a human rectifying his impurity is ruled out. **In 5a**, the preposition עד “until; as for” is read as a verb יעד “he appointed” and translated as συντάσσει “he instructs”⁶⁸³. The Greek ἐπιφάσκει “it shines” is a result of understanding/vocalising the Hebrew *hapax* as יִהְיֶה,

⁶⁷⁵ Cf. LSJ and Mangin 2005, 501.

⁶⁷⁶ Dhont 2018a, 149–51.

⁶⁷⁷ Mangin 2005, 509.

⁶⁷⁸ The verbs are translated in the same way in 4:17 and 15:14.

⁶⁷⁹ Orlinsky 1959, 164.

⁶⁸⁰ See, for example, Dhont 2018a, 34–6.

⁶⁸¹ Asterisked in LXX^{Zi} but not in Rahlfs’; it is not usually deemed OG by scholars. See, for example Pietersma 1985, 7; Gentry 1995, 24–6; Mangin 2005, 212–5.

⁶⁸² Cf. also Dhorme 1967, 369.

⁶⁸³ Cf. also Dhorme 1967, 369; Witte 1995, 127.

stemming from הלל “to shine”⁶⁸⁴. Dhorme suggests emending the Hebrew while Nömmik disagrees and suggests staying with the MT reading⁶⁸⁵. According to Szpek, P translator used contextual translation: *محصن لخاص* “it is able to be pure”⁶⁸⁶. In 5b, the verb לא זכו “they are not pure/clean” is understood as an adjective and translated accordingly with the adjective οὐ καθαρὰ “not pure” (root-repetition is kept).

Excursus: lowliness redaction

Lowliness redaction (*Niedrigkeitsredaktion*)

Lowliness redaction is a good starting point for comparing how different redactions were received by the translator. While Witte thinks it is an early (even earliest) redaction, Kaiser sees it being not too early but not late either, and the others think it is a later one (Syring⁶⁸⁷, Van Oorschot, Nömmik). Thus, it serves as a good corpus of passages to study: if the redaction is early, it should not be in any way noticeable in the *Vorlage* of the OG translation; if it is later or very late, the *Vorlage* may have contained noticeable irregularities.

According to Markus Witte, the lowliness redaction (*Niedrigkeitsredaktion*) was the main editing stage of the still independent poem of Job. The main added motif in this redaction was that of man’s lowliness, humility, and unworthiness before God. Suffering is a basic consequence of being a human, there might not be a reason for why one person suffers while another does not. Witte has noted that while Job confesses to being innocent in the original speeches (in the oldest layer of the poem), the lowliness redactor started invalidating these confessions and emphasised that humankind in general is sinful. Witte has identified this motif in the following passages: 4:12–21, 15:11–16, 25:1–6, 40:3–5, and 42:2, 3aß, 5–6.⁶⁸⁸

Sections 4:12–21, 15:11–16, 25:1–6, which are the main sections thought to have been from the lowliness redaction have already been discussed. Let us now look at the two remaining sections.

⁶⁸⁴ Cf. also Dhorme 1967, 369; Witte 1995, 128; Kepper and Witte 2011, 2102; Beeckman 2024, 182–3.

⁶⁸⁵ Dhorme 1967, 369; Nömmik 2010, 68.

⁶⁸⁶ Szpek 1992, 292.

⁶⁸⁷ He calls it the anthropological editing (*Anthropologische Bearbeitung*).

⁶⁸⁸ Witte 2021, 45–59.

40:3–5⁶⁸⁹

1	※	ויען יהוה את איוב ויאמר:
2a	※	הרב עם שדי יסור
2b	※	מוביח אלוה יענגה: פ
3	Ἵπολαβὼν δὲ Ἰὼβ λέγει τῷ κυρίῳ	ויען איוב את יהוה ויאמר:
4a	Τί ἔτι ἐγὼ κρίνομαι νοουθετούμενος καὶ ἐλέγχων κύριον	הן קלתי מה אשיבך
4b	ἀκούων τοιαῦτα οὐθὲν ὦν;	ידי שמתי למו פי:
4c	ἐγὼ δὲ τίνα ἀπόκρισιν δῶ πρὸς ταῦτα;	
4d	χεῖρα θήσω ἐπὶ στόματί μου·	
5a	ἅπαξ λελάληκα, ἐπὶ δὲ τῷ δευτέρῳ οὐ προσθήσω.	אחת דברתי ולא אענה
5b		ושתיים ולא אוסיף: פ

The short answer of Job in 40:3–5 is thought to belong to this lowliness redaction as well. Thematically, it is much simpler, the lowliness of man is explicitly mentioned only in v. 4a, where Job admits that he is of small account.

Witte says that vv. 1 and 2 are omitted, to make the the end of ch. 39 and the beginning of 40:3 more connected⁶⁹⁰. Actually, v. 2 of Hebrew is translated and paraphrased in Greek 4a. The translator has connected both God’s and Job’s short speeches into one: Job’s. The lowliness of man/Job has been emphasised from “I am of small account” (קלתי) into “being nothing” (οὐθὲν ὦν). Other differences are more to do with the usual smaller paraphrases, clarifying, or syntactical additions. The phrase “and I will not answer” in 5a has been left untranslated, possibly due to it not being very logical in the context (God not answering would be more suitable).

⁶⁸⁹ NETS: Why do I still contend—rebuked even while confuting the Lord, / hearing such things—when I am nothing? / And I, what answer shall I give to these things? / I will lay my hand on my mouth. / Once I have spoken, but to a second time I will not add.

NRSVUE (from verse 2): Shall a faultfinder contend with the Almighty? / Anyone who argue with God must respond./ ... / See, I am of small account; what shall I answer you? / I lay my hand on my mouth. / I have spoken once, and I will not answer, / twice but will proceed no further.

⁶⁹⁰ Witte 2019, 380.

42:2–6*⁶⁹¹

2a	οἶδα ὅτι πάντα δύνασαι	ידעת ⁶⁹² כי כל תוכל
2b	ἀδυνατεῖ δέ σοι οὐθέν	ולא יבצר ממך מזמה:
3a	τίς γάρ ἐστιν ὁ κρύπτων σε βουλήν	מי זה מעלים עצה בלי דעת
3b	<u>φειδόμενος δὲ ῥημάτων καὶ σὲ οἶεται</u> <u>κρύπτειν</u>	לכן הגדתי ולא אבין נפלאות
3c	τίς δὲ ἀναγγελεῖ μοι ἃ οὐκ ᾔδειν	ממני ולא אדע:
3d	μεγάλα καὶ θαυμαστὰ ἃ οὐκ ᾔπιστάμην	
4a	ἄκουσον δέ μου κύριε ἵνα καὶ γὰρ λαλήσω	שמע נא ואנכי אדבר
4b	ἐρωτήσω δέ σε σὺ δέ με δίδαξον	אשאלך והודיעני:
5a	ἀκοὴν μὲν ὥτ' ἤκουόν σου <u>τὸ πρότερον</u>	לשמע אזן שמעתך
5b	νυνὶ δὲ ὁ ὀφθαλμός μου ἐόρακέν σε	ועתה עיני ראתך:
6a	διὸ ἐφαύλισα ἐμαυτὸν καὶ ἐτάκην	על כן אמאס ונחמתי
6b	<u>ἡγῆμαι δὲ ἐμαυτὸν γῆν καὶ σποδόν</u>	על עפר ואפר: פ

The final unit of text added in this lowliness redaction is in the beginning of ch. 42, in vv. 2–6*. This is once again a short reply from Job to God, but long enough to be divided into two strophes.

In the Hebrew text, Job admits that God can do everything and that no one can change His actions. It references questions from God's first speech and then answers them: Job has hidden counsel without knowledge; he has uttered words that he did not actually understand. At the end of this speech, Job admits that he despises himself and he repents in dust and ashes.

In the OG translation, Job also admits that God can do anything and that nothing is impossible for God. However, Greek Job does not admit that he has spoken words without knowledge. Greek Job asks who hides counsel from God or even thinks to hide words from God. The translator brings v. 3 closer to the Greek text of 38:2, by adding colon 3b. Job then asks, if there is anyone who could tell him what he does not know. At the end of the speech, Job also admits

⁶⁹¹ NETS: I know that you can do anything, / and 'nothing is impossible for you.' (Gen 18:14) / For who is it that hides counsel from you, / and, sparing with words, even thinks to hide them from you? / But who will tell me what I did not know, / great and marvelous things that I did not understand? / Yet hear me, Lord, that I too may speak, / and I will question you; and you, teach me! / Formerly I used to hear an ear's report of you, / but now my eye has seen you; / therefore I disparaged myself and wasted away, / and I regard myself dust and ashes.

NRSVUE: I know that you can do all things / and that no purpose of yours can be thwarted. / 'Who is this that hides counsel without knowledge?' / Therefore have I uttered what I did not understand, / things too wonderful for me that I did not know. / 'Hear, and I will speak; / I will question you, and you declare to me.' / I had heard of you by the hearing of the ear, / but now my eye sees you; / therefore I despise myself / and repent in dust and ashes.

⁶⁹² Qere: ידעת

that he has disparaged himself and he has wasted away, and now he regards himself dust and ashes.

V. 2b has been paraphrased, influenced by Greek Gen 18:14 (μη ἀδυνατεῖ παρὰ τῷ θεῷ ῥῆμα); the paraphrase makes God's power more emphasised. In v. 3, just like in ch. 38, the phrase בלי דעת "without knowledge" is not translated but is instead replaced with φειδόμενος δὲ ῥημάτων "sparing with words" (with συνέχων δὲ ῥήματα ἐν καρδίᾳ "confining words in his heart" in ch. 38). In both chapters, the phrase οἴεται κρύπτειν "thinks to hide them" is added, only the pronoun is different.⁶⁹³ Hebrew 42:3b has changed from a confession ("Therefore have I uttered what I did not understand") into a question ("But who will tell me what I did not know"). V. 3d (translating Hebrew 3c) is made longer in Greek, but the meaning remains. In 4a, the translator has added the vocative form κύριε "Lord", adding emphasis to the beginning of the second strophe. Differing from the beginnings of ch. 38 and ch. 40, where יהודיעני is translated with different forms of ἀποκρίνομαι, in 42:4b the translation equivalent is με δίδασξον "teach me". Therefore, in some ways, the translator wanted to bring this section closer to ch. 38, and yet in some ways, distanced them. In verse 6a, ונחמתי "I repent" has become καὶ ἐτάκην "and I wasted away"⁶⁹⁴, while in 6b, the translator has added some clarification (ἡγημαι δὲ ἐμαυτὸν). Thus, Job's suffering is emphasised.

Lowliness redaction in OG Job

Now that we have looked at the supposed lowliness redaction passages individually, we should investigate them as a whole, to see, what commonalities and repeating motifs the OG translator saw.

In the first and third passages, the translator has made (intentionally or unintentionally) a human's actions relevant to his/her purity before God. More specifically, these were: in 4:17b, a human being pure in his own actions (not before the Lord like in Hebrew; this can be due to a difference in reading/vocalising), in 4:20b, humans not being able to help themselves leads to death (in Hebrew: they perish without notice/being noticed; once again, a different reading may be the reason behind this), and in 25:4b, a mortal cannot purify themselves (in Hebrew: a mortal cannot be pure; this can be due to a difference in vocalising).

Next, let us look at some of the keywords used in these passages (bolded in the Greek and Hebrew texts). For example, the noun אנוש "mortal." The word is not exclusive to this redaction in the book of Job and occurs in its singular abstract form 20 times, in several layers (*à la* Witte) of the Job-poem: 4:17 (lowliness); 5:17 (original?); 7:1, 17 (original); 9:2 (majesty or righteousness); 10:4, 5 (original); 13:9 (original); 14:19 (original); 15:14 (lowliness); 25:4, 6 (lowliness); 28:4, 13 (majesty); 32:8 (Elihu), 33:12, 26 (Elihu); and 36:25 (Elihu). It has been left untranslated by the OG translator once, namely in 13:9; the word appears twice in passages that are asterisked (10:4b and 14:19b in 14:18–19).

⁶⁹³ Cf. also Dhorme 1967, 645; Heater 1982, 122.

⁶⁹⁴ Dhorme 1967, 646 suggests that the translator double translates אָנַפְסָא "I despise myself".

It has been translated with *βροτός* “mortal” in the following passages: 4:17a, 9:2b⁶⁹⁵, 15:14a, 25:4a, 28:4b, 28:13a, 32:8a, 33:12b, and 36:25b. It has to be noted here that all of these occur in the redactions and not in the original layer of the Job-poem.

The word has been translated with the more general *ἄνθρωπος* “human being” in 5:17a, 7:1a, 7:17a, 25:6a (variation instead of repetition), 33:26c. Three of these are in the original layer, one of these in the lowliness redaction, but more than likely translated with *ἄνθρωπος* to avoid repetition, and one in a speech of Elihu. More often, this general noun translates *אִישׁ* / *אֲנָשִׁים* in Job.

In 10:5b, which is in the original layer, it has been translated with the adjective *ἀνθρώπινος* “human, of mankind.”

As a generalisation, therefore, it seems that when *אָנוּשׁ* is in a later addition, whether lowliness or other, the context motivates the translator to prefer *βροτός* “mortal” instead of the simple *ἄνθρωπος* “human being.”

A phrase that Witte has identified to be only used in the lowliness redaction and in 14:1, is *יָלֹד אִשָּׁה* “born of woman”⁶⁹⁶. In all of its three occurrences, it is translated with *γεννητὸς γυναικός* (that is 14:1a, 15:14b, 25:4b). In the lowliness redaction passages, the phrase is in the second colon, while *אָנוּשׁ* is in the first one. Contrarily, outside of lowliness redaction (14:1), the phrase is in the first colon and together with *אָדָם*, not *אָנוּשׁ*. The Greek translator has translated the latter with *βροτὸς γεννητὸς γυναικός* (therefore still keeping in mind the connection of these two words/phrases). 14:1b also exhibits the phrase *קָצֵר יָמִים* “few of days,” which the translator translates with *ὀλιγόβιος* “short-lived.” Independently⁶⁹⁷, the translator has used the same phrase in 11:12b (*ἄνθρωπος* in the first colon) and *γεννητὸς γυναικός ὀλιγόβιος* in 11:2c (*δίκαιος* in the second colon)⁶⁹⁸, which is an additional colon to the verse⁶⁹⁹.

Thus, due to some common keywords⁷⁰⁰ and possibly difficult Hebrew text in ch. 11, the translator made connections with the lowliness redaction and with the beginning of ch. 14.

In Hebrew, the first three passages all have the verb *יָצַדַק*, however, the Greek translator does not translate the same way in each case. They translate with *δίκαιος* in 15:14 and 25:4, but with *καθαρός* in 4:17 (linking with 25:4b and 15:14b). The rest, dealing with being not trustworthy or righteous before God is translated quite

⁶⁹⁵ 9:2b = 25:4a (*אָנוּשׁ יָצַדַק עַם-אֱלֹהִים*). The Greek translator varies only slightly: *πῶς γὰρ ἔσται δίκαιος βροτὸς παρὰ κυρίου*; and *πῶς γὰρ ἔσται δίκαιος βροτὸς ἐναντὶ κυρίου*; Although this question is identical to those in lowliness redaction, neither Witte nor Nömmik have identified it to be from this redaction.

⁶⁹⁶ Witte 1994a, 94–5.

⁶⁹⁷ The verse in Hebrew has some of the keywords that may have prompted this translation: *וְאִישׁ נָבוֹב יִלְבָּב וְעִיר פְּרָא אָדָם יוֹלֵד*: “But a stupid **man** will get understanding, when a wild donkey’s colt is **born** a **man**.”

⁶⁹⁸ The Hebrew verse has some common keywords again: *הֲרֹב דְּבָרִים לֹא יֵעֲנֶה וְאִישׁ שִׁפְתָּיִם יִצְדַּק*: “Should a multitude of words go unanswered, and a **man** full of talk be judged **right**?”

⁶⁹⁹ Cox, ‘Job’, 388 has suggested that the Greek comes from 14:1.

⁷⁰⁰ In addition to those already mentioned, v. 4 has *זָךְ* “pure” (*καθαρός*) and *בָּר* “clean, pure” (*ἄμεμπτος*), v. 11 has *מְתִישׁוּאָה* “worthless men” (*ἔργα ἀνόμων* “the works of transgressors”), and the beginning of the speech in general frequently mentions God, etc.

faithfully. In Hebrew, the three passages are linked with אָנוּשׁ and יָצִדֵק, in Greek, they are linked with βροτός and καθαρός. As the discussion of ch. 11 showed, the translator associated יָצִדֵק with this lowliness motif as well.

Summary

It can be said that the OG translator of Job recognised the motif of lowliness and even utilised it outside of the passages considered to be in the lowliness redaction (in ch. 11), when they were confronted with difficult text but familiar keywords. The translator operated on a larger level than a single verse and could bring up references from various parts of the book.

In the first three passages (4:12–21, 15:11–16, 25:2–6), the translator “mis-read” the consonantal text quite often. On its own, this could suggest that the *Vorlage* was badly written in the newer parts. However, similar “misreadings” can be found in basically all of the speeches in the book of Job. Before any conclusive statements, other redactional layers should be summarised similarly to the lowliness redaction as well.

In the first passage of lowliness redaction, the translator sensed the transition to be too abrupt and made changes so that the previous section of the speech had a conclusion and the new lowliness section (description of Eliphaz’ vision) had a formally marked introduction. Other textual problems caused differences in the translation, including those related to lowliness. For example, some of these are due to the *Vorlage* possibly not having a *mater lectionis* in certain readings.

Some of the keywords of lowliness have fixed or almost fixed equivalents in Greek. The keyword אָנוּשׁ “mortal” has no fixed equivalent overall; however, when it appears in the redactions of Job, the equivalent is overwhelmingly βροτός “mortal.” On occasion, ἄνθρωπος “human” is used, for example when the translator possibly wants to avoid repetition in a strophe. The phrase יָלֹד אִשָּׁה “born of woman” does have a fixed equivalent (γεννητὸς γυναικὸς) that the translator also uses outside of the lowliness redaction, independently of the Hebrew.

The first three passages of lowliness redaction are in Hebrew connected with the keywords אָנוּשׁ “mortal” and יָצִדֵק “to be righteous.” In Greek, however, the link is made with the words βροτός “mortal” and καθαρός “pure.” Further, ἄμειπτος “blameless” links chs. 4 and 15 with chs. 9 and 11; both 9 and 11 also have δίκαιος “just”. The two later passages in ch. 40 and 42 are not explicitly linked to the first three passages nor with each other in either language.

The translator has emphasised human actions in the context of purity before God, although the catalyst for these and related changes was probably different vocalisation/reading of the consonantal text. Humankind being made of clay and vulnerable before God was also brought in through interpretation. Therefore, certain readings and vocalisations of the consonantal text influenced the translator to bring in changes on a larger scale and in other passages of the text.

We can say that the translator noticed overarching themes in the book, such as the lowliness redaction, although they probably did not associate these themes with different authors. What this confirms is that the book of Job does and has contained in it distinguishable themes that did not go unnoticed by the OG translator.

JOB 29–31

Introduction

Job 29–31 contains Job's last speech: *Job reminisces about the days when God watched over him, he was wealthy and respected. But now everyone laughs at me, even the low ones and criminals. Direct address to God who has hurt him but does not listen to him. Job wishes to die; he has been lamenting. Job gives a speech about all the sins and misdeeds he did not commit, but if he did, may he be punished.*

In the OG translation, the speech divides into 24 strophes⁷⁰¹:

I (29:2–4, 3B) *Introduction: I wish that I were back in the days when God watched over me.*

II (29:5–6, 2B) *I was wealthy and I had my children.*

III (29:7–11, 4B) *I was respected in the city.*

IV (29:12–17, 1T4B) *I was helpful and just.*

V (29:18–24, 4B1M) *I thought I would live long: everyone wanted to listen to me.*

VI (30:1–4, 2T) *Now even the low ones laugh at me.*

VII (30:5–8, 1T1B) *Now even thieves have risen up against me.*

VIII (30:9–10, 2B) *They talk about me and they abhor me.*

IX (30:11–18, 2B2T1M) *God has hurt me and I am in pain.*

X (30:19–22, 1B1M1T) *To God: You have pained me and You do not listen to me.*

XI (30:23–24, 2B) *I wish I could die!*

XII (30:25–26, 2B) *I commiserated with sufferers, I was hoping for good but evil came upon me.*

XIII (30:28–31, 4B) *I have lamented loudly and endlessly.*

XIV (31:5–6, 2B) *I did not deceive (but if I did, may I be punished).*

XV (31:7–8, 1T1B) *I was not greedy (but if I was, may I be punished).*

XVI (31:9–12, 4B) *I did not defile another man's wife or marriage (but if I did, may I be punished).*

XVII (31:13–15, 3B) *I did not ignore the complaints of my servants.*

XVIII (31:16–23, 6B1M) *I did not ignore the needy, because I fear the Lord (but if I did, may I be punished).*

XIX (31:24–28, 2T1M1B) *I was not greedy for money or for other gods (?) (but if I was, may I be punished).*

XX (31:29–30, 2B) *I was not happy at my enemies' fall (but if I was, may I be punished.)*

XXI (31:31–32, 1T1B) *I was kind to servants and hospitable to strangers.*

⁷⁰¹ Cox 1991 sees this long speech dividing into the following units: vv. 29:1–6, 7–11, 12–17, 18, 21–24a; 30:2–10 (?), 11a–14, 15–18a, 19–22a, 23–31; 31:1–8, 9–12, 13–23a, 24b–30, 31–40b.

XXII (31:33–37, 4B) *I did not hide my sin, I was kind with the powerless and the debtor.*

XXIII (31:38–40b, 3B) *I did not mishandle my own or others' land (but if I did, may I be punished).*

There are some **keywords** in the speech, some of which are used in all three chapters. For example, אב “father” is used in 29:16, 30:1, and 31:18 (referring to Job as a father-figure in chs. 29 and 31). In Greek, πατήρ is used only in 29:16, as the other two verses are not translated. The verb אבד “to perish” is repeated in 29:13, 30:2, 31:19, while ἀπολλύω is repeated only in 31:12, 19, as 29:13a and 30:2 are not translated. The God-names אל in 31:14.23.28, אלה in 29:2, 4, 31:2, 6, and שדי in 29:5, 31:2, 35 are used. In Greek, κύριος is used in 31:6, 14, 23, 28, 35, and θεός in 29:2.4; some unreflected ones are positioned in untranslated verses or read differently by the translator. In both languages, body-parts are repeated in these chapters, often relating to Job’s suffering or in the case of “hand,” agency.

The following verses in **the Greek text** are asterisked: 29:10b, 11a, 13a, 19–20, 24b–25; 30:1c, 2–4a, 7a, 11b–13a, 16a, 18b, 20b, 22b, 27; and 31:1–4, 18, 23b, 24a, 27a, 35a. Nömmik thinks that 30:2–4 and 31:1–4 could have possibly been missing from the OG translation’s *Vorlage*. Fohrer thinks that the Hebrew text that the translator used deviated from the MT in verses 31:1–4⁷⁰². The structure of the strophes in this speech is varied, ranging from one tricolon up to eleven cola (strophe X). Still, the speech is framed with strophes that are three bicola in length and strophes that are four to eight cola in length are in the majority. As can be seen from the table above, there are a lot more strophes in Greek in this speech that do not align with Hebrew strophes at all. After stylistic analysis, special care needs to be taken in the critical analysis of those strophes to see exactly what lies behind such different texts in the Hebrew and its translation.

There are differing opinions on how large a portion of **the Hebrew text** of this speech was originally in the old Job-poem: estimations range from only six verses (Nömmik, Syring, Kaiser) up to most of the speech being original (van Oorschot).

More specifically, Witte sees a portion of this speech (29:2–31:37*) belonging to the original poem of Job (Hiobdichtung A): 29:2–16, 21–25a; 30:1a*, 9*–31; 31:4–10, 13–14, 16–17, 19–22, 24–27, 29–32, 35–37. The prose introduction in 29:1 was added in stage five (out of seven). In stage six, during the righteousness redaction (“Gerechtigkeitsredaktion”) 30:1c–8 and 31:1–3 and 38–40b were added. In the same stage, he categorises 29:18–20, 31:11–12, 31:23, and 31:28 under possible eschatological glosses or even later glosses. In the final (or in the previous) stage of additions of various origin and glosses, vv. 29:17, 29:18–20 (possibly in the righteousness redaction), 29:25c, 30:12b*, 30:15a*, 31:7c, 31:11–12 (possibly in the righteousness redaction), 31:23 (possibly in the righteousness redaction), 31:28 (possibly in the righteousness redaction), 31:34c, 31:35c, and 31:40c were inserted.⁷⁰³

⁷⁰² Fohrer 1963, 55–6.

⁷⁰³ Witte 1994a, 183–6, 191–2; 2021, 57–9, 438–48, 454–6.

According to Nömmik's latest model, this speech is mostly secondary; however, vv. 30:20–23* and 31:35b–37* could be from the earliest layer of this poem. To these, the “poem about the innocent suffering of a noble ruler” was added. Considered a source by him, it possibly included vv. 29:2–11, 21–25b and 30:1a–b, 9–19*, 24–31. Right after, Job's final monologue started to be reworked in the third layer of redactions and vv. 31:5–6, 7a–b, 8, 9–10, 16, 22 were added. The introduction to the speech in v. 29:1 was added now, as well as the concluding remark 31:40c. Vv. 29:12, 13b–20 are a late *Fortschreibung* on justice. Further verses in a late *Fortschreibung* that rework the final monologue are 30:1c–d, 5–8; 31:17, 19, 21, 24–27, 29–34, 38–40b. V. 31:31b might originate from 19:22b. Vv. 31:11–15, 23, 28 are late eschatological glosses on “otherworldly judgement”. He considers vv. 30:2–4? and 31:1–4? “Masoretic extra material” that may have been missing from the Greek translator's *Vorlage*. Finally, further glosses that cannot be dated are 29:13a, 25c; 30:3c; 31:7c, 18, 20, 35a.⁷⁰⁴

Van Oorschot thinks that this speech was partly from the original poetic dialogue (stage one out of five of literary growth). In stage three, what he calls the actions of the fear-of-God redactor, the prose introduction in 29:1 was added. In the last stage, stage five of growth, the righteousness redactor added vv. 30:1b–8; 31:1–3, 11f, 15, 18, 23, 28, 33f, 38–40. This means that he considers most of 29 and 30 to be original.⁷⁰⁵

According to Syring, 30:20–23 and 31:35–37 were part of the original Job-poem and they immediately followed 27:2–4. In stage three (out of five; linking redaction) of the development of Job, ch. 29, and vv. 30:1, 9–19, 24–31; 31:1–34, 38–40a, and 31:40b–32:5 were added. In the final stage, the theological editions (largely following Witte), vv. 30:2–8 were inserted. 30:20–23, supposedly original, are different from the rest of Job 29–30 in that these verses are a direct address to God, “interrupting” Job's complaint. Vv. 31:35–37 represent a challenge to God, again interrupting the rest of ch. 31 which protests Job's innocence. Thus, according to Syring, these two sections belong to Job's last speech in that they also prepare for God's answer. The rest of 29–31 were inserted together with the prologue; 29–30 and 31 could be considered as quite independent compositions. Further, these later additions are presumed school-texts.⁷⁰⁶

Kaiser also believes that only a small part of this speech belonged to an older text, namely 30:20–23 and 31:35–37. At the first stage of growth, the innocence editor added vv. 29:2–16, 21–25b; 30:1a, b, 9–14, 15b–31; and 31:4–10, 13–14, 16–17, 19–22, 24–27, 29–34b. The majesty editor added the introductory v. 29:1. Next, the righteousness editor added vv. 29:17–20; 30:1c–9a*; 31:1–3, 11–12, 15, 18, 23, 28, 34c, 38–40b. Finally, vv. 29:25 and 31:7c are considered glosses.⁷⁰⁷

Vermeulen sees the following passages belonging to the oldest version of the speech: 29:1–6, 7–11, 21–25b; 30:9–10, 11b, 12a, 13a, 15aβ–19, 26–31; 31:35aβ–37. In *rédaction* II, emphasising Job's positive qualities, vv. 29:12–20,

⁷⁰⁴ Nömmik 2013, 27–9, 229–41; 2014b, 20–2; 2025.

⁷⁰⁵ van Oorschot 2007, 171–84.

⁷⁰⁶ Syring 2004, 133–4, 139–42, 148–9, 153–4, 165–7, 168–73.

⁷⁰⁷ Kaiser 2006, 126.

25b; 30:12b, 13b, (24–)25; and 31:1–10, 13–17, 19–22, 24–35a, 38–40a were added. In *rédaction* III, which is negative towards Jobs, vv. 30:11, 15a and 31:11–12, 18, 23 are added. Finally, in *rédaction* IV, adding even more reproach towards Job, vv. 30:1–8, 20–23 are added. Thus, most of ch. 31 is considered to be from *rédaction* II.⁷⁰⁸

I: 29:2–4

Style

Verses 2–4 form the introductory strophe of the speech consisting of three bicola. The strophe/speech begins with a marked rhetorical question (מי יתנני “who could give me” in Hebrew and Τίς ἂν με θείη “who might put me” in Greek). In Hebrew, the beginning is also marked with a partial symmetry (ABC/B’DE). The strophe ends with the relative כאשר “as when” in Hebrew 4a.

Hebrew has a double framing repetition (and an additional repetition) whereas Greek has a single framing repetition (and another additional repetition) in this strophe: the preposition ב- “in, during” is repeated three times in Hebrew (3a/4a/4b), in Greek it is repeated four times (in the beginning of 3a–4b) as ὅτε “when”; the repetition of אלוה “God” and ὁ θεός “God” in 2b/4b is framing.

A couple of rare Hebrew words have been used, both of which were also reflected by the translator: in 3a, the verb בהלו (הלל “to shine”; 4x, Job: 3), reflected in Greek with the *hapax* verb ἡύχαι “it shone”⁷⁰⁹; and in 4a, the noun חרפי (חרף “autumn, harvest time”; 7x, Job: 1, Ps: 1, Prov: 1); the Greek translator uses the verb ἐπιβρίθω “to press on” (19x, OG Job: 1; it is Homeric and is considered rather poetic⁷¹⁰) in its place. In 2a, the translator uses the potential optative ἂν με θείη which can show an aim at a higher register of Greek⁷¹¹.

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 2a*, the plural כִּירְחֵי “like months” is translated with the singular κατὰ μῆνα “like (in) the month”. The phrase ἔμπροσθεν ἡμερῶν “of former days” translates קדם כִּימֵי “of old, like days” (Hebrew 2a/2b), omitting the preposition. *In 2b*, the already translated כִּימֵי is replaced by the pronoun ὧν “of those”, the preposition “like” is not translated. *In 3a*, the conjunction ὥς “as, like” is added, maybe to compensate for the omission of כ- “like” in 2b. The infinitive phrase בהלו נרו “when his lamp shines” is translated with the finite ὅτε ἡύχαι ὁ λύχνος αὐτοῦ “when his lamp shined, would shine.” *In 3b*, ὅτε ‘when’ is added for stylistic reasons, in order to unify the strophe and the verse. The Hebrew imperfective אֵלֶךְ “I walk” is translated with the Greek imperfective ἐπορεύμην “I was walking.” *In 4b*, ὅτε ὁ θεὸς ἐπισκοπήν ἐποιεῖτο τοῦ οἴκου μου “when God would pay a visit to my house” paraphrases the

⁷⁰⁸ Vermeylen 2015, 147–53, 181, 281. On p. 281 he has written vv. 31:11–20 as stemming from *rédaction* II.

⁷⁰⁹ Cf. also Mangin 2005, 498.

⁷¹⁰ Mangin 2005, 518.

⁷¹¹ Dhont 2018a, 149–51.

Hebrew **בסוד אלוה עלי אהל** “when the company (counsel) of God was upon my tent”. Dhorme and Witte suggest that several versions read **בסוך** (a variant of **שוך**) “with protection, covering”⁷¹²; Dhorme also suggests emending the Hebrew accordingly whereas Witte suggests not to⁷¹³. The equivalence of **סוך** and **ἐπισκοπή** does not exist in the LXX corpus. The paraphrase is simply the translator’s intentional rewording, possibly even taking into account the sound, as **ἐπ** repeats in three words of the verse. **אהל** “tent” being translated with **οἶκος** “house” is a common occurrence in OG Job, possibly due to the translator’s urban context in Alexandria⁷¹⁴.

Utilising the context or the translator's previous knowledge for the meaning of unknown words. **In 4a**, the phrase **ἐπιβρίθων ὁδοῖς** “pressing on on roads” or possibly **ἐπὶ βρίθων ὁδοῖς** “on roads of weights” replaces the Hebrew **בימי חרפי** “in the days of my autumn/harvest”, in which the **חרף** is a rare word⁷¹⁵.

II: 29:5–6

Style

Verses 5–6 form a strophe consisting of two bicola. The strophe begins with an emphatic temporal **בעוד** “when still” in Hebrew. The beginning of the strophe is marked with a partial chiasmus in Hebrew v. 5 (xAB/B’A’), but the end with a partial chiasmus in Greek v. 6 (xABC/B’A’C’).

There are some repetitions: the preposition **ב** (Greek **ὅτε**) “in, during” in 5a/6a; in Hebrew 5a/6b, the phrase **עמדי** “with me”; and in Greek 6ab, the verb **ἐχέοντο** “they were flowing”.

Some rare Hebrew words have been used in the second/last verse of the strophe: in 6a, the *hapax* nouns **הליכי** (הליך “step”) and **בחמה** (חמה “heat”); in 6b, the verb **יצוק** (צוק “to pour”; 3x, Job: 2) and the noun **פלגי** (פלג “stream, channel”; 10x, Job: 1, Ps: 4, Prov: 2). The Greek translator has used a rare word in both verses: in 5a, the adjective **ύλώδης** “woody; prosperous, thriving” (25x, OG Job: 1); and in 6a, the noun **βούτυρον** “butter” (βούτυρος, -ου, ὁ; 42x, LXX: 11, OG Job: 2).

Text

Reading, vocalising, or understanding the consonantal text differently than the later Masoretes. **In 5a**, the Hebrew phrase **בעוד שדי עמדי** “when the Almighty was still with me” is translated with **ὅτε ἤμην ύλώδης λίαν** “lit. when I was very wooded/full of substance”. The Hebrew **שדי עמדי** “the Almighty (was) with me” was probably read as **מַאד שְׂדֵי מָאד** “field, land” and “very much” and translated as

⁷¹² Cf. P with **בִּשְׂמֵי שָׁמַיִם** “when he was protecting”.

⁷¹³ Dhorme 1967, 416; Witte 2021, 438.

⁷¹⁴ Cox 2023.

⁷¹⁵ P translates as **בַּיָּמִים שֶׁנִּיבְּרַחֲמֶיךָ** “in the days of my favour”; see Szpek 1992, 192. For comparison, the rare noun appears once in Prov and the translator of that did not know the meaning either.

ύλώδης λίαν, “very woody, wooded”⁷¹⁶ but likely meaning “a person of substance” (see also the end of Job 19). LXX.D however proposes the same reading as in 19:29: the relative particle *ὅ* and *ὅ* “sufficiency”⁷¹⁷; however, the relative particle in this short form does not appear elsewhere in Job.

Vorlage different than the later MT. *In 6a*, the noun *בַּחמָה* “with heat; poison” is read as *בַּחמָה* and thus translated as *βουτύρω* “with butter” (cf. Vg *butyro*).

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 5b*, the personal suffix in *נַעֲרֵי* “my children” is not translated. *In 6a*, the phrase *בְּרַחֵץ הַלִּיכִי* “when washing my steps” is translated with *ὅτε ἐχέοντό μου αἱ ὁδοί* “when my roads were flowing” (Vg *pedes meos* “my feet”). *In 6b*, the Hebrew *וַיִּצְוֶה יִצְחָק שֶׁמֶן* “and the rock pour out for me streams of oil” is paraphrased into *τὰ δὲ ὄρη μου ἐχέοντο γάλακτι* “and my hills flowed with milk”. This choice creates a repetition with the first colon but also results in a more balanced verse in terms of parallelism and length (Hebrew: 13 and 19 consonants, Greek: 13 and 12 syllables).

III: 29:7–11

Style

Verses 7–11 form a strophe made up of four bicola in Greek (Hebrew v. 10 is not translated). The strophe begins with a temporal clause in v. 7a (*-ב* in Hebrew and *ὅτε* in Greek). In Hebrew, strophe also ends with a marked temporal (*כִּי* in 11a).

Several parallelistic structures can be seen: in v. 8, there is a partial symmetry in Greek (ABC/B'C') and a partial chiasmus in Hebrew (ABxC/xB'A'C); a partial symmetry in Hebrew in both vv. 10 (ABD/xA'C'D') and 11 (xABxC/xA'B'x C'); and in 10a/11b, a symmetry in Greek (ABC/A'B'C'). Therefore, both, although differently, have a xOxO pattern of parallelism.

There are also some lexical repetitions. In Greek, the repetition of *ἰδόντες* “seeing (pl.)” and *ἰδών* “seeing (sg.)” in 8a/11b reflects the same repetition in Hebrew (the verb *ראוּנִי* “they saw me” and *ראתה* “it saw”). In 8a/10a, the verb *וַיִּחְבְּאוּ* “and they hid themselves” and *וַיִּחְבְּאוּ* “they hid themselves” is repeated. This is not reflected in the translation; however, the Greek has a repetition in 7b/9b of *ἐτίθετο* “it was placed” and *ἐπιθέντες* “putting (pl)”.

A couple of marked words are used in Hebrew: in 7a, the noun *קִרְתָּ* (“town”; 5x, Job: 1, Prov: 4; considered late poetic by BDB); in 8b, the adjective *יָשִׁישִׁים* (“aged”; Job: 4); and finally, in 9a, the noun *בְּמִלִּים* (“with/from words” which is considered poetic by BDB).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 7a*, the infinitive phrase *בְּצֵאתִי* “when my coming out” is translated with the finite *ὅτε ἐξέπορευόμην* “when I went out”. *In 7b*, the phrase *בְּרַחֹב* “in the square” is translated with the plural *ἐν δὲ πλατείαις* “in the squares”. *In 8a*, the phrase *וַיִּצְוֶה יִצְחָק* “the young

⁷¹⁶ Dhorme 1967, 417.

⁷¹⁷ Kepper and Witte 2011, 2106.

men saw me and hid themselves” is translated with ἰδόντες με νεανίσκοι ἐκρύβησαν “having seen me, the young men hid”. **In 8b**, the Hebrew קמו עמדו “they rose and stood” is translated with πάντες ἔστησαν “they all stood up”. **In 9a**, the phrase במלים “(they refrained) from speech” is translated with the participle λαλοῦντες “(they stopped) talking”. **In 9b**, the Hebrew וכף ישימו לפיהם “and they lay their hands on their mouth” is paraphrased into δάκτυλον ἐπιθέντες ἐπὶ στόματι “putting a finger on (their) mouth” (cf. Vg *digitum*), using a participle dependent on the finite form in 9a, and omitting the personal suffix. Gorea explains that a difference in meaning is visible in Greek: whereas in Hebrew, putting your hand on your mouth is a mark of surprise (“est un geste qui trahit la surprise, la stupéfaction ou le saisissement”), in Greek, putting your finger on your mouth shows agreement, discretion, and listening (“un geste de convention tacite entre plusieurs personnes, incitant à la discrétion et à l’écoute”)⁷¹⁸. Greek v. **10a** translates Hebrew 11a: οἱ δὲ ἀκούσαντες “and those who heard” paraphrases און שמעה “the ear that heard”. **In 11b**, the Hebrew ראתה ותעידני “it saw and admonished me” is translated with ἰδὼν με ἐξέκλινεν “having seen me, it turned away”. Since “ear” is not translated in the first colon, the parallelism is not as strong as it could be in this verse. **V. 10**, קול נגידים נחבאו ולשונם לחכם דבקה “The voices of princes were hushed and their tongues stuck to the roofs of their mouths” is not translated. The verse does not have any rare vocabulary so the omission must be more intentional than skill based.

Reading, vocalising, or understanding the consonantal text differently than the later Masoretes. **In 7a**, the Hebrew שער “gate” is translated with ὄρθριος “at daybreak, in the morning”, probably due to reading שחר “dawn”; however, Cox explains that since the “Alexandrian” Job already lived in the city, he did not need to go to the gates⁷¹⁹. Interestingly enough, 11Q10 has both readings: ב[צפרין בתרעי “in] the mornings to the gates”⁷²⁰, possibly attesting to double translation of possible different readings. Thus, we might assume that the word was a bit hard to read in some manuscripts. **In 7b**, the verb אכין “I prepared” is changed into ἐτίθητό “it was placed”; Dhorme proposes that the translator may have read הכן “it was prepared” instead⁷²¹. Intentional change of person cannot be ruled out as the translator may have wanted to make Job seem more important in his past.

IV: 29:12–17

Style

Verses 12–17 form a strophe consisting of a *tricolon* and four *bicola* in Greek. In Hebrew, all verses are *bicola*. The strophe begins in 12a with a causal כִּי in Hebrew and γὰρ “for” in Greek.

There are several parallelistic structures in the strophe: in v. 12, a partial chiasmus in Greek (AxBD/xB’CA’), reflecting the partial symmetry in Hebrew

⁷¹⁸ Gorea 2007, 119.

⁷¹⁹ Cox 2023, 254.

⁷²⁰ García Martínez et al. 1998, 113–5; Witte 2021, 438.

⁷²¹ Dhorme 1967, 418.

(xABC/xB'C'); in v. 13, a partial symmetry in Hebrew (ABCD/xA'B'D'); in v. 14, a partial chiasmus in Greek (AB/B'A'C); and finally in v. 15, a partial symmetry in Greek (ABC/A'C') but a partial chiasmus in Hebrew (ABC/xA'C'B').

In Hebrew v. 14a, there is the repetition of לבשתי וילבשני “I put on and it clothed me”. This is not reflected in the Greek translation, however, there are several independent repetitions: in 12b, βοηθός, ἐβοήθησα “help, I helped”; in 14a/16b/17a, the root-repetition δικαιοσύνην “righteousness”, δίκην “case, cause (justice)”, and ἀδίκων “of the unjust”; in 12b/15a/16a ἦν “was”, ἤμην “I was”, ἤμην “I was”.

There is a simile in v. 14: צדק לבשתי וילבשני כמעיל וצניף משפטי “I put on righteousness, and it clothed me; my justice was like a robe and a turban” in Hebrew and δικαιοσύνην δὲ ἐνεδεδύκειν, ἡμφιασάμην δὲ κρίμα ἵσα διπλοῖδι “And I put on righteousness and was clothed with justice like a cloak” in Greek.

Some elevated vocabulary has been used: in Hebrew 14b, the noun צניף (עניף “turban”; 5x, Job: 1); the Greek translator translated this with the rare διπλοῖδι “with a double cloak” (διπλοῖς, -ίδος, ἡ; 11x, LXX: 9, OG Job: 1); in 16a, the noun לאביונים “to the needy” (אביון; considered mostly poetic by BDB); and in 17a, the noun מתלעות “jaw, teeth” (4x, Job: 1, Ps: 1, Prov: 1) and the noun עול “unjust person” (5x, Job: 4).

The Greek translator used several rare words in addition: in 16b, the verb ἐξιχνίασα “I tracked out” (ἐξιχνιάζω; LXX: 16, OG Job: 6); in 17b, the noun ἄρπαγμα “prey” (26x, LXX: 18, OG Job: 1), and the verb ἐξέσπασα “I pulled out” (ἐκσπάω; 39x, LXX: 21, OG Job: 1).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 12b*, ויתום ולא עזר לו “and the orphan who had no helper for him” is paraphrased into καὶ ὀρφανῷ ᾧ οὐκ ἦν βοηθός ἐβοήθησα “and the orphan, for whom there was no help, I helped”. The addition makes the chiasmic structure in the verse stronger. *In 13b* (v. 13a marked with ※), the Hebrew v. 13 ברכת אבד עלי תבא ולב אלמנה ארנן “The blessing of the wretched came upon me and I caused the widow’s heart to sing for joy” is shortened into στόμα δὲ χήρας με εὐλόγησεν “and the widow’s mouth blessed me”⁷²² (possibly also in 11Q10: ו לצל[ם] ארמלה הוית לצל[ם] 723). *In 14b*, the word וצניף “and a turban” is not translated, possibly because it simply would have been too foreign for the Alexandrian context⁷²⁴. The suffix in משפטי “my justice” is not translated. *In 15a*, the dual עינים “eyes” is changed into singular ὀφθαλμός “eye” (cf. Vg) but the singular לעור “to the blind” is changed into plural τυφλῶν “of the blind”. *In 15b*, the dual רגלים “feet” is again changed into singular ποὺς “foot” (cf. Vg) and the singular לפסח “to the lame” is again changed into plural χωλῶν “of the lame”, possibly influenced by the plural in 16a. *In 16a*, the verb ἤμην “I was” translates the אני “I” at the end of 15b (a common technique of the

⁷²² Cf. also Gorea 2007, 122.

⁷²³ García Martínez et al. 1998, 113–5.

⁷²⁴ Cox 2023, 254.

translator). The Hebrew phrase לַאֲבִיּוֹנִים “to the needy” is changed into ἀδυνάτων “of the powerless.” *In 16b*, the relative pronoun הַ “that” is added to create a relative clause. The verb אֶחְקְרוּ “I search it out” is translated with ἐξῆλθῃς “I searched out,” omitting the suffix. *In 17a*, the singular עוֹל “of the unrighteous” is translated with the plural ἀδίκων “of the unjust”; again, v. 16a might have been the influence for the plurals in this strophe. *In 17b*, the phrase וּמִשְׁנֵי “from his teeth” is expanded into with ἐκ δὲ μέσου τῶν ὀδόντων αὐτῶν “from the middle of /from between their teeth. The verb אֶשְׁלִיךְ “I threw away; I made it drop (?)” is changed into ἐξέσπασα “I pulled out” (cf. Vg *auferebam*).

Problems with the *Vorlage* manuscript. *In 12a*, the participle מְשֻׁעַ “the one who cries” is translated with ἐκ χειρὸς δυνάστου “from the hand of the powerful” (cf. exactly the same translation in Ps 72:12; Cox sees χειρὸς as a Hebraism⁷²⁵). Heater suggests that the Greek translator read מְשֻׁעַ (“from the mighty, noble”) and thus associated this passage with Ps 72:12, but more specifically with Job 5:15b, and 6:23b which in turn affected the translation in this verse. Witte offers that possibility as well but also adds the reading מְרֻשָּׁע “from the wicked.”⁷²⁶ P translates מִכַּלְכָּה “from calamity,” reading/understanding שׁוֹאָה “disaster” with the preposition. In this case we may assume that the text was difficult in several pre-MT manuscripts.

Reading, vocalising, or understanding the consonantal text differently than the later Masoretes. *In 14b*, the Hebrew וּלְבִשְׁנִי “it clothed me” (from the end of MT 14a) is either intentionally changed into ἡμφιασάμην “I put around me” or read in the first person אֶלְבִּישְׁנִי “I clothe myself”.

Nömmik considers vv. 12 and 13b–20 a late *Fortschreibung* on justice and 13a a gloss that cannot be dated; Witte states that vv. 17–20 were a later commentary or gloss, whereas the rest was probably added by the righteousness redactor. V. 17 is a later addition, according to Witte, as it does not fit into the strophic structure and has different syntax than the previous verses; v. 18–20 could be from the righteousness redaction or a later gloss. Kaiser thinks that vv. 29:17–20 were added by the righteousness redactor. On the contrary, Vermeylen dates vv. 12–20 to *rédaction* II.⁷²⁷ The translator does not translate v. 13a fully and shortens v. 13 into one colon but did not have any issues in v. 17. In v. 12, the pre-MT manuscripts might have been a bit difficult to read, suggesting that perhaps in some, the scribes had not understood the later added parts and copied carelessly.

⁷²⁵ Cox 2016a, 70.

⁷²⁶ Heater 1982, 88–9; Witte 2021, 439.

⁷²⁷ Kaiser 2006, 125–7; Nömmik 2013, 27–9, 229–41; 2014b, 20–2; Vermeylen 2015, 147–53, 181, 281; Witte 2021, 57–9, 438–9, 454–6, 461; Nömmik 2025.

V: 29:18–24

Style

Verses 29:18–24 form a strophe consisting of four bicola and a *monocolon* in Greek⁷²⁸, therefore the end is marked structurally. In Hebrew, vv. 18–25 consist of seven bicola and a tricolon (dividing possibly into three separate strophes: vv. 18–20, 21–23, and 24–25), the end being thus marked structurally as well.

The strophe begins with the verb ואמר and εἶπα δέ “I said” in both languages. The strophe ends with a conditional in Greek 24a (ἐάν “if”).

This strophe has several similes:

18a	εἶπα δέ Ἡ ἡλικία μου γηράσει,	ואמר עם קני אגוע
18b	ὥσπερ στέλεχος φοίνικος πολὺν χρόνον βιώσω· And I said, ‘My manhood will see old age; I shall live a long while, like the trunk of a palm tree’	וכחול ארבה ימים Then I said, ‘I shall die in my nest, and I shall multiply my days like the phoenix’.
23a	ὥσπερ γῆ διψῶσα προσδεχομένη τὸν ὕετόν,	ויחלו במטר לי
23b	οὕτως οὗτοι τὴν ἐμὴν λαλίαν. As thirsty earth welcomes the rain, so these welcomed what I said	ופיהם פערו למלקוש They waited for me as for the rain; they opened their mouths as for the spring rain.
25a		אבחר דרכם ואשב ראש
25b		ואשכון כמלך בגדוד
25c		כאשר אבליים ינחם I chose what they should do and sat as chief, and I lived like a king among his troops, like one who comforts mourners.

There is a partial chiasmus in Hebrew in vv. 20 (ABC/xA'C'B') and 21 (ABC/C'A'). In v. 23, there is a partial symmetry both in Greek (ABCD/A'B'D') and in Hebrew (xBCD/xAB'D'). In Hebrew, therefore, the end of the first strophe is marked, while the second strophe is framed.

Besides numerous repetitions of prepositions, particles, and pronouns, the only substantial lexical repetition is in Hebrew 21a/23a: ויחלו “and they waited”.

⁷²⁸ Gorea 2007, 123–5 sees the unit being in vv. 29:21–30:1a instead.

In Greek, there is a root-repetition in the end of 22b/23b: ἐλάλουν “I spoke” and λαλίαν “speech, what is said”.

Several marked Hebrew words have been used in this strophe: in 19b, the noun בקציר (קציר “foliage”; 5x, Job: 3, Ps: 1); in 20b, the verb תחליף “it was ever new” (חליף; considered mostly poetic by BDB); in 21b, the preposition למו “upon” (9x, Job: 3); in 22a, the verb ישנו (שנה “to repeat”; 9x, Job: 1, Prov: 2); in 22b, the noun מלתי “my word” (מלה; considered poetic by BDB); in 23b, the verb פער (to open”; 4x, Job: 2, Ps: 1) and the noun מלקוש (ש) “spring rain”; 8x, Job: 1, Prov: 1); finally, in 25c, the adjective אבלי (אבל “mourning”; 8x, Job: 1, Ps: 1). The Greek translation uses, the adverb ὅποτε “whenever” (the only occurrence in the whole of LXX⁷²⁹) in 22b.

Text

Reading, vocalising, or understanding the consonantal text differently than the later Masoretes. *In 18a*, maybe due to corrupt text in the *Vorlage*, the phrase עם קני “if my nest” is translated with Ἡ ἡλικία μου “my age”, Dhorme suggests the translator read עמי זקן “with me (my) age/aging”; Heater hypothesises that the translator read זקין and thus the translation with γηράσει (for him, “my age” is an addition⁷³⁰. P translator read קנה “reed” and translated as ἄσπλον “reed.”⁷³¹ Due to the reading, the verb אגוע “I shall die” is translated with γηράσει “it (my age) will grow old.” *In 18b*, the phrase וכחול “and like the sand” is possibly read as וכנחל “and like the palm tree” and translated with ὥσπερ στέλεχος φοίνικος “like the trunk of a palm tree” (Cf. Vg *palma*). The word στέλεχος “of the trunk” is considered as a clarifying or possibly dogmatic addition by Cox, since it removes the mythological element of the phoenix bird. Heater suggests that this difference is actually anaphorically inspired by Job 14:7–9, where several of the same words are used. He thinks that since the Hebrew is difficult here, ch. 14 was utilised; Cox does not necessarily agree that this is an associative translation.⁷³² Noegel finds that the Greek translator understood the polysemy (Janus parallelism) present in the Hebrew text. He sees that στέλεχος φοίνικος is a conflation of תול and קני and that φοῖνιξ refers to the palm the tree, the mythical phoenix, but also to Phoenicians (coastal people), capturing the polysemy of תול.⁷³³

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 18b*, the phrase ארבה ימים “I (will) multiply the days” is paraphrased πολλὸν χρόνον βιώσω “I will live a long time”. Vv. 19–20 ביד ילין בקצירי: כבודי חדש עמדי וקשתי בידי 19–20 תחליף: “my roots spread out to the waters. with the dew all night on my branches; my glory was fresh with me and my bow ever new in my hand” are not translated explicitly. V. 19 has a tree-motif (roots, branches), explaining the translation of 18a, so intentional shortening is once again visible here. *In 21a*, the phrase לי שמעו ויחלו “to me they listened and waited” is paraphrased into ἐμοῦ ἀκούσαντες

⁷²⁹ Cf. also Mangin 2005, 611.

⁷³⁰ Dhorme 1967, 426; Heater 1982, 89–91.

⁷³¹ Szpek 1992, 158, 279.

⁷³² Heater 1982, 89–91; Cox 1991, 333–4; 2016a, 70.

⁷³³ Noegel 1996, 41–2.

προσέσχον “having listened to me they gave heed”. *In 22a*, the Hebrew לא ישנו “they do not repeat” is translated with οὐ προσέθεντο “they did not add”. *In 23a*, לי ויחלו כמטר ל’ “they shall wait for me like for rain” is paraphrased and extended into ὥσπερ γῆ διψῶσα προσδεχομένη τὸν ὑετὸν “as thirsty earth welcomes the rain”⁷³⁴. *V. 23b* is different in both languages: Hebrew reads ופיהם פתרו למלך “and they opened their mouths as for the spring rain”, whereas OG reads οὕτως οὗτοι τὴν ἐμὴν λαλιάν “so these welcomed what I said”, creating a full simile and a lexical repetition in Greek. *V. 24a* is made into a conditional by adding ἐάν “if” (so also Vg). *Vv. 24b–25*, ואור פני לא יפילון: אבחר דרכם ואשב ראש ואשכון כמלך “and the light of my countenance they did not extinguish. I chose what they should do and sat as chief, and I lived like a king among his troops, like one who comforts mourners” are not translated. There is no rare vocabulary here that would give difficulties to the translator. Therefore, the omission might be more ideological or personal; possibly not wanting to portray Job as a king. Further, the simile at the end of the previous strophe is made more explicit and marked in Greek, signalling also the end of a larger unit. Perhaps the translator noticed that v. 25 had a simile but objected to the notion of portraying Job as a king, and to compensate, made the simile in v. 23 fuller. *V. 25c*, however, is thought to be a gloss by Witte, Nömmik, and Fohrer, although Witte does raise the possibility that the tricolon was an intentional way to mark the end of Job 29. Kaiser sees the whole of v. 25 as a gloss.⁷³⁵

Vorlage different than the later MT. *In 22b*, ועלימו תטף מלתי “and on them drops my word” is paraphrased and extended into περιχαρεῖς δὲ ἐγίνοντο ὅποτε αὐτοῖς ἐλάλουν “they became overjoyed whenever I spoke to them”. The second part actually translates/paraphrases the colon, although seemingly reading תיטב “it (my speech) is pleasing, it pleases” instead of תטף “it drops” (so also P with ⁷³⁶ *סִבַּח*). Heater says that the translation of the beginning of 22b comes from 3:22 (περιχαρεῖς δὲ ἐγένοντο), although neither the context nor the underlying Hebrew are similar. He hypothesises several reasons: the Hebrew “would not be intelligible to” the Greek readers and that the verb תטף was associated with נפת “honey” and that lead to paraphrasing.⁷³⁷ Both readings are a possibility, but at least two pre-MT manuscripts (*Vorlagen* of OG and P) had it.

Witte states that vv. 17–20 were a later commentary or gloss, whereas the rest was probably added by the righteousness redactor while Kaiser states that vv. 17–20 were added by the righteousness redactor.⁷³⁸ In these verses, the translator made intentional changes. In v. 18, however, the *Vorlage* manuscript may have been difficult as the translator read several words differently than others.

⁷³⁴ Cox 2016a, 70 considers γῆ διψῶσα an emphatic or even dramatic addition.

⁷³⁵ Fohrer 1963, 58, 401, 403; Kaiser 2006, 53, 125–7; Nömmik 2013, 27–9, 229–41; Witte 2021, 57–9, 438–48, 454–6, 465; Nömmik 2025.

⁷³⁶ Szpek 1992, 192.

⁷³⁷ Heater 1982, 91–2.

⁷³⁸ Kaiser 2006, 125–7; Witte 2021, 57–9, 438–9, 454–6, 461.

VI: 30:1–4

Style

Verses 30:1–4 form a strophe that consists of two *tricola* in Greek. The Hebrew has here two strophes: v. 1 is a tetracolon and a separate strophe, vv. 2–4 make up the second, consisting of a bicolon, tricolon, and another bicolon.

The strophe begins with adverbial transition markers: ועתה “and now” in Hebrew 1a, וְעַתָּה δὲ “and now” and νῦν “now” in Greek 1ab. In Hebrew, a new strophe begins in 2a with גם “also”. In Greek, the first verse has a partial symmetry (xBC/Ax'B'C'D).

The only significant lexical repetition in Hebrew is in 3c: the root-repetition of שואה ומשאה “devastation and desolation”.

The second strophe in Hebrew features marked words densely: in 2b, the noun בִּלָּח (“vigour”; Job: 2); in 3a, the noun בַּחֲסָר (חסר “poverty”; 2x, Job: 1, Prov: 1), the noun וּבִכְפֹּן (כפן “famine”; Job: 2), and the adjective גִּלְמוּד “solitary” (4x, Job: 3); in 3b, the participle הַעֲרִיקִים of the verb עָרַק “to gnaw” (Job: 2, both in ch. 30); in 3c, the noun אַמֶּשׁ “yesterday, last night” (5x, Job: 1) and the noun מְשֹׂאָה (משואה “desolation”; 3x, Job: 2); in 4a, the participle הַקֹּטְפִים of the verb קָטַף “to pluck” (6x, Job: 2), the *hapax* noun מְלוּחַ “a marsh plant (?)”, the noun שִׁיחַ “bush” (4x, Job: 2, both in ch. 30); and finally in 4b, the noun רְתָמִים (רתם “broom-plant”; 4x, Job: 1, Ps: 1).

The Greek translator has used marked vocabulary as well: in 1d, the use of the adjectival possessive pronoun ἐμῶν “points towards an elevated register”⁷³⁹; in 4b, the noun ἄλιμα “seaside vegetation as food for the hungry” (ἄλιμον, -ου, τό; 11x, LXX: 3, Job: 2, both in this verse, although the first one is in the asterisked 4a) and the singular ἧν (points to one of the few uses of *schema attikon* in Job⁷⁴⁰); and in 4c, the verb πεφασλισμένοι “disparaged” (φασλίζω; 20x, LXX: 16, OG Job: 3).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. In 1b, the Hebrew phrase צַעֲרֵי יָמִים מִמֶּנִּי לִימִים “smaller than me in terms of days” is shortened into ἐλάχιστοι “the smallest”. Translating ועתה שחקו עלי “but now they make sport of me” from 1a a second time, the phrase νῦν σουθετοῦσίν με ἐν μέρει “now they reprove me in turn” is used⁷⁴¹. As a result, Greek has a partial symmetry in this verse, marking the beginning of the strophe.

Problems with the Vorlage manuscript. The rest of the strophe seems to be translated and paraphrased from bits and pieces of the Hebrew. In 1d, the phrase οὓς οὐχ ἡγησάμην “whom I did not deem” is translated from Hebrew 1c אֲשֶׁר מֵאֲסֵתִי “who I disdained”⁷⁴². Muraoka agreeably proposes that ἄξιους “worthy” is

⁷³⁹ Dhont 2018a, 145.

⁷⁴⁰ Mangin 2005, 630.

⁷⁴¹ Cf. also Cox 2016a, 70.

⁷⁴² Cf. also Orlinsky 1958, 235–6.

an interpretation or paraphrase of לשית עם “to put with”⁷⁴³. The word אבותם “their fathers” is omitted. The phrase כלבי צאני “the dogs of my flock” is paraphrased into κυνῶν τῶν ἐμῶν νομάδων “of my shepherd dogs.” From Hebrew 3a, the phrase בחסר ובכפן “in want and in famine” is double-translated and paraphrased with ἐνδεεῖς παντὸς ἀγαθοῦ “in want of everything good” in Greek v. 4c⁷⁴⁴ and ὑπὸ λιμοῦ μεγάλου “out of great hunger” in v. 4d⁷⁴⁵. The adjective גלמוד “solitary” is not translated. From Hebrew 3b, the participle הערקים “those who gnaw” is translated with the finite ἐμασῶντο “they chewed” in Greek v. 4d. In Greek v. 4b, οἵτινες ἄλιμα ἦν αὐτῶν τὰ σῖτα “them—saltwort was their food” translates the noun מלוח “mallow, saltwort” from Hebrew 4a and לחמם “their food” from Hebrew 4b. From Hebrew 4b, the phrase ושרש רתמים “and the root of broom trees” is translated with οἱ καὶ ῥίζας ξύλων “who also (chewed) the roots of trees” in Greek v. 4d⁷⁴⁶. In Greek v. 4c, the phrase ἄτιμοι δὲ καὶ πεφανλισμένοι “and (they were) without honour and disparaged” seems to be an addition and not derived from the Hebrew text.

Thus, from the Hebrew text, v. 2 כלח לי עלימו אבד כלח 2 “What could I gain from the strength of their hands? All their vigor is gone” is completely untranslated; from v. 3, only three words are translated (underlined): בחסר ובכפן גלמוד הערקים ציה אמש שואה ומשאה “Through want and hunger they gnaw the dry and desolate ground”. From v. 4, three words are left untranslated (translated words are underlined): מלוח עלי שיה ושרש רתמים לחמם “They pick mallow and the leaves of bushes and their food (is) the roots of broom”. Vv. 4–5 are also missing in P,⁷⁴⁷ further giving evidence that not only was the *Vorlage* of OG corrupt, but it was also such in several pre-MT manuscripts. Evidence from 11Q10 is too fragmentary to compare fully, but it does seem to have v. 4 at the very least.

Witte considers vv. 1c–8, van Oorschot vv. 1b–8 to be from the righteousness redaction, i.e., the last identifiable redaction of Job. Similarly, Vermeylen dates vv. 1–8 to *rédaction* IV (the last redaction). Vv. 2–8 interrupt the flow of the speech and the contempt for the poor showed in these verses is unusual; in *rédaction* III (5:17) and IV (34:33) such contempt is denounced. The way the fate of the poor is described in these verses is similar to 24:5–8 which, according to him, comes from *rédaction* IV. Since vv. 1 and 9 both begin with ועתה, he thinks that one of them duplicates the other, and namely, it is v. 1 which belongs to *rédaction* IV: the expression ממני לימים in 1b is very similar to that in 32:4 (*rédaction* IV). The motif of שחקו is inspired by 29:24, whereas the motif of הערקים in v. 3 is inspired by 30:17. According to Nömmik, vv. 1c–d are a late *Fortschreibung* that reworks the final monologue; in these verses “the quality of Job’s piety regarding social justice and cultic purity was deepened intensively”.

⁷⁴³ Muraoka 2010, 365.

⁷⁴⁴ Cox 2016, 70 considers παντὸς ἀγαθοῦ an explanatory addition.

⁷⁴⁵ Cox 2016a, 70 considers μεγάλου as an emphatic addition

⁷⁴⁶ Cf. also Beekman 2020, 33.

⁷⁴⁷ See Szpek 1992, 162, who suggests “an earlier damaged text whose lacunae went unnoted by a later copyist.”

He considers vv. 2–4 “Masoretic extra material” that may have been missing from the Greek translator’s *Vorlage*. Finally, 3c is considered a gloss that cannot be dated. Kaiser thinks that vv. 1c–9a* are from the righteousness redaction. Syring thinks that v. 1 was added in the first big redaction that also connected the narrative with the poem; vv. 2–8 were added in the final, theological redaction.⁷⁴⁸

The large amount of rare vocabulary, possible glosses in Hebrew, and corruption in the *Vorlage* manuscript (pre-MT manuscripts?) could be behind the omissions and the bits and pieces that are translated. It is possible that since these additions were so late and part of them were not even in the *Vorlage* yet, the bits and pieces that the translator saw were actually more coherent than now seems. The most we can tell from OG and P, is that vv. 2–4 were partly in the *Vorlage*, but possibly in a much shorter and different form.

VII: 30:5–8

Style

Verses 5–8 form a strophe made up of a *tricolon* and a *bicolon* in Greek, but four *bicola* in Hebrew.

In Hebrew, the strophe begins with a simile: מִן גּוֹ יִגְרֹשׁוּ יִרְעוּ עֲלֵימֹו בְּגִבּוֹ “They are driven out from society; people shout after them as after a thief.” Additionally, the first verse is the only one with no parallelistic structures: there is a (partial) symmetry in vv. 6 (ABC/A’B’xB’) and 7 (ABC/A’B’C’), and an intra-colon symmetry (ABxA’B’) in 8a. Further, the strophe is framed with the repetition of the preposition מִן- “from” (5a/8b), and in 8a, the noun בְּנֵי “sons of” is repeated twice.

There is also quite a large amount marked vocabulary in Hebrew, like in the previous strophe: in 6a, the *hapax* noun בְּעֵרוֹן (עֵרוֹן “ravine”); in 6b, the nouns חֲרִי (חַר “hole”; 7x, Job: 1) and וּכְפִים (כֶּף “rock”; 2x, Job: 1); in 7a, the noun שִׁיחִים (שִׁיחַ “bush”; 4x, Job: 2, both in ch. 30), the verb יִנְהֲקוּ (נָהַק “to bray”; Job: 2); in 7b, the noun חֲרוֹל “nettle” (3x, Job: 1, Prov: 1) and the verb יִסְפְּחוּ (סָפַח “to attach, join”; 5x, Job: 1); and finally in 8b, the *hapax* verb נִכְאוּ (נָכַא “to whip”).

The Greek translator has used a couple of rare words as well: in v. 6, the noun τρῶγλαι “deep holes” (τρῶγλη, -ης, ἡ; 25x, LXX: 7, OG Job: 1); and in 7b, the noun φρύγανα “bushes” (φρύγανον, -ου, τό; 43x, LXX: 6, OG Job: 1).

Text

Problems with the *Vorlage* manuscript. Like the previous strophe, most of this strophe is a condensed version of Hebrew, translating and paraphrasing bits and pieces, possibly the bits and pieces that the translator could read out and understand, as there is a large amount of rare vocabulary here as well. Greek v. 5 (ἐπανάστησάν μοι κλέπται “Thieves have risen up against me”) corresponds to

⁷⁴⁸ Syring 2004, 168–73; Kaiser 2006, 125–7; van Oorschot 2007, 171–84; Nömmik 2013, 27–9, 229–41; 2014b, 20–2; Vermeylen 2015, 147–53, 181, 281; Witte 2021, 57–9, 454–6; Nömmik 2025.

Hebrew 5b (מִן גּוּ יִרְעוּ עֲלֵימוֹ כְּגַנֵּב) “they shout after him like a thief”), while 5a (גֵּרָשׁוּ כְּגַנֵּב “They are driven out from society”) is not translated at all. The phrase “like a thief” is translated with κλέπτει “thieves.” Heater supposes that the verb could have been inspired by the one in 17:8b (יִתְעַרֵּר) and proposes a possible rendition of what the Greek translator might have read: יִעֲרוּ עָלַי כְּמוֹ גַּנֵּב “they rouse themselves upon/against me like a thief”.⁷⁴⁹ Vg struggles in this verse as well and translates/paraphrases: *qui de convallibus ista rapientes cum singula repperissent ad ea cum clamore currebant* “Who snatched up these things out of the valleys, and when they had found any of them, they ran to them with a cry.” Greek v. 6 seems to combine Hebrew v. 6 (בְּעֵרוֹץ נַחְלִים לְשֹׁכֵן חֲרִי עֵפֶר וּכְפִים) “In the gullies of wadis they must live, in holes in the ground, and in the rocks”; translated/paraphrased bits underlined) into one colon: ὧν οἱ οἰῶσι ἀντῶν ἧσαν τρωγλᾶι πετρῶν “whose houses were caves in the rocks”⁷⁵⁰. As with the previous two verses, v. 7 (בֵּין שִׁחִים יִנְהָקוּ תַּחַת חֲרוֹל יִסְפְּחוּ) “Among the bushes they bray; under the nettles they huddle together”) is also shortened into one colon: οἱ ὑπὸ φρύγανα ἄγρια διητῶντο “who spent their lives under wild bushes”. The Hebrew שִׁחִים “bushes” and חֲרוֹל “nettle, weed (sg)” is combined into φρύγανα ἄγρια “wild undershrub, dry sticks (pl).” Beeckman considers this a contextual rendering but raises the possibility of a differing *Vorlage* where חֲרוֹל was not present while Cox considers ἄγρια a clarifying addition⁷⁵¹. The verb יִסְפְּחוּ “they are joined together” is translated with διητῶντο “they lived, spent their lives.” P translation omits the verse, and it proves to be difficult for Vg again, translating/paraphrasing: *qui inter huiuscemodi laetabantur et esse sub sentibus delicias computabant* “They pleased themselves among these kind of things, and counted it delightful to be under the briers.”

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. V. 8 seems to continue the translator’s usual stylistic, syntactic, and rhetorical changes, suggesting that the corrupt or broken section ended with the previous verses. **In 8a**, the common singular adjective נָבִל “foolish, senseless” is translated with the plural ἀφρόνων “of fools”. The repeating בְּנֵי “sons” is not translated. The phrase בְּלִי שֵׁם “(those) without name” is changed into ἀτίμων ὄνομα “of those who are not honourable by name”⁷⁵². **In 8b**, the verb נִכְאוּ “they have been stricken” is changed into a singular participle ἐσβεσμένον “extinguished”. The noun κλέος “reputation” translates once again the Hebrew בְּלִי שֵׁם, since it can carry the meaning of both “name” and “reputation”⁷⁵³; the negation is not translated directly here either; instead, the conjunction καὶ “and” is used.

Witte considers vv. 1c–8, van Oorschot vv. 1b–8 to be from the righteousness redaction, i.e. the last identifiable redaction of Job; similarly, Vermeylen dates vv. 1–8 to *rédaction* IV (the last redaction). According to Nömmik, vv. 5–8 are a

⁷⁴⁹ Heater 1982, 92–3.

⁷⁵⁰ Cf. Heater 1982, 93–4. He proposes that this combined and summarised verse may have influences from Isa 7:19 and 2:19.

⁷⁵¹ Cox 2016a, 70; Beeckman 2020, 33–4; 2024, 251–2.

⁷⁵² P interprets quite similarly as בְּנֵי חַסְדֵּי “iniquitous sons”. See Szpek 1992, 193.

⁷⁵³ Cf. also Cox 2016a, 62.

late *Fortsschreibung* that rework the final monologue; in these verses “the quality of Job’s piety regarding social justice and cultic purity was deepened intensively”. Kaiser sees vv. 1c–9a* being from the righteousness redaction. Syring thinks that v. 1 was added in the first redaction and vv. 2–8 were added in the last, theological redaction.⁷⁵⁴ Just like in the previous strophe, the translator was faced with several textual problems in the *Vorlage* manuscript. It is a possibility that the (later) passages were not yet integrated into the text too well by scribes and as such, the text was problematic in several pre-MT manuscripts.

VIII: 30:9–10

Style

Verses 9–10 form a strophe of two bicola. The strophe begins with an adverbial transition marker ועתה in Hebrew and νῦν δὲ “and now” in Greek. In Hebrew, the beginning is also marked with a (partial) chiasmus (xAB/B’A’) and the repetition of the verb “to be” in 9ab (הייתי “I was, I became” and ואהי “I am”). A couple of marked words have been used: in Hebrew 10b, the noun רק “spittle” (3x, Job: 2); and in 9b, the noun למלה (מלה) “as a (by)word” (considered poetic by BDB); and in Greek 9b, the *hapax* noun θρύλημα “byword” (Job: 2: 17:6a and 30:9b⁷⁵⁵).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 9a*, the Hebrew נגינתם “their music (of a stringed instrument)” is translated as κιθάρα ... αὐτῶν “their cithara, lyre”. The emphatic ἐγώ “I” is added. Kaiser thinks that ועתה is a gloss (vv. 1c–9a* are from the righteousness redaction)⁷⁵⁶. *In 9b*, ואהי להם למלה “and I am a byword to them” is paraphrased into καὶ ἐμὲ θρύλημα ἔχουσιν “and they have me as a byword”. *In 10a*, רחקו מני “they have removed themselves from me” is paraphrased into ἀποστάντες μακράν “standing afar off”.

IX: 30:11–18

Style

Vv. 11–18 form a strophe consisting of two bicola, two *tricola* and a final *monocolon* in Greek. In Hebrew, these verses contain several strophes: in vv. 11–14 (one bicolon, two *tricola*, and another bicolon; although van der Lugt sees vv. 12–13 as three bicola⁷⁵⁷), 15–17 (one *tricolon*, two bicola), and 18–19 (two bicola). The strophe begins with a marked causal כִּי in Hebrew 11a and γὰρ “for” in Greek 11a/13b.

⁷⁵⁴ Syring 2004, 168–73; Kaiser 2006, 125–7; van Oorschot 2007, 171–84; Nömmik 2013, 27–9, 229–41; 2014b, 20–2; Vermeulen 2015, 147–53, 181, 281; Witte 2021, 57–9, 454–6; Nömmik 2025.

⁷⁵⁵ See also Mangin 2005, 528.

⁷⁵⁶ Kaiser 2006, 54, 125–7.

⁷⁵⁷ van der Lugt 1995, 335–6, 477.

In Hebrew, the end of the first strophe and the beginning of the second are marked with parallelistic structures and similes: in v. 14, symmetry ABC/A'B'C' and the simile כפרץ רחב יאתיו תחת שאה התגלגלו "As through a wide breach they come; amid the crash they roll on."; and in 15bc, a partial chiasmus ABC/xB'A'C' and simile ישעתי וכעב עברה תרדף כרוח נדבתי "my honor is pursued as by the wind, and my prosperity has passed away like a cloud". In Hebrew, the last strophe also possibly begins with a simile: ברב כח יתחפש לבושי כפי כתנתי "By a great force my garment is distorted; It ties me up like the collar of my coat." (NASB).

In Greek, there is a partial chiasmus in v. 15bc (ABC/C'B') and a simile (ᾠχέτο μου ἢ ἐλπίς ὥσπερ πνεῦμα καὶ ὥσπερ νέφος ἢ σωτηρία μου "My hope has gone away like a puff of air, and my safety like a cloud"), and a partial symmetry in v. 17 (ABC/B'C').

In Greek, the strophe is framed with the repetition of μου τὴν στολήν "my robe" (13b) and μου τῆς στολῆς "of my robe" (18a). Throughout the strophe, "pains" is repeated: ἐν ὀδύναις in 14b, αἱ ὀδύναι in 15a, and ὀδυνῶν in 16b. Besides the repetition of prepositions and pronouns, the only significant lexical repetition in Hebrew is in 11b/12b of שלחו "they have cast off".

Quite a lot of marked Hebrew words are used: in 11a, the noun יתרו (תר) "cord"; 6x, Job: 2, Ps: 1); in 11b the noun ורסן (רסן "bridle"; 4x, Job: 2, Ps: 1); in 12a, the *hapax* noun פרחח "brood"; in 12c, the noun ארחות "roads" (ארח; considered mostly poetic by BDB); in 13a, the *hapax* verb נתסו (נתס "to break"); in 14a, the verb יאתיו "they came" (אתה; considered poetic by BDB); in 15a, the noun בלהות (בלהה "terror"; 10x, Job: 5, Ps: 1); in 15b, the *hapax* noun נדבתי (נדיבה "honour"); in 17a, the verb נקר ("to dig"; 6x, Job: 1, Prov: 1); and finally in 17b, the participle וערקי of the verb ערק "to gnaw" (Job: 2, both in ch. 30).

In Greek, one rare word has been used: in 14a, the verb καταγκόντισέν "he hurled a weapon and wounded" (κατακοντίζω; 15x, LXX: 2, OG Job: 1).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 11a*, the Hebrew יתרו "his bowstring" is translated with φάρετραν αὐτοῦ "his quiver" (cf. Vg *faretram suam*). The verb פתח "he opened" is translated with the participle ἀνοίξας "having opened." *In 15a*, the Hebrew ההפך עלי בלהות "terrors are turned upon me" is slightly paraphrased into ἐπιστρέφονται δέ μου αἱ ὀδύναι "my pains are turning back". Kaiser thinks that 15a is a gloss⁷⁵⁸. *In 15b*, the Greek ᾠχέτο "it has gone" translates the תרדף "it pursues" in 15b but more so עברה "it has passed away" in 15c, as the verb is not translated in Greek v. 15c at all. *V. 16a*, ועתה עלי תשתפך נפשי "And now my soul is poured out within me" is left untranslated. Gorea posits that the translator did not understand the expression in Hebrew or did not know how to express it in Greek; she further claims that the translator did not know the expression in 14:22 either⁷⁵⁹. The omission might be intentional, as the verse does

⁷⁵⁸ Kaiser 2006, 54.

⁷⁵⁹ Gorea 2007, 133–5.

lated as μου ἡ ἐλπίς “my hope”. In 17b, the Hebrew עֲרָקִי לֹא יִשְׁכַּחן “those/these that gnaw me take no rest” is translated with τὰ δὲ νεῦρά μου διαλέλγεται “and my sinews are parted, loosed from one another”. According to Szpek, the P translator struggled here as well. For example, for the עֲרָקִי “the pain that gnaws me” they used contextual translation and produced וְגַם לִּי “and my body.”⁷⁶⁸ This is reminiscent of the Greek “my sinews.” In Greek, the whole translation may be a contextual composition since it is hard to find any source for it in Hebrew, in this verse or others.

Gorea summarises the translator’s activity here simply: “Le traducteur se forge son propre texte et ne garde de son modèle que des mots épars, faibles échos à l’intérieur de ce qui paraît être plus une improvisation qu’une traduction.”⁷⁶⁹

Heater’s conclusion on the verses in this strophe is telling and really shows that the translator worked on a larger level than just one verse:

The original translation omitted 11b–13a, which was subsequently provided by KR. The G-translator has simply chosen to ignore the Hebrew of 13b–14a and to create an entirely new line to match his translation of 11a. G reads now (11a, 13b, 14a): “For he has opened his quiver and afflicted me. For they have stripped of my garment. He has shot his arrows at me.” This is harmonizing in a different sense. The words of another passage have not been brought in, but the concept of earlier verses has been linked with the verse, and words have been supplied to bring it into a harmonizing whole.⁷⁷⁰

Witte claims that the original first stanza continues now from v. 9, excepting the first word; the original second stanza is in vv. 12–15; vv. 12b and 15a contain later glosses. According to Vermeylen, 11a was added later, in *rédaction* III, to the speech: it now uses third person singular, although the surrounding verses use plural; the parallelism in v. 11 is weak; it begins with כִּי which Vermeylen deems a characteristic of *rédacteur* III; additionally, the idea that Job’s misfortune is punishment for his pride is also characteristic of the same redactor. Vv. 12 and 13 are both tricola, not fitting to the original structure of the Job-poem. *Rédacteur* II added 12b and 13b in parallel: they weaken Job’s complaint, affirm divine justice and the ineffectiveness of any action against it. V. 15 is also a tricolon. The first colon (15a), similarly to v. 11, speaks of the divine “he” who is a repressor, thus coming from the hand of *rédacteur* III. Fohrer thinks that 30:12b (“30:12aβ”) and 15a (“15aα”) were later glosses. Similarly, De Wilde considers vv. 12–14a and 15a as later glosses. He says that these verses do not connect with the preceding verses and that the Hebrew text is of poor condition. He considers 15a a secondary gloss that concludes and summarizes the previous one.⁷⁷¹ Whether the verses in this strophe are later additions and somehow were not integrated into the body of the text well enough by the scribes or the *Vorlage* of

⁷⁶⁸ Szpek 1992, 292.

⁷⁶⁹ Gorea 2007, 132–233.

⁷⁷⁰ Heater 1982, 94.

⁷⁷¹ Fohrer 1963, 58, 412, 413–4; De Wilde 1981, 299–300, 411; Vermeylen 2015, 147–53, 281; Witte 2021, 57–9, 454–6, 468.

OG and possibly other pre-MT manuscripts were damaged in this section, the current Hebrew and OG do not have much correspondence with each other. Some of the versions also are at variance with the current Hebrew.

X: 30:19–22

Style

Vv. 19–22 form a strophe consisting of a bicolon, *monocolon* and a tricolon in Greek. Hebrew has different strophe division: v. 19 belongs to the previous strophe, and the next strophe seems to rather be in vv. 20–23. In Greek, v. 19 is changed to fit into a new train of thought, an accusation towards God. Despite this, the relevant passages in Hebrew form a coherent strophe, just as do the Greek passages.

In v. 20, there is a partial symmetry in Hebrew (ABxC/A'xC'); in v. 21, there is a chiasmus in Greek (AB/B'A'), marking the end of the Greek strophe; in v. 22, there is a partial symmetry in Hebrew (ABC/xA'B').

Several rare Hebrew words have been used: in 19b, the verb **וַאֲתַמְשַׁל** (משל “to liken”; 7x, Job: 1, Ps: 4); in 21a, the adjective **לְאִכְזֹר** (אכזר “cruel”; 4x, Job: 2); and in 21b, the noun **בְּעֶצֶם** (עצם “strength”; 3x, Job: 1, Ps: 1) and the verb **תִּשְׁטַמְנִי** (שטם “to hate”; 6x, Job: 2, Ps: 1). In Greek one rare word has been used: in 21a, the adverb *ἀνελεημόνως* “mercilessly” (4x, Job: 2, here and in 6:21a⁷⁷²).

In Hebrew v. 19, there is a simile that marks the end of a strophe: **הֲרִנִי לַחֲמֶר** “He has cast me into clay, and I have become like dust and ashes”. The Greek translator however has turned this into an ungrammatical expression in the first colon, and the second one is metaphorical but not a simile explicitly.

Text

Reading or vocalising the consonantal text differently than the later Masoretes.

In 19a, the Hebrew **הֲרִנִי לַחֲמֶר** “He has cast me into clay” is translated with *ῥηγῆσαι δέ με ἴσα πηλῷ* “and you have regarded me as clay” (cf. Vg *comparatus sum luto* “I am compared to dirt”). Orlinsky has suggested that the *Vorlage* of the translation read **תִּרְנִי** instead of **הֲרִנִי** in 19a, probably due to later scribal error and thus it is to be preferred to MT⁷⁷³. The Greek is a unique equivalent here and may be due to understanding the radicals **יִרָא** as “to show” rather than “to shoot.” The different reading and understanding explain the fact why the Greek translator saw a new unit beginning here, while the current MT v. 19 still belongs with the previous one. **In 19b**, **וַאֲתַמְשַׁל כַּעֲפָר וָאֶפֶר** “and I have become like dust and ashes” is paraphrased into *ἐν γῇ καὶ σποδῷ μου ἡ μερίς* “my lot is in dust and ashes”, triggered by reading **בַּעֲפָר** instead of **כַּעֲפָר** in the Hebrew text⁷⁷⁴. Greek **v. 22a**, *ἔταξας δέ με ἐν ὀδύνας* “and you arrayed me in pains”, translates Hebrew

⁷⁷² Cf. also Mangin 2005, 489.

⁷⁷³ Orlinsky 1964, 76–7.

⁷⁷⁴ Cox 2016a, 70, considers *μου ἡ μερίς* an addition that completes the second line.

22b,⁷⁷⁵ ותמגני תשוה “and you toss me about in the roar of the storm” but reading בשא “in disaster” instead⁷⁷⁶.

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. In 20a, the phrase ולא תענני “and you do not answer me” is changed into καὶ οὐκ εἰσακούεις μου “and you do not listen to me”. V. 20b, עמדתי ותבנני בי “I stand and you look at me” is not translated. There are no rare words here, nor anything seemingly difficult, so the omission is probably intentional, turning the verse into a monocolon. In 21a, the phrase לאכזר “as cruel, as a cruel person” is translated with the adverb ἀνελεημόνως “mercilessly, cruelly”.

Later Greek manuscript corruption. In 21a, the Hebrew תהפך “you turn yourself” is translated with ἐπέβης “you have mounted, trampled”. Orlinsky argues for the original reading ἀπέβης δέ μοι ἀνελεήμων “Thou hast become merciless to me,” based on how ἀποβαίνω is usually used in the Greek translation of Job⁷⁷⁷, thus inner-Greek corruption is possible here.

Changes regarding religion or religious culture and law. In 21b, בעצם ירך “with the might of your hand you persecute me” is emphasised into χειρὶ κραταιᾷ με ἐμαστίνωσας “with a strong hand you have scourged me”, making God more violent, however Dhorme suggests that the translator read תשטטני (from שוט “to lash”) instead⁷⁷⁸.

Translator's limited vocabulary? Hebrew v. 22a, תשאני אל רוח תרכיבני “you lift me up on the wind, you make me ride on it” is not translated in Greek. The omission might be due to the difficult imagery.

According to Syring and Vermeylen, vv. 20–23 stand out from the rest of the speech because God is addressed with “you”. Vermeylen thinks that this is typical of *rédacteur* II (e.g. 7:7–8). However, based on other features of the addition, he leans towards the conviction that it was actually *rédacteur* III who added these verses. For example, the criticism against God is stronger and not typical of *rédaction* II. Job considering death as not something he wishes for (v. 23) goes against *rédaction* I and aligns more with *rédaction* III, with the following explanations. The verb אשוע in v. 20 might have been influenced/suggested by שוע in v. 24. Additionally, the verb תהפך in v. 21 and the motif of רוח in v. 22 already appeared in v. 15 (*rédacteur* III and I respectively). Furthermore, Elihu responds (in v. 33) to the expression ולא תענני in v. 20. The word לאכזר in v. 21 also appears in 41:2 which is from *rédaction* III. In 22b, he prefers the ketiv תשוה over qere תושיה and says that the expression is also used by Elihu in 36:29.⁷⁷⁹ There are some textual issues and difficult imagery in this strophe which influenced the OG translation. The OG is shorter, but the message is retained.

⁷⁷⁵ Qere תושיה.

⁷⁷⁶ Dhorme 1967, 443; Ziegler 1971, 11.

⁷⁷⁷ Orlinsky, ‘Ἀποβαίνω and Ἐπιβαίνω in the Septuagint of Job’, 365–66

⁷⁷⁸ Dhorme 1967, 443.

⁷⁷⁹ Syring 2004, 172; Vermeylen 2015, 150–1, 147–53.

XI: 30:23–24

Style

Verses 23–24 form a strophe consisting of two bicola in Greek. In Hebrew, v. 23 is at the end of a strophe, and vv. 24–26 form the next one. The strophe is well distinguishable from the surrounding ones in Greek: the particle γὰρ is repeated in three cola out of four and a root repetition with a poetic word (θάνατός “death” and θνητῷ “to a mortal”) marks the beginning of the strophe in 23ab. In v. 24, Hebrew has a partial symmetry (xABC/xB’C’).

A couple of marked Hebrew words have been used: in 24a, the noun בעי (עי “a ruin”; 5x, Job: 1, Ps: 1); and in 24b, the nouns בפידו (פיד “disaster”; 4x, Job: 3, Prov: 1) and שוע “a cry” (Job: 2). In Greek, a poetic word has been used in 23b: the adjective θνητῷ “mortal” which occurs only once in Job and seven times in the LXX (the equivalence with חי is unique)⁷⁸⁰.

Text

Changes regarding religion or religious culture and law. Although some changes in the previous strophe emphasised God’s violence, *in 23a*, כי ידעתי מות תשיבני, “I know that you will bring me to death”, is paraphrased into οἶδα γὰρ ὅτι θάνατός με ἐκτρίψει “Because I know that death will crush me”, removing God’s part in Job’s death and changing from addressing God to Job’s wishing for his own death. According to Mangin, this clearly refers to annihilating Job, since in Gen 19:29, the verb is used for the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah⁷⁸¹.

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 23b*, ובית מועד לכל חי “and to the house appointed for all living” is paraphrased into οἰκία γὰρ παντὶ θνητῷ γῆ “for earth is home to every mortal”, clarifying the message.

Problems with the Vorlage manuscript. *In 24a*, אַךְ לֹא בְעִי יִשְׁלַח יְיָ “Surely one does not turn against the needy” is translated with εἰ γὰρ ὄφελον δυνάμιμην ἐμαυτὸν χειρώσασθαι “Oh that I might be able to lay hands on myself”. A statement is turned into a suicidal wish⁷⁸². Dhorme supposes three “misreadings” in this colon: “לֹא instead of לֵא ... בִּי instead of בְּעִי, and אֲשַׁלַּח instead of יִשְׁלַח”⁷⁸³. *V. 24b* is also very different in the two languages. The Greek καὶ ποιήσει μοι τοῦτο “or, at least, entreat another, and he will do this for me” replaces the Hebrew phrase אִם בְּפִידוֹ לֵהֶן שׁוֹע “when in disaster they cry for help”⁷⁸⁴. According to Szpek, P translator also seemed to struggle here and resorted to contextual translation for בְּפִידוֹ “in his disaster, misfortune,” producing the verb יִפְדֶּם “he will deliver”⁷⁸⁵. Vg has seemingly struggled as well and translates *verumtamen non ad consumptionem eorum emittis manum tuam et si corruerint*

⁷⁸⁰ Mangin 2005, 528; Dhont 2018a, 173.

⁷⁸¹ Mangin 2005, 511.

⁷⁸² Cox 2016a, 70 considers εἰ ... ὄφελον an addition that expresses a wish.

⁷⁸³ Dhorme 1967, 445.

⁷⁸⁴ Cox 2016a, 70 considers the phrase καὶ ποιήσει μοι τοῦτο an addition that completes the line.

⁷⁸⁵ Szpek 1992, 293.

ipse salvabis “But yet thou stretchest not forth thy hand to their consumption: and if they shall fall down, thou wilt save.” Once again, Dhorme suggests that the translator read the Hebrew differently, namely לִי כֵן יַעֲשֶׂה “he does that to me;” however, he suggests emending the MT: in 24a, אֶשְׁלַח instead of יִשְׁלַח, and in v. 24b, לִי יִשׁוּעַ “he helps me” instead of לִהְיוֹן שׁוּעַ, both in agreement with Greek⁷⁸⁶.

Witte claims that the Hebrew text of vv. 24–25 has not been preserved completely intact. According to Vermeylen, vv. 20–23 stand out from the rest of the speech because God is addressed with “you”. He deems it possible that these verses are from *rédaction* IV, while v. 24 might be from *rédaction* II.⁷⁸⁷ Some textual issues in this strophe influenced the OG translation but also other versions. We might then assume that already several pre-MT manuscripts had problems here. Whether these issues are related to badly integrated and copied later additions to the Hebrew text, cannot be proved. However, Witte’s theory that vv. 24–25 simply got corrupt at some point is reasonable; with that later pre-MT and even MT manuscripts carried the issues with them.

XII: 30:25–26

Style

Vv. 25–26 form a strophe consisting of two bicola in Greek (in Hebrew, the strophe is in vv. 24–27, all bicola). In Greek, the beginning of the strophe is marked with a partial chiasmus in v. 25 (ABC/C’B’). In Hebrew, the whole strophe, except the last verse, has parallelistic structures: v. 24 was discussed above, v. 25 has a partial symmetry (xAC/A’BC’) and v. 26 a partial chiasmus (xABCD/xB’A’C’D’).

Lexical repetitions define and distinguish the strophe in Greek. Both of the verses begin with ἐγὼ δὲ “and I.” The second colon of both verses has the verb “to see”: ὁρᾶν “seeing” and the interjection ἰδοὺ “see!”. In Hebrew, there are a couple of repetitions: יום “day” (25a) and ימי “days” (27b), and in v. 26 ויבא “and it comes”.

Some marked Hebrew words have been used: in 25b, the *hapax* verb עָגַם “to be grieved”; in 26b, the noun אֶפֶל “darkness” (9x, Job. 6, Ps. 2; it is considered poetic by BDB); and in 27a, the verb רָתַח (רָתַח “to boil”; 3x, Job. 2).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 25a*, the rhetorical question אִם לֹא בִכִּיתִי לַקֶּשֶׁה יוֹם “Did I not weep for those whose day was hard?” is turned into an emphatic statement ἐγὼ δὲ ἐπὶ παντὶ ἀδυνατῶ ἔκλαυσα “And I wept over every powerless person”. *V. 25b*, עָגַם נַפְשִׁי לְאִבְיוֹן “(was not) my soul grieved for the poor?” is also paraphrased in a similar way and turned into first person: ἐστέναξα δὲ ἰδὼν ἄνδρα ἐν ἀνάγκαις “and I groaned when I saw a man in dire strains”. According to Vermeylen, the compassion expressed in v. 25 aligns with

⁷⁸⁶ Dhorme 1967, 445.

⁷⁸⁷ Vermeylen 2015, 147–53; Witte 2021, 443, 471–2.

that expressed in *rédaction* II⁷⁸⁸. *In 26a*, כִּי טוֹב קוִיָּתִי “but I waited for good” is changed into a more emphatic phrase ἐγὼ δὲ ἐπέχων ἀγαθοῖς “but me being intent upon good things”, having the pronoun in the emphatic first position and also creating a repetition with 25a. Greek *v. 26b* ἰδοὺ συνήγητησάν μοι μᾶλλον ἡμέραι κακῶν “look, days of evil met me all the more” translates and connects Hebrew 26a ויבא רע “evil came” and 27b קדמני ימי עני “days of affliction come to meet me”, giving ever more evidence of intentional shortening. Hebrew *v. 26b* ואֵיחֹלָה מְעִי רָחֹו “and when I waited for light, darkness came” and *v. 27a* מְעִי רָחֹו “My inward parts are in turmoil and are never still” are not translated. There are two rare words in these two cola, but these should not have hindered translation too much. The strophe is condensed, Job’s bodily experience, besides crying, is removed. So is the contrast between light and dark, whereas the dichotomy of good and bad is kept.

XIII: 30:28–31

Style

Vv. 28–31 form a strophe consisting of four bicola. The beginning of the strophe is marked with non-parallelism in Hebrew, whereas all verses have a parallelistic structure in Greek: in v. 28, a partial chiasmus in Greek (ABC/B’DA’); in v. 29, a partial symmetry in both Greek and Hebrew (ABC/A’C’); in v. 30, a partial symmetry in both Greek (ABC/A’D) and Hebrew (ABC/xA’B’D); and in v. 31, a partial chiasmus in both Greek (ABC/C’B’) and Hebrew (xABC/xC’B’).

Besides the repetition of prepositions and the like, the only significant lexical repetition in Hebrew is of the verb “to be”: הייתי “I was” in 29a and ויהי “and it is” in 31a.

Some marked vocabulary has been used in Hebrew: in 28a, the noun חמה “heat” (6x, Job: 1, Ps: 1; BDB considers it poetic); in 29b, the noun יענה “ostrich” (8x, Job: 1); in 30a, the *hapax* verb שחר “to be black”; and finally, in 31b, the noun ועגבי (עוגב “pipe”; 4x, Job: 2, Ps: 2).

The Greek translator has used a couple of rare words as well: in 28a, the noun φιμοῦ “muzzle” (φιμός, -οῦ, ὁ; 15x, LXX: 3, OG Job: 1); and in 30a, the verb ἐσκότῳται “it became dark” (σκοτώω; 24x, LXX: 6, OG Job: 2).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 28a*, the participle קֹדֶר “being dark” is clarified and translated with στένων “moaning, groaning”. *In 28b*, the verb אשוע “I cry for help” is translated with the participle κεκραγώς “having croaked, screamed”. *In 29b*, the phrase לבנות “to the daughters (of ostriches)” is omitted. *In 30a*, the adverb μέγας “greatly” replaces מעלי “on me, from me”, possibly for emphasis and clarity of the phrase. Gray suggests emending the MT מִעָלַי מִעָלַי “than a cauldron” (and so also in 30:17)⁷⁸⁹. *In 30b*, the common

⁷⁸⁸ Vermeylen 2015, 151, 281.

⁷⁸⁹ Gray 1974, 345; García Martínez et al. 1998, 117–9.

singular ועצמי “and my bone” is translated with the plural τὰ δὲ ὀστᾶ μου “and my bones” and the verb חרה “it has been scorched” is omitted. *In 31a*, the phrase ויהי לאבל “it became (into) mourning” is translated with ἀπέβη δὲ εἰς πάθος μου “it turned into my suffering”. Finally, *in 31b*, the rare Hebrew ועגבי “and my pipe” is translated with ὁ δὲ ψαλμός μου “and (the sound of) my harp”, and the phrase לקול בכים “into the sound of those who weep” is changed into εἰς κλαυθμόν ἐμοί “into weeping for me”. Thus, the last verse is more personalised with the added pronouns.

Utilising the context or the translator's previous knowledge for the meaning of unknown words. *In 28a*, the rare חמה בלא “without heat, sun” is translated with ἄνευ φιμοῦ “without a muzzle”; textual corruption in the Greek text has been suggested and the original may have been ἄνευ θυμοῦ “without anger”, understanding חמה as “anger”⁷⁹⁰. Vg translates *sine furore* “without indignation,” P translator understood here the root יחם and translated as سحابة “anger”⁷⁹¹. It is reasonable to assume that the rare word was not known to these translators and context was utilised. *In 29a*, the Hebrew לתנים “to jackals” is translated as σειρήνων “of sirens”. Vg opts for *draconum* “of dragons.” Both thus mythologise⁷⁹² based on the context.

XIV: 31:5–6

Style

Vv. 31:5–6 form a strophe consisting of two bicola. The strophe/speech begins with marked conditionals (םא in Hebrew 5a, εἰ δὲ and εἰ δὲ καὶ in Greek 5ab). The strophe ends with a marked apodosis in Greek (ἄρα in 6a). A couple of marked words have been used⁷⁹³: in Hebrew 6b, the rare noun תמתי (תמה “integrity”; 5x, Job: 4, Prov: 1); in Greek 5a, the noun γελοιαστῶν “jesters” (γελοιαστής, -οῦ, ὁ; 2x, Job: 1); and in 6b, the noun τῇν ἀκακίαν “moral innocence” (23x, LXX: 14, OG Job: 4).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *Vv. 31:1–4* are not translated (see Appendix III for text). The non-translation does not ruin the integrity of the speech, this strophe, nor the transition between chs. 30 and 31. According to Nömmik, they were “Masoretic extra material” that may have been missing from the Greek translator’s *Vorlage*. Witte, van Oorschot, and Kaiser think that vv. 1–3 were added in the last identifiable redaction (righteousness redaction); however, for the Greek translation, Witte leans towards intentional shortening and also mentions that the end of ch. 30 and the beginning of ch. 31 are now closer motif-

⁷⁹⁰ Ziegler 1982, 344; Kepper and Witte 2011, 2108.

⁷⁹¹ Szpek 1992, 280.

⁷⁹² See more on the OG translation in Beeckman 2024, 228–30.

⁷⁹³ Of the asterisked verses, v. 3 contains rare vocabulary: in 3a, the noun לעול (עול “the unjust one”, 5x, Job: 4); and in 3b, the noun נכר “misfortune” (2x, Job: 1).

wise⁷⁹⁴. The translator does not leave sections with God-names in it untranslated very often; however, passages to do with God counting Job's steps and the covenant⁷⁹⁵ are subject to changes. Moreover, the translator is sometimes sensitive to sections of the text that formally do not align with the surrounding strophes. In these verses, the sudden questions after Job lamenting his life but before Job claiming his innocence, might have been out of place. **In 5a**, the verb הלכתי "I have walked" is translated periphrastically as ἤμην πεπορευμένος "I had been walking". The phrase עם שוא "with falsehood, vanity" is interpreted as μετὰ γελοιαστῶν "with jesters, jokesters;" Witte mentions that some manuscripts have here מתי שוא "men of vanity" which would also match with the Greek and Syriac⁷⁹⁶. However, since the Greek does translate the preposition, it does not seem likely, especially since מתי is never translated directly in the OG. **In 5b**, the conditional εἰ δὲ "if" is added. **In 6a**, ישקלני במאזני צדק "let me be weighed in a just balance" is paraphrased into ἵσταί με ἄρα ἐν ζυγῷ δίκαιῳ "then may he place me in a just balance", adding the apodosis marker ἄρα "then" also.

Nömmik claims that Job's final monologue started to be reworked in the third layer of redactions and vv. 5–6 were added⁷⁹⁷. The translator made only stylistic changes in vv. 5 and 6 and found nothing objectionable in the contents.

XV: 31:7–8

Style

Vv. 7–8 form a strophe consisting of a tricolon and a bicolon, therefore the beginning is marked structurally. In Hebrew, the strophe begins with a marked conditional (אם in 7a) and the end with a cohortative. In Greek, the strophe is demarcated with the conditional sentence as well: the strophe begins with the conditional particle repeated in the first three cola and ends with a marked apodosis (ἄρα in 8a).

The only lexical repetition is that of εἰ/εἰ δὲ καὶ in the first three cola of the strophe. A couple of marked words have been used: in Hebrew 7a, the noun אשיר (אשר "step"; 9x, Job: 2, Ps: 6, Prov: 1); in 8b, the verb ישרשו (שרש "to uproot"; 8x, Job: 3, Ps: 2); in Greek 8b, the adjective ἄρριζος "without roots" (7x, OG Job: 1).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. **In 7a**, the imperfective תטה "it turns aside" is translated with the aorist ἐξέκλινεν "it has turned aside". **In 7c**, ובכפי דבק מאום "and (if) any spot has clung to my hands" is translated with εἰ δὲ καὶ ταῖς χερσίν μου ἥψάμην δώρων "and if too I touched gifts with my hands". The

⁷⁹⁴ Kaiser 2006, 125–7; van Oorschot 2007, 171–84; Witte 2007, 46–8; 2019, 379; 2021, 57–9, 454–6; Nömmik 2025.

⁷⁹⁵ ברית appears in MT Job in 5:23, 31:1, and 40:28. In ch. 5, the colon containing the word is not translated. In ch. 40, it is translated, but the context is the (im)possibility of Leviathan making an agreement with Job, to be in his employ.

⁷⁹⁶ Witte 2021, 444.

⁷⁹⁷ Nömmik 2025.

sentence is now in first person and the singular מאום “blemish” is for some reason changed into the plural δώρων “gifts.” Orlinsky sees this as just translation into idiomatic Greek whereas Dhorme and Hartley suggest that the translator read מאומה “something,” the “*kethib* of the Orientals”⁷⁹⁸; cf. also P with מוֹנֶה “something.”⁷⁹⁹ Of course, in the OG translation, it is possible that the translator simply wanted to make the potential sin clearer and more specific (for it to be a sin, Job himself had to have touched a “blemish” or “gifts”).

Utilising the context or the translator's previous knowledge for the meaning of unknown words. *In 7a*, the rare Hebrew noun אֲשֶׁרִי “my step” has been translated with ὁ πούς μου “my foot”. *In 7b*, the conditional εἰ δὲ “if” is added, the verb + adverb construction הָלַךְ ... וְאַחֵר “and after ... has gone” is appropriately condensed into ἐπηκολούθησεν “it has followed after”, and the dual עֵינַי “my eyes” is translated with the singular τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ “eye”, without the suffix. *In 7c*, again, the conditional εἰ δὲ “if” is added. *V. 8a*, אֶזְרְעָהּ וְאַחֵר יֹאכַל “I will sow and another will eat” is translated with σπείρμαιμι ἄρα καὶ ἄλλοι φάγοισαν “then may I sow and others eat”, using ἄρα “then” and optative appropriate for the apodosis; the common singular and the verb related are translated into plural. *In 8b*, the apodosis phrase יִשְׂרָשׁוּ וְצִאצְאֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל “my offspring/my produce will be uprooted” is paraphrased as ἄρριζος δὲ γενοίμην ἐπὶ γῆς “may I become rootless on earth”; Dhorme suggests several misreadings⁸⁰⁰, but the paraphrase seems quite naturally derived here.

V. 7c is seen as a gloss by several scholars; some also explain why: it apparently gives the whole verse the connotation of moral error (Nömmik), it makes Job seem flawless (Witte) or is simply interpretive (de Wilde). Nömmik claims that Job’s final monologue started to be reworked in the third layer of redactions and vv. 7a–b, 8 were added.⁸⁰¹ Most of the differences in this strophe are due to the translator not knowing some vocabulary and utilising the context and then making sure that the message and the potential sin are clearly and explicitly worded.

XVI: 31:9–12

Style

Verses 9–12 form a strophe consisting of four bicola⁸⁰². In Hebrew, the strophe begins with a marked conditional (אם in 9a) and ends with a marked causal (כי in 12a). In Greek, the strophe begins with marked conditionals (εἰ in 9a, εἰ καὶ in 9b), has a marked apodosis in 10a, and the second half is marked with causals (γάρ in 11a and 12a).

In v. 10, there is a partial chiasmus in Greek (AxB C/B’A) and in v. 11, a partial symmetry in Hebrew (xAB/XA’B’C).

⁷⁹⁸ Orlinsky 1958, 248, 251; Dhorme 1967, 452; Hartley 1988, 411.

⁷⁹⁹ Szpek 1992, 280, 284.

⁸⁰⁰ Dhorme 1967, 453.

⁸⁰¹ Fohrer 1963, 58, 423, 425; De Wilde 1981, 299, 411; Kaiser 2006, 55, 126; Nömmik 2013, 27–9, 229–41; 2014b, 20–2; Witte 2021, 57–9, 438–48, 454–6, 477; Nömmik 2025.

⁸⁰² Dhont 2018, 289–91 sees a literary unit made up of vv. 8–11 instead.

There are a couple of lexical repetitions in Hebrew: לְאַחֵר “for another” and אֲחֵרִים “others” in 10ab; the causal כִּי “for” in 11/12a. The latter is reflected in Greek with the repetition of γὰρ “for.” Additionally, Greek has the following repetitions: the conditional εἰ “if” in 9ab; the phrase “a man’s wife” (γυναῖκα ἀνδρὸς “to a man’s wife” in 9a and ἀνδρὸς γυναῖκα “a man’s wife” 11b); and in 9a/10a, ἑτέρου “of another” and ἑτέρω “to another”.

Several marked Hebrew words have been used: in 10a, the verb טָחַן “to grind”; 8x, Job: 1); in 11b, the noun פִּלְיָם (פִּלִּי “judge”; 3x, Job: 1); in 12a, the noun אַבְדּוֹן “Abaddon” (6x, Job: 3, Ps: 1, Prov: 2); and finally, in 12b, the verb תִּשְׁרֹשׁ “to uproot”; 8x, Job: 3, Ps: 2).

The Greek translator has used several rare words as well: in 9a, the verb ἐξηκολούθησεν (ἐξακολουθέω “to follow after”; 23x, LXX: 8, OG Job: 1); in 9b, the adjective ἐγκάθετος “lying in ambush” (7x, Job: 2); and in 11a, the adjective ἀκατάσχετος “uncontrollable” (10x, LXX: 2, OG Job: 1).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. **In 9a**, אִם נִפְתָּה לְבִי עַל אִשָּׁה “if my heart has been enticed by a woman” is paraphrased into εἰ ἐξηκολούθησεν ἡ καρδία μου γυναῖκα ἀνδρὸς ἑτέρου “if my heart followed another man’s wife”, including changing the verb נִפְתָּה “it has been enticed, deceived” into the active ἐξηκολούθησεν “it has followed after”, thus lifting the guilt/sin from the woman onto Job. The clarifying phrase ἀνδρὸς ἑτέρου “(a woman) of another man” utilises רֵעִי “my neighbour” from 9b⁸⁰³ (cf. also P “a strange woman”⁸⁰⁴). **In 9b**, וְעַל פֶּתַח רֵעִי אֶרְבֹּתִי “and I have lain in wait at my neighbour’s door” is paraphrased into εἰ καὶ ἐγκάθετος ἐγενόμην ἐπὶ θύραις αὐτῆς “and if I lay in wait at her doors”, adding the conditional and changing the details of whose door Job is waiting at. **In 10a**, the apodosis marker ἄρα καὶ “then too” is added. The verb טָחַן “she grinds” is changed into ἀρέσαι “may she please” (appropriate for the apodosis); Dhorme suggests corruption from ἀλέσαι “may she grind” whereas Ziegler denies it and says this is a case of a free rendering⁸⁰⁵. Cf. Vg with the explicit *scortum sit* “let her be the harlot, prostitute.” **In 12a**, the phrase הֵיא עַד אַבְדּוֹן תֹּאכַל “it burns down to Abaddon” is paraphrased into ἐστιν καίόμενον ἐπὶ πάντων τῶν μερῶν “it is burning in all parts”; the pronoun and finite verb combination is turned into a to-be verb and participle combination; Abaddon is paraphrased and clarified. **In 12b**, the verb תִּשְׁרֹשׁ “it roots out, uproots” is translated as ἐκ ριζῶν ἀπώλεσεν “it has destroyed from the roots”.

Reading, vocalising, or understanding the consonantal text differently than the later Masoretes. **In 10b**, וְעַלֶּיהָ יִכְרְעוּ אֲחֵרִים “and let other men kneel over her” is turned into τὰ δὲ νήπιά μου ταπεινωθείη “and may my children be humiliated”. Dhorme suggests that the Greek translates עוֹלִי “my child” and omits אֲחֵרִים “the

⁸⁰³ Dhorme 1967, 453; Kepper and Witte 2011, 2108. For some reason, Cox 2016a, 71 considers only ἑτέρου as a clarifying addition.

⁸⁰⁴ Szpek 1992, 135. She does not mention the similarity with OG.

⁸⁰⁵ Dhorme 1967, 454; Ziegler 1971, 16.

following”⁸⁰⁶. Considering how the translator usually operates, it is very likely that the Greek simply connects these two and shortens the phrase. The verb is translated in optative *ταπεινωθείη* “may they lower themselves, humble themselves,” appropriate for the apodosis. *In 12b*, *οὗ δ’ ἂν ἐπέλθῃ* “and wherever it has gone” seems to be a result of reading the phrase *ובכל תבוא* as *ובכל תבואתי* (“and everywhere it goes” from *בוא* “to go”). The Greek does seem to make more sense in the context.

Problems with the *Vorlage* manuscript. *V. 11* is completely different in both languages. The Greek *θυμὸς γὰρ ὀργῆς ἀκατάσχετος τὸ μιᾶναι ἀνδρὸς γυναῖκα* “for a fit of passion is uncontrollable, namely, the defiling of a man’s wife” does not exactly translate the Hebrew *זמה והיא*⁸⁰⁷ *עון פלילים*⁸⁰⁸ “for that would be a heinous crime; that would be a criminal offense.” The Hebrew is obviously a bit problematic. Thus, Heater says that “the translator feels a need to expand G so as to bring in the pertinent Levitical legislation involving the issue at hand, in this case, adultery.” More specifically, Dhorme suggests that *τὸ μιᾶναι ἀνδρὸς γυναῖκα* is an explanation of *זמה*, inspired by Num 5:13ff. Heater expands and says that Num 5:20 is especially similar to the verse in question; in addition, he mentions Ez 18:6b. Both of these verses deal with adultery.⁸⁰⁹

Nömmik claims that Job’s final monologue started to be reworked in the third layer of redactions and vv. 9–10 were added. Vv. 31:11–15 are late eschatological glosses on “otherworldly judgement”. Witte, van Oorschot, and Kaiser claim that vv. 11–12 were added to the poem by the righteousness redactor or as a later gloss (Witte); these expand the oath by asserting the seriousness of adultery. Witte mentions stylistic (v. 11 is more prosaic than poetic) and intellectual interruption as reasons why these verses might be secondary and from the righteousness redaction. Vermeylen explains that vv. 11–12 might be from *rédaction* III, because they are opened with the particle *כי* that usually introduces secondary remarks. The verses fall outside the pattern of oaths used in ch. 31, v. 12 also disturbs the rhythm. In v. 11 he also sees parallels with Sirach 9 and some warning in Proverbs.⁸¹⁰ The problems identified by these scholars bothered the translator as well. They read the text slightly differently than the later Masoretes, proving problems with handwriting/readability in the manuscript of the *Vorlage*. V. 11 with its problematic text was connected with Leviticus; in the context of this chapter, it makes sense.

⁸⁰⁶ Dhorme 1967, 454.

⁸⁰⁷ *Qere* *היא*.

⁸⁰⁸ *Qere* *והוא*.

⁸⁰⁹ Dhorme 1967, 454–5; Heater 1982, 94–5.

⁸¹⁰ Witte 1994a, 184–6; Kaiser 2006, 126; van Oorschot 2007, 171–84; Nömmik 2013, 27–9, 229–41; Vermeylen 2015, 151–3, 147–53, 281; Witte 2021, 57–9, 438–48, 454–6, 478; Nömmik 2025.

XVII: 31:13–15

Style

Vv. 13–15 form a strophe consisting of three bicola. The strophe begins with a marked conditional (אם/εἰ δὲ καὶ) and ends with a marked question (הלא “did not?” and πότερον οὐχ “were not?”).

In Hebrew, the middle of the strophe is marked with parallelism, but in Greek, the beginning of the strophe is marked with non-parallelism: in v. 14, there is a partial chiasmus both in Greek (xABCDE/C'D'A'B') and in Hebrew (xABCDE/xC'D'A'B'), and in v. 15, there is a partial symmetry in Greek (xABCxA'B'/B'C').

In Greek, each verse has a different distinctive lexical repetition: in v. 13, a root repetition (θεράποντός “of a male attendant” and θεραπαίνης “of a female attendant”); in v. 14, the verb “to make, do” three times (ποιήσω “I shall do”, ποιήσεται “he will make, do”, and ποιήσομαι “I shall do, make”); and in v. 15, the verb “to be born, be conceived” three times (ἐγενόμην “I was conceived”, γεγόνασιν “they were conceived”, and γεγόναμεν “we were conceived”).

In Hebrew, there are several lexical repetitions: the interrogative מה “what?” and the conditional/temporal כִּי “when” twice in 14ab, in chiasmic order; the verb “to make, do” three times (אעשה “I do” in 14a, עשני “he who made me” and עָשָׂהוּ “he made him” in 15a).

The Greek translator has used a couple of rare words: in 13a, the verb ἐφάυλισα “to hold in contempt” (φauλίζω; 20x, LXX: 16, OG Job: 3); and in 14a, the *hapax* noun ἔτασιν “scrutiny” (ἔτασις, -εως, ἡ; Job: 3, 10:17a, 12:6c, and 31:14a).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 13a*, the simple אם “if” is translated with εἰ δὲ καὶ “and if too”. The verb אָמַס “I despise, reject” is translated as ἐφάυλισα “I disparaged, held cheap.” *In 13b*, the phrase בְּרִבְבָם עִמָּדִי “when (they had) their strife with me” is translated with the genitive absolute κρινομένων αὐτῶν πρὸς μέ “when they bring a complaint against me”. *In 14a*, the interrogative ומה “and what?” is translated with τί γάρ “for/then what?”. *In 14b*, the verb וְכִי יִפְקֹד “and if He visits” is changed into the elliptical ἐὰν δὲ καὶ ἐπισκοπήν “and if he (makes) a visit”, where the verb (ποιήσεται) is in the previous colon.

Changes regarding religion or religious culture and law. *In 14a*, the phrase כִּי יָקוּם אֱלֹהִים “if God rises up” is changed to ἐὰν ἔτασιν μου ποιήσεται ὁ κύριος “if The Lord causes my affliction, trial” (Cf. Vg *surrexerit ad iudicandum Deus* “God shall rise to judge”). This change adds a lexical repetition but also changes the way Job thinks about God’s actions towards him. Orlinsky, however, says that the translator understood the verb as a legal term and translated into idiomatic Greek⁸¹¹. *In 14b*, the verb אָשִׁיבָנוּ “I answer him” is translated as ἀπόκρισιν ποιήσομαι “I will make, produce an answer”, the pronominal suffix “him” is not translated. Again, the translator adds a repetition by translating periphrastically. Donald Gard called this sub-category of exegetical actions by the translator the

⁸¹¹ Orlinsky 1958, 248, 251.

“arrogance of man before God avoided,” here specifically the possibility of directly answering God is avoided⁸¹². In 15a, הלא בבטן עשני עשהו “Did not he who made me in the womb make them?” is slightly changed into πότερον οὐχ ὡς καὶ ἐγὼ ἐγενόμην ἐν γαστρὶ καὶ ἐκεῖνοι γεγόνασιν “Just as I came into being in the belly, they also had come into being”. In 15b, the verb יכננו “He formed us” is changed to γεγόναμεν “we had come into being”; it seems to be a unique equivalence⁸¹³, but again creates a repetition. For some reason, the reference to God’s hand in creation of humans (“he made me,” “he made him,” “he formed us”) is removed and rephrased by the translator in this verse.

According to Nömmik, vv. 31:11–15 are late eschatological glosses on “otherworldly judgement”. Witte and Kaiser think that v. 15 was (possibly) added later by the righteousness redactor (stage 4a)⁸¹⁴. The translator made changes regarding religion in this strophe, most notably removing God’s agency in creating Job and other humans.

XVIII: 31:16–23

Style

Vv. 16–23 form a long strophe (the apodosis does not appear until v. 22) consisting of six bicola and a monocolon in Greek, but eight bicola in Hebrew. Therefore, the end of the strophe is marked structurally in Greek.

In Hebrew, the strophe begins with the conditional אם, but in Greek, the conditional is not used before 17a. The strophe ends with a marked causal in 23a (כי in Hebrew and γὰρ in Greek), before that the Greek has a marked apodosis (with ἄρα).

There is a partial chiasmus in Hebrew v. 17 (xABC/xA’C’B’), a partial symmetry in Hebrew in v. 18 (xABC/xA’B’) and a partial chiasmus in v. 19 (xABC/C’B’). In v. 22, there is a partial chiasmus in Greek (AxBC/B’C’A’) and a symmetry in Hebrew (ABC/xA’B’C’).

The strophe is framed with the repetition of εἶχον “I had” and συνέσχεν “it held” in Greek. In Hebrew, the conditional אם “if” is repeated in 16a/19a/20a/21a; this is reflected in Greek with the repetition of εἰ “if” and εἰ δὲ καὶ in 17a/19/20a/21a. The causal כי “for, because” is repeated in 18a/21b/23a which is not reflected in Greek. In Hebrew 17ab, there is the repetition of ואכל “and he ate” and אכל “he ate” which is again not reflected in the Greek translation. The noun יתום “the orphan” is repeated in 17b and 21a, this is reflected in Greek with ὀρφανῶ. The verb אראה “I saw” is repeated in 19a/21b but it is not reflected in the translation. The Greek, however, repeats the noun ἀδύνατοι “the powerless” in 16a and 20a, as well as οἱ ὥμοι “the shoulders” and ὁ ὥμος “the shoulder” in 20b/22a.

Some marked vocabulary has been used in Hebrew: in 16a, the noun דלים (דל) “the poor” (categorised under words that are poetic and common in wisdom

⁸¹² Gard 1967, 19.

⁸¹³ Cf. also Dhont 2018a, 257.

⁸¹⁴ Witte 1994a, 184–6; Kaiser 2006, 126; Nömmik 2013, 27–9, 229–41; 2025.

literature by BDB); in 19a, the negation מבלי “without” (considered mostly poetic by BDB); in 19b, the noun כסות “covering, clothing” (8x, Job: 3); in 20a, the noun חלצו (חלץ “loin”; 10x, Job: 3); in 20b, the noun ומגז (גז “fleece”; 4x, Job: 1, Ps: 1); and finally in 22b, the noun ואזורעי (אזורע “arm”; 2x, Job: 1).

Marked vocabulary appears in the Greek translation as well: in 16b, the verb ἐξέτηξα “I did not let waste away” (ἐκτέχω; 47x, LXX: 8, OG Job: 1); in 17a, the noun τὸν ψωμόν “small piece of food” (29x, LXX: 12, OG Job: 3); and in 20b, the noun κουράς “of the fleece” (κουρά, -ᾶς, ῆ; 47x, LXX: 3, OG Job: 1).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 16a*, the conditional אם אמנע “if I have withheld anything that the poor desired” is turned into a statement ἀδύνατοι δὲ χρεῖαν ἦν ποτ' εἶχον οὐκ ἀπέτυχον “And the powerless did not lose/miss the need that they ever had”, omitting the conditional and expanding “desire”. *In 16b*, the dual ועיני “and eyes” is translated with the singular δὲ τὸν ὀφθαλμόν “and the eye” and the verb אכלה “I bring to an end” is again translated using a negative οὐκ ἐξέτηξα “I did not melt away”. Now, *in 17a*, the opposite is done, and the translator adds the conditional εἰ δὲ “if”. The imperfective ואכל “and I eat” is translated with the aorist καὶ ... ἔφαγον “and I ate.” *In 17b*, the Hebrew ולא אכל יתום ממנה “and the orphan did not eat from it” is paraphrased as καὶ οὐχὶ ὀρφανῶ μετέδωκα “and I did not share with the orphan”, making it more personal with the first-person verb. *V. 18* כי מנעורי גדלני כאב ומבטן אמי אנחנה “for from my youth I reared the orphan like a father, and from my mother’s womb I guided the widow” is not translated in the Greek text. Gorea hypothesises that the translator thought v. 18 to be too anecdotal, and not sure enough⁸¹⁵. Vg translates with *quia ab infantia mea crevit mecum miseratio et de utero matris meae egressa est mecum* “for from my infancy mercy grew up with me and it came out with me from my mother’s womb,” raising the possibility of some issues in the *Vorlage*. However, Job considering himself a father to the helpless and helping orphans is already mentioned in the previous verse and in ch. 29, so the message cannot be that strange. Rather, the omission might be intentional, to connect vv. 17 and 19 more tightly together. *V. 19*, אם אראה אוֹבֵד מְבִלִּי לְבוֹשׁ וְאֵין כִּסּוֹת, “if I have seen anyone perish for lack of clothing or a poor person without covering” is paraphrased slightly into εἰ δὲ καὶ ὑπερεῖδον γυμνὸν ἀπολλύμενον καὶ οὐκ ἡμφίασα “and if too I overlooked a naked person, perishing”. The verb אראה “I see” is changed into ὑπερεῖδον “I overlooked.” According to Orlinsky, this is simply translation into idiomatic Greek⁸¹⁶, but it also gives nuance to the sin. The phrase מְבִלִּי לְבוֹשׁ “from lack of clothing” is changed to γυμνὸν “the naked one.” The phrase וְאֵין כִּסּוֹת “and without covering, clothing” is changed into καὶ οὐκ ἡμφίασα “and I did not clothe,” again adding the personal dimension with the first-person verb. *In 20a*, the singular לאֲבִיּוֹן “for the needy” from the end of Hebrew 19b is translated here as the plural ἀδύνατοι “the powerless”. The Hebrew

⁸¹⁵ Gorea 2007, 148–51.

⁸¹⁶ Orlinsky 1958, 248, 251.

חלצו “his loin” from 20a is possibly changed into οἱ ὦμοι αὐτῶν “their shoulders” in Greek v. 20b. The Hebrew יתחמם “he warmed himself” is changed into plural ἐθερμάνθησαν “they were warmed.” In 21a, the verb הניפותי “I swung, waved” is changed into ἐπῆρα “I lifted, raised”. The suffix י- “my” in ידי “my hand” is not translated. In 21b, אראה “I saw” is emphasised into πεποιθώς “being confident”. In 22a, the apodosis marker ἄρα “then” is added. The Hebrew משכמה “from the shoulder” is changed into ἀπὸ τῆς κλειδός “from the collarbone.” Both P and Vg specify here as well: סֶחַס “from its socket”⁸¹⁷ and a *iunctura* “from its joint”). The verb תפול “it falls” is translated as an optative ἀποσταίη “may it fall off, separate,” appropriately for the apodosis. In 22b, the Hebrew מקנה “from the shoulder(-joint)” is changed into ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀγκῶνος “from the elbow”. The verb תשבר “it is broken” is again translated into optative συντριβείη “may it break.” In 23a, the Hebrew כי פחד אלי איד אל “for fear of God’s calamity was upon me” is paraphrased as φόβος γὰρ κυρίου συνέσχεν με “for fear of God held me”, איד “calamity” is omitted completely. Heater suggests that due to the difficult Hebrew this translation could actually be anaphoric and refer to Job 3:24⁸¹⁸; however, the omission and paraphrase may as well be intentional. V. 23b, ומשאתו לא אוכל “and I could not have faced his majesty” is not translated. The message is not unclear and there are no rare or unknown words; however, the notion of 23a is repeated. Because v. 23 looks to be the concluding verse of a strophe, the translator might have omitted the second part intentionally, to mark the end of the strophe with a monocolon.

Reading, vocalising, or understanding the consonantal text differently than the later Masoretes. In 21b, the location of the city gates is omitted as going to the gate of the city was not necessary in Alexandria⁸¹⁹. Dhorme considers the possibility that the translator read תשאר “it remains”⁸²⁰ and thus translated תשאר עזרתי “my help remains” with ὅτι πολλή μοι βοήθεια περίεστιν “that there is much help for me.” Vg also paraphrases here and makes Job more confident: *viderem me superiorem* “I saw myself (being) superior.”

According to Nömmik, Job’s final monologue started to be reworked in the third layer of redactions and vv. 16 and 22 were added. Vv. 17, 19. and 21 are late *Fortschreibungen* that rework the final monologue, v. 23 is a late eschatological gloss on “otherworldly judgement”, and v. 20 is a gloss that cannot be dated. Kaiser thinks that vv. 16–17 and 19–22 were added by the *Unschuldserweiterung*, vv. 18 and 23 later by the righteousness redactor. Van Oorschot also thinks that vv. 18 and 23 come from the righteousness redactor. Witte thinks that vv. 23 and 28 are later glosses or possibly from the righteousness redaction, being on the same literary-historical level as v. 3. These verses interrupt the conditional chains. According to Vermeylen, v. 18 might be from *rédaction* III because it is introduced by the particle כי (characteristic of this redaction). The overall

⁸¹⁷ Szpek 1992, 289.

⁸¹⁸ Heater 1982, 95–6.

⁸¹⁹ Cox 2023, 254. Cf. also 29:7a in this very speech, where the mention of city gates is also removed, possibly due to reading a different word.

⁸²⁰ Dhorme 1967, 459.

meaning of the verse makes little sense, but Vermeulen considers the theme belonging to education provided by God and thus aligning with *rédaction* III (another example being 5:17). V. 23 is again introduced by the particle כִּי (characteristic of *rédaction* III) and *rédacteur* III also borrowed from 13:11.⁸²¹ The translator omitted v. 18 and the second half of v. 23, both of which are considered later additions by some. They could have seemed redundant and thus left out by the translator. The omission of 23b leaves a monocolon at the end of the strophe.

XIX: 31:24–28

Style

Verses 24–28 form a strophe consisting of five bicola in Hebrew, but two *tricola*, *monocolon*, and a bicolon in Greek.

Like previously, the strophe is delimited with markers for conditional clauses, more so in Greek, as it uses a marker for the apodosis as well (ἄρα in 28a). Besides the apodosis, the Greek has a marked object-clause after it (ὅτι in 28b). The strophe in Hebrew ends with the emphatic adverb גם “also” and a marked object-clause after it (כִּי in 28b).

In Hebrew, the strophe is framed with non-parallelism, whereas in Greek, there is parallelism right in the middle (three cola with no parallelism on both sides): all parallelistic structures are (partial) symmetries, namely in v. 25, in Hebrew (xABC/xB'C'); in v. 26ab, in both Greek (xABC/B'C') and Hebrew (xABCD/B'D'); and in v. 27, in Hebrew (xABC/xA'C'D').

In Hebrew, there are several lexical repetitions: the conditional אם “if” three times (24a/25a/26a); the causal כִּי “for, because” (25a/25b/26a/28b); יָדִי “my hand” in 25b/27b. In Greek, the conditional εἰ δὲ καὶ “and if too” is repeated four times (24b/25a/25b/27b), but there is also a root-repetition in 24b/25a (πολυτελεῖ “in a very expensive” and πολλοῦ “of much”) which marks the beginning of the strophe.

Several marked Hebrew words have been used in this strophe: in 24b, the noun ולכתם (תָּם) “gold”; 9x, Job: 3, Ps: 1, Prov: 1; BDB considers it poetic and late); in 25b, the adjective כְּבִיר (“mighty”; 10x, Job: 6; BDB considers it poetic); in 26a, the verb יָהַל (הָלַל “to shine”; 4x, Job: 3); in 26b, the noun וירח (יָרַח “and the moon” (considered poetic by BDB); and finally, in 28a, the *hapax* adjective פָּלִילִי “judging”.

In Greek 26a, the verb (participle) τὸν ἐπιφάσκοντα “to emit light and be bright” (ἐπιφάσκω) is used, it appears only in OG Job (25:5, 31:26, 41:10).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. V. 24b εἰ δὲ καὶ λίθῳ πολυτελεῖ ἐπεποιθήσα “And if too I trusted in precious stone” is a condensed form of Hebrew

⁸²¹ Witte 1994a, 184–6; Kaiser 2006, 126; van Oorschot 2007, 171–84; Nömmik 2013, 27–9, 229–41; 2014b, 20–2; Vermeulen 2015, 147–53, 281; Witte 2021, 57–9, 446, 454–6, 481; Nömmik 2025.

v. 24 מבטחי אמרתי כסלי זהב כסלי ולכתם “If I have made gold my trust or called fine gold my confidence”. The Hebrew זהב “gold, precious metal” from 24a and ולכתם “and in gold” from 24b is translated with λίθω πολυτελεῖ “in a very precious, costly stone”. The noun כסלי “my trust” from 24a and the phrase אמרתי מבטחי “I have called my confidence” from 24b is translated with a single verb ἐπεποιθήσα “I had trusted”. **In 25a**, אם אשמח כי רב חילי “if I rejoice because my wealth is great” is paraphrased into εἰ δὲ καὶ εὐφράνθην πολλοῦ πλούτου μοι γενομένου “and if too I rejoiced when much wealth accrued to me”, emphasising the conditional, changing the tense, and using a genitive absolute⁸²². **In 25b**, the Hebrew כביר מצאה ידי “my hand found much” is paraphrased into ἐπ’ ἀναριθμήτοις ἐθέμην χεῖρά μου “I put my hand on countless things”, making it more active on Job’s part with the first-person singular verb. **In 26a**, אם אראה אור כי יהל “if I have looked at the sun when it shone” is paraphrased into a question ἤ οὐχ ὁρῶ μὲν ἥλιον τὸν ἐπιφάσκοντα ἐκλείποντα “do I not see the shining sun failing”. The conditional אם “if” is this time translated with the interrogative ἤ οὐχ “do I not?” **In 26b**, the Hebrew phrase וירח יקר הלך “and the moon going in splendour” is paraphrased into σελήνην δὲ φθίνουσιν “and the moon waning”. After this, οὐ γὰρ ἐπ’ αὐτοῖς ἐστὶν “for it is not upon them” is added, although it is not entirely clear why⁸²³. **V. 27a**, ופת בסתר לבי “and my heart has been secretly enticed” is not translated, most likely intentionally. **In 27b**, the conditional εἰ δὲ καὶ “and if too” is added. The verb ותשק “it has kissed” is changed into ἐφίλησα “I kissed,” again making it more personalised, and the participle ἐπιθείς “having placed (my hand on my mouth)” is added for clarification. **In 28a**, גם הוא עון פלילי “this also would be an iniquity for a judge” is paraphrased and emphasised into καὶ τοῦτο μοι ἄρα ἀνομία ἢ μεγίστη λογισθείη “then may this too be reckoned to me as the greatest lawlessness”, adding the apodosis marker ἄρα “then” and also the personal dimension. Cox considers λογισθείη a sort of an addition⁸²⁴. **In 28b**, the Hebrew phrase למעל לאל “to God from above” is translated as ἐναντίον κυρίου τοῦ ὑψίστου “before Lord the highest”.

According to Nömmik, vv. 24–27 were part of a late *Fortschreibung* that re-work the final monologue; in these verses “the quality of Job’s piety regarding social justice and cultic purity was deepened intensively”. V. 28 is a late eschatological gloss. Kaiser sees vv. 24–27 being from the innocence extrapolation (*Unschuldserweiterung*) and v. 28 from the later righteousness redactor. Van Oorschot also places v. 28 to the righteousness redaction. Witte deems vv. 23–28 as secondary, more specifically from the righteousness redaction. According to him, the verses interrupt the conditional chains both stylistically and intellectually.⁸²⁵ In terms of the OG translation, we can only say that if these verses were added later to the Hebrew poem of Job, they were integrated so well thematically and

⁸²² Cox 2016a, 71 considers this an exegetical expansion: “Job’s joy was not in the possession of wealth, as in the source text, but in the acquiring of it”.

⁸²³ Cox 2016a, 71 considers this an explanatory addition.

⁸²⁴ Cox 2016a, nn. 64–65.

⁸²⁵ Witte 1994a, 184–6; Kaiser 2006, 126; van Oorschot 2007, 171–84; Nömmik 2013, 27–9, 229–41; 2014b, 20–2; Witte 2021, 57–9, 446, 455; Nömmik 2025.

formally that the translator only felt the need to make stylistic, syntactic, and rhetorical changes.

XX: 31:29–30

Style

Vv. 29–30 form a strophe consisting of two bicola. The strophe begins with a conditional: אם “if” in Hebrew and εἰ δὲ καὶ “and if too” in Greek. The strophe ends with a clearly marked apodosis in Greek (ἄρα in both 30a and b). This repetition of the apodosis marker is the only lexical repetition in the strophe. In 29a, a rare Hebrew word has been used: the noun בַּפִּיד (פִּיד “disaster”; 4x, Job: 3, Prov: 1). In Greek, two rare words have been used: in 29a, the adjective ἐπιχαρής “rejoiced” (5x, LXX: 2, OG Job: 1); and in 29b, the interjection Εὖγε (23x, LXX: 14, OG Job: 2).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. In 29a, אם אשמח בַּפִּיד מִשְׁנֵאִי “If I rejoice at the ruin of those who hate me” is paraphrased into εἰ δὲ καὶ ἐπιχαρής ἐγενόμην πτώματι ἐχθρῶν μου “And if too I was gratified at my enemies’ fall”, including emphasising the conditional. In 29b, the Hebrew והתעוררתי “I was excited” is paraphrased as καὶ εἶπεν ἡ καρδία μου Εὖγε “and my heart said: ‘Good!’” Dhorme and Heater suggests that the translator used Ps 35:25 (μὴ εἴπαισαν ἐν καρδίαις αὐτῶν εὖγε εὖγε τῇ ψυχῇ ἡμῶν μὴδὲ εἴπαισαν κατεπίομεν αὐτόν)⁸²⁶. The translator omitted the phrase כִּי מִצָּאוּרָע “when evil overtook him.”

Problems with the Vorlage manuscript? V. 30 is completely different in Hebrew and Greek, the only commonality being the word for “curse” (אָלָה in Hebrew and κατάρρα in Greek). Thus, the Greek ἀκούσαι ἄρα τὸ οὖς μου τὴν κατάρραν μου θρυληθείην δὲ ἄρα ὑπὸ λαοῦ μου κακούμενος “then may my ear hear a curse against me; yes, then may I be gossiped about by my people as one afflicted” replaces ולא נתתי לחטא חכי לשאל באלה נפשו “I have not let my mouth sin by asking for their lives with a curse.” Dhorme suggests that “It looks as if G is reconstituting a text with fragments of the Hebrew,” giving several hypothetical readings in this verse whereas LXX.D suggests a contextual production⁸²⁷. Seeing how the translator did this in ch. 12 and 30, this theory is agreeable. The translator constructs a proper apodosis with the relevant marker, like previously in this chapter.

Vv. 29–34 are considered a late *Fortschreibung* that reworks Job’s final monologue by Nömmik (“the quality of Job’s piety regarding social justice and cultic purity was deepened intensely”).⁸²⁸ The *Vorlage* may have been corrupt or damaged in v. 30 but elsewhere, the differences are stylistic.

⁸²⁶ Dhorme 1967, 463; Heater 1982, 96.

⁸²⁷ Dhorme 1967, 464; Kepper and Witte 2011, 2109.

⁸²⁸ Nömmik 2025.

XXI: 31:31–32

Style

Vv. 31–32 form a strophe comprising a *tricolon* and a *bicolon* in Greek, but two *bicola* in Hebrew, therefore the beginning is marked structurally in Greek. The strophe begins with a conditional: אִם לֹא “if ever” in Hebrew and εἰ δὲ καὶ πολλάκις “and if too ... often” in Greek. There is no apodosis in either language. Some marked vocabulary appears: in Hebrew 31a, the phrase מְתֵי אֹהֶל “men of my tent” is considered poetic by BDB; in Greek 31b, the use of the potential optative ἂν δώῃ can show an aim at a higher register of Greek⁸²⁹.

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 31a*, again, the conditional אִם “if” is translated with εἰ δὲ καὶ “and if too”. An awkwardness is visible *in 31b*, where the Hebrew מִי יִתֵּן construction is not properly Hellenised but rather translated literally with τίς ἂν δώῃ ἡμῖν “who might give us”. The singular מִבְּשָׁרוֹ “from his flesh” is, like almost always, translated with the plural τῶν σαρκῶν αὐτοῦ “from his fleshs.” The participle נִשְׂבַּע “being satisfied, sated” is changed into an infinitive πλησθῆναι “to be filled with.” The negation is omitted here, as in 31a, but Orlinsky suggests that the negation in 31b was originally there in the Greek, but due to haplography was eventually lost⁸³⁰. The translator adds *v. 31c*: λίαν μου χρηστοῦ ὄντος “though I was very/too kind”. Cox sees the addition both here and in the first colon as something that humanises Job and makes him more sympathetic⁸³¹. Adding a personal dimension in the first person is a frequently used technique in this chapter. *In 32a*, the imperfective לֹא יִלִּיךָ “he does not lodge” is translated with the Greek imperfective οὐκ ἠϋλίζετο “he did not lodge”. *In 32b*, the dual דְּלֹתַי “my doors” is translated with the singular ἡ δὲ θύρα μου “my door”. The verb אִפְתַּח “I open” is changed to ἀνέφωκτο “it had been opened,” removing the personal element but emphasising Job’s position in his society.

Utilising the context or the translator's previous knowledge for the meaning of unknown words? *In 31a*, אִם לֹא אָמְרוּ מְתֵי אֹהֶל “if the men of my tent ever said” is turned into εἰ δὲ καὶ πολλάκις εἶπον αἱ θεράπαιναι μου “And if too my female attendants often said”. The Hebrew phrase מְתֵי אֹהֶל “the men of my tent” is changed into αἱ θεράπαιναι μου “my maidservants.” Dhorme suggests that the translator may have read אִמָּהֶתִי “my maidservant” while Cox argues that “tents” were not part of the Alexandrian urban context and therefore did not fit into the translation⁸³². מְתֵי is never directly translated in OG, thus this may be a contextual choice that influenced a paraphrase.

Reading, vocalising, or understanding the consonantal text differently than the later Masoretes. *In 32b*, both the OG and P translator probably vocalised the Hebrew לְאֶרֶץ “to the way” with לְאֶרֶץ “to the wayfare(r)”, translating παντὶ

⁸²⁹ Dhont 2018a, 149–51.

⁸³⁰ Orlinsky 1962, 147.

⁸³¹ Cox 2016a, 71.

⁸³² Dhorme 1967, 464; Cox 2023, 254.

ἐλθόντι “to everyone that came” (παντὶ is an addition) and ܠܕܠܝܢ “to the way-fare”; Witte goes so far as to say that this is a better reading (as versions translate it as such) and the MT should be emended accordingly⁸³³.

Vv. 29–34 are considered a late *Fortschreibung* that reworks Job’s final monologue by Nömmik (“the quality of Job’s piety regarding social justice and cultic purity was deepened intensely”).⁸³⁴ In the OG translation, nothing points to the translator being disturbed with the topic or form of these verses.

XXII: 31:33–37

Style

Vv. 33–37 form a strophe made up of *four bicola* in Greek. In Hebrew, vv. 33–37 can be divided into two shorter strophes: a tricolon marks the end of the first one (vv. 33–34) and the beginning of the second one (vv. 35–37). Once again, the strophe is made up of conditionals, but no clear apodosis.

In Greek, the conditional εἰ δὲ καὶ/καὶ εἰ “and if too/and if” is repeated in 33/34b/37a and there is a root-repetition in v. 33 (ἁμαρτῶν “having sinned” and τὴν ἁμαρτίαν “the sin”) which marks the beginning of the strophe. In Hebrew, the conditional אם “if” is repeated 33a/36a and there is a root-repetition in 35c/37a (וספר “and a document/writing” and מספר “an accounting, number”).

The strophe ends with a simile in Hebrew v. 37: מספר צעדי אגידנו כמו נגיד אקרבו “I would give him an account of all of my steps; like a prince I would approach him.”

There is a chiasmus in Hebrew in vv. 34ab (xAB/B’A’) and 36 (xAB/B’A’).

Some marked Hebrew words have been used: in 33b, the *hapax* noun בחבי (חב “breast, bosom”); in 34b, the noun ובז (בז) “contempt” (categorised under words that are poetic and common to wisdom literature by BDB); in 35b, the noun תוי (תו “mark”; 3x, OG Job: 1); and finally, in 36b, the verb אענדנו (ענד “to bind, tie up”; 2x, Job: 1, Prov: 1).

The Greek translation has marked vocabulary as well: in 34a, the verb διетράπην “I was deterred” (διατρέπω; 32x, LXX: 5, OG Job: 1); the noun πολυοχλίαν “great number of population” (πολυοχλία, -ας, ῆ; 4x, LXX: 3, OG Job: 2; also considered literary koine⁸³⁵), and the verb ἐξαγορεύσαι “to make a declaration” (ἐξαγορεύω; 20x, LXX: 13, OG Job: 1); and finally in 37b, the noun χρεοφειλέτου “debtor” (χρεοφειλέτης, -ου, ό; 13x, LXX: 13, OG Job: 1⁸³⁶).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. Greek v. 33 εἰ δὲ καὶ ἁμαρτῶν ἀκουσίως ἔκρυψα τὴν ἁμαρτίαν μου “and if too, sinning haplessly, I hid my sin” paraphrases and shortens the Hebrew אם כסיתי באדם פשעי לטמון בחבי עוני “if I

⁸³³ Dhorme 1967, 465; Szpek 1992, 280; Witte 2021, 447.

⁸³⁴ Nömmik 2025.

⁸³⁵ Mangin 2005, 556.

⁸³⁶ Both Prov 29:13 and Job 31:37b have the *omicron* form χρεοφειλέτου.

have concealed my transgressions as others do, by hiding my iniquity in my bosom”.

Problems with the Vorlage manuscript? Vv. 34a and b οὐ γὰρ διετράπην πολυοχλίαν πλήθους τοῦ μὴ ἐξαγορεύσαι ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν εἰ δὲ καὶ εἴασα ἀδύνατον ἐξελθεῖν θύραν μου κόλπῳ κενῷ “for I was not deterred by the populous multitude from making a declaration before them, and if too I permitted the powerless to leave my door with empty pockets” translate Hebrew 34a כִּי אֶעְרוֹץ הַמּוֹן רַבָּה “because I stood in great fear of the multitude” and c וְאָדָם לֹא אֵצֶא פֶתַח “so that I kept silence and did not go out of doors”, while v. 34b וּבֹז מִשְׁפָּחוֹת יַחְתִּנִּי “and the contempt of families terrified me” is not translated. The Hebrew verb אֶעְרוֹץ “I tremble” is changed into οὐ διετράπην “I did not turn away,” וְאָדָם “I kept silence” is translated as τοῦ μὴ ἐξαγορεύσαι “to not speak out” and the whole phrase וְאָדָם לֹא אֵצֶא “I keep silence and I do not go out” is changed into εἴασα ἀδύνατον ἐξελθεῖν “I permitted the powerless to go out,” ἀδύνατον “helpless” and κόλπῳ κενῷ “with an empty bosom” are added for emphasis. The meaning of this verse is thus effectively inverted (“I was afraid of people and I kept silence” -> “I was not afraid of people and I spoke out”). Further charity done by Job is added in the translation. It is hard to say whether all of this paraphrasing is intentional or triggered by something amiss in the Vorlage. V. 35a מִי יִתֵּן לִי שְׁמַע לִי “O that I had one to hear me!” is not translated. V. 35b הֵן תִּוִּי שְׁדֵי יַעֲנֵנִי “Here is my signature! Let the Lord answer me!” does not have much connection with Greek 35b, χεῖρα δὲ κυρίου εἰ μὴ ἐδεδοίκεν “and if I had not feared the hand of the Lord”, besides mentioning the Lord and understanding הֵן as a conditional. In 35c, the Hebrew בִּי רִיבִי אִישׁ רִיבִי “(that) the man of my strife wrote” is rewritten as ἣν εἶχον κατὰ τινος “that which I held against someone”. V. 36 אִם לֹא עַל שִׁכְמִי אֲשֶׁאֲנֻ אֶעֱנֶדְנָה עֲטֹרוֹתַי “surely I would carry it on my shoulder, I would bind it on me like a crown” is turned into ἐπ’ ὤμοις ἂν περιθέμενος στέφανον ἀνεγίνωσκον “I would have put a chaplet on my shoulders and read it aloud”. The verse is connected to v. 35 as the last colon of a tricolon. Some of the changes are typical to the translator: the common singular עַל שִׁכְמִי “on my shoulder” translated with the plural ἐπ’ ὤμοις “on my shoulders,” the finite verb אֲשֶׁאֲנֻ “I carry it” changed into a participle περιθέμενος ‘placed, put around.’ The verb ἀνεγίνωσκον “I read aloud” could be the result of understanding the verb יָדַע “to know” in אֶעֱנֶדְנָה. Finally, v. 37 is also completely different in both languages. The Greek καὶ εἰ μὴ ῥήξας αὐτὴν ἀπέδωκα, οὐθὲν λαβὼν παρὰ χρεοφιλέτου “and if I did not tear it up and hand it back, having taken nothing from the debtor” replaces מִסְפָּר צַעְדֵּי אֲגִידְנָה כְּמוֹ נָגִיד אֶקְרַבְנָה “I would give him an account of all my steps; like a prince I would approach him.” Dhorme suggests that the translation is due to reading אִם לֹא פָרַצְתִּי “if I did not break” and כְּמוֹ נוֹשֵׂה “like a creditor” in the Hebrew text⁸³⁷. Vg paraphrases (?) some parts of the verse as well: *per singulos gradus meos pronuntiabo illum et quasi principi offeram eum* “At every step of mine I would pronounce it, and offer it as to a prince,” suggesting similar problems. Although some of these constitute intentional paraphrases, they are most likely triggered by whatever the translator

⁸³⁷ Dhorme 1967, 470.

read or could read in the *Vorlage*. Gorea considers vv. 33–37 a rewriting, where some words of the Hebrew are translated, but not a translation strictly speaking, LXX.D similarly considers vv. 35–37 a free reformulation of the difficult Hebrew⁸³⁸. Witte mentions that in the Greek translation Job maintains a “further moralistic-legal domain” and “does not offer an ultimate challenge to God”⁸³⁹.

Nömmik considers vv. 29–34 a late *Fortschreibung* that reworks Job’s final monologue by Nömmik (“the quality of Job’s piety regarding social justice and cultic purity was deepened intensely”) and 35a a gloss that cannot be dated. Kaiser also thinks that vv. 29–34 were a later extrapolation underlining Job’s piety and that 34c was added later by the righteousness redactor. Fohrer, however, sees 34c (“34b”) as the later gloss and that part of v. 35 has gone missing. Van Oorschot thinks that vv. 33f. were added in the righteousness redaction. Witte thinks that vv. 34c and 35c are later glosses. Vermeylen says that v. 34 is introduced by the particle **כִּי**, which is characteristic of *rédaction* III; however, he still assigns the whole verse to *rédacteur* II. Vv. 35–37 originally concluded 30:26–31 in *rédaction* I. V. 35, however, is a tricolon, of which the first colon seems to be from *rédaction* II. It seems to be modelled on 31b and is comparable to 19:23–24 (from *rédaction* II).⁸⁴⁰ Since the OG translation differs from the current MT significantly in these verses, it is not inconceivable the *Vorlage* manuscript was so corrupt, due to the scribes who did not understand the additions, that the translator struggled to make the text out and had to construct something meaningful on their own.

XXIII: 31:38–40b

Style

Vv. 38–40b form the final strophe consisting of three bicola. There are again conditionals, and the Greek strophe also ends with a marked apodosis (*ἄρα* “then”). The strophe is framed with partial symmetries in Greek: xAxBC/xB’C’D in v. 38 and AxBC/A’C’ in 40ab. Hebrew has partial symmetries in all three verses of the strophe: xABC/xxB’C’ in v. 38, xABC/xA’B’ in v. 39, and ABCD/ xA’B’D’ in 40ab.

The conditional **אם** “if” is repeated in 38a/39a; in Greek, the conditional *εἰ/εἰ δὲ καὶ* “if” / “and if too” is repeated four times, in the beginning of the first four cola. In 38a/39b there is the repetition of *ἡ γῆ* “the land” and *τῆς γῆς* “of the land”. The conjunction **תחת** “instead of” is repeated in the beginning of 40ab; this is reflected in Greek with the repetition of *ἀντὶ* “instead of”.

A couple of marked Hebrew words have been used in this strophe: in 38b, the noun **תלמיה** (תלם “furrow”; 5x, Job: 2, Ps: 1); in 39a, the negation **בלי** “without” (considered mostly poetic by BDB); in 40a, the noun **חטה** “wheat” (considered

⁸³⁸ Gorea 2007, 152–3; Kepper and Witte 2011, 2109–10.

⁸³⁹ Witte 2019, 379.

⁸⁴⁰ Fohrer 1963, 58, 424–7; Witte 1994a, 184–6; Kaiser 2006, 126; van Oorschot 2007, 171–84; Nömmik 2013, 27–9, 229–41; 2014b, 20–2; Vermeylen 2015, 151–3, 147–53; Witte 2021, 57–9, 454–6, 483, 486; Nömmik 2025.

mostly poetic by BDB); and in 40b, the *hapax* noun באשה “foul weed, stinkweed”. Greek has two rare words as well: in 38b, the noun οἱ ἀλλaxes “the furrows” (37x, LXX: 6, OG Job: 2); and in 40a, the noun κνίδη “nettle” (36x, OG Job: 1).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 38a*, the phrase אַעלִי אֲדַמְתִּי “if my land cries out against me” is translated with εἰ ἐπ’ ἐμοί ποτε ἡ γῆ ἐστέναξεν “if at any time the land groaned over me”, adding emphasis, changing the tense, and omitting the suffix from the noun and thus generalising the notion to all land instead of his own. *In 38b*, the imperfective יבכיין “they weep” is again translated with the aorist ἔκλαυσαν “they wept”. *In 39a*, once again, the simple אַ “if” is translated with εἰ δὲ καὶ “and if too”, and an emphatic adjective μόνος “alone, only” is added. *In 39b*, ונפש בעליה הפחתי “and I made its owners breathe their last” is extended and paraphrased into εἰ δὲ καὶ ψυχὴν κυρίου τῆς γῆς ἐκβαλὼν ἐλύπησα “and if too, in throwing it away, I grieved the soul of the lord of the land”, removing the allusion to killing and making Job’s hypothetic sin less serious in Greek⁸⁴¹. The addition of τῆς γῆς creates a repetition with 38a. *In 40a*, the verb אַצַּח “it comes out” is translated with the apodosis marker and the appropriate optative ἄρα ἐξέλθοι μοι “then may it come out for me”. The Hebrew חוֹח “thistle” is translated as κνίδη “nettle” and *in 40b*, the Hebrew *hapax* באשה “stinkweed” is translated as βάτος “bramble”. Beeckman explains that the translator did not know the meaning of the Hebrew *hapax* and chose a contextually and stylistically (parallelism) suited rendering⁸⁴². The botanical terms are thus utilising contextual translation but also taking style into consideration.

According to Nömmik, vv. 38–40b are part of a late *Fortschreibung* that rework the final monologue; in these verses “the quality of Job’s piety regarding social justice and cultic purity was deepened intensively”. Witte, Kaiser, van Oorschot, and Syring, agree that these verses were a later addition. Witte, Kaiser, and van Oorschot think they were added by the righteousness redactor, while Syring places this addition in his first redaction stage. Witte says that they correspond linguistically and thematically to the righteousness redaction and connects this addition to vv. 1–3 as well as 24:13–25; he also considers 40c, the final remark, a late gloss.⁸⁴³ The OG translator did not struggle with these verses in terms of topic nor form.

⁸⁴¹ Cox 2016a, 71 categorises the addition as an explanation: “addition of the circumstantial ptcp. explains how one might grieve the land’s owner, namely, by throwing away its crop”.

⁸⁴² Beeckman 2020, 34.

⁸⁴³ Witte 1994a, 184–6; Syring 2004, 168–73; Kaiser 2006, 126; van Oorschot 2007, 171–84; Witte 2021, 57–9, 447–8, 454–6, 487–8; Nömmik 2025.

JOB 38–39

Introduction

Job 38–39 contains God’s first speech: *God addresses Job with numerous rhetorical questions about the creation of earth, sea, the recesses of the world, light and dark, different states of water, wisdom to tell weather and to handmake things, and the creation of various animals and birds.* Once the animal descriptions begin, the division into strophes is quite obvious.

The OG translation seems to divide into 19 strophes:

I (38:2–3, 1T1B) *Addressing Job: I will question you; you should answer me!*

II (38:4–7, 4B) *Were you there when the earth and the stars were created?*

III (38:8–11, 4B) *Were you there when I created and made boundaries for the sea?*

IV (38:12–15, 4B) *Were you there when I made morning destroy the impious and when I created man?*

V (38:16–18, 3B) *Were you there when the deep and Hades were created?*

VI (38:19–21, 3B) *Are you old enough to know where light and darkness come from?*

VII (38:22–25, 4B) *Have you seen where different states of water come from?*

VIII (38:28–30, 3B) *Do you know who created rain and other states of water?*

IX (38:31–33, 2B) *Did you make the stars/constellations, and do you know how they influence the earth?*

X (38:34–35, 2B) *Can you give orders to clouds and thunder?*

XI (38:36–38, 3B) *Have you given wisdom to women or weather forecasters?*

XII (38:39–41, 2B1T) *Can you make sure that animals of prey get fed?*

XIII (39:1–3, 2B) *Have you helped deer with their pregnancy and offspring?*

XIV (39:5–7, 1B1T) *Did you create/free the wild ass?*

XV (39:9–12, 4B) *Did you make the one-horned a tame animal of labour?*

XVI (39:19–20, 2B) *Did you give courage to the (war)horse?*

XVII (39:21–23, 2B1M) *The (war)horse is strong and proud.*

XVIII (39:24–25, 2B) *The (war)horse graves battle.*

XIX (39:26–30, 2B1T) *Did you give birds of prey their hunting skills?*

There are some **keywords** that appear in both chapters of the speech. For example, God-names אֱלֹהִים (38:7), אֵל (38:41), אֱלֹהִי (39:17) in Hebrew. In Greek, these are not reflected; while κύριος is used in 38:41, the God-name is changed to

ἄγγελος in 38:7, and the ostrich-passage is famously not translated. Another keyword is ארץ “land, earth” used in 38:4, 13, 18, 24, 26, and 39:14, 24. The translator has used γῆ 38:4, 13, 14, 14, 19, 37, 38, and 39:24, reflecting most of the Hebrew but also adding additional occurrences. Again, one occurrence in the ostrich-passage is not reflected. One keyword that in Hebrew only appears in ch. 39:16, 22 is פחד “fear”. In Greek, however, φόβος is used in 38:17 and 39:3, 19 (v. 16, in the ostrich-passage, is of course not translated), connecting the chapters lexically.

Finally, the theme of knowledge runs through the speech: בינה is repeated in 38:4, 36 and 39:17, 26; חכמה in 38:36, 37 and 39:17, דעת in 38:2, and ידע in 38:4, 5, 18, 21, 33 and 39:1.2. In Greek, the terminology is a bit more varied and not everything is reflected: σύνεσις is used in 38:4, ἐπιστήμη is repeated in 38:36 and 39:26, σοφία in 38:36, 37 and 39:17, οἶδα in 38:5, 21, ἐπίσταμαι in 38:4, 20, 33, and νουθετέω is used in 38:18.

In the Greek text, the following verses are asterisked: 38:26–27, 32; and 39:1a, 3b–4, 6b, 8, 13–18, 28, 29b. Nömmik thinks that the ostrich passage in 39:13–18 could have been missing from the OG translation’s *Vorlage* altogether, calling it “Masoretic extra material”. Fohrer reckons that the *Vorlage* simply deviates from the MT in 39:13–18. Eckstein has shown with some evidence that this assumption might not hold, and the passage was/could have been in the *Vorlage*.⁸⁴⁴ More than half of the strophes in this speech are six to eight cola in length, and the rest are four to five cola in length. The verses vary from monocola to tricola; however, bicola are in the majority. It can be noted that the first and last verse of the speech are both tricola.

Agreement of Hebrew and Greek strophe delimitation is also varied. There are some strophes or a block of strophes that have more agreement and others where only the author of this dissertation sees an agreement. Therefore, special care needs to be taken in the critical analysis of those strophes where the Hebrew strophes does not line up exactly or where the Hebrew text cannot/has not been divided similarly. Differences in delimitation can arise from stylistic choices but also bigger changes made by the translator.

Before moving on, a brief introduction to the theories about whether the Hebrew text of this speech was part of the original poem is needed. God’s first speech is mostly thought to have been in the original layer of the Job-poem.

According to Witte, 38:1–39:30* formed the original conclusion to the Job-poem (in the Hiobdichtung A). In stage five of growth (the majesty redaction), the ostrich-passage in 39:13–18 was added. In the final, seventh, stage (additions of various origins and glosses) he sees 38:11a*, 39:1a*, 39:4a*, and 39:28.⁸⁴⁵

According to Nömmik’s theory, this speech belonged to the original poem of Job. However, many of the passages were added later and only vv. 38:2–9, 12–13a, 14b, 16–18, 21–22, 24–25, 28–33, 35 and 39:1–2, 5, 7, 9–10, 19–20, 26–27 were original and belonged to the “sources” in their earliest layer. The prose introduction in 38:1 was the first new layer to be added in the first stage of editing

⁸⁴⁴ Fohrer 1963, 55–6; Eckstein 2015, 114–5, 149–55; Nömmik 2025.

⁸⁴⁵ Witte 1994a, 180–1, 191–2; 2021, 57–9, 594–5.

of the book editor. After that, in the second stage of redactions (the righteousness redactions), vv. 38:13b–14a and 15 were added. Vv. 38:10–11, 19–20, 23, 26–27, 34, 36–41 and 39:3–4, 6, 8, 11–12, 28–30 are late *Fortschreibungen* or partly even later glosses that rely on the book editor’s work and deal with wild nature. The horse strophe in vv. 39:21–24a, 25 is also a late *Fortschreibung* as a separate poem, containing many rare words but no lexical repetitions or significant rhetorical markers. He considers the ostrich passage 39:13–18 as “Masoretic extra material” that may have been missing from the Greek translator’s *Vorlage*. Finally, a further gloss that cannot be dated is 39:24b.⁸⁴⁶

Van Oorschot sees 38:1–18, 21–27, 29–39:12, 19–27*, 28*, 29f as the original layer of the book of Job. To these were later added 38:19f, 38:28, 39:13–18, 39:27* and 39:28*. Out of these, he reckons that the ostrich-passage (39:13–18) was added by the fear-of-God redactor (stage three out of five of literary growth). The rest he does not order exactly.⁸⁴⁷

Syring thinks that Job 38–39* is original and represents the original speech of God, with the exception of 38:1, added in the first redaction, and 39:13–18, which is the ostrich-passage that was added in the last stage of development (*Theologische Bearbeitung(en)*).⁸⁴⁸

Kaiser thinks that the original poem consisted of 38:2–13a, 14a, 16–18, 21–22, 24–26, 29–41b and 39:1–12, 19–25b[+1]c, 26–29. The book editor added the introductory v. 38:1. The ostrich passage in 39:13–18 was added by the majesty editor. The righteousness editor added vv. 38:13b, 14b–15, 19–20, 23, 27–28. Finally, vv. 38:41c and 39:30 are considered later glosses.⁸⁴⁹

Vermeylen thinks that at the speech’s base layer (“*rédaction I*”) it consisted of vv. 38:2–27, 29–38. In *rédaction III*, the bestiary in verses 38:39–39:30* was added; to the bestiary, v. 39:17 was added even later in *rédaction IV*. He finds that the ostrich-passage is original to the bestiary (ten animals altogether being highly symbolic). He still dismisses the bestiary as a whole quite unnecessary and weakening the divine response. Without it, the speech would be comparable in length to Job’s final monologue (in its original length of 33 verses). He finds similarities with Ps 104, written by someone with affinities to the Sirach-school, and Job 34:13–15 (*rédaction III*).⁸⁵⁰

I: 38:2–3

Style

Verses 38:2–3 form an introductory strophe to God’s first speech, and it is made up of two bicola in Hebrew, but a *tricolon*⁸⁵¹ and a bicolon in Greek. Thus, the

⁸⁴⁶ Nömmik 2013, 27–9, 263–8; 2025; 2026.

⁸⁴⁷ van Oorschot 1987, 148–79, 213–6, 256; 2007, 171–84.

⁸⁴⁸ Syring 2004, 142, 166–7, 168–73.

⁸⁴⁹ Kaiser 2006, 127.

⁸⁵⁰ Vermeylen 2015, 176–7, 180–2, 330, 348.

⁸⁵¹ Read as a bicolon in LXX^{Zi} and codices/manuscripts. Cf. also Heater 1982, 122: “the extra colon in 38:2b”.

beginning of the strophe and consequently the speech is marked structurally in Greek. The strophe and speech begins with a who-question (מִי זֶה in Hebrew and Τίς οὗτος in Greek) and ends with an imperative (אָזר נָא in Hebrew and ζῶσαι “gird up!” in Greek). There is one repetition in Greek v. 2: ὁ κρύπτων “the one who hides” and κρύπτειν “to hide”.

The whole strophe has parallelistic structures in Greek, but in Hebrew only the second/last one has a structure: in v. 2, there is a partial symmetry and a partial chiasmus in Greek (xABC/A'C'D/B'A'), and in 3b, there is a partial chiasmus in Greek (ABA') but a symmetry in Hebrew (xAxA').

There are a couple of marked words in Hebrew: in 2b, the noun במלִין (מלה) “by words” and the negation בלי “without” (considered poetic by BDB); in 3a, the noun כגבר (גבר) “like a man” (considered quite poetic by BDB) and the noun חליצִיד (חליץ) “loins”; 10x, Job: 3).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 2a*, מחשיך “he who darkens” is clarified into ὁ κρύπτων με “he who hides from me”. *In 3b*, the verb והודיעני “and you make it known to me” is translated with σὺ δέ μοι ἀποκριθήτι “and you will answer me”, adding the emphatic σὺ in the first position.

Problems with the Vorlage manuscript. *In 2b*, במלִין בלי דעת “by words without knowledge” is extended into two cola συνέχων δὲ ῥήματα ἐν καρδίᾳ ἐμὲ δὲ οἴεται κρύπτειν “but confines words in his heart but thinks to hide them from me?”, emphasising also the first-person perspective. The participle συνέχων “confining” could be a second translation of מחשיך “he who darkens” in 2a. The translator probably read בלב “in the heart” instead of בלי “without” and thus translated ἐν καρδίᾳ “in (his) heart.” ἐμὲ δὲ οἴεται κρύπτειν is the third colon of a tricolon; with this, a lexical repetition is created with 2a. Dhorme suggests that the plus is an interpretation of דעת “knowledge”⁸⁵². Heater builds upon his theory and adds that κρύπτειν in 2b actually represents מעלים in 42:3a⁸⁵³. Cox, however, has proposed that v. 2 contains a double translation: חשך is translated in two different meanings (ὁ κρύπτων and συνέχων), as well as בלי (ἐν καρδίᾳ and ἐμὲ δὲ οἴεται κρύπτειν from בלי דעת in the sense “without informing me”); the latter involves reading the consonants slightly differently both times⁸⁵⁴. His theory of double translation is here the most reasonable and agreeable—the translator provided two translations in two cola for two possible readings, possibly due to the manuscript being difficult to read. In doing that, they created a tricolon and a lexical repetition that mark the beginning of the speech. Therefore, different readings triggered a bigger intentional change in style. Since neither of the components of

⁸⁵² Dhorme 1967, 575.

⁸⁵³ Heater 1982, 121–2. He notes that 42:3a translates Hebrew faithfully but 42:3b is actually inspired by Hebrew 38:2b. He thinks that the Greek translator handled vv. 38:2 and 42:3 as a strophe.

⁸⁵⁴ Cox 2022, 658.

the double translation are literal translations, the possibility of one of them being not OG (that is, a different translation utilised by Origen), is slim.

II: 38:4-7

Style

Vv. 4-7 form a strophe made up of four bicola in both languages. Just like in the beginning of the speech, this strophe begins with a combination of a question and an imperative, although this time in one verse: אִיפֹה “where?” and הַגִּד “tell!” in Hebrew, ποῦ “where?” and ἀπάγγειλον δέ μοι “but tell me!” in Greek. The other verses have marked questions as well, however.

In v. 5, there is a partial symmetry in both Greek (xABCD/xA'B'C') and Hebrew (ABCDE/xA'B'C'). In v. 7, there is a partial symmetry in Hebrew (xABC/xA'C'). Thus, Hebrew exhibits the xOxO pattern of parallelistic structures.

There are a couple of lexical repetitions in Hebrew: in 4b/5a יָדַעַת “you knew” and תָּדַע “you know”; the interrogative מִי “who?” in 5a/5b/6b; this is reflected in Greek with the repetition of τίς “who?” and additionally in 6a (τίνος); the conjunction או “or” in 5b/6b.

Several rare Hebrew words have been used in this strophe: in 4a, the interrogative particle אִיפֹה “where?” (10x, Job: 2, here and 4:7b); in 5a, the *hapax* noun מִמְדָּה (ממד “measurement”); in 5b, the noun קו “line, cord” (10x, Job: 1, Ps: 1); finally, in 6a, the verb הִטְבַּעוּ (טבע “to sink”; 10x, Job: 1, Ps: 3, Prov: 1).

The Greek translator has used rare vocabulary as well: in 4a, the verb θεμελιοῦν “to set up on a firm basis” (θεμελιόω; 46x, LXX: 42, OG Job: 1); in 5b, the noun σπαρτίον “small cord” (40x, LXX: 10, OG Job: 1); in 6a, the noun οἱ κρίκοι “rings” (30x, LXX: 13, OG Job: 1, ※: 1); and in 6b, the adjective γωνιαῖον “position in a corner” (γωνιαῖος, -α, -ον; 4x, OG Job: 1).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. **In 5b**, the definitive verb נָטָה “he stretched” is changed into a personified participle ὁ ἐπαγαγὼν “he who stretched”. **In 6a**, אֲדָנִיָּה הִטְבַּעוּ “its bases were sunk” is paraphrased into as οἱ κρίκοι αὐτῆς πεπήγασιν “its rings have been fastened”, likening the creation of Earth with setting up a tent⁸⁵⁵. **In 6b**, אוּ מִי יָרָה אֶבֶן פִּנְתָּהּ “or who laid its cornerstone?” is paraphrased into τίς δὲ ἐστὶν ὁ βαλὼν λίθον γωνιαῖον ἐπ' αὐτῆς “and who is the one who that cast a cornerstone upon it?”, the phrase ἐπ' αὐτῆς “upon it” creates a repetition with 5b. **In 7a**, the adverbial noun יַחַד “together” and the noun בֹּקֶר “of morning” are untranslated, as the translator did not feel the need to emphasise that the morning stars were born together and generalised the statement. **In 7b**, וִירְעוּ כָּל בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים “and all the sons of God shouted for joy” is paraphrased and extended into ἡγεσάν με φωνῇ μεγάλῃ πάντες ἄγγελοί μου “all my angels praised me⁸⁵⁶ with a loud voice”, emphasising also the first-person

⁸⁵⁵ See longer discussion in Häberlein 2024, 106–7.

⁸⁵⁶ Cf. *Vg cum me laudarent* in 7a, translating בָּרַן.

perspective (just like in the first strophe). Ziegler and Cox consider this colon a pleonastic translation⁸⁵⁷. Heater sees parallels with other passages in the LXX (2 Chr 20:19, Ps 148:2) which might have influenced the translator to make changes and additions here⁸⁵⁸.

Vorlage different than the later MT or problems with the *Vorlage* manuscript. In 4b, הגד “tell!” is personalised into ἀπαγγεῖλον δέ μοι “tell me!”. Cf. also 11Q10 הַחוּיִי, P ܚܚܘܝܝ and Vg *indica mihi*), suggesting that the pre-MT text had the first-person suffix in Hebrew. In 7a, בִּרְן “when singing” is translated with ὅτε ἐγενήθησαν “when they were born”. Dhorme suggests that the Greek translator read בָּרָא (“He created”)⁸⁵⁹. Cf. also P with בָּרָא “he created”⁸⁶⁰. The aspect of creation makes sense in the context of the speech and the strophe. 11Q10 reads or understands differently and translates בְּמִזְהָר “when they shone”, which has been considered as demythologising the translation⁸⁶¹. This suggests that the pre-MT manuscripts that the OG and P translators used could have read בָּרָא.

The Greek translator maintains the creation motive started in 4a in the whole strophe: the angels praise God after He has created the earth and stars whereas in Hebrew the stars and heavenly beings are joyous after God has created just the earth. Thus, in Hebrew, the morning stars existed before the creation of earth, but in Greek, the stars were created after the earth. Heater suggests that “[t]he entire translation of 38:7, from “sons of God” to “angels praising God,” and “praising God with a loud voice,” has solid literary tradition behind it which may have been utilized by the translator.” Fernández Marcos describes the difference in Hebrew and Greek being that of mythology: in Hebrew, “we meet a reminiscence of the Canaanite mythology that celebrates the birth of astral deities,” whereas the Greek has been partly demythologised and deals with the creation of stars⁸⁶².

III: 38:8–11

Style

Verses 8–11 form a strophe consisting of four bicola in both languages. The strophe begins in 8b with temporal particles -ב (Hebrew has the same particle in 9a as well, however) and ὅτε “when”. The last colon of the strophe has more distinctive transition markers: ופֶּא “and here” in Hebrew and ἀλλ’ “but” in Greek.

The strophe is framed with non-parallelism: in v. 9, there is a partial chiasmus in Greek (ABCD/C’B’A’) and a partial symmetry in Hebrew (xABC/xB’C’) and in v. 10, there is a partial symmetry in both Greek (ABC/A’C’xC’’) and Hebrew (xABC/xA’C’xC’’).

There are a couple of lexical repetitions in Hebrew: in 8a/10b, בִּדְלֹתִים “with doors” and וּדְלֹתִים “and doors” (this is reflected in Greek with the end-repetition

⁸⁵⁷ Ziegler 1971, 14; Cox 2016a, 65.

⁸⁵⁸ Heater 1982, 123–4.

⁸⁵⁹ Dhorme 1967, 577.

⁸⁶⁰ Szpek 1992, 281.

⁸⁶¹ García Martínez et al. 1998, 149–51.

⁸⁶² Heater 1982, 123; Fernández Marcos 1994, 258.

of πύλαις/πύλας “with gates/gates”); in 9a/10b, בשומי “when I made, set” and ואשים “and I made, set”. In Greek, there is the repetition-initial of ἐθέμην δὲ αὐτῇ “and I made for it” in 9a/10a, and of περιθείς “setting around” in 10b. Thus, the translator eliminated variation in favour of repetition here.

A couple of marked Hebrew words have been used: in 8a, the verb ויסך (סך) “to shut in”; Job: 2); in 8b, the infinitive בגיחו of the verb גיח “to burst forth” (7x, Job: 2, Ps: 1); in 9b, the *hapax* noun חתלתו (חלה) “swaddling-band”); and in 11b, the noun גלך (גל) “your waves” (the plural in this meaning (not in the meaning of “heap”) is considered poetic by BDB). Notably, the very first and the very last word of the strophe are considered poetic in Hebrew.

The Greek translator used some rare vocabulary: in 8b, the verb ἐμαίμασεν “to be very eager” (μαιάσσω; LXX: 2, OG Job: 1); in 9a, the *hapax* noun ἀμφίασιν “clothing” (ἀμφιάσις, -εως, ὁ, ἡ; 3x in Job: 22:6b, 24:7b, 38:9a⁸⁶³); and finally, in 9b, the verb ἐσπαργάνωσα “to swaddle” (σπαργανόω; 16x, LXX: 2, OG Job: 1).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. **In 8b**, בגיחו מרחם יצא “when it burst out from the womb” is paraphrased and clarified into ὅτε ἐμαίμασεν ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός αὐτῆς ἐκπορευομένη “when it quivered with eagerness as it issued from its mother’s womb”; μητρός αὐτῆς “its mother’s” is added and the infinitive phrase is translated with the finite verb whereas the finite verb is translated with the participle. **In 9a**, בשומי ענן לבשו “when I made the clouds its garment” is paraphrased into ἐθέμην δὲ αὐτῇ νέφος ἀμφίασιν “and I made the cloud clothing for it”, the infinitive phrase is again translated with a finite verb. **In 9b**, וערפל חתלתו “and thick darkness its swaddling band” is paraphrased into ὁμίχλη δὲ αὐτὴν ἐσπαργάνωσα “and with mist I swaddled it”, wherein the direct object is changed into an indirect object and the *hapax* noun is translated as a verb αὐτὴν ἐσπαργάνωσα “I swaddled it”. Using a finite verb creates a chiasmic structure in this bicolon.⁸⁶⁴ **In 10a**, the Hebrew ואשבר “I broke” is translated as ἐθέμην “I made” (cf. Vg *circumdedi* “I put around”, 11Q10 ותשוה “you put down”, P סבב “he made”), creating a repetition with 9a. There is no reason to think that *Vorlage* was different here or that the translators did not know the meaning; rather, they used contextually suitable verbs⁸⁶⁵. **In 10b**, the Hebrew ואשים “I set” is slightly changed into the participle περιθείς “having put around”. The singular בריח “bar” is translated with the plural κλειῖθρα “bars,” keeping with the plurals “borders” and “doors.” **In 11a**, the pronoun αὐτῇ “to it” is added for clarification after the verb “I said”; the pronoun repeats several times in this strophe, including in the dative form. The verb ולא תסיף “and you do not add, do more” is translated with καὶ οὐχ ὑπερβήσῃ “you shall not go beyond.” Witte reckons that ולא תסיף could

⁸⁶³ Cf. also Mangin 2005, 475, 487.

⁸⁶⁴ Cf. also Verbeke 2011, 314.

⁸⁶⁵ In OG Job and other books, the usual translation equivalent is συντρίβω “to break”.

be secondary because the phrase disrupts colometry⁸⁶⁶ (19:16); this obviously did not bother the translator, and they simply chose a more specific verb.

Reading, vocalising, or understanding the consonantal text differently than the later Masoretes. The beginning of **8a** is problematic. The Greek has first person singular verb ἔφραξα “I shut in, fenced in” and no question. Although the Hebrew has no question-particle in 8a, it is usually read as a question because of the third person singular verb ויסך (“he shut in”). Thus, many read מי סך (“who shut in”)⁸⁶⁷, including Vg (*quis conclusit* “who shut up”). 11Q10 interprets as a question, however in the second person (התסוג “did you hold back?”). Of the major versions, P is the only one that translates what currently stands in the MT. Dhorme suggests that the Greek translator actually read ואסך instead of the current MT⁸⁶⁸. However, the “me” aspect was also emphasised in the previous strophes, so it might as well be intentional. We might assume here, that either the pre-MT manuscripts had some visual discrepancies here or the translators felt the need to fix the unsuitable third person singular, as the major versions interpreted differently. **In 11b**, ופא ישית בגאון גליך “and here shall your proud waves be stopped” has turned into ἀλλ’ ἐν σεαυτῇ συντριβήσεται σου τὰ κύματα “rather, your waves shall be broken up within you”. ופא “and here” is translated with ἀλλ’ “but”. ἐν σεαυτῇ “within yourself” might be due to reading בגוך (possibly גו, meaning “back,” thus “in/on your back”) instead of בגאון that stands in the current MT⁸⁶⁹. For ישית, the Greek translator has chosen συντριβήσεται “they will shatter, they will be confined;” cf. also Vg *confringes* (“you break in pieces; shatter”). Dhorme and Witte suggest that they may have understood and read the verb שבר “to break” instead, whereas Seow says that they assumed the root שתת “to break up” and translated the form ישת and תשת respectively (i.e. reading without the *mater*)⁸⁷⁰. Do note that the verb ואשבר “I broke” was previously translated with ἐθέμην “I made,” which is the usual equivalent for שום. Since שום repeats in the strophe and the translator also saw שבר, it is not inconceivable that the meanings were swapped, to better suit the strophe and leaving the repetitions in Greek to the middle part of the strophe.

Vorlage different than the later MT. **In 10a**, חקי “my limit” is translated with the plural ὅρια “borders” (cf. 11Q10 תחומין). The whole strophe in MT lacks the personal suffix in first person, except here. Vg attests both readings with *terminis meis*. Thus, it is possible that the pre-MT manuscripts had here the plural חקים, of which the final *mem* disappeared in the copying processes.

According to Nömmik, vv. 10–11 are a late *Fortschreibung* or even a later gloss that relies on the book editor’s work (stage one of redactions), dealing with wild nature.⁸⁷¹ Considering the differences that appeared in this strophe, the *Vorlage* may have been different in some points (10a, plural חקים) but also a bit

⁸⁶⁶ Witte 2021, 597.

⁸⁶⁷ Fohrer 1963, 491; Dhorme 1967, 577; Witte 2021, 596.

⁸⁶⁸ Dhorme 1967, 577.

⁸⁶⁹ Dhorme 1967, 579.

⁸⁷⁰ Dhorme 1967, 579; Seow 2011, 67; Witte 2021, 597.

⁸⁷¹ Nömmik 2025.

hard to read in v. 11. These might have been influenced by a later addition to the Hebrew text that was not integrated well enough by copyists.

IV: 38:12–15

Style

Vv. 12–15 form a strophe consisting of four bicola. The strophe begins with a question marked with an interrogative particle (-ה in Hebrew, ᾗ in Greek, although it is repeated a couple of verses later).

There is a partial symmetry in Hebrew in vv. 12 (xABC/B'C'D) and 14 (ABC/xA'B'C'). In v. 15, there is a chiasmus in Greek (ABC/C'B'A') and a partial chiasmus in Hebrew (xABC/xC'A'). Thus, the end of the strophe is marked in Greek (although the next verses in Greek do have parallelistic structures as well).

The only significant lexical repetition in Hebrew is that of רשעים “the wicked” in 13b/15a. This is reflected in Greek with the repetition of ἀσεβείς/ἀσεβῶν (“the wicked”/“of the wicked”). Additionally, the Greek has a repetition-initial of the interrogative ᾗ “was?” in 12a/14a. In 13a/14a/14b, there is the repetition of γῆς “of the earth”, γῆν “earth”, and γῆς “of the earth”.

The Greek translator has used some rare vocabulary: in 12a, the adjective πρωινόν “occurring early in the day” (πρωινός, -ή, -όν; 14x, LXX: 12, OG Job: 1); in 12b, the noun ἑωσφόρος “the morning-star” (21x, LXX: 7, OG Job: 4); in 13b, the verb ἐκτινάξαι “to shake out” (ἐκτινάσσω; 33x, LXX: 25, OG Job: 1); in 14b, the *hapax* adjective λαλητὸν “able to talk” (λαλητός, -ή, -όν; neologism “on the basis of existing stems”⁸⁷²).

There is a simile in Hebrew v. 14: כחמר חותם ויתיצבו כמו לבוש “It is changed like clay under the seal, and it is dyed like a garment”. This is not reflected in Greek.

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 12a*, מימך “since your days” has been Hellenised into ἐπὶ σοῦ “in your time”. The Hebrew בקר “morning” has been extended into φέγγος πρωινόν “the morning light.” *In 12b*, ידעתה “you caused it to know” is translated as εἶδεν “it saw”, the noun שחר “dawn” with ἑωσφόρος “the morning star”, and the phrase מקמו “its place” with τὴν ἑαυτοῦ τάξιν “its own post, position”. In both cola, “morning” has been made more specific and marked. *In 13b*, the finite וינערו “and they are shaken off” is translated with the infinitive ἐκτινάξαι “to cast out, shake off” to match the first colon, omitting the w-conjunction. *In 15a*, the passive form וימנע “and it is withheld” is translated as a question addressing Job, ἀφείλας δὲ “and did you remove?”, possibly influenced by the reading in 15b. Questions addressed to Job are used in v. 14 as well. The suffix -ם “their” in אורם “their light” is not translated, as it is not needed in the context.

⁸⁷² Dhont 2018a, 147. Cf. also Mangin 2005, 539.

Reading, vocalising, or understanding the consonantal text differently than the later Masoretes. *In 12a*, the second person singular צוית “Have you commanded?” is translated with first person singular συντέταχα “Did I instruct?”, possibly due to reading צויתי instead⁸⁷³. Although the translator had emphasised the first-person perspective in the beginning strophes of the speech, it does not seem probable in this verse or strophe. *In 15b*, וזרוע רמה “and the upraised arm” is understood as genitive chain and thus translated into βραχίονα δὲ ὑπερηφάνων “the arm of the proud”. The passive form תשבר “is broken” is again translated as a question addressing Job, συνέτριψας “did you crush?” in Greek, possibly due to reading and understanding it as a second person verb.

Changes regarding religion or religious culture and law. *V. 14* is completely different in both languages, the only explicit commonality is the word “clay” (חמר and πηλός): תהפך כחמר חותם ויתצבו כמו לבוש “it is changed like clay under the seal, and it is dyed like a garment” in Hebrew, describing the Earth visually, and ἦ σὺ λαβὼν γῆν πηλὸν ἐπλασας ζῶον καὶ λαλητὸν αὐτὸν ἔθου ἐπὶ γῆς “Was it you that took clay soil and formed a living creature, and, able to talk, set him on earth?” in Greek, describing the creation of man. According to Dhorme, ζῶον in 14a might be the result of reading חיתם (“animal; living being” + pl.3 suffix) instead of חותם (“seal”)⁸⁷⁴. Heater, on the other hand, implies “theological amplification” and that the “translator has taken an admittedly obscure passage and turned it into a defence of God’s greatness by pointing out the crowning achievement in God’s creation of the world.” He also suggests that the translator read חית (“animal; living being”). The clay references are also found in vv. 4:19b, 10:9a, 13:12b, 27:16b, 30:19a, 33:6; referencing the forming of man can be influenced by Gen 2 which uses similar vocabulary in Greek.⁸⁷⁵ P translator possibly struggled with this word as well and seems to have read גותם “their back” and translated translated with גותם “their body”⁸⁷⁶. Witte has examined the Greek translation of ch. 38 thoroughly and concluded that v. 14 connects the chapter to cosmology found in Gen (more specifically, λαλητός can be connected with Gen 2:19) but also with v. 3 in this same chapter. Creation of man, in his opinion, is just another but equal aspect of creation covered in this chapter.⁸⁷⁷ Thus, this verse is changed in terms of theology, although possibly motivated by a reading of the text that differed from that of the later Masoretes⁸⁷⁸.

Nömmik proposes that vv. 13b, 14a, and 15ab were not part of the oldest poem in this form and were added later by the righteousness redactor. Kaiser differs slightly and thinks that vv. 13b and 14b–15 are not part of the original poem and were added later by the righteousness editor, whereas Witte thinks that only vv. 13b and 15 are possibly secondary.⁸⁷⁹ In terms of the OG translation, the major differences are seen in v. 14, while some differences in v. 15 are more due to

⁸⁷³ Dhorme 1967, 580.

⁸⁷⁴ Dhorme 1967, 581.

⁸⁷⁵ Heater 1982, 124–5. Cf. also Fernández Marcos 1994, 260.

⁸⁷⁶ Szpek 1992, 281.

⁸⁷⁷ Witte 2020, 62–3.

⁸⁷⁸ Cf. also Häberlein 2024, 118–9.

⁸⁷⁹ Kaiser 2006, 69, 127; Witte 2021, 617; Nömmik 2025.

reading and vocalising certain phrases in the consonantal text in an alternative way. V. 14 is rewritten extensively, possibly triggered by reading the text differently but also connecting the topic with the creation of man in Gen 2. It is hard to make any conclusions regarding the secondary nature of this verse just from the OG translation. A later addition in an older manuscript could have been copied and integrated poorly by scribes.

V: 38:16–18

Style

Vv. 16–18 form a strophe of three bicola. The strophe ends with an imperative that calls to answer, after several questions (marked in Hebrew, but not in Greek): הגד “declare!” in Hebrew and ἀνάγγειλον δή μοι “do tell me!” in Greek.

The end of the strophe is also marked with non-parallelism: in v. 16, there is a (partial) chiasmus in both Greek (ABC/B’C’A’) and Hebrew (xAB/xB’A’) and in v. 17, there is a (partial) chiasmus in both Greek (ABC/C’B’A’) and Hebrew (xABC/C’A’).

A couple of lexical repetitions have been created: in Hebrew 16a/17a, the interrogative particle -ה; in v. 17, the noun שערי “the gates” twice. The latter is reflected in Greek with a root-repetition: πύλαι “the gates” and πυλωροὶ “the gatekeepers.”

A couple of marked Hebrew words have been used: in 16a, the *hapax* noun נבכי (נבך “spring”); in 16b, the noun תהום “the deep” (considered mostly poetic by BDB); in 17b, the noun צלמות “deep darkness; shadow of death” (considered poetic by BDB); and in 18a, the adjective רחבי (רחב “broad, wide”; Job: 2).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 16a*, the interrogative ה is not translated. *In 16b*, the common singular ובחקר “and in the object to be searched out” is translated with the plural ἐν δὲ ἵχνεσιν “and in the tracks” (cf. also P וּבִסְדָּהּ “and in foundations” and Vg *in novissimis* “in the hindermost parts”); assuming a differing *Vorlage* here is not warranted. *In 17a*, the Greek translator has chosen ἀνοίγονται “(do) they open” for הגלו “have they have been revealed”. This decision seems to be intentional and might be a contextual collocation: ἀνοίγνυμι/ἀνοίγω and πύλη are logically often used together. The noun φόβω “with fear, out of fear” has been added, probably influenced by the double-translation in 17b⁸⁸⁰. *In 17b*, ושערי צלמות תראה “or have you seen the gates of deep darkness” is paraphrased into πυλωροὶ δὲ ᾧδου ἰδόντες σε ἔπτηξαν “and did the gatekeepers of Hades cower when they saw you?”. ושערי “and the gates” have not been repeated in the Greek and have been changed into πυλωροὶ “the gatekeepers”; this could be intentional or due to vocalising differently (also intentionally). ᾧδου “of Hades” is a unique equivalence for צלמות, as “Hades” is

⁸⁸⁰ See also longer discussion in Häberlein 2024, 128–9.

usually used to translate שאל. *In 18a*, the Hebrew התבוננת “you have comprehended” is changed into νενουθέτησαι “you have been admonished”.

Utilising the context or the translator’s previous knowledge for the meaning of unknown words. *In 16a*, the *hapax* נבך (“spring?”) is translated with πηγὴν “stream, source”. It is not certain if the translator actually knew the meaning of the word or based their translation on context and parallelism⁸⁸¹; the other versions choose contextually suitable translations as well (P 𐤏𐤍𐤕𐤕𐤕𐤕 “to the depths, valleys” and Vg *profunda* “depths”).

Reading, vocalising, or understanding the consonantal text differently than the later Masoretes. *In 17b*, the verb ἐπτηξαν “they cowered for fear” is seemingly added. Dhorme suggests that the translator saw in these consonants the “causative of ירא”⁸⁸²; thus, the translator would have double-translated the word. Double translation in order to convey both possible readings was also seen in v. 2. *In 18b*, הגד אם ידעת כלה “declare, if you know all this!” is paraphrased into ἀνάγγειλον δὴ μοι πόση τίς ἐστίν “do tell me how much it is!”, adding the particle δὴ “so, then” and the pronoun μοι “to me”. The translator possibly read כלה as כמה “how much?,” triggering the small paraphrase.

VI: 38:19–21

Style

Vv. 19–21 make up a strophe of three bicola. The beginning of the strophe in v. 19 is marked with a partial chiasmus in Hebrew (ABCD/xD’A’B’) and with repeated marked question in both languages: the interrogative compound איה זה “where then?”, reflected in Greek with the repetition of ποίᾳ “in what kind of?” and ποῖος “what kind of?”. The strophe ends with an emphasised expression of acknowledgment ידעת כי אז “surely you know, for then” in Hebrew and οἶδα ἄρα ὅτι “thereby I know that” in Greek. In v. 20, the middle of the strophe, Greek has a symmetry (xAB/xA’B’). The use of the optative in a subordinate clause εἰ ἀγάγοις in 20a is very rare in LXX and could show an attempt at a higher register⁸⁸³. The causal כי “that, for” is repeated three times (20a/20b/21a) in Hebrew but in Greek it (εἰ) is only repeated in 20ab.

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In v. 19*, the איה זה question “where is (this)?” is paraphrased both times with the adjective ποῖος, α, ον “of what kind?”: ποίᾳ in 19a and ποῖος in 19b. *In 19a*, הדרך “the way” is changed into γῇ “in the land”, possibly to be closer to the ὁ τόπος *in 19b*, which is translated without the suffix י- “its” from מקומו “its place”. *In v. 20*, the translator translates both כי-particles as conditionals (εἰ). *In 20a*, the phrase אל גבולו “to its territory” is translated with εἰς ὅρια αὐτῶν “inside their (light and darkness)

⁸⁸¹ Verbeke 2011, 316–7.

⁸⁸² Dhorme 1967.

⁸⁸³ Dhont 2018a, 149–51.

borders, to their territory”, using the same word as in v. 10a. *In 21b*, יָמֶיךָ “your days” is translated as ἐτῶν σου “your years”, but the over-all meaning is the same. The adjective רַבִּים “great” is used in singular, πολὺς, necessitated by Greek syntax.

Reading, vocalising, or understanding the consonantal text differently than the later Masoretes. *In 20a*, the Greek translator uses ἀγάγοις με “might you lead me?” to translate תִּקְחוּנוּ “you may take it”. The pronominal suffix נִי- may have been read as נִי- by the translator, although emphasising the first-person perspective is especially common in the first strophes of this speech. *In 20b*, the translator has shortened נִתְיָבוֹת בֵּיתוֹ “paths to/of its home” into τρίβους αὐτῶν “their paths”. It is not impossible that נִתְיָבוֹת was simply missed by the translator since נִתְיָבוֹת ends with similar consonants. *In 21a*, the verb יָדַעַת “you know” is translated as οἶδ᾽ ἄρα “thereby I know”, possibly due to reading the first-person suffix here; again, as a result, the first-person perspective is emphasised in this strophe. ἄρα is used due to the conditionals in v. 20. The translation now would suggest that *if* Job can answer the previously asked question, *then* God can know that Job is old enough to have seen the phenomena mentioned⁸⁸⁴.

According to Nömmik, vv. 19–20 are a late *Fortschreibung* or even a later gloss that rely on the book editor’s work (stage one of redactions) and deal with wild nature. He notes that these two verses are influenced by 28:12, 20, and 24. Kaiser, van Oorschot, and Fohrer also think that these verses are secondary, Kaiser thinks that they are from the righteousness redactor. Witte, however, thinks that they are not secondary and that they fit with the style of this speech⁸⁸⁵. The translator made mostly intentional stylistic changes in these verses, although it is a possibility that the translator read a first-person suffix in 20a and missed a word in 20b, suggesting that there may have been some issues with readability in the manuscript.

VII: 38:22–25

Style

Vv. 22–25 form a strophe of four bicola in Greek. In Hebrew, vv. 22–24 and 25–27 (of which 26–27 are not part of the OG) could be divided into two strophes. In Hebrew, the strophe begins with a marked question (-הֲ interrogative particle); this is not reflected by the translator. However, the strophe ends in v. 25 with a who-question (τίς in Greek, which reflects the מִי that marks the beginning of the second strophe in Hebrew). These are not the only transition markers in this range of verses, however.

The beginning of the strophe is marked with a lexical repetition in v. 22: אֲצִרוֹת “the storehouses” which is reflected in Greek with θησαυρούς. Both strophes in

⁸⁸⁴ See similar cases in ch. 31 and the discussion in Häberlein 2024, 137–8, who agrees on seeing vv. 20–21 as a conditional clause, against, for example the NETS translation.

⁸⁸⁵ Fohrer 1963, 58, 488, 492; van Oorschot 1987, 256; Kaiser 2006, 127; van Oorschot 2007, 171–84; Nömmik 2013, 264; 2014a, 288; Witte 2021, 607–8; Nömmik 2025.

Hebrew have two words in common: in 24a/25b, הדרך “the way” and ודרך “and a way”; and in 24b/26a, עלִי ארץ “over the earth” and על ארץ “on a land”.

As the very last word of the strophe, the Greek translator used the noun *κυδοιμῶν* “exceedingly loud noise” (*κυδοιμός*, -οῦ, ὁ) in 25b, reflecting a rare noun in Hebrew (23x, OG Job: 1). Mangin considers it also poetic since it used by Homer and Theocritus⁸⁸⁶.

Several rare words have been in used in Hebrew: in the first strophe, in 23b, the noun קרב “battle” (10x, Job: 1, Ps: 5); in the second strophe, in 25a, the verb פלג (“to divide, split”; 5x, Job: 1, Ps: 1), the noun לשטף (שטף “flood”; 7x, Job: 1, Ps: 1, Prov: 1), and the noun תעלה “conduit, course” (9x, Job: 1); in 25b, the noun לחוזי (חוזי “lightning”; 3x, Job: 2); and in 27a, the noun משואה (משואה “desolation”; 3x, Job: 2). In the second strophe, the rare words are limited to the frames of the strophe.

The whole strophe in Greek has parallelistic structures and in Hebrew, the whole of the first strophe has parallelistic structures and the end of the second strophe is marked with non-parallelism: in v. 22, there is a chiasmus in both Greek (AB/B'A') and Hebrew (xAB/B'A'); in v. 23, a partial symmetry in both Greek (ABC/B'C'xC') and Hebrew (xABC/B'C'xC'); in v. 24, a partial symmetry in both Greek (xAB/xA'B'C) and Hebrew (ABCD/C'D'E); in v. 25, a partial chiasmus in both Greek (ABC/C'B') and Hebrew (ABCD/xD'C'); and in v. 26, a partial symmetry in Hebrew (ABC/B'C').

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 22a*, just like in 16a, הַבֹּאֵת is translated without the interrogative particle. *In 23a*, the relative clause אשר חשבתי לעת צר “which I have reserved for the time of trouble” is paraphrased into ἀπόκειται δέ σοι εἰς ὥραν ἐχθρῶν “but it is at your disposal for a time of enemies”; the relative particle is untranslated, the first-person singular is turned into third person singular (the first-person perspective has been emphasised previously), and the common singular is translated with plural. *In 23b*, the phrase קרב ומלחמה “of battle and war” is inverted and translated as πολέμου καὶ μάχης “of war and battle”, possibly to create assonance or even rhyme with the end of the next colon (πάχνη, this word, however, does not reflect MT). *In 24a*, אי זה הדרך יחלק “what is the way (to where) it is distributed” is paraphrased into πόθεν δὲ ἐκπορεύεται “from where it goes out?”. *In 24b*, the conjunction ἢ “or” is added (but see discussion of 24a below) and the noun קדים “east wind” (bringing dryness in Palestine⁸⁸⁷) becomes νότος “south wind” in the translation. *In 25a*, the verb פלג “he cut, divided” is changed into ἡτοίμασεν “he prepared”. The phrase לשטף “for the flood” is interpreted as ὑετῶ λάβρω “for furious (heavy) rain” (cf. Vg

⁸⁸⁶ Mangin 2005, 539.

⁸⁸⁷ Witte 2021, 621 gives Gen 41:6, Ez 17:10 and 19:12, Hos 13:15, and Jonah 4:8 as examples. Further, the word appears thrice in Job and is translated differently each time, suggesting a contextual translation. νότος was considered to be the wind that brought wetness and rain in the Greek-speaking world, especially so in Alexandria. Cf. also Witte 2020, 65; Cox 2023, 255.

vehementissimo imbri “to the violent showers”). The “rain” hints at the otherwise untranslated v. 26 (להמטיר “to bring rain”⁸⁸⁸) and the translated v. 28a; a similar phrase is used also in v. 34b. *In 25b*, the word לחזיז “for the lightning” is omitted by the translator, making the last colon of the strophe shorter and marked. *Vv. 26–27* להמטיר על-ארץ לא-איש מדבר לא-אדם בו: להשביע שאה ומשאה “to bring rain on a land where no one lives, on the desert, which is empty of human life, to satisfy the waste and desolate land, and to make the ground put forth grass.” are left untranslated. Fohrer and Gorea claim that the Greek translator left these verses out intentionally in order to condense the text and Witte supposes that the translator may have felt they were redundant⁸⁸⁹. The probability of intentional omission is definitely strong here, assuming that the translator did not want to turn these verses into questions to fit them with the rest of the strophe and speech. V. 26 has been left partly untranslated in 11Q10, possibly due to redundancy⁸⁹⁰.

Vorlage different than the later MT. *In 24a*, the noun אור “light” in Hebrew has become πάγην “hoarfrost” in Greek. In this way, the whole strophe is about different states of water. אור could have been read as כפר (so Dhorme), as אד “mist” (so LXX.D), as איד “vapour, fog” (so Terrien); or as רוח “wind” (so Witte, who says that this word is what was intended here on account of parallelism and that the Greek confirms it)⁸⁹¹. However, when taking into account the added conjunction וְ in 24b (cf. also 11Q10 and P which have the waw), we might suppose a reading אד ויפץ between the two cola of the verse in some pre-MT manuscripts. The context of snow and hail in v. 22 would further have suggested this reading or meaning to the translator. Since vv. 22–30 deal with different states of water, the reading makes sense. Curiously enough, there is a *vacat* in 11Q10 where the noun should be translated; intentional omission has been theorised, but also the possibility that the translator left the *vacat* to come back to it later⁸⁹².

Reading, vocalising, or understanding the consonantal text differently than the later Masoretes. *In 24b*, יפץ “it scatters” is translated with the medio-passive διασχεδάννυται “it is dispersed”; Witte concludes that the better reading would be either יפיץ or יפון, to account for the Greek and Syriac translations⁸⁹³. If the *Vorlage* or pre-MT manuscript read יופץ, it is not inconceivable that the translator translated the waw first as a conjunction and then saw it as signalling a passive form, such as suggested by Witte.

According to Nömmik, vv. 23 and 26–27 late *Fortschreibungen* or even glosses that rely on the book editor’s work (stage one of redactions) and deal with wild nature. Kaiser sees vv. 23 and 27–28 as being from the righteousness redaction. Witte thinks that the fact that v. 23 is a relative clause, does not

⁸⁸⁸ Cf. Gorea 2007, 201; Häberlein 2024, 143–4.

⁸⁸⁹ Fohrer 1963, 488, 492; Gorea 2007, 200–1; Witte 2020, 65.

⁸⁹⁰ Shepherd 2004, 66–7.

⁸⁹¹ Terrien 1963, 251; Dhorme 1967, 585; Kepper and Witte 2011, 2118; Witte 2021, 598.

⁸⁹² Shepherd 2004, 55–6.

⁸⁹³ Witte 2021, 598.

necessarily mean that it is secondary⁸⁹⁴. In the OG translation, V. 23 is paraphrased in the translation so that the result is not a relative clause. Since other versions translate vv. 26–27 at least partly, it looks like they were not missing in the pre-MT manuscripts and in the *Vorlage*, suggesting intentional omissions to make the strophes of the speech more uniform.

VIII: 38:28–30

Style

Vv. 28–30 form a strophe of three bicola that continues the topic of water-based phenomena started in vv. 22 (essentially making up a large two-part strophe). The beginning of the strophe is marked with a partial chiasmus in Greek (ABC/A'C'B'), but the end with a partial symmetry in Hebrew (ABC/B'C'). The beginning is also marked with questions (הישׁ “is there?” in Hebrew and τίς ἐστίν “who is?” in Greek).

The last bicolon of the strophe, v. 30, has a simile: ἡ καταβαίνει ὥσπερ ὕδωρ ῥέον πρόσωπον δὲ ἀβύσσου τίς ἐπηξεν “that descend like flowing water. And who froze the face of the deep?” and יתלבדו ופני תהום כאבן מים “The waters become hard like stone, and the face of the deep is frozen.” While Hebrew keeps the end as a description with a simile, the Greek translator has transformed the last colon into a question.

In Hebrew, the interrogative מי “who?” is repeated thrice (28b/29a/29b). In Greek, this interrogative is repeated five times: τίς ἐστίν “who is?” in 28ab, τίνος “whose?”, and τίς in 29b/30b. In 28b/29b, there is the repetition of הוליד “he begot” and ילדו “gives birth to it”; this is reflected in Greek with the repetition of ὁ τετοκῶς “the one who has begotten” and τέτοκεν “he has given birth/begotten”. Additionally, there is a root-repetition in Greek 29b/30b: πάχην “frost” and ἐπηξεν “he has frozen”.

Some marked vocabulary has been used in Hebrew: in 28b, the *hapax* noun אגל (אגל “a drop”); in 29a, the noun הקרח (קרח “ice”; 7x, Job: 3, Ps: 1); in 29b, the noun וכפר (כפור “hoar frost”; 3x, Job: 1, Ps: 1); and in 30b, the noun תהום “the deep” (considered mostly poetic by BDB).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. **In 28a**, instead of asking *if* the rain has a father (הישׁ), the Greek asks *who* the rain’s father is (τίς ἐστίν; cf. also Vg). **In 28b**, the conjunction או “or” is not directly translated, but the colon does have the usual δέ particle. The finite verb הוליד “he fathered” is translated with ἐστίν ὁ τετοκῶς “he is the one who fathered.” **In 29b**, the noun שמים “of heaven” is translated with ἐν οὐρανῷ “in heaven”. The suffix ו- “him, it” in ילדו “he has given birth to it” is not translated. **In 30b**, יתלבדו “they are frozen” is changed into the question τίς ἐπηξεν “who froze?”. With the added interrogative, all but

⁸⁹⁴ Kaiser 2006, 125–7; Witte 2021, 608; Nömmik 2025.

one cola in the strophe have a form of $\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$, perfectly distinguishing it from the surrounding strophes.⁸⁹⁵

Utilising the context or the translator's previous knowledge for the meaning of unknown words. *V. 30a* is subordinated to 29b by means of the added relative pronoun η that refers to η $\pi\acute{\alpha}\chi\gamma\eta$. The rest, כאבן מים יתחבאו “the waters become hard like stone” is changed into η $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\beta\alpha\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\iota$ $\acute{\omega}\sigma\pi\epsilon\rho$ $\acute{\upsilon}\delta\omega\rho$ $\acute{\rho}\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\nu$ “that descends like flowing water.” There is a simile but the comparandum is different: כאבן “like stone” in Hebrew is translated with $\acute{\omega}\sigma\pi\epsilon\rho$ $\acute{\upsilon}\delta\omega\rho$ $\acute{\rho}\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\nu$ “like flowing water” in Greek (“flowing” is an addition made by the translator, it seems to be a Hellenising stylisation as it creates an antonym for “freezing”⁸⁹⁶). The verb יתחבאו “they become hard” is translated with $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\beta\alpha\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\iota$ “it descends.” The verb חבא occurs five times in Job: 5:21, 24:4, 29:8, 29:10 and here in 38:30. Out of these five times, it is translated as $\kappa\rho\acute{\upsilon}\pi\tau\omega$ in 5:21 and 29:8 (as it mostly is in the rest of the LXX); while 24:4b, 29:10b are asterisked and thus not part of the OG. Since the OG translator understood it as “to hide,” it might not have made sense in this context, and a more suitable verb was chosen. In relation, adjustments are made in the rest of the colon.

Van Oorschot, Fohrer, and de Wilde think v. 28 is secondary. De Wilde theorises that it was inserted as a transition-part. Kaiser thinks that vv. 27–28 are not part of the original poem and were later added by the righteousness redactor. Vermeylen considers the possibility that v. 28 is a later gloss inspired by v. 29. He says that the question presented here does not fit with the two types of questions used in this God’s speech (you-questions directed at Job and questions asking the source of something). Witte, however, thinks that v. 28 is not secondary and that it fits with the style of this speech⁸⁹⁷. In the OG translation, nothing points to the verses that have been considered secondary being problematic for the translator.

IX: 38:31–33

Style

Verses 31–33 form a strophe consisting of three bicola in the Hebrew text and two bicola in the OG text (v. 32 is asterisked). The strophe begins with a chiasmus in both Greek (AB/B’A’) and Hebrew (xAB/xB’A’). In v. 32, there is a partial chiasmus in Hebrew (xABC/xB’A’). As a result, the beginning of the strophe is marked with a partial chiasmus in Greek whereas in Hebrew, the end of the strophe is marked with non-parallelism. The only significant lexical repetition is in Greek v. 33, marking the end of this short strophe: $\omicron\upsilon\rho\alpha\nu\omicron\upsilon$ “of heaven” and $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\prime$ $\omicron\upsilon\rho\alpha\nu\omicron\nu$ “under heaven”.

⁸⁹⁵ However, see Häberlein 2024, 148, who argues for a different *Vorlage*.

⁸⁹⁶ The phrase $\acute{\upsilon}\delta\omega\rho$ $\acute{\rho}\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\nu$ “flowing water” can be found in Plato’s *Theaetetus* and Aristotle’s *Problemata*, for example.

⁸⁹⁷ Fohrer 1963, 58, 488, 492; De Wilde 1981, 365, 411; van Oorschot 1987, 256; Kaiser 2006, 127; van Oorschot 2007, 171–84; Vermeylen 2015, 176–7; Witte 2021, 607–8.

Many rare or marked Hebrew words have been used in this strophe: in 31a, the noun מעדנות “bonds” (2x, Job: 1), and the noun כימה “Pleiades” (3x, Job: 2); in 31b, the *hapax* noun משכות (משכת “cord”), and the noun כסיל “Orion” (3x, Job: 2); in 32a, the *hapax* noun מזרות “Mazzaroth”; in 32b, the noun ועיש (עיש “Bear”; Job: 2); finally, in 33b, the *hapax* noun משטרו (משטר “rule, authority”). In Greek, one relatively rare word has been used which also reflects a rare word in Hebrew: in 31b, the noun φραγμὸν “the barrier” (φραγμός, -οῦ, ὁ; 46x, LXX: 2, OG Job: 1).

Text

Reading, vocalising, or understanding the consonantal text differently than the later Masoretes. In 31a, the verb התקשר “do you bind” is translated with στυγῆσας “(did) you understand”, maybe relating the consonants to the meaning “to conspire”.

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. In 31a, the plural מעדנות “chains” is translated with the singular δεσμὸν “the bond, chain”. In 31b, the conjunction או “or” is translated with καὶ “and”. The plural *hapax* משכות “cords”⁸⁹⁸ is again translated with a singular φραγμὸν “the barrier.” The imperfective תפתח “you open” is translated with the aorist ἤνοιξας “you opened.” In 33a, the noun חקות “ordinances” became τροπὰς “turns, changes” in the translation, which is a *terminus technicus* related to cosmology in Greek literature⁸⁹⁹. This could refer to both seasonal changes and solstices.

Translator’s limited vocabulary. V. 32, התציא מזרות בעתו ועיש על בניה תנחם “Can you lead forth the Mazzaroth in their season, or can you guide the Bear with its children?” is not translated. Fohrer thinks that the OG translator left the verse out to shorten the text, whether intentionally (redundancy) or because it was hard to interpret and Witte supposes that the translator was not familiar with the *hapax* מזרות “Mazzaroth”⁹⁰⁰. In 33b, the phrase ὁμοθυμαδὸν τὰ γινόμενα “the corresponding events” replace the Hebrew משטרו תשים “you establish its rule” which might not have been understandable due to the *hapax* משטר “rule”⁹⁰¹, or might have been changed to make more sense for the translator. The translator has tried to hint that the movements of heaven (stars, moon) cause changes on earth.

All three verses in Hebrew contain rare vocabulary, v. 31 being almost fully made up of them; thus, the translation choices and omissions are probably influenced by this fact, leading then to more conventional stylistic choices of the OG translator. The versions all differ in details here, attesting to the rarity of the vocabulary used in Hebrew and different strategies to deal with difficult vocabulary. All translators, however, recognised the celestial context.

⁸⁹⁸ See discussion in Verbeke 2011, 318–20.

⁸⁹⁹ Witte 2020, 66.

⁹⁰⁰ Fohrer 1963, 492; Witte 2020, 65.

⁹⁰¹ See discussion in Verbeke 2011, 324.

X: 38:34–35

Style

Verses 34–35 form a strophe consisting of two bicola. The end of the strophe is marked with the question $\tau\acute{\iota}$ ἐστὶν; “What is it?” in Greek, and with the interjection הֲנֵנוּ “here we are!” in Hebrew. The only lexical repetition is that of the interrogative particle ה- in the beginning of 34a/35a (started in v. 31). A couple of marked words have been used in Hebrew: in 34b, the noun שפעה (שפעת “abundance”; 6x, Job: 2); and in 35a, the noun ברקים (ברק “lightnings” (used mostly in poetry, according to BDB).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 34a*, the phrase התרים לעב קולך “can you lift up your voice to the clouds?” has been paraphrased into καλέσεις δὲ νέφος φωνῇ “will you call a cloud by voice?”⁹⁰². *In 35b*, the answer of the thunderbolts has been changed from הֲנֵנוּ “here we are” to $\tau\acute{\iota}$ ἐστὶν “what is it”, maybe to show that the situation is unrealistic, to make the sarcasm more explicit. Job cannot possibly summon clouds and thunderbolts.

Reading, vocalising, or understanding the consonantal text differently than the later Masoretes. *In 34b*, the phrase ושפעת מים תבסך “and a flood of waters covers you” has been interpreted as καὶ τρόμῳ ὕδατος λάβρῳ ὑπακούσεται σου “and with a violent burst of water it will obey you”⁹⁰³. Dhorme, Terrien and Witte suggest that translator may have read תַּעֲנֶךָ “it answers you”⁹⁰⁴; this choice or reading results in a closer correspondence to καλέω “call, summon” at the beginning of the verse. The rest of the phrasing is similar to that in v. 25a, attesting to the fact that the translator managed large units of text freely and made efforts to use similar vocabulary in a larger context, independently of the Hebrew.

According to Nömmik, v. 34 is a late *Fortschreibung* or a gloss that relies on the book editor’s work (stage one of redactions) and deals with wild nature. It may be influenced by 22:11b.⁹⁰⁵ The translator possibly read one word differently in v. 34b, but the rest is simply paraphrased corresponding to the reading, context, and the preceding strophes that dealt with states of water.

XI: 38:36–38

Style

Vv. 36–38 form a strophe consisting of three bicola. V. 36 is a bicolon that does not fit with neither the previous nor the next strophe; however, due to the use of מה/σοφίαν it is analysed with vv. 37–38.

The strophe begins with a marked who-question (מִי in Hebrew and τίς in Greek). In Greek, the beginning is also marked with a parallelistic structure, while

⁹⁰² Cf. also Orlinsky 1958, 252–3, 256; Dhorme 1967, 591.

⁹⁰³ Cox 2016, 74 considers τρόμῳ a descriptive addition.

⁹⁰⁴ Terrien 1963, 252; Dhorme 1967, 591; Witte 2021, 599.

⁹⁰⁵ Nömmik 2025.

in Hebrew, the strophe is framed: verse 36 is (partially) symmetric in Greek (ABCD/xD') and Hebrew (ABCD/xA'B'C'D'), and in verse 38, there is a partial chiasmus in Hebrew (xABC/xB'A').

In Greek 36b, marking the beginning of the strophe, the adjective *ποιικιλτικὴν* “pertaining to embroidery” (*ποιικιλτικός*, -ή, -όν) is very rare as it appears only twice, both in LXX (including this once in Job). In Hebrew, the strophe is framed with marked vocabulary: in 36a, the noun *בטחות* “inner parts?”; 2x, Job: 1, Ps: 1); in 36b the *hapax* noun *לשכוי* (שכוי) “mind?”; in 38a, the noun *למוצק* “a casting”; 4x, Job: 1); and in 38b, the noun *ורגבים* (רגב) “a clod”; 2x, Job: 1).

The strophe ends with a simile in Greek: *κέχυται δὲ ὥσπερ γῆ κονία, κεκόλληκα δὲ αὐτὸν ὥσπερ λίθῳ κύβον*. “And dust has been poured out like soil, but I have cemented it, like a block to a stone.”

Besides the repetition of interrogatives, both Hebrew and Greek have an end-repetition of “wisdom” in 36a/37a: *חכמה* and *בחכמה* in Hebrew and *σοφίαν* and *σοφία* in Greek. The Greek translator has independently added the repetition of *γῆν* “earth” and *γῆ* “earth” in 37b/38a.

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 36a*, the verb has been slightly changed from *מי שח* “who put?” to *τίς ἔδωκεν* “who gave?”. *In 36b*, the question *מי נתן* “who gave?” is omitted by the translator to condense the verse. *In 37a*, the finite verb *יספר* “he numbers, recounts” is changed into a participle *ὁ ἀριθμῶν* “he who numbers”. *In 38a*, the active infinitive *בצקת* “when pouring, flowing” is changed into the passive *κέχυται* “it has been poured out”. The translator has created a simile *ὥσπερ γῆ κονία* “like dusty earth” from just *עפר* “dust, earth.” *In 38b*, the translator has changed the third person plural *ידבקו* “they cling together” into a first person singular *κεκόλληκα δὲ αὐτὸν* “I have cemented it”, to emphasise God’s personal work just like some other times in this speech. In this way, God answers to the question he asked in v. 37.

Reading, vocalising, or understanding the consonantal text differently than the later Masoretes. *In 36a*, the translator could have understood the verb *טוה* “to spin” instead of *טחות* “viscera, innards”⁹⁰⁶, thus *γυναιξὶν ὑφάσματος* “(the wisdom) of weaving to women” in Greek (connected to the Tabernacle in Ex 35:25–26⁹⁰⁷). In this scenario, the addition of “women” would make sense (Vg sees it necessary to add *hominis* “of man”), to contextualise the skill. *In 36b*, to continue the theme of handicrafts, *ποιικιλτικὴν* “of embroidery” is used to translate *לשכוי*. Here, the Hebrew was likely related to *שכים* “thorns” (like in Num 33:55, where it is translated with *σκόλοpes* “anything pointed; thorns”). The context in mind was still probably Ex 35.⁹⁰⁸ All in all, as Witte says, the verse is in Greek connected

⁹⁰⁶ Cf. also Dhorme 1967, 591; Witte 2021, 625.

⁹⁰⁷ Witte 2020, 66–7; Cox 2023, 255–6.

⁹⁰⁸ Witte 2020, 66–7; Cox 2023, 255–6. However, Verbeke 2011, 326 is sure that *ποιικιλτικὴν* is not in any way connected to the Hebrew *לשכוי* and is an addition based on the context and parallelism.

“to a genuine Israelite-Jewish cult motif”⁹⁰⁹. In 37b, וּנְבִלֵי שָׁמַיִם מִי יִשְׁכִּיב “and who can tilt the waterskins of the heavens?” is turned into οὐρανὸν δὲ εἰς γῆν ἔκλινεν “and (who) inclined sky to earth?”. The noun וּנְבִלֵי “and the skin-bags, waterskins” (a synonym for clouds) is translated as εἰς γῆν “into, onto the earth”⁹¹⁰. The translator could have understood גְּבוּל “territory; mountain, hill-country” or תֵּבֵל “world.” Both have been translated as γῆ elsewhere in the LXX. Heater has explained the changes in this colon with influences from other poetic passages (2 Sam 22:10a, Ps 18:10a (LXX 17:10a), and 144:5 (LXX 143:5)) that also talk about “bowing the heavens”⁹¹¹. The repeating interrogative מִי “who” is omitted. The equivalence between יִשְׁכִּיב “he makes to lie down, he tilts” and ἔκλινεν “he caused to lean, recline” is unique, but suits the context. Vg struggles with the Hebrew as well and translates *concentum caeli quis dormire faciet* “who can make the harmony of heaven to sleep?”. From לְמוֹצֵק וְרִגְבִּים “into a mass and the clods” in 38a/b, the translator has created another simile ὥσπερ λίθω κύβον “like a block to a stone”. The thing cemented together is changed: in the Hebrew text, clods of soil cling together, whereas in the Greek text, God has cemented a block (of stone?) to a stone. Maybe the first word was read as מִצּוֹק “pillar.” Dhorme, however, thinks that the OG and Vg translators understood מוֹצֵק as “earth” (γῆ)⁹¹².

Witte has summarised the actions in these verses as such: “Unique characteristics of the Greek text in the closing frame of Job 38 are: firstly, that, with the motif of “tilting (κλίνω) heaven” (v. 37)—as compared to “tilting the waterskins of heaven” in the MT—the aspect of theophany is again introduced; secondly, that God’s actions are especially emphasized (v. 38b: “I have cemented”); and thirdly, that heaven is (metaphorically) compared with a cube (κύβος).”⁹¹³

All in all, the translator has created a three-verse strophe consisting of two questions and an answer to the second one, partly triggered by a differing reading of the consonantal text and then associating the readings with passages from Ex. This is a strategy of the translator to deal with difficult passages.

According to Nömmik, vv. 36–41 are late *Fortschreibungen* or partly even later glosses that rely on the book editor’s work (stage one of redactions) and deal with wild nature.⁹¹⁴ It looks like the text was quite difficult here, as the Greek has several differences, some of which may be related to reading and understanding the consonantal text differently than the later Masoretes (especially v. 34). This triggered the translator to utilise passages from Ex to find meaning to some words and finally emphasising God’s creative power in answer to His own question. An

⁹⁰⁹ Witte 2020, 66–7. having to do with “the production of priestly robes” (Ex 28:8.17; 36:17[39:10] and 29 [39:21]) and the tabernacle (Ex 37:21[23]), and the two together in Ex 35:25–26. Thus, “creation, cosmos and temple are thought of in close correlation”.

⁹¹⁰ Cox 2016a, 74 considers this an addition that completes the line.

⁹¹¹ Heater 1982, 125.

⁹¹² Dhorme 1967, 594.

⁹¹³ Witte 2020, 59.

⁹¹⁴ Nömmik 2025.

effort has been made to turn the three verses, seemingly loosely related into a coherent block.

XII: 38:39–41

Style

Vv. 39–41 form a strophe consisting of two bicola and a tricolon that marks the end of the strophe. A new speech dealing with living beings, animal and creatures, begins here. In Hebrew, the strophe begins with a question, marked with the interrogative particle -ה.

The strophe ends in 41a with a marked who-question in both languages (מי in Hebrew and τίς in Greek). The end is also marked with non-parallelism in both languages: in v. 39, there is a partial chiasmus in both Greek (ABC/B'A') and Hebrew (xABC/xC'A'), and in v. 40, there is a partial symmetry in both Greek (AxB/A'B'C) and Hebrew (xAB/A'B'C).

In Hebrew 39a/41a, in a sense framing the strophe, there is the root-repetition of תצוד “you hunt” and צידו “its prey”; this is reflected in Greek with the end-repetition of βοράν “prey”. In Hebrew, the temporal כי “when” is repeated in 40a/41b; this is also reflected in Greek with the repetition of the causal γὰρ “for”.

Some marked Hebrew words have been used in this strophe: in 40a, the noun במעוֹנוֹת (מענה “dwelling, habitation”; 9x, Job: 2, Ps: 1); in 40b, the preposition לְמוֹ “upon” (9x, Job: 3), and the noun אֲרֵב (“an ambush, a lair”; Job: 2); in 41a, the noun צִידוֹ (ציד “food”; 5x, Job: 1, Ps: 1); and in 41c, the negation לְבִלִּי “without” (considered mainly poetic by BDB).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 39a*, the common singular לְלִבֵּי “for the lion” is translated with the plural λέουσιν “for lions”. *In 39b*, the singular וְחַיָּת “and the life” is translated with the plural ψυχὰς δὲ “and the souls”. The clarifying pronoun αὐτῶν “their” is added to “lairs, dens.” *In 40a*, the verb δεδοίκασι “they fear” translates the Hebrew יִשְׁחוּ “they crouch”⁹¹⁵. The translation could be an elaboration or amplification of the שָׁח “to crouch” to strengthen the argument that the lions and their cubs (“dragons”) need God’s help with catching their prey. *In 40b*, the prepositional phrase לְמוֹ אֲרֵב “in order to ambush, lie in wait” has been changed into a participle ἐνεδρεύοντες “lying in wait”. *In 41a*, the suffix -וֹ “its” in צִידוֹ “its prey” is not translated, allowing for a perfect repetition with the end of 39a. *In 41c*, the finite verb יִתְעוּ “they wander” is changed into a participle πλανώμενοι “wandering” and the phrase לְבִלִּי אֵכָל “for lack of food” is changed into τὰ σῖτα ζητοῦντες “searching for food”, emphasising the desperation in hunger.

Utilising the context or the translator’s previous knowledge for the meaning of unknown words. *In 39b*, the noun כְּפִירִים “of young lions” is translated as

⁹¹⁵ In 9:13 it is translated appropriately as κάμπτω; however, it seems to be translated as δαίδω in Isa 60:14 as well.

δρακόντων “of dragons”; this is done in 4:10 as well. Beeckman proposes that the translator did not know the Hebrew word and chose something else that could be appropriate; since “lion” and “dragon” appear together in literature and LXX, the choice was clear⁹¹⁶.

According to Nömmik, vv. 36–41 are late *Fortschreibungen* or partly even later glosses that rely on the book editor’s work (stage one of redactions) and deal with wild nature. He notes that v. 39 is influenced by 4:10. Kaiser believes 41c to be a gloss. Contrarily, Fohrer believes that there is a colon missing between 41b and c; Witte also deems it likely that a colon is missing in verse 41⁹¹⁷. If these were later additions, they were integrated to the main text well as the translator only paraphrased here and utilised the context and their knowledge when a word was not known.

XIII: 39:1–3

Style

Verses 39:1–3 form a strophe consisting of two bicola in the Greek text; vv. 1–4 form a strophe of four bicola in the Hebrew text. In Hebrew, the strophe begins with a question, marked with the interrogative -ה. The end of the strophe is marked with non-parallelism in Hebrew: there is a partial chiasmus in v. 1 (xABCD/B’C’A’) and a partial symmetry in vv. 2 (ABC/xA’B’C’) and 3 (ABC/B’C’).

In Hebrew 1a/2b, there is the repetition of the phrase ידעת עת לדת “you know the time when they give birth”. In Greek, this is partly reflected in 1b/2b with the repetition of ὠδῖνας “birth pangs”.

Several rare Hebrew words have been used: in 1a, the noun יעלי (על “goat”; 2x, Job: 1, Ps: 1); in 3a, the verb תפלחנה (פלח “to cleave, slice”; 5x, Job: 2, Ps: 1, Prov: 1); in 3b, the noun חבליהם (חבל “pain, pang”; 9x, Job: 2); finally, in 4a, the verb יחלמו (חלם “to be healthy”; 2x, Job: 1), and the noun בבר (בר “a field”; 9x, Job: 1).

The Greek translator has used a rare noun in 2a: τοκετοῦ “childbirth” (τοκετός, -οῦ, ὅ; 9x, LXX: 4, OG Job: 1, ※: 1 (v. 1a)).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. **In 1b**, the infinitive חלל “calving” is translated with the noun ὠδῖνας “birth pangs”. The imperfective תשמר “you guard” is translated with the aorist ἐφύλαξας “you guarded.” **In 2a**, the imperfective verb תספר “you number” is again translated into aorist: ἡρίθμησας “you numbered”. The phrase ירחים תמלאנה “months that they fulfill” is paraphrased by both the OG and Vg translators into “their months full of pregnancy” (μῆνας αὐτῶν πλήρεις τοκετοῦ) and “months of their conceiving” (*menses conceptus*).

⁹¹⁶ Beeckman 2024, 223–4. Cf. also Dhont 2018b, 621–2.

⁹¹⁷ Fohrer 1963, 58; Kaiser 2006, 71, 127; Nömmik 2013, 264; Witte 2021, 600; Nömmik 2025.

Problems with the *Vorlage* manuscript. In 2b, the phrase ὠδῖνας δὲ αὐτῶν ἔλυσας “and you relieved their birth pangs” is translated from Hebrew 3b חבליהם תשלחנה “they are set free from their pains”⁹¹⁸, addressing Job with a direct question just like in 1b. V. 3a ἐξέθρεψας δὲ αὐτῶν τὰ παιδία ἔξω φόβου “did you rear their young ones outside of fear?” seems to paraphrase the beginning of Hebrew 4a יחלמו בניהם “their young ones become strong”. Gorea hypothesises that ἔξω φόβου “outside/without fear” is actually translated from בלי פחד in 39:16 in the ostrich passage, which supports the idea, that it was not missing from the *Vorlage* at all. Dhorme has supposed that the Greek ἐξέθρεψας derives from reading תלחם “it eats, dines” instead of יחלמו and that ἔξω φόβου paraphrases ירבו that was read as יראה בבר “fear outside.” Cox has proposed that the translator may have read לכהם “you have reared” instead of לחם “to become strong.”⁹¹⁹ In this instance, Dhorme’s suggestions seem the most plausible. The *Vorlage* manuscript may have been a bit hard to read, but the translator condensed the information into a solid and short strophe.

The rest of the strophe, namely Hebrew vv. 1a, הידעת עת לדת יעלי סלע, “Do you know when the mountains goats give birth?”, 2b, וידעת עת לדתנה, “and do you know the time when they give birth”, 3a תכרענה ילדיהן תפלחנה “when they crouch to give birth to their offspring”, and 4b חבליהם תשלחנה “they go forth and do not return to them” are not translated. The omissions could be purely intentional, since formally, the Greek only has short, unmarked questions, whereas the Hebrew (or the current MT) has questions mixed with statements (see similar omission in 38:26–27). The P translator has shortened vv. 3–4 considerably as well, although redundancy has been posited to be the motivation behind it⁹²⁰; 11Q10 translates all verses, however.

According to Nömmik, vv. 3–4 belong to late *Fortschreibungen* or partly even later glosses that rely on the book editor’s work (stage one of redactions) and deal with wild nature. According to Witte vv. 1a (either עת or לדת are secondary) and 4a (ירבו could be secondary) are comotrically too long⁹²¹. Taking into account the several different readings previously mentioned, the *Vorlage* was probably problematic in this strophe. Whether the translator shortened it intentionally or due to issues of readability, cannot be said with certainty as the strategies of translation here correspond to both intentional omissions seen elsewhere but also constructing a meaningful strophe out of bits and pieces of Hebrew, they could make out (such as in chs. 12 and 30). The fact that 11Q10 and P translate all the verses (although P shortens) would suggest that at least some pre-MT manuscripts had the full text in a more readable state, whereas the manuscript that the OG translator used was more problematic. Still, the efforts of the translator can be seen, as the result is a clear and concise strophe made up of questions. Based

⁹¹⁸ Cf. also Ziegler 1971, 11.

⁹¹⁹ Dhorme 1967, 598–9; Gorea 2007, 204–7; Cox 2009, 668.

⁹²⁰ Shepherd 2004, 102–4.

⁹²¹ Witte 2021, 600–1; Nömmik 2025.

on the translation choices, it looks like vv. 1b and 2a were less problematic, while the other two were more so.

XIV: 39:5–7

Style

Vv. 5–7 form a strophe consisting of a bicolon and a *tricolon* (6a + 7ab) in the Greek text. Vv. 5–8 form a strophe of four bicola in the Hebrew. Therefore, the end of the strophe is marked structurally in Greek. The strophe begins with marked who-questions in the first two cola in both languages (מי in Hebrew and τίς δέ ἐστιν and τίς in Greek). These also constitute the only lexical repetitions in the strophe.

The strophe is framed with parallelism in Greek (the middle colon does not have one), but in Hebrew, the end is marked with non-parallelism: in v. 5, there is a partial chiasmus in Hebrew (ABCD/xC'A'B') and in Greek (ABCD/C'A'B'), in v. 6, there is another partial chiasmus in Hebrew (xABC/C'B'), and in v. 7, there is a chiasmus in both Greek and Hebrew (AB/B'A').

The end of the strophe is marked with rare and literary words in Greek: in 7a, the noun πολυσυχλίας “great number of population” (πολυσυχλία, -ας, ἡ; 4x, LXX: 3, OG Job: 2; also considered literary koine⁹²²); and in 7b, the noun φορολόγου “collector of tributes” (LXX: 6, OG Job: 2⁹²³; considered literary koine and appears in papyri⁹²⁴).

Some marked Hebrew words have been used as well: in 5a, the noun פרא “wild donkey” (10x, Job: 4, Ps: 1); in 5b, the noun ומסרות (מוסר) “the bonds” (considered poetic and late by BDB), and the noun ערוד “wild donkey, wild ass” (2x, Job: 1); in 6b, the noun מלחה “saltiness” (3x, Job: 1, Ps: 1); in 7a, the noun קריה “the city” (considered mostly poetic and of higher style by BDB); in 7b, the noun תשאות (תשאה) “noise, clamour”; 4x, Job: 2); finally, in 8b, the *hapax* noun ירוק “green thing”.

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 5a*, the finite verb שלח “he has let (sent)” is translated as ἐστίν ὁ ἀφείξ “he is the one who let go”. *V. 6a* begins with the relative particle אשר which the translator does not translate, and the colon is made into a simple statement. *V. 6b*, ומשכנותיו מלחה “and the salt land for its dwelling place” is not translated. The reason might be due to the vocabulary as משכן is usually understood as “tabernacle,” and מלחה is very rare. The omission might also be completely intentional, to avoid repeating the same idea twice and to form a tricolon from two verses instead. *In 7a*, the finite verb ישחק “he scorns” is changed into a participle καταγελῶν “laughing to scorn”⁹²⁵, and in

⁹²² Mangin 2005, 556.

⁹²³ In 3:18, a very similar phrase is used: οὐκ ἤχουσιν φωνήν φορολόγου.

⁹²⁴ Mangin 2005, 580.

⁹²⁵ 11Q10 similarly translates יחאך “he laughs”; see also García Martínez et al. 1998, 155–8.

Greek could be understood as describing either God or the donkey. *In 7b*, the plural תשאות “shouts” is translated as a singular μέμψιν “the chiding”. The noun נוגש is understood explicitly as φορολόγου “the tax-gatherer;” this meaning is also possible in Hebrew but traditionally it is translated as “driver.” A tax-gatherer might be associated with the city more than a driver or an overseer (cf. also ancient versions who prefer a similar meaning). Again, the finite verb לא ישמע “it does not hear” is changed into a participle οὐκ ἀκούων “not hearing,” and in Greek could be understood as describing either God or the donkey. *V. 8*, יתור הרים מרעהו ואחר כל ירוק ידרוש “It ranges the mountains as its pasture, and it searches after every green thing” is not translated in the Greek text. The verse has one rare word but that usually does not stop the translator from either utilising the context or simply translating without the word. It looks as if the translator kept only the moralising part of the strophe here, omitting vv. 6b and 8: God made the wild ass, a free roamer in the wilderness who does not approve of the modern city life. According to Nömmik, vv. 6 and 8 are late *Fortschreibungen* or partly even later glosses that rely on the book editor’s work (stage one of redactions) and deal with wild nature.⁹²⁶ The translator possibly noticed that the descriptiveness of these verses did not quite suit and chose to omit them partly.

Translator’s limited vocabulary? *In 5b*, the very rare noun ערוד “of the wild donkey” is replaced by a pronoun αὐτοῦ “its” (cf. also the Vg and P⁹²⁷). Using a synonym could have been unnecessary⁹²⁸ or the translator simply could not come up with a synonym on their own.

XV: 39:9–12

Style

Verses 9–12 form a strophe that is made up of four bicola in both the Hebrew and Greek.

The Hebrew has several lexical repetitions, the Greek translation only reflects one: the interrogative particle -ה in the beginning of all four verses; in 9a/10a, the noun רים “the wild ox”; the conjunction אם “or” at the beginning of 9b/10b (reflected in Greek with ἢ “or”); and in 11a/12a, the words בו כי “in him, so that”.

Some rare Hebrew words have been used in the first half of the strophe: in 9a and 10a, the noun רים (ראם) “a wild ox” (9x, Job: 2, Ps: 3); in 9b, the noun אבוסך (אבוס “a crib, manger”; 3x, Job: 1, Prov: 1); in 10a, the noun בתלם (תלם “furrow”; 5x, Job: 2, Ps: 1); and in 10b, the verb ישדד (שדד “to harrow”; 3x, Job: 1).

The Greek translator has used a couple of rare or relatively rare words as well: in 9a, the noun μονόκερως “the one-horned” (reflects a rare word in Hebrew; 18x, LXX: 8, OG Job: 1); in 10b, the noun αὐλακας “furrows” (αὐλαξ, -ακος, ἡ; 37x,

⁹²⁶ Nömmik 2025.

⁹²⁷ Shepherd 2004, 105–6.

⁹²⁸ Verbeke 2011, 329.

LXX: 6, OG Job: 2); and in 11b, the verb ἐπαφήσεις “to entrust” (ἐπαφίημι; 40x, LXX: 4, OG Job: 3).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 9b*, the finite verb ילִן “it spends the night” is changed into an infinitive κοιμηθῆναι “to lie down”, subordinated to βουλήσεται “he is willing” in 9a. *In 10b*, בתלם “in the furrow” from Hebrew 10a is not omitted but translated in 10b instead as σου αὐλακας “your furrows”. Dhorme suggests emending the MT in agreement with Greek: תלמים instead of בתלם in the current text⁹²⁹. The pronoun could also be the result of shortening the Hebrew אחריך “behind you” into σου “your” and not necessarily the alternative reading provided by Dhorme; the word is also omitted in P⁹³⁰. The plural עמקים “valleys,” also having the meaning of “lowland, plain,” is translated with the singular ἐν πεδίῳ “in the plain.” *In 11b*, the common singular יגיע “your toil, work” is translated with the plural τὰ ἔργα σου “your works”. *In 12a*, τὸν σπόρον “the seed” is sourced from the beginning of Hebrew 12b, זרע “your grain”, omitting the suffix.

Reading, vocalising, or understanding the consonantal text differently than the later Masoretes. *In 10a*, התקשר רים בתלם עבתו “Can you tie it in the furrow with ropes?” is paraphrased into δήσεις δὲ ἐν ἱμάσι ζυγὸν αὐτοῦ “And you will bind its yoke with straps”. רים “wild ox” is not repeated. Both the ἱμάς “strap, rope” and ζυγόν “yoke” could be a translation of the Hebrew עבת “rope.” Cox considers ζυγόν a clarifying addition; Gray and Witte, however, propose that ζυγόν possibly comes from reading ניר “dominion” (derived from “field”) instead of רים “wild ox”⁹³¹. *In 12a*, the Hebrew ישוב “it turns back” is translated as ἀποδώσει “it will give back”; perhaps it was read as the polel ישובב “it brings back”.

Utilising the context or the translator's previous knowledge for the meaning of unknown words. *In 9a*, the animal behind רים is translated as μονόκερως “the one-horned”⁹³² while Vg translates as *rinoceros* “the rhinoceros”. There is no reason to see this as mythologisation (or as an actual rhinoceros), as μονόκερως is mentioned alongside cattle animals elsewhere, such as in Aristotle’s *Historia Animalia* 499b19⁹³³.

⁹²⁹ Dhorme 1967, 601.

⁹³⁰ Shepherd 2004, 77–8.

⁹³¹ Gray 1974, 347; Cox 2016a, 74; Witte 2021, 602.

⁹³² Also in Num 23:22, 24:8; Deut 33:17; Ps 22:21, 29:6; but in Isa 34:7 as χρίός “a ram”. In Plutarch’s *Pericles* (VI.2), μονόκερως refers to a one-horned ram whose one and only horn grows from the middle of the forehead – presumably a rhinoceros.

⁹³³ “Ἔστι δὲ καὶ τὰ μὲν κερατοφόρα τῶν ζῴων τὰ δ’ (15) ἄκερα. Τὰ μὲν οὖν πλεῖστα τῶν ἐχόντων κέρατα διχαλὰ κατὰ φύσιν ἐστίν, οἷον βοῦς καὶ ἔλαφος καὶ αἰξ· μώνυχον δὲ καὶ δίκερων οὐδὲν ᾧπται. Μονοκέρατα δὲ καὶ μώνυχα ὀλίγα, οἷον ὁ Ἰνδικὸς ὄνος. Μονόκερων δὲ καὶ διχαλὸν ὄρυξ. Καὶ ἀστράγαλον δ’ ὁ Ἰνδικὸς ὄνος ἔχει τῶν μωνύχων (20) μόνον· ἡ γὰρ ὕς, ὥσπερ ἐλέχθη πρότερον, ἐπαμφοτερίζει, διὸ καὶ οὐ καλλιστράγαλόν ἐστιν. “Furthermore, of animals some are horned, and some are not so. The great majority of the horned animals are cloven-footed, as the ox, the stag, the goat; and a solid-hooved animal with a pair of horns has never yet been

According to Nömmik, vv. 11–12 are part of late *Fortschreibungen* or partly even later glosses that rely on the book editor’s work (stage one of redactions) and deal with wild nature.⁹³⁴ There is a possibility that the text was read a bit differently in these verses, but most of the differences could well as be intentional and are minor enough.

XVI: 39:19–20

Style

Vv. 19–20 form a strophe of two bicola; it is the first part of a tripartite longer strophe about the horse (vv. 19–25). This short strophe is made up of mostly questions in both languages. All three questions in Hebrew are marked with the interrogative particle *ה*. Since it appears three times, it does not act as a significant transition marker. However, in Greek, the strophe begins with the interrogative particle and an emphasised personal pronoun *ἤ σὺ* “did you?.” The end of the strophe is marked with a simile in Hebrew 20a, marking the end of the strophe: *התרעישנו כארבה* “Do you make it leap like the locust?”.

The beginning of the strophe is marked in Hebrew, whereas the Greek strophe, wholly in parallelistic structures, is distinguished from the surrounding strophes: there is a partial symmetry in both Greek (xABCD/xB’C’D’) and Hebrew (XABC/A’B’C’) in v. 19; in v. 20, there is a partial symmetry in Greek (ABC/B’C’).

In Hebrew, only interrogatives are repeated (consequently, every colon in Hebrew begins and ends with the *ה* consonant) but in Greek 19a/20a, the verb *περιέθηκες* “you have put around” is repeated.

A couple of marked Hebrew words have been used in this strophe⁹³⁵: in 19b, the *hapax* noun *רעמה* “mane; vibration”; in 20b, the noun *הוד* “majesty” (considered mostly poetic by BDB), the noun *נחר* (נחר “snorting”; 2x, Job: 1), and the noun *אימה* “terror” (considered mostly poetic by BDB). In Greek 20a, the noun *πανοπλία* “full armor” (*πανοπλία*, -ας, ῆ; 41x, LXX: 11, OG Job: 1).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. The ostrich-passage *in 39:13–18* could have been omitted intentionally. Most of the words in the strophe were known to the translator, although there are rare words present. The strophe consists of statements and facts instead of questions and the surrounding creatures are animals not birds. Thus, it may simply have not been fitting here, and the translator chose not to translate. *In 19a*, the emphatic pronoun *σὺ* “you” is added.

met with. But a few animals are known to be **singled-horned** and single-hooved, as the Indian ass; and one, to wit the oryx, is **single horned** and cloven-hooved.”

http://classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/history_anim.2.ii.html Accessed 24.06.2025

See also, e.g., Beeckman 2024, 230–1.

⁹³⁴ Nömmik 2025.

⁹³⁵ In vv. 13–18, the so-called ostrich-passage, there are nine rare words and one *hapax legomenon*.

The imperfective תתן “you give” is translated with the aorist περιέθηκες “you placed around.” In 19b, again, the imperfective verb תלביש “you clothe” is translated with the aorist ἐνέδυσας “you clothed”. The *hapax legomenon* רעמה, usually understood as “mane of the horse” is translated as φόβος “fear.” Often-times רעם refers to thundering, which could have provoked this translation. The Greek translation results in a better symmetry (power-terror rather than power-mane). It should be noted, however, that coincidentally ἡ φόβη in Greek does mean “a lock of hair; horse’s mane” and Noegel is of the opinion that the lexical choice of the translator was intentional⁹³⁶. P translator interpreted with לֵבָא “weapon, armour”⁹³⁷ and Vg with *hinnitum* “neighing,” thus it seems that the exact meaning of the word was not entirely known to the other ancients, but the Greek does keep the word play present in the Hebrew (or the current MT).

Translator’s limited vocabulary. In 20a, the question התרעישנו בארבה “Will you make it shake like a locust?” has been replaced with περιέθηκες δὲ αὐτῷ πανοπλίαν “Did you endow it with a suit of armour?”. Ziegler sees περιέθηκες δὲ αὐτῷ πανοπλίαν being a pleonastic translation of התרעישנו “will you make it shake?”⁹³⁸. The lexical choice does create a lexical repetition with 19a. In 20b, הוד נחרו אימה “its majestic snorting is terrible” is changed into δόξαν δὲ στηθέων αὐτοῦ τόλμη; “and the courage of its breast with majesty” (subordinated to the verb in 20a). δόξαν, now the object, is quite a common equivalent of the Hebrew הוד. נחר is a *hapax legomenon* and the translator could have understood the Aramaic חדי “breast” instead of the Hebrew נחרו, presumably “snorting” or “nostril”, and thus translated στηθέων⁹³⁹. τόλμη “courage” does not reflect the Hebrew אימה directly, thus it could be an intentional or contextual change. Verbeke deems the Greek translation a contextual exegesis⁹⁴⁰. Taking this into account, it seems that the translator did not understand the underlying text in v. 20 in all its entirety and constructed a verse in Greek that made sense in the context, i.e. the description of a war-horse. This short sub-strophe describes the power, terror, impenetrability (armour), and courage of the horse,⁹⁴¹ being lexically expressive and syntactically tight knit.

XVII: 39:21–23

Style

Verses 21–23 form a strophe made up of two bicola and a *monocolon* in Greek but three bicola in Hebrew. Thus, the end is marked structurally in Greek.

In v. 22, there is a partial symmetry in Hebrew (ABCD/C’D’E), marking the middle of the strophe.

⁹³⁶ Noegel 1996, 42–3. Cf. also Dhorme 1967, 606–7; Verbeke 2011, 332–4.

⁹³⁷ Szpek 1992, 297.

⁹³⁸ Ziegler 1971, 14.

⁹³⁹ In the *Iliad*, also describes a war-horse’s (11.282) and the Myrmidons’ (compared to wolves) breast (16.163).

⁹⁴⁰ Verbeke 2011, 334–5.

⁹⁴¹ Cf. also Beekman 2024, 233.

The strophe is framed with rare vocabulary in both Hebrew and Greek. In Hebrew, these words are: in 21b, the noun נשק “a weapon” (10x, Job: 2, Ps: 1); in 23a, the *hapax* verb תרנה (רנה “to rattle”) and the noun אשפה “a quiver” (6x, Job: 1, Ps: 1); and in 23b, the noun וכידון (כידון “a javelin”; 9x, Job: 2). In Greek, these are: in 21a, the verb ἀνορύσσω “to dig up that which has been buried” (34x, OG Job: 2, here and 3:21b); and in 21a/23, the verb γαυριᾶ “to act with a sense of pride” (22x, LXX: 5, OG Job: 2, in this strophe).

The Greek translator has created two repetitions that very clearly distinguish this strophe from the surrounding ones: in 21ab, ἐν πεδίῳ “in the plain” and εἰς πεδῖον “into the plain”; and in 21a/23, the verb γαυριᾶ “it exults” (framing the strophe).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 21a*, the imperfective יחפרו “they dig, search” is translated with the participle ἀνορύσσων “digging up”. Witte says that יחפור should be read, in agreement with several versions⁹⁴², thus suggesting a slightly different *Vorlage*; however, changing of verbal forms is not unusual in OG Job. In connection, the conjunction -ו “and” before the next verb is not translated. *In 21b*, בכח יצא “it goes out in strength” is expanded into ἐκπορεύεται δὲ εἰς πεδῖον ἐν ἰσχύι “and it goes out into the plain in strength” instead of mentioning arms or battle, the translator repeats the location with an addition, εἰς πεδῖον “the plain”. The last words of Hebrew 21b are translated *in OG 22a*; this means that for the translator, these were a beginning of a new phrasal unit. Thus, לקראת נשק “to meet the weapons” from 21b and ישחק “it laughs” from 22a is paraphrased into συναντῶν βέλει καταγελά “meeting with an arrow, it laughs in scorn”.

Vorlage different than the later MT. *In 22a*, the phrase לפחד ולא יחת “at fear and it is not dismayed” is not translated. Vg omits the latter two words; 11Q10 and P translate everything, although with some minor differences. As such, we cannot rule out that in some pre-MT manuscripts, v. 22 was shorter than the MT.

Translator's limited vocabulary and utilising the context or the translator's previous knowledge for the meaning of unknown words. *In v. 23*, עליו תרנה “Upon it rattle the quiver, the flashing spear, and the javelin” is shortened into ἐπ' αὐτῷ γαυριᾶ τόξον καὶ μάχαιρα “Upon it exult the bow and dagger”, marking the end of the strophe with a monocolon and framing the strophe with γαυριᾶ, which is probably a contextual translation since תרנה “it rattles (?)” is a *hapax*. Dhorme suggests that the translator may have associated it with “a root parallel to רנן ‘to sing’”⁹⁴³. It might also be possible that the translator associated what they saw with רוע (in hiphil “shout, cry out; shout joyfully,” for example). The noun אשפה “quiver for arrows” is translated as τόξον “bow,” and וכידון “javelin, short sword” is translated as μάχαιρα “sword.” Instead of three weapons, the Greek mentions only two, and the phrase להב חנית “flashing spear”

⁹⁴² Witte 2021, 603.

⁹⁴³ Dhorme 1967, 608–9. But see arguments against this in Verbeke 2011, 336.

is omitted. Thus, in this verse we see either intentional shortening or shortening due to unknown vocabulary (multiple rare words) and relying on the context.

According to Nömmik, the horse strophe in vv. 39:21–24a, 25 is a late *Fort-schreibung* as a separate poem⁹⁴⁴. If it was, it was not particularly noticed by the OG translator, who faced their usual issues with possibly difficult vocabulary. Most changes in the strophe are stylistic.

XVIII: 39:24–25

Style

Vv. 24–25 form a strophe made up of two *bicola* in Greek (although a tricolon could be argued for, *σὺν ἄλματι καὶ κραυγῇ* being the third colon) but a bicolon and a tricolon in Hebrew. Therefore, the end of the strophe is marked structurally in Hebrew. The end of the strophe is marked with the temporal *-ב* in Hebrew (not reflected directly in Greek) and with the adverb *πόρρωθεν δὲ* “and from afar” (reflects Hebrew *ומרחוק*) in Greek.

In Hebrew, the strophe is framed with rare vocabulary: in 24a, the noun *ורגז* (*רגז* “turmoil”; 7x, Job: 5) and the verb *יגמא* (*גמא* “to swallow”; 2x, Job: 1); finally, in 25c, the noun *רעם* “thunder” (6x, Job: 2, Ps: 3).

The Greek translator has used some marked vocabulary as well, in the second (last) verse: in 25a, the interjection *Εὔγε* (23x, LXX: 14, OG Job: 2); and in 25b, the noun *ἄλματι* “act of leaping” (*ἄλμα*, *-ματος*, *τό*; 26x, OG Job: 1; it is also considered a typically poetic and scientific word⁹⁴⁵ and a poetic equivalent to the prose *πήδημα*⁹⁴⁶).

The only lexical repetition in Hebrew is that of *שופר* and *שפר* “the trumpet” in 24b/25a. The Greek translator has reflected and extended this with *σημάνη* *σάλπιγξ* “the trumpet sound” and *σάλπιγγος δὲ σημαινούσης* “when the trumpet sounds” (genitive absolute).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. **In 24a**, the phrase *ברעש ורגז יגמא ארץ* “with fierceness and rage it swallows the ground” is shortened into *καὶ ὀργῇ ἀφανιεῖ τὴν γῆν* “and in rage it will stamp out the ground” The rare verb *יגמא* “it swallows” is translated as *ἀφανιεῖ* “it makes to disappear”, which could be an intentional or contextual choice. **In 24b**, the particle *כִּי* “when” is interpreted as *ἕως* “until”. The noun *קול* “sound” is changed into a verb *σημάνη* “it sounds.” **In 25a**, the phrase *בְּדִי שֹׁפֵר* “whenever the trumpet” is turned into a temporal genitive absolute, *σάλπιγγος δὲ σημαινούσης* “when the trumpet sounds”. **In v. 25b**, *σὺν ἄλματι καὶ κραυγῇ* “with leap and cry” translates and interprets Hebrew 25bc *רעם שרים ותרועה* “the thunder of the captains and the shouting”. Dhorme suggests that

⁹⁴⁴ Nömmik 2025.

⁹⁴⁵ Mangin 2005, 485; Dhont 2018a, 145.

⁹⁴⁶ LSJ.

the $\sigma\upsilon$ in Greek could stem from reading $\epsilon\mu$ as $\epsilon\mu$ “with”⁹⁴⁷. However, it seems more probable that the noun שרים “the captains” was omitted or missing (11Q10 does not have an equivalent either) while the other two are simply interpreted. Thus, we cannot rule out that the *Vorlage* or even several pre-MT manuscripts were different than the later MT.

Nömmik believes that the horse strophe in vv. 39:21–24a, 25 is a late *Fort-schreibung* as a separate poem and 24b is a gloss that cannot be dated, while Fohrer, Witte, and Kaiser believe that a colon is missing in v. 25, namely a fourth colon⁹⁴⁸. Nothing in the OG translation reflects thematic issues that could arise from later layers of the poem. The only textual issue is the fact that שרים in v. 25 might have been missing in some pre-MT manuscripts.

XIX: 39:26–30

Style

Vv. 26–30 form a concluding strophe consisting of two bicola and a *tricolon* in Greek. In Hebrew, these verses seem to divide into two separate strophes: vv. 26–27 (questions directed at Job) and vv. 28–30 (description of the eagle’s life and preying). Consequently, the end of the strophe and the speech is marked structurally with a tricolon in Greek.

In Hebrew, the first strophe begins with a marked ה -question. The end of the first strophe in Hebrew is marked again with a question, this time marked with אם . In Greek, these questions are unmarked. The last colon is marked with several transition markers in both languages: ובאשר “and where” and ע' ד' ט' “and wherever,” שם “there” and παραχρημα “at once,” and the pronoun הוא “it” only in Hebrew.

Hebrew has some parallelistic structures in its second strophe: in v. 28, a chiasmus (AB/B'A', where ויתלן begins the second part) and in v. 29 a partial symmetry (ACD/A'BC'). The last verse of the strophe and the speech is marked with non-parallelism.

In Hebrew, there are a couple of repetitions: the noun סלע “the crag” twice in v. 28 (marks the beginning of the second strophe); and in 29a/30b, the adverb שם “there”.

Some marked Hebrew words have been used: at the beginning of the first strophe in 26a, the *hapax* verb יאבר (אבר “to fly”) and the noun נץ “a hawk” (3x, Job: 1); in 26b, the noun לתימן (תימן) “toward the south” (considered mainly poetic by BDB); and at the end of the second strophe in 30a, the noun ואפרחו (אפרח “a young one”; 4x, Job: 1, Ps: 1) and the *hapax* verb יעלעו (עלע “to suck”).

⁹⁴⁷ Dhorme 1967, 610.

⁹⁴⁸ Fohrer 1963, 490, 494; Kaiser 2006, 127; Nömmik 2013, 27–9, 263–8; Witte 2021, 604; Nömmik 2025.

In Greek 30a, a non-Attic form, the ionic νεοσσὸι “young birds” (instead of the Attic νεοττός) is used⁹⁴⁹. The repeated use of the adjectival possessive pronoun σῆς/σῶ in 26a and 27a “points towards an elevated register”⁹⁵⁰.

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics, but probably influenced by problems with the *Vorlage* manuscript, as bits and pieces from Hebrew are used in different parts of the Greek. **In 26b**, ἀναπετάσας τὰς πτέρυγας ἀκίνητος καθορῶν τὰ πρὸς νότον “having spread its wings, motionless, eyeing what lies to the south” seems to incorporate both 26b לְתִימָן⁹⁵¹ יִפְרֹשׁ כְּנָפָיו “and spreads its wings toward the south” and 29b לְמֶרְחוֹק עֵינָיו יִבִּיטוּ “its eyes see it from far away”. The adjective ἀκίνητος “motionless” is added, possibly due to reading יַעֲמֵד in 26a⁹⁵²; Heater thinks it interprets לְמֶרְחוֹק from 29b⁹⁵³. **In 27a**, the interrogative particle אֵם is not translated directly but with δὲ. **In 27b**, ἐπὶ νοσσιᾶς αὐτοῦ καθεσθεις αὐλίζεσαι “it lodges, sitting on its brood” incorporates the phrase קִנּו “its nest” and יִשְׁכֵּן וְיִתְלַנֵּן “it dwells and makes its home” from Hebrew 28a. Witte thinks that based on colometry, the verb וְיִתְלַנֵּן “and it lodges” could have originally belonged to the too short 27b⁹⁵⁴. The words יָרִים “it makes high” in 27b and סֶלַע “crag” in 28a are not translated. Hebrew 28b, עַל שֵׁן סֶלַע וּמִצּוֹדָה “in the fastness of the rocky crag” is not translated, possibly due to redundancy. **In 29a**, מִשָּׁם חָפַר אָכַל “from there it spies the prey” is slightly paraphrased into ἐκεῖσε ὧν ζητεῖ τὰ σῖτα “while it is there it searched for food”. **In 30b**, וּבֵאֵשׁר חֲלָלִים שָׁם הוּא “and where the slain are, there it is” is paraphrased into οὗ δ' ἂν ὥσι τεθνεώτες παραχρῆμα εὐρίσκονται “and, wherever there are carcasses, at once they are found”. The phrase שָׁם הוּא “there it (the eagle) is” is changed it into παραχρῆμα εὐρίσκονται “at once they (the vulture’s young or the carcasses) are found.”

Reading, vocalising, or understanding the consonantal text differently than the later Masoretes. **In 26a**, the translator uses ἔσθηγεν “it stops still” to translate the hapax יֶאֱבֵר “it soars”. Dhorme suggests, and Verbeke agrees, that the translator has read instead the niphal of עָבַד “to be tilled, cultivated”⁹⁵⁵. However, the translator having read יַעֲמֵד “he stands” is more likely⁹⁵⁶. **In 27b**, the noun γύψ “vulture” is added; it has been theorised that כִּי was a bird⁹⁵⁷. Hebrew and Vg only have the eagle, whereas the Greek changes from the eagle to the vulture now, possibly to suit 30b (“carcasses”) better. Additionally, both cola of v. 27 now have a bird. 11Q10 also adds a bird here, namely וְעוֹזָא “and the black eagle”. **In**

⁹⁴⁹ Mangin 2005, 543; Dhont 2018a, 122–3.

⁹⁵⁰ Dhont 2018a, 145.

⁹⁵¹ Qere כְּנָפָיו. This could account for the plural in Greek; however, translating singulars with plurals is commonplace in OG Job.

⁹⁵² Cf. Häberlein 2024, 209.

⁹⁵³ Heater 1982, 126.

⁹⁵⁴ Witte 2021, 604.

⁹⁵⁵ Dhorme 1967, 610; Verbeke 2011, 337.

⁹⁵⁶ Cf. Häberlein 2024, 209, who has come to the same conclusion.

⁹⁵⁷ See García Martínez et al. 1998, 158–60 for references; Hartley 1988, 512–3.

30a, ⁹⁵⁸וּפְּרָחוּ יַעֲלֵעוּ דָם “and its young ones suck up blood” is translated with νεοσσοὶ δὲ αὐτοῦ φύρονται ἐν αἵματι “and its young are wetted with blood”. The common singular וּפְּרָחוּ “and its young” is translated with the plural νεοσσοὶ δὲ αὐτοῦ “its young ones” but cf. the *qere*. The *hapax* verb יַעֲלֵעוּ “they suck up” is translated with φύρονται “they are mixed with, wetted,” possibly due to reading and understanding the verbing as גָּלַל (“to roll”) instead. Verbeke again suggests contextual exegesis on the translator’s part⁹⁵⁹.

Some verses or parts of verses are thought to be later additions. According to Nömmik, vv. 28–30 are part of late *Fortschreibungen* or partly even later glosses that rely on the book editor’s work (stage one of redactions) and deal with wild nature. Witte and LXX.D conclude on the basis of the shorter v. 28 and some of v. 28 being translated in v. 27 that the current MT has not been preserved in its original form in this strophe. Fohrer suggests that in 27a יַגְבִּיהַ נֶשֶׁר וְכִי is a gloss, and that in 28a, agreeing with Greek, סָלַע יִשְׁכֵּן is a gloss. Van Oorschot also believes that vv. 27 and 28 are later edited. Kaiser thinks that only v. 30 is a gloss⁹⁶⁰. It is obvious that the translator did make intentional paraphrases and changes here, but also moved bits and pieces into different verses, which could suggest some troubles with the *Vorlage* or the manuscript of the *Vorlage*. The result is a meaningful strophe about birds of prey.

⁹⁵⁸ וּפְּרָחוּ *Qere*.

⁹⁵⁹ Verbeke 2011, 338.

⁹⁶⁰ Fohrer 1963, 490, 494; van Oorschot 1987, 256; Witte 1994a, 180; Kaiser 2006, 73, 127; van Oorschot 2007, 171–84; Kepper and Witte 2011, 2120; Witte 2021, 633; Nömmik 2025.

JOB 40:6–41:26

Introduction

Job 40:6–41:26 contains God’s second speech: *God once again addresses Job with questions and descriptions of two immensely powerful and strong creatures: the beast and the dragon.*

The OG translation of this speech divides into 14 strophes:

- I (40:7–8, 2B) *A new address to Job: I will question you; you should answer me!*
- II (40:9–14, 5B1M) *Are you like God and can you act powerfully like Him?*
- III (40:15–18, 4B) *Look at the beast who is unbelievably strong.*
- IV (40:19–20, 2B) *It was the first, although mockable.*
- V (40:21–23, 2B1M) *It is big.*
- VI (40:25–29, 1T3B) *The dragon is also so big it cannot be caught or tamed.*
- VII (40:30–41:1, 1B1M1T1B) *It cannot be fed upon, and you will not want to even touch it.*
- VIII (41:2–3, 2B) *Is my creative power not fearful? No one can stand against me.*
- IX (41:5–8, 3B1M) *The dragon is impenetrable to even air.*
- X (41:10–13, 4B) *It breathes fire and is fire itself.*
- XI (41:14–17, 1B1M1B1M) *Its body is powerful and strong.*
- XII (41:18–21, 2T) *It is impenetrable to weapons.*
- XIII (41:22–24, 1B1T) *It is so tough it does not feel sharpness; the deep, the sea, and Tartarus are weaker than it.*
- XIV (41:25–26, 2B) *It is king of everything, although mockable.*

There are not many **keywords** repeating throughout the speech in both chapters. לַאֱלֹהִים “God” is used in 40:9, 19 and 41:17 (אֱלֹהִים). The Greek translator reflects the ones in ch. 40 with κύριος. Independently, the translator repeats ἄγγελος “angel” in 40:11, 19 and 41:25.

In the **Greek text**, the following passages are asterisked: 40:23b–24, 26a, 31b; and 41:4, 8a, 9, 15b, 18b, 21a, 24b. Fohrer reckons that the translator *Vorlage* deviated from the MT in 41:9⁹⁶¹. Like in many previous speeches, the structure of the strophes varies, being made up of strictly bicola, but also having a combination of monocola, bicola, and tricola. The first and last strophes of the speech are made up of four bicola. Based on the differences in Greek and Hebrew strophe-division, special care needs to be taken in the stylistic and critical analysis of the first half of the speech, the end of Job 40, and beginning of Job 41.

⁹⁶¹ Fohrer 1963, 55–6.

The Hebrew text of this God's second speech is mostly thought to be a from younger layer. It is mostly agreed that the poems about Behemoth and Leviathan were added later than the beginning of Job 40 (up to around v. 14).

Witte does not see the second speech of God being original. In his opinion, most of Job 40:6–41:26, more specifically 40:6–14 and 40:15–41:26 were added in the same stage as the Elihu speeches (his stage IV called “Buch B” after the original poetic parts, the frame story, and then the connection of the poetic and prosaic parts). He calls the Behemoth and Leviathan stories school text (“Schul-texte”). 40:23b is partly, according to him, a very late addition or gloss. As the Elihu speeches emphasize God's justice and “Leidenspädagogik,” he sees the same tendencies in the second speech of God (God as creator also preserves justice and tames creatures of chaos).⁹⁶²

According to Nömmik's theory, this speech did not belong to the original poem (the source layer) of Job. The possible order of adding the passages of this speech was the following. Firstly, in the righteousness redaction, vv. 40:10–14 were added. A bit later as late *Fortschreibungen*, the Behemoth and Leviathan poems (40:15–18, 21–24 and 40:25–41:8, 10–25* respectively) were added. These show that God is the one “capable of contesting enormous monsters” and thus also the wicked. The last editor of the book added vv. 40:6–8, 7b being influenced by 38:3b, with the two short Job-speeches. Vv. 40:19–20, 41:9(?), 26(?) are later glosses that cannot be dated.⁹⁶³

Van Oorschot, in his monograph, sees Job 40:8–14 as being the earliest layer of the God-speech, although not from the oldest layer of the book of Job. Later, 40:15–41:26 was added. 40:8–14 are to him a clear continuation of v. 2, both substantively and functionally. Formal features speak for the secondary nature of 40:15–24 and 40:25–41:26. His first argument is that vv. 40:15–24* form an originally independent description of nature, which was later supplemented by vv. 19f. and 24 and found its way into the speech of God. His second argument is that in comparison with chs. 38–39, where descriptions and rhetorical questions alternate, the questions are overwhelmingly in the first part of the Leviathan story, but the second part has more descriptions.⁹⁶⁴

Syring also thinks that this speech was inserted in the last stage of editing. These last editions were of theological nature, describing God's majesty, justice, and creative power: 40:6–14 and 40:15–41:26.⁹⁶⁵

Kaiser also believes that this speech was not part of the original poem. The speech started to be built much later by the righteousness editor with 40:6–11, 13–14; a later editor added 40:15–24, 40:25–41:26. Finally, a gloss in 40:12 is added.⁹⁶⁶

Vermeulen believes that the existence of a second speech of God is illogical and unnecessary, especially after 40:3–5. He suggests that the entirety of 40:6–

⁹⁶² Witte 2021, 55, 57–9, 650–1.

⁹⁶³ Nömmik 2013, 27–9, 268–75; 2025.

⁹⁶⁴ van Oorschot 1987, 256–9.

⁹⁶⁵ Syring 2004, 166–7, 168–73.

⁹⁶⁶ Kaiser 2006, 127.

42:6 was added very late, namely in *rédaction* IV. One of the characteristics of *rédacteur* IV was to strongly underline the contrast between God and the insignificant man (like, for example, in 33:7–8.16–20). According to his theory, *rédacteur* III already completed the divine response in 38–39. The introduction in vv. 6 and 7 can already be seen in 38:1 and 3 and Vermeyleylen thinks it to be a method of borrowing and imitation especially characteristic of *rédacteur* IV (he compares 34:17 and 14:16, 35:5 and 22:12, and 35:6–7 and 22:2–3). Additionally, v. 8 repeats in a more aggressive tone 34:5 which was added in *rédaction* III. He further notes that the sections on Behemoth and Leviathan are too long compared to the other animals in the bestiary, and that Behemoth and Leviathan (or the animals they are usually associated with) are not found in Mesopotamian texts unlike those of the bestiary.⁹⁶⁷

I: 40:7–8

Style

Verses 40:7–8 form an introductory strophe that consists of two bicola. The strophe/speech begins with an imperative in 7a: אָזֶר נָא כְּגִבֹּר חֲלָצִיךָ “Gird up your loins like a man” in Hebrew and Μή, ἀλλὰ ζῶσαι ὥσπερ ἄνθρω τὴν ὀσφύν σου “No, but gird up your loins like a man” in Greek; the Greek translator also adds some emphatic words at the beginning.

The beginning of the strophe is marked with elevated vocabulary in Hebrew: in Hebrew 7a, the noun כְּגִבֹּר (גִּבֹּר) “like a man” (considered mostly poetic by BDB) and the noun חֲלָצִיךָ (חֶלֶץ) “loins”; 10x, Job: 3).

The end of the strophe is marked with a rare word in Greek: in 8a, the verb ἀπεποιήσω “you have set aside” (ἀποποιέω; 7x, OG Job: 6). The end is also marked with the prohibiting imperative μὴ ἀποποιῶ “do not reject!” in Greek and with an interrogative-interjection particle combination הֲאֵי “will you even?” in Hebrew.

In 7b, there is an intra-colon partial chiasmus in Greek (ABA’) and a partial symmetry in Hebrew (AxA’). The only repetition is in Greek 7a/8a of μὴ “not”.

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 7a*, Μή, ἀλλὰ “No, but” is added, which acts as a transition marker. *In 7b*, the Hebrew verbal phrase וְהוֹדִיעֵנִי “you make known to me” is changed into the imperative σὺ δέ μοι ἀποκρίθητι “but you answer me!”. Cf. also 38:3 for almost the exact same wording in the verse.

Changes regarding religion or religious culture and law. *In 8a*, the question הֲאֵי תִפְרַם מִשְׁפָּטִי “Will you even put me in the wrong?” is changed into the prohibition μὴ ἀποποιῶ μου τὸ κρίμα “Do not reject my judgment!”. *In 8b*, תִּרְשָׁעֵנִי “Will you condemn me that you may be justified?” is paraphrased into οἶμαι δέ με ἄλλως σοι κεχρηματικέσθαι ἢ ἵνα ἀναφανῆς δίκαιος “But do you think I have dealt with you in any other way than that you might appear to be righteous?”.

⁹⁶⁷ Vermeyleylen 2015, 178–82, 349.

Gard considers this a theological toning down of a blasphemous phrase while Witte says that in v. 8 the sovereignty of God is emphasised⁹⁶⁸.

Nömmik thinks that the last editor of the book added vv. 40:6–8, 7b being influenced by 38:3b, with the two short Job-speeches. Kaiser believes that the speech started to be built much later by the righteousness editor with 40:6–11, 13–14. Fohrer sees vv. 6 (the prose introduction) and 7 as a later gloss, Vermeylen thinks that v. 8 repeats in a more aggressive tone 34:5 which was added in *rédaction* III and is thus a later addition.⁹⁶⁹ There are no major differences between the OG and the MT in this section. The translator made some stylistic and theological adjustments in this strophe. Therefore, if these verses were added later, nothing in the content or form bothered the translator.

II: 40:9–14

Style

Verses 9–14 form a strophe consisting of five bicola and a *monocolon* in Greek but five bicola in Hebrew. Thus, the end of the strophe is marked structurally in Greek. The strophe begins in v. 9 with interrogative particles וְאִם in Hebrew and ἤ in Greek and ends in v. 14 with the emphasised וְגַם אֲנִי “Then I” in Hebrew and ἄρα “then” in Greek.

There are several parallelistic structures in the strophe: in v. 9, a partial chiasmus in Greek (xABC/xA'C'B') and a partial symmetry Hebrew (xABC/xA'B'D); in v. 10, a partial chiasmus in both Greek (ABxB'/B''xB'''A') and Hebrew (ABxB'/xB''xB'''A'); in v. 12, a partial chiasmus in both Greek (AB/B'A'C) and Hebrew (ABC/xC'B'D); and in v. 13, a chiasmus in Hebrew (ABC/C'B'A'). Therefore, in Hebrew, the pattern is a regular OOxOOx, whereas in Greek it is OOxOxx.

At the beginning of Hebrew 11b/12a, the phrase רֵאה כָּל גֹּאֵה “look on all who are proud” is repeated. In v. 13, there is the envelope-pattern repetition of טָמְנוֹם “hide them!” and בְּטִמְנוֹן “in the hidden (place)”. These are not reflected in Greek, but a root-repetition has been created in 10a/14 with δύναμις “power” and δύναται “it can, it has the power to”.

Some marked Hebrew words have been used in this strophe: in 10a, the verb עָדָה (עָדָה “to adorn”; 8x, Job: 1); in 10b, the nouns וְהוֹד “and glory” and וְהִדָּר “and splendour” (both are considered mainly poetic by BDB); in 11b and 12a, the adjective גָּאֵה “proud” (9x, Job: 2, Ps: 3, Prov: 2); finally, in 12b, the *hapax* verb וְהִדָּד (וְהִדָּד “to tread down”).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 9a*, the verb ἐστίν “it is” is added. *In 10a*, נָא עָדָה “deck yourself” is translated with ἀνάλαβε δὴ “take on!”. *In 11a*, the imperative הפֶּץ “scatter!” is translated as ἀπόστειλον “send away!”.

⁹⁶⁸ Gard 1967, 24; Witte 2007, 381.

⁹⁶⁹ Fohrer 1963, 58, 491, 494; Kaiser 2006, 125–7; Vermeylen 2015, 179, 178–80; Nömmik 2025.

The suffix ך- “your” in אפך “of your anger” is not translated, and the noun itself is translated instrumentally ὀργῇ “with/in wrath.” *In 11b*, the imperative ראה כל גאה והשפיליהו “and look on all who are proud and humble them!” is shortened into πᾶν δὲ ὑβριστῆν ταπεινῶσον “and every insolent person humble!”, making it stricter and more concise. *In 12a*, similarly, the imperative ראה כל גאה הכניעהו “look on all who are proud and bring them low!” is shortened into ὑπερήφανον δὲ σβέσον “and the proud extinguish!” with the same result. *In 12b*, the imperative תחתם רשעים תחתם והדך “and tread down the wicked where they stand” is translated with σῆψον δὲ ἀσεβεῖς παραχρῆμα “and putrify the impious at once”, again being more intense and visual. *In 13a*, the suffix ם- “them” in טמנם “hide them!” is not translated. The adverb ἔξω “outside” is added, however. *V. 14*, וגם אני אודך כי “And then I will also acknowledge to you that your own right hand can give you victory” is shortened into ὁμολογήσω ἄρα ὅτι δύνатаι ἡ δεξιὰ σου σῶσαι “then I will acknowledge that your right hand can save”, marking the end of the strophe. The translator omits the emphatic personal pronoun אני “I.” The verb אודך “I will give thanks to you” is changed to ὁμολογήσω “I will agree,” turning cultic vocabulary into non-cultic vocabulary⁹⁷⁰. The meaning is slightly skewed from Job being able to save himself *versus* Job being able to save everyone or everything.

Reading, vocalising, or understanding the consonantal text differently than the later Masoretes. *In 10a*, גאון וגבה “majesty and dignity” is translated with ὕψος καὶ δύναμιν “loftiness and power”, due to reading און “strength” instead of גאון (just like in v. 16). *In 10b*, the Hebrew תלבש “you clothe yourself” is translated as an imperative ἀμφιάσαι “put on, clothe yourself!”, to match the first colon. *In 11a*, the Hebrew עברות “outpourings, overflowings” seems to have been misunderstood as the plural of אביר “mighty”⁹⁷¹, which is sometimes understood to refer to angels (e.g. in Ps 78:25), and thus translated as ἀγγέλους “angels, messengers”. Gammie proposes that the translator read (or heard) חברות “companies,” although it usually does not appear with the feminine plural either⁹⁷². *In 13b*, the imperative פניהם חבש בטמון “bind their faces in the world below!” is translated as τὰ δὲ πρόσωπα αὐτῶν ἀτιμίας ἐμπλησον “and their faces fill with dishonor!”. The noun בטמון “in the hidden place” is translated with ἀτιμίας “with dishonour,” Gard supposes that the translator understood here the root טמא “unclean” and that “the translator more clearly emphasizes the shame and disgrace which accompany the judgment of the wicked”⁹⁷³. This colon probably also utilises Ps 82:17a⁹⁷⁴.

According to Nömmik, vv. 10–14 were the first to be added to this second speech of God in the righteousness redaction. Kaiser believes that this speech started to be built much later by the righteousness editor with 40:6–11, 13–14 and that 40:12 is a late gloss. Vermeylen thinks that v. 9 is very similar to 37:5 (from

⁹⁷⁰ Cf. Terrien 1963, 260–1.

⁹⁷¹ The usual plural of this word is אבירים. Cf. also Dhorme 1967, 617.

⁹⁷² Gammie 1985, 10.

⁹⁷³ Gard 1954, 143.

⁹⁷⁴ Dhont 2018a, 204.

rédaction IV), whereas 12b repeats 34:26 (from *rédaction* III).⁹⁷⁵ As in the previous strophe, the translator made more stylistic changes here, omitting parts of vv. 11b and 12a, which resulted in stricter and more concise commands. Some minor differing readings brought in further differences; however, the overall message remains the same in both languages.

III: 40:15–18

Style

Verses 15–18 form a strophe consisting of four bicola. The strophe begins in verses 15a and 16a with the repeated interjection “Look!” (הנה נא in Hebrew, ἀλλὰ δὴ ἰδοὺ and ἰδοὺ δὴ in Greek). The strophe ends in Greek 18a with a repetition of the noun αἱ πλευραὶ αὐτοῦ πλευραὶ “its flanks (are) flanks ...”.

Symmetry is used twice in the strophe: in v. 16, the Greek ABC/B'C' and Hebrew ABC/xB'C'; and in v. 18, the Greek ABC/A'B'C' and Hebrew ABC/A'xB'C'. In sum, the pattern is a regular xOxO, in contrast to the previous strophe.

Several marked Hebrew words have been used in this strophe: in 15a, the *hapax* noun בהמות “Behemoth”; in 16b, the *hapax* noun בשרירי (שריר “muscle, sinew”); in 17a, the *hapax* verb יחפץ (חפץ “to sway, move”); in 17b, the noun גידי (גיד “sinew”; 7x, Job: 2), the *hapax* noun פחדו (פחד “thigh”), and the verb ישרגו (שרג “to intertwine”; 2x, Job: 1); in 18a, the noun אפיקי (אפיק “tubes” (considered poetic by BDB); finally, in 18b, the noun גרמיו (גרם “bone, strength?”; 6x, Job: 1, Prov: 2) and the *hapax* noun כמטיל (מטיל “a rod”).

The Greek translation has a couple of marked words as well: in 17b, the singular συμπλέκεται is one of the few uses of *schema attikon* in Job⁹⁷⁶; in 18a, the adjective χάλκεια “of copper” (χάλκειος, -η, -ον; according to LSJ, an epic form for the prosaic χάλκεος); and in 18b, the adjective χυτός “cast” (47x, LXX: 2, OG Job: 1).

There is a simile in v. 15: הנה נא בהמות אשר עשיתי עמך חציר כבקר יאכל “Look at Behemoth, which I made just as I made you; it eats grass like an ox” in Hebrew and ἀλλὰ δὴ ἰδοὺ θηρία παρὰ σοί, χόρτον ἴσα βουσὶν ἐσθίει. “But look now, you are familiar with ‘Beasts;’ they eat grass like cattle” in Greek. There is another simile in v. 17: יחפץ זנבו כמו ארז גידי פחדו ישרגו “It makes its tail stiff like a cedar; the sinews of its thighs are knit together” in Hebrew and ἔστησεν οὐρὰν ὡς κυπάρισσον, τὰ δὲ νεῦρα αὐτοῦ συμπλέκεται. “It stood up its tail like a cypress, and its sinews have been interwoven” in Greek. Finally, Hebrew has a simile in v. 18: עצמיו אפיקי נחושה גרמיו כמטיל ברזל “Its bones are tubes of bronze, its limbs like bars of iron” which the Greek translator translates aptly but without marking it like a simile. Almost the whole strophe is made up of comparisons, marked and unmarked.

⁹⁷⁵ Kaiser 2006, 74, 127; Vermeylen 2015, 179, 178–80; Nömmik 2025.

⁹⁷⁶ Mangin 2005, 630.

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. **In 15a**, the conjunction ἀλλὰ “but” is added to emphasise the transition to a new topic⁹⁷⁷. The phrase אשר עשיתי “that I made” is omitted thus removing the reference that God made Behemoth. Orlinsky and Dhorme are of the opinion that it did not exist in the Greek translation’s *Vorlage*, that it ruins the metre, and is not necessary; Dhorme suggests that it should be omitted from the MT; Witte also thinks that the phrase overloads the verse colometrically and is a later gloss⁹⁷⁸. In contrast to chs. 38–39, where God referenced to Himself in first-person and where the translator often emphasised the first-person perspective of God, this speech lacks the first-person perspective almost entirely, in both languages, after the first two strophes. Even there, the first-person perspective is more general, God asking the introducing the speech and showing willingness to acknowledge Job. Unlike the previous speech where God emphasised His creative power, in this speech, the focus is on the two creatures. Therefore, the translator may have deemed the phrase “that I made” unsuitable here and simply proceeded to describe the beast. Only when describing the dragon in the beginning of ch. 41, the first-person perspective appears once again, for the last time. Creation by God in v. 19a is referenced in third person. We cannot rule out the possibility that the phrase was missing from the *Vorlage*. However, if the phrase was simply a later gloss that existed in the *Vorlage*, the translator noticed that it did not suit here and chose to omit. **In 15b**, the common singular כבקר “like cattle” is translated with the plural ἴσα βουσιν “like cows”. **In 16a**, the phrase במתניו “in his loins” is translated with ἐπ’ ὀσφύι “in loins”, omitting the suffix. **In 16b**, similarly, the suffix is omitted in ואנו “and his power” and in בטנו “of his belly”. **In 17a**, once again, the suffix “his” in זנבו “his tail” is not translated; however, from 17b onwards, the suffixes are retained. The tree ארז “cedar” is translated with the very similar κυπάρισσον “cypress.” **In 18a**, עצמו נחושה אפיקי “its bones are tubes of bronze” is paraphrased into αἱ πλευραὶ αὐτοῦ πλευραὶ χάλκλαι “its flanks are flanks of copper”, specifying the bones and creating a repetition⁹⁷⁹. **In 18b**, again, גרמיו כמטיל ברזל “its limbs are like bars of iron” is paraphrased into ἡ δὲ ῥάχϊς αὐτοῦ σίδηρος χυτός “and its spine is cast iron” (cf. also Vg *cartilago illius* “his cartilage”).

Utilising the context or the translator's previous knowledge for the meaning of unknown words. **In 17a**, the *hapax* יחפץ “he moves, bends (?)” is translated with ἔστυσεν “he set, stood up”. Similarly, P has used يرفع “it lifts up”⁹⁸⁰.

Reading or vocalising the consonantal text differently than the later Masoretets. **In 16b**, the noun phrase בשרירי “in the muscles, sinews” is probably read and understood to be relating to שרר or שר meaning “navel; umbilical cord” and thus translated ἐπ’ ὀμφαλοῦ “in the navel” (cf. also the Vg *in umbilicis*). **In 17b**, גידי

⁹⁷⁷ *בהמות* is translated literally as θηρία “the wild beasts”.

⁹⁷⁸ Orlinsky 1964, 78; Dhorme 1967, 618–9; Witte 2021, 657.

⁹⁷⁹ However, see Häberlein 2024, 256, who suggests inner-Greek corruption and that there was no repetition here originally.

⁹⁸⁰ Szpek 1992, 293.

ישרגו⁹⁸¹ פחדו “the sinews of its thigh are knit together” is translated with τὰ δὲ νεῦρα αὐτοῦ συμπλέκται “and its sinews have been interwoven”, omitting the *hapax* פחדו “of his thigh” except for the suffix, which now goes with “sinews”. Wolters however argues that the translator did not omit anything in this colon and that they might have read ישרגו יחדו גידיו “his sinews are knit together,” where גידיו יחדו “his sinews together” is a misreading, due to a difficult to understand *hapax* and a broken or hard-to-read manuscript.⁹⁸² The verb is translated with the singular due to *schema attikon*. Since the translator arrived at a meaningful translation, it is hard to confirm here whether they simply omitted the word they did not know or read the consonantal text differently.

IV: 40:19–20

Style

Verses 19–20 form a strophe of two bicola. The emphasised personal pronouns הוּא and τοῦτ’ ἔστιν mark the beginning of the strophe. In Hebrew, the strophe ends in v. 20 with the causal כִּי-particle.

The translator has added an independent repetition in 19b/20b: the repetition-initial of πεποιημένον “the thing made” and ἐποίησεν “it made”.

One rare word has been used in Hebrew: in 20a, the noun בּוֹל “produce, outgrowth” (2x, Job: 1). The Greek translator has used three: in 19b, the *hapax* verb ἐγκαταπαίξεσθαι “to use as a plaything” (ἐγκαταπαίζω; appearing only here and in 41:25b⁹⁸³); in 20a, the adjective ἀκρότομον “having vertical, steep face” (ἀκρότομος, -ον; 15x, LXX: 11, OG Job: 1, ※: 1); and in 20b, the noun χαρμονήν “joy” (χαρμονή, -ής, ῆ; 14x, LXX: 5, OG Job: 3).

Text

Reading, vocalising, or understanding the consonantal text differently than the later Masoretes. In 19b, העשו יגש חרבו “its maker brings near his sword” is turned into πεποιημένον ἐγκαταπαίξεσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀγγέλων αὐτοῦ “made to be mocked at by his angels”. Dhorme, Gammie, and Hartley suggest that the translator vocalised העשו “he who is made” and Dhorme even proposes to emend the MT accordingly⁹⁸⁴. The phrase יגש חרבו “he brings near his sword” is completely replaced with ἐγκαταπαίξεσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀγγέλων αὐτοῦ “to be mocked at by his angels;” Heater sees here an influence of Ps 104:26 that is about Leviathan. Gammie, however, has posited that the translator may have understood the Hebrew as “made so that he will be hard pressed” (reading the qal passive participle, and understanding נגש as “to be hard pressed”) and “his company, i.e. his angels” from reading חֲבֵרֹו instead of חֲבֵרֹו that we see in the MT. He admits that the syntax of the Hebrew would not be perfect in this case, but that metathesis

⁹⁸¹ Qere פחדו.

⁹⁸² Wolters 1994.

⁹⁸³ Cf. also Mangin 2005, 510.

⁹⁸⁴ Dhorme 1967, 621; Gammie 1985, 9; Hartley 1988, 523.

would explain the translation better than just anaphoric translation technique that Heater has proposed.⁹⁸⁵ *In v. 20*, **כי בול הרים ישאו לו וכל חית השדה ישחקו שם** “for the mountains yield food for it where all the wild animals play” is translated with ἐπελθὼν δὲ ἐπ’ ὄρος ἀκρότομον ἐποίησεν χαρμονὴν τετράποσιν ἐν τῷ ταρτάρῳ “but when it went up on a steep mountain, it brought gladness to the quadrupeds in Tartarus”. The plural הרים “mountains” is translated with ὄρος “a mountain.” It has been hypothesised that Greek paraphrases a Hebrew text that might have been שם השדה ישחק שם **כי בוא להר משאל כל חית השדה** “when he came to a mountain in the nether world, he played with all the animals of the ground there” (so Gerleman and Dhont after him) or ... **כי יבוא להרים ישאו לו** “when he comes (to) mountains they lift him up” and leaving ישחקו untranslated (so Dhorme)⁹⁸⁶. The collective singular וכל חית השדה “and every wild beast” is translated as τετράποσιν “to the quadrupeds.” The phrase ישחקו שם “they play there” is changed into ἐποίησεν χαρμονὴν “it produces joy.” ἐν τῷ ταρτάρῳ “in Tartarus” is added⁹⁸⁷, or if the above-mentioned hypothetical reading is true, it could translate משאל. Habel has suggested that שם “There” (with a capital letter) is translated with ἐν τῷ ταρτάρῳ “in Tartarus” and says that שם is used in Job (1:21 and 3:17) to refer to both the underworld and the earth. Gammie, however, explains that it is “a poetic hyperbole for the river,” as the list of plants that follows clarify⁹⁸⁸. In any case, the section from 19b to 20b is problematic in Hebrew and whatever the translator read, they tried to come up with a somewhat sensible strophe here. It definitely is not perfect, and the two verses are awkward in Greek as well. According to Nömmik, vv. 19–20 are a later gloss that cannot be dated⁹⁸⁹. What the translator read and what the later Masoretes read in these verses are definitely at variance. If these verses were a later gloss, it would explain why the translator struggled so much—the form is awkward and the topic interrupts the narrative.

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 19a*, the copula ἔστιν “it is” is added.

Changes regarding religion or religious culture and law. *In 19a*, the Hebrew דרכי “of the ways” is replaced with πλάσματος “of a thing formed, moulded” (cf. also P בְּחַיֵּיהֶם “his creatures”⁹⁹⁰), emphasising the creation.

⁹⁸⁵ Heater 1982, 126–8; Gammie 1985, 9–10.

⁹⁸⁶ Gerleman 1946, 21; Dhorme 1967, 622; Dhont 2018a, 276–8.

⁹⁸⁷ Seow 2023, 37 suggests connections with Apophis, “known in Egyptian mythology as a marine, serpentine monster, represents darkness, evil, and chaos. All these details make the “dragon” the opposite of God and angels— a monster at home in the dark underworld representing everything evil.” This is an example of the Greek translator connecting the translation to the Hellenistic milieu.

⁹⁸⁸ Gammie 1985, 14–5; Habel 1985, 567.

⁹⁸⁹ Nömmik 2013, 27–9, 268–75; 2025.

⁹⁹⁰ According to Szpek 1992, 297, both P and 11Q10 understood the root as צָלַל “to grow dark” and thus P translated with צִלָּה “his shade”. Cf. also Vg *sub umbra* “under the shadow”.

V: 40:21–23

Style

Vv. 21–23 form a strophe of two bicola and a *monocolon* in Greek. Thus, the end of the strophe is marked structurally in Greek. The end in 23a is also a conditional sentence, marked with *ἐάν* in Greek and *הן* in Hebrew.

In Hebrew, the beginning of the strophe is marked with non-parallelism: in v. 22, there is a partial symmetry (ABC/A'B') and in v. 23, there is a partial chiasmus (xABC/C'xA'B'D).

In 21a/22a, the noun *צאלים* “lotus plants” is repeated; this is reflected in Greek with the repetition of *δένδρα* “trees”.

Some marked vocabulary has been used in Hebrew: in 21a and 22a, the noun *צאלים* “a kind of lotus” (Job: 2); in 21b, the noun *ובצה* (בצה) “a swamp, marsh”; 3x, Job: 2); in 22b, the noun *ערבי* (ערבה) “a poplar, willow”; 4x, Job: 1, Ps: 1); in 23a, the verb *יחפוז* (חפז) “to hurry”; 9x, Job: 1, Ps: 4); and in 23b, the verb *גיה* (גיה) “to burst forth”; 7x, Job: 2, Ps: 1).

Rare vocabulary has been used in Greek as well: in 21b, the nouns *πάπυρον* “papyrus” (*πάπυρος*, -ου, ὁ, ἡ; 13x, LXX: 3, OG Job: 2) and *βούτομον* “sedg” (*βούτομον*, -ου, τό; 14x, OG Job: 2); in 22a, the verb *σκιάζονται* “they are overshadowed” (*σκιάζω*; 47x, LXX: 14, OG Job: 2); in 22b, the *hapax* noun *ὁ ῥάδαμνος* “the branch” (appears a couple of times in OG Job: 8:16b, 14:7c, 15:32b, 40:22b⁹⁹¹); the noun *ἄγνου* “chaste-tree” (*ἄγνος*, -ου, ἡ; reflects a rare word in Hebrew; 40x, LXX: 2, OG Job: 1); and in 23a, the noun *πλήμμυρα* “flood” (14x, OG Job: 1).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 21b*, *בסתר* “in the cover of” is omitted and replaced with *παρὰ πάπυρον* “by the papyrus”, possibly influenced by Job 8:11⁹⁹². *In 22a*, the words *צללו ... יסכחו* “they cover him ... his shadow” are combined into *σκιάζονται ἐν αὐτῷ* “they (the big trees) are overshadowed by it”. *In 23a*, *הן יעשק נהר לא יחפוז* “even if the river is turbulent, it is not frightened” is paraphrased into *ἐάν γένηται πλήμμυρα οὐ μὴ αἰσθηθῇ* “if there is a flood, it will not notice at all”, emphasising the creature’s might and impenetrability. *V. 23b*, *יהוה אל פיהו יבטח כי גיה ירדן אל פיהו* “it is confident though Jordan rushes against its mouth” is not translated; Cox is convincing in claiming that Jordan as a violent river would not have been relevant to Alexandrians who have the Nile, a much larger river, near them⁹⁹³. Further, due to the omission, a monocolon is now marking the end of the strophe structurally. Witte thinks that *ירדן* is probably a gloss⁹⁹⁴.

Utilising the context or the translator's previous knowledge for the meaning of unknown words. *In 21a*, the Hebrew *צאלים* “lotus plants” is generalised with

⁹⁹¹ Cf. also Mangin 2005, 562. Even its traditional form *ὁ ῥάδαμνος*, -ου, ὁ appears eleven times (including the times it is parsed as *ὁ ῥάδαμνος* by TLG).

⁹⁹² Heater 1982, 128.

⁹⁹³ Cox 2023, 256.

⁹⁹⁴ Witte 2021, 644.

παντοδαπὰ δένδρα “all sorts of trees”⁹⁹⁵, understanding that the context implies a tree, but not knowing exactly the kind. *In 21b*, the very rare noun ובצה “and the swamp” is translated with καὶ βούτομον “rush”. *In 22a*, the noun צאלים “lotus plants” is now translated with δένδρα μεγάλα “big trees”⁹⁹⁶. Vg translates with *protegent umbrae umbram eius* “the shades/shadows cover his shadow.” This suggests that the tree was unfamiliar to both translators, but at least the OG translator knew it was a tree of some sort. For some differences it is hard to find an exact source; however, contextual clues probably played a role *in 22b*, where יסבוהו ערבי נחל “the willows of the wadi surround it” is replaced with σὺν ῥαδάμνοις καὶ κλῶνες ἄγνου “with the limbs and branches of the chaste tree”. The only literal common word, the plural ערבי “the willows” is changed into singular ἄγνου “of a chaste tree.” The rest adheres to the theme of plants.

VI: 40:25–29

Style

Vv. 24–29 form a strophe consisting of five bicola in Hebrew, but vv. 25–29 form a strophe consisting of a *tricolon* and three bicola in Greek. Thus, the beginning of the strophe is marked structurally in Greek.

The end of the strophe is marked with a partial symmetry in Greek v. 29 (ABC/xA'B'C'D). There is a (partial) symmetry in Hebrew vv. 24 (AB/A'B'C) and 27 (xABC/xA'B'C') and a partial chiasmus in vv. 25 (ABC/C'A'B') and 26 (xABC/xB'A'C').

The end is also marked with a simile in v. 29: התשחק בו כצפור ותקשרנו לנערותיך “Will you play with it as with a bird or will you put it on leash for your young women?” in Hebrew and παίξῃ δὲ ἐν αὐτῷ ὥσπερ ὀρνέῃ ἢ δήσεις αὐτὸν ὥσπερ στρουθίον παιδίῳ; “And will you play with it as with a bird or tie it up as a sparrow for a child?” in Greek.

In Greek, the strophe is framed with rare words: in 25a, the noun ἀγκίστρω “with a fishhook” (ἄγκιστρον, -ου, τό; reflects a rare word in Hebrew; 35x, LXX: 5, OG Job: 1); in 25b, the noun φορβεᾶν “a halter” (φορβεία, -ᾶς, ἡ; 7x, OG Job: 1); in 26b, the noun ψελίω “U-shaped armlet” (ψέλιον, -ου, τό; 38x, LXX: 9, OG Job: 1); and in 29b, the noun στρουθίον “small bird” (45x, LXX: 14, OG Job: 1).

Some marked Hebrew words have been used as well: in 25a, the noun לִוְיָתָן “Leviathan” (6x, Job: 2, Ps: 2; BDB considers it also poetic) and the noun בחכה “a hook”; 3x, Job: 1); in 25b, the verb תשקיע (שקע “to sink”; 5x, Job: 1); lastly, in 26a, the noun אֶגְמוֹן (אגמן) “twisted rope” (5x: Job 2).

The interrogative particle -ה is repeated at the beginning of vv. 26–29 (four times). In Greek 25b/28a, there is the repetition of περιθήσεις “will you put around” and θήσεται “it will put”.

⁹⁹⁵ Szpek 1992, 282.

⁹⁹⁶ Cf. also Beekman 2020, 35; 2024, 254.

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *V. 24*, בענינו יקחנו במוקשים ינקב, א “Can one take it with hooks or pierce its nose with a snare?” is not translated. If the verse was in the *Vorlage*, it looks to be misplaced and would better suit to be after v. 25. Vermeylen thinks that v. 24 is comparable to 34:30 (from *rédaction* IV; also, the only other use of במוקשים is there). Witte thinks that the text of v. 24 has not been preserved in its original form, as the first colon is too short⁹⁹⁷. Assuming that the verse was in the *Vorlage*, it bothered the translator enough to omit it. *OG 25b* περιθήσεις δὲ φορβεὰν περὶ ῥῖνα αὐτοῦ “and you put a halter around its snout” translates and paraphrases Hebrew 26a, בתפן התשים אגמון באפו “can you put a rope in its nose”, while Hebrew 25b, ובחבל תשקיע לשנו “and press down its tongue with a cord” is not translated, most likely intentionally, to have a tricolon at the beginning of this strophe. As the two other cola translated also mentioned ways to make the dragon submit, the omission does not affect the integrity of the strophe. *In 26b*, the Hebrew לחי “his jaw” is translated as τὸ χεῖλος αὐτοῦ “his lip”; this might have simply seemed more logical⁹⁹⁸. *V. 27*, Will it make many supplications to you? Will it speak soft words to you” is paraphrased and shortened into λαλήσει δέ σοι δεήσει ἱκετηρία μαλακῶς “Will it speak to you with a petition, with a supplication softly?”. תחנונים “pleas” is translated twice with δεήσει “with a petition” and ἱκετηρία “of a suppliant, fit for a suppliant”. The plural adjective רכות “soft” is translated as an adverb μαλακῶς “softly.” *In 29b*, לנערותיך “for your maidens” is extended into ὥσπερ στρουθίον παιδίω “like a sparrow for a child, servant”.

Vorlage different than the later MT. *In 25a*, ליתן “Leviathan” is translated with δράκοντα “the dragon, serpent”⁹⁹⁹. It has been proposed that the OG *Vorlage* may have read תנין instead (so in 11Q10; similarly in 26:13; cf. also P ללס “sea serpent”), like in 7:12, where תנין is translated with δράκων “dragon, serpent”¹⁰⁰⁰.

VII: 40:30–41:1

Style

Verses 40:30–41:1 form a strophe consisting of a bicolon, a monocolon, a tricolon, and a bicolon in Greek. In Hebrew, the strophe does not extend beyond v. 32, which is a bicolon. This strophe is difficult to delimit; however, if we keep the current division, the strophe does end with two negative questions in Greek, whereas הן “if” and -ה question particle in Hebrew mark the beginning of the next strophe. There are imperatives in v. 32, marking the end of the strophe in Hebrew.

The end of the strophe in Hebrew (v. 32) is marked with non-parallelism, whereas the Greek strophe is framed with parallelistic structures: in v. 30, there is a partial symmetry in both Greek (ABC/A'B'C') and Hebrew (ABC/A'C'); in

⁹⁹⁷ Vermeylen 2015, 178–80; Witte 2021, 661.

⁹⁹⁸ Cf. also Orlinsky 1958, 260.

⁹⁹⁹ Translated with τὸ μέγα κῆτος “the big sea monster, huge fish” in 3:8.

¹⁰⁰⁰ Beekman 2024, 224–5.

v. 31, there is a partial symmetry in Hebrew (xABC/xB'C'); and in v. 41:1, there is a partial chiasmus in Greek (ABC/A'C'B').

Besides the numerous repetitions of pronouns, prepositions, and the like, the only substantial lexical repetition is in Greek 32bc: τὸν γινόμενον “what is happening” and γινέσθω “may it happen”.

Several rare Hebrew words have been used in this strophe: in 30a, the verb יכרו (“to trade”; 4x, Job: 2) and the *hapax* noun חברים (“an associate”); in 30b, the noun כנעני (“a merchant; a Canaanite?”; 8x, Job: 1, Prov: 1); in 31a, the *hapax* noun בשכות (“a barb, spear”); in 31b, the *hapax* noun ובצלצל (“a spear”); in 1a, the noun תחלתו (“hope”; 6x, Job: 1, Ps: 1, Prov: 3).

The translator has used a couple of rare words as well: both ἐνσιτοῦνται “they feed on” (ἐνσιτέομαι; in a way, reflects a rare verb in Hebrew) in 30a and μεριτεύονται “they divvy up” (μεριτεύομαι) in 30b are *hapax legomena*¹⁰⁰¹; in 31a, the noun βύρσαν “skin” (βύρσα, -ης, ῆ; 47x, LXX: 4, OG Job: 2).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics, but definitely not completely independent from the textual problems. *In 32a*, the Hebrew imperative שים “put!” is translated as a future ἐπιθήσεις “you will put on”, which is used with the imperative function as well. The suffix ך- “your” in כפך “your hand” is not translated. *In 32b*, the imperative זכר מלחמה “remember the battle!” is extended into μνησθεὶς πόλεμον τὸν γινόμενον ἐν σώματι αὐτοῦ “remembering the battle that is waging in its body” with the participle μνησθεὶς “having been reminded, having remembered”¹⁰⁰². *For 32c*, the end of Hebrew 32b, אל תוֹסֵף “do not do again!” is paraphrased into μηκέτι γινέσθω “may it not happen again!”.

Problems with the Vorlage manuscript. *V. 31* is completely different in Greek πᾶν δὲ πλωτὸν συνελθὼν οὐ μὴ ἐνέγκωσιν βύρσαν μίαν οὐράς αὐτοῦ “and a whole fleet, gathered, will never carry the mere skin of its tail” (31b technically asterisked in LXX^{Zi}) and Hebrew עורו ובצלצל דגים ראשו “can you fill its skin with harpoons or his head with fishing spears?”, with only “skin” being in common. Dhorme does suggest that the verse is a paraphrase due to reading שכיות “ships,” which only appears in Is 2:16, instead of בשכות in the Hebrew text¹⁰⁰³. This aligns with how the translator operates. The *Vorlage* or several pre-MT manuscripts might have had readability issues as both Vg and P deviate slightly, but differently. *V. 41:1* is again completely different in both languages. The Hebrew seems to allude to the impossibility of capturing or seeing the creature, with אל מראיו “Behold, his hope is false; he is laid low even at the sight of him.” On the contrary, the Greek seems to allude that it is possible to see the creature and asks οὐχ ἑώρακας αὐτὸν οὐδὲ ἐπὶ τοῖς λεγομένοις τεθαύμακας “Have you not seen it? Have you not wondered at the things said of him?”. οὐχ ἑώρακας αὐτὸν “have you not seen it” seems to translate

¹⁰⁰¹ Cf. also Mangin 2005, 513, 542.

¹⁰⁰² Cf. also Cox 2016a, 75.

¹⁰⁰³ Dhorme 1967, 628.

part of Hebrew 1b, אל מראיו, vocalising the preposition as a negation. Cox has proposed that the translator read אמריו “what is said” instead of מראיו “the sight of it”¹⁰⁰⁴ and thus the translation ἐπὶ τοῖς λεγομένοις. In this case, the translator then double-translated the consonants in two different meanings¹⁰⁰⁵. The rest of the Hebrew in v. 1 seems not to have been translated. Fernández Marcos categorises this particular translation under those where the Greek translator has successfully presented the reader with “a meaningful sentence” instead of the obscure Hebrew¹⁰⁰⁶. Both P and Vg differ significantly here¹⁰⁰⁷, suggesting that the pre-MT manuscripts were already corrupt or hard to read. Again, we see here how the translator utilises context and their stylistic sensibilities to construct a verse from what they could make out in Hebrew.

Utilising the context or the translator's previous knowledge for the meaning of unknown words. In 30a, the rare verb יכרו “they trade” is possibly connected with כרה “to feast” (so Dhorme¹⁰⁰⁸) and translated with ἐνσιτοῦνται “they feed on”. Other versions deviate as well (P: יכבשו “they will be gathered”¹⁰⁰⁹, V: *concidet eum amici* “shall friends cut him in pieces,” understanding the verb כרת “to cut”¹⁰¹⁰), thus the word probably was not too familiar for the ancients and they had to rely on context. The *hapax* noun חברים “associates, partners” is changed to ἔθνη “people, nations” (Vg: *amici* “friends”), associating it with the second colon (Phoenician races).

Reading, vocalising, or understanding the consonantal text differently than the later Masoretes. In 30b, the Greek Φοινίκων γένη “Phoenician races” is probably the result of understanding the Hebrew בין כנענים (possibly בני) as “son(s) of Canaanites”.

V. 30 interrupts the sequence of questions addressed to “you” and could be a gloss, according to Witte¹⁰¹¹. The translator made translation choices according to the context and reading but did not see the need to change the person here or leave it untranslated due to unsuitability. Instead, v. 31 is translated with a general third person as well, adjusting the “interrupting” verse to the strophe.

VIII: 41:2-3

Style

Vv. 2–3 form a strophe consisting of two bicola in Greek; in Hebrew, the strophe starts in v. 1. The only significant repetition in Hebrew is that of the interrogative מי “who?” at the beginning of 2b/3a; this is reflected in Greek with the repetition

¹⁰⁰⁴ Cox 2009, 668.

¹⁰⁰⁵ Cf. also Häberlein 2024, 298–9.

¹⁰⁰⁶ Fernández Marcos 1994, 262.

¹⁰⁰⁷ Behold, your foot is unimpeded, so also God will remove his venom”, and *Ecce: spes eius frustrabitur eum, et videntibus cunctis praecipitabitur* “Behold: his hope shall fail him, and in the sight of all he shall be cast down”.

¹⁰⁰⁸ Dhorme 1967, 627.

¹⁰⁰⁹ Szpek 1992, 293.

¹⁰¹⁰ Cf. also Dhorme 1967, 627.

¹⁰¹¹ Witte 2021, 652.

of τίς “who?”. Independently, there is the repetition of ὁ ἐμοὶ ἀντιστάς “the one that withstands me” and ἀντιστήσεται μοι “he will withstand me” in 2b/3a. In 2a, a rare Hebrew word has been used: the adjective אכזר “cruel” (4x, Job: 2). In Greek, the use of the adjectival possessive pronoun ἐμή “points towards an elevated register”¹⁰¹².

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 2b*, ומי הוא לפני יחיצב “and who can stand before me?” is slightly paraphrased into τίς γάρ ἐστὶν ὁ ἐμοὶ ἀντιστάς “for who is it that withstands me?”. The Hebrew pronoun הוא “he” is changed into the verb ἐστὶν “he is,” which is a common enough technique used by the translator. *In 3a*, מי הקדימני ואשלם “Who can confront me and I keep safe?” has been turned into ἢ τίς ἀντιστήσεται μοι καὶ ὑπομενεῖ “or who will withstand me and survive”. The perfective הקדימני “he has confronted me” is translated into future ἀντιστήσεται μοι “he will stand against me,” creating a lexical repetition with the previous colon. The verb ואשלם “and I keep (him) safe” is paraphrased into καὶ ὑπομενεῖ “and he remains, survives,” removing the first-person perspective. Heater does suggest that the *Vorlage* actually had the third person ישלם “he remained safe;” so also Dhorme who even suggests emending the Hebrew text to וישלם, in agreement with Greek.¹⁰¹³ However, if the translator simply understood ואשלם to be technically transitive, they translated appropriately. *In 3b*, the translator adds εἰ “if”. Again, the pronoun הוא “it” is changed into the verb ἐστὶν “it is”¹⁰¹⁴.

Problems with the *Vorlage*. *V. 2a* is completely different in both languages: יעורנו לא אכזר “no one is fierce so that it rouses it” and οὐ δέδοικας ὅτι ἡτοίμασται μοι “do you not fear because it has been prepared by me?”. The adjective phrase לא אכזר “not fierce” is changed into οὐ δέδοικας “are you not afraid?”. The second phrase, כי יעורנו “that it rouses it” is changed into ὅτι ἡτοίμασται μοι “that it has been prepared by me;” Dhorme suggests that the translator read יערכני “he arranges for me” and translated accordingly¹⁰¹⁵. The Greek paraphrase, thus, is probably the result of this reading and also taking into account the second colon of the verse. P and Vg probably read something else as well¹⁰¹⁶, suggesting that already some pre-MT manuscripts were corrupt here.

¹⁰¹² Dhont 2018a, 145.

¹⁰¹³ Dhorme 1967, 631–2; Heater 1982, 128–9. Both see influences or similarities in 9:4b and Heater also in 22:21a.

¹⁰¹⁴ Dhont 2018, 117 considers ἐστὶν an addition.

¹⁰¹⁵ Dhorme 1967, 630.

¹⁰¹⁶ אֶל נַפְשׁוֹ בְּהַלְחָצוֹ / בְּהַלְחָצוֹ אֶחָד וְאַחֶר נִפְסָה. “He will not be distant when he is aroused. Who can stand before me?” and *non quasi crudelis suscitabo eum quis enim resistere potest vultui meo* “I will not stir him up, like one that is cruel, for who can resist my countenance”.

IX: 41:5-8

Style

Verses 5–8 form a strophe consisting of three bicola and a *monocolon* in Greek. In Hebrew, the strophe ranges from vv. 4–9 and has thus six bicola. In Greek, the end of the strophe is then structurally marked.

The strophe begins in v. 5ab+6a with who-questions in Greek (marked with τίς); these reflect Hebrew (מי), however, in Hebrew they are found within the strophe and not marking the beginning.

The end of the strophe is marked with non-parallelism in Greek: in v. 5, in both languages, there is a partial chiasmus (ABC/C'A'B'), while 6a is symmetrical with 5b and partly chiasmic with 5a (C'A'B'); finally, in v. 7, Greek has a symmetry (AB/A'xB').

V. 8 has a simile in Greek: τὰ ἔγκατα αὐτοῦ ἀσπίδες χάλκειαι, σύνδεσμος δὲ αὐτοῦ ὥσπερ σμιρίτης λίθος. “It inwards are bronze shields, and its hide is like emery stone”.

There are some lexical repetitions in the strophe, more in Hebrew than in Greek: the interrogative מי “who?” in 5a/5b/6a (reflected in Greek with τίς “who?”); in 5a/6a, פני “the face of” and פניו “its face” (reflected in Greek with πρόσωπον “face” and προσώπου “of face”); in 5b/8b, the verb יבוא “he goes” (reflected in Greek with εἰσέλθοι “he could enter” and διέλθῃ “it goes through”); and in 8a, אחד באחד “one to another”.

Some marked Hebrew words have been used in this strophe: in 4a, the noun בדיו (בד “empty talk”; 7x, Job: 2); in 4b, the *hapax* noun וחין “beauty”; in 5b, the nouns בכפל (כפל “a doubling, double”; 3x, Job: 2) and רסנו (רסן “a bridle”; 4x, Job: 2, Ps: 1); in 6b, the noun אימה “terror” (considered mostly poetic by BDB); in 7a, the noun אפיקי (אפיק “bones, furrows” (considered poetic by BDB); and finally, in 7b, the adjective צר “narrow, tight” (8x, Job: 1, Prov: 2).

The translator has used some marked vocabulary as well: in 5a, the noun ἐνδύσεως “clothing, garment” (ἐνδύσις, -εως, ἡ; 12x, LXX: 7, OG Job: 1); in 5b, the noun πτύξις “fold of crocodile’s (?) scales” (πτύξις, -εως, ἡ; 2x, OG Job: 1); in 7a, the noun τὰ ἔγκατα “intestines” (17x, LXX: 6, OG Job: 2); and in 7b, the *hapax* noun σμιρίτης “emery powder”¹⁰¹⁷. The use of the potential optative αὐ εἰσέλθοι in 5b can show an aim at a higher register¹⁰¹⁸.

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. V. 4, אַחֲרֵי שֶׁ בָּדִי וְדַבָּר ¹⁰¹⁹לֹא אֶחְרִישׁ “I will not keep silent concerning its limbs or its mighty strength or its splendid frame” is not translated. This might be an intentional omission to reduce unnecessary and unfitting statements. In 5a, the perfective גִּלָּה “he has revealed” is translated with the future ἀποκαλύψει “he will reveal”. In 6a, the perfective מִי פָתַח “who opened?” is translated again into future τίς ἀνοίξει “who

¹⁰¹⁷ Cf. also Mangin 2005, 565.

¹⁰¹⁸ Dhont 2018a, 149–51.

¹⁰¹⁹ Qere לוֹ.

will open?”. *V. 8a*, אחד באחד יגשו “one is so near to another” is not translated, probably intentionally, to condense the final verse of the strophe into a monocolon. *In 8b*, the Hebrew לא יבוא ביניהם “it does not go between them” is slightly changed to οὐ μὴ διέλθῃ αὐτόν “it does not go through it”, since everything before this is in singular. *V. 9*, אִישׁ באחיהו ידבקו יתלכדו ולא יתפרדו “they are joined one to another, they clasp each other and cannot be separated” is again untranslated, possibly due to redundancy. According to Nömmik, v. 9 is possibly a later gloss that cannot be dated¹⁰²⁰. The translator recognised it to be redundant here.

Problems with the Vorlage. *In 5b*, the Hebrew בכפל רסנו “into the double(ness) of his harness” is paraphrased as εἰς δὲ πτύξιν θώρακος αὐτοῦ “into the plate of its cuirass”; Dhorme and Hartley suggest that the translator read סרינו “his armour” and to emend the Hebrew accordingly¹⁰²¹. Vg deviates and translates *in medium oris eius quis intrabit* “who can go into the midst of his mouth?”. According to Szpek, P translator confused the Hebrew בנפל with בנפל “when falling” and thus translated as هبط (when the net) falls¹⁰²². These different readings and translations suggest that perhaps the *Vorlage* and some pre-MT manuscripts were hard to read or even corrupt here. *In 7a*, the Hebrew גאֹוה “pride” is translated with τὰ ἔγκατα αὐτοῦ “his insides, entrails” (Vg *corpus illius* “his body”). Dhorme suggests that the translator read either גאֹוה or גוה “his back” and even suggests emending the Hebrew to גוה, in agreement with several versions¹⁰²³. P deviates more, leaving the possibility that the *Vorlage* and some pre-MT manuscripts were actually corrupt here and all versions read it slightly differently.

Utilising the context or the translator's previous knowledge for the meaning of unknown words. *In 7a*, the phrase including a very rare word אפיקי מגנים “rows of shields” is translated with ἀσπίδες χαλκείαι “bronze shields” (Vg *scuta fusilia* “molten shields”); the OG translator has translated אפיק differently every time it appears, utilising the context for the possible meaning.

Reading, vocalising, or understanding the consonantal text differently than the later Masoretes. *In 7b*, סגור חותם צר “shut up closely as with a seal” is paraphrased into σύνδεσμος δὲ αὐτοῦ ὥσπερ σμυρίτης λίθος “and its hide is like emery stone”. חותם “signet, seal” is changed into ὥσπερ σμυρίτης “like emery” (this noun also appears in 38:14 where the verse is also completely rewritten, suggesting the possibility that the translator did not know the exact meaning). The Greek λίθος “stone” probably results from vocalising the Hebrew as צר “flint” (Dhorme even suggests emending the Hebrew accordingly¹⁰²⁴).

¹⁰²⁰ Nömmik 2013, 27–9, 268–75; 2025.

¹⁰²¹ Dhorme 1967, 633; Hartley 1988, 527.

¹⁰²² Szpek 1992, 282.

¹⁰²³ Dhorme 1967, 634.

¹⁰²⁴ Dhorme 1967, 634.

X: 41:10–13

Style

Verses 10–13 form a strophe consisting of four bicola; this time the strophe delimitation matches in both languages.

In vv. 11–12a, there is a partial symmetry in Greek (ABC/xB'C'/A'B'C') and a partial symmetry and partial chiasmus combination in Hebrew (ABC/B'C'/A'C'B').

There are several lexical and phrasal repetitions in this strophe: in 11a/13b, the phrase מפי “from his mouth” (reflected in Greek with ἐκ στόματος αὐτοῦ “from its mouth”); in 11a/13b, the verb יצא “it goes out” (reflected in Greek with ἐκπορεύονται “they go out” and ἐκπορεύεται “it goes out”; additionally, the verb is also used in 12a: ἐκπορεύεται “it goes out”). The Greek translator has added independent repetitions in 11a/12b, καιόμεναι “flaming (pl.)” and καιομένης “of a flaming (sg.)”; in 11b/12b, πυρός “of fire” and πυρὶ “with fire”; and in 12b/13a, ἀνθράκων “of coals” and ἄνθρακες “coals”.

Several rare Hebrew words have been used in this strophe: in 10a, the *hapax* noun עִישְׁתִּי (עִישָׁה “sneezing”) and the verb תהל (הלל “to shine”; 4x, Job: 3); in 10b, the noun כַּעֲפַעִי (עַפְעָף “an eyelid”; 10x, Job: 3, Ps: 2, Prov: 4); in 11b, the *hapax* noun כִּידוּדִי (כִּידוּד “a spark”); in 12a, the *hapax* noun מִנְחִירִי (נַחִיר “a nostril”); lastly, in 12b, the nouns כְּדוּד (דוּד “a pot”; 8x, Job: 1, Ps: 1) and וַאֲגֹמֶן “a bulrush” (5x, Job: 2).

The translator has used a couple of rare words as well: in 10a, the verb ἐπιφάσκειται “to emit light and be light” (ἐπιφάσκω; reflects a rare verb in Hebrew; appears only in OG Job: 25:5, 31:26, 41:10); in 10b, the noun ἑωσφόρου “of the morning-star” (ἑωσφόρος, -ου, ὁ; 21x, LXX: 7, OG Job: 4); and in 11b, the verb διαρρίπτονται “to throw about” (διαρρίπτω; 38x, LXX: 2, OG Job: 1).

There is a simile in Hebrew v. 10: עִישְׁתִּי תהל אור ועיני כַּעֲפַעִי שחר “Its sneezes flash forth light, and its eyes are like the eyelids of the dawn”. There is another simile in Hebrew v. 12: כ מִנְחִירִי יצא עשן כְּדוּד נִפּוּחַ וַאֲגֹמֶן “Out of its nostrils comes out smoke, as from a boiling pot and burning rushes”. The Greek translator opts to translate these without marking them explicitly as similes.

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 10b*, the Hebrew כַּעֲפַעִי “like eyelids” is replaced with εἶδος “appearance”. The translator knew the word; thus, this change is an intentional paraphrase. *In 11a*, the translator adds the participle καιόμεναι “flaming”, describing the lamps, creating a repetition with 12b. *In 11b*, the Hebrew יתמלטו “they leap out” is changed into διαρρίπτονται “they are scattered”. *In 12b*, the participle καιομένης “burning” translates the participle נִפּוּחַ “breathing, blowing”, repeating 11a. *In 13a*, the verb תלהט “it burns, scorches” is omitted and the translation of the verse is concise. Orlinsky and Dhorme think that originally the word was translated with φλέξει, but due to haplography in

having similar consonants with the following word, it went missing in copying the manuscripts¹⁰²⁵.

Vorlage different than the later MT. In 10a, the *hapax* עִישָׁתָיו “its sneezings” is translated with the singular ἐν παρμῶν αὐτοῦ “at his sneezing”. Although variation with singular and plural is usual in the OG translation, based on several versions, there is a possibility that the pre-MT was indeed in singular (עִישָׁתָיו); Dhorme even suggest emending the MT¹⁰²⁶.

Utilising the context or the translator's previous knowledge for the meaning of unknown words. In 11b, the Hebrew *hapax* כִּדּוּדֵי “sparks” is translated as ἐσχάραι “fireplaces”, suggesting that the general meaning was understood. The translator probably understood the same word in 12b (instead of MT כִּדּוּדֵי), where a synonym, καμίνου “of a furnace” is used for the translation (creating alliteration with καπνὸς and καιομένης in the verse and καιόμεναι in 11a). Witte, however, thinks that the Greek translator read בּוּר “smelting-pot, furnace” and as it is a better reading, the Hebrew should be emended¹⁰²⁷. In 12b, πυρὶ ἀνθράκων “with the fire of coals” is used for the rare Hebrew noun וַאֲגַמֵּן “and burning rushes”.

XI: 41:14-17

Style

Verses 14–17 form a strophe consisting of four bicola in Hebrew, but a bicolon, a *monocolon*, a bicolon and another *monocolon* in Greek.

The strophe begins in v. 14 with a symmetry in both Greek (ABC/A'B'C') and Hebrew (ABC/xA'B'C'). In v. 16, there is a partial symmetry in both Greek (ABC/B'C') and Hebrew (ABC/xB'C'). Thus, in both Hebrew and Greek, the pattern of parallelistic structures is OxOx, which is intensified in Greek with the non-parallelistic verses being actually monocola.

The only lexical repetition is in Hebrew 15b/16a/16b: the passive participle יָצוּק “(that which is) cast”. These are not reflected by the translator nor are independent repetitions added.

Several rare or marked Hebrew words have been used in this strophe: in 14a, the noun עֵז “neck” (considered quite poetic by BDB); in 14b, the *hapax* verb תְּדוּץ “to dance”) and the *hapax* noun דֹּאבָה “dismay”; in 15a, the noun מַפְלֵי (מַפֵּל) “hanging parts”; 2x, Job: 1); In 15b, the verb יָמוּט (מוֹט) “he is moved” (considered poetic by BDB); in 16b, the noun כְּפֶלֶח (פֶּלֶח) “a millstone”; 6x, Job: 1); finally, in 17a, the verb יִגְוֹר (גּוֹר) “to dread”; 10x, Job: 2, Ps: 2).

The Greek translator has used a couple of rare words in 16b: the noun ἄκμων “anvil” (reflects a rare word in Hebrew; 37x, LXX: 2, OG Job: 1) and the adjective ἀνήλατος “not struck with a hammer” (5x, OG Job: 1).

There is a simile in v. 16: לִבּוֹ יָצוּק כְּמוֹ אֶבֶן וְיָצוּק כְּפֶלֶח תַּחְתִּית “Its heart is as hard as stone, as hard as the lower millstone” in Hebrew and ἡ καρδία αὐτοῦ

¹⁰²⁵ Orlinsky 1962, 150–1; Dhorme 1967, 637.

¹⁰²⁶ Dhorme 1967, 635.

¹⁰²⁷ Witte 2021, 647.

πέπηγεν ὡς λίθος, ἔστηκεν δὲ ὥσπερ ἄκμων ἀνήλατος. “Its heart is solid like stone, and it stands like an unyielding anvil.” in Greek.

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *V. 15b*, יצוק עליו בל ימוט “it is firmly cast and immovable” is not translated in Greek, probably due to due to redundancy with the next cola¹⁰²⁸. *In 16a*, the participle יצוק “is cast” is translated as a finite verb πέπηγεν “it has fastened, stiffened”. *In 16b*, the translation of the participle is not repeated in Greek, instead, the translator varies and translates as a finite verb ἔστηκεν “it stands”. The Hebrew כפלח תחתית “like a lower mill-stone” is translated as ὥσπερ ἄκμων ἀνήλατος “like an unmalleable anvil,” contextualising the setting in urban, industrial Alexandria¹⁰²⁹, but also creating α-alliteration. *V. 16* could be a gloss, due to the repetition of יצוק, according to Witte, although he does admit that inner-verse repetition is not uncommon in Job¹⁰³⁰. If anything, the repetition bothered the translator: v. 15b is omitted and variation is chosen in v. 16.

Vorlage different than the later MT. *In 14b*, ולפניו תדון דאבה “and terror dances before it” has been turned into ἐμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ τρέχει ἀπώλεια “before it runs destruction”. The *hapax* verb תדון “it dances” is translated as τρέχει “it runs” due to reading the *dalet* as a *resh*, תרץ “it runs,” either with or without the mater (רוץ “to run”)¹⁰³¹; so also 11Q10 (תרוט), and similarly Vg (*praecedat*). Therefore, some pre-MT manuscripts could actually have had *resh* instead of *dalet*.

Reading or vocalising the consonantal text differently than the later Masoretes. *In 14b*, the *hapax* noun דאבה “faintness, dismay” is translated as ἀπώλεια “death, destruction”, due to reading the consonants as אויבד “perishing”, or as דבא “strength” (Terrien, Clines’ dictionary), or, as אבדון “destruction” (Habel)¹⁰³². 11Q10 translates with תקפה “strength”, possibly reading דבא “strength”; P translates with גלגל “fear”, possibly associating the word with יראה; Vg, translates as *egestas* “extreme poverty, want”, reading רעב “famine, hunger”. Thus, the *hapax* was not known to the ancient translators, and each relied on the context and a possible reading to arrive at a translation.

Utilising the context or the translator's previous knowledge for the meaning of unknown words. *In 15a*, the Hebrew phrase with a very rare word, מפלי בשרו “the hanging parts of its flesh”, is changed into σάρκες δὲ σώματος αὐτοῦ “the flesh (fleshes) of its body”¹⁰³³.

Changes regarding religion or religious culture and law. *V. 17*, משתו יגורו אלים “when it raises itself up the gods are afraid, at the crashing they

¹⁰²⁸ Vg deviates and translates *mittet contra eum fulmina et ad locum alium non ferentur* “he shall send lightnings against him, and they shall not be carried to another place.” Thus, the *Vorlage* that Jerome used might have been problematic.

¹⁰²⁹ Cox 2023, 256–7.

¹⁰³⁰ Witte 2021, 652.

¹⁰³¹ Cf. also Cox 2009, 668.

¹⁰³² Terrien 1963, 266; Habel 1985, 556.

¹⁰³³ Cox 2016a, 75 notes that the addition of σώματος was necessary for better Greek.

are beside themselves” is paraphrased into *στραφέντος δὲ αὐτοῦ φόβος θηρίοις τετράποσιν ἐπὶ γῆς ἀλλομένοις* “and when it turns, fear (comes) to the wild quadrupeds leaping about on the earth”. The translator uses *θηρίοις τετράποσιν ἐπὶ γῆς ἀλλομένοις* “for the wild quadrupeds jumping upon the earth”¹⁰³⁴ to replace the omitted *אלים משברים יתחטאו* “gods, from crashings they lose themselves.” This seems to be theologically motivated, to avoid any reference to polytheism. Orlinsky suggests corruption in the Greek text and that originally *ἀλωμένοις* “wandering about”¹⁰³⁵ was used.

XII: 41:18–21

Style

Vv. 18–21 form a strophe consisting of four bicola in Hebrew, but two *tricola* in Greek. In Greek, the strophe begins with the conditional *ἐάν* “if” (an addition) in 18a.

In v. 19, there is a partial symmetry in both Greek (AxBC/B'xC') and Hebrew (ABC/B'C').

There are a couple of lexical repetitions in Hebrew: in 19a/21a, *יחשב* “he counts, reckons” and *נחשבו* “they are counted, reckoned”; and the noun *קש* “chaff” in 20b/21a. In Greek, there a couple as well: the root-repetition of *χαλκόν* “bronze” and *χάλκειον* “of bronze” in 19b/20a; in 19a/20b, the verb *ἡγῆται* “he counts” (partly reflects Hebrew).

Numerous marked Hebrew words have been used in this strophe: in 18a, the negation *בלי* (considered mostly poetic by BDB); in 18b, the *hapax* nouns *מסע* “missile, dart” and *ושריה* “lance, javelin”; in 19b, the *hapax* noun *רקבון* “rotteness” and the noun *נחושה* “bronze” (considered poetic by BDB); in 20b, the noun *קלע* “sling, slingstone” (6x, Job: 1); in 21a, the *hapax* noun *תותח* “a club, mace”; and in 21b, the noun *כידון* “javelin” (9x, Job: 2).

The Greek translator has used a couple of rare words as well: in 19b, the adjective *σαθρόν* “rotten” (*σαθρός*, -ά, -όν; reflects a rare word in Hebrew; 35x, LXX: 2, OG Job: 1); in 20b, the adjective (here used substantively) *πετροβόλον* “a catapult” (*πετροβόλος*, -ον; reflects a rare word in Hebrew; 39x, LXX: 5, OG Job: 1); and in 21b, the adjective (here used substantively) *πυρφόρου* “firebrand, fire bearer” (*πυρφόρος*, -ον; reflects a rare word in Hebrew; 34x, OG Job: 1).

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *V. 18*, *משיגהו חרב בלי תקום חנית*, *ושריה מסע* “Though the sword reaches it, it does not avail, nor does the spear, the dart, or the javelin” is condensed into *ἐάν συναντήσωσιν αὐτῷ λόγχαι οὐδὲν μὴ ποιήσωσιν* “If spears meet it, they will do nothing”. The conditional conjunction *ἐάν* “if” is added. The singular participle *משיגהו* “reaching him” is translated as a

¹⁰³⁴ Cox 2016a, 75 considers only *τετράποσιν* and *ἐπὶ γῆς* as additions that contextualise and explain.

¹⁰³⁵ Orlinsky 1962, 151.

plural finite *συναντήσωσιν αὐτῷ* “they would meet with him.” Witte posits that the Greek translator may have read *תשיגהו* and it is one possibility to also emend the Hebrew accordingly¹⁰³⁶; however, the translator has made similar changes throughout the book. *λόγχοι* “spears, javelins” is translated from 18b, suggesting intentional shortening of the verse. In connection with the plural “spears,” the verb *בלי תקום* “it does not arise, stand” is translated with *οὐδὲν μὴ ποιήσωσιν* “they do not do anything.” *In 19a*, the translator adds *γὰρ* “for”, turning the verse into an explanation of 18a. *In 20a*, the Hebrew verb *לא יבריחנו* “it does not cause him to flee” is changed into *οὐ μὴ τρώσῃ αὐτόν* “it does not wound him”. Heater notes that the colon is brought in, almost word-for-word, from 20:24b, due to very similar keywords¹⁰³⁷. The Hebrew phrase *בן קשת* “son of bow = arrow” is translated with changed into *τόξον χάλκειον* “a bow of bronze,” creating a root-repetition in the strophe. *In 20b*, *לקש נהפכו לו אבני קלע* “slingstones for it are turned to chaff” is paraphrased into *ἡγγεται μὲν πετροβόλον χόρτον* “a catapult it considers grass”, creating a fuller symmetry in the translation, but also emphasising the size of the creature. *V. 21a*, *בקש נחשבו תותח* “clubs are counted as chaff” is not translated neither here nor in the P¹⁰³⁸. It is conceivable that the colon was not there in some pre-MT manuscripts, but it is also very likely that the translator (or both translators) omitted it due to redundancy. The whole strophe is thus condensed, as the list of weapons is shortened¹⁰³⁹.

Utilising the context or the translator's previous knowledge for the meaning of unknown words. *In 21b*, the Hebrew *כידון* “of a javelin, dart” is translated as *πυρφόρου* “of a fire-bearing arrow/stone”. The translator did not know the word (cf. 39:23) and used contextual clues.

XIII: 41:22–24

Style

Vv. 22–24 form a strophe consisting of three bicola in Hebrew, but a bicolon and a *tricolon* in Greek. The end of the strophe is thus marked structurally in Greek.

In vv. 23–24a, there is a partial symmetry in Greek (ABC/A'B'C'/B''C'') and in v. 23, there is a partial chiasmus in Hebrew (ABC/C'A'B').

The only lexical repetitions are in Greek: in 22b/23b, *θαλάσσης* “of the sea” and *τὴν θάλασσαν* “the sea”; and in 23a/24a, *τὴν ἄβυσσον* “the deep” and *τῆς ἄβύσσου* “of the deep”.

Several rare or marked Hebrew words have been used in this strophe: in 22a, the *hapax* noun *חֲדוּדִי* (חֲדוּד “a pointed, sharpened thing”); in 22b, the verb *יִרְפֹּד* (רָפַד “to spread”; 3x, Job: 1) and the noun *חֲרוּץ* “sharp thing” (10x, Job: 1, Prov: 5); in 23a, the verb *יִרְתַּח* (רָתַח “to boil”; 3x, Job: 2); in 23b, the noun *מַרְקָחָה* (מַרְקָחָה “ointment pot”; 2x, Job: 1); and in 24b, the noun *תְּהוֹם* “the deep” (considered mostly poetic by BDB).

¹⁰³⁶ Witte 2021, 647.

¹⁰³⁷ Heater 1982, 129.

¹⁰³⁸ Szpek 1992, 162.

¹⁰³⁹ See also discussion in Häberlein 2024, 318–22.

The Greek translator has used rare words as well: in 22b, the adjective ἀμύθητος “untold” (29x, LXX: 5, OG Job: 3); and in 23b, the noun ἐξάλειπτρον “unguent-box” (reflects a rare word in Hebrew; 6x, OG Job: 1).

In Greek, vv. 22b and 23a contain a simile: πᾶς δὲ χρυσὸς θαλάσσης ὑπ’ αὐτὸν ὥσπερ πηλὸς ἀμύθητος “and all the sea’s gold under it is like untold clay” and ἀναζει τὴν ἄβυσσον ὥσπερ χαλκίον “it makes the deep boil like a cauldron”. In Hebrew, v. 23 is a simile: ירתיח בסיר מצולה ים ישם כמרקחה “It makes the deep boil like a pot, it makes the sea like a pot of ointment”, marking the middle of the strophe.

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. In 22a, תחתיו חרש “the things under him are like sharp potsherds” is paraphrased into ἡ στρωμνὴ αὐτοῦ ὀβελίσκοι ὀξεῖς “its bed is sharp points”. Gammie has noted that in Egypt, these were usually covered with gold¹⁰⁴⁰, therefore matching with the second colon but also with the Alexandrian/Egyptian readership. In 23b, the verb ישם “he makes” is translated as ἡγγεται “he regards”, possibly influenced by יחשב in 24a.

Reading or vocalising the consonantal text differently than the later Masoretes. The Hebrew of v. 22b ירפד חרוץ עלי טיט “it spreads itself like a threshing sledge on the mire” is replaced with πᾶς δὲ χρυσὸς θαλάσσης ὑπ’ αὐτὸν ὥσπερ πηλὸς ἀμύθητος “and all the sea’s gold under it is like untold clay”. Dhorme explains that the translator, and some other versions¹⁰⁴¹, understood חרוץ as “gold” (used like that in Ps, for example), whence the paraphrase¹⁰⁴². In Greek, the verse is more coherent, talking about the place where the creature lays in both cola. OG v. 24a, τὸν δὲ τάρταρον τῆς ἀβύσσου ὥσπερ αἰχμάλωτον “and (regards) Tartarus of the deep as a captive” originates from Hebrew 24b, יחשב תהום לשיבה “he considers the deep to be white-haired”. The verb יחשב “he considers” is not translated as it is already used in the previous colon. The noun תהום “the deep” is extended into τὸν δὲ τάρταρον τῆς ἀβύσσου “Tartarus of the deep”¹⁰⁴³, creating a repetition with 23a. The phrase לשיבה “as grey-headed, old” is probably read as לשבי “as a captive”¹⁰⁴⁴, triggering the whole paraphrase. As a result, the enormous power and influence of the dragon is emphasised.

¹⁰⁴⁰ Gammie 1987, 18.

¹⁰⁴¹ Vg translates the verse as *sub ipso erunt radii solis sternet sibi aurum quasi lutum* “The beams of the sun shall be under him, and he shall strew gold under him like mire.”

¹⁰⁴² Dhorme 1967, 642.

¹⁰⁴³ Seow 2023, 37, suggests connections with Apophis, “known in Egyptian mythology as a marine, serpentine monster, represents darkness, evil, and chaos. All these details make the “dragon” the opposite of God and angels – a monster at home in the dark underworld representing everything evil.” This is an example of the Greek translator connecting the translation to the Hellenistic milieu.

¹⁰⁴⁴ Cf. also Witte 2021, 670.

XIV: 41:25–26

Style

Vv. 25–26 form a concluding strophe consisting of two bicola. The beginning of the strophe is marked with an emphatic negation in the first position: אֵין and οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδὲν. The last colon also has an emphatic pronoun in the first position: הוּא and αὐτός. The end of the strophe and the speech is marked with repetitions: in 26ab, the noun כָּל “all” is repeated; this is reflected in Greek with the repetition of πᾶν “very” and πάντων “of all”.

A couple of rare or marked Hebrew words have been used in this strophe: in 25a, the *hapax* (?) noun מְשֻׁל (מִשְׁל “likeness”); in 25b, the negation לְבִלִּי (considered mostly poetic by BDB) and the noun חַת “terror, fear” (2x, Job: 1); finally, in 26b, the noun שְׁחָץ “dignity, pride” (Job: 2). The Greek translator has used a *hapax* verb in 25b, namely ἐγκαταπαίξασθαι (appears only here and in 40:19b)¹⁰⁴⁵.

Text

Intentional changes in style, syntax, or rhetorics. *In 25a*, the negation אֵין “there is not” is extended into οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδὲν “there is nothing”.

Reading or vocalising the consonantal text differently than the later Masoretes. *In 25b*, the Hebrew לְבִלִּי חַת “without fear” is replaced with ἐγκαταπαίξασθαι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀγγέλων μου “to be mocked at by my angels” (similarly to 40:19b; Heater suggests that it was directly brought from 40:19b but also influenced by Isa 38:17a¹⁰⁴⁶). Gammie, however, has suggested that the translation is based on understanding the infinitive תֵּחַ “to be filled with terror” and לְבִלִּי was read as לְבִלִּי “for (by) my all,” understanding here כָּל בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים from 38:7¹⁰⁴⁷.

Vorlage different than the later MT. *In 26b*, the Hebrew phrase עַל כָּל בְּנֵי שְׁחָץ “over all sons of pride” is translated with πάντων τῶν ἐν τοῖς ὕδασι “of all that are in the waters” which corresponds to the “water-creature” theme and also creates a nice parallelism with ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς in 25a; שְׁחָץ is read as שְׂרָץ “swarmer”¹⁰⁴⁸. 11Q10 interprets in the same vein, עַל כָּל רֶחַשׁ “over all reptiles”¹⁰⁴⁹, as well as P, ܐܬܪܐ ܕܪܥܝܐ “over all reptiles”¹⁰⁵⁰. According to Nömmik, v. 26 could be a later gloss that cannot be dated; Vermeylen thinks that the expression עַל בְּנֵי שְׁחָץ in v. 26 is elsewhere only attested in 28:28, which is from *redaction* III.¹⁰⁵¹ If it was a later addition, it did not cause any troubles for the OG translator; we can only assume that the text changed between the pre-MT and MT copying processes.

¹⁰⁴⁵ Cf. also Mangin 2005, 510.

¹⁰⁴⁶ Heater 1982, 127–8.

¹⁰⁴⁷ Gammie 1985, 9.

¹⁰⁴⁸ Cf. also Cox 2009, 668.

¹⁰⁴⁹ Cf. also García Martínez et al. 1998, 168–70.

¹⁰⁵⁰ Szpek 1992, 293.

¹⁰⁵¹ Nömmik 2013, 27–9, 268–75; Vermeylen 2015, 179, 178–80; Nömmik 2025.

CONCLUSIONS

This dissertation, titled “Style of Old Greek Job. Its value for textual, literary and redaction criticism of Hebrew Job” set out to find the links between the way OG Job was stylised by the translator and the value of this stylisation for dealing with textual, literary, and redaction critical questions of the Hebrew text of Job.

To accomplish this task, ten speeches from throughout the book of Job were studied: Job 4–5 (Eliphaz), 8 (Baldad), 12–14 (Job), 15 (Eliphaz), 19 (Job), 21 (Job), 29–31 (Job), 38–39 (God), and 40:6–41:26 (God). These speeches were chosen for several varied reasons. Firstly, in both Greek and Hebrew, they represent varied stages of textual difficulties. For example, ch. 8 contains no asterisked passages and has less textual problems in the Hebrew; chs. 4–5, 15, and 25 contain passages from the lowliness redaction (*à la Witte*) and have therefore characteristics to compare. Chs. 19 and 21 contain interesting theological discussion points and ch. 21 also has a large minus in OG that surprisingly has not been considered secondary by redaction critics. Chs. 29–31 were chosen because of how different the three chapters in one speech are. In addition, ch. 30 is notoriously difficult and the Greek translation has major divergencies. The speeches of God were chosen as a certain control group as previous scholarship has emphasised the fact that the translator’s omissions waned in these. Overall, the choice of speeches under study reflects a variety in terms of textual problems in Hebrew, asterisked passages in Greek, and overall length and number of strophes.

The texts of Greek and Hebrew Job were firstly approached in terms of style and more specifically, in terms of the strophic structure and how different stylistic techniques are used within them. It attempted to answer the question: Are the speeches in OG Job strophic in structure just as they are in Hebrew Job? If the speeches are stylised on the level of the strophe, are both stylistic techniques and changes in style, syntax, rhetorics made on the strophic level? If both style and general changes made to the text take the macrostructure into account, are these systematic across speeches? If they are, we can evaluate these against passages that are thought to be textually difficult or later additions to the Hebrew text, i.e. not there in the original poem.

This approach to OG Job and its relation to the Hebrew text was highly experimental, but some findings can be published with certainty.

Style and value for literary criticism

The main part of the stylistic analysis done in this dissertation focused on the level of a strophe, that is, a thematically and formally delimited block of text within the speech.

It was found that OG Job is relatively consistent, intentional, and deliberate in its stylisation. At the largest level, the translator replicated the structure of the Hebrew book of Job which has a narrative frame story and poetic speeches between Job, his friends, and finally God. On the level of a speech, the poetry of

Hebrew is usually followed, with the exception of regular (or mostly regular) colometry. This is not converted into metre nor any type of isosyllabic or otherwise systematic verse length in the OG translation. Therefore, in the strictest sense of Greek poetics, this OG translation cannot be considered poetry. Besides colometry and metre, however, other poetic, rhetorical, and stylistic techniques of the Hebrew, such as parallelism, lexical repetitions, similes, transition markers, and elevated vocabulary are understood and used well. This includes both reflection, change, and addition but also non-reflection and even omission of stylistic techniques. Therefore, although the Greek translation cannot be considered Ancient Greek poetry in the strictest sense due to the lack of metre, it is still poetic in form in every other way.

It was found that not only are the dialogues in Hebrew Job strophic, but they are also strophic in the OG translation. The length of two to four bicola (or the equal of four to eight cola) is most common in both languages. This is however dictated by the source text, where smaller topics were brought up in these intervals. Although this strophic division does not always exactly align in the two languages, the Greek translation was not converted into a different form. The translator understood this form well enough to keep it in mind when making changes or using various stylistic or rhetorical techniques. The basis of the strophic structure is determined by Hebrew; however, it does look like the translator saw the connection between the frequent change of topic and the literary devices used in connection and as such there are cases where this structure was intensified with repetitions, transition markers, and verse structures, such as monocola and tricola.

The strophic structure was followed and occasionally improved upon. For example, sometimes, translational choices were made that affected the whole strophe, such as having only questions when Hebrew has questions mixed with statements or remarks (38:22–25 vs Hebrew 22–27), or repetitions instead of variation (although the opposite is done as well). In 5:6–7, the topic of birds and flying are very much enforced in Greek when compared to Hebrew; in 8:20–22, the strophe in Greek is framed with the “impious”, while the middle deals with the “righteous” people; and in ch. 12, several strophes of the speech have similar endings to do with the topic of knowledge, independently of Hebrew.

The biggest differences in strophic division were found to be in Job 29–31, specifically in ch. 30. On the contrary, in Job 8 and 25, the strophic division is very similar in both languages. In other speeches, there are sections where the strophes align perfectly in both languages and other sections where there is little alignment (such as chs. 12 and 21). In most cases, the strophes in Greek are well distinguished and delimited, showing that the translator had a clear understanding of the macro-structure of the speeches and saw it necessary to replicate the structure in their translation. On the one hand, some differences in strophe delimitation are purely subjective and based on the understanding of individual researchers, as is seen in Appendix II, where even the MT has led to numerous different possible strophic divisions. On the other hand, various reasons, such as textual issues in the *Vorlage*, omissions, additions, and variant readings and under-

standings of the consonantal text, led to an obviously different strophe delimitation in the OG translation.

The default **verse structure** in Job, and in Biblical Hebrew poetry in general, is the colometrically balanced bicolon. As mentioned above, colometry was not transferred onto the Greek translation. However, deviations from the usual, default verse structure, that means using monocola, tricola, and tetracola instead of bicola, are more often than not structuring devices in both Hebrew and Greek. Hebrew generally only deviates towards tricola (31¹⁰⁵² times in these ten speeches), once a tetracolon (30:1); most of the time these deviations are in structural positions. The OG translator did reflect the structure of Hebrew verses in the majority of cases; however, they also varied with omissions, additions, and paraphrases so that very often, the resulting monocola and tricola ended up in a structural position independently of Hebrew. Sometimes the translator's changes led to the whole speech being framed with a tricola, like in Job 38–39, or the beginning of the speech being made up of only tricola (ch. 12). Based on the ten speeches studied in this dissertation, it can be said that most of the time when the translator changed the Hebrew bicolon into a monocolon or a tricolon, it played a structural role in the strophe or even the whole speech. The last speech under study, Job 40–41, is especially remarkable in that way, as the Hebrew has only bicola and the translator has varied the verse-structure in several places.

Parallelistic structures, that is symmetry and chiasmus, seem to have a supporting role in delimiting strophes, especially so in Hebrew. They are not in and of themselves structuring devices but a simple and densely used technique that enhances the overall style of the speeches and marks them for poetry. Often, these parallelistic structures in delimiting positions are reflected by the Greek translator. The translator is also comfortable and independent in creating parallelistic structures. Job 29–31 with its difficult Hebrew text in ch. 30 resulted in quite a few independent structures. The difficult text may have motivated the translator to be more creative in how strophes were delimited and stylistically elevated; this included creating their own parallelistic structures. Sometimes, the Hebrew parallelistic structure was changed to the opposite, i.e. symmetry into chiasmus or chiasmus into symmetry. Mostly, however, the translator followed the word order of the Hebrew and naturally ended up with the same type of parallelism. Still, it seems that the translator well understood parallelistic structures and was able to create them on their own or change them. What has been considered as removing poetry that is collapsing parallelistic clauses in the translation was in fact a technique of strengthening the strophic structure, as quite often, these changed verse structures are in delimiting positions.

Lexical repetitions seem to have supporting role in delimiting strophes as well and could have structural roles, for example, marking the frames of the strophe but also helping to distinguish one strophe from the other in general (one word repeated in one strophe and another in the next; several strophes beginning with the same word). The translator did not have a set strategy for dealing with

¹⁰⁵² Counting 31:40 as a tricolon.

the repetitions present in the Hebrew text and strophes. Often, they were simply reflected, other times they were ignored or replaced with variation. Other times, again, the repetitions were extended, independent repetitions were added to the reflected ones, or independent repetitions were added in strophes or verses where the Hebrew had none.

Marked vocabulary, like rare and poetic words, can be observed in both languages in all of the speeches studied. Sometimes these words do happen to be in structural positions; however, it seems that this elevated language was used to embellish the Job-poem overall, maybe to show the education and literary prowess of the author(s), maybe to just let the hearer or reader know that they are not hearing or reading an ordinary prose text but also to make them focus their attention.

Words and function words, such as particles, adverbs, interrogatives, that can be seen as **transition markers** bear importance both on the level of a colon and a verse and on a larger level. On the smaller level, it can be hypothesised that they were mostly added to distinguish cola and verses, especially in early manuscripts where visual markers and punctuation were not used. In Greek, $\delta\epsilon$ marks that function most often, while $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ is sometimes used for micro-level structuring and other times for strophic-level structuring. On the larger level, for example, marked questions are found at the beginning of several strophes. However, in some speeches that are in large parts composed of questions, they are not reliable markers for macro-scale structuring. Instances were observed, where the translator inserted short rhetorical questions (such as $\tau\acute{\iota}\ \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$;) to the beginning of strophes. Emphatic adverbs and particles and combinations of particles in Greek do appear more often in the beginning or end of strophes, while being rarer in the middle of them. This shows the translator's clear understanding of the thematic blocks in the speeches and their need to mark them. In some speeches, imperatives mark the beginning of several strophes, while in others they might be more at the end of strophes; again, more rarely are they used in the middle of strophes. Overall, the use of different transition markers helps to understand the way the OG translator perceived the structure of the speeches in the book of Job. Thanks to the abundant use of particles and adverbs in Greek, the translation preserves much clearer verse boundaries and often clearer strophic boundaries than the Hebrew (ch. 31 is the clearest example of this, with most of its strophes being conditional clauses).

Similes are a strong structuring poetic device both in Hebrew and in Greek. Out of the ten speeches, only Job 8 and 25 do not have any. Out of the rest, similes are definitely a structuring device in the Greek translations of Job 12–14, 15, 21, and 38–39. In Job 4–5 and 19 there are some ambiguities with the strophe-division; however, the similes still play a structuring role. In Greek 29–31, only one simile out of three is strictly structuring; in the Hebrew text, however, there are more similes and most of them are structuring. In 40–41 the concentration of similes is the largest, there are also several comparisons in both languages and some ungrammatical comparisons in Greek which cannot be considered under similes. The inconsistencies with their structural function are more frequent as

well. Still, in the second speech of God, similes play a structuring role several times; some are more ambiguous (inside the strophe or more on the latter half of the strophe). More often than not, similes are used to mark the end of a strophe, as an illustration to the topic just discussed. Similarly, the beginning of the strophe is marked with a simile and then followed up with the explanation or discussion. A couple of times, the end-of-strophe similes also mark the end of a speech or chapter within a speech: the end of chs. 12 and 13 in both Hebrew and Greek; and the end of ch. 29 in Hebrew and in Greek, although in Greek chapter ends sooner. Most similes in the OG translation are reflecting Hebrew, as a direct translation or a changed or paraphrased one. There are instances where the translator has created similes on their own (13:25, 38:28, 41:7, 41:22); however, they have also left similes untranslated (29:25) or changed them in a way that the verses no longer contain any (marked) similes (30:5, 30:14, 30:19, 38:14, 39:20, 40:18, 41:10). This shows that simile as a poetic device was familiar to the OG translator, enough so to create their own but also to just translate the Hebrew ones adequately. The speech in chs. 29–31 caused troubles on many levels, including the poetic, as can be seen from how many similes were not translated into Greek as similes. The nature of a simile, to illustrate, makes it convenient to use both as an introduction or conclusion to a certain topic.

In both languages, **strophes** are thus thematically coherent blocks of texts that are often formally delimited with the help of deviations from bicola and similes. However, in Greek, the role of monocola and tricola in delimiting strophes is far more distinctive than in Hebrew and it is obvious that the translator has used this technique consciously. Otherwise, the structural importance of these deviating verses would be too coincidental. Reflecting parallelistic structures, similes, and a large amount of the lexical repetitions speaks to the translator respecting the source text and following it quite closely. Still, repetitions are extended and added, sometimes even similes. Both Hebrew and Greek are abundant in marked vocabulary, thus the authors of both can be seen as educated and attempting to aim at a higher style, markedness, and the unusual – possibly to keep the listener or reader attentive and aware of the fact that the book of Job is not so ordinary. It is obvious that the translator stylised the text on the larger level, both by reflecting the Hebrew, but also improving upon it. As such, the way the translator operated on the macro-level in terms of translation and style are similar to the Proverbs-translator (as studied by Cook).

The translator was not consistent throughout and sometimes their efforts ended up with a strophe that has no formal integrity (see, for example, 15:2–3 with inconsistent tenses and 21:11–14 with several inconsistencies).

With that said, the general notion in previous scholarship that the Greek translation is not poetry can be agreed with. However, we can now confirm that the translator definitely knew they were translating poetry and more importantly strophic poetry. The translation is not poetry in the Greek sense, since metre is not used, nor is it poetry in the Hebrew sense, since colometry is not followed. There is no metre or a generally even syllabic count in verses and half-verses. Thus, we might call the speeches highly stylised prose, approaching poetry with

shorter (verses) and longer (strophes) units of text. The basic structure of these clauses and sentences was often followed from Hebrew, however, thrown out of balance by the very variable number of syllables in each colon and verse. The sentence structure follows more poetry than prose, more often than not having two or three very similar parts. Further, stichographical writing in the Greek manuscripts cannot have been a completely random thing to have happened. Based on the fact that the later codices are stichographic to the level of a colon and that the translator uses an abundance of particles in a large amount of the cola, gives reason to believe that this may have been a compensating technique in absence of metre or an equivalent to colometry. The translator does not break the Hebrew poetry and does not create new poetry completely but instead builds a different poetic system. Perhaps this was the norm for the Jewish-Greek polysystem in Alexandria, as has been argued by Dhont in her studies. All of this is convincing enough to conclude that the OG translation had *to approach poetry*, with its visibly demarcated short cola and stylistically marked macro-level units but *not be poetry* exactly by lacking metre.

For the *literary criticism of the Hebrew Job*, OG Job gives testament to the fact that not only is the strophic structure visible to today's scholars who have the capability and opportunity to format the text as they like, it was already visible to at least one of the ancient translators. Whatever their *Vorlage* manuscript looked like, the translator noticed, replicated, and independently strengthened, changed, or added where needed to the strophic structure. The ancient manuscripts most likely were not stichographic nor showed the division of larger units, while displaying a variety of difficult handwritings and possibly even corrupted sections, thus the fact that this structure was noticed so clearly, is remarkable.

In speeches, where the strophic structures of Greek and Hebrew differ greatly, we might question whether the OG translation reflects the translator's own stylisation based on what they could make out in the source text (text-critical issues) or whether this different stylisation and structure reflects an equally different poetic structure in the *Vorlage* (i.e. the *Vorlage* could attest to an intermediary stage of the Hebrew text, a pre-MT form that was shorter than and different from the MT). Thus, there is still plenty of ground to cover in future studies.

Style and value for textual criticism

There is no denying that Job is a difficult book, both textually and thematically. This is visible today, in the MT, but as previous studies have shown and this one has further proven, the pre-MT manuscripts, including the *Vorlage* of the OG translation, were just as difficult. Even though we do not possess any *Vorlagen* of ancient translations, the *Vorlage* of the OG has usually been deemed almost identical to the later MT.

Previous scholarship has been very critical in how much OG Job, deviating from the MT in many places, can be used for emending the text of MT Job. Studying the OG Job translation on the strophic level has shown that this is half-

true. The translation is a problematic but still important witness to the Hebrew text that was in circulation during the second century BCE.

Since the translator did work on the level of a strophe, they often made changes that not only affected the verse but the whole strophe. For that reason, very often, **the OG cannot help with emending the current MT** or finding out the possible form of the *Vorlage*. For example, the translator freely translates singular into plural or vice versa¹⁰⁵³, so that emendations based on that cannot be accepted unless several versions agree (e.g. in 5:18b)¹⁰⁵⁴. When looking at the whole strophe, more often than not, the change of number is made throughout either for unity or for better Greek style or simply because the one in Hebrew makes little sense in the context. Similarly, emendations of suffixes cannot readily be accepted because the translator freely omits them if the object or the subject is understandable in the strophe. Another common translation choice of the Greek translator was to transform Hebrew pronouns or pronominal suffixes into the Greek “to-be” verb (in 4:7a, 8:6a, 9a, 12a, 16a; 13:2b, 19a; 31:12a; 41:2b, 3b). In some of these cases, previous scholarship has claimed that the pronoun or suffix had been left untranslated.

Where OG Job, whose translator worked on the strophic level, can help us with emendations is in cases where several versions read the same word at variance with the MT. In these cases, we can assume that their *Vorlage(n)*, a pre-MT form, might have actually been different. However, especially in the case of P and Vg, which were made later, it is not impossible that their translators were aware of and consulted the Greek translation. Convergences with 11Q10 are more significant, however, as they were translated at a similar time. Following is a list of passages, where **a different pre-MT, including the OG *Vorlage***, could be possible and even probable.

- In 5:5b, thought to be secondary by some, several versions (Vg, Aquila, Symmachus) agree with the OG in opposition to the MT in translating מצרים instead of מצנים, suggesting that several pre-MT manuscripts had this reading.
- In 5:17a, OG, P, and Vg do not translate the interjection הנה, implying that some of the pre-MT manuscripts did not have the interjection and it was added later. It is unusual for the OG translator to omit a significant transition marker in the beginning of a strophe; thus, it is reasonable to think that it simply was not there in the *Vorlage*. Perhaps it was added later by a scribe or redactor.

¹⁰⁵³ For example, the collective or common singular and abstract nouns are very often translated with plural forms. The Hebrew “flesh” (בשר) is translated into plural in Greek (σάρκες); this form was already common in Homer. Body parts in dual are translated both with singular and plural and there does not seem to be a fixed strategy for them. A plural form which is often translated into singular, however, is for example, the phrase “my/his/their/etc. days” which is almost always translated with “my/his/their/etc. life”, except for in 38:21b.

¹⁰⁵⁴ However, Szpek 1992, 64–5 has noted that the P translator has translated a plural into singular 51 times and a singular to a plural 150 times. Therefore, changing number seems to have been a common enough technique amongst the ancient translators.

- In 5:18b, the pre-MT manuscripts (*Vorlagen* of OG, P, Vg) had the plural וִידֵי instead of the singular וִידֹ, corresponding to the *qere*.
- In 5:21a, OG, P, and Vg translated מְשׁוֹט instead of בְּשׁוֹט, implying that several pre-MT manuscripts had this reading. In the context of the strophe, the *mem*-preposition suits better, as it is used in preceding and succeeding cola.
- In 8:17, some pre-MT manuscripts may have read יִשְׁכְּבוּ instead of יִסְבְּכוּ, בֵּין instead of בֵּית, and יַחֲיֶה instead of יַחֲזֶה. All of these look to be in the *Vorlage* of the OG, while in those of P and Vg, we have some but not all of these readings. The strophe uses several phrases and words that denote positions, thus at least בֵּין is a very probable reading.
- In 8:20a, the *Vorlagen* of OG, P, and Vg may not yet have had הֵן at the beginning (cf. 5:17a). It is a transition marker and emphatic word that is not often left simply untranslated, especially so in the beginning of a strophe.
- V. 12:9 is considered a late addition due to several reasons (the use of יְהוָה, redundancy). The translator handled vv. 7, 8, and 10 as a strophe, making some adjustments for better flow and rhetorics, but leaving no trace of v. 9. The translator seldom leaves the God-name untranslated, and the verse has no difficult vocabulary otherwise, suggesting the possibility of v. 9 being so late that it was missing in the *Vorlage*.
- In 13:4a, thought to be part of a later gloss, the first word וְאוֹלָם might have been missing in some pre-MT manuscripts (*Vorlagen* of OG and Vg), since it is usually translated strongly in OG (cf. 5:17a, 8:20a with missing strong transition markers), especially in the beginning of a strophe.
- In 13:15a, several pre-MT manuscripts (*Vorlagen* of OG, P, Vg, Aquila) read לֹי (*qere*) instead of לֹא (*ketiv*).
- In 14:3b, thought to be part of a gloss, several pre-MT manuscripts (*Vorlagen* of OG, P, Vg) read וְאַתָּה instead of וְאַתִּי. Although both readings can make sense in the strophe, the versions are more united in not bringing Job personally into the conversation about the short-lived nature of man that is expressed in this and the surrounding strophes.
- In 15:15a, part of a later redaction, some pre-MT manuscripts (*Vorlagen* of OG, P, Vg) read the plural בְּקִדְשֵׁי (*qere*) instead of the singular בְּקִדְשׁוֹ (*ketiv*).
- In 15:32a, the *Vorlagen* of OG, P, and possibly Vg read תָּמַל instead of תִּמְלֹא. In the context of the dying plant imagery in this strophe, this reading makes sense.
- In 19:11b, the *Vorlagen* of OG, P, and Vg read the singular כָּצְרוּ instead of כָּצְרִיו. In the context, the singular makes the most sense as it refers to Job himself (him as an enemy).

- In 19:13, the translators of OG, P, and 11Q10 saw *הרחיקו ידעי* or *ידעי רחוקו* in their *Vorlagen*, the first word at the end of 13a, the second at the beginning of 13b instead of *הרחיק וידעי*. In the context of the strophe, this reading does not imply that God made Job's acquaintances distant from him but rather that they themselves all distanced themselves. God's direct action is mentioned in the previous strophe, but from this one, it is about the actions of other people against Job.
- In 19:20a, the *Vorlagen* of OG and Vg possibly read *רקבה* instead of *דבקה*. Rotting of the flesh and the accompanying smell would explain quite well why some of Job's acquaintances would abhor him.
- In 21:3b, the *Vorlagen* of OG, Vg, and possibly 11Q10 had the plural verb *תלעיגו* instead of the singular *תלעיג*. Since Job is conversing with several friends, the plural makes sense in the context.
- In 21:20a, the *Vorlagen* of OG, P, 11Q10, and Vg read *פידו* instead of *בידו*. In the context of the speech and the strophe, this reading makes sense.
- In 29:22b, the *Vorlagen* of OG and P might have read *טיטב* instead of *תטף*.
- In 38:7a, the *Vorlagen* of OG, and P might have read *ברא* instead of *ברן*. The aspect of creation makes sense in the context of the speech and the strophe.
- In 38:10a, part of a suspected later addition, the *Vorlagen* of OG, 11Q10, and possibly Vg might have read *חקים* instead of *חקי*. The whole strophe in MT lacks the personal suffix in first person, except here. Thus, it is possible that the pre-MT manuscripts had here the plural *חקים*, of which the final *mem* disappeared in the copying processes.
- In 38:24, the *Vorlagen* of OG, 11Q10, and P might have read *אד ויפץ* instead of *אור יפץ* at the junction of the two cola. Since vv. 22–30 deal with different states of water, the reading makes sense.
- In 39:22a, the *Vorlagen* of OG and Vg might not have had the phrase *ולא יחת*.
- In 40:25a, the *Vorlagen* of OG, 11Q10, and P might have read *תנין* instead of *לזיתן*.
- In 41:10a, some pre-MT manuscripts might have read the singular *עטישתו* instead of the plural *עטישתיו*.
- In 41:14b, the *Vorlagen* of OG, 11Q10, and Vg might have read *תרץ* or *תרוץ* instead of *דוץ*.
- In 41:26b, the *Vorlagen* of OG, 11Q10, and P probably read *שרץ* instead of *שחץ*. Since the creature's description do overlap with those of reptiles, the reading makes sense here.

Some differences can be due to the inconsistencies in writing *matres* in the *Vorlage* vs the later MT. From the translation choices, it looks like **the defective writing must have been a bit more prevalent in the *Vorlage***. All evidence

points to the fact that in the OG *Vorlage*, the form שלום “peace” did not exist, but rather שלם, which was interpreted as a verbal form in this translation (5:24a, 15:21b, 21:9a, 25:2b). Another example can be seen in 4:19c, which is thought to be a gloss by some redaction critics, where not having the mater (ידכאם) in the *Vorlage* caused a difference in the translation that explicitly makes God the one who strikes people and angels alike. In the strophe (4:17–21) this reading makes sense, as it deals with the lowliness of man before God. In 5:11a, the *Vorlage* may have read לשם instead of לשום, although the translator’s need for unity in the strophe could have caused the difference as well. In 15:23b, the *Vorlage* possibly read נכון instead of נבון, as is evident from the translation.

Many differences can be found that are rather due to vocalising the consonantal text differently than the later Masoretes. Very often, the vocalisation makes sense as it results in a coherent and well thought out translation. The consonantal text, by its nature, already contains different possible readings in itself. Since the translator paraphrased often in any case, it is hard to say whether they vocalised in one way or the other, even if possibilities are offered throughout this dissertation. Different vocalisation as compared to the later MT does not mean that the Masoretes were necessarily the ones who did it right, as sometimes several ancient versions arrive at similar translations that can be explained by a differing vocalisation. Therefore, the value of the OG translation for emending the MT vocalisation is generally not good, unless backed up with additional evidence from other versions.

The manuscript of the OG *Vorlage* was in some places quite difficult to read or possibly even corrupt as is evident from the frequent readings that are at variance with the MT. The translator used different strategies to deal with the difficulties. Firstly, they might just construct a verse on their own from the words they could make out and also condensing these words into shorter strophes. In some cases, the words they could understand or read made them use different parts of the LXX, such as the Pentateuch (for example 31:11 uses Leviticus, 38:14 uses Genesis, 38:36 uses Exodus), instead of constructing a verse completely on their own. This technique is often called anaphoric or associative translation. For example, in some cases if two readings from the consonants were possible, they decided to double-translate (for example the beginning of ch. 38). In cases such as these, OG can help us confirm at least some of the words in the underlying *Vorlage*, which triggered the different strategies.

To sum up, although it is true that the OG Job cannot be used very often to emend the MT, it can help us pinpoint where already the ancients faced troubles. Some previously proposed emendations (such as plural and singular variations and suffixes) cannot be confirmed due to the translator often changing number and omitting suffixes to suit the strophe better. However, with others, the context of the strophe does suggest that a different *Vorlage* might have been at play. In short, the fact that the translator worked on the strophic level, helps us estimate the plausibility of previously made emendations to the MT, rejecting some (or rating them more unlikely) while confirming others, and helps estimate the possible differences between the *Vorlage* and the MT.

Style and value for redaction criticism

There is an abundance of verses in these ten speeches that redaction critics consider later additions. Based on how the translator operated on the strophic level in both style and textual changes, the potential of OG Job for redaction criticism of Hebrew Job can be evaluated. For most, the OG translation cannot confirm nor reject their claims of the secondary nature of these verses. However, in some cases, we can make modest assumptions and conclusions.

In some cases, the growth of the Hebrew text after the translation can be assumed. These cases were discussed in the previous section, where the *Vorlage* might have been different from the MT, and in some cases, shorter. We might, thus, assume that some transition markers were missing in the pre-MT manuscripts in 5:17a, 8:20a, and 13:4a, and were added later for the flow of text. V. 12:9 was possibly missing altogether during the time of the translation.

The translator was oftentimes sensitive to abrupt transitions between topics or verses and felt the need to smooth them over. They were also sensitive to certain phrases or words being in an unsuitable positions. In some cases, but not always, these coincide with suspected later additions to Hebrew Job. Suspected later redactions could have been integrated to the Hebrew text noticeably or even badly, resulting in errors in further copying of the manuscripts. Very late additions to the Hebrew text might have not gone through enough stages of integration by the time of the translation and thus might have felt raw or otherwise out of place. Unsuitable phrases or words might also be a sign of later editors, who felt the need to add them to structure the text or to signal transitions, explanations, and such. Following are some notable examples of when the translator was noticeably disturbed by some suspected later additions.

- In ch. 4, namely the start of the vision description, caused issues. From the translator's standpoint, the narrative was not as smoothly integrated into the speech as it could have been. V. 12 in Hebrew must have been hard to read in the *Vorlage* and also had abruptness in it, so much so that the translator constructed three cola out of it, two of which (12a and b) serve as a conclusion to one strophe and the third (12c) as an introduction to the next. The end of the vision was also rewritten quite heavily. The vision itself may have contained possibly corrupt text, but also rare vocabulary. The vision narrative is thought to belong to the lowliness redaction, which is dated quite early in the literary growth of Job by Witte, Kaiser, but late by Syring (*Anthropologische Bearbeitung*), van Oorschot, and Nömmik. If we accept that the section was added later rather than earlier, it being incorporated badly by the time of translation would make sense. If it had been earlier, succeeding editors and scribes might have wanted to smooth the transition more. This smoothing was done by the OG translator.

- In 8:6b, seen as a later commentary or gloss by some, the phrase **כִּי עֵתָה** is omitted and the rest is paraphrased. This is one of the very few times that the translator leaves **כִּי עֵתָה** untranslated. If it was in the *Vorlage*, the translator thought it completely unsuitable in the middle of the verse and strophe and omitted it, while adjusting the rest of the colon.
- In 8:15, a suspected later gloss, was smoothed over and integrated into the strophe by the translator, by making it into a conditional clause.
- Issues with the *Vorlage* coincide with a larger insertion by one redactor, possibly majesty redactor, who added 12:7–13:2, and especially in even later glosses in vv. 12:3c–6 and 12:9. In Greek, the issues begin in the first strophes of ch. 12. The translator omits two cola in v. 3 and constructs two tricola out of vv. 4–6, translating bits and pieces of Hebrew (or what we currently have as the MT). P and Vg are in opposition to the MT in vv. 4–6 as well, suggesting some issues in pre-MT manuscripts in general. If indeed these verses are significantly later than others, they might have not been incorporated into the body of the speech well enough. V. 12:9 is considered a late addition due to several reasons (the use of **יְהוָה**, redundancy). The translator handled vv. 7, 8, and 10 as a strophe, making some adjustments for better flow and rhetorics, but leaving no trace of v. 9. The translator seldom leaves the God-name untranslated, and the verse has no difficult vocabulary otherwise, suggesting the possibility of v. 9 being so late that it was missing in the *Vorlage*. Vv. 12:20–21 might have been corrupted in several pre-MT manuscripts, including the OG *Vorlage*. No textual problems seem to arise after these verses in this suspected larger addition.
- In 15:11–13, part of lowliness redaction, the beginning might have been difficult to read or even corrupt in the *Vorlage*. In the translation, the first verse is significantly different and more accusing towards Job; v. 11 was not problematic in only the OG *Vorlage* but in the *Vorlage* of P and Vg as well, as they all differ here. We might then assume that just like in ch. 4, the beginning of a later addition (and in both cases lowliness redaction) was somehow in worse condition than the rest of it and so much so that it caused differences in translations.
- In 19:28–29, thought to be a later gloss by several redaction critics, the *Vorlage*, as does the MT, displayed several peculiarities, which the translator noticed and made adjustments to arrive at a concluding strophe to the speech, turning it into a warning to his friends.
- In vv. 30:1–8 (considered a late addition), the *Vorlage* was significantly corrupt or had issues with the integration of the later verses, caused by scribes. The translator translated bits and pieces in these verses, resulting in two strophes of questionable Greek and overall

quality. The translator did what they could with what they had (or could read out). The verses were in the *Vorlage*, but either in a very different or very corrupt form. Vv. 11–18, translated partly and completely omitting the Hebrew of 11b–14b and 16a, displays similar problems, although the bits and pieces in the first half are harder to identify than at the beginning of the speech. However, these verses are mostly thought to be from the original layer of Job, containing occasional glosses. The evidence from these two sections shows that the *Vorlage* was in an extremely bad condition regardless of the redactional layers and the translator reacted similarly, by putting together bits and pieces.

- In vv. 31:33–37, partly from a suspected later addition, the *Vorlage* must have been quite difficult or even corrupt, possibly due to the scribes who did not understand the additions. The translator had no choice but to construct verses from what they could read. The result is not perfect and indeed could have been much better considering how well the translator marked the strophes in this speech otherwise.

However, the translator constructed and adjusted verses also in passages that have not been identified as later additions (cf. the sections in ch. 30 discussed above). Thus, these actions speak more to the fact that the translator was sensitive to the problems of a difficult *Vorlage* and was concerned with delivering a sensible translation in sensible blocks (strophes). Further, the translator seemingly saw no issues in text nor in form in many of the suspected later additions and glosses.

Throughout the speeches, we see instances where the suspected later additions (mostly glosses) coincide with verses where the translator felt the need to change some statements, such as the too mild treatment of the impious in Hebrew ch. 21 (see for example vv. 21:16–18, where the translation reads almost like a curse). However, again, we may note the same adjustments in passages that have not been thought to be secondary (for example Job, in his speeches, emphasising the hurt that God has caused him). Thus, strengthening or lessening the force of some statements is a general technique for the translator and not necessarily them noticing a thematic irregularity brought in by a redactor.

That is not to say that the translator did not notice overarching themes in the book and the speeches. As was covered in the excursus on the lowliness redaction after the analysis of ch. 25, we discovered that the topic of man's lowliness was noticed by the translator. They even emphasised in some of these sections the fact that a human is not only pure but cannot ever purify themselves. The topic and related keywords were brought up independently in other sections of the book, where the underlying text was difficult, but the translator recognised some similarities.

Throughout the book of Job, the Greek translation has smaller and larger sections missing. In the speeches studied, the **larger minuses** are: 14:18–19 (five cola), 21:28–33 (13 cola), 29:19–20 (four cola), 29:24b–25 (four cola), 30:2–4a (six cola), 31:1–4 (eight cola), 38:26–27 (four cola), 39:3b–4 (four cola), and

39:13–18 (12 cola). The consensus thus far has been that these were omitted intentionally. Let us look at them together again to see if that can be confirmed.

- Vv. 14:18–19. From previous scholarship it had been established that these untranslated verses are similar to those in ch. 28, in that they contain natural phenomena that the translator avoids relating in Greek (so Cook). The first verse begins with וְאֵלֶּם, which the Greek translator always translated strongly and left untranslated only twice (here and in 13:4, where we assumed that it might have been missing from the *Vorlage*). Other than that, these verses have a couple of rare words but not enough that the translator could not have worked out the context. The translator did not leave any trace of these verses in the surrounding ones. Both Nömmik and Vermeylen think that vv. 14:18–22 are a late addition to the poem. In some of the verses, the consonantal text was read or vocalised differently than the later Masoretes did. Based on only Greek, we might then assume that vv. 18–19 were not added at the same time as vv. 20–22. Seeing how the speech has imagery in previous strophes, we cannot confidently say that the translator did not omit this particular one because it seemed redundant, but we also cannot say that a later redactor did not intend to add further imagery to the speech. The translator in general is not opposed to plant and nature imagery. Thus, we cannot identify anything in these verses that, besides redundancy, could have prompted an intentional omission. Although with no confidence, an assumption can be made that these verses were possibly missing in the *Vorlage*. The OG cannot give us a clear answer on the growth of the Hebrew text nor the *Vorlage* of the OG, but it can inform us on how the omission fits into the general context of omissions in the OG translation and thus, redaction critics can take into account the possibility of vv. 18–19 being so late that they were not yet in the *Vorlage*, when creating and adjusting their models.
- Vv. 21:28–33, a total of 13 cola, are missing from the OG translation. This section, with the exception of v. 33c, is thought to have been original to the Job-poem by Witte, Kaiser, Nömmik but coming from *rédaction* III (second to last) by Vermeylen. While vv. 27 and 34 are incorporated and shortened with numerous changes into a monocolon and a bicolon, concluding the speech, there is no trace of vv. 28–33 in the OG text. The keywords in the missing section have not been avoided by the translator elsewhere, nor are there too many rare words that could have obscured the meaning for the translator. It is as if they were not even there. Taking into account all of the differences between Greek and the later MT, the *Vorlage* manuscript must have been either quite damaged or badly written or most of this section happened to be in a spot that was easily missed by the reader (perhaps added later, incorporated badly by later scribes, and thus

easy to miss or skip over). In the end, the translator managed to turn vv. 27 and 34 into a very competent conclusion to the speech. In a way, this case is similar to the omission of 12:9, where the strophe had no trace of it all, and the omission in ch. 14, where no traces of it are left behind either. The difference lies in the fact that the omission in ch. 14 was between two strophes. It is not out of the realm of possibilities that this section simply was not there in the *Vorlage*, as there is no trace of it at all in Greek.

- Vv. 29:19–20 are not translated explicitly. However, v. 19 has a tree-motif (roots, branches) that can explain the translation of 18b (ὥσπερ στέλεχος φοίνικος “like the trunk of a palm tree”). Therefore, in these verses we might see evidence of intentional shortening by the translator, leaving traces of the omitted part in the translation. Both Witte and Kaiser think that vv. 17–20 were added later to the poem. Although the translator read v. 18 in a way that allowed them to retain the tree-motif from vv. 19–20, the rest did not cause them difficulties. Thus, we may safely assume that if these verses were added later to the poem, they were not added so late as to be missing from the *Vorlage*.
- Vv. 29:24b–25. There is no rare vocabulary here that would give difficulties to the translator. Therefore, the omission might be more ideological or personal; possibly not wanting to portray Job as a king. Further, the simile at the end of the previous strophe is made more explicit and marked in Greek, signalling also the end of a larger unit. Perhaps the translator noticed that v. 25 had a simile but objected to the notion of portraying Job as a king, and to compensate, made the simile in v. 23 fuller. V. 25c is thought to be a gloss by Witte, Nömmik, and Fohrer, although Witte does raise the possibility that the tricolon was an intentional way to mark the end of Job 29. Kaiser sees the whole of v. 25 as a gloss. When we take into account that the first part of ch. 30 is textually very difficult, the textual issues might have already started here in ch. 29 and the translator could not make out enough of the text to construct a strophe. Therefore, this is one of the cases where the OG again cannot give us any answers on the growth of the Hebrew text or the *Vorlage* of the translation. However, once again, it can inform us on how the omission fits into the general context of omissions in the OG translation and thus, text and redaction critics can take it into account when building their models. To put simply: emphasising of the simile before this section (marking the end of the chapter) and the possibility of not wanting to portray Job as an actual king speak for intentional omission, while the textual issues at the beginning of ch. 30 speak for forced omission (the translator could not make out the text).
- Vv. 30:2–4 are thought to be part of a later addition by Witte, van Oorschot, and Vermeylen and so late that they were missing from the

Vorlage of the OG translation by Nömmik. Based on the OG translation of vv. 1–4 we can say that the verses in question were not missing from the *Vorlage*, at least not completely. V. 2 was completely untranslated; however, vv. 3 and 4 were translated partly in what is numbered as v. 4 in LXX^{Zi}. The translation strategies in these verses match those of several other strophes in ch. 30 and in ch. 12, where bits and pieces of Hebrew, more specifically when taking the current MT as comparison, were translated and often paraphrased. The large amount of rare vocabulary, possible glosses in Hebrew, and corruption in the *Vorlage* manuscript (pre-MT manuscripts?) could be behind the omissions and the parts that are translated. It is possible that since these additions were so late and part of them were not even in the *Vorlage* yet, the fragments that the translator saw were actually more coherent than now seems. The most we can tell from OG is that vv. 2–4 were partly in the *Vorlage*, but possibly in a much shorter and different form.

- Vv. 31:1–4 are thought to have possibly been missing from the *Vorlage* by Nömmik, whereas Witte, van Oorschot, and Kaiser think that vv. 1–3 were added later. The translator has skipped over this section completely, leaving no trace in the translation. The non-translation does not ruin the integrity of the speech, the following strophe, nor the transition between chs. 30 and 31. The translator does not leave sections with God-names in it untranslated very often; however, passages to do with God counting Job's steps are subject to changes and omissions as well as passages to do with making a covenant. Again, the section barely has any rare vocabulary that could have obscured the meaning for the translator. In this case, it cannot be confirmed nor denied that the section was missing from the *Vorlage*, as there are some topics mentioned here that the translator might have objected to. However, it is the fact that not a trace of them has been included in the OG, which can give us reason to think that perhaps they were missing in the *Vorlage* at the time of translation.
- Vv. 38:26–27. Previous scholarship has claimed that the Greek translator left these verses out intentionally in order to condense the text and that the translator may have felt they were redundant. V. 26 has been left partly untranslated in 11Q10, possibly due to redundancy. Nömmik thinks that vv. 26–27 are late *Fortschreibungen* or even glosses that rely on the book editor's work (stage one of redactions) and deal with wild nature. Kaiser sees vv. 27–28 as being from the righteousness redaction. The probability of intentional omission is definitely strong here as the translator has left a trace of v. 26 in v. 25a and probably did not want to turn these verses into questions to fit them with the rest of the strophe and speech. We might then assume that the OG translator did not like the sudden infinitive phrases in the midst of strophes with questions and opted

for omission. Whether knowingly or not, they noticed that something about these (supposed) later additions was wrong in the context. They left a trace of the verses and left out everything else.

- Vv. 39:3b–4, by current LXX numbering, is asterisked. However, when studying the strophe (vv. 1–3), it was discovered that the translator actually did translate Hebrew vv. 3b and 4a, but left vv. 1a, 2b, 3a, and 4b untranslated. According to Nömmik, vv. 3–4 belong to late *Fortschreibungen* or are partly even later glosses that rely on the book editor's work (stage one of redactions) and Witte thinks that vv. 1a and 4a were originally a bit shorter. The *Vorlage* definitely was problematic in this strophe. Whether the translator shortened it intentionally or due to issues of readability, cannot be said with certainty as the strategies of translation here correspond to both intentional omissions seen elsewhere but also constructing a meaningful strophe out of bits and pieces of Hebrew, they could make out (such as in chs. 12 and 30). The fact that 11Q10 and P translate all the verses (albeit P shortens) would suggest that at least some pre-MT manuscripts had the full text in a more readable state, whereas the manuscript that the OG translator used was more problematic. Still, the efforts of the translator can be seen, as the result is a clear and concise strophe made up of questions. Based on the translation choices, it looks like vv. 1b and 2a were less problematic, while the other two were more so. Thus, this section is an example of how the translator dealt with a section that was hard to read and repetitive. We might theorise that these verses were added later to the Hebrew poem but was integrated badly by later scribes, leading to confusion in some pre-MT manuscripts. The fact that the translator worked on the strophe-level can help us adjust the numbering of the verses of the OG text.
- The ostrich-passage in 39:13–18, having 12 cola in total, is thought to have been later (Witte, Kaiser, Syring, van Oorschot) or even so late that it was missing from the *Vorlage* (Nömmik). All the other omissions and minuses in the speeches of God are significantly shorter than this. Most of the words in the strophe were known to the translator; however, the number of rare words is more significant than in the previously discussed missing sections. The strophe consists of statements and facts instead of questions (see the omission of 38:26–27) and the surrounding creatures are animals not birds. Thus, it may have been a bit difficult for the translator but also simply not fitting here and the translator chose not to translate. Since the translator also left no trace of this section in the surrounding strophes, the OG alone cannot give us an answer whether it was missing from the *Vorlage*. Assuming that a later addition was different in topic and form, the translator could have instinctively left it out, instead of trying to make it fit and turn it into questions.

To sum up, the translator sometimes omitted sections that they did not like or found redundant but still left a trace of them elsewhere. In these cases, we can confirm that the verses were in the *Vorlage* and omitted intentionally. However, in cases where a translator left out several verses without a trace, we cannot be so sure. Later additions might have been objectionable and thus omitted; if they were so late that they were not even there in the *Vorlage*, they cannot have been translated. In some cases, like the ostrich-passage, the omissions might have been intentional because the verses simply do not fit. As the section is also long, the translator might have felt lazy and opted for omission instead of changing the form into questions. Each assumption of a section missing in the *Vorlage* has to be studied in a way that takes into account the translator's strategies elsewhere, in the context of strophes. In short, the OG translation can give us some answers on some larger omissions or sections that have been deemed younger than the *Vorlage*, while with others, further research is needed.

In conclusion, the OG translation's *value for redaction criticism* is not immense, but it is also not negligible. With the help of OG and its translator, we can confirm that some sections, suspected to be so young that they were missing from the *Vorlage*, were definitely there. In other sections, the OG can indicate that perhaps some sections that are thought to be original to the poem, might actually be younger (e.g. the end of ch. 21). Due to the translator's consistent stylisation of strophes, some sections where the *Vorlage* was shorter by a word (mostly transition markers) were identified. We can also say that the translator also noticed overarching themes in the book, such as the lowliness redaction, although they probably did not associate these themes with different authors. What this confirms is that the book of Job does and has contained in it distinguishable themes that did not go unnoticed by the OG translator.

This dissertation proves that the translator was sensitive to textual issues in their *Vorlage*, whether these are related to suspected later additions and glosses or not. Most importantly, we can confirm that in most cases the *Vorlage* of OG Job was essentially the same text as MT Job, already containing many of the suspected expansions, irregularities, and complexities we see today. The *Vorlage* was unpointed and ambiguous, had fewer *matres* than MT, and was already complex in the second century BCE. The translator's divergences are overwhelmingly due to interpretive, stylistic, and poetic choices—not a radically different Hebrew source. Where the *Vorlage* was very difficult or corrupt, in the majority of the cases, the translator opted to still construct meaningful verses and strophes out of bits and pieces, rather than omit them. Larger omissions seemed rather to be due to redundancy or unsuitability of the contents rather than textual difficulties.

Greek text

Although the inaccuracies of how the OG text is currently shown in published editions are noted throughout this dissertation, finding solutions was not an aim that was set from the start. However, after analysing ten speeches, and altogether

17 chapters, it is clear, that some things can be changed in future editions. Verification and numbering needs to be updated as the current system is misleading and does not take into account the fact that the translator shortened some strophes, taking bits and pieces from several verses. Some examples of sections where the numbering needs to be updated are: 29:10–11, 29:13, 30:2–4, 39:2–3. The criticism that has already been voiced by others, is to avoid setting OG and other translations together, especially punctuating and numbering them in a matter that still follows Hebrew.

Further research

This dissertation followed a mix of methods to study both the OG and the MT of Job. Although this type of approach is experimental and not without its flaws, it lays preliminary groundwork for future studies. Considerably more work needs doing in studying the style of OG Job on the macro-level, that is strophes, and why not even collections of strophes (stanzas, cantos), and this style connection to the suspected redactional layers. That is not to say that all micro-level studies have now run their course and cannot provide any insights anymore.

Use of the LXX translations for dealing with text critical issues of the Hebrew texts has been done before and is still being done. A greater focus on the translation on the macro-level, whether they are strophes in biblical poetry or paragraphs in prose, and this macro-level working being related to textual problems in the Hebrew text could produce interesting findings. Both verse-by-verse translations that have been considered very isomorphic and translations that are seen as more literary and freer could be subject to this type of new paradigm in studying the LXX corpus.

SUMMARY

This dissertation, titled “Style of Old Greek Job. Its value for textual, literary, and redaction criticism of Hebrew Job” studied ten speeches in the Old Greek (OG) translation of the book of Job, considered the first translation and interpretation of it, in a multifaceted and experimental way. It attempted to find whether and how the translator’s stylistic and poetic efforts reflect the state of the Hebrew text in the second century BCE.

The dissertation is structured around these chosen speeches chosen for study, i.e. chs. 4–5, 8, 12–14, 15, 19, 21, 25, 29–31, 38–39, and 40–41. These speeches were chosen for several reasons. Firstly, in both Greek and Hebrew, they represent varied stages of textual difficulties. For example, ch. 8 contains no asterisked passages and also has less textual problems in the Hebrew; chs. 4–5, 15, and 25 contain passages from the lowliness redaction (*à la Witte*) and have therefore characteristics to compare. Chs. 19 and 21 contain interesting theological discussion points and ch. 21 also has a large minus in OG that surprisingly has not been considered secondary by redaction critics. Chs. 29–31 were chosen because of how different the three chapters in one speech are and especially because ch. 30 is notoriously difficult and the Greek translation has major divergencies. The speeches of God were chosen as a certain control group as previous scholarship has emphasised the fact that the translator’s omissions waned in these. Overall, the choice of speeches under study reflects a variety in terms of textual problems in Hebrew, asterisked passages in Greek, and overall length, giving the perfect opportunity to survey the translator’s activities across the multilayered source-text.

The study established that, although not poetry in the classical sense, the Old Greek translation of Job is poetically stylised and structured in strophes, both reflecting the structure that can be seen in the current Masoretic Text (MT) but also deviating from it. It was further found that when introducing changes into the text, the translator more often than not, took the whole strophe or even several strophes into account.

For the *literary criticism of the Hebrew Job*, OG Job gives testament to the fact that not only is the strophic structure visible to today’s scholars who have the capability and opportunity to format the text as they like, it was already visible to at least one of the ancient translators, the OG translator. Whatever their *Vorlage* manuscript looked like, the translator noticed, replicated, and independently strengthened, changed, or added where needed to the strophic structure. The ancient manuscripts most likely were not stichographic nor showed the division of larger units, while displaying a variety of difficult handwritings and possibly even corrupted sections, thus the fact that this structure was noticed so clearly, is remarkable.

In speeches where the strophic structures of Greek and Hebrew differ greatly, we might question whether the OG translation reflects the translator’s own stylisation based on what they could make out in the source text (text-critical issues) or whether this different stylisation and structure reflects an equally

different poetic structure in the *Vorlage* (i.e. the *Vorlage* could attest to an intermediary stage of the Hebrew text, a pre-MT form that was shorter than and different from the MT). Thus, there is still plenty of ground to cover in future studies.

There is no denying that Job is a difficult book, both textually and thematically. This is visible today, in the MT, but as previous studies have shown and this one has further proven, the pre-MT manuscripts, including the *Vorlage* of the OG translation, were just as difficult. Even though we do not possess any *Vorlagen* of ancient translations, the *Vorlage* of the OG has usually been deemed almost identical to the later MT. Previous scholarship has been very critical in how much OG Job, deviating from the MT in many places, can be used for emending the text of MT Job. Studying the OG Job translation on the strophic level has shown that this is half-true. The translation is a problematic but still important witness to the Hebrew text that was in circulation during the second century BCE.

Although it is true that the OG Job cannot be used very often *for the textual criticism of the Hebrew text* and to emend the MT, it can help us pinpoint where already the ancients faced troubles. Some previously proposed emendations (such as plural and singular variations and suffixes) cannot be confirmed due to the translator often changing number and omitting suffixes to suit the strophe better. However, with some others, the context of the strophe does suggest that a different *Vorlage* might have been at play. In short, the fact that the translator worked on the strophic level, helps us estimate the plausibility of previously made emendations to the MT, rejecting some (or rating them more unlikely) while confirming others, and helps estimate the possible differences between the *Vorlage* and the MT.

The book of Job, according to redaction critics, grew over several centuries to the form that we now witness in the Masoretic Text. The OG translation's *value for redaction criticism* is not immense, but it is also not negligible. With the help of OG and its translator, we can confirm that some sections, suspected to be so young that they were missing from the *Vorlage*, were definitely there. In other sections, the OG can indicate that perhaps some sections that are thought to be original to the poem, might actually be younger (e.g. the end of ch. 21). Due to the translator's consistent stylisation of strophes, some sections where the *Vorlage* was shorter by a word (mostly transition markers) were identified. We can also say that the translator also noticed overarching themes in the book, such as the lowliness redaction, although they probably did not associate these themes with different authors. What this confirms is that the book of Job does and has contained in it distinguishable themes that did not go unnoticed by the OG translator.

This dissertation proves that the translator was sensitive to textual issues in their *Vorlage*, whether these are related to suspected later additions and glosses or not. Most importantly, we can confirm that in most cases the *Vorlage* of OG Job was essentially the same text as MT Job, already containing many of the suspected expansions, irregularities, and complexities we see today. The *Vorlage* was unpointed and ambiguous, had fewer *matres* than the MT, and was already complex in the second century BCE. The translator's divergences are over-

whelmingly due to interpretive, stylistic, and poetic choices—not a radically different Hebrew source. Where the *Vorlage* was very difficult or corrupt, in the majority of the cases, the translator opted to still construct meaningful verses and strophes out of bits and pieces, rather than omit them. Larger omissions seemed rather to be due to redundancy or unsuitability of the contents rather than textual difficulties.

REFERENCES

- Aejmelaeus, A. 1987. "What Can We Know about the Hebrew Vorlage of the Septuagint?" *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 99 (1) (January 1):58–89. <https://doi.org/10.1515/zatw.1987.99.1.58>
- Alonso Schökel, L. 1988. *A Manual of Hebrew Poetics*. Subsidia Biblica 11. Roma: Pontificio Istituto Biblico.
- Althann, R. 2009. "Job 3 in the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint." *Orientalia* 78 (3):348–57. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43077966> Last accessed 01/08/2026.
- Beeckman, B. 2020. "Unitas Vegetabilium?: The Greek Rendering of Hebrew Floral, Plant and Herb Names in LXX-Proverbs and LXX-Job." *Journal of Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 53:19–41. <https://doi.org/10.2143/JSCS.53.0.3289023>
- . 2022a. "Absentia Nominum Sacrorum in Libro Iob: The Examination of אֵלֹהִים in Job without Counterpart in the LXX." *Biblische Zeitschrift* 66 (1) (January 18):16–30. <https://doi.org/10.2143/BIB.103.4.3291464>
- . 2022b. "Nomina Sacra in Libro Iob: Theological Exegesis in Verses of Job LXX Containing ὁ Θεός and ὁ Κύριος without Any Counterpart in MT?" *Vetus Testamentum* 73 (1) (February 28):1–27. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1163/15685330-bja10089>
- . 2024. *One or Two Translators?: Translation Technique and Theology of LXX Proverbs and Its Relation to LXX Job*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft. De Gruyter.
- Berlin, A. 2008. *The Dynamics of Biblical Parallelism*. Revised and Expanded Edition. Biblical resource series. Grand Rapids, Michigan ; Cambridge, United Kingdom: William B. Eerdmans.
- Brogan, T.V.F. 2012. "Isocolon and Parison." Ed. Stephen Cushman, Clare Cavanagh, Jahan Ramazani, and Paul Rouzer. *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics, Fourth Edition*. Princeton: University Press.
- Büchner, D. 2017. *The SBL Commentary on the Septuagint: An Introduction*. Septuagint and cognate studies series ; no. 67. Atlanta: SBL Press.
- Clines, D.J.A. 2015. *Job 1–20, Volume 17*. Word biblical commentary. Zondervan.
- Cook, J. 2002. "Unit Delimitation in the Book of Proverbs: In the Light of the Septuagint of Proverbs." In *Studies in Scriptural Unit Division*, edited by Marjo C. A. Korpel and Josef M. Oesch, 46–65.
- . 2010. "Are the Additions in LXX Job 2,9a-e to Be Deemed as the Old Greek Text?" *Biblica* 91 (2):275–84. <https://doi.org/10.2143/BIB.91.2.3188866>
- . 2011. "The Profile and Some Theological Aspects of the Old Greek of Job – Resurrection and Life after Death as Points in Case." *Old Testament Essays* 24 (2):324–45.
- . 2013. "The Provenance of the Old Greek Job." In *XIV Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Helsinki, 2010*, edited by Melvin K. H. Peters, 73–92. *Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 59. Society of Biblical Literature.
- Cox, C.E. 1987. "The Wrath of God Has Come to Me: Job's First Speech According to the Septuagint." *Studies in Religion/Sciences Religieuses* 16 (2) (June):195–204. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000842988701600206>
- . 1991. "Job's Concluding Soliloquy: Chh 29-31." In *VII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Leuven 1989*, edited by Claude E. Cox, 325–39. *Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 31. Atlanta: Scholars Press

- . 2005. "Tying It All Together: The Use of Particles in Old Greek Job." *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 38:41–54.
- . 2006. "The Historical, Social, and Literary Context of Old Greek Job." In *XII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies Leiden, 2004*, 105–16. *Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 54. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- . 2009. "Job." In *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*, edited by Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright, 667–96. New York ; Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2014. "Does a Shorter Hebrew Parent Text Underlie Old Greek Job." In *In the Footsteps of Sherlock Holmes: Studies in the Biblical Text in Honour of Anneli Aejmelaeus*, edited by Kristen De Troyer, T. Michael Law, and Marketta Liljeström, 451–62. Leuven, Paris, Walpole MA: Peeters.
- . 2015a. "Job." In *The T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint*, edited by James K. Aitken, 385–400. Bloomsbury companions. London: T & T Clark.
- . 2015b. "The Text of Old Greek Job: A History of Its Transmission (Provisional Copy)." . https://www.academia.edu/9585809/_The_Text_of_Old_Greek_Job_a_History_of_its_Transmission Last accessed 01/08/2026.
- . 2016a. "'Ipsissima Verba': The Translator's Actual Words" in Old Greek Job and What They Tell Us about the Translator and the Nature of the Translation." *Journal of Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 49:61–81.
- . 2016b. "Old Greek Job 42 – A Surprise at the End of the Road: Intertextual Connections between the Epilogue and the Prologue Introduced by the Translator." In *Septuagint, Sages, and Scripture*, edited by Randall X. Gauthier, Gideon Kotzé, and Gert Steyn, 180–9. *Vetus Testamentum Supplements* 172. Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- . 2017. "Septuagint." In *Textual History of the Bible Vol. 1C*, edited by Armin Lange and Emanuel Tov, 175–81. Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- . 2021. "The Translator's Commitment to Preserving an Element of the Linguistic Makeup of the Source Text in Old Greek Job: Hebraisms." *Journal of Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 54:151–6.
- . 2022. "How the Translator of Old Greek Job Understood Job's Suffering." In *XVII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Aberdeen, 2019*, edited by Gideon R. Kotzé, Michaël N. van der Meer, and Martin Rösel, 635–63. 1st ed. *Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 76. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- . 2023. "Biography of a Translator: Personal Details That the Translator Reveals in the Course of Producing the Old Greek Translation of Job." *Like Nails Firmly Fixed (Qoh 12:11)*:243–60.
- . n.d. "Old Greek Job: The Translation of Thematic Blocks of Text That Have as Their Subjects 1. the Lord; 2. Mere Mortals; 3. the Impious; and 4. the Just and Restored." . https://www.academia.edu/31953352/Old_Greek_Job_The_translation_of_thematic_blocks_of_text_that_have_as_their_subjects_1_the_Lord_2_mere_mortals_3_the_impious_and_4_the_just_and_restored?source=swp_share Last accessed 01/08/2026
- Cuddon, J.A. 1999. *The Penguin Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory*. 4th ed. / revised by C.E. Preston. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Dafni, E.G. 2006. "ΝΟΥΣ in Der Septuaginta Des Hiobbuches. Zur Frage Nach Der Rezeption Der Homerepik Im Hellenistischen Judentum." *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Period* 37 (1):35–54.

- <https://www.jstor.org/stable/24669679> Last accessed 01/08/2026.
- . 2007. “Ἐπιτομή. A Favourite Word of Homer in the Septuagint Version of Job.” *Verbum et Ecclesia* 28 (1) (November 17):35–65. <https://doi.org/10.4102/ve.v28i1.96>
- De Wilde, A. 1981. *Das Buch Hiob*. Oudtestamentische studien 22. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Dhont, M. 2014a. “The word διαίτα in LXX Job.” *Journal of Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 47:48–58.
- . 2014b. “A New Look at the LXX Rendering of Job 20,25.” *Zeitschrift Für Die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 126 (1) (April 1):111–6. <https://doi.org/10.1515/zaw-2014-0010>
- . 2016a. “Literary Features in the First Cycle of Speeches of LXX Job.” In *XV Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Munich, 2013*, edited by Wolfgang Kraus, Michaël N. van der Meer, and Martin Meiser, 361–78. Septuagint and Cognate Studies 64. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- . 2016b. “Double Translation in Old Greek Job.” In *Die Septuaginta - Orte Und Intentionen: 5. Internationale Fachtagung Veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 24.–27. Juli 2014*, edited by Siegfried Kreuzer, Martin Meiser, and Marcus Sigismund, 361:475–90. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 361. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- . 2018a. *Style and Context of Old Greek Job*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 183. Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- . 2018b. “The Cultural Outlook of Old Greek Job: A Reassessment of the Notion of Hellenization.” In *Die Septuaginta – Geschichte, Wirkung, Relevanz: 6. Internationale Fachtagung Veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 21.-24. Juli 2016*, edited by Martin Meiser, Michaela Geiger, Siegfried Kreuzer, and Marcus Sigismund, 618–30. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 405. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Dhorme, É. 1967. *A Commentary on the Book of Job*. London: Nelson.
- Driver, S.R., and G.B. Gray. 1921. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Job: Together with a New Translation*. The international critical commentary. New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons.
- Eckstein, J.M. 2015. *Kurz- Oder Langvorlage?: Anwendung Des Idiolekttests Auf Die in Der Griechischen Textüberlieferung Asterisierten Passagen Des Ijobbuches*. Arbeiten zu Text und Sprache im Alten Testament. St. Ottilien: EOS Verlag.
- . 2018. “The Idiolect Test and the Vorlage of Old Greek Job: A New Argument for an Old Debate.” *Vetus Testamentum* 68 (2) (March 16):197–219. <https://doi.org/10.1163/15685330-12341322>
- Emde Boas, E. van. 2019. *Cambridge Grammar of Classical Greek*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Fernández Marcos, N. 1994. “The Septuagint Reading of the Book of Job.” In *The Book of Job*, edited by W. A. M. Beuken, 251–66. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 114. Leuven: Leuven University Press, Uitgeverij Peeters.
- . 2000. *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Version of the Bible*. Leiden, Boston, Köln: Brill.
- Fohrer, G. 1963. *Das Buch Hiob*. Kommentar zum Alten Testament Band 16. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn.
- Fokkelman, J.P. 2012. *The Book of Job in Form: A Literary Translation with Commentary*. Studia Semitica Neerlandica 58. Leiden: Brill.

- Fresch, C.J. 2021. "The Septuagint and Discourse Grammar." In *T&T Clark Handbook of Septuagint Research*, edited by William A. Ross and W. Edward Glenny, 79–93. London: T&T Clark.
- Gammie, J.G. 1985. "The Angelology and Demonology in the Septuagint of the Book of Job." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 56:1–19.
- . 1987. "The Septuagint of Job: Its Poetic Style and Relationship to the Septuagint of Proverbs." *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 49 (1):14–31.
- García Martínez, F., and E.J.C. Tigchelaar, eds. 1999. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*. Leiden, New York: Brill.
- García Martínez, F., E.J.C. Tigchelaar, A.S. van der Woude, and J.P.M. van der Ploeg. 1998. *Qumran Cave 11. Discoveries in the Judaean desert* 23. Oxford: Clarendon press.
- Gard, D.H. 1953. "The Concept of Job's Character According to the Greek Translator of the Hebrew Text." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 72 (3):182–6.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/3262058>
- . 1954. "The Concept of the Future Life According to the Greek Translator of the Book of Job." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 73 (3):137–43.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/3261726>
- . 1967. *The Exegetical Method of the Greek Translator of the Book of Job*. Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Gehman, H.S. 1949. "The Theological Approach of the Greek Translator of Job 1-15." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 68 (3):231–40. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3261330>
- Gentry, P.J. 1995. *The Asterisked Materials in the Greek Job*. Septuagint and cognate studies series / Society of Biblical Literature 38. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- . 1998. "The Asterisked Materials in the Greek Job and the Question of the Kaige Recension." *Textus* 19 (1) (August 19):141–56.
<https://doi.org/10.1163/2589255X-01901012>
- Gerleman, G. 1946. *Studies in the Septuagint I. Book of Job*. Lund: Gleerup.
- Gorea, M. 2007. *Job Repensé Ou Trahi?: Ommissions et Raccourcis de La Septante*. Études bibliques 56. Paris: Gabalda.
- . 2021. "The Book of Job." In *The Oxford Handbook of the Septuagint*, edited by Alison G. Salvesen and Timothy Michael Law, 369–83. Oxford: University Press.
- Gray, J. 1974. "The Massoretic Text of the Book of Job, the Targum and the Septuagint Version in the Light of the Qumran Targum (11 QtargJob)." *Zeitschrift Für Die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 86 (3):331–50.
<https://doi.org/10.1515/zatw.1974.86.3.331>
- . 2010. *The Book of Job* Ed. David J. A. Clines. Text of the Hebrew Bible 1. Sheffield: Phoenix.
- Habel, N.C. 1985. *The Book of Job: A Commentary*. The Old Testament library. Philadelphia: Westminster Press.
- Häberlein, M. *Speaking to Job in Greek: Text, Translation Technique, Literary and Theological Profile of OG Job 38:1–42:6*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter.
- Haralambakis, M. 2012. "The Fate of the Poetry and Prose in the Reception of Literature about Job." *Scripta & E-Scripta* (10–11):203–26.
- Hartley, J.E. 1988. *The Book of Job*. New international commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.
- Hatch, E. 1889. *Essays in Biblical Greek*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- Heater, H. 1982. *A Septuagint Translation Technique in the Book of Job*. Catholic Biblical quarterly. Monograph series 11. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association.
- Jobling, D. 2001. "Methods of Modern Literary Criticism." In *The Blackwell Companion to the Hebrew Bible*, edited by Leo G. Perdue, 19–35. Oxford, Malden: Blackwell Publishers.
- Jones, J.B. 2021. *Translation and Style in the Old Greek Psalter: What Pleases Israel's God*. Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- Kaiser, O. 2006. *Das Buch Hiob: übersetzt und eingeleitet*. Stuttgart: Radius.
- Kepper, M., and M. Witte. 2011. "Job. Das Buch Ijob / Hiob." *Septuaginta Deutsch ; Bd. 2: Psalmen bis Daniel*:2041–126.
- Kooij, A.V. der. 2008. "Textual Criticism." In *The Oxford Handbook of Biblical Studies*, 579–90. Oxford: University Press.
- Kugel, J.L. 1998. *The Idea of Biblical Poetry: Parallelism and Its History*. Baltimore, London: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Kwon, J.J. 2019. "Rewritten Theology in the Greek Book of Job." *Biblica* 100 (3):339–52. <https://doi.org/10.2143/BIB.100.3.3286871>
- Lausberg, H. 1998. *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric: A Foundation for Literary Studies*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Law, T.M. 2013. *When God Spoke Greek: The Septuagint and the Making of the Christian Bible*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Linafelt, T. 2016. *The Hebrew Bible as Literature: A Very Short Introduction*. Very short introductions 478. New York: Oxford University Press.
- . 2021. "Why Is There Poetry in the Book of Job?" *Journal of Biblical Literature* 140 (4):683–701. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jbl.2021.0032>
- Loretz, O., and I. Kottsieper. 1987. *Colometry in Ugaritic and Biblical Poetry: Introduction, Illustrations and Topical Bibliography*. Ugaritisch-biblische Literatur 5. Altenberge: CIS-Verlag.
- Lowth, R. 1753. *De sacra poesi Hebraeorum : praelectiones academiae Oxonii habitae*. Oxonii: E Typographeo Clarendoniano.
- Lozada, F. 2023. "Literary Criticism." In *The New Cambridge Companion to Biblical Interpretation*, edited by Ian Boxall and Bradley C. Gregory, 73–90. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- van der Lugt, P. 1995. *Rhetorical Criticism and the Poetry of the Book of Job*. Oudtestamentische studiën 32. Leiden: Brill.
- Lust, J., E. Eynikel, and K. Hauspie. 2003. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- Maehler, H. 2004. "Books, Greek and Roman." In *The Oxford Companion to Classical Civilization*, edited by Simon Hornblower and Antony Spawforth, 120–4. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mangin, D. 2005. *Le Texte Court de La Version Grecque Du Livre de Job et La Double Interprétation Du Personnage Jusqu'au Iie Siècle*. These de doctorat, Université d'Aix-Marseille-1.
- Mangum, D. 2018. "The Biblical Hebrew Idiom 'Lift the Face' in the Septuagint of Job." *HTS Theologiese Studies / Theological Studies* 74 (3) (July 31):1–6. <https://doi.org/10.4102/hts.v74i3.5025>
- Margolis, M.L. 1917. *The Story of Bible Translations*. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America.

- Mazur, K. 2012. "Repetition." Ed. Stephen Cushman, Clare Cavanagh, Jahan Ramazani, and Paul Rouzer. *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics, Fourth Edition*. Princeton: University Press.
- Merwe, C.H.J. van der, J.A. Naudé, and J.H. Kroeze. 2017. *A Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar*. Second edition. London, Oxford, New York, New Delhi, Sydney: T&T Clark.
- Miller, S.T. 2012. "Innovation and Convention: An Analysis of Parallelism in Stichographic, Hymnic and Sapiential Poetry in the Dead Sea Scrolls." PhD dissertation, Florida State University. <https://diginole.lib.fsu.edu/islandora/object/fsu:183016/datastream/PDF/view> Last accessed 01/08/2026.
- . 2015. "The Oral-Written Textuality of Stichographic Poetry in the Dead Sea Scrolls." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 22 (2):162–88. <https://doi.org/10.1163/15685179-12341360>
- Muraoka, T. 2010. *A Greek-Hebrew/Aramaic Two-Way Index to the Septuagint*. Louvain, Paris, Walpole: Peeters.
- . 2016. *A Syntax of Septuagint Greek*. Leuven: Peeters.
- Noegel, S.B. 1996. "Wordplay and Translation Technique in the Septuagint of Job." *Aula Orientalis* 14 (1):33–44. <https://www.ub.edu/ipoa/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/19961AuOrNoegel.pdf> Last accessed 01/08/2026.
- Nömmik, U. 2010. *Die Freundesreden des ursprünglichen Hiobdialogs: eine form- und traditions geschichtliche Studie*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 410. Berlin, New York: De Gruyter.
- . 2012. "The Idea of Ancient Hebrew Verse." *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 124 (3) (September 1):400–8. <https://doi.org/10.1515/zaw-2012-0028>
- . 2013. *Iiobi Raamat*. Piibel kontekstis 1. Tartu: Ülikooli Kirjastus.
- . 2014a. "Thinking of Water in the Book of Job: A Fluvial Introduction to the Job Literature." In *Thinking of Water in the Early Second Temple Period*, edited by Ehud Ben Zvi and Christoph Levin, 279–98. Berlin, München, Boston: De Gruyter.
- . 2014b. "Discussion on a Ruler's Corruptness in the Wisdom Literature, Using Job 29-31 as an Example." *Usuteaduslik Ajakiri* 67 (2):11–23. <https://ojs.utlib.ee/index.php/UA/article/view/23567> Last accessed 01/08/2026.
- . 2025. "Literary History of the Book of Job: A Sketch." <https://usuteaduskond.ut.ee/sites/default/files/2025-09/Literary%20History%20of%20Job.%20A%20Sketch.pdf> Last accessed 01/08/2026.
- . 2026. "Hebrew Job through the Lens of Diachronic Poetics." In *Job Unveiled and Reimagined. Current Issues, Emerging Paradigms, and Future Horizons.*, edited by JiSeong James Kwon, Tobias Häner, and Janina M. Hiebel, 172:9–26. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 2. Reihe. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- van Oorschot, J. 1987. *Gott Als Grenze: Eine Literar- Und Redaktionsgeschichtliche Studie Zu Den Gottesreden Des Hiobbuches*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 170. Berlin, New York: De Gruyter.
- . 2007. "Die Entstehung des Hiobbuches." In *Das Buch Hiob und seine Interpretationen. Beiträge zum Hiob-Symposiums auf dem Monte Verita vom 14.-19. August 2005*, edited by Thomas Krüger, Manfred Oeming, Konrad Schmid, and Christoph Uehlinger, 165–84. Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments 88. Zürich: TVT, Theologischer Verlag.
- Orlinsky, H.M. 1935a. "Job 5.8, a Problem in Greek-Hebrew Methodology." *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 25 (3):271–8. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1451623>

- . 1935b. “Some Corruptions in the Greek Text of Job.” *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 26 (2):133–45. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1452342>
- . 1937a. “Ἀποβαίνω and Ἐπιβαίνω in the Septuagint of Job.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 56 (4):361–7. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3259647>
- . 1937b. “The Hebrew and Greek Texts of Job 14.12.” *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 28 (1):57–68. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1452587>
- . 1958. “Studies in the Septuagint of the Book of Job: Chapter II The Character of the Septuagint Translation of the Book of Job.” *Hebrew Union College Annual* 29:229–71. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/23506526> Last accessed 01/08/2026.
- . 1959. “Studies in the Septuagint of the Book of Job: Chapter III: On the Matter of Anthropomorphisms, Anthropopathisms, and Euphemisms.” *Hebrew Union College Annual* 30:153–67. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/23506453> Last accessed 01/08/2026.
- . 1961. “Studies in the Septuagint of the Book of Job: Chapter III (Continued).” *Hebrew Union College Annual* 32:239–68. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/23524621> Last accessed 01/08/2026.
- . 1962. “Studies in the Septuagint of the Book of Job: Chapter IV: The Present State of the Greek Text of Job.” *Hebrew Union College Annual* 33:119–51. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/23506602> Last accessed 01/08/2026.
- . 1964. “Studies in the Septuagint of the Book of Job: Chapter V: The Hebrew ‘Vorlage’ of the Septuagint of Job: The Text and the Script.” *Hebrew Union College Annual* 35:57–78. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/23506612> Last accessed 01/08/2026.
- Pietersma, A. 1985. “Review of Job.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 104 (2):305–11. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3260976>
- Reed, A.Y. 2001. “Job as Jobab: The Interpretation of Job in LXX Job 42:17b-e.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 120 (1):31–55. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3268592>
- de Regt, L.J. 1994. “Implications of Rhetorical Questions in Strophes in Job 11 and 15.” In *The Book of Job*, edited by W. A. M. Beuken, 321–8. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 114. Leuven: Leuven University Press, Uitgeverij Peeters.
- Rogers, J. 2012. “The Testament of Job as an Adaptation of LXX Job.” In *Text-Critical and Hermeneutical Studies in the Septuagint*, edited by Johann Cook and Hermann-Josef Stipp, 395–408. Leiden: Brill.
- Salvesen, A. 2021. “Textual Criticism, Translation Studies, and Symmachus’s Version in the Book of Job.” *Textus* 30 (1) (February 9):43–63. <https://doi.org/10.1163/2589255X-bja10008>
- Srenock, J. 2021. “The Septuagint and Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible.” In *T&T Clark Handbook of Septuagint Research*, edited by William A. Ross and W. Edward Glenny, 135–47. T&T Clark Handbooks. London: T&T Clark.
- Seow, C.L. 2011. “Orthography, Textual Criticism, and the Poetry of Job.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 130 (1):63–85. <https://doi.org/10.2307/41304188>
- . 2013. *Job 1-21: Interpretation and Commentary*. Illuminations. Grand Rapids, Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- . 2023. *The Many Faces of Job: The Premodern Period*. 1st ed. Handbooks of the Bible and Its Reception (HBR) Series ; v.5/1. Berlin, Boston: Walter de Gruyter GmbH.
- Shepherd, D. 2004. *Targum and Translation: A Reconsideration of the Qumran Aramaic Version of Job*. Studia Semitica Neerlandica 45. Assen: Royal Van Gorcum.
- Skehan, P.W. 1971. *Studies in Israelite Poetry and Wisdom*. Catholic Biblical quarterly. Monograph series 1. Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America.

- Steck, O.H. 1998. *Old Testament Exegesis: A Guide to the Methodology*. 2. ed. Resources for biblical study 39. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Strawn, B.A. 2017. "Problems and Poetics in the Text History of Job." In *The Text of the Hebrew Bible and Its Editions*, edited by Andrés Piquer Otero and Pablo A. Torijano Morales, 449–80. Supplements to the Textual History of the Bible 1. Boston: Brill. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004335028_021
- Swete, H.B. 1914. *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*. 2nd [i.e. 3rd] ed. Cambridge: University Press.
- Syring, W.-D. 2004. *Hiob Und Sein Anwalt: Die Prosatexte Des Hiobbuches Und Ihre Rolle in Seiner Redaktions- Und Rezeptionsgeschichte*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft. Berlin, New York: De Gruyter.
- Szpek, H.M. 1992. *Translation Technique in the Peshitta to Job: A Model for Evaluating a Text with Documentation from the Peshitta to Job*. Dissertation series / Society of Biblical Literature 137. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Terrien, S.L. 1963. *Job*. Commentaire de l'Ancien Testament 13. Neuchâtel: Éditions Delachaux & Niestlé.
- Tov, E. 2001. *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. 2nd ed. Vol. 3. JBST. Minneapolis/Assen: Fortress.
- . 2015. *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*. Third edition, completely revised and expanded. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Verbeke, E. 2011. "Hebrew *Hapax legomena* and Their Greek Rendering in LXX Job." . <https://lirias.kuleuven.be/retrieve/162612>. Last accessed 01/08/2026.
- Vermeylen, J. 2015. *Métamorphoses: Les Rédactions Successives Du Livre de Job*. Bibliotheca Ephemerides theologiae Lovanienses 276. Leuven: Peeters.
- Watson, W.G.E. 1986. *Classical Hebrew Poetry: A Guide to Its Techniques*. 2nd ed. Journal for the study of the Old Testament. Supplement series 26. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- Webster, E.C. 1983. "Strophic Patterns in Job 3-28." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 8 (26) (June):33–60. <https://doi.org/10.1177/030908928300802602>
- . 1984. "Strophic Patterns in Job 29-42." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 9 (30) (October):95–109. <https://doi.org/10.1177/030908928400903006>
- West, M.L. 2007. *Indo-European Poetry and Myth*. Oxford: University Press.
- Wevers, J.W. 1996. "The Interpretative Character and Significance of the Septuagint Version." In *Hebrew Bible. Old Testament. 1. From the Beginnings to the Middle Ages (until 1300)*. – P. 1. *Antiquity*, edited by Magne Sæbø, 84–107. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Wissmann, J. 2010. "Education." In *A Companion to Hellenistic Literature*, edited by James J. Clauss and Martine Cuypers, 62–77. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- Witte, M. 1994a. *Vom Leiden Zur Lehre: Der Dritte Redegang (Hiob 21 - 27) Und Die Redaktionsgeschichte Des Hiobbuches*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft. Berlin, New York: De Gruyter.
- . 1994b. "Die dritte Rede Baldads (Hiob 25) und die Redaktionsgeschichte des Hiobbuches." In *The Book of Job.*, edited by W. A. M. Beuken, 349–55. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 114. Leuven: Leuven University Press, Uitgeverij Peeters.
- . 1995. *Philologische Notizen Zu Hiob 21–27*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 234. Berlin, New York: Walter De Gruyter.
- . 2007. "The Greek Book of Job." In *Das Buch Hiob und seine Interpretationen: Beiträge zum Hiob-Symposium auf dem Monte Verita vom 14.–19. August 2005*, edited

- by Thomas Krüger, Manfred Oeming, Konrad Schmid, and Christoph Uehlinger, 33–54. *Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments* 88. Zürich: TVZ, Theologischer Verlag Zürich.
- . 2016. “Job / Das Buch Ijob / Hiob.” In *Handbuch zur Septuaginta. LXX.H Band 1. Einleitung in die Septuaginta.*, edited by Martin Karrer, Wolfgang Kraus, and Siegfried Kreuzer, 407–21. *Handbuch zur Septuaginta. LXX.H 1*. München: Gütersloher Verlagshaus.
- . 2019. “Job.” In *Introduction to the LXX*, edited by Siegfried Kreuzer trans. David A. Brenner and Peter Altmann, 369–82. Waco: Baylor University Press.
- . 2020. “Cosmos and Creation in Job 38 (Septuagint).” In *Cosmos and Creation*, edited by Michael W. Duggan, Renate Egger-Wenzel, and Stefan C. Reif, 55–76. Berlin, New York: De Gruyter.
- . 2021. *Das Buch Hiob*. *Alte Testament deutsch*; Teilbd. 13. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Wolters, A. 1994. “Text and Script of the LXX Vorlage of Job 40:17b.” *Textus* 17 (1) (August 19):101–15. <https://doi.org/10.1163/2589255X-01701007>
- Würthwein, E. 2014. *The Text of the Old Testament: An Introduction to the Biblia Hebraica*. Third edition. Grand Rapids: William Beerdman's Publishing Company.
- Ziegler, J. 1971. “Der Textkritische Wert Der Septuaginta Des Buches Job.” In *Sylloge: Gesammelte Aufsätze Zur Septuaginta*, 9–28. *Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen X*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- . 1982. *Iob*. Vol. XI, 4. *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- . 1985. *Beiträge zum griechischen Iob*. *Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens (MSU)* 18. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

SUMMARY IN ESTONIAN

Old Greek Iiobi stiil. Selle tähtsus heebreakeelse Iiobi teksti-, kirjandus- ja redaktsioonikriitika jaoks

See doktoritöö pealkirjaga “Style of Old Greek Job. Its value for textual, literary, and redaction criticism of Hebrew Job” (“Old Greek Iiobi stiil. Selle tähtsus heebreakeelse Iiobi teksti-, kirjandus- ja redaktsioonikriitika jaoks.”) uuris mitmekülgset ja eksperimentaalset viisil kümmet kõnet Iiobi raamatu vanakreekakeelses tõlkes, mida peetakse selle raamatu esimeseks tõlkeks ja tõlgenduseks. Püüti leida, kas ja kuidas tõlkija stiililised ja poeetilised pingutused peegeldavad heebreakeelse teksti seisu 2. sajandil eKr.

Doktoritöö on üles ehitatud uurimiseks valitud kõnede ümber, see tähendab, kõned peatükkides 4–5, 8, 12–14, 15, 19, 21, 25, 29–31, 38–39 ja 40–41 on töös eraldi peatükkides. Need kõned valiti mitmel erineval põhjusel. Esiteks esindavad need nii kreeka kui ka heebrea keeles tekstiliste raskuste erinevaid tasemeid. Näiteks 8. peatükis pole asteriskiga tähistatud (nooremaid, teiste tõlkijate tõlgitud) lõike ja ka heebrea keeles on seal vähem tekstiprobleeme. Peatükid 4–5, 15 ja 25 sisaldavad lõike alanduse redaktsioonist (*à la* Witte) ja seetõttu on neil võrreldavaid omadusi. Peatükid 19 ja 21 sisaldavad huvitavaid teoloogilisi arutluspunkte ning peatükis 21 on tõlkes pikk lõik puudu, mida redaktsioonikriitikud üllataval kombel teisejärguliseks ei ole pidanud. Peatükid 29–31 valiti kõnes sisalduva kolme peatüki erinevuste tõttu ja eriti seetõttu, et peatükk 30 on keerulisuse poolest kurikuulus ning kreekakeelses tõlkes on suuri lahknevusi. Jumala kõned peatükkides 38–41 valiti teatud kontrollrühmaks, kuna varasemad uurinud on rõhutanud asjaolu, et tõlkija ärajätud nendes vähenesid. Üldiselt peegeldab uuritavate kõnede valik mitmekesisust heebrea keele tekstiprobleemide, kreekakeelsete asteriskiga tähistatud lõikude ja üldise pikkuse osas, andes suurepärase võimaluse uurida tõlkija tegevust mitmekihilises lähtetekstis.

Uuring näitas, et kuigi Iiobi vanakreeka tõlge pole luule klassikalises tähenduses, on see siiski poeetiliselt stiliseeritud ja stroofidena üles ehitatud, peegeldades praeguse masoreetse teksti struktuuri, aga kohati ka sellest kõrvale kaldudes. Lisaks leiti, et teksti muudatuste tegemisel võttis tõlkija enamasti arvesse kogu stroofi või isegi mitut stroofi.

Heebrea Iiobi kirjanduskriitika seisukohast annab vanakreeka Iiobi tõlge tunnistust tõsiasjast, et stroofiline struktuur on nähtav mitte ainult tänapäeva teadlastele, kellel on võimekus ja võimalus teksti oma äranägemise järgi vormistada (see tähendab, visuaalselt stroofideks), vaid see oli nähtav juba vähemalt ühele vanale tõlkijale, nimelt vanakreeka tõlkijale. Olenemata sellest, milline tema kasutatav *Vorlage* käsikiri välja nägi, pani tõlkija seda struktuuri tähele, peegeldas seda tõlkes, aga ka tugevdas, muutis või täiendas seda vajadusel. Muistsed heebrea käsikirjad ei olnud tõenäoliselt stihhograafilised ega näidanud suuremate üksuste jagunemist, kuid neis võis näha olla mitmeid erinevaid käekirju ja võimalik, et isegi rikutud osi, seega on tähelepanuväärne, et tõlkija seda struktuuri märkas.

Kõnedes, kus kreeka ja heebrea keele stroofilised struktuurid oluliselt erinevad, võime küsida, kas vanakreekakeelne tõlge peegeldab tõlkija enda stilisatsiooni, mis põhineb sellel, mida ta suutis lähtetekstist välja lugeda (tekstikriitilised küsimused), või kas see erinev stiliseerimine ja struktuur peegeldavad samavõrd erinevat poeetilist struktuuri *Vorlages* (see tähendab, *Vorlage* võis hüpoteetiliselt peegeldada heebrea teksti vaheetappi, masoreetse teksti eelset vormi, mis oli sellest lühem ja erinev). Seega on tulevastes uuringutes veel palju teha jäänud.

Ei saa eitada, et Iiobi raamat on keeruline nii teksti kui ka temaatika poolest. See on nähtav nii tänapäevani säilinud masoreetses tekstis, kuid nagu varasemad uuringud on näidanud ja käesolev on veelgi tõestanud, olid sama keerulised ka masoreetse teksti eelsed käsikirjad, sealhulgas vanakreekakeelse tõlke *Vorlage*. Kuigi meil puuduvad vanade tõlgete *Vorlaged*, on vanakreekakeelse Iiobi *Vorlaget* senini peetud peaaegu identseks hilisema masoreetse tekstiga. Varasemad uurijad on olnud väga kriitilised selle suhtes, kui palju saab seda Iiobi tõlget, mis paljudes kohtades masoreetsest tekstist kõrvale kaldub, kasutada heebreakeelse Iiobi raamatu teksti parandamiseks. Iiobi tõlke uurimine stroofilisel tasandil on näidanud, et see on pooleldi tõsi. Tõlge on problemaatiline, kuid siiski oluline tunnistus heebreakeelse teksti kohta, mis oli käibel teisel sajandil eKr.

Kuigi on tõsi, et vanakreekakeelset Iiobi tõlget ei saa heebreakeelse teksti tekstikriitikaks ja masoreetse teksti parandamiseks väga sageli kasutada, aitab see meil täpselt kindlaks teha, kus juba antiikaja lugejad raskustega silmitsi seisis. Mõningaid varem välja pakutud parandusi (näiteks mitmuse ja ainsuse variatsioonid ja sufiksid) ei saa kinnitada, kuna tõlkija muutis sageli mitmust ainsuseks ja vastupidi ning jättis sufikseid ära, kui stroofi seisukohalt nii paremini sobis. Mõne teise puhul viitab stroofi kontekst aga sellele, et mängus võis olla teistsugune *Vorlage*. Lühidalt öeldes aitab asjaolu, et tõlkija töötas ja stiliseeris stroofi tasemel, hinnata varem väljapakutud parandusi masoreetses tekstis, lükates mõned tagasi (või hinnates neid ebatõenäolisemaks), samal ajal teisi kinnitades, ning aitab hinnata võimalikke erinevusi *Vorlage* ja masoreetse teksti vahel.

Redaktsioonikriitikute sõnul kasvas Iiobi raamat mitme sajandi jooksul vormini, mida me praegu näeme masoreetses tekstis. Vanakreekakeelse tõlke väärtus redaktsioonikriitikas ei ole tohutu, kuid ka mitte tühine. Tõlke ja selle tõlkija abiga saame kinnitada, et mõned lõigud, mis arvatakse olevat nii noored, et need lausa *Vorlages* puudusid, olid seal kindlasti olemas. Teistes lõikudes võib tõlge viidata sellele, et mõned lõigud, mida peetakse algupärasteks, võivad tegelikult olla nooremad (näiteks 21. peatüki lõpp). Tõlkija järjepideva stroofide stiliseerimise najal tuvastati mõned lõigud, kus *Vorlage* oli sõna võrra lühem (enamasti partiklid ja määrsõnad ning hüüatused, mida kasutati stroofide alguses markeritena). Samuti võime väita, et tõlkija märkas raamatus läbivaid teemasid, näiteks alandusredaktsiooni, kuigi tõenäoliselt ei seostanud ta neid teemasid erinevate autoritega. See kinnitab, et Iiobi raamat sisaldab ja sisaldas eristatavaid teemasid, mis tõlkijale märkamata ei jäänud.

See doktoritöö tõestab, et vanakreeka tõlkija oli oma *Vorlages* esinevate tekstiprobleemide suhtes tundlik, olenemata sellest, kas need on seotud arvata-

vate hilisemate lisanduste ja glossidega või mitte. Saab kinnitada, et enamasti oli tõlkija ees olnud heebrea tekst sisuliselt sama nagu masoreetne tekst, juba sisaldades paljusid arvatavaid laiendusi ja lisandusi, ebakorrapärasusi ja keerukusi, mida me tänapäevani näeme. *Vorlage* oli kohati ebamäärane ja mitmetähenduslik, selles oli vähem vokaalipikendusmärke kui hilisemas masoreetses tekstis ning see oli igati keeruline juba teisel sajandil eKr. Tõlkija poolt sisse toodud lahknemused tulenevad valdavalt tõlgenduslikest, stiililistest ja poeetilistest valikutest, mitte radikaalselt erinevast heebrea algtekstist. Seal, kus *Vorlage* oli väga keeruline või rikutud, otsustas tõlkija enamasti ikkagi luua sisukaid värse ja stroofe juppidest, mida ta suutis välja lugeda, selle asemel et neid välja jätta. Suuremad väljajätmised tundusid pigem olevat tingitud sisu ülemäärasusest, liiasusest või sobimatusest kui tekstilistest ja vormilistest raskustest.

APPENDIX I:

Redaction models

Witte 2021 has been developing his redactional model of the Book of Job for a couple of decades now, starting with his 1994 monograph¹⁰⁵⁵. His latest rendition of how the Hebrew Book of Job grew during the centuries after its initial writing down, between the 5th and 3rd centuries BCE, comes from his 2021 book *Das Buch Hiob*.

Witte uses linguistic, formal, content, and tendency analysis, relating it to theological and historical currents in Ancient Judaism, to judge whether parts of Job are from the original/oldest layer or later additions. All in all, he distinguishes seven stages of literary growth: Ia Hiobdichtung A (*Eigentliche Hiobdichtung*), Ib Hiobnovelle, II Hiobdichtung B (*Niedrigkeitsredaktion*), III Buch A (*Buchredaktion*), IV Buch B (*Elihuredaktion*), V Buch C (*Majestätsredaktion*), VI Buch D (*Gerechtigkeitsredaktion* or *Endredaktion*), VII Buch E (additions of differing origins and glosses).

At the first stage, the primary Job-poem (*Hiobdichtung A*) and narrative (*Hiobnovelle*) were separate entities that date back to the Persian time, although Witte suspects that the poem might be slightly older than the prose. The oldest version of the Job-poem consisted of the following chapters and verses: 3:2–26; 4:1–24:12*; 27:1–6* + 29:2–31:37*; and 38:1–39:30*; the oldest version of the narrative frame consisted of the following chapters and verses: 1:1–3a, (3b), 4, 5*, 13–21 + 42:11*, 12–13, (14–15), 16–17.

In the next stage of the development, when the poem and narrative were still separate, the editor(s) of the lowliness redaction (*Niedrigkeitsredaktion*) supplemented the poem with vv. 4:12–21; 15:11–16; 25:1–6; 40:3–5; and 42:2, 3aβ, 5–6. This redaction is identified by themes of man's unworthiness and lowliness and the unescapable suffering. Witte calls it the anthropological-theological answer or solution to the Job-problem.

After this, either in the late Persian or early Hellenistic period, the Job-poem and narrative were finally combined into one—the Book of Job. This book redaction (*Buchredaktion*) included the addition of the following verses: 1:(3b)5*; 1:6–12; 2:1–7; 2:8–10; 2:11–13; 3:1; and 42:7–10, 11aβ, γ. The introductory formulas before the speeches (such as 3:2, 4:1, 6:1 and so on) were also possibly added during this stage of editing. The goal of this redaction was to display the different themes and treatments of Job into one composition.

Now that the Book of Job in its true sense had come into being, it did not stop growing. After this third stage of growth came the addition of Elihu speeches (*Elihuredaktion*) and a large part of the second speech of God. With the exception of some verses, the Elihu speeches in 32:1–37:24 were added at once. The main goal of this addition was to emphasise God's justice, including Him handing out suffering. The second God speech was also added mostly in its full form: vv. 40:6–14 and 40:15–41:26. The shorter answers of Job in vv. 40:3–5 and 42:1 + 42:2, 3aβ, b, 5–6 were possibly added at this time, too. The God speech serves to emphasise God as creator, guardian of justice, and tamer of chaos.

In the next stage came what Witte calls the majesty redaction (*Majestätsredaktion*), in which the following hymnic forms were added: vv. 12:7–13:2; 26:1–14; 27:1*; 27:11–12; 28:1–14, (15–19), 20–28; 29:1; and 39:13–18. This redaction emphasises the importance of fearing God and builds upon the Elihu redaction. It is close to the original poem and to the book redaction.

The final clearly identifiable redaction that Witte proposes is the righteousness or end redaction (*Gerechtigkeitsredaktion* / *Endredaktion*). In this redaction, the following

¹⁰⁵⁵ Witte 1994a.

verses were added: 9:2–14 (possibly the majesty redaction); 12:4–6 (possibly original); 24:5–8, (9), 13–25; 27:7–10, 13–23; 30:1c–8; 31:1–3, 38–40b; 40:1–2; and 42:3aα, 4. This redaction enhances Job’s confessions and elevates him, it also enhances the idea of retribution, nearing the theology of the Torah.

As the seventh stage of growth, Witte registers a long list of additions and glosses, some of which may have been added to the text after its “completion” in the 3rd century BCE: vv. 5:5aβ, 10, 22; 6:6aβ, 10b, 14, 27; 7:4b(?), 11b(?), 20aα, 21aα; 8:6b; 9:24b; 10:1b(?), 3b, 15b. 17b, 22b(?); 11:6, 8–9 (cf. majesty redaction), 19b; 12:7a*; 13:17, 27b(?), 28; 14:1a*, 3–4, 5c, 7c, 12b (possibly righteousness redaction), 14a; 15:18–19, 24c*, 28c, 30a, 31; 17:4, 8–10; 18:4aα; 19:28–29 (possibly righteousness redaction); 20:10–11, 16–17, 23aα, 26b, 29a*; 21:17c, 22, 33c; 22:12, 17–18, 24–25; 24:9 (possibly righteousness redaction); 27:5a*, 6a* (possibly righteousness redaction), 8a* (possibly righteousness redaction); 29:17, 18–20 (possibly righteousness redaction), 25b; 30:12a*, 15a*; 31:7b, 11–12 (possibly righteousness redaction), 23 (possibly righteousness redaction), 28 (possibly righteousness redaction), 34b, 35b, 40b; 32:2aβ, b–4 (?); 33:15aβ, 19a*; 34:29b–30; 36:7b, 11b, 12a*; 37:7, 17; 38:11a*; 39:1a*, 4a*, 28; 40:23b*; and 42:14–15 (?).

Kaiser 2006 identifies the *Grundbestand*, the base or the oldest layer of bigger sections of the Book of Job: the prologue, the first cycle of speeches, the second cycle of speeches, final speeches (chapters 21–31), the Elihu speeches, the speeches of God and the final short replies of Job, and the epilogue.

He identifies the following stages of literary growth in order: *Grundbestand*, *Unschuldserweiterung*, *Buchredaktor*, *Niedrigkeitsbearbeiter*, *Elihu* and *Elihuredaktor*, *Majestätsbearbeiter*, *Gerechtigkeitsbearbeiter*, *Späte Bearbeiter*, and glosses.

The base layer of the narrative frame is, in Kaiser’s theory, quite similar to Witte’s, with some minor differences: the prologue consisted of vv. 1:1ab, 1, 2–3, 13–20a, 21aa and the epilogue in vv. 42:11aα, 12b–17¹⁰⁵⁶. In the first cycle of speeches, the base layer consisted of the following chapters and verses: 3:3–4a, c, 5a, c, 6b–9a, c, 10–15, 17–23, 25–26; 4:2–11; 5:1–2, 6–8, 18–21, 23–27; 6:2–4a, c, 5–10a, 11–13, 15–26, 28–7:19, 20bc, 21cd; 8:2–5, 6b–8, 10–14, 16–22; 9:2, 15–18, 20–23, 25–10:3b, 4–15b, 16–17a, c, 18–22a, c; and 11:2–5, 10–17, 19b–20. In the second cycle of speeches, the base layer consisted of the following chapters and verses: 12:2–3b; 13:3, 5–27a, c; 14:1–3, 5–7b, 8–12a, c, 13a–c[+d], 14b–19c[+d], 20–22; 15:2–10, 17, 20–24b, 26–28b, 29, 30bc, 32–35; 16:2–9b, 12–17:3, 5–7, 11, 13–16; 18:2–3, 4b–21; 19:2–12a, c, 13–25ab1, 27a–c[+d]; and 20:2–9, 12–15, 18–20b, 22, 24–26a, 27–29. In the third “cycle” of speeches (up to ch. 31, excluding Elihu), the base layer consisted of the following chapters and verses: 21:2–15, 17–21, 23–33b, 34; 22:2–11, 13–16, 19–23, 26–30; and 23:2–7, 10–13, 15–17 + 27:2–4, 5a*b, 6a, c + 30:20–23 + 31:35–37. In the God speeches the base layer consisted of the following: 38:2–13a, 14a, 16–18, 21–22, 24–26, 29–41b and 39:1–12, 19–25b[+1]c, 26–29(30).

As the first stage of growth, Kaiser identifies the innocence extension/addition (*Unschuldserweiterung*), in which the following is added to the third cycle of speeches: vv. 27:5a*, 6b; 29:2–16, 21–25b; 30:1a, b, 9–14, 15b–31; 31:4–10, 13–14, 16–17, 19–22, 24–27, 29–34b. This expansion added Job’s lamentation and declaration of his innocence.

Kaiser thinks that after this, the book editor (*Buchredaktor* à la Syring) connected the prose and the poetry. To the prologue, this editor adds vv. 1:1b2.4–5.20b.21ab.22 and vv. 2:11–3:2 to act as a transition between the narrative frame and the poetic speeches. In the speeches, they add the prose introductions to chapters 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 19,

¹⁰⁵⁶ However, on p. 127, this is “42:11a*b, 12b–13” instead.

20, 21, 22, 23, 38 as well as the transition to the epilogue in 42:7–9. In the epilogue, the added verses are 42:10, 11a*, 12a, 14–17¹⁰⁵⁷. This editor worked to ensure that the righteous Job of the poem was also a pious Job in the narrative. The expansions made in the narrative part reinterpreted the poem; Job's suffering was put into the context of divine testing.

The next stage of editing was presumably done by the lowliness editor (*Niedrigkeitsbearbeiter* à la Witte). In this redaction, the following verses were added: 4:12–16a, b, 17–19a, b, 20–21; 15:11–16; 25:1–5; 27:1; and 40:3–5 + 42:2, 3cd, 5–6. This editor added sections that emphasised that just like every other human being, Job is a sinner and God's forgiveness can only come to those who confess their sins.

Now, the Elihu speeches were added to the poem, in their base form consisting of vv. 32:6a*–33:15a, c, 16–23b, 24ab, 26ab, 27–29, 31–33; 34:2–6, 10b–19b, 20ab, 21–29, 34–37a, c; 35:2–12, 14–16; 36:2–7ab, 8–11b, 12, 16–25, 27–33; and 37:6–10, 14–19, 21–23b.

Either at the same time or at least before the next editor, the Elihu editor (*Elihu-redaktor*) added vv. 32:1–6a*; 34:1; 35:1; and 36:1.

Next, Kaiser identifies the work of the majesty editor (*Majestätsbearbeiter* à la Witte), who added the following verses: 9:3–14; 11:6–9; 12:4–13:2; 23:8–9; 26:1–14b; 27:11–12; 28:1–3b, 4a, c, 5–14, 20–23, 25–27; 29:1; 36:26; 37:1–5; 39:13–18. This editor wants to emphasise God's majesty and hidden wisdom.

After the majesty editor, the righteousness editor (*Gerechtigkeitsbearbeiter* à la Witte) supplemented the following verses: 3:4b, 5b, 6a, 9b, 16, 24; 5:3–5b, 9–17¹⁰⁵⁸; 17:8–10; 19:28–29b; 24:1–14b, 15a–b, 16a–b, 17–18b, 19, 21–22, 24ab, 25; 27:7–10, 13–23; 29:17–20; 30:1c–9a*; 31:1–3, 11–12, 15, 18, 23, 28, 34c, 38–40b; 34:30–33; 36:13–15; 37:11–13, 23c–24; 38:13b, 14b–15, 19–20, 23, 27–28; 40:6–11, 13–14; and 42:1. This editor makes Job reference directly to the friends' speeches.

In some speeches, he identifies a late editor (*Späte Bearbeiter*), who was influenced by the previous ones and who added vv. 1:6–12, 21ab; 2:1–10; 28:28; 33:40c; 34:7–10a; 40:1–2; 40:15–24; 40:25–41:26; and 42:3ab, 4.

After these more specific editors, he lists various glosses and smaller additions: vv. 3:4b, 5b, 6a, 16, 24; 4:16c, 19c; 5:10, 22; 6:4b, 10c, 14, 27; 7:20a, 21a, b; 8:6a, 9, 15; 9:19, 24; 10:3c, 15c, 17b, 22b; 11:19b, 12:3c, 6c; 13:4, 27b, 28; 14:4, 7c, 14a; 15:18–19, 24c–25, 28c, 30a, 31; 16:9c–11; 17:4, 12; 18:4a; 19:12b; 20:10–11, 16–17, 21, 23, 26b–c; 21:16, 22, 33c; 22:12, 17–18, 24–25; 23:14; 24:14c, 15c, 16c, 18c, 20, 23, 24c; 26:14c; 28:3c, 4b, 15–19, 24; 29:25; 31:7c; 33:15b, 23c, 24c, 26c, 30; 34:19c, 20c, 37b; 35:13; 36:7c, 11c; 37:20; 38:41c; 39:30; and 40:12.

Finally, he identifies some eschatological glosses (*Eschatologische Glosse*): vv. 14:12b(?); and 19:25b2–26, 29c.

Syring 2004 identifies the following stages of literary growth: the original poem and the original narrative, Elihu speeches, *Verknüpfende Hiob-Redaktion*, *Anthropologische Bearbeitung*, *Theologische Bearbeitung*, glosses.

According to his model, the original poem and the original narrative were transmitted separately at first. The original poem consisted of chapters 3:2–22:30*; 23:1–17; 27:2–4; 30:20–23; 31:35–37; and 38–39*. Before being connected to the narrative (originally exclusively descriptive, consisting of vv. 1:1a, 2–3, 13–19, 20a, 21aa, and 42:11aab, 12b–13?), it was extended with the initial Elihu speeches in 32:6–37:24. The latter extensions served to trace the idea of God's education through suffering.

¹⁰⁵⁷ But see p. 125, where the addition is “42:11aab, 12b–17” instead.

¹⁰⁵⁸ Written as “65,3–5b.9–17” on p. 125.

Next came the redaction that firstly connected the narrative with the original poem (*Verknüpfende Hiob-Redaktion*). For that purpose, both were expanded and the following verses were added: vv. 1:1b, 4–5, 6–12, 20b, 21a^βy^b, 22 and 2:1–10 to the prologue; vv. 2:11–3:1 to link the narrative and the beginning of the poem; vv. 3:2, 4:1, 6:1, 8:1, 9:1, 11:1, 12:1, 15:1, 16:1, 18:1, 19:1, 20:1, 21:1, 22:1, and 23:1 to introduce the individual speeches; vv. 27:1, 5–6, 11–12, chs. 28 and 29, and vv. 30:1, 9–19, 24–31, and 31:1–34, 38–40a to expand Job’s final speech; vv. 31:40b–32:5 to link Job’s final speech with Elihu’s speech; vv. 32:6a^α, 34:1, 35:1, 36:1, and 38:1 as further introductions to speeches; vv. 42:7–9 to link God’s speech with the epilogue; and finally vv. 42:10, 11a^βy, 12a, 14–17 to expand the epilogue. The additions to the narrative develop the character of Job (his losses, illness, him being blameless, God-fearing, sinless, pious) and insert YHWH into the story. The additions to the poetry include the hymn of wisdom, Job’s lament, his suffering, and his claims of innocence.

As the next stage of growth, Syring identifies the anthropological editing (*Anthropologische Bearbeitung*) in which vv. 4:12–21 and 15:11–16 were added to expand two Eliphaz’s speeches; vv. 25:1–6 to add Baldad’s speech; and vv. 40:3–5 and 42:2–6* to add Job’s short answers (confessions) to God. This redaction emphasises the lowliness of man before God.

In the final stage of growth that can be defined in detail, in the so-called theological editing (*Theologische Bearbeitung*), the following verses were added: 9:2–14 and 12:7–13:2; 24:1–25 and 26:1–14; 27:7–10, 13–23 and 30:2–8; 39:13–18, 40:1–2, 6–14, and 40:15–41:26; and finally 42:1. This stage emphasises the majesty, justice, and creative power of God.

After these, glosses were added by later scribes.

Van Oorschot 2007 + 1987 has identified a four-stage development of the Book of Job. As the oldest stage he sees an independent Job-poem (*Ursprüngliche Hiobdichtung*) consisting of chs. 3*, 4–23*, 27–31*, and 38–39* and an independent Job-narrative (*selbständige Hiobberzählung*) consisting of the prologue (vv. 1:1a, 2–5, 13–20) and the epilogue (vv. 42:11*, 12, 13, 16b).

This narrative is now, in the fear-of-God redaction (*Gottesfurcht Redaktion*) supplemented with vv. 1:1b, 6–12, 21f, and 2:1–10, 2:11–3:1). He also recognises that the majesty redaction (*Majestätsredaktion*), originally identified by Witte to be in chs. 27:5f. and 28, belongs to this God-fearing redaction. Furthermore, vv. 12:7–13:2; ch. 26; vv. 27:5f, 11f¹⁰⁵⁹; ch. 28; vv. 29:1; 39:13–19; 42:7–9; 42:10:12a are also added in this redaction. This redaction is characterised by negative anthropology and theology.

Next, the Job-poem is expanded with the Elihu speeches and the righteousness redaction (*Gerechtigkeitsredaktion*). With the righteousness redaction the following verses are added: 7:20a, 21; 9:2–14; 12:4–6; 17:8–10; 19:28f.; 24:5–8, 13–25; 27:7–10, 13–23; 30:1b–8; 31:1–3, 11f, 15, 18, 23, 28, 33f, 38–40; 40:3–5; and 42:1–6*.

The final identifiable editing is done in the lowliness redaction (*Niedrigkeitsredaktion*) whereby the following sections are added: 4:12–21; 15:11–16; 25:1–6; 40:3–5; and 42:1–6*. Justice is God’s and injustice is man’s.

In 1987, he published a monograph centered on the God-speeches of Job, where he concluded, after thorough analysis, that the original text of the God-speeches consisted of the following verses: 38:1–18, 21–27, 38:29–39:12, 19–27*, 28*, 29f.; and 40:2, 8–14 (vv. 40:3–5; 42:2, 3a*, b, 5f. from Job’s short answers were also in the original layer). Vv. 38:1–3 made up the original introduction to God’s speech, vv. 38:4–39:30* made up the actual speech, and vv. 40:2, 8–14 were the original conclusion. With the additions of

¹⁰⁵⁹ Several times referred to as “25:5f.11f.”

the Behemoth and Leviathan passages in vv. 40:15–41:26, the previous conclusion is turned into an introductory part for these “creatures.” The addition of vv. 40:6f. makes the shift more formal. With these, v. 42:1 was also added. Later, v. 40:1 was added. As a result, two parallel but separate God-speeches were arrived at. Later on, further additions were made with vv. 38:19f.; 38:28; 39:13–18; 39:27f; and 42:3a*, 4.

Nömmik 2025 has developed and updated his model of the literary growth of Job for over a decade now and he has been studying redactional models for almost two decades. According to his latest updates, “[t]he literary history of Job has not only numerous layers but also represents three types of literary activities: independent sources, which were used to compile the book; redactions, which wanted to shift the focus of the book; and a huge number of smaller and larger *Fortschreibungen*, together with glosses, which are mainly unsystematic.”

Under “sources,” he places the poem of Job, the narrative of Job, a short version of chapters 29–30, Elihu speeches in their primary form, and some smaller poems and fragments that were later incorporated into the Book of Job.

The poem and the narrative parts of Job existed independently at first. The base layer of the poem, one of the sources, consisted of the following verses: 3:3, 7–8, 10–15, 17–22, 24–26; 4:2–11 + 5:1–8*, 18–21, 23–27; 6:2–13*, 21–26, 28–30 + 7:19, 20b–c, 21c–d; 8:2–8*, 10–14, 16–22; 9:15–16, 19–20, 27–28, 30–35 + 10:1b–c, 3a–b, 6–15b, 18–21(?); 11:2–5, 7, 10–18, 19b–20; 12:2–3b + 13:5–8, 13–16, 18–27b + 14:13a–b, 15–17; 15:2–10, 17, 20–24b, 25–28b, 29, 30b–c, 32–35; 16:2–4, 7–9, 12–16, 18–19, 21–22 + 17:1–3, 6–7, 13–15; 18:2–3, 4b–21; 19:2–9, 13–24, 20:2–9, 12–15, 18–22, 23b–26b*, 27–29; 21:2–15, 17a–b, 18, 27–33b, 34; 22:2–11, 13–16, 19–23, 26–30; 23:2, 4–7, 10, 13, 15, 17 + 27:2–4 + 30:20–23* + 31:35b–37*; 38:2–9, 12–13a, 14b, 16–18, 21–22, 24–25, 28–33, 35 + 39:1–2, 5, 7, 9–10, 19–20, 26–27.

The base layer of the narrative frame, one of the sources, consisted of the following verses: 1:1a, 2–3, 13–19, 20a, 21a, 21b, 21c and 42:9b, 11aα, b, 12b–13. To this original narrative, vv. 1:1b, 4–5, 20b, 21bβ, and 42:10b, 11aβ, 12a, 16–17 were added even before the poem and narrative were connected into one Book of Job.

The first big wave of editing was done by the so-called book editor. Firstly, to do with the majesty of God, two additions were made: vv. 9:2–14 and 12:7–8, 10–25 + 13:1–2. Next, the narrative and poem of Job were connected into one Book of Job by means of vv. 2:11–13 and the introductory prose sections to individual speeches (the first verses of chs. 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, and 38). Although called the book editor, they also added Job’s responses to Eliphaz’ speeches with the following additions: vv. 6:15–20; 13:9–12; 16:4c–6; 16:9c–11 (possibly righteousness redaction), 27:5–6; and 27:11–12.

The next wave of editing is called the righteousness redaction, adding first 27:13–25 and then possibly 38:13b–14a, 15 and 40:10–14.

During the same period as the righteousness redaction, some single smaller source texts, vv. 26:5–13 and ch. 28* (vv. 28:1–3b, 4a–b, 5–14, 20–23, 25–27) were incorporated into the poem.

Nömmik places early *Fortschreibungen* in the same time period as the righteousness redaction. These are firstly, the Creation Hymn in vv. 26:1–14, possibly related to the book editor; the Wisdom Hymn in vv. 28:1–3b, 4a–b, 5–14, 20–23, 25–27, possibly related to the book editor.

Approximately after the righteousness redaction, a small source about the noble ruler was incorporated into the poem: a short version of chs. 29–30*, which may have consisted of vv. 29:2–11, 21–25b + 30:1a–b, 9–19*, 24–31.

Following this incorporation, Job's final monologue in chs. 23–31* was reworked. The small independent poem that was previously incorporated into the book is supplemented with 31:5–6, 7a–b+8, 9–10, 16+22. Two prose introductions are added to chs. 27 and 29, and now the initial monologue is turned into three separate speeches in chs. 23–24*, 27*, and 29–31*. Finally, 31:40c is added.

Next, the source of the Elihu speeches, originally a separate work of poetry (32:18–22 + 33:1–3, 5–14, 16–18; 36:22–28, 31–33 + 37:6–14), is incorporated. Quite shortly it became to grow, with added verses such as 34:16–19b, 21–24; 36:5–6, 7b–12, 15. Then, verses that give “an introduction and legitimation in the book” were also added: 32:1, 4, 6–7, 9–10. After this, either righteousness redactors or redactors inspired by them reworked the beginning of the Elihu speeches by adding vv. 32:11–17, and expanded the speeches with vv. 33:31–33 + 34:1–6, 10b–15, 29–33*, 36–37*; and 36:1–4. Finally, vv. 35:1–7, 13–15, 19, 23–24* were added.

In the next stage, some other smaller independent source texts were incorporated to the book. In terms of expanding the book, transcience redactions and late *Fortschreibungen* can be distinguished. Lamentation in the Book of Job is enhanced by the transcience redactions by adding the key texts 7:11–18; 14:1–2, 5–10*; and 21:23–26.

The last distinctive redaction in the Book of Job is the lowliness redaction which is especially influenced by the previous transcience redactions. As a key text, vv. 4:12–20b, 21 is added, and after it vv. 15:11–16 and ch. 25. With this, ch. 26 gets a prose introduction as well.

Nömmik also distinguishes a so-called last editor, who adds vv. 1:6–12 and 1:22–2:10 to the prologue, vv. 40:1–5 between the two speeches of God, and vv. 42:7–9a, 10a to the epilogue. Then, vv. 40:6–8 are added, creating two separate divine speeches. This editor also adds vv. 32:2–3, 5 to Elihu's speech. Quite possibly, this editor also adds 33:23–30.

Nömmik says that the late *Fortschreibungen* started to be added to the Book of Job parallel to the transcience redactions, but they cannot be dated exactly within the last redactions of the book. These late *Fortschreibungen* include those that rely on the book editor (also called the majesty/fear-of-God redactions) by adding vv. 5:9–10; 22:12, 24–25; 23:3, 8–9; 38:10–11, 19–20, 23, 26–27, 34, 36–41; and 39:3–4, 6, 8, 11–12, 28–30. Another *Fortschreibung* is the description thunder and clouds in vv. 37:1–5 and 15–18. Some *Fortschreibungen* deal with justice: vv. 5:11–17; 9:23–24 (?); 10:3c; 11:8–9 (?); 17:8–10; 20:10–11; 21:19–22; 22:17–18; 24:1–11*, 21–25*; 27:7–10; 29:12, 13b–20; 34:7–10a; 34:25a, 26*, 28*; 34:34–35; and 35:16. Another one reworks Job's final monologue even more by adding vv. 30:1c–d, 5–8; 31:17, 19, 21, 24–27, 29–34, 38–40b. Some *Fortschreibungen* are inspired by the transcience redactions and add vv. 7:1–3, 6–10; 9:21–22, 25–26 (?); 10:4–5; 14:18–22; 19:10–12 (?); 34:19c–20; and possibly some glosses in chs. 23–24. Nömmik also thinks that the “Poem about the enemies of light” (vv. 24:12–16, 18, 20 (?)), the “reworking of Job's opening curse” (vv. 3:4–6, 9), and the “Poem about the angel saving from the pit” (vv. 33:23–30) were added as *Fortschreibungen*. He also categorises vv. 19:25–27, and eschatological glosses in vv. 19:28–29 and 31:11–15, 23, 28 under *Fortschreibungen*. The Poems of Behemoth (vv. 40:15–18, 21–24) and Leviathan (vv. 40:25–41:8, 10–25*) belong here, as well as the description of the horse in vv. 39:21–24a, 25, sharing the same poetic profile. Some late *Fortschreibungen* were also added to the Elihu speeches (vv. 33:15, 19–22) and to the epilogue (vv. 42:14–15).

He identifies some passages so late that they were possibly missing from the *Vorlage* of the OG translation (“Masoretic extra material”): vv. 28:15–19; 30:2–4 (?); 31:1–4 (?); and 39:13–19.

Finally, he lists numerous glosses that he cannot date: vv. 3:16, 23; 4:20b; 5:(3)4–5, 22; 6:4b, 10c, 14, 27; 7:4–5, 20a, 21a–b; 8:6b, 9, 15; 9:17–18, 29; 10:1a, 3, 15c–17, 22;

11:6, 19a; 12:3c–6*, 9; 13:3–4, 17, 27c, 28; 14:3, 4, 11–12* (11+12b and 12a+c), 13c, 14; 15:18–19, 24c, 28c, 30a, 31; 16:17, 20; 17:4–5, 11–12, 16; 18:4a; 20:16–17, 23a, 25bβ, 26c; 21:16, 17c, 33c; 23:11–12, 14, 16; 24:17, 19; 28:3c, 4c, 24, 28; 29:13a, 25c; 30:3c; 31:7c, 18, 20, 35a; 32:8; 33:4; 34:25b + 26aα, 27; 35:8–12; 36:7a, 13–14, 16, 17–21, 29–30; 37:20–22; 39:24b; 40:19–20; 41:9(?), 26(?); 42:2–4.

Vermeylen 2015 distinguishes five stages of growth in the Book of Job between the 5th and 2nd centuries BCE, all identified with certain schools of thought.

According to his theory, the Job-story existed at first, during the royal period, as a narrative form, consisting of vv. 1:1a, 2–3, 13–19, 20a, 21aβ, b (the last verse being possibly later) and vv. 42:10aα, 11–13, 16b–17.

The poem was added during the first redaction (*rédaction* I; identified with the Nehemiah school) which included chs. 3–31*; 38*; 40:3–5. This redaction added vv. 2:11–13 to the narrative, describing the arrival of Job's friends.

The second redaction (*rédaction* II, identified with the Ezra school) supplemented both the narrative frame and the poem with the following verses: 1:1b, 4–12, 20b–21aα, 21aβ, b (the last verse being possibly from the original narrative), 22; 2:1–10; 6:10, 15–20; 7:1–4a, 5–11a, 12, 16–19, 20*, 21; 9:5–10, 13, 20(corr.), 21, 25–31; 10:3aβ, 4–15aα, 20–22; 12:13, 16–25; 13:1–2, 16, 20–27; 14:3b, 13, 14aβ–17; 16:7–8*, 16:18–17:1, 3–4, 11; 19:4, 7, 13, 17, 20, 23–29; 24:1–4, 5*, 6*, 11–12a, 13, 16aβ–17a, 18aβ, 19, 24; 26:5–13; 27:7–10, 13–23; 28:1–2, 5–6, 9–14, 21, 23–27; 29:12–20, 25b; 30:12b, 13b, (24–)25; 31:1–10, 13–17, 19–22, 24–35aα, 38–40a; and 42:7–9, 10aβ, b. This redaction emphasises the positive qualities of Job in the narrative and adds the heavenly scenes to the prologue.

Vermeylen dates the third redaction (*rédaction* III; identified with the Sirach school) to the 2nd century BCE. In this redaction, the Elihu speeches in chapters 32–37 were added, because the friends have not so far convinced Job. Further, the first speech of God was added in chs. 38:29–39:30. Other speeches and the epilogue were expanded in this redaction as well, by adding the following verses: 3:16, 24–26; 4:12–21; 5:3–7, 17–27; 6:14; 7:4b, 11b, 13–15; 8:4, 6aα, 9, 11–12; 9:11–12; 10:1; 11:4–6, 11–12, 14–15, 20b; 12:3b–12, 14–15; 13:9–10, 15, 17–19; 13:28–14:3a, 4–6, 18–22; 15:2–7, 11–19, 28b, 31; 16:3; 17:12, 15–16; 18:2–3, 4b; 19:12, 15*; 20:23, 26b, 28; 21:3b–4a, 10, 16–21, 27–33; 22:24–25, 29–30; 23:8–9, 14; 25:1–6; 26:1–4, 14; 27:1, 11–12; 28:7–8, 15–20, 22, 28; 30:11, 15aα; 31:11–12, 18, 23. Vermeylen identifies the redaction as a whole quite negative towards Job.

In the last stage of growth, the fourth redaction (*rédaction* IV; identified to the time of Antiochos IV), the second speech of God (40:6–42:6) and the following verses were added: 5:1; 14:7–12; 20:15, 19–21; 21:15; 22:2–11, 17–18; 24:5–6*, 9–10, 12b, 14–16aα, 17b–18aα, b, 20–23; 28:7–8; 30:1–8, 20–23; 32:2–5, 6b, 10, 15–16, 18; 33:31; 34:7–9, 16–20, 25, 29b–33; 35:1–12, 14–15; 36:13–14; 37:1–3, 5, 11–13, 16; 39:17; and 40:1–2. This redaction takes up the point of view of the previous redaction but adds aggression as Job is reproached more.

He also lists some glosses that he cannot date precisely: vv. 33:15aβ; 36:7aβ, 11b, 16–21; 37:4, 12*, 19, 23.

APPENDIX II:

Strophic structures in Hebrew Job: a selection

Terrien 1963¹⁰⁶⁰

- Chs. 4–5:** 4:2–6 (2–4, 5–6) | 7–11 (7–9, 10–11) | 12–16 (12–13, 14–16) | 17–21 (17–18, 19–21) | 5:1–7 (1–3, 4–5, 6–7) | 8–17 (8–10, 11–13, 14–16, 17) | 18–27 (18–20, 21–23, 24–26, 27)
- Ch. 8:** 8:2–7 (2–4, 5–7) | 8–12 (8–10, 11–12) | 13–17 (13–15, 16–17) | 18–22 (18–19, 20–22)
- Chs. 12–14:** 12:2–6 (2–3, 4–6) | 7–12 (7–8, 9–10, 11–12) | 13–16 (13–14, 15–16) | 17–25 (17–19, 20–22, 23–25) | 13:1–6 (1–3, 4–6) | 7–12 (7–9, 10–12) | 13–19 (13–16, 17–19) | 20–22 | 23–25 | 26–28 | 14:1–6 (1–3, 4–6) | 7–12 (7–9, 10–12) | 13–17 (13–15, 16–17) | 18–22 (18–20, 21–22)
- Ch. 15:** 15:2–6 (2–4, 5–6) | 7–11 (7–8, 9–11) | 12–16 (12–13, 14–16) | 17–21 (17–19, 20–21) | 22–26 (22–24, 25–26) | 27–30 (27–28, 29–30) | 31–35 (31–33, 34–35)
- Ch. 19:** 19:2–6 (2–3, 4–6) | 7–12 (7–9, 10–12) | 13–18 (13–16, 17–18) | 19–24 (19–22, 23–24) | 25–29 (25–27, 28–29)
- Ch. 21:** 21:2–6 (2–3, 4–6) | 7–13 (7–9, 10–13) | 14–18 (14–15, 16–18) | 19–22 (19–21, 22) | 23–28 (23–26, 27–28) | 29–34 (29–31, 32–34)
- Ch. 25:** 25:2–6 (2–3, 4–6)
- Chs. 29–31:** 29:2–6 (2–3, 4–6) | 7–11 (7–8, 9–11) | 12–17 (12–13, 14–17) | 18–20 (+ 30:1–2?) | 21–25 (21–22, 23–25) | (29:18–20? +) 30:1–2 | 3–8 (3–5, 6–8) | 9–14 (9–11, 12–14) | 15–19 (15–16, 17–19) | 20–24 (20–21, 22–24) | 27–31 (27–29, 30–31) | 30:25–26 + 31:1–4 | 5–8 (5–6, 7–8) | 9–12 (9–10, 11–12) | 13–18 (13–15, 16–18) | 19–23 (19–20, 21–23) | 24–28 (23–25, 26–28) | 29–34 (29–32, 33–34) | 35–40b (35–37, 38–40b) | 40c
- Chs. 38–39:** 38:2–7 (2–3, 4–7) | 8–18 (8–11, 16–18) | 19–21 + 12–15 | 22–30 (22–24, 25–28, (29–30)) | 31–38 (31–33, 34–38) | 38:39–41 + 39:1–4 | 5–12 (5–8, 9–12) | 13–18 (13–15, 16–18) | 19–25 (19–21, 22–25) | 26–30 (26–28, 29–30)
- Chs. 40:6–41:26:** 40:7–14 (7–9, 10–14) | 15–19 (15–16, 17–19) | 20–24 (20–22, 23–24) | 25–29 (25–26, 27–29) | 40:30–32 + 41:1–3 | 4–9 (4–6, 7–9) | 10–14 (10–11, 12–14) | 15–21 (15–16, 17–21) | 22–26 (22–24, 25–26)

Fohrer 1963

- Chs. 4–5:** (4:1) | 2–6 | 7–11 | 12–16 | 17–21 | 5:1–5 | 6–9 + 11 | 12–16 | 17–21 | 23–27
- Ch. 8:** (8:1) | 2–4 | 5–7 | 8–10 | 11–13 | 14–15 + 19 | 16–18 | 20–22
- Chs. 12–14:** (12:1) | 2–3 | 4–6 | 7–11 | 12–15 | 16–20 | 21–25 | 13:1–3 | 4–6 | 7–9 | 10–12 | 13–15 | 16 + 18–19 | 20–22 | 23–25 | 26–28 | 14:1–3 | 4–6 | 7–9 | 10–12 | 13–14 | 15–17 | 18–19 | 20–22
- Ch. 15:** (15:1) | 2–6 | 7–10 | 11–13 | 14–16 | 17–19 | 20–22 | 23–25 | 26–28 | 29–30 + 32 | 33–35
- Ch. 19:** (19:1) | 2–4 | 5–8 | 9–12 | 13–16 | 17–20 | 21–24 | 25–27 | 28–29
- Ch. 21:** (21:1) | 2–5 | 6–9 | 10–13 | 14–15 + 17–18 | 19–22 | 23–26 | 27–30 | 31–34

¹⁰⁶⁰ Strophes that match with OG are underlined.

Ch. 25: (25:1) | 2–6

Chs. 29–31: (29:1) | 2–6 | 7–10 + 21 | 22–24 + 11 | 12–17 | 18–20 | 30:1 + 9–10 | (2–8) | 11–14 | 15–19 | 20–23 | 24–27 | 28–31 | 31:1–4 | 5–8 | 9–12 | 13–15 | 16–19 | 20–23 | 24–28 | 29–32 | 33–34 + 38–40 | 35–37

Chs. 38–39: (38:1) | 2–3 | 4–7 | 8–11 | 12–15 | 16–18 + 20 | 22–25 | 26–27 + 29–30 | 31–34 | 35–38 | 39–41 | 39:1–4 | 5–8 | 9–12 | 13–14 + 16 + 18 | 19–22 | 23–25 | 26–30 | 40:2 + 8–10 | 11–14

Chs. 40:6–41:26: 40:15–24 | 25–30 | 31–32 + 41:1–4 | 5–8 + 10 | 11–15 | 17–21 | 22–26

Habel 1985

Chs. 4–5: 4:1–11 | 12–21 | 5:1–7 | 8–16 | 17–27

Ch. 8: 8:1–7 | 8–20 | 21–22

Chs. 12–14: 12:1–6 | 7–12 | 13–25 | 13:1–5 | 6–12 | 13–16 | 17–23 | 24–28 | 14:1–6 | 7–22

Ch. 15: 15:1–16 | 17–35

Ch. 19: 19:1–5 | 6–12 | 13–20 | 21–29

Ch. 21: 21:1–6 | 7–16 | 17–26 | 27–34

Ch. 25¹⁰⁶¹: 25:1–6

Chs. 29–31: 29:1–2 | 3–10 | 11–17 | 18–24 | 25 | 30:1–11 | 12–19 | 20–31 | 31:1–6 | 7–12 | 13–23 | 24–28 | 29–34 | 35–40

Chs. 38–39: 38:1–3 | 4–7 | 8–11 | 12–15 | 16–18 | 19–21 | 22–30 | 31–33 | 34–38 | 39–41 | 39:1–4 | 5–8 | 9–12 | 13–18 | 19–25 | 26–30

Chs. 40:6–41:26: 40:6–14 | 15–24 | 25–32 | 41:1–4 | 5–21 | 22–26

Hartley 1988

Chs. 4–5: 4:1–6 | 7–11 | 12–21 | 5:1–7 | 8–16 | 17–27

Ch. 8: 8:1–7 | 8–10 | 11–19 | 20–22

Chs. 12–14: 12:1–3 | 4–6 | 7–11 | 12–25 | 13:1–12 | 13–17 | 18–22 | 23–28 | 14:1–6 | 7–12 | 13–17 | 18–22

Ch. 15: 15:1–16 | 17–35

Ch. 19: 19:1–6 | 7–12 | 13–20 | 21–27 | 28–29

Ch. 21: 21:1–6 | 7–16 | 17–21 | 22–26 | 27–34

Ch. 25¹⁰⁶²: 25:1–6

Chs. 29–31: 29:1–6 | 7–10 | 11–17 | 18–20 | 21–25 | 30:1–8 | 9–15 | 16–23 | 24–31 | 31:1–4 | 5–8 | 9–12 | 13–15 | 16–23 | 24–28 | 29–32 | 33–34 | 38–40b | 35–37 + 40c

Chs. 38–39: 38:1–3 | 4–15 | 16–24 | 25–38 | 39–41 | 39:1–4 | 5–8 | 9–12 | 13–18 | 19–25 | 26–30

Chs. 40:6–41:26: 40:6–14 | 15–24 | 40:25–41:26

¹⁰⁶¹ Taken as the first strophe of 25:1–6 + 26:5–14.

¹⁰⁶² Taken as the first part of 27:13–23.

Van der Lugt 1995¹⁰⁶³

- Chs. 4–5:** (4:1), I.1 (2–4 | 5–6), I.2 (7–9 | 10–11), II.1 (12–14 | 15–16), II.2 (17–19 | 20–21). I.1 (5:1 | 2–3 | 4–5), I.2 (6–7), II.1 (8 | 9–11 | 12–14), II.2 (15–16), III.1 (17 | 18–20 | 21–23), III.2 (24–26), B (27)
- Ch. 8:** (8:1), I (2–4 | 5–7), II (8–10 | 11–13), III (14–16 | 17–19), IV (20–22)
- Chs. 12–14:** (12:1), I.1 (2–3 | 4–6), I.2 (7–8 | 9–10 | 11–13), II.1 (14–16 | 17–18 | 19–20), II.2 (21–22 | 23–25). I (13:1–2 | 3–4), II.1 (5–6 | 7–8), II.2 (9–10 | 11–12), II.3 (13–14 | 15–16), III.1 (17–18 | 19–20), III.2 (21–22 | 23–24), III.3 (25–26 | 27–28). I.1 (14:1–3 | 4–6), I.2 (7–9 | 10–12), II.1 (13–15 | 16–17), II.2 (18–19 | 20–22)
- Ch. 15:** (15:1), I (2–3 | 4–6), II (7–8 | 9–11), III (12–13 | 14–16). A (15:17–19), I.1 (20–21 | 22–23), I.2 (24–25 | 26–27), II.1 (28–29 | 30–31), II.2 (32–33 | 34–35)
- Ch. 19:** (19:1), A (2–3 | 4–5), I.1 (6–8 | 9–10 | 11–12), I.2 (13–15 | 16–17 | 18–19), II.1 (20–22 | 23–24), II.2 (25–27 | 28–29)
- Ch. 21:** (21:1), A (2–4), I (5–7 | 8–10 | 11–13 | 14–15), II (16–18 | 19–21 | 22–24 | 25–26), III (27–28 | 29–30 | 31–33), B (34)
- Ch. 25¹⁰⁶⁴:** (25:1), I (2–3 | 4–6 | 26:2–4)
- Chs. 29–31:** I.1 (29:2–3 | 4–6), I.2 (7–8 | 9–10), II.1 (11–12 | 13–14), II.2 (15–16 | 17–18), III.1 (19–20), III.2 (21–22 | 23–25). I (30:1–3a | 3b–5 | 6–8), II.1 (9–10 | 11–12b), II.2 (12c–13 | 14–15), III.1 (16–17 | 18–19), III.2 (20–21 | 22–23), IV.1 (24–25 | 26–27), IV.2 (28–29 | 30–31). I.1 (31:1–2 | 3–4 | 5–6), I.2 (7–8 | 9–10 | 11–12), II.1 (13–15 | 16–18), II.2 (19–21 | 22–23), II.3 (24–26 | 27–28), III.1 (29–30 | 31–32 | 33–34), III.2 (35–37 | 38–40)
- Chs. 38–39:** (38:1), A (2–3), I.1 (4–5 | 6–7), I.2 (8–9 | 10–11), I.3 (12–13 | 14–15), II.1 (16–18 | 19–21), II.2 (22–24 | 25–27), III.1 (28–30 | 31–32), III.2 (33–35 | 36–38). I.1.1 (39–41), I.1.2 (39:1–2 | 3–4), I.2.1 (5–6 | 7–8), I.2.2 (9–10 | 11–12), II.1 (13–15 | 16–18), II.2 (19–20 | 21–23 | 24–25), III (26–28 | 29–30)
- Chs. 40:6–41:26:** (40:6), I (7–9 | 10–12 | 13–14), II.1 (15–18 | 19–22 | 23–24), II.2 (25–28 | 29–32 + 41:1–3), III.1 (4–6 | 7–9), III.2 (10–13 | 14–17), III.3 (18–21 | 22–24 | 25–26)

Fokkelman 2012

- Chs. 4–5:** (4:1), I (2–4 | 5–6), II (7–9 | 10–11), III (12–13 | 14–16), IV (17–18 | 19–21). I (5:1–2 | 3–5 | 6–7), II (8–9 | 10–11 | 12–14 | 15–16), III (17–18 | 19–20 | 21–23 | 24–26 | 27)
- Ch. 8:** (8:1), I (2–4 | 5–7), II (8–10 | 11–12), III (13–15 | 16–17), IV (18–19 | 20–22)
- Chs. 12–14:** (12:1), I (2–3 | 4–6), II (7–8 | 9–10 | 11–13), III (14–16 | 17–19 | 20–22 | 23–25). I (1–3 | 4–6), II (7–9 | 10–12 | 13–14), II (15–16 | 17–19 | 20–22), IV (23–25 | 26–28). I (14:1–3 | 4–6), II (7–9 | 10–12), III (13–14 | 15–17), IV (18–20 | 21–22)
- Ch. 15:** (15:1), I (2–3 | 4–6), II (7–8 | 9–10), III (11–13 | 14–16), IV (17–19 | 20–21), V (22–24 | 25–27), VI (28–29 | 30–31), VII (32–33 | 34–35)
- Ch. 19:** (19:1), I (2–3 | 4–6), II (7–8 | 9–10 | 11–12), III (13–14 | 15–17 | 18–20), IV (21–22 | 23–24), V (25–27 | 28–29)

¹⁰⁶³ Dozens of other possible divisions by various scholars are given in Van der Lugt's monograph.

¹⁰⁶⁴ Taken as part of the first canto of Job 25–26.

Ch. 21: (21:1), I (2-4 | 5-6), II (7-9 | 10-11 | 12-13 | 14-15), III (16-18 | 19-21), IV (22-24 | 25-26), V (27-29 | 30-31 | 32-33 | 21:34)

Ch. 25: (25:1), I (2-3 | 4-6)

Chs. 29-31: (29:1), I (2-3 | 4-6), II (7-8 | 9-10), III (11-13 | 14-15 | 16-17), IV (18-20 | 21-23 | 24-25). I (30:1-3a | 3b-5 | 6-8), II (9-10 | 11-13a | 13b-15), III (16-17 | 18-19 | 20-21 | 22-23), IV (24-26 | 27-28 | 29-31). I (31:1-3 | 4-6), II (7-8 | 9-10 | 11-12), III (13-15 | 16-18), IV (19-20 | 21-23), V (24-25 | 26-28), VI (29-30 | 31-32 | 33-34), VII (35-37 | 38-40b), 40c

Chs. 38-39: (38:1), I (2-3 | 4-5 | 6-7), II (8-9 | 10-11), III (12-13 | 14-15), IV (16-18 | 19-21), V (22-24 | 25-27 | 28-30), VI (31-32 | 33-35 | 36-38). I (39-41 | 39:1-2 | 3-4), II (5-6 | 7-8), III (9-10 | 11-12), IV (13-15 | 16-18), V (19-20 | 21-23 | 24-25), VI (26-27 | 28-30)

Chs. 40:6-41:26: (40:6); I (7-9 | 10-12 | 13-14), II (15-16 | 17-18 | 19-20), III (21-23 | 24-26), IV (27-28 | 29-30 | 31-32). I (41:1-2 | 3-4), II (5-6 | 7-9), III (10-11 | 12-13), IV (14-15 | 16-17), V (18-19 | 20-21), VI (22-24 | 25-26)

Nömmik 2013

Chs. 4-5: (4:1) | 2-6 | 7-11 | 12-16 | 17-21 | 5:1-7 | 8-11 | 12-16 | 17-22 | 23-27

Ch. 8: (8:1) | 2-5 | 6-10 | 11-13 | 14-18 | 19-22

Chs. 12-14: (12:1) | 2-6 | 7-10 | 11-13 | 14-16 | 17-19 | 20-22 | 23-25 | 13:1-4 | 5-6 | 7-10 | 11-14 | 15-19 | 20-23 | 24-28 | 14:1-6 | 7-10 | 11-15 | 16-17 | 18-22

Ch. 15: (15:1) | 2-6 | 7-10 | 11-13 | 14-16 | 17-19 | 20-24 | 25-29 | 30-35

Ch. 19: (19:1) | 2-5 | 6-9 | 10-12 | 13-16 | 17-20 | 21-24 | 25-27 | 28-29

Ch. 21: (21:1) | 2-5 | 6-9 | 10-13 | 14-18 | 19-22 | 23-26 | 27-30 | 31-34

Ch. 25: (25:1) | 2-6

Chs. 29-31: (29:1) | 2-6 | 7-11 | 12-16 | 17-20 | 21-25 | 30:1-4 | 5-8 | 9-11 | 12-15 | 16-19 | 20-23 | 24-27 | 28-31 | 31:1-3 | 4-6 | 7-12 | 13-18 | 19-23 | 24-28 | 29-34 | 35-37 | 38-40

Chs. 38-39: (38:1) | 2-5 | 6-11 | 12-17 | 18-24 | 25-30 | 31-34 | 35-38 | 39-41 | 39:1-4 | 5-8 | 9-12 | 13-18 | 19-22 | 23-25 | 26-30

Chs. 40:6-41:26: (40:6) | 7-10 | 11-14 | 15-20 | 21-24 | 25-28 | 29-32 | 41:1-4 | 5-9 | 10-13 | 14-17 | 18-21 | 22-26

Witte 2021

Chs. 4-5: (4:1) | 2-6 | 7-11 | 12-16 | 17-21 | 5:1-5 | 6-9+11 (10 is secondary) | 12-16 | 17-21 (22 is secondary) | 23-27

Ch. 8: (8:1) | 2-7 | 8-13 | 14-19 | 20-22

Chs. 12-14: (12:1) 2-3 | 4-6 | 7-10 | 12:11-13:2 | 3-6 | 7-12 | 13-16 + 18-19 (17 is secondary) | 20-23 | 24-27 | 13:28-14:1-2 + 5-6 (3-4 are secondary) | 7-12 | 13-17 | 18-22

Ch. 15: (15:1) | 2-6 | 7-10 + 17 (11-16 and 18-19 are secondary) | 20-24 | 25-29 | 30 + 32-35 (31 is secondary)

Ch. 19: (19:1) | 2-5 | 6-9 | 10-12 | 13-16 | 17-20 | 21-24 | 25-27 | (28-29 is secondary)

Ch. 21: (21:1) | 2-5 | 6-9 | 10-13 | 14-17 | 18-21 (22 is secondary) | 23-26 | 27-30 | 31-34

Ch. 25: (25:1) | 2–6

Chs. 29–31: (29:1) | 2–6 | 7–11 | 12–16 | (17, 18–20 are secondary) | 21–25 | 30:1ab + 9–11 (1bc–8 are secondary) | 12–15 | 16–19 | 20–23 | 24–27 | 28–31 | 31:1–6 (1–3 are secondary) | 7–12 (11–12 are secondary) | 13–18 | 19–23 (23 is secondary) | 24–27 (28 is secondary) | 29–34 | 35–40a (38–40 is secondary)

Chs. 38–39: (38:1) | 2–3 | 4–7 | 8–11 | 12–15 | 16–18 | 19–21 | 22–24 | 25–27 | 28–30 | 31–34 | 35–38 | 39–41 | 39:1–4 | 5–8 | 9–12 | 13–18 | 19–22 | 23–25 | 26–30

Chs. 40:6–41:26: (40:6) | 7–14 | 15–24 | 25–28 | 29–32 | 41:1–6 | 7–9 | 10–13 | 14–16 | 17–22 | 23–26

APPENDIX III: Texts of OG and MT Job

Job 4-5

v. ¹⁰⁶⁵		Greek ¹⁰⁶⁶	Hebrew ¹⁰⁶⁷
I	4:2a	Μὴ <u>πολλάκις</u> σοι λελάληται ἐν κόπῳ;	הנסה דבר <u>אליך תלאה</u>
	2b	ἰσχύν δὲ <u>ῥημάτων</u> <u>σου</u> τίς ὑποίσει;	ועצר <u>במלין מי</u> יוכל:
	3a	/ εἰ <u>γάρ</u> σὺ ἐνουθέτησας πολλούς	<u>הנה</u> יסרת רבים /
	3b	/ καὶ χεῖρας <u>ἀσθενούς</u> παρεκάλεσας	/ וידים <u>רפות</u> תחזק:
	4a	/ <u>ἀσθενούντας</u> <u>τε</u> ἐξανέστησας <u>ῥήμασιν</u>	/ כושל יקימון <u>מליך</u>
	4b	/ γόνασιν τε ἀδυνατοῦσιν θάρσος περιέθηκας,	/ וברכים כרעות תאמץ:
	5a	/ νῦν δὲ ἥκει ἐπὶ σὲ πόνος <u>καὶ</u> ἥψατό σου,	<u>כי</u> <u>עתה</u> תבוא <u>אליך ותלא</u> /
	5b	/ <u>σὺ</u> δὲ ἐσπούδασας.	/ תגע עדיד ותבהל:
II	6a	<u>πότερον</u> οὐχ ὁ φόβος σοῦ <u>ἐστίν</u> ἐν ἀφροσύνῃ	<u>הלא</u> יראתך כסלחך
	6b	<u>καὶ</u> ἡ ἐλπίς σου καὶ ἡ ἀκακία τῆς ὁδοῦ σου;	תקותך ותם דרכיך:
	7a	/ <u>μνησθητι</u> <u>οὖν</u> τίς καθαρὸς <u>ὦν ἀπώλετο</u>	/ <u>זכר נא</u> <u>מי הוא</u> נקי <u>אבד</u>
	7b	/ <u>ἢ πότε</u> ἀληθινοὶ <u>ὀλόρριζοι</u> <u>ἀπώλοντο</u> .	/ <u>ואיפה</u> ישרים נכחדו:
	8a	/ καθ' ὃν τρόπον εἶδον τοὺς ἀροτριῶντας τὰ ἄτοπα,	<u>כאשר</u> יראיתי חרשי און
	8b	/ οἱ δὲ σπείροντες αὐτὰ ὀδύνας θεριοῦσιν ἑαυτοῖς.	/ וזרעי עמל יקצרהו:
	9a	/ <u>ἀπὸ</u> προστάγματος κυρίου <u>ἀπολούνται</u> ,	/ <u>מנשמת</u> אלוה <u>יאבדו</u>
	9b	/ <u>ἀπὸ</u> δὲ πνεύματος ὀργῆς αὐτοῦ ἀφανισθήσονται.	/ <u>ומרוח</u> אפו יכלו:
III	10a	/ σθένος <u>λέοντος</u> , φωνὴ δὲ λεαίνης,	/ <u>שאגת</u> אריה וקול <u>שחל</u>
	10b	/ γαυρίαμα δὲ δρακόντων ἐσβέσθη·	/ <u>ושני</u> כפירים <u>נתעו</u> :
	11a	<u>μυρμηκολέων</u> ὦλετο παρὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν βοράν,	<u>ליש</u> אבד מבלי טרף
	11b	σκύμνοι δὲ <u>λεόντων</u> ἔλιπον ἀλλήλους.	/ ובני לביא יתפרדו:
	12a	<u>εἰ δέ</u> <u>τι</u> <u>ῥήμα</u> <u>ἀληθινὸν</u> ἐγεγόνει ἐν λόγοις σου,	ואלי דבר יגנב
	12b	<u>οὐθὲν</u> <u>ἄν</u> σοι τούτων κακὸν ἀπήντησεν.	<u>תקח</u> אזני <u>שמך</u> מנהו:

¹⁰⁶⁵ Roman numerals in the first column indicate the strophes of the Greek text. The second column refers to the verse numbers as noted in both BHS and Ziegler's edition, however, further noting of cola with the letters a, b, c, etc. is added. In the Greek and Hebrew texts, the following are marked: parallelistic structures have a / next to them, lexical repetitions are bolded, transition/discourse markers have a single underline, similes have a double underline, rare vocabulary is marked with a grey highlight. Pluses and minuses are boxed (the parts that the translator added to the text are boxed as they are pluses in comparison to the MT; the parts that the translator omitted in the Hebrew are boxed as they are pluses in comparison to the OG).

¹⁰⁶⁶ The Greek text is that of the 1982 Göttingen edition prepared by Ziegler. Occasional adjustments to punctuation are made by the author. Other changes to the text are commented in footnotes.

¹⁰⁶⁷ The Hebrew text is that of BHS, although unpointed.

	v.	Greek	Hebrew
IV	12c	<u>πρότερον οὐ</u> δέξεται μου τὸ οὖς ἐξαίσια παρ' αὐτοῦ;	<u>בשעפים</u> מחזינות לילה
	13a	<u>φόβος</u> <u>δὲ</u> <u>καὶ</u> ἡχώ νυκτερινή,	בנפל תרדמה על אנשים:
	13b	<u>ἐπιπίπτων φόβος ἐπ'</u> ἀνθρώπους,	<u>פחד</u> קראני ורעדתי
	14a	φρίκη μοι <u>συνήντησεν</u> καὶ τρόμος	ורב עצמותי <u>הפחיד</u> :
	14b	καὶ <u>μεγάλως</u> μου τὰ ὅσα <u>συνέσεισεν</u> ,	ורוח על פני יחלף
	15a	καὶ πνεῦμα <u>ἐπὶ</u> πρόσωπόν μου <u>ἐπήλθεν</u> ,	<u>תסמר</u> <u>שערת</u> בשרי:
	15b	ἔφριξαν <u>δὲ</u> μου τρίχες καὶ σάρκες.	יעמד ולא אכיר מראה
V	16a	/ ἀνέστην, καὶ οὐκ <u>ἐπέγνων</u> .	תמונה לנגד עיני
	16b	/ εἶδον, <u>καὶ</u> οὐκ <u>ἦν</u> μορφή πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν μου,	דממה וקול אשמע:
	16c	<u>ἀλλ'</u> <u>ἦ</u> αὖραν καὶ φωνὴν ἤκουον	/ <u>תאנוש</u> מאלוה יצדק /
	17a	/ <u>τί γάρ</u> <u>μη</u> καθαρὸς <u>ἔσται</u> βροτὸς ἐναντίον κυρίου	/ <u>אם</u> מעשהו יטהר גבר: /
	17b	/ ἢ ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ ἄμεμπτος ἀνὴρ;	/ <u>הן</u> בעבדיו לא יאמין /
	18a	/ <u>εἰ</u> <u>κατὰ</u> παίδων αὐτοῦ οὐ πιστεύει,	/ ובמלאכיו <u>ישים</u> תהלה: /
	18b	/ <u>κατὰ</u> <u>δὲ</u> ἀγγέλων αὐτοῦ σκολιὸν <u>τί</u> ἐπενόησεν,	<u>אף</u> שכני בתי חמר
	19a	τοὺς <u>δὲ</u> <u>κατοικοῦντας</u> οἰκίας <u>πηλίνας</u> ,	<u>אשר</u> בעפר יסודם
	19b	ἐξ ὧν <u>καὶ</u> αὐτοὶ ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ <u>πηλοῦ ἔσμεν</u> ,	ידכאום לפני עש:
	19c	<u>ἔπαισεν</u> αὐτοὺς <u>σητὸς</u> <u>τρόπον</u> .	/ מבקר לערב יכתו /
	20a	<u>καὶ</u> ἀπὸ πρωῒθεν ἕως ἑσπέρας οὐκέτι εἰσίν,	/ מבלי <u>משים</u> לנצח יאבדו: /
	20b	<u>παρὰ τὸ</u> <u>μη</u> δύνασθαι αὐτοὺς ἑαυτοῖς βοηθῆσαι <u>ἀπώλοντο</u> .	<u>הלא</u> נסע <u>יתרם</u> בם
VI	21a	<u>ἐνεφύσησεν γὰρ</u> αὐτοῖς <u>καὶ</u> ἐξηράνθησαν,	ימותו ולא בחכמה:
	21b	<u>ἀπώλοντο</u> <u>παρὰ τὸ</u> <u>μη</u> ἔχειν αὐτοὺς σοφίαν.	<u>קרא</u> <u>נא</u> <u>היש</u> עונך
	5:1a	<u>ἐπικάλεσαι</u> <u>δέ</u> , <u>εἴ</u> τίς σοι ὑπακούσεται,	ואל <u>מי</u> מקדשים תפנה:
	1b	ἢ <u>εἴ</u> <u>τινα</u> <u>ἀγγέλων</u> ἀγίων ὀψη.	<u>כי</u> לאויל יהרג כעש
	2a	/ <u>καὶ</u> <u>γὰρ</u> ἄφρονα ἀναρεῖ ὀργή,	/ ופתה תמית קנאה: /
VII	2b	/ πεπλανημένον <u>δὲ</u> θανατοῖ ζῆλος.	<u>אני</u> ראיתי אויל <u>משריש</u>
	3a	ἐγὼ <u>δὲ</u> ἐόρακα ἄφρονας <u>ρίζαν</u> <u>βάλλοντας</u> ,	ואקוב נוהו <u>פתאם</u> :
	3b	<u>ἀλλ'</u> <u>εὐθέως</u> ἐβρώθη αὐτῶν ἡ δίαίτα.	ירחקו בניו מישע
	4a	<u>πόρρω</u> <u>γένονιντο</u> οἱ υἱοὶ αὐτῶν ἀπὸ σωτηρίας,	וידכאו בשער ואין מציל:
	4b	<u>κολαβρισθείησαν</u> <u>δὲ</u> ἐπὶ θύραις <u>ἡσσόνων</u> ,	<u>אשר</u> קצירו רעב יאכל
	4c	καὶ οὐκ <u>ἔσται</u> ὁ ἐξαιρούμενος.	ואל <u>מצנים</u> יקחוהו
	5a	/ ἂ <u>γὰρ</u> <u>ἐκείνοι</u> <u>συνήγαγον</u> , δίκαιοι ἔδονται,	<u>ושאף</u> <u>צמים</u> חילים:
VIII	5b	<u>αὐτοὶ</u> <u>δὲ</u> <u>ἐκ</u> <u>κακῶν</u> οὐκ <u>ἐξάιρετοι ἔσονται</u> ,	/ <u>כי</u> <u>לא</u> יצא מעפר און /
	5c	<u>ἐκσιφωνισθείη</u> αὐτῶν ἡ ἰσχύς.	/ <u>ומאדמה</u> לא יצמח <u>עמל</u> : /
	6a	/ <u>οὐ</u> <u>γὰρ</u> <u>μη</u> <u>ἐξέλθη</u> <u>ἐκ</u> τῆς γῆς <u>κόπος</u> ,	<u>כי</u> <u>אדם</u> לעמל יולד
	6b	/ <u>οὐδὲ</u> <u>ἐξ</u> ὀρέων ἀναβλαστήσει πόνος.	ובני <u>רשף</u> יגביהו עוף:
	7a	<u>ἀλλὰ</u> ἄνθρωπος γεννᾶται <u>κόπῳ</u> ,	
	7b	νεοσσοὶ <u>δὲ</u> γυπὸς τὰ ὑψηλὰ πέτονται.	

	v.	Greek	Hebrew
IX	8a	/ οὐ μὴν δὲ ἀλλὰ ἐγὼ δεηθήσομαι κυρίου,	/ אולם אני אדרש אל אל /
	8b	/ κύριον δὲ τὸν πάντων δεσπότην ἐπικαλέσομαι	/ ואל אלהים אשים דברתי:
	9a	/ τὸν ποιοῦντα μεγάλα καὶ ἀνεξιχνίαστα,	/ עשה גדלות ואין חקר /
	9b	/ ἔνδοξά τε καὶ ἐξαισία, ὧν οὐκ ἔστιν ἀριθμός·	/ נפלאות עד אין מספר:
	10a	/ τὸν διδόντα ὑετὸν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν,	/ הנתן מטר על פני ארץ /
	10b	/ ἀποστέλλοντα ὕδωρ ἐπὶ τὴν ὑπ' οὐρανόν·	/ ושלח מים על פני חוצות:
X	11a	/ τὸν ποιοῦντα ταπεινοὺς εἰς ὕψος	/ לשום שפלים למרום /
	11b	/ καὶ ἀπολωλότας ἐξεγείροντα·	/ וקדרים שגבו ישע:
	12a	διαλλάσσοντα βουλὰς πανούργων,	מפר מחשבות ערומים
	12b	καὶ οὐ μὴ ποιήσωσιν ¹⁰⁶⁸ αἱ χεῖρες αὐτῶν ἀληθές·	ולא תעשינה ידיהם תושיה:
	13a	ὁ καταλαμβάνων σοφούς ἐν τῇ φρονήσει,	לכד חכמים בערמם
	13b	βουλὴν δὲ πολυπλόκων ἐξέστησεν·	ועצת נפתלים נמהרה:
XI	14a	/ ἡμέρας συναντήσεται αὐτοῖς σκοτός,	/ יומם יפגשו חשך /
	14b	/ τὸ δὲ μεσημβρινὸν ψηλαφήσασαν ἴσα νυκτί·	/ וכלילה ימששו בצהרים:
	15a	/ ἀπόλουντο δὲ ἐν πολέμῳ,	/ ושע מחרב מפיהם
	15b	/ ἀδύνατος δὲ ἐξέλθοι ἐκ χειρὸς δυνάστου·	/ ומיד חזק אביון:
	16a	/ εἶη δὲ ἀδυνάτω ἐλπίς,	/ ותהי לדל תקוה
	16b	/ ἀδίκου δὲ στόμα ἐμφραχθείη·	/ ועלתה קפצה פיה:
XII	17a	μακάριος δὲ ἄνθρωπος, ὃν ἤλεγξεν ὁ κύριος·	תנה אשרי אנוש יוכחנו אלוה
	17b	νουθέτημα δὲ παντοκράτορος μὴ ἀπαναίνου·	ומוסר שדי אל תמאס:
	18a	/ αὐτὸς γὰρ ἀλγεῖν ποιεῖ καὶ πάλιν	/ כי הוא יכאיב ויחבש /
	18b	/ ἀποκαθίστησιν·	
	19a	/ ἔπαισεν, καὶ αἱ χεῖρες αὐτοῦ ἰάσαντο·	/ ימחץ וידיו ¹⁰⁶⁹ תרפינה:
	19b	/ ἐξάκεις ἐξ ἀναγκῶν σε ἐξελεῖται,	/ בשש צרות יצילך /
XIII	19b	/ ἐν δὲ τῷ ἐβδόμῳ οὐ μὴ ἄψηταί σου κακόν·	/ ובשבע לא יגע בד רע:
	20a	/ ἐν λιμῷ ῥύσεται σε ἐκ θανάτου,	/ ברעב פדך ממות /
	20b	/ ἐν πολέμῳ δὲ ἐκ χειρὸς σιδήρου λύσει σε·	/ ובמלחמה מידי חרב:
	21a	/ ἀπὸ μάλιστα γλώσσης σε κρύψει,	בשוט לשון תחבא
	21b	/ καὶ οὐ μὴ φοβηθῇς ἀπὸ κακῶν ἐρχομένων·	ולא תירא משד כי יבוא:
	22a	/ ἀδίκων καὶ ἀνόμων καταγελάση,	לשד ולכפן תשחק
	22b	/ ἀπὸ δὲ θηρίων ἀγρίων οὐ μὴ φοβηθῇς·	ומחית הארץ אל תירא:
	(23a)		כי עם אבני השדה ברידתך /
	23	θηρες γὰρ ἄγριοι εἰρηνεύσουσίν σοι·	/ וחיית השדה השלמה לך:
	24a	/ εἴτα γνώσῃ ὅτι εἰρηνεύσει σου ὁ οἶκος,	/ וידעת כי שלום אהלך /
XIV	24b	/ ἡ δὲ δίαίτα τῆς σκηνῆς σου οὐ μὴ ἀμάρτη·	/ ופקדת נוד ולא תחטא:
	25a	/ γνώσῃ δὲ ὅτι πολὺ τὸ σπέρμα σου,	/ וידעת כי רב זרעך /
	25b	/ τὰ δὲ τέκνα σου ἔσται ὥσπερ τὸ παμβότανον	/ וצאצאֶיך כעשב הארץ:
		τοῦ ἀγροῦ·	

¹⁰⁶⁸ LXX^{Zi}: ποιήσωσιν; correction based on Gentry.

¹⁰⁶⁹ Qere וידיו.

v.		Greek	Hebrew
26a	/	<u>ἐλεύση δὲ ἐν τάφῳ ὥσπερ σῖτος ὥριμος κατὰ</u> <u>καιρὸν θεριζόμενος</u>	<u>תבוא בכלח</u> <u>אלי קבר</u> /
26b	/	<u>ἢ ὥσπερ θημωνιά ἄλωνος καθ' ὥραν</u> <u>συγκομισθεῖσα.</u>	<u>בעלות גדיש בעתו:</u> /
XV 27a	/	<u>ἰδοὺ ταῦτα οὕτως ἐξιχνιάσαμεν,</u>	<u>הנה זאת חקרנוה כן היא</u>
27b	/	<u>ταῦτά ἐστιν ἃ ἀκηκόαμεν.</u>	<u>שמענה ואתה דע לד:</u>
27c		<u>σὺ δὲ γνώθι σεαυτῷ εἴ τι ἔπραξας.</u>	

v.	NETS ¹⁰⁷⁰	NRSVUE ¹⁰⁷¹
4:2	Is it often that something has been said to you in a time of trouble? But who can endure the force of your words?	If one ventures a word with you, will you be offended? But who can keep from speaking?
3	For if you admonished many, and encouraged the hands of the weak one,	See, you have instructed many; you have strengthened the weak hands.
4	and lifted up the weak with your words, and wrapped feeble knees in courage—	Your words have supported those who were stumbling, and you have made firm the feeble knees.
5	now distress has come upon you, and touched you, and you acted in haste.	But now it has come to you, and you are impatient; it touches you, and you are dismayed.
6	Is your fear not grounded in a lack of sense, and your hope and the innocence of your way?	Is not your fear of God your confidence and the integrity of your ways your hope?
7	Think now, who, being pure, perished, or when did the true perish root and all?	Think now, who that was innocent ever perished? Or where were the upright cut off?
8	In the same way, I saw those who plow wrongs, and those who sow them reap torments for themselves.	As I have seen, those who plow iniquity and sow trouble reap the same.
9	By the command of the Lord they will perish, and by the breath of his anger they will disappear.	By the breath of God they perish, and by the blast of his anger they are consumed.
10	The strength of the lion, and the sound of the lioness, and the arrogance of dragons was extinguished;	The roar of the lion, the voice of the fierce lion, and the teeth of the young lions are broken.
11	the ant-lion perished for lack of food, and the lions' whelps abandoned one another.	The strong lion perishes for lack of prey, and the whelps of the lioness are scattered.
12ab	But if there had been anything truthful in your words, nothing bad in them would have met you.	Now a word came stealing to me; my ear received the whisper of it.
12c	Will my ear not receive extraordinary things from him?	
13	Now there was terror and an echo sound in the night— when terror falls on mortals;	Amid thoughts from visions of the night, when deep sleep falls on mortals,

¹⁰⁷⁰ The translation of the Greek text is that of Claude Cox's in the NETS (2020 provisional version); occasional adjustments are made. To conserve space, individual cola are not separated in the translation.

¹⁰⁷¹ The translation of the Greek text is that of NRSVUE 2021. Occasional adjustments are made. To conserve space, individual cola are not separated in the translation.

v.	NETS	NRSVUE
14	then shuddering befell me, and trembling, and my bones shook mightily.	dread came upon me and trembling, which made all my bones shake.
15	And a spirit came upon my face, and my hair and flesh bristled up.	A spirit glided past my face; the hair of my flesh bristled.
16	I arose, and I did not recognize it. I looked and there was no shape before my eyes, but I heard a breeze, and a voice:	It stood still, but I could not discern its appearance. A form was before my eyes; there was silence; then I heard a voice:
17	‘What? Can a mortal be pure before the Lord, or a man be blameless on the basis of his actions?’	Can mortals be righteous before God? Can humans be pure before their Maker?
18	If he does not fully believe in his servants, and he took full note of any crookedness in his angels,	Even in his servants he puts no trust, and his angels he charges with error;
19	those that inhabit houses of clay—being their offspring, we ourselves too are of the same clay—he struck them like a moth!	how much more those who live in houses of clay, whose foundation is in the dust, who are crushed like a moth.
20	And so between morning and evening they ceased to exist; they perished, because they were not able to help themselves.	Between morning and evening they are destroyed; they perish forever without any regarding it.
21	For he breathed on them, and they withered; they perished, because they did not possess wisdom.	Their tent cord is plucked up within them, and they die devoid of wisdom.
5:1	But call, if anyone will respond to you or if you will see any of the holy angels.	Call now; is there anyone who will answer you? To which of the holy ones will you turn?
2	To be sure, anger takes away a fool’s life, and jealousy puts to death one who is misled.	Surely vexation kills the fool, and jealousy slays the simple.
3	Now, I have seen fools taking root, but at once their way of living was devoured.	I have seen fools taking root, but suddenly I cursed their dwelling.
4	May their children be far from safety, and may they be derided at the doors of their inferiors, and there will be no one to deliver them.	Their children are far from safety, they are crushed in the gate, and there is no one to deliver them.
5	For what they gathered, the upright shall eat, and they will not be excepted from harmful things; may their strength be drained.	The hungry eat their harvest, and they take it even out of the thorns, and the thirsty pant after their wealth.
6	For hardship shall not come from the earth, nor will trouble sprout from mountains,	For misery does not come from the earth, nor does trouble sprout from the ground,
7	but a human being is born to hardship, whereas the vulture’s young soar on high.	but humans are born to trouble just as sparks fly upward.
8	Nonetheless, I will entreat the Lord, and I will call on the Lord, the master of all,	As for me, I would seek God, and to God I would commit my cause.
9	who does great and inscrutable things, things both glorious and extraordinary, without number,	He does great things and unsearchable, marvelous things without number.
10	who gives rain on the earth, sending water on what is under heaven.	He gives rain on the earth and sends waters on the fields;
11	who sets on high those that are lowly and lifts up those that are in ruin,	he sets on high those who are lowly, and those who mourn are lifted to safety.
12	changing the plans of the crafty—and their hands shall not produce what is genuine;	He frustrates the devices of the crafty, so that their hands achieve no success.
13	who takes the wise in their cleverness—and subverted the scheming of the wily.	He takes the wise in their own craftiness, and the schemes of the wily are brought to a quick end.

v.	NETS	NRSVUE
14	In the daytime, darkness will meet them, and may they grope at noonday as in the night.	They meet with darkness in the daytime and grope at noonday as in the night.
15	And may they perish in war, but may the powerless escape from the hand of the mighty.	But he saves the needy from the sword of their mouth, from the hand of the mighty.
16	And may the powerless have hope, but the mouth of the unjust be shut.	So the poor have hope, and injustice shuts its mouth.
17	But happy is the one whom the Lord reproved, and do not reject the admonition of the Almighty,	How happy is the one whom God reproves; therefore do not despise the discipline of the Almighty.
18	for he makes one suffer and restores again; he struck, and his hands healed.	For he wounds, but he binds up; he strikes, but his hands heal.
19	Six times he will deliver you from troubles, and the seventh time no harm shall touch you.	He will deliver you from six troubles; in seven no harm shall touch you.
20	In famine he will rescue you from death, and in war he will free you from a blade's power.	In famine he will redeem you from death and in war from the power of the sword.
21	He shall hide you from the tongue-lashing, and you shall not fear harmful things that come.	You shall be hidden from the scourge of the tongue and shall not fear destruction when it comes.
22	At injustices and lawless acts you shall laugh, and you shall not fear wild animals—	At destruction and famine you shall laugh and shall not fear the wild animals of the earth.
23	for wild animals shall be at peace with you.	For you shall be in league with the stones of the field, and the wild animals shall be at peace with you.
24	Next, you shall know that your household will be at peace, and the fare of your tent shall not fail.	You shall know that your tent is safe; you shall inspect your fold and miss nothing.
25	And you shall know that your descendants will be many, and your children shall be as all the herbage of the field.	You shall know that your descendants will be many and your offspring like the grass of the earth.
26	And you shall come to the grave like ripe grain, harvested at the right time, or as a heap on the threshing floor, gathered in its season.	You shall come to your grave in ripe old age, as a shock of grain comes up to the threshing floor in its season.
27	Look, these things we traced to be so. These are the things we have heard, but do know for yourself whether you have done anything.	See, we have searched this out; it is true. Hear, and know it for yourself.

Job 8

v.	Greek	Hebrew
I 8:2a	<u>Μέχρι τίνος</u> λαλήσεις ταῦτα;	עד <u>אן</u> תמלל אלה
2b	πνεῦμα <u>πολυῆμον</u> τοῦ στόματός σου.	<u>רוח</u> כביר אמרי פיד:
3a	/ <u>μὴ</u> ὁ κύριος <u>ἀδικήσῃ</u> κρίνων	האל <u>יעות</u> משפט /
3b	/ <u>ἢ</u> ὁ τὰ πάντα ποιήσας <u>ταράξει</u> τὸ <u>δίκαιον</u> ;	<u>ואם</u> שדי <u>יעות</u> צדק: /
4a	<u>εἰ</u> οἱ υἱοὶ σου ἥμαρτον ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ,	<u>אם</u> בניך חטאו לו
4b	ἀπέστειλεν ἐν χειρὶ ἀνομίας αὐτῶν.	וישלחם ביד פשעם:
II 5	<u>σὺ δὲ ὀρβριζε</u> πρὸς κύριον παντοκράτορα <u>δεόμενος</u> .	<u>אם אתה</u> תשחר אל אל /

v.	Greek	Hebrew
(5b)		ואל שדי תתחנן:
6a	εἰ καθαρὸς εἶ καὶ ἀληθινός,	אם זך וישר אתה
6b	δεήσεως ἐπακούσεται σου, ¹⁰⁷²	כי עתה יעיר עליך
6c	ἀποκαταστήσει δέ σοι δίκαιαν δικαιοσύνην.	ושלם נות צדקך:
7a	/ ἔσται οὖν τὰ μὲν πρῶτά σου ὀλίγα,	/ והיה ראשיתך מצער
7b	/ τὰ δὲ ἔσχατά σου ἀμύθητα.	/ ואחריתך ישגה מאד:
III 8a	/ ἐπερώτησον γὰρ γενεὰν πρώτην,	/ כי שאל נא לדר רישון
8b	/ ἐξιχνίασον δὲ κατὰ γένος πατέρων.	/ וכונן לחקר אבות:
9a	χθιζοὶ γὰρ ἐσμὲν καὶ οὐκ οἶδαμεν,	כי תמול אנהנו ולא נדע
9b	σκιά γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡμῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ὁ βίος.	כי צל ימינו עלי ארץ:
10a	ἢ οὐχ οὗτοί σε διδάξουσιν καὶ ἀναγγελοῦσιν	הלא הם יורוד יאמרו לך
10b	καὶ ἐκ καρδίας ἐξάξουσιν ῥήματα;	ומלבם יוצאו מלים:
IV 11a	/ μὴ θάλλει πάπυρος ἄνευ ὕδατος	/ היגאה גמא בלא בצה
11b	/ ἢ ὑψωθήσεται βούτομον ἄνευ πότου;	/ ישגה אחו בלי מים:
12a	ἔτι ὃν ἐπὶ ῥίζης, καὶ οὐ μὴ θερισθῇ,	עדנו באבן לא יקטף
12b	πρὸ τοῦ πτεῖν πᾶσα βοτάνη οὐχὶ ξηραίνεται.	אלפני כל חציר ייבש:
13a	οὕτως τοίνυν ἔσται τὰ ἔσχατα πάντων τῶν	כן ארחות כל שכחי אל
13b	ἐπιλανθανομένων τοῦ κυρίου.	
	ἐλπίς γὰρ ἄσεβοῦς ἀπολείται.	ותקות חנה תאבד:
V 14a	/ ἀοίκητος γὰρ αὐτοῦ ἔσται ὁ οἶκος,	/ אשר יקוט כסלו
14b	/ ἀράχνη δὲ αὐτοῦ ἀποβήσεται ἢ σκηνή.	/ ובית עכביש מבטחו:
15a	/ ἔαν ὑπερείσῃ τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ, οὐ μὴ στή.	/ ישען על ביתו ולא יעמד
15b	/ ἐπιλαβομένου δὲ αὐτοῦ οὐ μὴ ὑπομείνῃ.	/ יחזיק בו ולא יקום:
VI 16a	ὕγρὸς γὰρ ἐστὶν ὑπὸ ἡλίου,	/ רטב הוא לפני שמש
16b	καὶ ἐκ σαπρίας αὐτοῦ ὁ ῥάδαμνος αὐτοῦ	/ ועל גנתו ינקתו תצא:
	ἐξελεύσεται.	
17a	/ ἐπὶ συναγωγὴν λίθων κοιμᾶται,	/ על גל ירשין יסבכו
17b	/ ἐν δὲ μέσῳ χαλίκων ζήσεται.	/ בית אבנים יחזה:
18a	ἔαν καταπίῃ, ὁ τόπος ψεύσεται αὐτόν.	אם יבלענן ממקומן
18b	οὐχ ἐόρακας τοιαῦτα.	תכחש בו לא ראיתך:
19a	ὅτι καταστροφὴ ἄσεβοῦς τοιαύτη,	הו הוא משוש דרכו
19b	ἐκ δὲ γῆς ἄλλον ἀναβλαστήσει.	ומעפר אחר יצמחו:
VII 20a	/ ὁ γὰρ κύριος οὐ μὴ ἀποποιήσεται τὸν ἄκακον,	/ הן אל לא ימאס תם
20b	/ πᾶν δὲ δῶρον ἄσεβοῦς οὐ δέζεται.	/ ולא יחזיק ביד מרעים:
21a	/ ἀληθινῶν δὲ στόμα ἐμπλήσει γέλωτος,	/ עד ימלה שחוק פת
21b	/ τὰ δὲ χεῖλη αὐτῶν ἐξομολογήσεως.	/ ושפתך תרועה:
22a	οἱ δὲ ἐχθροὶ αὐτῶν ἐνδύσονται αἰσχύνῃν,	שנאך ילבשו בשת
22b	δαίαιτα δὲ ἄσεβοῦς οὐκ ἔσται.	ואהל רשעים איננו:

¹⁰⁷² A bicolon in codices and LXX^{Z1} but it clearly corresponds to the Hebrew tricolon.

v.	NETS	NRSVUE
8:2	How long will you say these things— wordy wind of your mouth?	How long will you say these things and the words of your mouth be a great wind?
3	Will the Lord act unjustly when he judges, or will the maker of all things upset what is right?	Does God pervert justice? Or does the Almighty pervert the right?
4	If your children sinned before him, he sent them off by force of their lawlessness.	If your children sinned against him, he delivered them into the power of their transgression.
5	But you, quickly approach the Lord Almighty in prayer.	If you will seek God and make supplication to the Almighty,
6	If you are pure and genuine, he will hear your entreaty, and restore to you a righteous way of life.	if you are pure and upright, surely then he will rouse himself for you and restore to you your rightful place.
7	Then, your beginning will be small, but your end unspeakably great.	Though your beginning was small, your latter days will be very great.
8	For inquire of an earlier generation, and track it through a line of ancestors;	For inquire now of bygone generations and consider what their ancestors have found,
9	for we are of yesterday and we know nothing, for our life is a shadow on the earth.	for we are but of yesterday, and we know nothing, for our days on earth are but a shadow.
10	Will they not teach you and declare, and bring forth words from the heart?	Will they not teach you and tell you and utter words out of their understanding?
11	Does papyrus grow without water, or sedge become tall without drink?	Can papyrus grow where there is no marsh? Can reeds flourish where there is no water?
12	While it is still on the root, it will in no way be harvested; no plant becomes dry, in preference to drinking!	While yet in flower and not cut down, they wither before any other plant.
13	Such indeed will be the end of all who forget the Lord, for the hope of the impious shall perish.	Such are the paths of all who forget God; the hope of the godless shall perish.
14	For his house will be uninhabited, and his tent will prove to be a spider's web.	Their confidence is gossamer, a spider's house their trust.
15	If he props up his house, it will not stand, and though he lays hold of it, it will not remain,	If one leans against its house, it will not stand; if one lays hold of it, it will not endure.
16	for he is supple beneath the sun and his shoot will spread forth out of his rottenness.	The wicked thrive before the sun and their shoots spread over the garden.
17	He goes to sleep on a gathering of stones, and he will live among rubble.	Their roots twine around the stoneheap; they live among the rocks.
18	If it swallows him up, the place will deny him; you have not seen such things,	If they are destroyed from their place, then it will deny them, saying, 'I have never seen you.'
19	because such is the ruin of the impious, but from the soil something else will sprout up.	See, these are their happy ways, and out of the earth still others will spring.
20	For the Lord will not reject the blameless person, but no gift will he accept from the impious.	See, God will not reject the blameless, nor take the hand of evildoers.
21	But he will fill the mouths of the sincere with laughter and their lips with acknowledging,	He will yet fill your mouth with laughter and your lips with shouts of joy.
22	but their enemies will clothe themselves with shame, and the way of life of the impious will be no more.	Those who hate you will be clothed with shame, and the tent of the wicked will be no more.

Job 12-14

	v.	Greek	Hebrew
I	12:2a	Εἶτα ὕμεις ἐστε ἄνθρωποι·	אמנם כי אתם עם
	2b	ἢ μεθ' ὕμῶν τελευτήσει σοφία.	ועמכם תמות חכמה:
	3	καὶ οἱ μὲν καρδία καθ' ὕμᾱς ἐστίν .	גם לי לבב כמוכם
	(3b)		לא נפל אנכי מכם
	(3c)		ואת מי אין כמו אלה:
II	4	δίκαιος γὰρ ἀνὴρ καὶ ἄμεμπτος ἐγενήθη εἰς χλεύασμα .	שחק לרעהו אהיה
	(4b)		קרא לאלוה ויענהו
	(4c)		שחוק צדיק תמים:
	5a	/ εἰς χρόνον γὰρ τακτὸν ἡτοίμαστο πεσεῖν ὑπὸ ἄλλους,	לפיד בוח לעשתות שאנן
	5b	/ οἴκους τε αὐτοῦ ἐκπορθεῖσθαι ὑπὸ ἀνόμων.	נכון למועדי רגל:
	6a	οὐ μὴν δὲ ἀλλὰ μηδεὶς πεποιθέτω πονηρὸς ὢν ἀθῶς ἔσσεσθαι ,	ישליו אהלים לשדדים
	6b	ὅσοι παροργίζουσιν τὸν κύριον,	ובטחות למרגיזי אל
III	6c	ὥς οὐχὶ καὶ ἔτασις αὐτῶν ἔσται .	לאשר הביא אלוה בידו:
	7a	/ ἀλλὰ δὴ ἐπερώτησον τετράποδα ἐάν σοι εἰπωσιν,	ואולם שאל נא בהמות ותרך
	7b	/ πετεινὰ δὲ οὐρανοῦ ἐάν σοι ἀπαγγείλωσιν·	ועוף השמים ויגד לך:
	8a	/ ἐκδιήγησαι δὲ γῇ ἐάν σοι φράσῃ,	או שיח לארץ ותרך
	(8b)		ויספרו לך דגי הים:
	(9a)		מי לא ידע בכל אלה
	(9b)		בי יד יהוה עשתה זאת:
	10a	/ εἰ μὴ ἐν χειρὶ αὐτοῦ ψυχὴ πάντων τῶν ζώντων	אשר בידו נפש כל חי
	10b	/ καὶ πνεῦμα παντὸς ἀνθρώπου;	ורוח כל בשר אשר:
IV	11a	/ νοῦς μὲν γὰρ ῥήματα διακρίνει,	הלא און מלין תבחן
	11b	/ λάρυγξ δὲ σῖτα γεύεται.	וחד אכל יטעם לו:
	12a	/ ἐν πολλῷ χρόνῳ σοφία ,	בישישים חכמה
	12b	/ ἐν δὲ πολλῷ βίῳ ἐπιστήμη.	וארך ימים תבונה:
	13a	/ παρ' αὐτῷ σοφία καὶ δύναμις,	עמו חכמה וגבורה
	13b	/ αὐτῷ βουλή καὶ σύνεσις.	לו עצה ותבונה:
V	14a	/ ἐάν καταβάλλῃ , τίς οἰκοδομήσει;	תו יהרוס ולא יבנה
	14b	/ ἐάν κλείσῃ κατὰ ἀνθρώπων, τίς ἀνοίξει;	יסגר על איש ולא יפתח:
	15a	/ ἐάν κωλύσῃ τὸ ὕδωρ, ξηρανεῖ τὴν γῆν·	תו יעצר במים ייבשו
	15b	/ ἐάν δὲ ἐπαφῇ , ἀπώλεσεν αὐτήν καταστρέψας .	וישלחם ויהפכו ארץ:
	16a	/ παρ' αὐτῷ κράτος καὶ ἰσχύς,	עמו עז ותושיה

	v.	Greek	Hebrew
VI	16b	/ αὐτῷ ἐπιστήμη καὶ σύνεσις.	/ לוֹ שִׁגְגָּה וּמִשְׁגָּה:
	17a	διαγών βουλευτὰς <u>αἰχμαλώτους</u> ,	/ מוֹלִיךְ יוֹעֵצִים שׁוֹלֵל
	17b	κριτὰς δὲ <u>γῆς</u> ἐξέστησεν.	/ וּשְׁפֹטִים יְהוֹלֵל:
	18a	<u>καθιζάνων</u> βασιλεῖς <u>ἐπὶ θρόνους</u>	/ מוֹסֵר מַלְכִּים פֶּתַח
	(18b)		/ וַיֹּאסֶר אֶזְרוֹר בַּמַּתְנִיחַם:
VII	19a	ἐξαποστέλλων ἱερεῖς <u>αἰχμαλώτους</u> ,	/ מוֹלִיךְ כַּהֲנִים שׁוֹלֵל
	19b	δυναστας δὲ <u>γῆς</u> κατέστρεψεν.	/ וְאַתְנִים יִסְלֶף:
	20a	διαλλάσσω χεῖλη πιστῶν,	/ מִסִּיר שִׁפָּה לְנֶאֱמָנִים
	20b	σύνεσιν δὲ πρεσβυτέρων ἔγνω.	/ וְטַעַם זִקְנִים יָקַח:
	(21a)		שׁוֹפֵךְ בּוֹז עַל נְדִיבִים
	21b ¹⁰⁷³	ταπεινοὺς δὲ ἰάσατο.	/ וּמִזִּיחַ אֲפִיקִים רִפָּה:
	22a	ἀνακαλύπτων βαθέα ἐκ σκοτούς,	/ מְגַלָּה עֲמֻקּוֹת מִנִּי חֹשֶׁךְ
	22b	ἐξήγαγεν δὲ εἰς φῶς σκιάν θανάτου.	/ וַיֹּצֵא לְאוֹר צִלְמוֹת:
-	(23a)		מִשְׁגִּיא לְגוֹיִם וַיֹּאבֵדֵם
	(23b)		/ שֹׁטֵחַ לְגוֹיִם וַיִּנְחֵם:
VIII	24a	διαλλάσσω καρδίας ἀρχόντων γῆς,	/ מִסִּיר לֵב רֹאשֵׁי עַם הָאָרֶץ
	24b	<u>ἐπλάνησεν</u> δὲ αὐτοὺς ὁδῶ, ἥ οὐκ ᾔδεισαν·	/ וַיַּחְטֵאם בַּתְּהוֹלָא דֶּרֶךְ:
	25a	<u>ψηλαφήσαισαν</u> σκοτός καὶ μὴ φῶς,	/ וַיִּמְשְׁשׁוּ חֹשֶׁךְ וְלֹא אוֹר
	25b	<u>πλανηθείσασιν</u> δὲ ὥσπερ ὁ μεθύων.	/ וַיַּחְטֵאם כַּשְׁכּוֹר:
IX	13:1a	/ ἰδοὺ ταῦτα ἑώρακέν μου ὁ ὀφθαλμός	/ הִנֵּה כָּל רֵאֲתָה עֵינִי
	1b	/ καὶ ἀκήκοέν μου τὸ οὖς·	/ שָׁמְעָה אָזְנִי וְתָבֵן לִּי:
	2a	καὶ οἶδα ὅσα καὶ <u>ὕμεις</u> ἐπίστασθε,	/ כִּדְעַתְכֶם יִדְעָתִי גַם אֲנִי
	2b	καὶ οὐκ ἄσυνετώτερός εἰμι <u>ὕμῶν</u> .	/ לֹא נִפְלְ אֲנֹכִי מִכֶּם:
X	3a	<u>οὐ μὴν</u> δὲ ἄλλ' ἐγὼ πρὸς κύριον λαλήσω,	/ אִוֵּלִים אֲנִי אֵל שְׂדֵי אֲדָבָר
	3b	ἐλέγξω δὲ ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ <u>ἐάν</u> βούληται.	/ וְהוֹכַח אֵל אֶל אַחֲפָי:
	4a	/ <u>ὕμεις</u> δὲ <u>ἐστέ</u> ἱατροὶ ἄδικοι	/ וְאוֹלִים אַתֶּם טְפִלֵּי שָׁקֶר
	4b	/ καὶ ἱαταὶ κακῶν πάντες.	/ רִפְאֵי אֵלֶּל כָּלְכֶם:
XI	5a	/ εἶη δὲ <u>ὕμῖν</u> κωφεῦσαι,	/ מִי יִתֵּן הַחֹרֶשׁ תַּחֲרִישׁוֹן
	5b	/ καὶ ἀποβήσεται <u>ὕμῖν</u> σοφία.	/ וְתִהְיֶה לָכֶם לַחֲכָמָה:
	6a	/ <u>ἀκούσατε</u> ἔλεγχον <u>τοῦ στόματός</u> μου,	/ שְׁמַעוּ נָא וְהוֹכַחְתִּי
	6b	/ κρίσιν δὲ χεῖλέων μου <u>προσέχετε</u> .	/ וְרִבּוֹת שִׁפְתֵי הַקְּשִׁיבוּ:
XI	7a	/ <u>πότερον</u> <u>οὐκ</u> <u>ἐναντι</u> κυρίου λαλεῖτε,	/ תִּלְאֵל תִּדְבְּרוּ עוֹלָה
	7b	/ <u>ἐναντι</u> δὲ αὐτοῦ φθέγγεσθε δόλον;	/ וְלוֹ תִּדְבְּרוּ רִמְיָה:
	8a	ἢ ὑποστελεῖσθε;	/ תִּפְנִיזוּ תִּשְׁאוּן
	8b	<u>ὕμεις</u> δὲ αὐτοῖ <u>κριται</u> γένεσθε.	/ אִם לֹא־לֵא תִּרְבִּיבוּ:
	9a	<u>καλόν</u> <u>γέ</u> , <u>ἐάν</u> <u>ἐξιχνιάσῃ</u> <u>ὕμᾱς</u> ·	/ תִּטּוֹב כִּי יַחְקֹר אַתְּכֶם

¹⁰⁷³ The whole v. 21 is asterisked in LXX^{Zi} but not in Rahlfs. Several scholars seem to agree that 21b is indeed from the hand of the OG translator. See, for example Pietersma 1985, 311; Gentry 1998, 537; Mangin 2005, 212–5.

v.	Greek	Hebrew
9b	<u>εἰ γὰρ τὰ πάντα ποιοῦντες</u>	<u>אם כהתל באנוש תהתלו</u> בו:
	<u>προσθεθήσεσθε</u> αὐτῷ,	
10a	οὐθὲν ἤττον ἐλέγξει <u>ὑμᾶς</u> .	הוכח יוכיח אתכם
XII 10b	<u>εἰ δὲ καὶ</u> <u>κρυφῇ</u> πρόσωπα θαυμάσεσθε,	<u>אם</u> בסתר פנים <u>תשאון</u> :
11a	/ <u>πότερον οὐχὶ</u> δεινὰ αὐτοῦ <u>στροβήσει</u>	<u>הלֹא</u> <u>שאתו</u> תבעת <u>אתכם</u> /
	<u>ὑμᾶς</u> ,	
11b	/ φόβος δὲ παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐπιπεσεῖται <u>ὑμῖν</u> ,	/ ופחדו יפל עליכם:
12a	<u>ἀποβήσεται</u> δὲ <u>ὑμῶν</u> τὸ <u>γαυρίαμα ἴσα</u>	/ זכרניכם משלי אפר
	<u>σποδῶ</u> ,	
12b	<u>τὸ δὲ σῶμα πῆλινον</u> .	/ <u>לנב</u> חמר <u>גב</u> <u>בכם</u> :
XIII 13	<u>κωφεύσατε</u> . <u>ἵνα</u> <u>λαλήσω</u> καὶ	<u>החרישו</u> <u>ממני</u> ואדברה <u>אני</u>
	<u>ἀναπαύσωμαι</u> θυμοῦ	<u>ויעבר עלי מה</u> :
(13b)		
14a	/ <u>ἀναλαβὼν</u> τὰς σάρκας μου τοῖς ὁδοῦσιν,	/ <u>על מה</u> אשא בשרי בשנ
14b	/ ψυχὴν δέ μου θήσω <u>ἐν χειρί</u> .	/ ונפשי אשים בכפ
15a	<u>ἐάν</u> με <u>χειρώσῃται</u> <u>ὁ</u> <u>δυνάστης</u> , <u>ἐπεὶ</u> καὶ	<u>הו</u> יקטלני <u>לא</u> ¹⁰⁷⁴ איחל
	ἥρκεται,	
15b	<u>ἢ μὴν</u> <u>λαλήσω</u> καὶ ἐλέγξω <u>ἐναντίον</u>	<u>אד</u> דרכי אל <u>פניו</u> אוכיח:
	<u>αὐτοῦ</u> .	
16a	καὶ τοῦτό μοι <u>ἀποβήσεται</u> <u>εἰς</u> σωτηρίαν,	<u>גם</u> הוא לי לישועה
16b	οὐ <u>γὰρ</u> <u>ἐναντίον</u> αὐτοῦ δόλος	<u>כי</u> <u>לא</u> <u>לפניו</u> חנף יבוא:
	<u>εἰσελεύσεται</u> .	
XIV 17a	<u>ἀκούσατε ἀκούσατε</u> τὰ ῥήματά μου·	<u>שמעו שמעו</u> מלתי
17b	ἀναγγελῶ <u>γὰρ</u> ὑμῶν <u>ἀκούοντων</u> .	<u>ואחותי</u> באזניכם:
18a	<u>ἰδοὺ</u> <u>ἐγώ</u> ἐγγύς <u>εἰμι</u> τοῦ <u>κρίματός</u> <u>μου</u> ,	<u>הנה</u> <u>נא</u> ערכתי משפט
18b	<u>οἶδα</u> <u>ἐγώ</u> ὅτι δίκαιος ἀναφανοῦμαι.	ידעתי <u>כי</u> <u>אני</u> אצדק:
19a	<u>τίς</u> <u>γάρ</u> <u>ἐστιν</u> ὁ <u>κριθισόμενός</u> <u>μοι</u> ,	<u>מי</u> הוא יריב עמדי
(19b)		<u>כי</u> <u>עתה</u> אחריש ואגוע:
XV 20a	δυεῖν δέ μοι χρήσῃ·	<u>אד</u> שתיס <u>אל</u> <u>תעש</u> עמדי
(20b)		<u>אז</u> מפניך לא אסתך:
21a	τὴν χεῖρα <u>ἀπ'</u> ἐμοῦ <u>ἀπέχου</u> ,	כפך מעלי הרחק
21b	καὶ ὁ φόβος σου <u>μὴ</u> <u>με καταπλησσέτω</u> .	ואמתך <u>אל</u> <u>תבעתני</u> :
22a	/ <u>εἴτα</u> καλέσεις, <u>ἐγώ</u> <u>δὲ</u> <u>σοι</u> ὑπακούσομαι·	/ וקרא <u>ואנכי</u> אענה
22b	/ <u>ἢ</u> <u>λαλήσεις</u> , <u>ἐγώ</u> <u>δὲ</u> <u>σοι</u> δώσω	/ <u>אז</u> אדבר והשיבני:
	<u>ἀνταπόκρισιν</u> .	
23a	<u>πόσαι</u> <u>εἰσὶν</u> αἱ ἁμαρτίαι μου καὶ αἱ	<u>כמה</u> לי עונות <u>וחטאות</u>
	ἀνομίαι μου;	
23b	<u>δίδαξόν</u> <u>με</u> <u>τίνες</u> <u>εἰσὶν</u> .	פשעי <u>וחטאתי</u> <u>הדיעני</u> :
XVI 24a	<u>διὰ</u> <u>τί</u> <u>ἀπ'</u> ἐμοῦ κρύπτῃ,	<u>למה</u> פניך תסתיר
24b	ἤγησαι δέ με <u>ὑπεναντίον</u> σοι;	<u>ותחשבני</u> לאויב לך:

¹⁰⁷⁴ Qere יל.

v.		Greek	Hebrew
25a	/	ἢ ὡς φύλλον κινούμενον ὑπὸ ἀνέμου εὐλαβηθήσῃ	העלה נדף תערוץ /
25b	/	ἢ ὡς χόρτω φερομένῳ ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἀντίκεισάι μοι;	ואת קש יבש תרדף: /
XVII	26a	ὅτι κατέγραψας κατ' ἐμοῦ κακά,	כי תכתב עלי מררות
	26b	περιέθηκας δέ μοι νεότητος ἀμαρτίας,	ותורישני עונות נעורי:
	27a	ἔθου δέ μου τὸν πόδα ἐν κωλύματι,	ותשם בסד רגלי
	27b	ἐφύλαξας δέ μου πάντα τὰ ἔργα,	ותשמור כל ארחותי
	27c	εἰς δὲ ρίζας τῶν ποδῶν μου ἀφίκου·	על שרשי רגלי תתחק:
XVIII	28a	ὁ παλαιοῦται ἴσα ἀσκά	והוא ברכב יבלה
	28b	ἢ ὥσπερ ἱμάτιον σητόβρωτον.	בבגד אכלו עש:
	14:1a	βροτὸς γὰρ γεννητὸς γυναικὸς	אדם ילוד אשה
	1b	ὀλιγόβιος καὶ πλήρης ὀργῆς	קצר ימים ושבע רגז:
	2a	ἢ ὥσπερ ἄνθος ἀνθήσαν ἐξέπεσεν,	כצץ יצא וימל /
	2b	ἀπέδρα δὲ ὥσπερ σκιά καὶ οὐ μὴ στή.	ויברח בצל ולא יעמוד: /
	3a	οὐχὶ καὶ τούτου λόγον ἐποιήσω	אף על זה פקחת עינד
	3b	καὶ τοῦτον ἐποίησας εἰσελθεῖν ἐν κρίματι ἐνώπιόν σου;	ואתי תביא במשפט עמד:
	4	τίς γὰρ καθαρὸς ἔσται ἀπὸ ῥύπου; ἀλλ'	מי יתן טהור מטמא
	(4b)	οὐθεὶς.	לא אחד:
XIX	5a	ἐὰν καὶ μία ἡμέρα ὁ βίος αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς,	אם חרוצים ימי
	5b	ἀριθμητοὶ δὲ μῆνες αὐτοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ,	מספר חדשיו אתך
	5c	εἰς χρόνον ἔθου, καὶ οὐ μὴ ὑπερβῇ.	חקו ¹⁰⁷⁵ עשית ולא יעבור:
	6a	ἀπόστα ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, ἵνα ἡσυχάσῃ	שעה מעליו ויחדל
	6b	καὶ εὐδοκήσῃ τὸν βίον ὥσπερ ὁ μισθωτός.	עד ירצה כשכיר יומ:
XX	7a	ἔστιν γὰρ δένδρῳ ἐλπίς.	כי יש לעץ תקוה
	7b	ἐὰν γὰρ ἐκκοπῇ, ἔτι ἐπανθήσει.	אם יכרת יעוד יחליף
	7c	καὶ ὁ ῥάδαμνος αὐτοῦ οὐ μὴ ἐκλείπῃ ¹⁰⁷⁶ .	וינקת לא תחדל:
	8a	ἐὰν γὰρ γηράσῃ ἐν γῇ ἡ ρίζα αὐτοῦ,	אם יזקין בארץ שרשו /
	8b	ἐν δὲ πέτρᾳ τελευτήσῃ τὸ στέλεχος αὐτοῦ,	ובעפר ימות גזעו: /
	9a	ἀπὸ ὁσμῆς ὕδατος ἀνθήσει.	מריח מים יפרח
	9b	ποιήσῃ δὲ θερισμὸν ὥσπερ νεόφυτον.	ועשה קציר כמו נטע:
XXI	10a	ἄνῃρ δὲ τελευτήσας ὥχετο,	וגבר ימות ויחלש /
	10b	πесὼν δὲ βροτὸς οὐκέτι ἔστιν.	ויגוע אדם ואין: /
	11a	χρόνῳ γὰρ σπανίζεται θάλασσα,	אזלו מים מני ים /
	11b	ποταμὸς δὲ ἐρημωθείς ἐξηράνθη.	ונהר יחרב ויבש: /

¹⁰⁷⁵ Qere וקח.

¹⁰⁷⁶ LXX^{Zi}: ἐκλείπη; correction based on Gentry.

v.	Greek	Hebrew
12a	ἄνθρωπος δὲ κοιμηθεὶς οὐ μὴ ἀναστῇ,	ואיש שכב ולא יקום
12b	ὥς ἂν ὁ οὐρανὸς οὐ μὴ συρραφῇ·	עד בלתי שמים לא יקיצו
(12c)		ולא יערו משנתם:
XXII 13a	εἰ γὰρ ὄφελον ἐν ἄδῃ με ἐφύλαξας,	מי יתן בשאול תצנני
13b	ἔκρυψας δέ με, ὥς ἂν παύσηταί σου ἡ ὀργή	תסתירני עד שוב אפך
13c	καὶ τάξῃ μοι χρόνον, ἐν ᾧ μνείαν μου ποιήσῃ.	תשית לי חק ותזכרני:
14a	ἐὰν γὰρ ἀποθάνῃ ἄνθρωπος, ζήσεται	אם ימות גבר חייה
14b	συντελέσας ἡμέρας τοῦ βίου αὐτοῦ;	כל ימי צבאי איחל
14c	ὑπομενῶ, ὥς ἂν πάλιν γένωμαι.	עד בוא חליפתי:
XXIII 15a	εἴτα καλέσεις, ἐγὼ δέ σοι ὑπακούσομαι,	תקרא ואנכי אענה
15b	τὰ δὲ ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν σου μὴ ἀποποιού.	למעשה ידיך תכסה:
16a	ἡρίθμης δέ μου τὰ ἐπιτηδεύματα,	כי עתה צעדי תספור /
16b	καὶ οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ σε οὐδὲν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν μου·	לא תשמור על חטאתי: /
17a	ἐσφράγισας δέ μου τὰς ἀνομίας ἐν βαλλαντίῳ,	חתם בצרור פשעי /
17b	ἐπεσημήνω δέ, εἴ τι ἄκων παρέβην.	ותטפל על עוני: /
- (18a)		ואולם הר נופל יכול
(18b)		וצור יעתק ממקמו:
(19a)		אבנים שחקו מים /
(19b)		תשטף ספיחיה עפר ארץ /
(19c)		ותקות אנוש האבדת: /
XXIV 20a	ᾧσας αὐτὸν εἰς τέλος, καὶ ὥχετο·	תתקפהו לנצח ויהלך
20b	ἐπέστησας αὐτῷ τὸ πρόσωπον, καὶ ἐξαπέστειλας·	משנה פניו ותשלחן:
21a	/ πολλῶν δὲ γενομένων τῶν υἱῶν αὐτοῦ οὐκ οἶδεν,	/ יכבדו בניו ולא ידע /
21b	/ ἐὰν δὲ ὀλίγοι γίνωνται, οὐκ ἐπίσταται·	/ ויצערו ולא יבין למו: /
22a	/ ἀλλ' ἢ αἱ σάρκες αὐτοῦ ἤλγησαν,	/ אך בשרו עליו יכאב /
22b	/ ἡ δὲ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ ἐπένθησεν.	/ ונפשו עליו תאבל: /

v.	NETS	NRSVUE
12:2	So, are you human beings? Will wisdom die with you?	No doubt you are the people, and wisdom will die with you.
3	For one thing, I too have a heart, just like you.	But I have understanding as well as you; I am not inferior to you. Who does not know such things as these?
4	A just and blameless man, you see, has become a laughingstock.	I am a laughingstock to my friends; I, who called upon God and he answered me, a just and blameless man, I am a laughingstock.

v.	NETS	NRSVUE
5	To be sure, he had been prepared to fall under others for a set time and that his houses be plundered by the lawless.	Those at ease have contempt for misfortune, but it is ready for those whose feet are unstable.
6	Nonetheless, let the wicked not trust that he will be guiltless—as many as provoke the Lord to anger— as if indeed there will be no scrutiny of them.	The tents of robbers are at peace, and those who provoke God are secure, who bring their god in their hands.
7	But, do ask the quadrupeds, if they should speak to you, and the birds of the air, if they should declare to you,	But ask the animals, and they will teach you, the birds of the air, and they will tell you;
8	and tell the earth in detail if it should expound to you.	ask the plants of the earth, and they will teach you, and the fish of the sea will declare to you.
9		Who among all these does not know that the hand of the Lord has done this?
10	Is not the life of all living things in his hand, and the breath of every human being?	In his hand is the life of every living thing and the breath of every human being.
11	For it is the mind that discerns words but the throat that tastes food.	Does not the ear test words as the palate tastes food?
12	Wisdom comes with much time, and knowledge with much living.	Is wisdom with the aged and understanding in length of days?
13	With him are wisdom and power; counsel and understanding are his.	With God are wisdom and strength; he has counsel and understanding.
14	If he tears down, who can rebuild? If he shuts out people, who can open?	If he tears down, no one can rebuild; if he shuts someone in, no one can open up.
15	If he withholds the water, he will dry up the earth, but if he lets it loose, he has destroyed it by throwing it upside down.	If he withholds the waters, they dry up; if he sends them out, they overwhelm the land.
16	With him are strength and power; knowledge and understanding are his.	With him are strength and wisdom; the deceived and the deceiver are his.
17	Ferrying counselors away captive, he drove mad earthly judges.	He leads counselors away stripped and makes fools of judges.
18	Seating kings upon thrones,	He looses the sash of kings and binds a waistcloth on their loins.
19	sending away priests captive, he overthrew earth's mighty ones.	He leads priests away stripped and overthrows the mighty.
20	Disrupting the lips of the trustworthy, he found out the understanding of elders—	He deprives of speech those who are trusted and takes away the discernment of the elders.
21	but healed the humble.	He pours contempt on princes and looses the belt of the strong.
22	Revealing deep things out of darkness, he brought death's shadow to light.	He uncovers deep things from the darkness and brings deep darkness to light.
23		He makes nations great, then destroys them; he enlarges nations, then leads them away.
24	Changing the hearts of earthly rulers, he made them wander by a way that they did not know:	He strips understanding from the leaders of the earth and makes them wander in a pathless waste.
25	May they grope in the dark without light, and may the wander about like a drunkard.	They grope in the dark without light; he makes them stagger like a drunkard.
13:1	Look, my eye has seen these things, and my ear has heard them,	Look, my eye has seen all this; my ear has heard and understood it.

v.	NETS	NRSVUE
2	and I know what you too understand and am no less intelligent than you.	What you know, I also know; I am not inferior to you.
3	Nonetheless, I will speak to the Lord and argue my case before him if he wishes.	But I would speak to the Almighty, and I desire to argue my case with God.
4	But you are harmful physicians and practitioners of pain, all of you.	As for you, you whitewash with lies; all of you are worthless physicians.
5	But oh that you would be quiet and wisdom be yours as a result.	If you would only keep silent, that would be your wisdom!
6	Hear the reasoning of my mouth, and give heed to the argument of my lips.	Hear now my reasoning, and listen to the pleadings of my lips.
7	Are you not speaking before the Lord and uttering deceit before him?	Will you speak falsely for God and speak deceitfully for him?
8	Will you shrink back in awe? Go ahead; become judges yourselves!	Will you show partiality toward him; will you plead the case for God?
9	It would indeed be good, if he traced your footsteps; for if, in doing everything you can, you will 'join yourselves to him,'	Will it be well with you when he searches you out? Or can you deceive him as one person deceives another?
10a	He will convict you nonetheless.	He will surely rebuke you
10b	And even if secretly you will show partiality,	if in secret you show partiality.
11	will not his terrors disturb you and fear from him assail you?	Will not his majesty terrify you and the dread of him fall upon you?
12	But your arrogance will turn out to be like ashes, and your body made of clay.	Your maxims are proverbs of ashes; your defenses are defenses of clay.
13	Be quiet! so I may speak and be relieved of rage.	Let me have silence, and I will speak, and let come on me what may.
14	Having taken my flesh in my teeth, I will put my life in my hand.	I will take my flesh in my teeth and put my life in my hand.
15	Though the Mighty One overpower me—inasmuch as he has begun—certainly, I will speak and argue my case before him.	See, he will kill me; I have no hope; but I will defend my ways to his face.
16	And this for me will prove to be salvation, for deceit cannot enter before him.	This will be my salvation, that the godless shall not come before him.
17	Hear, hear my words, for I will declare, while you listen.	Listen carefully to my words, and let my declaration be in your ears.
18	Look, I am near my trial; I know that I will be shown to be in the right.	I have indeed prepared my case; I know that I shall be vindicated.
19	For who is there that will find fault with me?	Who is there who will contend with me? For then I would be silent and die.
20	But you shall indulge me in two things:	Only grant two things to me; then I will not hide myself from your face:
21	withdraw your hand from me, and let fear of you not terrify me.	withdraw your hand far from me, and do not let dread of you terrify me.
22	Then you will call, and I will answer you, or you will speak, and I will give you a response.	Then call, and I will answer; or let me speak, and you reply to me.
23	How many are my sins and my acts of lawlessness? Teach me what they are.	How many are my iniquities and my sins? Make me know my transgression and my sin.
24	Why do you hide from me and regard me your opponent?	Why do you hide your face and count me as your enemy?
25	Will you be wary of one that is like a windblown leaf, or do you oppose me, one like windborne grass?—	Will you frighten a windblown leaf and pursue dry chaff?

v.	NETS	NRSVUE
26	because you wrote harmful things against me, and surrounded me with the sins of my youth.	For you write bitter things against me and make me reap the iniquities of my youth.
27	And you put my foot in a hobble and watched all my actions, and you reached to the bottoms of my feet.	You put my feet in the stocks and watch all my paths; you set a bound to the soles of my feet.
28	A worn out thing, like a skin, I am, or like a moth-eaten garment.	One wastes away like a rotten thing, like a garment that is moth-eaten.
14:1	For a mortal, born of woman, is short-lived and full of aggravation	A mortal, born of woman, few of days and full of trouble,
2	or, like a flower that has bloomed, falls off, and flees like a shadow and will not halt.	comes up like a flower and withers, flees like a shadow, and does not last.
3	Of him did you not in fact take account and make him enter into judgment before you?	Do you fix your eyes on such a one? Do you bring me into judgment with you?
4	For who can be pure from filth? None, not one!	Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? No one can.
5	Even if his life on the earth be but one day and his months be counted out by him, you placed him for a time, and he shall not go beyond it.	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,
6	Stay away from him, that he may have quiet and enjoy life, like a wage earner!	look away from them and desist, that they may enjoy, like laborers, their days.
7	For there is hope for a tree; for if it is cut down, it will flower again, and its branch will not fail.	For there is hope for a tree, if it is cut down, that it will sprout again and that its shoots will not cease.
8	For, if its root grow old in earth and the crown of its root die in rock,	Though its root grows old in the earth and its stump dies in the ground,
9	at the scent of water it will blossom and produce a crop like one newly planted.	yet at the scent of water it will bud and put forth branches like a young plant.
10	But a man, once dead, has gone, and a mortal, once fallen, is no more.	But mortals die and are laid low; humans expire, and where are they?
11	For a sea with time diminishes, and a river, laid waste, is dried up,	As waters fail from a lake and a river wastes away and dries up,
12	and a person, once lying down, shall never rise again until the sky become unstitched.	so mortals lie down and do not rise again; until the heavens are no more, they will not awake or be roused out of their sleep.
13	O that you had kept me in Hades and had concealed me until your anger had ceased, and you had set me a time, when you would remember me.	O that you would hide me in Sheol, that you would conceal me until your wrath is past, that you would appoint me a set time and remember me!
14	For if a person dies, will he live when he has completed the days of his life? If so, I will endure until I become alive again.	If mortals die, will they live again? All the days of my service I would wait until my release should come.
15	Then you will call, and I will answer you—only do not reject the works of your hands.	You would call, and I would answer you; you would long for the work of your hands.
16	But you tabulated my pursuits, and not one of my sins will pass by you,	For then you would not number my steps; you would not keep watch over my sin;
17	and you sealed up my lawless acts in a pouch and marked down if I had somehow transgressed inadvertently.	my transgressions would be sealed up in a bag, and you would cover over my iniquity.
18		But the mountain falls and crumbles away, and the rock is removed from its place;

v.	NETS	NRSVUE
19		the waters wear away the stones; the torrents wash away the soil of the earth; so you destroy the hope of mortals.
20	You thrust him aside completely, and he was gone; you set your face against him and sent him away.	You prevail forever against them, and they pass away; you change their countenance and send them away.
21	And though his sons become many, he does not know, and if they become few, he is not aware.	Their children come to honor, and they do not know it; they are brought low, and it goes unnoticed.
22	Ah, but his flesh suffered pain, and his soul grieved.	They feel only the pain of their own bodies and mourn only for themselves.

Job 15

v.	Greek	Hebrew
I 2a	Πότερον σοφὸς ἀπόκρισιν δώσει συνέσεως πνεύματος	חֲכָם יַעֲנֶה דַּעַת רוּחַ
2b	καὶ ἐνέπλησεν πόνον γαστρός	וַיִּמְלֵא קִדְּיִם בִּטְנֵהוּ:
3a	/ ἐλέγχων ἐν ῥήμασιν, οἷς οὐ δεῖ,	/ הוֹכַח בְּדִבְרֵי לֹא יִסְכּוֹ /
3b	/ ἐν λόγοις, οἷς οὐδὲν ὄφελος;	/ וּמַלִּים לֹא יוֹעִיל בָּם: /
II 4a	/ οὐ καὶ σὺ ἀπεποιήσω φόβον,	/ אַף אַתָּה תִּפְרֵ יִרְאָה /
4b	/ συνετελέσω δὲ ῥήματα τοιαῦτα ἔναντι τοῦ κυρίου;	/ וְתִגְרַע שִׁיחָה לִפְנֵי אֵל:
5a	ἔνοχος εἶ ῥήμασιν στόματός σου	כִּי יֵאֵלָּה עוֹנֵד פִּיךָ
5b	οὐδὲ διέκρινας ῥήματα δυναστῶν.	וּתְבַחֵר לִשׁוֹן עֲרוֹמִים:
6a	/ ἐλέγξαι σε τὸ σὸν στόμα καὶ μὴ ἐγῶ,	/ יִרְשִׁיעַךְ פִּיךָ וְלֹא אֲנִי /
6b	/ τὰ δὲ χεῖλή σου καταμαρτυρήσουσίν σου.	/ וּשְׁפַתְךָ יַעֲנוּ בְךָ: /
III 7a	/ τί γάρ; μὴ πρῶτος ἀνθρώπων ἐγενήθης;	/ תִּרְאִישׁוֹן אָדָם תּוֹלֵד /
7b	/ ἢ πρὸ θινῶν ἐπάγης;	/ וּלְפָנַי גְּבוּעוֹת חוֹלְלֹת: /
8a	/ ἢ σύνταγμα κυρίου ἀκήκοας,	תִּבְּסוֹד אֱלֹהֵי תִשְׁמַע
8b	/ εἰς δὲ σὲ ἀφίκετο σοφία;	וְתִגְרַע אֲלֶיךָ חֲכָמָה:
9a	/ τί γὰρ οἶδας, δ οὐκ οἶδαμεν;	/ מַה יִּדְעַת וְלֹא נָדַע /
9b	/ ἢ τί συνίεις, δ οὐχὶ καὶ ἡμεῖς;	/ תְּבִין וְלֹא עֲמַנּוּ הוּא: /
(10a)		גַּם שֶׁב גַּם יִשִּׁישׁ בְּנוֹ
(10b)		כְּבִיר מֵאֲבִיךָ יָמִים:
IV 11a	ὀλίγα ὧν ἡμάρτηκας μεμαστίγῳσαι,	חֲמֵט מִמֶּךָ תִּנְחַמּוֹת אֵל
11b	μεγάλως ὑπερβαλλόντως λελάληκας.	וְדִבֵּר לֹאֵשׁ עִמָּךְ:
12a	/ τί ἐτόλμησεν ἡ καρδιά σου,	/ מַה יִּקְחֶךָ לִבְךָ /
12b	/ ἢ τί ἐπήνεγκαν οἱ ὀφθαλμοί σου,	/ וְמַה יִּרְזֹמוּ עֵינֶיךָ: /
13a	ὅτι θυμὸν ἔρρηξας ἔναντι κυρίου,	כִּי תִשִּׁיב אֵל אֵל רוּחֶךָ
13b	ἐξήγαγες δὲ ἐκ στόματος ῥήματα τοιαῦτα;	וְהִצַּאת מִפִּיךָ מַלִּין:
V 14a	/ τίς γὰρ ὧν βροτός, ὅτι ἔσται ἄμεμπτος,	/ מַה אֲנוּשׁ כִּי יִזְכָּה /
14b	/ ἢ ὧς ἐσόμενος δίκαιος γεννητὸς γυναικός;	/ וְכִי יִצְדַּק יוֹלֵד אִשָּׁה: /

v.	Greek	Hebrew
15a	/ εἰ κατὰ ἀγίων οὐ πιστεύει,	/ הן בקדשו ¹⁰⁷⁷ לא יאמין
15b	/ οὐρανὸς δὲ οὐ καθαρὸς ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ.	/ ושמים לא זכו בעיניו:
16a	ἔα δὲ ἐβδελυγμένος καὶ ἀκάθαρτος,	אף כי נתעב ונאלח
16b	ἀνὴρ πίνων ἀδικίας ἴσα ποτῶ.	איש שתה כמים עולה:
VI	17a ἀναγγελῶ δέ σοι, ἄκουέ μου·	אחוד שמע לי
17b	ἃ δὴ ἐόρακα, ἀναγγελῶ σοι,	וזה חזיתי ואספרה:
18a	ἃ σοφοὶ ἐροῦσιν	אשר חכמים יגידו
18b	καὶ οὐκ ἔκρυψαν πατέρας αὐτῶν·	ולא כחדו מאבותם:
19a	αὐτοῖς μόνοις ἐδόθη ἡ γῆ,	להם לבדם נתנה הארץ
19b	καὶ οὐκ ἐπῆλθεν ἀλλογενὴς ἐπ' αὐτούς.	ולא עבר זר בתוכם:
VII	20a πᾶς ὁ βίος ἀσεβοῦς ἐν φροντίδι,	כל ימי רשע הוא מתחולל
20b	ἔτη δὲ ἀριθμητὰ δεδομένα δυνάστη,	ומספר שנים נצפנו לעריץ:
21a	ὁ δὲ φόβος αὐτοῦ ἐν ὣσιν αὐτοῦ·	קול פחדים באזניו
21b	ὅταν δοκῇ ἤδη εἰρηνεύειν,	בשלום שודד יבואנה:
21c	ἥξει αὐτοῦ ἡ καταστροφή.	
VIII	22a μὴ πιστευέτω ἀποστραφῆναι ἀπὸ σκοτούς·	לא יאמין שוב מני חשך
22b	/ ἐντέταλται γὰρ ἡδὴ εἰς χεῖρας σιδήρου,	וצפו ¹⁰⁷⁸ הוא אלי חרב:
23a	/ κατατέτακται δὲ εἰς σῖτα γυψίν·	נדד הוא ללחם איה
23b	οἶδεν δὲ ἐν ἑαυτῷ ὅτι μένει εἰς πτώμα.	ידע כי נכון בידו יום חשך:
23c	/ ἡμέρα δὲ αὐτὸν σκοτεινὴ στροβήσει,	
24a	/ ἀνάγκη δὲ καὶ θλίψις αὐτὸν καθέξει	יבעתה צר ומצוקה
24b	ὥσπερ στρατηγὸς πρωτοστάτης πίπτων.	תתקפרו כמלך עתיד לכידור:
25a	/ ὅτι ἦρκεν χεῖρας ἐναντίον τοῦ κυρίου,	/ בי נסה אל אל יד
25b	/ ἐναντι δὲ κυρίου παντοκράτορος	/ ואל שדי יתגבר:
	ἐτραχηλίασεν,	
26a	/ ἔδραμεν δὲ ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ ὕβρει,	ירוך אליו בצואר
(26b)		בעבי גבי מגניו:
(27a)		כי כסה פניו בחלבו
(27b)		ויעש פימה עלי כסל:
IX	28a / ἀύλισθῆναι δὲ πόλεις ἐρήμους,	/ וישכון ערים נכחדות
28b	/ εἰσέλθου δὲ εἰς οἴκους ἀοικήτους·	/ בתים לא ישבו כמו
28c	/ ἃ δὲ ἐκείναι ἡτοίμασαν, ἄλλοι ἀποίσονται.	אשר התעתדו לגלים:
29a	/ οὕτε μὴ πλουτισθῇ,	/ לא יעשר ולא יקום חילו
	/ οὕτε μὴ μείνη αὐτοῦ τὰ ὑπάρχοντα·	
29b	οὐ μὴ βάλη ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν σκιάν	ולא יטה לארץ מנלם:
30a	οὐδὲ μὴ ἐκφύγη τὸ σκότος·	לא יסור מני חשך

¹⁰⁷⁷ בקדשו *Qere*.

¹⁰⁷⁸ וצפוי *Qere*.

	v.	Greek	Hebrew
X	30b	/ τὸν βλαστὸν αὐτοῦ <u>μαράναι</u> ἄνεμος,	<u>ינקתו תיבש</u> <u>שלהבת</u>
	30c	/ <u>ἐκπέσοι</u> δὲ αὐτοῦ <u>τὸ ἄνθος</u> .	ויסוד ברוח פיו:
	31a	<u>μὴ πιστευέτω</u> <u>ἔτι</u> ὑπομενεῖ,	<u>אל יאמן</u> <u>בשן</u> ¹⁰⁷⁹ <u>נתעה</u>
	31b	κενὰ <u>γὰρ</u> ἀποβήσεται αὐτῷ.	<u>בי שוא</u> תהיה תמורתו:
	32a	/ ἡ τομὴ αὐτοῦ <u>πρὸ ὥρας</u> φθαρήσεται,	<u>בלא</u> יומו תמלא
	32b	/ καὶ ὁ ῥάδαμνος αὐτοῦ οὐ μὴ πυκάσῃ.	וכפתו <u>לא</u> רענגה:
	33a	/ <u>τρυγηθεῖ</u> δὲ ὡς <u>ὄμφαξ</u> <u>πρὸ ὥρας</u> .	<u>יחמס כנפו</u> <u>בסרו</u> /
	33b	/ <u>ἐκπέσοι</u> δὲ ὡς <u>ἄνθος</u> ἐλαίας.	<u>וישלך כזית נצח</u> /
XI	34a	μαρτύριον <u>γὰρ</u> ἀσεβοῦς θάνατος,	<u>בי עדת חנה</u> גלמוד
	34b	πῦρ δὲ καύσει οἴκους <u>θωροδεκτῶν</u> .	ואש אכלה אהלי שחד:
	35a	ἐν γαστρὶ δὲ λήμψεται ὀδύνας,	/ הרה עמל וילד און
	35b	ἀποβήσεται δὲ αὐτῷ κενά,	ובטנם תכין מרמה:
	35c	ἡ δὲ κοιλία αὐτοῦ ὑποίσει δόλον.	

v.	NETS	NRSVUE
15:2	Will a wise man give an answer of windy insight, and did he satisfy the ache in his belly—	Should the wise answer with windy knowledge and fill themselves with the east wind?
3	arguing with statements that are beside the point, with words that are of no benefit?	Should they argue in unprofitable talk or in words that can do no good?
4	Have you not as well set aside fear and exhausted such statements before the Lord?	But you are doing away with the fear of God and hindering meditation before God.
5	You are guilty by the statements of your mouth and did not discern statements of the mighty.	For your iniquity teaches your mouth, and you choose the tongue of the crafty.
6	May your mouth refute you, and not I, and your lips will testify against you.	Your own mouth condemns you, not I; your own lips testify against you.
7	What? Were you the first of the human race to be born? Or were you established before the dunes?	Are you the firstborn of the human race? Were you brought forth before the hills?
8	Did you hear the plan of the Lord, and did wisdom reach only you?	Have you listened in the council of God? And do you limit wisdom to yourself?
9	For what do you know that we do not know? Or what do you understand that we do not as well?	What do you know that we do not know? What do you understand that is not clear to us?
10		The gray-haired and the aged are on our side, those older than your father.
11	You have been scourged for few of the sins you have committed; you have spoken wildly extravagantly.	Are the consolations of God too small for you or the word that deals gently with you?
12	What did your heart dare, or what did your eyes set themselves upon,	Why does your heart carry you away, and why do your eyes flash,

¹⁰⁷⁹ Qere בשן.

v.	NETS	NRSVUE
13	that you burst forth in rage before the Lord and brought out such remarks from your mouth?	so that you turn your spirit against God, and let such words go out of your mouth?
14	For who, being mortal, can be blameless, or who can be in the right, born of woman?	What are mortals, that they can be clean? Or those born of woman, that they can be righteous?
15	If he places no faith at all in his holy ones, and heaven is not pure before him ...	God puts no trust even in his holy ones, and the heavens are not clean in his sight;
16	But aha, abominable and impure, a man drinking injustices like a drink!	how much less one who is abominable and corrupt, one who drinks iniquity like water!
17	But I will declare to you; hear me; indeed, what I have seen I will declare to you—	I will show you; listen to me; what I have seen I will declare—
18	what sages will say and did not hide from their ancestors;	what sages have told and their ancestors have not hidden,
19	to them alone the earth was given, and no alien came upon them.	to whom alone the land was given, and no stranger passed among them.
20	The entire life of the impious is spent in anxiety, and the years given to the mighty are numbered.	The wicked writhe in pain all their days, through all the years that are laid up for the ruthless.
21	And the dread of him is in his ears; just when he thinks he is at peace, his destruction will come.	Terrifying sounds are in their ears; in prosperity the destroyer will come upon them.
22	Let him not believe he will return from darkness, for he has already been consigned to a blade's power;	They despair of returning from darkness, and they are destined for the sword.
23	rather, he has been allocated to be food for vultures, and he knows within himself that he remains to be a carcass. And a dark day will whirl him around,	They wander abroad for bread, saying, 'Where is it?' They know that a day of darkness is ready at hand;
24	and distress and affliction will take hold of him; he will be like a general in the front rank falling in battle.	distress and anguish terrify them; they prevail against them like a king prepared for battle.
25	Because he lifted his hands against the Lord and stiffened his neck against the Lord Almighty	Because they stretched out their hands against God and bid defiance to the Almighty,
26	and ran against him with insolence,	running stubbornly against him with a thickly bossed shield;
27		because they have covered their faces with their fat and gathered fat upon their loins,
28	then may he lodge in desolate cities and enter uninhabited houses, and what they prepared, others will carry away.	they will live in desolate cities, in houses that no one should inhabit, houses destined to become heaps of ruins;
29	Neither shall he ever become rich, nor shall his possessions last. He shall not cast a shadow upon the ground,	they will not be rich, and their wealth will not endure, nor will they strike root in the earth;
30a	nor shall he escape darkness.	they will not escape from darkness;
30bc	May the wind dry up his bud, and may his blossom fall off.	the flame will dry up their shoots, and their blossom will be swept away by the wind.

v.	NETS	NRSVUE
31	Let him not believe that he will endure, for emptiness will turn out to be his lot.	Let them not trust in emptiness, deceiving themselves, for emptiness will be their recompense.
32	His stump will perish before its time, and his branch will provide no cover.	It will be paid in full before their time, and their branch will not be green.
33	But may he be picked like unripe grapes, before his time, and fall off, like an olive blossom.	They will shake off their unripe grape, like the vine, and cast off their blossoms, like the olive tree.
34	For the testimony of the impious is death, and fire will burn the houses of bribe-takers.	For the company of godless is barren, and fire consumes the tents of bribery.
35	And he will conceive sorrows, and his lot will turn out to be emptiness, and his belly will carry deceit.	They conceive mischief and bring forth evil, and their belly prepares deceit.

Job 19

v.	Greek	Hebrew
I 2a	Ἐως τίνος ἐγκοπον ποιήσετε ψυχὴν μου	עד אנה תוגיון נפשי
2b	καὶ καθαιρεῖτέ με λόγοις;	ותדכאוני במלים:
3a	γνώτε μόνον ὅτι ὁ κύριος ἐποίησέν με οὕτως·	זה עשר פעמים תכלימוני
3b	καταλαλεῖτέ μου, οὐκ αἰσχυνόμενοί με ἐπείκεισθέ μοι.	לא תבשו תהכרו לי:
II 4a	ναὶ δὴ ἐπ' ἀληθείας ἐγὼ ἐπλανήθην,	ואף אמנם שגיתי
4b	παρ' ἐμοὶ δὲ αὐλίζεται πλάνος	אתי תלין משוגת:
4c	/ λαλῆσαι ῥῆμα, ὃ οὐκ ἔδει,	
4d	/ τὰ δὲ ῥήματά μου πλανᾶται καὶ οὐκ ἐπὶ καιροῦ.	
5a	/ ἔα δὲ ὅτι ἐπ' ἐμοὶ μεγαλύνεσθε,	אם אמנם עלי תגדילו /
5b	/ ἐνᾷλλεσθε δέ μοι ὀνειδίζει.	ותוכיחו עלי חרפת:
III 6a	γνώτε οὖν ὅτι ὁ κύριός ἐστιν ὁ ταραξας,	דעו אפן כי אלוה עותני
6b	ὁ χύρωμα δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐπ' ἐμέ ὕψωσεν.	ומצודו עלי הקיף:
7a	/ ἰδοὺ γελῶ ὀνειδίζει καὶ οὐ λαλήσω·	הן אצחק חמס ולא אענה /
7b	/ κεκραῖξομαι, καὶ οὐδαμοῦ κρίμα.	אשוע ואין משפט:
8a	κύκλω περιφοδόμηναι, καὶ οὐ μὴ διαβῶ,	ארחי גדר ולא אעבור
8b	ἐπὶ πρόσωπόν μου σκότος ἔθετο.	ועל נתיבותי חשך ישים:
IV 9a	/ τὴν δὲ δόξαν ἀπ' ἐμοῦ ἐξέδυσεν,	/ כבודי מעלי הפשיט
9b	/ ἀφείλεν δὲ στέφανον ἀπὸ κεφαλῆς μου.	/ ויסר עטרת ראשי:
10a	διέσπασέν με κύκλω, καὶ ὥχόμην·	יתצני סביב ואלך
10b	ἐξέκοψεν δὲ ὥσπερ δένδρον τὴν ἐλπίδα μου.	ויסע כעץ תקותי:
11a	δεινῶς δέ μοι ὀργῇ ἐχρήσατο,	ויחר עלי אפו
11b	ἡγήσατο δέ με ὥσπερ ἐχθρόν.	ויחשבני לן כצריך:
12a	ὁμοθυμαδὸν δὲ ἦλθον τὰ πειρατήρια αὐτοῦ ἐπ' ἐμοί,	יחד יבאו גדודיו

v.	Greek	Hebrew
12b	ταῖς ὁδοῖς μου ἐκύκλωσαν με ἐγκάθετοι.	וַיִּסְלֹךְ עָלַי דַּרְכִּם
(12c)		וַיַּחֲנוּ סָבִיב לְאַהֲלִי:
V 13a	ἀπ' ἐμοῦ δὲ ἀδελφοί μου ἀπέστησαν ,	אָחֵי מַעֲלֵי הָרָחִיק
13b	ἔγνωσαν ἄλλοτρίους ἢ ἐμέ·	וַיַּדְעֵי אַךְ זָרוּ מִמֶּנִּי:
13c	φίλοι δέ μου ἀνελεήμονες γεγόνασιν .	
14a	/ οὐ προσεποιήσαντό με οἱ ἐγγύτατοί μου,	חֲדָלוּ קְרוֹבֵי וּמִדְעֵי /
14b (+15a)	/ καὶ οἱ εἰδότες μου τὸ ὄνομα ἐπελάθοντό μου.	שְׂכַחוּנִי: גִּרֵּי בֵּיתִי /
15a	γείτονες οἰκίας θεράπαιναί τε μου,	וְאַמְהַתִּי לִזְר תַּחֲשַׁבְנִי
15b	ἄλλογενῆς ἤμην ἐναντίον αὐτῶν.	נִכְרֵי הֵייתִי בְּעֵינֵיהֶם:
VI 16a	θεράποντά μου ἐκάλεσα , καὶ οὐχ ὑπήκουσεν·	לְעַבְדִּי קִרְאתִי וְלֹא יַעֲנָה
16b	στόμα δέ μου ἐδέετο.	בְּמִן פִּי אֶתְחַנֵּן לִּי:
17a	/ καὶ ἰκέτευσον τὴν γυναῖκά μου,	רוּחִי זָרָה לְאַשְׁתִּי /
17b	/ προσεκαλούμην δὲ κολακεύων υἱοὺς παλλακίδων μου·	וְחֹנְתִּי לְבָנֵי בִטְנִי: /
18a	οἷ δὲ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνά με ἀπεποιήσαντο ·	גַּם עוֹלִים מֵאַסּוּ בִּי
18b	ὅταν ἀναστῶ, κατ' ἐμοῦ λαλοῦσιν.	אֶקוּמָה וַיִּדְּבְרוּ בִּי:
VII 19a	/ ἐβδελύξαντο με οἱ εἰδότες με·	תַּעֲבוּנִי כָּל מֵתֵי סוּדִי /
19b	/ οὓς δὲ ἡγαπήκειν, ἐπανεστήσαν μοι.	זֹה אֶהְבֵּתִי נִהְפְּכוּ בִּי: /
20a	/ ἐν δέρματί μου ἐσάπησαν αἱ σάρκες μου,	בַּעוּרִי וּבִבְשָׁרִי דִּבְקָה עִצְמִי
20b	/ τὰ δὲ ὅσα μου ἐν ὁδοῦσιν ἔχεται.	וְאַתְמַלְטָה בַּעוּר שֵׁנִי:
VIII 21a	ἐλεήσατέ με, ἐλεήσατέ με . ὦ φίλοι·	חַנְּנִי חַנְּנִי אַתֶּם רַעִי:
21b	χεῖρ γὰρ κυρίου ἡ ἀψαμένη μου ἔστιν.	כִּי יָד אֱלֹהֵי נִגְעָה בִּי:
22a	διὰ τί δέ με διώκετε ὥσπερ καὶ ὁ κύριος ,	לִמָּה תִּרְדַּפְנִי כִּמוֹ אֵל
22b	ἀπὸ δὲ σαρκῶν μου οὐκ ἐμπίπλασθε;	וּמִבְשָׁרִי לֹא תִשְׁבְּעוּ:
23a	/ τίς γὰρ ἂν δῶ γραφῆναι τὰ ῥήματά μου,	/ מִי יֵתֵן אִפְּוֹ לִי כִּתְבוֹן מִלִּי /
23b	/ τεθῆναι δὲ αὐτὰ ἐν βιβλίῳ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα	/ מִי יֵתֵן בִּסְפָר וַיַּחֲקוּ: /
24a	/	בַּעַט בְּרוֹזַל וְעִפְרָת
24b	/ ἢ ἐν πέτραις ἐγγλυφῆναι;	לְעַד בְּצוּר יִחַצְבוּ:
IX 25	οἶδα γὰρ ὅτι ἀέναός ἐστιν ὁ ἐκλύειν με μέλλων ἐπὶ γῆς.	וְאַנִּי יִדְעֵתִי גֵּאֲלִי חֵי
(25b)		וְאַחֲרָיו עַל עֵפֶר יָקוּם:
26a	ἀναστῆσαι ¹⁰⁸⁰ τὸ δέρμα μου τὸ ἀναντλοῦν ταῦτα·	וְאַחֲרָיו עוֹרִי נִקְפוּ זֵאת
26b	παρὰ γὰρ κυρίου ταῦτά μοι συντετέλεσθη ,	וּמִבְשָׁרִי אֶחֱזָה אֱלֹהֵי:
27a	/ ἃ ἐγὼ ἐμαυτῷ συνεπίσταμαι,	/ אֲשֶׁר אֲנִי אֶחֱזָה לִי /
27b	/ ἃ ὁ ὀφθαλμός μου ἑώρακεν καὶ οὐκ ἄλλος·	/ וְעֵינִי רָאוּ וְלֹא זֶר /
27c	πάντα δέ μοι συντετέλεσται ἐν κόλπῳ.	כָּלֹו כְּלִיתִי בַּחֲקִי:
X 28a	εἰ δὲ καὶ ἐρέϊτε τί ἐροῦμεν ἔναντι αὐτοῦ;	כִּי תֹאמְרוּ מָה נִרְדֵּף לֹו

¹⁰⁸⁰ LXX^{Zi}: ἀναστήσαι.

v.	Greek	Hebrew
28b		וּשְׂרַשׁ דְּבַר נִמְצָא בִּי:
29a	εὐλαβήθητε <u>δὲ καὶ</u> ὑμεῖς ἀπὸ <u>ἐπικαλύμματος</u> .	<u>גִּוְרוֹ</u> לִכְסֵּם מִפְּנֵי חֶרֶב
29b	θυμὸς γὰρ <u>ἐπ'</u> ἀνόμους <u>ἐπελεύσεται</u> ,	<u>כִּי</u> חֲמָה עֲוֹנוֹת <u>חֶרֶב</u>
29c	<u>καὶ τότε</u> γνώσονται <u>ποῦ ἔστιν αὐτῶν</u> ἡ ὕλη.	לִמְעַן תִּדְעוּן שְׂדֵי ¹⁰⁸¹ :

v.	NETS	NRSVUE
19:2	How long will you make my soul weary and destroy me with words?	How long will you torment me and break me in pieces with words?
3	Know only that the Lord treated me this way; you speak against me; shamelessly you press upon me.	These ten times you have cast reproach upon me; are you not ashamed to wrong me?
4	Yes indeed, I have truly erred, and error lodges with me—to have spoken a word that was not called for, and my words err and are inappropriate.	And even if it is true that I have erred, my error remains with me.
5	But alas, it is because you magnify yourselves against me and jump at me with reproach.	If indeed you magnify yourselves against me and make my humiliation an argument against me,
6	Know then that it is the Lord who troubles me, and he raised up his stronghold against me.	know then that God has put me in the wrong and closed his net around me.
7	Look, I laugh at reproach, and I will not speak; I will cry out, and nowhere is there judgment.	Even when I cry out, ‘Violence!’ I am not answered; I call aloud, but there is no justice.
8	I am hemmed in all around and absolutely cannot pass through; he has placed darkness upon my face.	He has walled up my way so that I cannot pass, and he has set darkness upon my paths.
9	And he has stripped my glory from me and taken the crown from my head.	He has stripped my glory from me, and taken the crown from my head.
10	He tore me apart on all sides, and I was gone, and he has cut down my hope like a tree.	He breaks me down on every side, and I am gone, he has uprooted my hope like a tree.
11	And he has dealt with me terribly in anger and has counted me as an enemy.	He has kindled his wrath against me and counts me as his adversary.
12	And with one accord his gangs of brigands came against me; they encircled me on my paths, lying in ambush.	His troops come on together; they have thrown up siegeworks against me, and encamp around my tent.
13	And my brothers turned away from me; they recognized strangers rather than me. And friends of mine became merciless.	He has put my family far from me, and my acquaintances are wholly estranged from me.
14	My nearest kin disowned me, and those who knew my name forgot me.	My relatives and my close friends have failed me;
15	As for neighbors next door and my servant girls— I was an alien before them.	the guests in my house have forgotten me; my female servants count me as a stranger; I have become an alien in their eyes.
16	I called my attendant, and he did not respond; yet my mouth kept pleading.	I call to my servant, but he gives me no answer; I must myself plead with him.

¹⁰⁸¹ Qere שִׂדְיִן.

v.	NETS	NRSVUE
17	I also repeatedly implored my wife, and, using flattery, I kept summoning sons of my concubines,	My breath is repulsive to my wife; I am loathsome to my own family.
18	but they rejected me for all time; when I rise, they talk against me.	Even young children despise me; when I rise, they talk against me.
19	Those who knew me abhorred me, and those I had loved rose up against me.	All my intimate friends abhor me, and those whom I love have turned against me.
20	My flesh rotted under my skin, and my bones are held in my teeth.	My bones cling to my skin and to my flesh, and I have escaped by the skin of my teeth.
21	Pity me; pity me, O my friends, for it is the Lord's hand that has touched me.	Have pity on me, have pity on me, O you my friends, for the hand of God has touched me!
22	But why do you pursue me just as the Lord does, and why are you not satisfied with my flesh?	Why do you, like God, pursue me, never satisfied with my flesh?
23	For who would grant that my words be written and that they be put in a book forever	O that my words were written down! O that they were inscribed in a book!
24	or be carved in rock?	O that with an iron pen and with lead they were engraved on a rock forever!
25	To be sure, I know that he who is about to undo me on earth is everlasting.	For I know that my vindicator lives and that in the end he will stand upon the earth;
26	May my skin, which patiently endures these things, rise up; for these things have been accomplished on me by the Lord—	and after my skin has been destroyed, then in my flesh I shall see God,
27	things I am conscious of in myself, things my eye has seen and no other, and all of them have come to and for me in my bosom.	whom I shall see on my side, and my eyes shall behold, and not another. My heart faints within me!
28	But even if you say, 'What shall we say before him?'	If you say, 'How we will persecute him!' and, 'The root of the matter is found in him,'
29	Do as well be afraid of concealment, for wrath will come upon the lawless, and then they will find out where their substance is.	be afraid of the sword, for wrath brings the punishment of the sword, so that you may know there is a judgment.

Job 21

v.	Greek	Hebrew
I 2a	<u>Ἀκούσατε ἀκούσατέ</u> μου τῶν λόγων,	<u>שמעו שמעו</u> מלתי
2b	<u>ἵνα μὴ ἢ</u> [μοι] παρ' ὑμῶν αὐτῇ ἢ παράκλησις.	ותהי זאת תנחומתיכם:
3a	<u>ἄρατέ με, ἐγὼ δὲ λαλήσω,</u>	<u>שאוני ואנכי אדבר</u>
3b	<u>εἴτ' οὐ καταγελάσετε</u> μου.	ואחר <u>דברי</u> תלעגי:
II 4a	[<u>τί γάρ</u>] <u>μὴ</u> ἀνθρώπου μου ἢ <u>ἐλεγξίς</u> ;	<u>האנכי</u> לאדם שיחי
4b	<u>ἢ διὰ τί</u> οὐ θυμωθήσομαι;	<u>ואם</u> מדוע לא תקצר רוחי:
5a	<u>εἰσβλέψαντες</u> εἰς ἐμὲ <u>θανυμάσατε,</u>	<u>פנו</u> אלי <u>והשמו</u>
5b	<u>χεῖρα</u> θέντες ἐπὶ <u>σιαγόνι,</u>	<u>ושמו</u> יד על פה:
6a	<u>ἐάν τε</u> [<u>γὰρ</u>] <u>μνησθῶ, ἐσπούδακα,</u>	<u>ואם</u> זכרתי <u>אנבהלתי</u>

	v.	Greek	Hebrew
	6b	ἔχουσιν δέ μου τὰς σάρκας ὀδύναι.	ואחז בשרי פלצות:
III	7a	διὰ τί ἄσεβεῖς ζῶσιν,	מדוע רשעים יחיו
	7b	πεπαλαίωνται δὲ καὶ ἐν πλούτῳ;	עתקו גַם גִּבְרוֹן חיל:
	8a	/ ὁ σπóρος αὐτῶν κατὰ ψυχὴν,	/ זרעם נכון לפניהם עמם /
	8b	/ τὰ δὲ τέκνα αὐτῶν ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς.	/ וצאצאיהם לעיניהם: /
	9a	οἱ οἴκοι αὐτῶν εὐθηνούσιν, φόβος δὲ οὐδαμοῦ,	בתיהם שלום מפחד
	9b	μάστιξ δὲ παρὰ κυρίου οὐκ ἔστιν ἐπ' αὐτοῖς.	ולא שבט אלוה עליהם:
	10a	/ ἡ βοῦς αὐτῶν οὐκ ὤμοτόκησεν,	/ שורו עבר ולא יגעל /
	10b	/ διεσώθη δὲ αὐτῶν ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσα καὶ οὐκ ἔσφαλεν.	/ תפלט פרתו ולא תשכל: /
IV	11a	μένουσιν δὲ ὡς πρόβατα αἰώνια,	ישלחו כצאן עוֹלִיָּהם
	11b	τὰ δὲ παῖδια αὐτῶν προσπαίζουσιν	וילדיהם ירקדון:
	12a	ἀναλαβόντες ψαλτήριον καὶ κιθάραν	/ ישאו כתף וכנור /
	12b	καὶ εὐφραίνονται φωνῇ ψαλμοῦ.	/ וישמחו לקול עוגב: /
	13a	/ συνετέλεσαν δὲ ἐν ἀγαθοῖς τὸν βίον αὐτῶν,	יבל ¹⁰⁸² בטוב ימיהם
	13b	/ ἐν δὲ ἀναπαύσει ἥδου ἐκοιμήθησαν.	וברגע שאול יחתו:
	14a	λέγει δὲ κυρίῳ 'Ἀπόστα ἀπ' ἐμοῦ,	ויאמרו לאל סור ממנו
	14b	ὁδός σου εἰδέναι οὐ βούλομαι.	ודעת דרכך לא חפצנו:
	15a		מה שדי בִּי נעבדנו /
	15b		ומה נועיל בִּי נפגע בו: /
V	16a	ἐν χερσὶν γὰρ ἦν αὐτῶν τὰ ἀγαθὰ,	הן לא בידם טובם
	16b	ἔργα δὲ ἄσεβῶν οὐκ ἐφορᾷ.	עצת רשעים רחקה מנִי:
	17a	οὐ μὴν δὲ ἀλλὰ καὶ ἄσεβῶν λύχνος σβεσθήσεται,	כמה נר רשעים ידעך
	17b	/ ἐπελεύσεται δὲ αὐτοῖς ἡ καταστροφή,	ויבא עלימו אידם
	17c	/ ὠδίνες δὲ αὐτοὺς ἔξουσιν ἀπὸ ὀργῆς.	חבלים יחלק באפן:
	18a	/ ἔσονται δὲ ὥσπερ ἄχυρα πρὸ ἀνέμου	/ יהיו כתבן לפני רוח /
	18b	/ ἢ ὥσπερ κονιορτός, ὃν ὑφείλατο λαίλαψ.	/ וכמץ גגבתו סופה: /
VI	19a	ἐκλίπῃ υἱούς τὰ ὑπάρχοντα αὐτοῦ.	אלוה יצפן לבניו אונו
	19b		ישלם אליו וידע:
	20a	ἴδοισαν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτοῦ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ σφαγὴν,	יראו עינו ¹⁰⁸³ בידו
	20b	ἀπὸ δὲ κυρίου μὴ διασωθῇ.	ומחמת שדי ישתה:
	21a		כי מה חפצו בביתו אחריו
	21b		ומספר חדשיו חצצו:
	22a	/ πότερον οὐχὶ ὁ κύριός ἐστιν ὁ διδάσκων σύνεσιν καὶ ἐπιστήμῃ;	הלא ילמד דעת
	22b	/ αὐτὸς δὲ φόνους διακρινεῖ.	והוא רמים ישפוט:
	23a		זה ימות בעצם תמו

¹⁰⁸² Qere יכלו.

¹⁰⁸³ Qere עינו.

v.	Greek	Hebrew
23b		כלו שלאנן ושליז:
VII 24a	/ τὰ δὲ ἔγκατα αὐτοῦ πλήρης στέατος,	/ עטיניו מלאו חלב /
24b	/ μυελὸς δὲ αὐτοῦ διαχεῖται.	/ ומח עצמותיו ישקה:
25a	ὁ δὲ τελευτᾷ ὑπὸ πικρίας ψυχῆς	וח ימות בנפש מרה
25b	οὐ φαγὼν οὐδὲν ἀγαθόν.	ולא אכל בטובה:
26a	ὁμοθυμαδὸν δὲ ἐπὶ γῆς κοιμῶνται,	יחד על עפר ישכבו
26b	σαπρία δὲ αὐτοὺς ἐκάλυψεν.	ורמה תכסה עליהם:
VIII 27	ὥστε οἶδα ὅμᾱς ὅτι τόλμῃ ἐπίκεισθέ μοι,	הן ידעתי מחשבותיכם
(27b)		ומזמות עלי תחמסו:
28a		בי תאמרו איה בית נדיב
28b		ואיה אהל משכנות רשעים:
29a		הלא שאלתם עוברי דרך
29b		ואתתם לא תנכרו:
30a		בי ליום איד יחשך רע
30b		ליום עברות יובלו:
31a		מי יגיד על פניו דרכו
31b		והוא עשה מי ישלם לו:
32a		והוא לקברות יובל
32b		ועל גדיש ישקוד:
33a		מתקו לו רגבי נחל
33b		ואחריו כל אדם ימשוך
33c		ולפניו אין מספר:
34a	πῶς δὲ παρακαλεῖτέ με κενά;	ואיך תנחמוני הבל
34b	τὸ δὲ ἐμὲ καταπαύσασθαι ἀφ' ὁμῶν οὐδέν.	ותשובתיכם נשאר מעל:

v.	NETS	NRSVUE
21:2	Listen, listen to my words, lest this be your consolation for me.	Listen carefully to my words, and let this be your consolation.
3	Lift me up, and I will speak; then you will not laugh me to scorn.	Bear with me, and I will speak; then after I have spoken, mock on.
4	What? My reproof is not that of a mortal, is it? Or, why should I not be angry?	As for me, is my complaint addressed to mortals? Why should I not be impatient?
5	Look at me, and marvel, laying your hand on your cheek.	Look at me and be appalled, and lay your hand upon your mouth.
6	For even when I remember, I am in haste, and pains seize my flesh.	When I think of it I am dismayed, and shuddering seizes my flesh.
7	Why do the impious live on and grow old, even in wealth?	Why do the wicked live on, reach old age, and grow mighty in power?

v.	NETS	NRSVUE
8	Their progeny are according to their pleasure, and their children in their sight.	Their children are established in their presence and their offspring before their eyes.
9	Their houses prosper without any fear, and no scourge from the Lord is upon them.	Their houses are safe from fear, and no rod of God is upon them.
10	Their cow did not miscarry, and their pregnant one came through safely and did not falter.	Their bull breeds without fail; their cow calves and never miscarries.
11	And they remain as ageless sheep, and their children play about	They send out their little ones like a flock, and their children dance around.
12	when they take up the harp and lyre and make merry to the sound of a melody.	They sing to the tambourine and the lyre and rejoice to the sound of the pipe.
13	And they finished their life in prosperity and lay down in the repose of Hades.	They spend their days in prosperity, and in peace they go down to Sheol.
14	But he says to the Lord, 'Stay away from me; I do not wish to know your ways.'	They say to God, 'Leave us alone! We do not desire to know your ways.
15		What is the Almighty, that we should serve him? And what profit do we get if we pray to him?'
16	For their good things were in their hands, but he does not regard the works of the impious.	Is not their prosperity indeed their own achievement? The plans of the wicked are repugnant to me.
17	Nonetheless, the lamp of the impious shall also be put out, and destruction shall come upon them, and sharp pains shall seize them, because of anger.	How often is the lamp of the wicked put out? How often does calamity come upon them? How often does God distribute pains in his anger?
18	And they shall be as chaff before the wind or as dust that the whirlwind has purloined.	How often are they like straw before the wind and like chaff that the storm carries away?
19	May his possessions fail his sons.	You say, 'God stores up their iniquity for their children.' Let it be paid back to them, so that they may know it.
20	May his eyes see his own slaughter, and may he not escape from the Lord.	Let their own eyes see their destruction, and let them drink of the wrath of the Almighty.
21		For what do they care for their household after them, when the number of their months is cut off?
22	Is it not the Lord who teaches understanding and knowledge? But he will discerningly judge murders.	Will any teach God knowledge, seeing that he judges those that are on high?
23		One dies in full prosperity, being wholly at ease and secure,
24	But as for his inwards, he is full of fat, and his marrow is being dispersed.	his loins full of milk and the marrow of his bones moist.
25	And he dies of bitterness of soul, not eating anything good.	Another dies in bitterness of soul, never having tasted of good.
26	But one and all, they lay down on the ground, and decay covered them.	They lie down alike in the dust, and the worms cover them.
27	So I know you, that you daringly attack me.	Oh, I know your thoughts and your schemes to wrong me.
28		For you say, 'Where is the house of the prince? Where is the tent in which the wicked lived?'

v.	NETS	NRSVUE
29		Have you not asked those who travel the roads, and do you not accept their testimony,
30		that the wicked are spared in the day of calamity and are rescued in the day of wrath?
31		Who declares their way to their face, and who repays them for what they have done?
32		When they are carried to the grave, a watch is kept over their tomb.
33		The clods of the valley are sweet to them; everyone will follow after, and those who went before are unnumberable.
34	How then will you encourage me with emptiness? And, I have no relief at all from you.	How then will you comfort me with empty nothings? There is nothing left of your answers but falsehood.

Job 25

v.	Greek	Hebrew
I 2a	Τί γὰρ προοίμιον ἢ φόβος παρ' αὐτοῦ,	המשל ופחד עמו
2b	ὁ ποιῶν τὴν σύμπασαν ἐν ὑψίστῳ;	עשה שלום במרומיך:
3a	μὴ γὰρ τις ὑπολάβοι ὅτι ἐστὶν παρέλκυσις πειραταῖς;	היש מספר לגדודיך
3b	ἐπὶ τίνας δὲ οὐκ ἐπελεύσεται ἔνεδρα παρ' αὐτοῦ;	ועל מי לא יקום אורחו:
II 4a	/ πῶς γὰρ ἔσται δίκαιος βροτὸς ἐναντὶ κυρίου;	/ ומה יצדק אנוש עם אל /
4b	/ ἢ τίς ἂν ἀποκαθαρσάι ἐαυτὸν γεννητὸς γυναικός;	/ ומה יזכה ילוד אשה: /
5a	εἰ σελήνῃ συντάσσει, καὶ οὐκ ἐπιφάσκει·	/ הן עד ירח ולא יאהיל /
5b	ἄστρα δὲ οὐ καθαρὰ ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ.	/ / וכוכבים לא זכו בעיניו:
6a	ἔα δέ, ἄνθρωπος σαπρία	/ אף כי אנוש רמה /
6b		/ ובן אדם תולעה:

v.	NETS	NRSVUE
25:2	Why, what preamble or fear is there from him, he who on high keeps making the entire earth?	Dominion and fear are with God; he makes peace in his high heaven.
3	For would there be anyone who thinks there is respite for brigands? And upon whom will not come ambushes from him?	Is there any number to his armies? Upon whom does his light not arise?
4	For how can a mortal be right before the Lord? Or who, born of woman, could purify himself?	How then can a mortal be righteous before God? How can one born of woman be pure?
5	If he instructs the moon, then it does not shine, and the stars are not pure before him.	If even the moon is not bright and the stars are not pure in his sight,
6	But alas, a human being is rot!	how much less a mortal, who is a maggot, and a human being, who is a worm!

Job 29-31

	v.	Greek	Hebrew
I	29:2a	Τίς ἄν με θείῃ κατὰ μῆνα ἔμπροσθεν ἡμερῶν,	מי יתנני כירחי קדם /
	2b	ἄν με ὁ θεὸς ἐφύλαξεν;	מי אלוה ישמרני: /
	3a	ὥς ὅτε ἡῦγαι ὁ λύχνος αὐτοῦ ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς μου,	בהלו נרו עלי ראשי
	3b	ὅτε τῷ φωτὶ αὐτοῦ ἐπορευόμην ἐν σκότει·	לאורו אלך חשך:
	4a	ὅτε ἤμην ἐπιβρίθων ὁδοῖς,	כאשר הייתי בימי חרפִי
	4b	ὅτε ὁ θεὸς ἐπισκοπῆν ἐποιεῖτο τοῦ οἴκου μου·	בסוד אלוה עלִי אהלי:
	5a	ὅτε ἤμην ὑλώδης λίαν,	בעוד שדי עמדי /
II	5b	κύκλω δέ μου οἱ παῖδες·	סביבותי נערִי: /
	6a	/ ὅτε ἐχέοντο μου αἱ ὁδοί βουτύρῳ,	ברחץ הליכי בחמה
III	6b	/ τὰ δὲ ὄρη μου ἐχέοντο γάλακτι·	וצור יצוק עמדי פלגי שמן:
	7a	ὅτε ἐξεπορευόμην ὄρθριος ἐν πόλει,	בצאתי שער עלי קרת
	7b	ἐν δὲ πλατείαις ἐτίθετό μου ὁ δίφρος·	ברחוב אכין מושבי:
	8a	/ ιδόντες με νεανίσκοι ἐκρύβησαν,	ראוני נערים ונחבאו /
	8b	/ πρεσβῦται δὲ πάντες ἔστησαν·	וישישים קמון עמדו: /
	9a	ἄδρῳ δὲ ἐπαύσαντο λαλοῦντες	שרים עצרו במלים
	9b	δάκτυλον ἐπιθέντες ἐπὶ στόματι·	וכף ישימו לפיהם:
	10a	/ οἱ δὲ ἀκούσαντες ἐμακάρισάν με,	קול נגידים נחבאו /
	10b	/	ולשונם לחכם דבקה: /
	11a	/	כי און שמעה ותאשרני /
IV	11b	/ ὀφθαλμοὺς δὲ ιδών με ἐξέκλινεν·	ועין ראתה ותעדיני: /
	12a	/ διέσωσα γὰρ πτωχὸν ἐκ χειρὸς δυνάστου	כי אמלט עני משוע /
	12b	/ καὶ ὀρφανῷ, ὃ οὐκ ἦν βοηθός , ἐβοήθησα ·	/ ויתום ולא עזר לו: /
	13a		ברכת אבד עלי תבא /
	13b	στόμα δὲ χήρας με εὐλόγησεν·	/ ולב אלמנה ארנן: /
	14a	/ δικαιοσύνην δὲ ἐνεδεδύκειν,	צדק לבשתי וילבשני
	14b	/ ἡμφιασάμην δὲ κρίμα ἴσα διπλοῖδι ·	כמעיל וצניח משפטִי: /
	15a	/ ὀφθαλμοὺς ἡμην τυφλῶν,	/ עינים הייתי לעור /
	15b	/ ποὺς δὲ χωλῶν·	/ ורגלים לפסח אנִי: /
	16a	ἐγὼ ἡμην πατὴρ ἀδυνάτων,	אב אנכי לאביונים
	16b	δίκην δέ, ἣν οὐκ ἤδην, ἐξιχνίασα ·	ורב לא ידעתי אחקרהִן: /
V	17a	συνέτριψα δὲ μύλας ἀδίκων ,	ואשברה מתלעות עול
	17b	ἐκ δὲ μέσου τῶν ὀδόντων αὐτῶν ἄρπαγμα ἐξέσπασα ·	ומשניו אשליך טרף: /
	18a	εἶπα δέ ᾗ ἡλικία μου γηράσει,	ואמר עם קני אגוע
	18b	ὥσπερ στέλεχος φοίνικος πολὺν χρόνον βιώσω·	וכחול ארבה ימים: /
	19a		שרשי פתוח אלי מים
	19b		וטל ילין בקצירי: /

v.	Greek	Hebrew
20a		כבודי חדש עמדי /
20b		וקשתי בידי תחיה: /
21a	ἐμοῦ ἀκούσαντες προσέσχον,	לי שמעו ויחלו /
21b	ἐσιώπησαν δὲ ἐπὶ τῇ ἐμῇ βουλῇ·	וידמו למו עצתי: /
22a	ἐπὶ δὲ τῷ ἐμῷ ῥήματι οὐ προσέθεντο,	אחרי דברי לא ישנו /
22b	περιχαρεῖς δὲ ἐγίνοντο, ὁπόταν αὐτοῖς ἐλάλουν·	ועלימו חטף מלחי: /
23a	/ ὥσπερ γῆ διψῶσα προσδεχομένη τὸν ὑετόν,	ויחלו כמטר לי /
23b	/ οὕτως οὗτοι τὴν ἐμὴν λαλίαν.	ופיהם פערו למלקוש: /
24a	ἐὰν γελάσω πρὸς αὐτούς, οὐ μὴ πιστεύσωσιν,	אשחק אלהם לא יאמינו /
24b		ואור פני לא יפילון: /
25a		אבחר דרכם ואשב ראש /
25b		ואשכון כמלך בגדוד /
25c		כאשר אבליס ינחם: /
VI	30:1a / νυνὶ δὲ κατεγέλασάν μου,	ועתה שחקו עלי /
1b	/ ἐλάχιστοι νῦν νουθετοῦσίν με ἐν μέρει,	צעירים ממני לימים /
1c		אשר מאסתי אבותם /
1d	οὓς οὐχ ἡγησάμην ἀξιούς κυνῶν τῶν ἐμῶν νομάδων.	לשית עם כלבי צאני: /
2a		גם כח ידיהם למה לי /
2b		עלימו אבד כלח: /
3a		בחסר ובכפן גלמוד /
3b		הערקים ציה /
3c		אמש שואה ומשאה: /
4a		הקטפים מלוח עלי שיה /
4b	οἵτινες ἄλιμα ἦν αὐτῶν τὰ σῖτα,	ושרש רתמים לחמם: /
4c	ἄτιμοι δὲ καὶ πεφאυλισμένοι, ἐνδεεῖς παντὸς ἀγαθοῦ,	
4d	οἱ καὶ ῥίζας ξύλων ἐμασῶντο ὑπὸ λιμοῦ μεγάλου.	
VII	5 ἐπανεστήσαν μοι κλέπται,	מן גו יגרשו /
(5b)		יריעו עלימו כנגב: /
6	ὧν οἱ οἴκοι αὐτῶν ἦσαν τρώγλαι πετρῶν·	בערוץ נחלים לשכון /
(6b)		חרי עפר וקכפים: /
7a		בין שיחים ינהקו /
7b	οἱ ὑπὸ φρύγανα ἄγρια διητῶντο,	תחת חרול יספחו: /
8a	ἀφρόνων υἱοὶ καὶ ἀτίμων ὄνομα	בני נבל גם בני בלי שם /
8b	καὶ κλέος ἐσβεσμένον ἀπὸ γῆς.	נכאו מן הארץ: /
VIII	9a νυνὶ δὲ κιθάρα ἐγὼ εἰμι αὐτῶν,	ועתה נגינתם הייתי /
9b	καὶ ἐμὲ θρύλημα ἔχουσιν·	ואהי להם למלה: /

v.	Greek	Hebrew
10a	ἐβδελύξαντο δέ με ἀποστάντες μακράν,	תעבוני רחקו מני
10b	ἀπὸ δὲ προσώπου μου οὐκ ἐφείσαντο πτύελον.	ומפני לא חשכו רק:
IX 11a	ἀνοίξας γὰρ φαρέτραν αὐτοῦ ἐκάκωσέν με,	כי יתרו ¹⁰⁸⁴ פתח ויענני
11b		ורסן מפני שלחו:
12a		על ימין פרחח יקומו
12b		רגלי שלחו
12c		ויסלו עלי ארחות אידם:
13a		נתסו נתיבתי
13b	ἐξέδυσεν γάρ μου τὴν στολήν.	להותי יעילו לא עזר למו:
14a	βέλεσιν αὐτοῦ κατηκόντισέν με,	כפרץ רחב יאתיו /
14b	κέχρηται μοι ὥς βούλεται, ἐν ὀδύναίς πέφυρμαι.	תחת שאה התגלגלו: /
15a	ἐπιστρέφονται μοι αἱ ὀδύναι,	ההפך עלי בלהות
15b	/ ὥχετό μου ἡ ἐλπίς ὥσπερ πνεῦμα	תרדף כרות נדבתי /
15c	/ καὶ ὥσπερ νέφος ἡ σωτηρία μου.	ובעב עברה ישעתי: /
16a		ועתה עלי תשתפך נפשי
16b	ἔχουσιν δέ με ἡμέραι ὀδυνῶν.	יאחזוני ימי עני:
17a	/ νυκτὶ δέ μου τὰ ὀσᾶ συγκέκασται,	לילה עצמי נקר מעלי
17b	/ τὰ δὲ νεῦρά μου διαλέλυνται.	וערקי לא ישכבון:
18a	ἐν πολλῇ ἰσχύι ἐπελάβετό μου τῆς στολῆς,	ברב כח יתחפש לבושי
18b		כפי כתנתי יאזרני:
X 19a	ἡγησai δέ με ἴσα πηλῶ,	הרני לחמר
19b	ἐν γῇ καὶ σποδῶ μου ἡ μερίς.	ואתמשל כעפר ואפר:
20a	κέκραγα δὲ πρὸς σέ καὶ οὐκ εἰσακούεις μου,	אשוע אליך ולא תענני /
20b		עמדתי ותתבנן בי: /
21a	/ ἐπέβης δέ μοι ἀνελεημόνως,	תהפך לאכזר לי
21b	/ χειρὶ κραταιᾷ με ἐμαστίγωσας.	בעצם ידך תשטמני:
22a	/ ἔταξας δέ με ἐν ὀδύναίς	תשאני אל רוח תרכיבני /
22b		ותמגגני תשוה ¹⁰⁸⁵ : /
XI 23a	οἶδα γὰρ ὅτι θάνατός με ἐκτρίψει.	כי ידעתי מות תשיבני
23b	οἰκία γὰρ παντὶ θνητῷ γῇ.	ובית מועד לכל חי:
24a	εἰ γὰρ ὄφελον δυνάμην ἐμαυτὸν χειρώσασθαι,	אך לא בעי ישלח יד /
24b	ἢ δεηθεὶς γε ἐτέρου, καὶ ποιήσει μοι τοῦτο.	אם בפידו להן שוע: /
XII 25a	/ ἐγὼ δὲ ἐπὶ παντὶ ἄδυνάτῳ ἔκλαυσα,	אם לא בכיתי לקשה יום /
25b	/ ἐστῆναι δὲ ἰδὼν ἄνδρα ἐν ἀνάγκαις.	עגמה נפשי לאביון: /
26a	ἐγὼ δὲ ἐπέχων ἀγαθοῖς,	כי טוב קויתי ויבא רע /

¹⁰⁸⁴ Qere יתרי.

¹⁰⁸⁵ Qere תושיה.

v.	Greek	Hebrew
26b	<u>ἰδοὺ</u> συνήντησάν μοι <u>μᾶλλον</u> ἡμέραι κακῶν.	/ ואיחלה לאור ויבא אפל:
27a		מע' רתחו ולא דמו
27b		קדמני ימי עני:
XIII 28a	/ στένων πεπóρευμαι ἄνευ <u>φίμοῦ</u> ,	קדר הלכתי בלא חמה
28b	/ ἔσθηκα δὲ ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ κεκραγώς.	קמתי בקהל אשוע:
29a	/ ἀδελφὸς γέγονα σειρήνων,	/ אח הייתי לתנים
29b	/ ἑταῖρος δὲ στρουθῶν.	/ ורע לבנות יענה :
30a	/ τὸ δὲ δέρμα μου <u>ἐσκότῳ</u> μέγας,	/ עורי שחר מעלי
30b	/ τὰ δὲ ὀστέα μου <u>ἀπὸ</u> καύματος.	/ ועצמי חרה מני חרב:
31a	/ <u>ἀπέβη</u> δὲ εἰς πάθος μου ἡ κιθάρα,	/ ויהי לאבל כנרי
31b	/ ὁ δὲ ψαλμός μου εἰς κλαυθμὸν <u>ἐμὸν</u> .	/ ועגבי לקול בכים:
- 31:1a		ברית כרתי לעיני
1b		ומה אתבונן על בתולה:
2a		ומה חלק אלוה ממעל
2b		ונחלת שדי ממרמים:
3a		הלא איד לעול
3b		ונכר לפעלי און:
4a		הלא הוּא יֵדָאָה דרכי
4b		וכל צעדי יספור:
XIV 5a	<u>εἰ δὲ</u> ἤμην πεπορευμένος μετὰ <u>γελοιαστῶν</u> ,	אם הלכתי עם שוא
5b	<u>εἰ δὲ</u> <u>καὶ</u> ἐσπούδασεν ὁ πούς μου εἰς δόλον,	ותחש על מרמה רגלי:
6a	<u>ἵσταί</u> με <u>ἄρα</u> ἐν ζυγῷ δικαίῳ,	ישקלני במאזני צדק
6b	οἶδεν δὲ ὁ κύριος τὴν ἀκακίαν μου.	וידע אלוה תמתי:
XV 7a	<u>εἰ</u> ἐξέκλινεν ὁ πούς μου ἐκ τῆς ὁδοῦ,	אם תטה אשרי מני הדרך
7b	<u>εἰ δὲ</u> <u>καὶ</u> τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ ἐπηκολούθησεν ἡ καρδιά μου,	ואחר עיני הלך לבי
7c	<u>εἰ δὲ</u> <u>καὶ</u> ταῖς χερσίν μου ἠψάμην δώρων,	ובכפי דבק מאוס:
8a	σπείρῃμι <u>ἄρα</u> καὶ ἄλλοι <u>φάγοισαν</u> ,	אזרעה ואחר יאכל
8b	<u>ἄρριζος</u> δὲ <u>γενοίμην</u> ἐπὶ γῆς.	וצאצאי ישרשו:
XVI 9a	<u>εἰ</u> ἐξηκολούθησεν ἡ καρδιά μου <u>γυναικὶ ἀνδρὸς ἐτέρου</u> ,	אם נפתה לבי על אשה
9b	<u>εἰ</u> <u>καὶ</u> ἐγκάθετος ἐγενόμην ἐπὶ θύραις αὐτῆς,	ועל פתח רעי ארבתי:
10a	/ <u>ἀρέσαι</u> <u>ἄρα</u> καὶ <u>ἡ</u> <u>γυνή</u> μου <u>ἐτέρω</u> ,	תסחן לאחר אשתי
10b	/ τὰ δὲ νήπιά μου <u>ταπεινωθείη</u> .	ועליה יכרעון אחרין :
11a	/ θυμὸς <u>γάρ</u> ὀργῆς <u>ἀκατάσχετος</u>	/ כי הוא ¹⁰⁸⁶ זמה
11b	/ τὸ μιᾶναι <u>ἀνδρὸς γυναικα</u> .	/ והיא ¹⁰⁸⁷ עון פלילים:
12a	πῦρ <u>γάρ</u> ἐστιν καιόμενον ἐπὶ πάντων τῶν μερῶν,	כי אש היא עד אבדון תאכל

¹⁰⁸⁶ Qere יהי.

¹⁰⁸⁷ Qere והוא.

v.	Greek	Hebrew
12b	οὐ δ' ἂν ἐπέλθῃ, ἐκ ῥιζῶν ἀπώλεσεν.	ובכל תבואתי תשרש:
XVII 13a	εἰ δὲ <u>καὶ</u> ἐφαύλισα κρίμα θεράποντός μου ἢ θεραπαίνης	אם אמאס משפט עבדי ואמתי
13b	κρινομένων αὐτῶν πρὸς μέ,	ברבם עמדי:
14a	/ τί γὰρ ποιήσω, <u>ἐὰν</u> ἔτασίν μου ποιήσῃται ὁ κύριος;	/ ומה אעשה כי יקום אל
14b	/ <u>ἐὰν</u> δὲ καὶ ἐπισκοπήν, τίνα ἀποκρισιν ποιήσομαι;	/ וכי יפקד מה אשיבנו:
15a	/ πότερον οὐχ <u>ὥς καὶ ἐγὼ</u> ἐγενόμην ἐν γαστρὶ, <u>καὶ</u> ἐκείνοι γεγόνασιν;	הלא בבטן עשני עשהו
15b	/ γεγόναμεν δὲ ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ κοιλίᾳ.	ויכננו ברחם אחד:
XVIII 16a	ἀδύνατοι δὲ χρεῖαν, ἣν ποτ' εἶχον, οὐκ ἀπέτυχον,	אם אמנע מחפץ דלים
16b	χήρας δὲ τὸν ὀφθαλμὸν οὐκ ἐξέτηξα.	ועיני אלמנה אכלה:
17a	<u>εἰ δὲ καὶ</u> τὸν ψωμόν μου ἔφαγον μόνος	/ ואכל פתי לבדי
17b	καὶ οὐχὶ ὀρφανῶ μετέδωκα.	/ ולא אכל יתום ממנה:
18a		כי מנגעורי גדלני כאב
18b		ומבטן אמי אנחנה:
19	<u>εἰ δὲ καὶ</u> ὑπερεῖδον γυμνὸν ἀπολλύμενον	/ אם אראה אובד מבלי לבוש
(19b)	καὶ οὐκ ἡμφίασα,	/ ואין כסות לאביון:
20a	ἀδύνατοι δὲ <u>εἰ μὴ</u> εὐλόγησάν με,	אם לא ברכוני חלצו ¹⁰⁸⁸
20b	ἀπὸ δὲ <u>κουρᾶς</u> ἀνῶν μου ἐθερμάνθησαν οἱ ὦμοί αὐτῶν,	ומגן כבשי יתחמם:
21a	<u>εἰ</u> ἐπῆρα ὀρφανῶ χεῖρα	אם הניפותי על יתום יד
21b	πεποιθῶς ὅτι <u>πολλή</u> μοι βοήθεια περίεστιν,	כי אראה בשער עזרת:
22a	/ ἀποσταίη <u>ἄρα</u> ὁ ὦμός μου ἀπὸ τῆς κλειδός,	/ כתפי משכמה תפול
22b	/ ὁ δὲ βραχίον μου ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀγκῶνος <u>συντριβείη</u> .	/ ואזרעי מקנה תשבר:
23a	φόβος γὰρ κυρίου <u>συνέσχεν</u> με,	כי פחד אלי איד אל
23b		ומשאתו לא אוכל:
XIX 24a		אם שמתו זהב כסלי
24b	<u>εἰ δὲ καὶ</u> λίθω πολυτελεῖ ἐπεποιθήσα,	ולכתם אמרתי מבטחי:
25a	<u>εἰ δὲ καὶ</u> εὐφράνθη <u>πολλοῦ</u> πλούτου μοι γενομένου,	אם אשמח כי רב חילי
25b	<u>εἰ δὲ καὶ</u> ἐπ' ἀναριθμήτοις ἐθέμην χεῖρά μου,	/ וכי כביר מצאה ידי:
26a	/ ἢ <u>οὐχ</u> ὥρῳ μὲν ἥλιον τὸν ἐπιφάυσκοντα ἐκλείποντα,	/ אם אראה אור כי יהל
26b	/ σελήνην δὲ φθίνουσαν;	/ וירח יקר הלך:
26c	οὐ γὰρ <u>ἐπ'</u> αὐτοῖς ἐστιν.	/
27a		ויפת בסתר לבי
27b	<u>εἰ δὲ καὶ</u> χεῖρά μου <u>ἐπιθείς</u> ἐπὶ στόματί μου ἐφίλγησα,	/ ותשק ידי לפי:

¹⁰⁸⁸ Qere חלצו.

v.	Greek	Hebrew
28a	καὶ τοῦτό <u>μοι ἄρα</u> ἀνομία <u>ἢ</u> μεγίστη <u>λογισθείη</u> ,	<u>גם הוא</u> עון פלילי
28b	<u>ὅτι</u> ἐψευσάμην ἐναντίον κυρίου τοῦ ὑψίστου.	<u>כי</u> כחשתי לאל ממעל:
XX 29a	εἰ δὲ <u>καὶ</u> ἐπιχαρῆς ἐγενόμην πτώματι ἐχθρῶν μου	<u>אם</u> אשמח בפיך משנאי
29b	καὶ εἶπεν ἡ καρδία μου Εὕγε,	והתעררתי <u>כי</u> מצאון רע:
30a	<u>ἀκούσαι ἄρα</u> τὸ οὖς μου, τὴν κατάραν μου,	ולא נתתי לחטא חכי
30b	<u>θρυληθείην δὲ ἄρα</u> ὑπὸ λαοῦ μου κακούμενος.	<u>לִשְׁאֹל</u> באלה <u>נִפְשׁוּ</u> :
XXI 31a	εἰ δὲ <u>καὶ</u> <u>πολλάκις</u> εἶπον αἱ θεραπείαι μου	<u>אם לא</u> אמרו מתי אהלי
31b	Τίς ἂν δώῃ <u>ἡμῖν</u> τῶν σαρκῶν αὐτοῦ πλησθῆναι;	<u>מי יתן</u> מבשרו לא נשבע:
31c	<u>λίαν μου χρηστοῦ ὄντος</u> .	
32a	ἔξω δὲ οὐκ ἠύλιζετο ξένος,	בחוק לא ילין גר
32b	ἢ δὲ θύρα μου <u>παντὶ</u> ἐλθόντι ἀνέωκτο.	דלתי לארח אפתח:
XXII 33	<u>εἰ δὲ καὶ</u> <u>ἁμαρτῶν</u> <u>ἀκουσίως</u> ἔκρυψα <u>τὴν ἁμαρτίαν</u> μου,	<u>אם</u> כסיתי <u>כאדם</u> פשעי
(33b)		<u>לִטְמוֹן</u> ב חֲבִי עוֹנִי:
34a	<u>οὐ γὰρ</u> διετράπην πολυσχλίαν πλήθους τοῦ μὴ ἐξαγορευῆσαι <u>ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν</u> ,	<u>כי</u> אערין המון רבה /
34b	<u>εἰ δὲ καὶ</u> εἶσα <u>ἀδύνατον</u> ἐξελθεῖν θύραν μου <u>κόλπῳ κενῷ</u> ,	ובזו משפחות יחתני /
34c		ואדם לא אצא פתח:
35a		<u>מי יתן לִי</u> שמע <u>לִי</u>
35b	χεῖρα δὲ κυρίου <u>εἰ μὴ</u> ἔδεδοίκειν,	<u>הוּא</u> תוי שדי <u>יעֲנֵנִי</u>
35c	συγγραφήν δέ, ἣν εἶχον κατὰ τινος,	<u>וספר</u> כתב איש ריבי:
36	ἐπ' ὧμοις <u>ἂν</u> περιθέμενος στέφανον <u>ἀνεγίνωσκον</u> ,	<u>אם לא</u> על שכמי אשאנו /
(36b)		<u>אעֲנִידֵנּוּ</u> עטרות <u>לִי</u> : /
37a	<u>καὶ εἰ μὴ</u> ῥήξας αὐτὴν ἀπέδωκα	<u>מספר</u> צעדי אגידנו
37b	οὐθὲν λαβὼν παρὰ <u>χρεοφειλέτου</u> ,	<u>כמו</u> נגיד <u>אֶקְרַבְנֵנּוּ</u> :
XXIII 38a	/ <u>εἰ</u> ἐπ' ἐμοί <u>ποτε</u> <u>ἢ γῆ</u> ἐστέναξεν,	<u>אם</u> עלי אדמת <u>תזעק</u> /
38b	/ <u>εἰ δὲ καὶ</u> οἱ αὐλακες αὐτῆς ἔκλαυσαν ὁμοθυμαδόν,	ויחד <u>תלמיה</u> יבכיו: /
39a	<u>εἰ δὲ καὶ</u> τὴν ἰσχὺν αὐτῆς ἔφαγον <u>μόνος</u> ἄνευ τιμῆς,	<u>אם</u> כחה אכלתי בלי כסף /
39b	<u>εἰ δὲ καὶ</u> ψυχὴν κυρίου <u>τῆς γῆς</u> ἐκβαλὼν ἐλύπησα,	ונפש בעליה הפחתי: /
40a	/ <u>ἀντὶ</u> πυροῦ <u>ἄρα</u> ἐξέλθοι <u>μοι</u> <u>κνίδη</u> ,	<u>תחת</u> חטה יצא חוח /
40b	/ <u>ἀντὶ</u> δὲ κριθῆς βάτος.	<u>ותחת</u> שערה <u>באשה</u> /

v.	NETS	NRSVUE
29:2	Who might put me a full month before now, when God watched over me,	O that I were as in the months of old, as in the days when God watched over me,
3	as when his lamp would shine over my head, when by his light I strode in darkness,	when his lamp shone over my head, and by his light I walked through darkness,

v.	NETS	NRSVUE
4	when I was pressing on my ways, when God would pay a visit to my house.	when I was in my prime, when the friendship of God was upon my tent,
5	when I was very much a person of substance and my children were around me,	when the Almighty was still with me, when my children were around me,
6	when my roads were flowing with butter and my hills flowed with milk!—	when my steps were washed with milk and the rock poured out for me streams of oil!
7	when I would go out early in the city and my seat was placed in the squares.	When I went out to the gate of the city, when I took my seat in the square,
8	When young men saw me, they hid, and the aged, all of them stood,	the young men saw me and withdrew, and the aged rose up and stood;
9	and prominent men stopped talking, putting a finger to their mouth.	the nobles refrained from talking, and laid their hands on their mouths;
10	And those who heard counted me happy,	the voices of princes were hushed, and their tongues stuck to the roofs of their mouths.
11	and the eye that saw me averted its glance.	When the ear heard, it commended me, and when the eye saw, it approved,
12	for I delivered the poor from the hand of the powerful, and the orphan, who had no helper, I helped,	because I delivered the poor who cried and the orphan who had no helper.
13	and the widow's mouth blessed me.	The blessing of the wretched came upon me, and I caused the widow's heart to sing for joy.
14	And I put on righteousness and was clothed with justice like a cloak.	I put on righteousness, and it clothed me; my justice was like a robe and a turban.
15	I was the eye of the blind and the foot of the lame.	I was eyes to the blind and feet to the lame.
16	It was I that was a father of the powerless, and a case I did not know I investigated.	I was a father to the needy, and I championed the cause of the stranger.
17	And I broke the molars of the unjust and tore prey from between their teeth.	I broke the fangs of the unrighteous and made them drop their prey from their teeth.
18	And I said, 'My manhood will see old age; I shall live a long while, like the trunk of a palm tree.'	Then I thought, 'I shall die in my nest, and I shall multiply my days like the phoenix;
19		my roots spread out to the waters, with the dew all night on my branches;
20		my glory was fresh with me and my bow ever new in my hand.
21	When they heard me, they took heed and fell silent at my counsel.	They listened to me and waited and kept silence for my counsel.
22	And they did not add to what I said but became overjoyed whenever I spoke to them.	After I spoke they did not speak again, and my word dropped upon them like dew.
23	As thirsty earth welcomes the rain, so these welcomed what I said.	They waited for me as for the rain; they opened their mouths as for the spring rain.
24	If I smiled toward them, they would not believe it.	I smiled on them when they had no confidence, and the light of my countenance they did not extinguish.

v.	NETS	NRSVUE
25		I chose what they should do and sat as chief, and I lived like a king among his troops, like one who comforts mourners.
30:1	But now they have laughed me to scorn; now the least of them reprove me in turn—whom I did not deem worthy of my shepherd dogs!	But now they make sport of me, those who are younger than I, whose fathers I would have disdained to set with the dogs of my flock.
2		What could I gain from the strength of their hands? All their vigor is gone.
3		Through want and hard hunger they gnaw the dry and desolate ground; they pick mallow and the leaves of bushes and to warm themselves the roots of broom.
4	Who indeed! Saltwort was their food, and they were without honor and disparaged, in want of everything good, who also chewed on tree roots out of great hunger.	
5	Thieves have risen up against me,	They are driven out from society; people shout after them as after a thief.
6	whose houses were caves in the rocks,	In the gullies of wadis they must live, in holes in the ground, and in the rocks.
7	who spent their lives under wild bushes—	Among the bushes they bray; under the nettles they huddle together.
8	sons of fools and of people dishonored in name, and a reputation quenched from earth.	A senseless, disreputable brood, they have been whipped out of the land.
9	But now I am their lyre, and they have me as chitchat;	And now they mock me in song; I am a byword to them.
10	and they abhorred me, standing afar off, and they did not spare my face their spit.	They abhor me; they keep aloof from me; they do not hesitate to spit at the sight of me.
11	For he opened his quiver and harmed me,	Because God has loosed my bowstring and humbled me, they have cast off restraint in my presence.
12		On my right hand the rabble rise up; they send me sprawling and build roads for my ruin.
13	for he took off my robe.	They break up my path; they promote my calamity; no one restrains them.
14	He shot me down with his arrows; he has treated me as he wishes; I am a jumble of pain.	As through a wide breach they come; amid the crash they roll on.
15	My pains are returning; my hope has gone away like a puff of air, and my safety like a cloud.	Terrors are turned upon me; my honor is pursued as by the wind, and my prosperity has passed away like a cloud.
16	And days of pain seize me,	And now my soul is poured out within me; days of affliction have taken hold of me.
17	while at night my bones are inflamed, and my sinews are dissolved.	The night racks my bones, and the pain that gnaws me takes no rest.
18	With great force he took hold of my robe.	With violence he seizes my garment; he grasps me by the collar of my tunic.
19	And you have regarded me as clay; my lot is in dust and ashes.	He has cast me into the mire, and I have become like dust and ashes.
20	But I have cried to you, and you do not listen to me.	I cry to you and you do not answer me; I stand, and you merely look at me.

v.	NETS	NRSVUE
21	And you fell upon me without mercy; with a strong hand you have scourged me,	You have turned cruel to me; with the might of your hand you persecute me.
22	and you arrayed me in pains.	You lift me up on the wind, you make me ride on it, and you toss me about in the roar of the storm.
23	I know that death will crush me, for earth is home to every mortal.	I know that you will bring me to death, and to the house appointed for all living.
24	Oh that I might be able to lay hands on myself or, at least, entreat another, and he will do this for me.	Surely one does not turn against the needy, when in disaster they cry for help.
25	And I, I wept over every powerless person, and I groaned when I saw a man in dire straits.	Did I not weep for those whose day was hard? Was not my soul grieved for the poor?
26	And I, when I was intent on good, look, days of evil met me all the more.	But when I looked for good, evil came, and when I waited for light, darkness came.
27		My inward parts are in turmoil and are never still; days of affliction come to meet me.
28	I have gone about, groaning without restraint, and I have stood in the assembly, crying out.	I go about in sunless gloom; I stand up in the assembly and cry for help.
29	I have become a brother of sirens and a companion of ostriches.	I am a brother of jackals and a companion of ostriches.
30	And my skin has blackened greatly, and my bones, from heat.	My skin turns black and falls from me, and my bones burn with heat.
31	And, my lyre has been turned into mourning, and my melody into weeping for me.	My lyre is turned to mourning and my pipe to the voice of those who weep.
31:1		I have made a covenant with my eyes; how, then, could I look upon a virgin?
2		What would be my portion from God above and my heritage from the Almighty on high?
3		Does not calamity befall the unrighteous and disaster the workers of iniquity?
4		Does he not see my ways and number all my steps?
5	But if I had walked with jesters and if too my foot hurried to deceit,	If I have walked with falsehood, and my foot has hurried to deceit—
6	then may he place me ¹⁰⁸⁹ in a just balance— and the Lord knows my innocence...	let me be weighed in a just balance, and let God know my integrity!—
7	If my foot has turned aside from the way and if too my heart followed my eye and if too I touched gifts with my hands,	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 may I sow and others eat, and may I become rootless on earth.	then let me sow and another eat, and let what grows for me be rooted out.
9	If my heart followed another man's wife, if in fact I lay in wait at her doors,	If my heart has been enticed by a woman and I have lain in wait at my neighbor's door,
10	then may my wife too be pleasing to another, and may my children be humiliated.	then let my wife grind for another, and let other men kneel over her.

¹⁰⁸⁹ In the newest version of NETS (provisional), Claude Cox has changed this into “for I am weighed”.

v.	NETS	NRSVUE
11	For a furious rage is uncontrollable, at the defiling of a man's wife;	For that would be a heinous crime; that would be a criminal offense;
12	for a fire is set burning in all parts, and wherever it has gone, it has destroyed root and branch.	for that would be a fire consuming down to Abaddon, and it would burn to the root all my harvest.
13	And if too I have disparaged the case of my male or female attendant when they bring a complaint against me,	If I have rejected the cause of my male or female slaves, when they brought a complaint against me,
14	what then shall I do if the Lord puts me under scrutiny? And if too he makes an inspection, what answer shall I give?	what then shall I do when God rises up? When he makes inquiry, what shall I answer him?
15	Just as I was conceived in the belly, were not they also? But we were conceived in the same cavity.	Did not he who made me in the womb make them? And did not one fashion us in the womb?
16	And as for the powerless, what need they had—I did not miss it, and they eye of the widow I did not let waste away.	If I have withheld anything that the poor desired or have caused the eyes of the widow to fail
17	And if too I ate my morsel alone and I did not share with the orphan,	or have eaten my morsel alone and the orphan has not eaten from it—
18		for from my youth I reared the orphan like a father, and from my mother's womb I guided the widow—
19	and if too I overlooked a naked person, perishing, and did not clothe him,	if I have seen anyone perish for lack of clothing or a poor person without covering,
20	and as for the powerless, if they did not bless me—yet their shoulders were warmed with the fleece of my lambs—	whose loins have not blessed me, and who was not warmed with the fleece of my sheep;
21	if I raised a hand against an orphan, confident that I have much help at my disposal,	if I have raised my hand against the orphan because I saw I had supporters at the gate;
22	then may my shoulder separate from its socket and my arm be crushed from the elbow.	then let my shoulder blade fall from my shoulder, and let my arm be broken from its socket.
23	To be sure, fear of the Lord controlled me.	For I was in terror of calamity from God, And I could not have faced his majesty.
24	And if too I trusted in precious stone	If I have made gold my trust or called fine gold my confidence,
25	and if too I rejoiced when much wealth accrued to me and if too I placed my hand on things without number—	if I have rejoiced because my wealth was great or because my hand had gotten much,
26	do I not see the shining sun failing, and the moon waning? For they do not have it in them.	if I have looked at the sun when it shone or the moon moving in splendor,
27	And if too I placed my hand on my mouth and kissed it,	and my heart has been secretly enticed, and my mouth has kissed my hand,
28	then may this too be reckoned to me as the greatest lawlessness, because I played false before the Lord Most High.	this also would be an iniquity to be punished by the judges, for I should have been false to God above.
29	And if too I was gratified at my enemies' fall, and my heart said, 'Good!'—	If I have rejoiced at the ruin of those who hated me or exulted when evil overtook them—

v.	NETS	NRSVUE
30	then may my ear hear a curse against me; and then may I be gossiped about by my people as one afflicted.	I have not let my mouth sin by asking for their lives with a curse—
31	And if too female attendants often said, ‘Who might grant us to be filled with his flesh?’ though I was very kind—	if those of my tent ever said, ‘O that we might be sated with his flesh!’—
32	and no stranger would lodge outside, but my door stood open to everyone that came.	the stranger has not lodged in the street; I have opened my doors to the traveler—
33	and if too, sinning haplessly, I hid my sin—	if I have concealed my transgressions as others do, by hiding my iniquity in my bosom,
34	for I was not deterred by the populous multitude from making a declaration before them—and if too I permitted the powerless to leave my door with empty pockets,	because I stood in great fear of the multitude, and the contempt of families terrified me, so that I kept silence, and did not go out of doors—
35	and if I had not feared the hand of the Lord, then the writ that I had against someone	O that I had one to hear me! (Here is my signature! Let the Almighty answer me!) O that I had the indictment written by my adversary!
36	I would have put on my shoulders, a chaplet, and read it aloud,	Surely I would carry it on my shoulder; I would bind it on me like a crown;
37	and if I did not tear it up and hand it back, having taken nothing from the debtor—	I would give him an account of all my steps; like a prince I would approach him.
38	if at any time the land groaned over me and if too its furrows wept with one accord	If my land has cried out against me and its furrows have wept together,
39	and if too I ate its strength alone, without payment, and if too I, in throwing it away ¹⁰⁹⁰ , grieved the soul of the lord of the land,	if I have eaten its yield without payment and caused the death of its owners,
40	then may nettles come forth to me instead of wheat, and a bramble instead of barley.	let thorns grow instead of wheat and foul weeds instead of barley.

Job 38–39

v.	Greek	Hebrew
I 38:2a	/ Τίς οὗτος ὁ κρύπτων με βουλὴν,	מי זה מחשיך עצה
2b	/ συνέχω δὲ ῥήματα ἐν καρδίᾳ,	במלין בלי דעת:
	/ ἐμὲ δὲ οἶεται κρύπτειν ;	
3a	ζῶσαι ὥσπερ ἄνθρωπος τὴν ὁσφύν σου,	אזר נא כגבר חלציד
3b	/ ἐρωτήσω δέ σε, σύ δέ μοι ἀποκρίθητι .	והשאלך והודיעני: /
II 4a	ποῦ ἦς ἐν τῷ θεμελιοῦν με τὴν γῆν;	איפה היית ביסדי ארץ
4b	ἀπάγγειλον δὲ μοι , εἰ ἐπίστη σύνεσιν.	הגד אם ידעת בינה:
5a	/ τίς ἔθετο τὰ μέτρα αὐτῆς, εἰ οἶδας;	מי שם ממדיה בי תדע /
5b	/ ἢ τίς ὁ ἐπαγαγὼν σπαρτίον ἐπ’ αὐτῆς ;	או מי נטה עליה קו: /
6a	ἐπὶ τίνος οἱ κρίκοι αὐτῆς πεπήγασιν;	על מה אדניה הטבעו

¹⁰⁹⁰ In the newest version of NETS (provisional), Claude Cox translates as “in taking it”.

v.	Greek	Hebrew
6b	τίς δέ ἐστιν ὁ βαλὼν λίθον γωνιαῖον ἐπ' αὐτῆς;	אֲנִי מִי יָרָה אֶבֶן פְּנֵתָהּ:
7a	ὅτε ἐγενήθησαν ἄστρα,	בְּרֹן יִחַד כּוֹכְבֵי בָקָר
7b	ἤνεσάν με φωνῇ μεγάλῃ πάντες ἄγγελοί μου.	וַיִּרְעוּ כָּל בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים:
III 8a	ἔφραξα δὲ θάλασσαν πύλαις,	וַיִּסַּח בְּדִלְתִּים יָם
8b	ὅτε ἐμαίμασεν ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς αὐτῆς ἐκπορευομένη·	בְּגִיתוֹ מֵרַחַם יָצָא:
9a	/ ἐθέμην δὲ αὐτῇ νέφος ἀμφιάσιν,	/ בְּשׂוֹמֵי עֵנָן לִבְשׁוֹ /
9b	/ ὁμίχλη δὲ αὐτὴν ἐσπαργάνωσα·	/ וַעֲרַפֵּל חֲתֻלְתּוֹ: /
10a	/ ἐθέμην δὲ αὐτῇ ὅρια	/ וַאֲשֶׁבֶר עָלָיו חֲקִי /
10b	/ περιθελὶς κλειῖθρα καὶ πύλας·	/ וַאֲשֵׁים בְּרִיחַ וּדְלִתִּים: /
11a	εἶπα δὲ αὐτῇ Μέχρι τούτου ἐλεύσει καὶ οὐχ ὑπερβήσῃ,	וַאֲמַר עַד פֶּה תְּבוֹא וְלֹא תִסִּיף
11b	ἀλλ' ἐν σεαυτῇ συντριβήσεται σου τὰ κύματα.	וּפָא יִשִּׁית בְּגֹאֵן גְּלִיד:
IV 12a	ἢ ἐπὶ σοῦ συντέταχα φέγγος πρωινόν,	/ הַמִּימִיד צוֹיֵת בָּקָר /
12b	ἕως φῶρος δὲ εἶδεν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ τάξιν	/ יַדְעָתָהּ ¹⁰⁹¹ שַׁחַר ¹⁰⁹² מִקְמוֹ: /
13a	ἐπιλαβέσθαι πτερύγων γῆς,	לֹאֲחֹז בַּכִּנְפוֹת הָאָרֶץ
13b	ἐκτινάξαι ἀσεβεῖς ἐξ αὐτῆς;	וַיִּנְעֲרוּ רַשְׁעִים מִמֶּנָּה:
14a	ἢ σὺ λαβὼν γῆν πηλὸν ἔπλασας ζῶον	/ תַּתְּהַפֵּךְ כְּחֶמֶר חֻתָּם /
14b	καὶ λαλητὸν αὐτὸν ἔθου ἐπὶ γῆς;	/ וַיִּתְּצֵבּוּ כִּמוֹ לְבוֹשׁ: /
15a	/ ἀφείλας δὲ ἀπὸ ἀσεβῶν τὸ φῶς,	/ וַיִּמְנַע מֵרַשְׁעִים אֹרֶם /
15b	/ βραχίονα δὲ ὑπερηφάνων συνέτριψας;	/ וְזֹרֹעַ רִמָּה תִּשְׁבֵּר: /
V 16a	/ ἤλθες δὲ ἐπὶ πηγὴν θαλάσσης,	/ תָּבֹאֵת עַד אֲבִכִּי יָם /
16b	/ ἐν δὲ ἔχνεσιν ἀβύσσου περιπάτησας;	/ וּבַחֲקֶר תְּהוֹם הַתְּהֻלָּה: /
17a	/ ἀνοίγονται δέ σοι φόβῳ πύλαι θανάτου,	/ תִּנְגְּלוּ לְךָ שַׁעֲרֵי מוֹת /
17b	/ πυλωροὶ δὲ ἄδου ἰδόντες σε ἔπτηξαν;	/ וְשַׁעֲרֵי צַלְמוֹת תִּרְאֶה: /
18a	νενουθέτησαι δὲ τὸ εὖρος τῆς ὑπ' οὐρανόν;	הַתְּבַנְנַת עַד רַחֲבִי אָרֶץ
18b	ἀνάγγελον δὴ μοι πόση τίς ἐστιν.	הַגֵּד אִם יָדַעַת כֻּלָּהּ:
VI 19a	ποῖα δὲ γῆ αὐλίζεται τὸ φῶς,	/ אִי זֶה הַדֶּרֶךְ יִשְׁכֵּן אֹר /
19b	σκότους δὲ ποῖος ὁ τόπος;	/ וְחֹשֶׁךְ אִי זֶה מִקְמוֹ: /
20a	/ εἰ ἀγάγοις με εἰς ὅρια αὐτῶν;	כִּי תִקְחֵנִי אֶל גְּבוּלוֹ
20b	/ εἰ δὲ καὶ ἐπίστασαι τρίβους αὐτῶν;	וְכִי תִבֵּן נִתְיֹבוֹת בֵּיתוֹ:
21a	οἶδα ἅρα ὅτι τότε γεγέννησαι,	יָדַעַת כִּי אֲנִי תוֹלֵד
21b	ἀριθμὸς δὲ ἐτῶν σου πολὺς.	וּמִסְפָּר יְמִיד רַבִּים:
VII 22a	/ ἤλθες δὲ ἐπὶ θησαυροῦς χιόνος,	/ תָּבֹאֵת אֶל אֲצֻרוֹת שֶׁלֹּג /
22b	/ θησαυροῦς δὲ χαλάζης ἐόρακας.	/ וַאֲצֻרוֹת בֶּרֶד תִּרְאֶה: /
23a	/ ἀπόκειται δὲ σοὶ εἰς ὥραν ἐχθρῶν,	/ אֲשֶׁר חֲשַׁכְתִּי לַעֵת צָר /
23b	/ εἰς ἡμέραν πολέμου καὶ μάχης.	/ לְיוֹם קָרֵב וּמִלְחָמָה: /

¹⁰⁹¹ Qere ידעתה.

¹⁰⁹² Qere השחר.

v.	Greek	Hebrew
24a	/ <u>πρόθεν</u> δὲ ἐκπορεύεται <u>πάχνη</u>	/ <u>אֵי זוֹ הַדֶּרֶךְ</u> יִחַלֵּק אֹר /
24b	/ ἢ διασκεδάννυνται νότος εἰς τὴν ὑπ' οὐρανόν;	/ יִפֹּץ קָדִים עַל־אָרֶץ:
25a	/ <u>τίς δὲ</u> ἡτοίμασεν ὑετῷ λάβρῳ ῥύσιν,	/ <u>מִי פִלַּג לְשֹׁטֶף תַּעֲלֶה</u> /
25b	/ ὁδὸν δὲ <u>κυδοιμῶν</u>	/ וּדְרַךְ לַחֲזִיז קְלוֹת:
26a		/ לְהַמְטִיר עַל אֶרֶץ לֹא אִישׁ /
26b		/ מַדְבָּר לֹא אָדָם בּוֹ:
27a		/ לְהַשְׁבִּיעַ שָׁאָה וּמִשָּׁאָה /
27b		/ וּלְהַצְמִיחַ מִצָּא דְשָׂא:
VIII 28a	/ <u>τίς ἐστίν</u> ὑετοῦ πατὴρ;	/ הִישׁ לְמֹטֵר אֵב /
28b	/ <u>τίς δὲ ἐστίν</u> ὁ <u>τετοκῶς</u> βώλους δρόσου;	/ <u>אֹן מִי הוּלִיד אֲגִלִּי טַל:</u> /
29a	ἐκ γαστρὸς δὲ <u>τίνος</u> ἐκπορεύεται ὁ κρύσταλλος;	מִבֶּטֶן <u>מִי יֵצֵא הַקֶּרַח</u> /
29b	<u>πάχνην</u> δὲ ἐν οὐρανῷ <u>τίς τέτοκεν</u> ,	וּכְפָר שָׁמַיִם <u>מִי יִלְדוּ:</u> /
30a	<u>ἢ καταβαίνει ὥσπερ ὕδωρ ῥέον</u> ;	/ <u>בָּאֵבֶן מִיִּם יִתְחַבֵּא</u> /
30b	πρόσωπον δὲ ἀβύσσου <u>τίς ἔπηξεν</u> ;	/ וּפְנֵי תְהוֹם יִתְלַכְדּוּ:
31a	/ <u>συνήκας</u> δὲ δεσμὸν Πλειάδος	/ <u>תִּתְקַשֵּׁר מַעֲדָנוֹת כִּימָה</u> /
31b	/ <u>καὶ φραγμὸν</u> Ὠρίωνος ἡνοίξας;	/ <u>אֹן מִשְׁכּוֹת כִּסִּיל תַּפְתַּח:</u> /
32a		/ <u>תִּתְצִיא מִזְרוֹת בַּעֲתוֹ</u> /
32b		/ <u>וְעִישׁ עַל בְּנִיָּה תִנְחַם:</u> /
33a	ἐπίστασαι δὲ τροπὰς οὐρανοῦ	<u>יִדְעֵת חֲקוֹת שָׁמַיִם</u> /
33b	ἢ τὰ ὑπ' οὐρανὸν ὁμοθυμαδὸν γινόμενα;	<u>אֵם תְּשִׁים מִשְׁטָרוֹ בְּאָרֶץ:</u> /
X 34a	καλέσεις δὲ νέφος φωνῇ,	<u>תִּתְרִים לַעֲב קוֹלֶךָ</u> /
34b	καὶ τρόμῳ ὕδατος λάβρῳ ὑπακούσεται σου;	וּשְׁפַעַת מִיִּם תַּכְסֵּךְ:
35a	ἀποστελεῖς δὲ κερανοὺς καὶ πορεύσονται;	<u>תִּתְשַׁלַּח בְּרָקִים וְיִלְכוּ</u> /
35b	<u>ἐροῦσιν</u> δὲ σοι <u>τί ἐστίν</u> ;	<u>וַיֹּאמְרוּ לֹךְ הֲנִנּוּ:</u> /
XI 36a	/ <u>τίς δὲ</u> ἔδωκεν <u>ἡγυῖαι</u> ὑφάσματος <u>σοφίαν</u>	/ <u>מִי שֵׁת בִּטְחוֹת חֲכָמָה</u> /
36b	/ ἢ <u>ποιικιτικὴν</u> ἐπιστήμην;	/ <u>אֹן מִי נָתַן לְשֹׁכֵי בֵּינָה:</u> /
37a	<u>τίς δὲ</u> ὁ ἀριθμῶν νέφη <u>σοφία</u> ,	<u>מִי יִסְפֵּר שְׁחָקִים בַּחֲכָמָה</u> /
37b	οὐρανὸν δὲ εἰς <u>γῆν</u> ἔκλινεν;	וּנְבִלֵי שָׁמַיִם <u>מִי יִשְׁכִּיב:</u> /
38a	<u>κέχυται δὲ ὥσπερ γῆ κονία</u> ,	/ בַּעֲקַת עֹפֶר לְמוֹצֵץ /
38b	<u>κεκόλληκα δὲ αὐτὸν ὥσπερ λίθῳ κύβον</u> .	/ וּרְגָבִים יִדְבְּקוּ:
XII 39a	θηρεύσεις δὲ λέουσιν <u>βοράν</u> ,	/ <u>תִּתְצוּד לְלִבִּיא טֹרֶף</u> /
39b	ψυχὰς δὲ δρακόντων ἐμπλήσεις;	/ וְחַיִּת כַּפִּירִים תִּמְלֹא:
40a	δεδοίκασιν <u>γὰρ</u> ἐν κοίταις αὐτῶν,	/ <u>כִּי יִשְׁחוּ בַּמַּעֲוֹנוֹת</u> /
40b	κάθηνται δὲ ἐν ὕλαις ἐνεδρεύοντες.	/ יֵשְׁבוּ בַּסִּכָּה לְמוֹ אֲרֶב:
41a	<u>τίς</u> δὲ ἡτοίμασεν κόρακι <u>βοράν</u> ;	<u>מִי יִכֵּן לַעֲרֵב צִידֶךָ</u> /
41b	νεοσσοὶ <u>γὰρ</u> αὐτοῦ πρὸς κύριον κεκράγασιν	<u>כִּי יִלְדוּ</u> ¹⁰⁹³ <u>אֵל אֵל יִשׁוּעוֹ</u> /
41c	πλανώμενοι τὰ σῖτα ζητοῦντες.	יִתְעוּ לְבָלֵי אֲכָל:

¹⁰⁹³ Qere ילדיו.

	v.	Greek	Hebrew
XIII	39:1a		וַיִּדְעַת עַת לִדְתָּ יְעֲלִי סִלַּע /
	1b	ἐφύλαξας δὲ ὠδῖνας ἐλάφων;	חָלַל אֵילוֹת תִּשְׁמַר: /
	2a	ῥιθίμηςας δὲ μῆνας αὐτῶν πλήρεις τοκετοῦ,	תִּסְפֹּר יָרִיחִים תַּמְלֵאנָה /
	2b	ὠδῖνας δὲ αὐτῶν ἔλυσας;	וַיִּדְעַת עַת לִדְתָּנָה: /
	3a	ἐξέθρεψας δὲ αὐτῶν τὰ παιδία ἔξω φόβου;	תִּכְרַענָה יִלְדֵיהֶן תַּפְלַחנָה /
	3b		חֲבִלֵיהֶם תִּשְׁלַחנָה: /
	4a		יַחֲלֹמוּ בְנֵיהֶם יִרְבוּ בְּבָר /
	4b		יֵצְאוּ וְלֹא שָׁבוּ לִמּוֹן: /
XIV	5a	/ τίς δέ ἐστιν ὁ ἀφείς ὄνον ἄγριον ἐλεύθερον,	מִי שֶׁלֹּחַ פֶּרָא חֲפָשִׁי /
	5b	/ δεσμούς δὲ αὐτοῦ τίς ἔλυσεν;	וּמִסְרוֹת עֶרֶוֹד מִי פֶתַח: /
	6a	ἐθέμην δὲ τὴν δίαίταν αὐτοῦ ἔρημον	אֲשֶׁר שְׁמַתִּי עֲרַבָה בֵּיתוֹ /
	6b		וּמִשְׁכְּנוֹתָיו מִלְחָה: /
	7a	/ καταγελῶν πολυσχλίας πόλεως,	יִשְׁחַק לְהַמּוֹן קִרְיָה /
	7b	/ μέμψιν δὲ φορολόγου οὐκ ἀκούων	תִּשְׁאוֹת נֹגֵשׁ לֹא יִשְׁמַע: /
	8a		יְתוֹר הָרִים מִרְעָהוּ /
	8b		וְאַחַר כָּל יְרוּק יִדְרוֹשׁ: /
XV	9a	βουλήσεται δέ σοι μονόκερως δουλεῦσαι	מִיֵּאֲבָה רִים עֲבֹדךָ /
	9b	ἢ κοιμηθῆναι ἐπὶ φάτνης σου;	אִם יֵלִין עַל אֲבוֹסֶךָ: /
	10a	θήσεις δὲ ἐν ἱμάσιν ζυγὸν αὐτοῦ,	תִּתְקַשֵּׁר רִים בְּתֵלֶם עֲבָתוֹ /
	10b	ἢ ἐλκύσει σου αὔλακας ἐν πεδίῳ;	אִם יִשְׁדֹּד עֲמָקִים אַחֲרֶיךָ: /
	11a	πέποιθας δὲ ἐπ' αὐτῷ, ὅτι πολλὴ ἡ ἰσχὺς αὐτοῦ,	תִּתְבַּטֵּחַ בּוֹ כִּי רַב כּוֹחַ /
	11b	ἐπαφήσεις δὲ αὐτῷ τὰ ἔργα σου;	וּתַעֲזֹב אֵלָיו יִגְיעֶךָ: /
	12a	πιστεύσεις δὲ ὅτι ἀποδώσει σοι τὸν σπόρον,	תִּתְאַמֵּין בּוֹ כִּי יִשׁוּב ¹⁰⁹⁴ /
	12b	εἰσοίσει δέ σου τὸν ἄλωνα;	זֶרַעךָ וְגֶרֶנְךָ יֵאָסֶף: /
-	13a		כִּנְף רִנָּנִים נַעֲלֶסָה /
	13b		אִם אֲבָרָה חֲסִידָה וְנִצָּה: /
	14a		כִּי תַעֲזֹב לְאַרְץ בְּצִיָּה /
	14b		וְעַל עֵפֶר תַּחֲמֹם: /
	15a		וּתִשְׁכַּח כִּי רֵגֶל תִּזְוֶרָה /
	15b		וְחֵית הַשָּׂדֶה תִּדְוֶשֶׁה: /
	16a		הַקִּשְׁיָח בְּנִיה לֹא לָהּ /
	16b		לִרְיָק יִגְיעָה בְּלִי פֶחֶד: /
	17a		כִּי הִשָּׂה אֱלֹהֵי חֲכָמָה /
	17b		וְלֹא חֶלֶק לָהּ בְּבִינָה: /
	18a		כַּעַתּ בְּמָרוֹם תִּמְרִיא /
	18b		תִּשְׁחַק לְסוֹס וּלְרַכְבּוֹ: /

¹⁰⁹⁴ Qere ישיב.

	v.	Greek	Hebrew
XVI	19a	/ ἡ <u>σὺ</u> <u>περιέθηκας</u> ἵππῳ δύναιμιν,	/ <u>הַתַּתְּנוּ</u> לְסוֹס גְּבוּרָה /
	19b	/ ἐνέδυσας δὲ τραχήλῳ αὐτοῦ φόβον;	/ <u>וַתַּלְבִּישׁ</u> צוּאָרוֹ רַעְמָה: /
	20a	/ <u>περιέθηκας</u> δὲ αὐτῷ <u>πανοπλίαν</u> ,	<u>הַתַּרְעִישְׁנוּ</u> בְּאַרְבָּה /
	20b	/ δόξαν δὲ στηθέων αὐτοῦ τόλμῃ;	הוּד נִחְרוּ אִימָה: /
XVII	21a	<u>ἀνορύσσω</u> ἐν <u>πεδίῳ</u> <u>γαυριᾶ</u> ,	יִחְפְּרוּ בַעֲמַק יִישׁׁשׁ /
	21b	ἐκπορεύεται δὲ <u>εἰς</u> <u>πεδίον</u> ἐν ἰσχύϊ.	בִּכְח יֵצֵא לְקִרְאָת נִשְׁק: /
	22a	συναντῶν βέλει καταγεῶλᾷ	יִשְׁחַק לִפְחַד וְלֹא יַחַת /
	22b	καὶ οὐ μὴ ἀποστραφῇ ἀπὸ σιδήρου·	/ וְלֹא יִשׁוּב מִפְּנֵי חֶרֶב: /
	23	ἐπ' αὐτῷ <u>γαυριᾶ</u> τόξον καὶ μάχαιρα,	עַלְיוֹ תִּרְנָה אֲשֶׁפָּה /
	(23b)		<u>לְהַב</u> חֲנִית וְכִידוֹן: /
			<u>בְּרַעַשׁ</u> וְרִגָּז יִגְמָא אֶרֶץ /
XVIII	24a	καὶ ὀργῇ ἀφανιεῖ τὴν γῆν	וְלֹא יֵאֱמִין כִּי קוֹל שׁוֹפָר: /
	24b	καὶ οὐ μὴ πιστεύσῃ, <u>ὥς ἂν</u> <u>σημάνῃ</u> <u>σάλπιγγ</u> :	<u>בְּדִי שׁוֹפֵר</u> יֵאֱמָר הָאֵח /
	25a	<u>σάλπιγγος</u> δὲ <u>σημαινούσης</u> <u>λέγει</u> Εὐγέ,	<u>וּמִרְחֹק</u> יִרִיחַ מִלְחָמָה /
	25b	<u>πόρρωθεν</u> δὲ ὁσφραίνεται πολέμου σὺν <u>αἵματι</u>	<u>רַעַם</u> יִשְׂרָיִם וְתִרְוָעָה: /
	25c	καὶ κραυγῇ.	<u>מִמְּבִינֶתְךָ</u> יֵאֱבָר נֶץ /
XIX	26a	ἐκ δὲ τῆς σῆς ἐπιστήμης ἔστηκεν ἱέραξ	יִפְרֹשׁ כְּנָפָיו ¹⁰⁹⁵ לְתִמְנוֹן: /
	26b	ἀναπετάσας τὰς πτέρυγας <u>ἀκίνητος</u> καθορῶν	אִם עַל פִּיךָ יִגְבִּיָּה נִשְׂר /
	27a	τὰ πρὸς νότον;	וְכִי יִרִים קִנּוּ: /
	27b	ἐπὶ δὲ σῶι προστάγματι ὑψοῦται αἰετός,	<u>סֵלַע</u> יִשְׁכֵּן וְיִתְלַנֵּן /
	27c	γυψ δὲ ἐπὶ νοσσιᾶς αὐτοῦ καθεσθεῖς αὐλίζεταί	עַל שֵׁן <u>סֵלַע</u> וּמִצּוּדָה: /
	28		<u>מִשֶּׁם</u> חִפְּרָ אָכַל /
	29a	<u>ἐκείσε</u> <u>ὧν</u> ζητεῖ τὰ σῖτα,	לְמִרְחֹק עֵינָיו יִבִּיטוּ: /
	29b		וּאִפְרָחוּ ¹⁰⁹⁶ יַעֲלֶעֱן דָּם /
	30a	νεοσσοὶ δὲ αὐτοῦ φύρονται ἐν αἵματι,	<u>וּבֹאֶשֶׁר</u> חֲלָלִים <u>שֵׁם הוּא</u> : /
	30b	<u>οὗ</u> δ' <u>ἂν</u> <u>ὧσιν</u> τεθνεώτες, <u>παραχρῆμα</u>	
		εὐρίσκονται.	

v.	NETS	NRSVUE
38:2	Who is this that hides his counsel from me but confines words in his heart but thinks to hide them from me?	Who is this that darkens counsel by words without knowledge?
3	Gird up your loins like a man, and I will question you; and you, answer me!	Gird up your loins like a man; I will question you, and you shall declare to me.
4	Where were you when I was laying the earth's foundation? But tell me if you know understanding.	Where were you when I laid the foundation of the earth? Tell me if you have understanding.
5	Who determined its measures if you know? Or who was it that stretched a line upon it?	Who determined its measurements—surely you know! Or who stretched the line upon it?

¹⁰⁹⁵ *Qere* כִּנְפָיו.

¹⁰⁹⁶ *Qere* וּאִפְרָחוּ.

v.	NETS	NRSVUE
6	On what have its rings been fastened? And who is the one that cast a cornerstone upon it?	On what were its bases sunk, or who laid its cornerstone
7	When the stars were born, all my angels praised me with a loud voice.	when the morning stars sang together and all the heavenly beings shouted for joy?
8	And I shut up the sea with gates, when it quivered with eagerness, as it issued from its mother's womb,	Or who shut in the sea with doors when it burst out from the womb,
9	and I made the cloud clothing for it, and with mist I swaddled it;	when I made the clouds its garment and thick darkness its swaddling band,
10	and I put in place bounds for it, setting bars and gates around it.	and prescribed bounds for it, and set bars and doors,
11	And I said to it, 'Thus far you shall come, and you shall not go beyond; rather, your waves shall be broken up within you!'	and said, 'Thus far shall you come and no farther, and here shall your proud waves be stopped'?
12	Was it in your time that I instructed the morning light and that the morning star saw its post,	Have you commanded the morning since your days began and caused the dawn to know its place,
13	to take hold of earth's wings, to shake the impious off it?	so that it might take hold of the skirts of the earth, and the wicked be shaken out of it?
14	Was it you that took clay soil and formed a living creature, and, able to talk, set him on earth?	It is changed like clay under the seal, and it is dyed like a garment.
15	And did you remove the light from the impious and crush the arm of the proud?	Light is withheld from the wicked, and their uplifted arm is broken.
16	And did you go to the source of the sea and walk in the tracks of the deep?	Have you entered into the springs of the sea or walked in the recesses of the deep?
17	And do the gates of death open to you out of fear, and did the gatekeepers of Hades cower when they saw you?	Have the gates of death been revealed to you, or have you seen the gates of deep darkness?
18	And have you been advised of the breadth of what is under heaven? Do tell me how much it is.	Have you comprehended the expanse of the earth? Declare, if you know all this.
19	And in what kind of land does the light dwell, and of what kind is the place of darkness?	Where is the way to the dwelling of light, and where is the place of darkness,
20	Might you perhaps lead me to their borders? And perhaps too you know their paths?	that you may take it to its territory and that you may discern the paths to its home?
21	Thereby I know that you were born then, and the number of your years is great!	Surely you know, for you were born then, and the number of your days is great!
22	And have you gone to the storehouses of the snow, and have you seen the storehouses of the hail?	Have you entered the storehouses of the snow, or have you seen the storehouses of the hail,
23	But it is at your disposal for a time of enemies, for a day of war and battle.	which I have reserved for the time of trouble, for the day of battle and war?
24	And from where does the hoarfrost come, or the south wind dispersed to what is under heaven?	What is the way to the place where the light is distributed or where the east wind is scattered upon the earth?
25	And who prepared a course for the driving rain and the way of the tumults?	Who has cut a channel for the torrents of rain and a way for the thunderbolt,
26		to bring rain on a land where no one lives, on the desert, which is empty of human life,

v.	NETS	NRSVUE
27		to satisfy the waste and desolate land, and to make the ground put forth grass?
28	Who is the rain's father? And who is it that has given birth to the dew's nuggets?	Has the rain a father, or who has fathered the drops of dew?
29	And from whose womb does the ice come forth? And who has given birth to freezing rain in heaven	From whose womb did the ice come forth, and who has given birth to the hoarfrost of heaven?
30	that descends like flowing water? And who froze the face of the deep?	The waters become hard like stone, and the face of the deep is frozen.
31	And did you understand the bond of Pleiades, and did you open the barrier of Orion?	Can you bind the chains of the Pleiades or loose the cords of Orion?
32		Can you lead forth the Mazzaroth in their season, or can you guide the Bear with its children?
33	And do you know the sky's changes or the corresponding events under heaven?	Do you know the ordinances of the heavens? Can you establish their rule on the earth?
34	And will you summon a cloud by voice, and, with a violent burst of water, will it obey you?	Can you lift up your voice to the clouds, so that a flood of waters may cover you?
35	And will you send out thunderbolts—and will they go? And will they say to you, 'What is it?'	Can you send forth lightnings, so that they may go and say to you, 'Here we are'?
36	And who gave to women skill in weaving or knowledge of embroidery?	Who has put wisdom in the inward parts or given understanding to the mind?
37	And who is the one that numbers the clouds by wisdom and inclined sky to earth?	Who has the wisdom to number the clouds? Or who can tilt the waterskins of the heavens
38	And dust has been poured out like soil, but I have cemented it, like a block to a stone.	when the dust runs into a mass and the clods cling together?
39	And will you hunt prey for the lions and satisfy the appetite of dragons?	Can you hunt the prey for the lion or satisfy the appetite of the young lions,
40	For they are in a state of fear in their lairs, and they crouch in the woods, lying in wait.	when they crouch in their dens or lie in wait in their covert?
41	And who prepared food for the raven? For its young have cried to the Lord as they wander about, searching for food.	Who provides for the raven its prey, when its young ones cry to God and wander about for lack of food?
39:1	And did you protect the birth pangs of the deer?	Do you know when the mountain goats give birth? Do you observe the calving of the deer?
2	And did you check off their months full of pregnancy, and did you relieve their birth pangs?	Can you number the months that they fulfill, and do you know the time when they give birth,
3	And did you rear their little ones without fear?	when they crouch to give birth to their offspring and are delivered of their young?
4		Their young ones become strong; they grow up in the open; they go forth and do not return to them.
5	And who is he that let the wild ass go free, and its bonds—who loosed them?	Who has let the wild ass go free? Who has loosed the bonds of the swift ass,
6	And, I made its home the wilderness,	to which I have given the steppe for its home, the salt land for its dwelling place?

v.	NETS	NRSVUE
7	while it laughs to scorn the city's crowds and hears not the chiding of the tax-gatherer.	It scorns the tumult of the city; it does not hear the shouts of the driver.
8		It ranges the mountains as its pasture, and it searches after every green thing.
9	And will the one-horned be willing to be your slave or to lie down at your manger?	Is the wild ox willing to serve you? Will it spend the night at your crib?
10	And will you bind its yoke with straps, or will it draw your furrows in the plain?	Can you tie it in the furrow with ropes, or will it harrow the valleys after you?
11	And do you trust it, because its strength is great, and will you discharge to it your work?	Will you depend on it because its strength is great, and will you hand over your labor to it?
12	And will you believe that it will return to you your seed and bring it to your threshing floor?	Do you have faith in it that it will return and bring your grain to your threshing floor?
13		The ostrich's wings flap wildly, though its pinions lack plumage.
14		For it leaves its eggs to the earth and lets them be warmed on the ground,
15		forgetting that a foot may crush them and that a wild animal may trample them.
16		It deals cruelly with its young, as if they were not its own; though it slabor should be in vain, yet it has no fear;
17		because God has made it forget wisdom and given it no share in understanding.
18		When it spreads its plumes aloft, it laughs at the horse and its rider.
19	Was it you that endowed the horse with power and clothed its neck with terror?	Do you give the horse its might? Do you clothe its neck with mane?
20	And did you endow it with full armor and the majesty of its breast with courage?	Do you make it leap like the locust? Its majestic snorting is terrible.
21	Digging in the plain, it bears itself proudly, and it goes out into the plain in strength.	It paws violently, exults mightily; it goes out to meet the weapons.
22	Meeting up with an arrow, it laughs in scorn and will never turn back from a blade.	It laughs at fear and is not dismayed; it does not turn back from the sword.
23	Upon it exult the bow and dagger,	Upon it rattle the quiver, the flashing spear, and the javelin.
24	and in rage it will stamp out the ground and will not believe, until the trumpet sounds.	With fierceness and rage it swallows the ground; it cannot stand still at the sound of the trumpet.
25	But when the trumpet sounds, it says, 'Good!' and from afar it scents battle with leap and cry.	When the trumpet sounds, it says 'Aha!' From a distance it smells the battle, the thunder of the captains, and the shouting.
26	And is it by your understanding that the hawk stops still, having spread its wings, motionless, eyeing what lies to the south?	Is it by your wisdom that the hawk soars and spreads its wings toward the south?
27	And is it at your decree that the eagle rises up and the vulture lodges, sitting on its brood?	Is it at your command that the eagle mounts up and makes its nest on high?
28		It lives on the rock and makes its home in the fastness of the rocky crag.

v.	NETS	NRSVUE
29	While it is there it searches for food,	From there it spies the prey; its eyes see it from far away.
30	and its young are befouled with blood, and, wherever there are carcasses, at once they are found.	Its young ones suck up blood, and where the slain are, there it is.

Job 40:6–41:26

	v.	Greek	Hebrew
I	40:7a	<u>Μή, ἀλλὰ ζῶσαι</u> ὥσπερ ἀνὴρ τὴν ὀσφύν σου,	<u>אִזְרָא</u> כְּגִבֹּר <u>חֲלָצִיד</u>
	7b	/ ἐρωτήσω δέ σε, <u>σύ</u> δέ μοι ἀπόκριναι·	/ אִשְׁאֹלְךָ וְהוֹדִיעֲנִי:
	8a	<u>μὴ ἀποποιῶ</u> μου τὸ κρίμα.	<u>הֲאֵפ</u> תִּפְרַם מִשְׁפָּטִי
	8b	<u>οἶμαι</u> δέ με ἄλλως σοι κεχρηματικένοι· <u>ἢ</u> ἵνα ἀναφανῆς δίκαιος;	<u>תִּרְשִׁיעֲנִי</u> לִמְעַן תִּצְדַּק:
II	9a	/ <u>ἢ</u> βραχίων σοί ἐστιν <u>κατὰ</u> τοῦ κυρίου,	/ <u>וְאִם</u> זְרוּעַ כָּאֵל לְךָ
	9b	/ <u>ἢ</u> φωνὴ <u>κατ'</u> αὐτὸν βροντᾶς;	/ <u>וּבִקּוֹל</u> כִּמְהוּ תִרְעַם:
	10a	/ <u>ἀνάλαβε</u> δὴ ὕψος καὶ <u>δύναμιν</u> ,	/ <u>עֲדָה</u> נָא גֵאוֹן וּגְבוּהָ
	10b	/ δόξαν δὲ καὶ τιμὴν <u>ἀμφιάσαι</u> ·	/ <u>וְהוֹד</u> וְהִדְרָתְךָ תִּלְבֹּשׁ:
	11a	<u>ἀπόστειλον</u> δὲ ἀγγέλους ὁργῇ,	<u>הַפֶּז</u> עֲבֵרוֹת אִפְךָ
	11b	πᾶν δὲ ὑβριστὴν <u>ταπεινώσον</u> ,	<u>וְרָאָה</u> כָּל גֹּאֲחַי <u>וְהִשְׁפִּילֵהוּ</u> :
	12a	/ ὑπερήφανον δὲ <u>σβέσον</u> ,	/ <u>רָאָה</u> כָּל גֹּאֲחַי הַכְּנִיעֵתוֹ
	12b	/ <u>σῆψον</u> δὲ ἀσεβεῖς <u>παραχρῆμα</u> ,	/ <u>וְהִדְךָ</u> רִשְׁעִים תַּחֲתֵם:
	13a	<u>κρύψον</u> δὲ εἰς γῆν <u>ἔξω</u> ὁμοθυμαδόν,	/ <u>טָמְנוּ</u> בְּעֶפְרַי יָחַד
	13b	τὰ δὲ πρόσωπα αὐτῶν ἀτιμίας ἔμπλησον·	/ <u>פְּנֵיהֶם</u> חֲבֹשׁ בַּטְמוֹן:
	14	<u>ὁμολογήσω</u> ἄρα ὅτι <u>δύναται</u> ἡ δεξιὰ σου σῶσαι.	<u>וְגַם</u> אֲנִי אֹדֶךָ
	(14b)		<u>כִּי</u> תוֹשַׁע לְךָ יְמִינְךָ:
III	15a	<u>ἀλλὰ</u> <u>δὴ</u> <u>ἰδοὺ</u> θηρία παρὰ σοί,	<u>הִנֵּה</u> נָא בְּהֵמוֹת <u>אֲשֶׁר</u> עֲשִׂיתִי עִמָּךְ
	15b	<u>χόρτον</u> ἴσα βουσὶν ἐσθίει.	<u>חֲצִיר</u> כְּבָקָר יֹאכֹל:
	16a	/ <u>ἰδοὺ</u> <u>δὴ</u> ἡ ἰσχὺς αὐτοῦ ἐπ' ὀσφύϊ,	/ <u>הִנֵּה</u> נָא כְּחוֹ בְּמַתְנֵי
	16b	/ ἡ δὲ δύναμις ἐπ' ὀμφαλοῦ γαστρού·	/ <u>וְאָנֹן</u> בְּשִׁרְיִי בִטְנוֹ:
	17a	<u>ἔστησεν</u> οὐρανὸν ὥς <u>κυπάρισσον</u> ,	<u>יִחְפֹּץ</u> זַנְבֹּן כְּמוֹ אֲרָז
	17b	τὰ δὲ νεῦρα αὐτοῦ συμπέπλεκται·	<u>גִּידֵי</u> פָּחַדוֹ ¹⁰⁹⁷ יִשְׂרָגוּ:
	18a	/ <u>αἱ πλευраὶ</u> αὐτοῦ <u>πλευраὶ</u> χάλκειαι,	<u>עֲצָמוֹ</u> אִפְיָקִי נְחוֹשָׁה

¹⁰⁹⁷ Qere פִּחְדִּי.

v.	Greek	Hebrew
18b	/ ἡ δὲ ῥάχις αὐτοῦ σίδηρος χυτός.	גרמיו כמטיל ברזל:
IV 19a	τοῦτ' ἔστιν ἀρχὴ πλάσματος κυρίου,	הוא ראשית דרכי אל
19b	πεπονημένον ἐγκαταπαίζεσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀγγέλων αὐτοῦ.	העשו יגש חרבו:
20a	ἐπελθὼν δὲ ἐπ' ὄρος ἀκρότομον	בי בול הרים ישאו לו
20b	ἐποίησεν χαρμονὴν τετράποσιν ἐν τῷ ταρτάρῳ.	וכל חית השדה ישחקו שם:
V 21a	ὑπὸ παντοδαπὰ δένδρα κοιμᾶται	תחת צאלים ישכב
21b	παρὰ πάπυρον καὶ κάλαμον καὶ βούτομον.	בסתור קנה ובצה:
22a	σκιάζονται δὲ ἐν αὐτῷ δένδρα μεγάλα	/ יסכהו צאלים צללו /
22b	σὺν βαδάμοις καὶ κλῶνες ἄγνου.	/ יסבוהו ערבי נחל: /
23a	ἐὰν γένηται πλήμμουρα, οὐ μὴ αἰσθηθῇ,	/ הן יעשק נהר לא יחפוז /
23b		/ יבטח ב' יגח ירדן אל פיהו: /
- 24a		/ בעיניו יקחנו /
24b		/ במוקשים ינקב אף: /
VI 25a	ἄξεις δὲ δράκοντα ἐν ἀγκίστρῳ,	/ תמשך לויתן בחכה /
25b	περιθήσεις δὲ φορβεὰν περὶ ῥίνα αὐτοῦ;	/ ובחבל תשקיע לשנו: /
26a		/ תשים אגמון באפו /
26b	ψελίῳ δὲ τρυπήσεις τὸ χεῖλος αὐτοῦ;	/ ובחוח תקוב לחיו: /
27a	λαλήσει δέ σοι δεήσει,	/ תירבה אליך תחנונים /
27b	ἱκετηρία μαλακῶς;	/ אם ידבר אליך רכות: /
28a	θήσεται διαθήκημ μετὰ σοῦ,	תכרת ברית עמך
28b	λήμψῃ δὲ αὐτὸν δοῦλον αἰώνιον;	תקחנו לעבד עולם:
29a	/ παίξῃ δὲ ἐν αὐτῷ ὥσπερ ὀρνέῳ	תשחק בו כצפור
29b	/ ἢ δήσεις αὐτὸν ὥσπερ στρουθίον παιδίῳ;	ותקשרנו לנערותיך:
VII 30a	/ ἐνσιτοῦνται δὲ ἐν αὐτῷ ἔθνη,	/ יכרו עליו חברים /
30b	/ μεριτεύονται δὲ αὐτὸν Φοινίκων γένη;	/ יחצוהו בין כנענים: /
31a	πᾶν δὲ πλωτὸν συνελθὼν οὐ μὴ ἐνέγκωσιν βύρσαν μίαν οὐράς αὐτοῦ,	/ התמלא בשכות עורו /
31b		/ ובצלצל דגים ראשו: /
32a	ἐπιθήσεις δὲ αὐτῷ χεῖρα	שים עליו כף
32b	μνησθεῖς πόλεμον τὸν γινόμενον ἐν σώματι αὐτοῦ,	זכר מלחמה אל תוסף:
32c	καὶ μηκέτι γινέσθω.	
41:1a	/ οὐχ ἐόρακας αὐτὸν	תן תחלתו נכזבה

v.	Greek	Hebrew
1b	/ οὐδὲ ἐπὶ τοῖς λεγομένοις τεθαύμακας;	תגם אל מראיו יטל:
VIII 2a	οὐ δέδοικας ὅτι ἡτοίμασται μοι;	לא אכזר בי יעורנו
2b	τίς γάρ ἐστιν ὁ ἐμοὶ ἀντιστάς;	ומי הוא לפני יתיצב:
3a	ἢ τίς ἀντιστήσεται μοι καὶ ὑπομενεῖ,	מי הקדימני ואשלם
3b	εἰ πᾶσα ἡ ὑπ' οὐρανὸν ἐμή ἐστιν;	תחת כל השמים לי הוא:
- 4a		לא ¹⁰⁹⁸ אחריש בדיו
4b		ודבר גבורות וחין ערכו:
IX 5a	/ τίς ἀποκαλύψει πρόσωπον ἐνδύσεως αὐτοῦ;	מי גלה פני לבושו /
5b	/ εἰς δὲ πτύξιν θώρακος αὐτοῦ τίς ἂν εἰσέλθοι;	בכפל רסנו מי יבוא: /
6a	/ πύλας προσώπου αὐτοῦ τίς ἀνοίξει;	דלתי פניו מי פתח /
6b	κύκλω ὀδόντων αὐτοῦ φόβος.	סביבות שניו אימה:
7a	/ τὰ ἔγκατα αὐτοῦ ἀσπίδες χάλκειαι,	גאווה אפיקי מגנים
7b	/ σύνδεσμος δὲ αὐτοῦ ὥσπερ σμιρίτης λίθος.	סגור חותם צר:
8a		אחד באחד יגשו
8b	πνεῦμα δὲ οὐ μὴ διέλθῃ αὐτόν.	ורוח לא יבוא ביניהם:
9a		איש באחיהו ידבקו
9b		יתלכדו ולא יתפרדו:
X 10a	ἐν παρμῷ αὐτοῦ ἐπιφαύσκειται φέγγος,	עטישתיו תהל אור
10b	οἱ δὲ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτοῦ εἶδος ἑωσφόρου.	ועיניו כעפעפי שחר:
11a	/ ἐκ στόματος αὐτοῦ ἐκπορεύονται λαμπάδες καιόμεναι	מפיו לפידים יהלכו /
11b	/ καὶ διαρριπτοῦνται ἐσχάται πυρός.	כידודי אש יתמלטו: /
12a	/ ἐκ μυκτήρων αὐτοῦ ἐκπορεύεται καπνὸς	מנחיריו יצא עשן /
12b	καμίνου καιομένης πυρὶ ἀνθράκων.	כדוד נפוח ואגמן:
13a	ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ ἄνθρακες,	נפשו גחלים תלהט
13b	φλόξ δὲ ἐκ στόματος αὐτοῦ ἐκπορεύεται.	ולהב מפיו יצא:
XI 14a	/ ἐν δὲ τραχήλῳ αὐτοῦ αὐλίζεται δύναμις,	בצוארו ילין עז /
14b	/ ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ τρέχει ἀπώλεια.	ולפניו תדוך דאבה: /
15a	σάρκες δὲ σώματος αὐτοῦ κεκόλληνται.	מפלי בשרו דבקו
15b		יצוק עליו בל ימוט:
16a	/ ἡ καρδία αὐτοῦ πέπηγεν ὡς λίθος,	לבו יצוק כמו אבן /

¹⁰⁹⁸ Qere יל.

v.	Greek	Hebrew
16b	/ <u>ἔστηκεν δὲ ὥσπερ ἄκμων ἀνήλατος.</u>	/ <u>וַיִּצוֹק כַּפְלָח תַּחְתִּית:</u> /
17	στραφέντος δὲ αὐτοῦ φόβος <u>θηρίοις</u> <u>τετράποσιν ἐπὶ γῆς ἀλλομένοις.</u>	מִשְׁתּוֹ יִגּוּרוֹ <u>אֵלִים</u>
(17b)		<u>מִשְׁבָּרִים יַתְחַטְּאוּ:</u>
XII 18a	<u>ἐὼν</u> συναντήσωσιν αὐτῷ λόγχοι, <u>οὐδὲν</u> μὴ ποιήσωσιν	מִשְׁיָגוֹ חֶרֶב בְּלִי תִקּוֹם
18b		<u>תִּנִּית מִסַּע וְשָׂרִיחַ:</u>
19a	/ <u>ῥῆγεται μὲν ἡὰρ σίδηρον ἄχυρα.</u>	/ <u>יַחֲשֵׁב לִתְבוֹן בְּרוֹז</u> /
19b	/ <u>χαλκὸν δὲ ὥσπερ ξύλον σαθρόν.</u>	/ <u>לַעֲץ רִקְבוֹן נַחוּשָׁה:</u> /
20a	οὐ μὴ τρώσῃ αὐτὸν τόξον <u>χάλκειον,</u>	לֹא יִבְרִיחֵנוּ בֶן קֶשֶׁת
20b	<u>ῥῆγεται μὲν πετροβόλον χόρτον.</u>	<u>לִקֵּשׁ נִהְפְּכוּ לוֹ אַבְנֵי קִלְעַ:</u>
21a		<u>כִּקֵּשׁ נַחֲשָׁבוּ תוֹתַח</u>
21b	καταγελαῖ δὲ σεισμοῦ <u>πυρφόρου.</u>	וַיִּשְׁחַק לִרְעֵשׁ בִּידוֹן:
XIII 22a	ἢ στρωμνὴ αὐτοῦ ὀβελίσκοι ὀξεῖς,	תַּחְתּוֹ תַּחְדּוּדֵי חֶרֶשׁ
22b	<u>πᾶς δὲ χρυσὸς θαλάσσης ὑπ' αὐτὸν</u> <u>ὥσπερ πηλὸς ἀμύθητος.</u>	<u>יִרְפַּד חֲרוּץ עַלִי טִיט:</u>
23a	/ <u>ἀναζεῖ τὴν ἄβυσσον ὥσπερ χαλκίον.</u>	/ <u>יִרְתִּיחַ כְּסִיר מִצּוֹלָה</u> /
23b	/ <u>ῥῆγεται δὲ τὴν θάλασσαν ὥσπερ</u> <u>ἐξάλειπτον.</u>	/ <u>יֵם יִשִּׁים כְּמִרְקָחָה:</u> /
24a	/ <u>τὸν δὲ τάρταρον τῆς ἀβύσσου ὥσπερ</u> <u>αἰχμάλωτον.</u>	אֲחֲרָיו יֵאִיר נְתִיב
24b		<u>יַחֲשֵׁב</u> תְּהוּם לְשִׁיבָה:
XIV 25a	<u>οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδὲν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ὅμοιον αὐτῷ</u>	<u>אֵין עַל עֵפֶר מִשּׁוֹל</u>
25b	<u>πεποιημένον ἐγκαταπαίζεσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν</u> <u>ἀγγέλων μου.</u>	<u>הָעֹשִׂי לְבִלִי חַת:</u>
26a	<u>πάν</u> ὑψηλὸν ὄρε᾽,	אֵת כָּל גְּבֵה יִרְאֶה
26b	<u>αὐτὸς δὲ βασιλεὺς πάντων</u> τῶν ἐν τοῖς <u>ὕδασιν.</u>	הוּא מֶלֶךְ עַל כָּל בְּנֵי שַׁחַץ:

v.	NETS	NRSVUE
40:7	No, but gird up your loins like a man, and I will question you; but you, answer me!	Gird up your loins like a man; I will question you, and you declare to me.
8	Do not reject my judgment. But, do you think I have dealt with you in any other way than that you might appear to be righteous?	Will you even put me in the wrong? Will you condemn me that you may be justified?
9	Do you have an arm like the Lord, or do you thunder with a voice like his?	Have you an arm like God, and can you thunder with a voice like his?
10	Go ahead, take on loftiness and power, and put on glory and honor.	Deck yourself with majesty and dignity; clothe yourself with glory and splendor.

v.	NETS	NRSVUE
11	And send forth angels in wrath and every insolent person humble.	Pour out the overflowings of your anger, and look on all who are proud, and humble them.
12	And the proud extinguish, and putrify the impious at once.	Look on all who are proud and bring them low; tread down the wicked where they stand.
13	And hide them outside together in the earth, and their faces fill with dishonor;	Hide them all in the dust together; bind their faces in the world below.
14	then I will acknowledge that your right hand can save.	Then I will also acknowledge to you that your own right hand can give you victory.
15	But look now, you are familiar with 'Beasts'; they eat grass like cattle.	Look at Behemoth, which I made just as I made you; it eats grass like an ox.
16	Look now, its strength is in its loins, and its power in its belly's navel.	Its strength is in its loins and its power in the muscles of its belly.
17	It stood up its tail like a cypress, and its sinews have been interwoven.	It makes its tail stiff like a cedar; the sinews of its thighs are knit together.
18	Its flanks are flanks of copper, and its spine is cast iron.	Its bones are tubes of bronze, its limbs like bars of iron.
19	This is the beginning of what the Lord formed, made to be mocked at by his angels.	It is the first of the great acts of God; only its Maker can approach it with the sword.
20	But when it went up on a steep mountain, it brought gladness to the quadrupeds in Tartarus.	For the mountains yield food for it where all the wild animals play.
21	Under trees of every kind it lies down, by the papyrus and reed and sedge.	Under the lotus plants it lies, in the covert of the reeds and in the marsh.
22	And tall trees with their limbs are overshadowed by it, as are the chaste-tree's branches.	The lotus trees cover it for shade; the willows of the wadi surround it.
23	If there is a flood, it will not notice at all.	Even if the river is turbulent, it is not frightened; it is confident though Jordan rushes against its mouth.
24		Can one take it with hooks or pierce its nose with a snare?
25	And will you catch a dragon with a fish hook, and put a halter around its snout?	Can you draw out Leviathan with a fishhook or press down its tongue with a cord?
26	And will you pierce its lip with a ring?	Can you put a rope in its nose or pierce its jaw with a hook?
27	And will it speak to you with a petition, with a supplication, softly?	Will it make many supplications to you? Will it speak soft words to you?
28	And will it make a covenant with you, and will you take it as your perpetual slave?	Will it make a covenant with you to be taken as your servant forever?
29	And will you play with it as with a bird, or tie it up as a sparrow for a child?	Will you play with it as with a bird or will you put it on leash for your young women?
30	And do nations feed on it, and do the Phoenician races divvy it up?	Will traders bargain over it? Will they divide it up among the merchants?
31	And a whole fleet, gathered, will never carry the mere skin of its tail.	Can you fill its skin with harpoons or his head with fishing spears?
32	But you will put a hand on it, though you remember the battle that is waging in its body, and let it happen no more!	Lay hands on it; think of the battle; you will not do it again!

v.	NETS	NRSVUE
41:1	Have you not seen it, and have you not marveled at what is said?	Any hope of capturing it will be disappointed; one is overwhelmed even at the sight of it.
2	Do you not fear because it has been prepared for me? For who is it that withstands me?	No one is so fierce as to dare to stir it up. Who can stand before it?
3	Or who will withstand me and survive, if all that is under heaven is mine?	Who can confront it and be safe?—under the whole heaven, who?
4		I will not keep silent concerning its limbs or its mighty strength or its splendid frame.
5	Who will uncover the front of what it is wearing? And the plate of its cuirass who could enter?	Who can strip off its outer garment? Who can penetrate its double coat of mail?
6	The gates of its face, who will open? All around its teeth—fear!	Who can open the doors of its face? There is terror all around its teeth.
7	Its inwards are bronze shields, and its hide is like emery stone—	Its back is made of shields in rows, shut up closely as with a seal.
8	and no puff of air will ever pass through it!	One is so near to another that no air can come between them.
9		They are joined one to another; they clasp each other and cannot be separated.
10	At its sneezing light shines forth, and its eyes are the image of the morning star.	Its sneezes flash forth light, and its eyes are like the eyelids of the dawn.
11	From its mouth proceed flaming torches, and fiery braziers are being cast forth.	From its mouth go flaming torches; sparks of fire leap out.
12	From its nostrils proceeds smoke of a furnace burning with the fire of coals.	Out of its nostrils comes smoke, as from a boiling pot and burning rushes.
13	Its soul is coals, and a flame proceeds from its mouth.	Its breath kindles coals, and a flame comes out of its mouth.
14	And in its neck lodges power; before it destruction runs.	In its neck abides strength, and terror dances before it.
15	And the flesh of its body cleaves together.	The folds of its flesh cling together; it is firmly cast and immovable.
16	Its heart is solid like stone, and it stands like an unyielding anvil.	Its heart is as hard as stone, as hard as the lower millstone.
17	And when it turns, fear grips the wild quadrupeds leaping about on the earth.	When it raises itself up the gods are afraid; at the crashing they are beside themselves.
18	If spears meet it, they will do nothing,	Though the sword reaches it, it does not avail, nor does the spear, the dart, or the javelin.
19	for iron it considers chaff and bronze as rotten wood.	It counts iron as straw and bronze as rotten wood.
20	A bronze bow will never wound it; a catapult it considers grass	The arrow cannot make it flee; sling-stones, for it, are turned to chaff.
21	and laughs to scorn the shaking of a fire-bearer.	Clubs are counted as chaff; it laughs at the rattle of javelins.
22	Its bed is sharp points, and all the sea's gold under it is like untold clay.	Its underparts are like sharp potsherds; it spreads itself like a threshing sledge on the mire.
23	It makes the deep boil like a caldron and regards the sea as a pot of ointment	It makes the deep boil like a pot; it makes the sea like a pot of ointment.

v.	NETS	NRSVUE
24	and Tartarus of the deep as a captive.	It leaves a shining wake behind it; one would think the deep to be white-haired.
25	There is nothing on earth like it, made to be mocked at by my angels.	On earth it has no equal, a creature without fear.
26	Everything high it sees, and it is king of all that are in the waters.	It surveys everything that is lofty; it is king over all that are proud.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Name: Kristin Klaus
Date of birth: February 23, 1993, Tartu, Estonia
Contact: kristinklaus@gmail.com

Education:

2018–2020 University of Tartu, M.A. *cum laude* in Classical Philology
2016–2018 University of Tartu, B.A. in Classical Philology
2009–2012 Nõo Reaalgümnaasium

Employment:

2020–... SA Academia Artium Liberalium (teacher of Ancient Greek and Septuagint)
2025–... University of Tartu (teacher of Latin)
2024–2025 University of Tartu (junior research fellow in religious studies)
2023–2024 University of Tartu (adjunct instructor of Latin)
2020–2024 University of Tartu (research staff for R&D project “The Emergence of the Biblical Book of Job on the Backdrop of the so-called Job Literature” PRG938)

Main research areas: philology and linguistics (Ancient Greek and Latin), stylistics and poetry, Septuagint studies, biblical translation (focus on Septuagint)

Publications:

1. Klaus, K. 2026. “Possibilities of Dividing the Speeches of Old Greek Job into Thematic-Formal Units.” In *XVIII Congress of the International Organization of Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Zurich, 2022*, edited by Marieke Dhont, Gideon R. Kotze, Joshua Alfaro, and Alison Salvesen, 80:351–69. SCS. Atlanta: SBL Press.
2. Klaus, K. 2022. “Esimese Moosese Raamatu Allegooriline Tõlgendus.” *Vikerkaar* 10–11:35–9.

Conference Papers:

- 2025 Colloquium Balticum (Lund), “Self-loathing in the Book of Job: Hebrew vs Greek”
2025 OTSEM (Copenhagen), “Literary growth of Hebrew Job vs the Old Greek translation of Job”
2025 CAEMC vanaaja talvekool doktorantidele ja magistrantidele (CAEMC winter school for doctoral and master students of antiquity; Tartu), “Värsside lühendamise poeetilise teksti struktureerimise tehnikana Iiobi raamatu vanakreeka keelses tõlkes” (“Shortening verses as a technique of structuring the poetic text in Old Greek Job”)

- 2023 Conference “Text, Form and Redaction in Job” (Tartu), “OG Job and the literary growth of Hebrew Job: did the later additions to the Hebrew text disturb the Greek translator?”
- 2023 ENLIGHT/U4 Ancient World Winter School 2023, The Old and the New: Tradition and Innovation in Antiquity (Rome), “The Translation of the Hebrew Bible into Ancient Greek: With Focus on the Old Greek Job”
- 2022 OTSEM (Kiel), “The poetic profile of the Greek translator of the book of Job: thematic-formal units”
- 2022 Conference “In the Wake of Wisdom – With a Special Emphasis on the Book of Job” (Tartu), “Reception of poetic in the Old Greek translation of Job”
- 2022 IOSCS International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, 18th Congress (Zurich), “Possibilities of Dividing the Speeches of Old Greek Job into Thematic-Formal Units”

Memberships:

- 2024–... Morgensterni Selts
- 2022–... The International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies
- 2022–2023 European Association of Biblical Studies

ELULOOKIRJELDUS

Nimi: Kristin Klaus
Sünniaeg: 23. veebruar 1993, Tartu, Eesti
Kontakt: kristinklaus@gmail.com

Hariduskäik:

2018–2020 Tartu Ülikool, M.A. *cum laude* klassikalises filoloogias
2016–2018 Tartu Ülikool, B.A. klassikalises filoloogias
2009–2012 Nõo Reaalgümnaasium

Teenistuskäik:

2020–... SA Academia Artium Liberalium (vanakreeka keele ja Septuaginta õpetaja)
2025–... Tartu Ülikool (ladina keele õpetaja)
2024–2025 Tartu Ülikool (religiooniuuringute nooremteadur)
2023–2024 Tartu Ülikool (ladina keele abiõpetaja)
2020–2024 Tartu Ülikool (täitja projektis “The Emergence of the Biblical Book of Job on the Backdrop of the so-called Job Literature” PRG938)

Peamised uurimisalad: filoloogia ja lingvistika (vanakreeka ja ladina), stilistika ja poeetika, Septuaginta uuringud, piiblitõlge (Septuaginta)

Publikatsioonid:

1. Klaus, K. 2026. “Possibilities of Dividing the Speeches of Old Greek Job into Thematic-Formal Units.” In *XVIII Congress of the International Organization of Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Zurich, 2022*, edited by Marieke Dhont, Gideon R. Kotze, Joshua Alfaro, and Alison Salvesen, 80:351–69. SCS. Atlanta: SBL Press.
2. Klaus, K. 2022. “Esimese Moosese Raamatu Allegooriline Tõlgendus.” *Vikerkaar* 10–11:35–9.

Konverentsiettekanded:

- 2025 Colloquium Balticum (Lund), “Self-loathing in the Book of Job: Hebrew vs Greek”
- 2025 OTSEM (Kopenhaagen), “Literary growth of Hebrew Job vs the Old Greek translation of Job”
- 2025 CAEMC vanaaja talvekool doktorantidele ja magistrantidele (Tartu), “Värsside lühendamine poeetilise teksti struktureerimise tehnikana Iiobi raamatu vanakreekakeelses tõlkes”
- 2023 Konverents “Text, Form and Redaction in Job” (Tartu), “OG Job and the literary growth of Hebrew Job: did the later additions to the Hebrew text disturb the Greek translator?”

- 2023 ENLIGHT/U4 Ancient World Winter School 2023, The Old and the New: Tradition and Innovation in Antiquity (Rooma), “The Translation of the Hebrew Bible into Ancient Greek: With Focus on the Old Greek Job”
- 2022 OTSEM (Kiel), “The poetic profile of the Greek translator of the book of Job: thematic-formal units”
- 2022 Konverents “In the Wake of Wisdom – With a Special Emphasis on the Book of Job” (Tartu), “Reception of poetic in the Old Greek translation of Job”
- 2022 IOSCS International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, 18th Congress (Zürich), “Possibilities of Dividing the Speeches of Old Greek Job into Thematic-Formal Units”

Liikmelisus:

- 2024–... Morgensterni Selts
- 2022–... The International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies
- 2022–2023 European Association of Biblical Studies

DISSERTATIONES THEOLOGIAE UNIVERSITATIS TARTUENSIS

1. **Tarmo Kulmar.** Die Theologie der Kraft-, Götter- und Seelenvorstellungen der ältesten Schicht der estnischen Urreligion. Tartu, 1994, Autorreferat, 45 S.
2. **Toomas Paul.** Die Geschichte der estnischen Bibelübersetzung, I Teil (XVI–XIX Jahrhundert). Tartu, 1994, Autorreferat, 27 S.
3. **Kalle Kasemaa.** Semitistikat ja poeetikat. Tartu, 1997, 131 lk.
4. **Arne Hiob.** Uku Masingu religioonifilosoofia põhijooned. Tartu, 2000, 186 lk.
5. **Riho Altnurme.** Eesti Evangeeliumi Luteriusu Kirik ja Nõukogude riik 1944–1949. Tartu, 2000, 326 lk.
6. **Pille Valk.** Eesti kooli religiooniõpetuse kontseptsioon. Tartu, 2003, 209 lk.
7. **Peeter Roosimaa.** Uue Testamendi eestikeelsetest tõlgetest ja tõlkimist toetavast eksegeesist. Tartu, 2004, 242 lk.
8. **Einike Pilli.** Terviklik elukestva õppe kontseptsioon Eesti protestantlike koguduste kontekstis. Tartu, 2005, 265 lk.
9. **Lea Altnurme.** Kristlusest oma usuni. Uurimus muutustest eestlaste religioossuses 20. sajandi II poolel. Tartu, 2005, 329 lk.
10. **Aira Võsa.** Johann Georg Gichtel – teosoofilise idee kandja varauusaegses Euroopas. Tartu, 2006, 311 lk.
11. **Veiko Vihuri.** Hugo Bernhard Rahamägi, Eesti Evangeelse Luterliku Kiriku teine piiskop 1934–1939. Tartu, 2007, 364 lk.
12. **Kaido Soom.** Täiskasvanute leeritöö Eesti Evangeelses Luterlikus Kirikus ja selle arengustrateegia koostamine. Tartu, 2007, 242 lk.
13. **Meelis Friedenthal.** Tallinna Linnaarhiivi *Tractatus moralis de oculo*. Tartu, 2008, 206 lk.
14. **Andrei Sõtšov.** Eesti Õigeusu Piiskopkond Nõukogude religioonipoliitika mõjuväljas 1954–1964. Tartu, 2008, 208 lk.
15. **Jaan Lahe.** Gnosis und Judentum. Alttestamentliche und jüdische Motive in der gnostischen Literatur und das Ursprungsproblem der Gnosis. Tartu, 2009, 412 S.
16. **Roland Karo.** Eros & Mysticism. Are Mystical States of Consciousness Evolutionary Byproducts of Sexual Response? Tartu, 2009, 237 p.
17. **Olga Schihalejev.** Estonian young people, religion and religious diversity: personal views and the role of the school. Tartu, 2009, 256 p.
18. **Ingmar Kurg.** Oikumeenilise evangelisatsiooni perspektiiv Euroopa kontekstis: missioloogiline ja religioonisotsioloogiline uurimus. Tartu, 2010, 354 lk.
19. **Peeter Espak.** The God Enki in Sumerian Royal Ideology and Mythology. Tartu, 2010, 284 p.
20. **Piret Lotman.** Heinrich Stahli pastoraalne tegevus Rootsi Läänemere provintsides 17. sajandi esimesel poolel. Tartu, 2011, 180 lk.

21. **Kaarina Rein.** Arstiteadus rootsiaegses Tartu gümnaasiumis ja ülikoolis aastatel 1630–1656. Meditsiinalased disputatsioonid ja oratsioonid ning nende autorid. Tartu, 2011, 198 lk.
22. **Ain Riistan.** Ajalooline Jeesus: teaduse probleem religiooni kontekstis. Tartu, 2011, 301 lk.
23. **Ringo Ringvee.** Riik ja religioon nõukogudejärgses Eestis 1991–2008. Tartu, 2011, 234 lk.
24. **Atko Rimmel.** Religioonivastane võitlus Eesti NSV-s aastail 1957–1990. Tähtsamad institutsioonid ja nende tegevus. Tartu, 2011, 324 lk.
25. **Anu Põldsam.** Lazar Gulkowitsch – eine vergessene Stimme der Wissenschaft des Judentums. Tartu, 2011, 293 S.
26. **Priit Rohtmets.** Teoloogilised voolud Eesti evangeeliumi Luteri usu kirikus aastatel 1917–1934. Tartu, 2012, 488 lk.
27. **Maire Latvala.** Koguduslik hingehoid Eesti nelja konfessiooni näitel. Tartu, 2012, 309 lk.
28. **Raul Tiganik.** Sotsiaalne kontroll ja religioon. Tartu, 2013, 232 lk.
29. **Elo Süld.** Muhammad, der Gesandte Gottes, und Paulus, der Gesandte Christi. Ein Vergleich der Berufungs- und offenbarungsgeschichtlichen Vorstellungen mit Bezug auf die islamische sowie die biblische Tradition. Tartu, 2014, 301 S.
30. **Mart Jaanson.** Nikaia-Konstantinoopoli usutunnistuse ladinakeelse normteksti grammatiline, teoloogiline ja muusikaline liigendamine. Tartu, 2014, 371 lk.
31. **Erki Lind.** The Concept of the Body in Chinese and Indian Bodily Practices: Transformation, Perspective, and Ethics. Tartu, 2015, 371 p.
32. **Marko Uibu.** Religiosity as Cultural Toolbox: A Study of Estonian New Spirituality. Tartu, 2016, 258 p.
33. **Liina Eek.** Tänapäeva eestikeelsete õigeusklike katehheesist ja uskumustest. Tartu, 2017, 246 lk.
34. **Marju Lepajõe.** Pastorid ja kirjakultuur: kristliku humanismi variatsioonidest Eesti- ja Liivimaal XVII sajandi esimesel poolel. Tartu, 2017, 330 lk.
35. **Liidia Meel.** Interdisciplinary team based pastoral care model for Estonian healthcare institutions. Tartu, 2018, 192 p.
36. **Ege Lepa.** Eesti islamikogukonna dünaamika pärast taasiseseisvumist. Tartu, 2019, 207 lk.
37. **Andreas Johandi.** The god Asar/Asalluḫi in the early Mesopotamian pantheon. Tartu, 2019, 277 p.
38. **Indrek Peedu.** Positioning the Scholar: Issues of Epistemology and Methodology in the Evolutionary Study of Religion. Tartu, 2019, 247 p.
39. **Liina Kilemit.** Kristlike kogudustega liitumise põhjustest. Tartu, 2020, 186 lk.
40. **Tiina-Erika Friedenthal.** Võitlus ja väitlus teatri üle Eesti- ja Liivimaal 18. sajandi lõpus ja 19. sajandi alguses. Tartu, 2020, 472 lk.
41. **Triin Käpp.** Kristlik väärtuskasvatus kristlikes koolides ning kristlike koolide roll Eesti ühiskonnas 21. sajandi algul. Tartu, 2021, 205 lk.

42. **Silja Härm.** Eesti gümnaasiumiastme usundiõpetuse õpetajate professionaalsed valikud usundiõpetuse õpetamisel. Tartu, 2021, 183 lk.
43. **Helle Kaasik.** Sacred medicine from the forest: chemical, psychological and spiritual aspects of ayahuasca. Tartu, 2022, 170 p.
44. **Hedi Vilumaa.** Avatud sõna- ja sakramendiosadus. Ristitud laste ja noorte armulaua admissioon: kontekstid ja arusaamad Eesti luterlikus kirikus 1917–2005. Tartu, 2022, 356 lk.
45. **Ahenkora Siaw Kwakye.** Transcendence, as a Theme in Theology and Technology. Tartu, 2022, 273 p.
46. **Iakov Kadochnikov.** Deification of kings in Ancient Mesopotamia. Tartu, 2023, 367 p.
47. **Helen Haas.** Alevis in Contemporary Izmir: Imaginaries, Beliefs and Practices regarding Hacı Bektaş Veli. Tartu, 2023, 227 p.
48. **Imar Y. Koutchoukali.** “Our ‘*irbīt*’ is not like your ‘*arabiyya*’”. Linguistic and Socio-Political Change in Late Antique South Arabia (550 – 850 AD). Tartu, 2023, 240 p.
49. **Üllas Linder.** Adam Reinhold Schiewe. Esimese Eesti baptistikoguduse rajaja elulugu. Tartu, 2024, 228 lk.
50. **Rain Soosaar.** The Process of Secularization in Rural Communes of Estonia and Latvia (1920–40). Tartu, 2024, 371 p.
51. **Indrek Pekko.** Eesti Evangeelne Luterlik Kirik aastatel 1991–2015 – muutused, identiteet ja teoloogilised hoiakud. Tartu, 2024, 214 lk.
52. **Indrek Linnuste.** Spirituaalse dimensiooni integreerimise võimalusest ja vajadusest tervishoiu- ja rehabilitatsioonisüsteemis. Tartu, 2025, 220 lk.
53. **Amir Vashaghanifarhani.** Poetical Features of the Peshitta Psalter: A Comparative Study of the Hebrew and Syriac Psalms. Tartu, 2025, 234 p.
54. **Cristina Barcina Pérez.** Before Civilization: A Non-Evolutionist History of Community-Making in Southwest Asia. Tartu, 2025, 478 p.
55. **Igor Ahmedov.** Kierkegaardian Theology of Education. Tartu, 2025, 224 p.
56. **Ago Lilleorg.** Uurimus koguduse kasvust Eesti protestantlike koguduste näitel. Koguduse arengustrateegia sõnastamine. Tartu, 2025, 191 lk.
57. **Aleksandra Sooniste.** Religious Literacy of Estonian Basic School Graduates. Tartu, 2025, 168 p.
58. **Matthew L. Kalkman.** Enlightened Sovereignty: A Postsecular Semiotic ‘Image of God’. Tartu, 2025, 347 p.
59. **Mati Simm.** Raha, teoloogia ja voorused: etnograafilise teoloogia rakenduskatse. Tartu, 2026, 255 p.