

Marquette University

e-Publications@Marquette

Dissertations (1934 -)

Dissertations, Theses, and Professional
Projects

Behold the Beasts Beside You: The Adaptation and Alteration of Animals in LXX-Job

James Wykes
Marquette University

Follow this and additional works at: https://epublications.marquette.edu/dissertations_mu



Part of the Religion Commons

Recommended Citation

Wykes, James, "Behold the Beasts Beside You: The Adaptation and Alteration of Animals in LXX-Job" (2022). *Dissertations (1934 -)*. 1157.

https://epublications.marquette.edu/dissertations_mu/1157

“BEHOLD THE BEASTS BESIDE YOU”: THE ADAPTATION AND ALTERATION
OF ANIMALS IN LXX-JOB

by

James Wykes, B.A., M.A.

A Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School,
Marquette University,
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Milwaukee, Wisconsin
May 2022

ABSTRACT

“BEHOLD THE BEASTS BESIDE YOU”: THE ADAPTATION AND ALTERATION
OF ANIMALS IN LXX-JOB

James Wykes, B.A., M.A.

Marquette University, May 2022

“Behold the beasts beside you; they eat grass like cattle” (LXX-Job 40:15). The first translator for the book of Job into Greek was faced with a difficult text, replete with archaisms, corruptions, and convoluted Hebrew. He produced a distinctive – and often misunderstood – translation. Though its central characteristic is one of omission, its general approach to the text has proven hard to categorize. This study continues this trend by following one feature of Job that a casual reader cannot overlook: the book of Job’s zoological panoply. The LXX-translator handles these creatures in a variety of ways, often contextually-sensitive and quite creative. Furthermore, he brings in external material, from other LXX books and Greek literature, to translate other passages. Most surprisingly, he displays a remarkably “inclusive” approach to canonicity and “exclusive” ideas about animals and wisdom. At the end, the individual character of the translator is much more visible in the translation than what it would appear at first. “Beholding the beasts” in LXX-Job tells us as much about the translator as the translation itself.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

James Wykes, B.A., M.A.

Throughout the writing of this dissertation, I have received a great deal of support and assistance. I would first like to thank my director, Dr. Joshua Burns; without his thorough feedback and patient guidance throughout this entire multi-year process, this dissertation would have gone nowhere. Colleagues, especially those whom I was able to see at conferences, listened to my ideas and provided very helpful feedback and critiques.

My parents and siblings were instrumental in providing prayers, moral support, a sounding board.

Ultimately, this dissertation would also not have been possible without the support of my wife, Cecilia, whose love, understanding, patience, and insight, truly surpasses my ability to properly articulate here.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	i
INTRODUCTION.....	1
A. Introduction.....	1
B. Analytical objective.....	3
C. The Hexapla.....	4
D. Job in the Hexapla.....	5
E. Job and modern scholarship.....	6
F. Job's translation technique.....	8
G. Previous scholarship and attitudes toward LXX-Job.....	11
H. Methodology.....	15
I. This dissertation.....	17
CHAPTER	
I. THE HEBREW TEXT.....	20
A. Introduction.....	20
B. The Narrator.....	21
C. Job.....	23
D. Eliphaz.....	33
E. Bildad.....	36
F. Zophar.....	38
G. Elihu.....	39
H. God.....	40

I.	Conclusion.....	55
II.	LXX-JOB’S “POSITIVE” TECHNIQUE I: VOCABULARY-LEVEL...57	
A.	Introduction.....	57
B.	Literal translations.....	58
C.	Grammatical adjustment.....	60
D.	Creative substitutions and near-equivalents.....	60
E.	The Sources of LXX-Job’s Vocabulary.....	62
1)	LXX sources.....	63
2)	Secular Greek literature.....	66
3)	Mixed Influence.....	72
F.	Conclusion.....	76
III.	LXX-JOB’S “POSITIVE” TECHNIQUE II: LARGER LITERARY UNITS.....	77
A.	Introduction.....	77
B.	Greek biblical translations.....	78
1)	Job 9:26.....	78
2)	Job 4:18–19.....	80
3)	Job 5:22–23.....	82
C.	Greek literature.....	84
1)	Job 24:5.....	84
D.	Literary adjustments.....	87
1)	Job 8:14.....	87
2)	Job 1:16.....	89

E. Conclusion.....	90
IV. LXX-JOB'S "NEGATIVE" TECHNIQUE.....	92
A. Introduction.....	92
B. Job 30:1.....	92
1) Hebrew.....	93
2) Greek.....	93
C. Job 39:1–4.....	94
1) Hebrew.....	94
2) Greek.....	95
D. Job 39:19–25.....	97
1) Hebrew.....	97
2) Greek.....	98
E. Job 40–41.....	101
F. Miscellaneous features.....	106
1) Job 21:11.....	106
2) Job 32:22.....	106
G. Conclusion.....	107
V. CONCLUSION: WHAT CAN WE SAY ABOUT THE TRANSLATOR?.....	108
A. Introduction.....	108
B. The translator was a reader of Hellenistic literature and earlier biblical translations.....	108

C. The translator uses elimination as a means of preventing an unfocused text.....	110
D. The translator's allusions may have unified his writing with the greater biblical canon.....	112
E. The translator does not want to associate wisdom and animals.....	114
F. The translator does not cut mythological overtones, but merely alters them.....	116
G. Conclusion.....	117
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	118

INTRODUCTION

ἀλλὰ δὴ ἰδοὺ θηρία παρὰ σοί... (LXX-Job 40:15)
But now behold the beasts that are around you...¹

ἀλλὰ δὴ ἐπερώτησον τετράποδα ἐάν σοι εἴπωσιν
πετεινὰ δὲ οὐρανοῦ ἐάν σοι ἀπαγγείλωσιν·
ἐκδιήγησαι δὲ γῆ ἐάν σοι φράσῃ... (LXX-Job 12:7–8)
But, do ask the quadrupeds if they should speak to you,
and the birds of the air, if they should declare to you,
and tell the earth in detail if it should expound to you...²

A. Introduction

Job—and the biblical story of his fall, debate, and theophany—has proven to be a character of enduring importance for Jews and Christians. In both the ancient and modern worlds, the story has been summarized, retold, and interpreted. In the New Testament, Job’s story only appears briefly in James 5:11.³ With Gregory the Great’s sixth-century *Moralia in Iob* (*Morals on the Book of Job*), the book’s reputation as a source of moral instruction grew, influencing and directing subsequent exegesis.⁴ Seven centuries later, Thomas Aquinas’ *Expositio super Iob ad litteram* (*Literal Exposition on Job*) demonstrated a “literal” approach that differed from Gregory’s method.⁵ In the Jewish world, the book was no less popular. Robert Eisen notes that one accounting of Jewish

¹ My translation

² NETS translation. All translations from the Septuagint are taken from the New English Translation of the Septuagint (NETS), unless otherwise indicated.

³ “You have heard of the endurance of Job, and you have seen the purpose of the Lord, how the Lord is compassionate and merciful” (τὴν ὑπομονὴν Ἰὼβ ἠκούσατε, καὶ τὸ τέλος Κυρίου εἶδετε, ὅτι πολὺσπλαγγνός ἐστιν ὁ Κύριος καὶ οἰκτίμων), NRSV.

⁴ Mary L. O’Hara, “Truth in Spirit and Letter: Gregory the Great, Thomas Aquinas, and Maimonides on the Book of Job,” in *From Cloister to Classroom: Monastic and Scholastic Approaches to Truth: The Spirituality of Western Christendom* (ed. E. Rozanne Elder; Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, 1986), 56.

⁵ John Yocum, “Aquinas’ Literal Exposition on Job,” in *Aquinas on Scripture: An Introduction to His Biblical Commentaries* (ed. Thomas Weinandy; New York: T&T Clark, 2005), 21–42.

commentaries on the book yielded around seventy-six composed between 900 and 1500, with others lost to history.⁶

Job's popularity has not waned in the modern era, although the appeal of the text has undertaken a noticeable shift. The underlying assumption of the earlier texts was that God's actions vis-à-vis Job were unquestionably just. Modern theologians and philosophers, however, have used the text to explore theodicy.⁷ Whether because of its seemingly-skeptical nature or the piety of its main character, it has elicited commentary from such eclectic sources as psychiatrist Carl Jung (*Answer to Job: Researches into the Relation between Psychology and Religion*)⁸ to playwright Archibald MacLeish (*J.B.*).⁹

One of its earliest interpretations is the LXX translation. LXX-Job's material is an abridgment of the Hebrew text, giving it more commonality with the pseudepigraphic *Testament of Job* than the literal translations of the Pentateuch.¹⁰ The translation is nearly 18% shorter than the Hebrew text.¹¹ Scholars have undergone radical development in their assessment of the Greek translator's complexity. One early theory was that he was a faithful translator of a defective or abridged Hebrew text.¹² The other theory regarding the translator was the assumption that he possessed a simplistic agenda driven mainly by

⁶ Robert Eisen, *The Book of Job in Medieval Jewish Philosophy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 4.

⁷ Karl-Johan Illman, "Theodicy in Job," in *Theodicy in the World of the Bible* (Antti Laato and Johannes C. de Moor, eds.; Leiden: Brill, 2003): 305–6; Marcel Sarot, "Theodicy and Modernity: An Inquiry into the Historicity of Theodicy," in *Theodicy in the World of the Bible* (Antti Laato and Johannes C. de Moor, eds.; Leiden: Brill, 2003): 5.

⁸ C. G. Jung, *Answer to Job: Researches into the Relation between Psychology and Religion* (trans. R. F. C. Hull; London: Routledge, 1954).

⁹ A. MacLeish, *JB: A Play in Verse* (London: Samuel French, 1956).

¹⁰ Claude E. Cox, "Job," in *The T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint* (ed. J. K. Aitken; New York: T&T Clark, 2015), 387–9.

¹¹ Markus Witte, "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* (Thomas Krüger et al., eds; Zurich, Switzerland: TVZ, 2007), 34.

¹² Harry Orlinsky, "The Hebrew Vorlage of the Septuagint of the Book of Joshua," *VTSup* (1969): 194; T.K. Cheyne, "Dillmann on the Text of Job," *The Expositor* 4, no. 10 (1891): 143.

offense at certain elements of the text.¹³ Newer, more complex theories about the translator's worldview soon developed.¹⁴ Recent approaches have recognized the translator's independent agenda.¹⁵ However, the bigger project—discerning the translator's motivations for these changes—is still underway.

B. Analytical objective

The simplest way to properly analyze the translator of LXX-Job is to choose one particular feature and follow it throughout; from that, patterns should become obvious. The analysis of those patterns can lead to a greater understanding of the philosophy, mindset, and context of the translator. (Of course, this is a highly simplified account of the method.)

For this dissertation, the central feature chosen is the natural world, particularly the diversity of animals in the text. These creatures are a microcosm of the book's approach to translation, because the book's animals are found in both the poetic and prose sections of the book. Idiomatic usage often presents a mismatch between the Hebrew text and Greek translation, requiring unique and creative solutions by the translator. Furthermore, tracking a certain set of material, especially material that

¹³ Gustav Bickell, *De indole ac ratione versionis alexandrinae in interpretando libro Jobi* [On the Nature and Method of the Alexandrian Version in Translating the Book of Job] (Marburg: Pfeilii, 1862), 5, 12; Harry M. Orlinsky, "Studies in the Septuagint of the Book of Job," *HUCA* 28 [1957]: 58–60; Cox, "Job," 394.

¹⁴ Henry Gehman, "The Theological Approach of the Greek Translator of Job 1–15," *JBL* 68 (1949): 239; Donald H. Gard, "The Concept of Job's Character According to the Greek Translator of the Hebrew Text," *JBL* 72 (1953): 186; Donald H. Gard, "The Concept of the Future Life According to the Greek Translator of the Book of Job," *JBL* 73 (1954): 143.

¹⁵ Witte, "The Greek Book of Job," 36.

constitutes such a substantial part of the original text, supplies consistent evidence to analyze.

The central analytical objective is to determine the goals of the translator in this translation. It can be assumed that the translator wanted to translate the text, but there are always unstated preferences held by the translator. What did he want to preserve for his? What did he want to eliminate? More importantly, what about the “character” of the original did he wish to preserve or eliminate? The gaps between the two texts are attributable to different reasons, many of which involve the translator’s specific heuristic.

C. The Hexapla

The history of critical study on the state of the LXX text intertwines with the history of the various translations and Origen’s *Hexapla*, a six (ἕξ) columned compendium that covered the entire LXX and was meant to aid in the revision of the LXX text. His venture irrevocably altered the shape of the Septuagint text; Christian citations of the LXX that would follow were from Origen’s text, not pre-Origenic texts.¹⁶ That textual tradition still, as earlier discussed, exercises influence on the shape of the standard text.

Without necessarily intending to replace the text, Origen set about collating the various Greek biblical texts and comparing them to the Hebrew. Pinpointing the moment that led to Origen’s revision of the LXX text is impossible, but the circumstances that led to the need for such a revision is clearer. Christians had grown to rely upon a version of the LXX that was increasingly shown to be at odds with the underlying Hebrew text and other Jewish Greek texts.¹⁷

¹⁶ Eugene Ulrich, “Origen’s Old Testament Text: The Transmission History of the Septuagint to the Third Century C.E.” in *Origen of Alexandria: His World and His Legacy* (Charles Kannengiesser and William L. Petersen, eds.; Notre Dame, IN: Notre Dame University Press, 1988): 4–5.

¹⁷ Jennifer M. Dines, *The Septuagint* (ed M. A. Knibb; New York: T&T Clark, 2004), 97.

Its probable layout: the first column was the Hebrew consonantal text; the second, a transliteration into Greek; third, Aquila's translation (α'); fourth, Symmachus (σ'); fifth, the generic LXX text in circulation; and sixth, Theodotion (Θ').¹⁸ Origen's letter to Africanus (c. 240) alludes to this venture:

I have to tell you what it behooves us to do in the cases not only of the History of Susanna...or of the two other passages you mention at the end of the book containing the history of Bel and the Dragon...but of thousands of other passages also which I found in many places when with my little strength I was collating the Hebrew copies with ours...And in many other of the sacred books I found sometimes more in our copies than in the Hebrew, sometimes less.¹⁹

D. Job in the Hexapla

Origen of Alexandria is the first to record the abbreviated text of LXX-Job, though he was not the first to notice it:

Throughout the entire Book of Job there are many passages in the Hebrew which are wanting in our copies, many times four or three verses, but sometimes, however, even fourteen, and nine, and six. But why do I have to list all the instances we collected with so much labor, to prove that the difference between our copies and those of the Jews did not escape us?²⁰

Jerome, following Origen, scornfully notes in his preface to his proper translation of Job that,

...previous to the publication of our recent translation with asterisks and obeli, about seven or eight hundred lines were missing in the Latin, so that the book, mutilated, torn, and disintegrated, exhibits its deformity to those who publicly read it.²¹

The "asterisks and obeli" mentioned by Jerome are the result of Origen's Hexapla text.

For all the books—but most noticeably for Job—where the Greek material was longer

¹⁸ Dines, *The Septuagint*, 98.

¹⁹ Origen, "A Letter to Origen from Africanus About the History of Susanna" (ANF 4:386–7).

²⁰ Origen, "A Letter to Origen from Africanus About the History of Susanna" (ANF 4:386–7).

²¹ Jerome, "Preface to Job" (NPNF Series II 6:491).

than the Hebrew, he placed before the word or phrase an obelus (÷) and after it a metobelus (∖).²² Where the Hebrew lacked a Greek equivalent, he did not content himself with merely marking the location. Instead, he relocated material from another Greek translation into the gaps in the LXX translation and placing an asterisk (※) alongside it.²³ Job's supplementary material comes from a translation attributed to Theodotion (Θ'), supposedly a first-century Jewish translator.²⁴ The result is "a genetic monstrosity hybridized from apples and oranges."²⁵

E. Job and Modern Scholarship

Modern scholars have noticed the difference in translation style between the marked and unmarked lines. Thackeray describes Θ' as filled with "Hebraisms, transliterations, etymological renderings of Divine names...aim[ing] at completeness and accuracy without much regard to style."²⁶ Peter John Gentry gives a more complete description of the translation style of Θ' as tending towards woodenness (with some "bit[s] of genius" scattered throughout) in that it seeks to align fairly closely with the parent text, but without the "absurdities" encountered in Aquila.²⁷ Unlike what would be implied by Origen's method of meshing the two bodies of material,

²² Witte, "The Greek Book of Job," 33–5. The representations of the sigla here are just one of several variants used over time (Keith Houston, *Shady Characters: The Secret Life of Punctuation, Symbols, and Other Typographical Marks* [New York: Norton, 2013], 102).

²³ Claude E. Cox, "Elihu's Second Speech According to the Septuagint," in *Studies in the Book of Job* (ed. W. E. Aufrecht; Waterloo: Wilfred Laurier, 1983): 90.

²⁴ Witte, "The Greek Book of Job," 33–5; Peter John Gentry, *The Asterisked Material in the Greek Job* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 494.

²⁵ Peter John Gentry, "The Place of Theodotion-Job in the Textual History of the Septuagint," in *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments: Papers Presented at the Rich Seminar on the Hexapla, Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies, 25th July-3rd August 1994* (ed. Alison Salvesen; Tübingen: Mohr, 1998), 199.

²⁶ Henry St. John Thackeray, *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek* (Reprint; Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2008), 4.

²⁷ Gentry, *Asterisked Material*, 494.

the asterisked materials represent the very opposite in translation technique when compared with OG. One may simplistically describe the difference in terms of the ‘literal’ approach versus the ‘free’ method of OG. Furthermore, Theod has the character of a *de novo* translation. It is not a revision of OG. As Origen discovered in creating the Hexapla, alignment of OG with the parent text is not easy. This in itself may help to explain why the asterisked materials represent a new translation rather than just a revision of OG.²⁸

Hence, while the combined Greek text for Job – the abridged text plus the additions – treats these translations as an inseparable pair, the abbreviated text that so irked Origen and Jerome must be treated on its own. Copies of the resulting text, now termed the “Ecclesiastical Text” (ET), omitted the sigla, presenting an undifferentiated text.²⁹ The text found in critical editions is the ET with the signs restored. Non-sigla text is often labeled “Old Greek” (OG), but the nomenclature is not strictly followed. “LXX-Job” can be interchanged with “OG-Job,” while at other points it refers to the ET. (Throughout this dissertation, “LXX-Job” will refer to the Old Greek text.)

All told, there are 800 lines that are missing in LXX-Job that are present in the Hebrew.³⁰ Removing these lines to analyze the composition of the Old Greek is further complicated by two factors. The first is that the mixed text was often copied *sans* Origen’s critical signs, and this mixed text became the majority text, often termed the “Ecclesiastical Text” (ET).³¹ Removing this material would be made easier for scholars were the second factor not present: the limited preservation of the diacritical signs.³² Restoring the Aristarchian signage is itself a text-critical venture that renders its results

²⁸ Gentry, *Asterisked Material*, 495.

²⁹ G. B. Gray, “The Additions in the Ancient Greek Version of Job,” *The Expositor* 19 (1920): 423. The term “Ecclesiastical Text” originates in Gentry, *Asterisked Material*, 2.

³⁰ Cox, “Elihu’s Second Speech,” 90.

³¹ Gentry, *The Asterisked Material*, 2.

³² Gentry, *The Asterisked Material*, 1–2.

tentative; but although there is some debate over the proper allocation of certain sigla in modern printed versions, most scholars have assumed their reliability.³³

Stripping away the Θ' text, the Old Greek (OG) text remains. Unfortunately, it is extremely unlikely that this text is the "original" text:

We do not, and Origen did not, have extant for any book what anyone would consider the original form of that translation. All manuscripts display a considerable amount of textual development certainly unintentional changes, such as the well-known panoply of errors, but also intentional changes, such as clarifications, revisions, doublets, and harmonizations.³⁴

With this caveat in mind, the resulting text is coherent. Further, after much back and forth, the current consensus about the Hebrew archetype of LXX-Job is that it was similar to the extant MT. Because of this relative certainty, the profile of the translator is more easily discerned.

F. Job's translation technique

This journey into the motivations of the translator builds upon the work of earlier scholarship. The translator demonstrates literary skill, and his handling of the text demonstrates craftsmanship found in few other Septuagint books.³⁵ The book presents several different ways of dealing with the Hebrew text, whether by varying its terminology,³⁶ multiplying pleonasm,³⁷ relying on favorite terms, importing words or

³³ The critical edition retains these sigla: *Iob: Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Göttingensis editum* (ed. Joseph Ziegler; XI/4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982). Albert Pietersma criticizes Ziegler's edition for certain reassignments ("Review of *Iob*," *JBL* 104 [1985]: 310); Peter Gentry also offers several proposals (Gentry, *The Asterisked Material*, 237).

³⁴ Ulrich, "Origen's Old Testament Text," 16.

³⁵ Cox, "Job," 390.

³⁶ Karl V. Kutz, "The Old Greek of Job: A Study in Early Biblical Exegesis" (Ph.D. diss., Wisconsin-Madison 1997), 29.

³⁷ Kutz, "The Old Greek of Job," 30; J. Ziegler, "Der Textkritische Wert der Septuaginta des Buches Job," *Miscellanea Biblica* 2 (1934): 282–3.

phrases from other passages,³⁸ using terms with a different level of specificity,³⁹ and inverting the meaning of a word or passage.⁴⁰ He also tends to use material from other LXX books or earlier in LXX-Job in lieu of directly translating certain lines (a technique known as “associative” or “anaphoric translation”).⁴¹

He uses particles in diverse situations, lending “nuance, vigour, and subtlety” to even the smallest parts of the translation.⁴² For example, in the account of Job’s property at Job 1:3, the Masoretic Text’s (henceforth MT) list is punctuated by ׀, “and,” before every item. Only three of them are translated with the equivalent Greek word (καί). Those are furthermore placed strategically between categorical groups “as the[y] shift from livestock to servants, holdings, and conclusion.”⁴³ The balanced effect of the changes and their accordance with Greek style strongly suggest a conscious effort; the reappearance of the same technique in the similar list in 42:8 strengthens this proposal.⁴⁴

The book’s biggest translation-related mystery is its abridgment. Complicating matters is its unevenness. The percentage of omitted lines increases as the book continues: “There is little abbreviation until chs. 12–14, where the LXX is approximately 4% shorter; in chs. 15–21, 16%; in 22–31, 25%; in 32–37, the Elihu speeches, 35%; in 38–42, 16%.”⁴⁵ G.B. Gray concluded that the translator may have “found the speeches

³⁸ Ziegler, “Der Textkritische Wert,” 284–5; P. Katz, “Notes on the LXX,” *JTS* 47 (1946): 168; Kutz, “The Old Greek of Job,” 31–37.

³⁹ Kutz, “The Old Greek of Job,” 37–9.

⁴⁰ Kutz, “The Old Greek of Job,” 39–44.

⁴¹ Cox, “Job,” 47–52; Homer Heater, Jr., *A Septuagint Translation Technique in the Book of Job* (Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1982), 6.

⁴² A particle is “anything not a noun, pronoun, or verb” (Claude Cox, “Tying it all Together: The Use of Particles in Old Greek Job,” *BIOSCS* 38 [2005]: 41). See also Cox, “Job,” 390.

⁴³ Cox, “Tying it All Together,” 43.

⁴⁴ Cox, “Tying it All Together,” 43.

⁴⁵ Cox, “Job,” 386, citing statistics found in S.R. Driver and G. Gray, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Job: Together with a New Translation* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1921), lxxv.

over long, but the story over short,” and others followed suit in this evaluation.⁴⁶ Henry Swete tied this desire to the translator’s classical training:

The evident desire of the translator to follow classical models suggests that he was an Alexandrian Hellenist who intended his version for general reading, rather than for use in the synagogue. Under such circumstances he may have been tempted to reduce the length of his original, especially in passages where it did not lend itself readily to his treatment. On the other hand he has not scrupled here and there to add to the original.⁴⁷

The style, so the theory goes, reflects a good education, which gave the translator freedom to change and alter Job to fit his ideology.

Such a facile view of the translator’s motivations, however, hardly do justice to the grand sweep of the translation. The aforementioned traits of the translation do suggest a translator interested in fixing, and often taking liberties to change, the material in the original book. But reducing the motivation down to a “power trip” by the translator – he could make changes, and therefore he did – the issues and ambiguities of the original text are “undersold” and the translator’s changes are framed as arbitrary.

The translator is anything but arbitrary, and the original text is anything but entirely clear. Yet there is space between “arbitrary” changes and “exact translation.” In that space lives the LXX-Job translator. His skills and education make him a perfect candidate for tackling such a challenging book in a fresh way.

⁴⁶ Gray, *The Book of Job*, 425; Cox, “Job,” 387.

⁴⁷ Henry Barclay Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1902), 256.

G. Previous scholarship and attitudes toward LXX-Job

LXX-Job is a complex translation, even compared to other books in the Septuagint. It is commonly dated to the mid-second century BCE and placed in Alexandria; a highly abridged translation, it is also roughly one-sixth shorter than the Hebrew Masoretic text.⁴⁸ Despite this trend toward abridgment, it also contains two substantial additions: at the beginning of the book (expanding the dialogue of Job's wife at 2:9) and a post-script chronicling both the author's purported source and Job's lineage, which conflates him with Jobab from Genesis 36:33.⁴⁹ It is considered to be a free translation, sometimes deviating from the Hebrew text, but at other points indicating the translator's dedication to his *Vorlage*.⁵⁰

In its assessment of the material attributed to the LXX translator, especially its characteristic omissions, scholarship developed several competing theories. The first was that he was a faithful translator of a defective or abridged Hebrew text. This had several prominent supporters, chief among them Harry Orlinsky: "So far as Job is concerned, my own detailed study has led me to the conclusion that the LXX text is one-sixth shorter than the preserved Hebrew text simply because its Hebrew *Vorlage* was approximately one-sixth shorter."⁵¹

Sometimes this was mixed with a suspicion of the translator's incompetence. T.K. Cheyne, for example, posited that the translator had before him "a badly-written Hebrew MS" that "he either could not read or could not understand," thus throwing into doubt the

⁴⁸ Cox, "Job," 388.

⁴⁹ Annette Yoshiko Reed, "Job as Jobab: The Interpretation of Job in LXX Job 42:17b-e," *JBL* 120.1 (Spring, 2001): 31-55; Johann Cook, "Were the LXX Versions of Proverbs and Job Translated by the Same Person?" *Hebrew Studies* 51 (2010): 129-56.

⁵⁰ Cox, "Job," 394.

⁵¹ Orlinsky, "Vorlage of Joshua," 194.

“justice of his omissions.”⁵² The other theory regarding the translator was the assumption that he possessed a simplistic agenda driven mainly by offense at certain elements of the text. Gustav Bickell argued that the translator objected to the Hebrew text’s anthropomorphisms and anthropopathisms.⁵³ Bickell’s overall impression that “the translator paraphrased, changed, deleted and added whenever he deemed it necessary or was in the mood,” lacking a method worthy of study, was echoed by subsequent literature.⁵⁴

Newer, more complex theories about the translator’s worldview developed. Henry Gehman developed the theory of an “Alexandrian school” of which the translator of LXX-Job was a part.⁵⁵ Though Donald H. Gard does not depend on placing the translator in a “school” of translation, stating that “[t]he hermeneutical method followed in G is a broad and general one which is not bound by fixed rules or by a rigid system,” elsewhere he explains that “[t]he differences [between the MT and LXX] are due rather to a tendency on the part of the Greek translator to introduce a theological point of view.”⁵⁶

Recent approaches begin by recognizing the translator’s independent agenda.⁵⁷ The error of previous scholarship was not a lack of evidence but the selective way in which it was interpreted:

The majority of Bible commentators, sometimes even those specializing in the textual criticism of the Book [of Job], ignore for the most part such instances [of the Greek differing from the Hebrew when the latter presents no difficulty] or at

⁵² Cheyne, “The Text of Job,” 143.

⁵³ Bickell, *De indole*, 5,12; H.M. Orlinsky, “Studies in the Septuagint of the Book of Job,” *HUCA* 29 (1957): 58–60.

⁵⁴ Orlinsky, “Studies I,” 59; Cox, “Job,” 394. LXX-Job’s putative anti-anthropomorphism was refuted by Harry M. Orlinsky in a series of articles in *HUCA*.

⁵⁵ Gehman, “The Theological Approach,” 239.

⁵⁶ Gard, “Job’s Character,” 186; Gard, “The Future Life,” 143.

⁵⁷ Witte, “The Greek Book of Job,” 36. Emphasis added.

best pass over them with comments like ‘paraphrase’ and ‘loose rendering’.⁵⁸

The current consensus regarding the Hebrew archetype of LXX-Job is that it was largely similar to the extant MT. From this comes the inevitable conclusion that most changes are attributable to the translator. Much of scholarship has cataloged many of these changes, but the bigger project—discerning the translator’s motivations for these changes—is still underway.

Two previous articles have explored the topic of the bestiary of LXX-Job. David Bertrand, in “Le bestiaire de Job,” offers an annotated catalog of animals from the Greek versions (Old Greek, Theodotion [Θ’], Aquila [α’], Symmachus [σ’]), the Masoretic text, and the Latin versions (Vulgate and Old Latin).⁵⁹ Bertrand points out the unity of the book’s bestiary, emphasizing that the translator’s unusual approach is more coherent and understandable than it first appears.⁶⁰ The translation articulates a concentric vision of the world where the distinctions between the animals is based on their proximity to humans.⁶¹

Despite the usefulness of his contribution to the study of LXX-Job’s bestiary, several flaws limit the application of Bertrand’s conclusions. Even though the various Greek and Latin translations are similar, covering so many different translations in the space of an article severely hampers the ability to explain the unique nature of each. The

⁵⁸ H. M. Orlinsky, “Some Corruptions in the Greek Text of Job,” *JQR* 26 (1935–36): 134.

⁵⁹ Daniel Bertrand, “Le bestiaire de Job. Notes sur les versions grecques et latines. Index des noms des animaux,” in *Le livre de Job chez les Pères* (ed. Pierre Maraval; Strasbourg: Centre d’Analyse et de Documentation Patristiques, 1996).

⁶⁰ Bertrand, “Le bestiaire de Job,” 257.

⁶¹ “Distributed around man, the axis of the poem, [the animals] progress, it could be said, from four concentric zones: there are, first, proximate domestic animals (camels or herds of donkeys); then, remotely, the wild animals (lionesses or ostriches of the desert); then, beyond, the extreme animals (sirens or unicorns of the terrestrial confines); finally, even further, the cosmic animals (Dragon or Sea Monster) of the world inaccessible to mortals” (Bertrand, “Le bestiaire de Job,” 258; translation mine).

diffuse nature of the article makes it difficult to extend its purpose beyond cataloging the differences and making general observations. His material would also benefit from interaction with scholarship on the Hebrew text, since the reader is not informed as to whether his conclusions differ from the scholarly consensus or reinforce it.

Mario Cimosà and Gillian Bonney's article, "Job LXX and the Animals. The Mystery of God in Nature," though ostensibly "concerned with the way in which the Hellenistic culture...re-elaborated [Wisdom] literature," focuses primarily on the translation of Behemoth and Leviathan in LXX-Job.⁶² Like Bertrand, they recognize that the book "teem[s] with animals" of all kinds.⁶³ Material integrated from MT Job scholarship brings context to their conclusions. They draw out Behemoth's primordial dimensions by focusing on the presence of ἀρχή ("beginning"), πλάσμα ("formed"), and τάρταρος ("Tartarus") in its description.⁶⁴ Greek terminology used by the translator is given its literary context.⁶⁵ For the authors, Behemoth is "a brutal beast of immense strength and the description of his strength in [Job 40:16], specifically alludes to his sexual vigour. Even he has to contend with the violence of the river's current but he overcomes it."⁶⁶ Most of the article highlights New Testament parallels and the repeated vocabulary from Behemoth's description.⁶⁷ Their comments on Leviathan are shorter and of more limited use, though they also do describe the connection of the δράκων ("dragon") to the Hebrew *tannin* and the crocodile.⁶⁸

⁶² Mario Cimosà and Gillian Bonney, "Job LXX and the Animals. The Mystery of God in Nature," in *La cultura scientifico-naturalistica nei Padri della Chiesa, I-V sec.: XXXV Incontro di studiosi dell'antichità cristiana, 4-6 maggio 2006* (Rome: Institutum patristicum Augustinianum, 2007), 25.

⁶³ Cimosà, "Job LXX and the Animals," 29.

⁶⁴ Cimosà, "Job LXX and the Animals," 30.

⁶⁵ Cimosà, "Job LXX and the Animals," 30–1.

⁶⁶ Cimosà, "Job LXX and the Animals," 33.

⁶⁷ Cimosà, "Job LXX and the Animals," 34–6.

⁶⁸ Cimosà, "Job LXX and the Animals," 37.

However, their comments on the text are sometimes insufficient. For example, after the description of Leviathan in Job 41:15–22, they merely state that “[t]hese verses [...] give a minute description of the physical aspects of the beast,” without discussing its details further.⁶⁹ Various intertextual connections between Behemoth and Leviathan are unexplained and unexplored. Occasionally, it is unclear whether the comment concerns the Greek text or the Hebrew passage.

Bertrand, Cimoso, and Bonney have been instrumental in drawing out the translation’s understanding of the animal world of Job and thus the mindset of the translator. Bertrand’s exhaustive catalog of creatures and their Greek equivalents and his textual notes lay much of the necessary groundwork for establishing the contours of the topic to be covered. Bonney and Cimoso, too, present a useful model for similar inquiries.

H. Methodology

Thanks to the work of previous scholars, we do not enter into our analysis bereft of a framework for delving into the text of LXX-Job. There are several assumptions that can be made from the start.

First, despite the early ambiguity from early scholars such as Orlinsky or Cheyne, we can assume that the *Vorlage* for LXX-Job was close to the extant Hebrew text of Job. No evidence has been rallied for such a heavily-abridged version of the Hebrew, as with the confirmation of LXX-Jeremiah’s *Vorlage* by the Dead Sea Scrolls.⁷⁰ Early theories relied upon shaky standards, claiming that the manuscript was “badly-written” or that the

⁶⁹ Cimoso, “Job LXX and the Animals,” 37.

⁷⁰ Armin Lange, “Texts of Jeremiah in the Qumran Library,” in *The Book of Jeremiah: Composition, Reception, and Interpretation* (Jack R. Lundbaum, et al., eds.; Leiden: Brill, 2018), 281.

translator was unable to read it (in general, rather than relying upon specific examples). With increasing understanding that the LXX translators were not stenographers but more independently-minded, the basic assumption remains that any base text is, unless otherwise proven, similar to the extant MT.

Secondly, the coherence of the translator's vision is a presupposition. From Orinsky's time onward, the assumption has held strong that the translator made deliberate changes to the text for his own personal reasons. The purposes were obscure and frequently misunderstood—from being allegedly anti-anthropomorphic to being a slave to his "theology"—but the translator's freedom has been largely presupposed by analysts.

Thirdly, the translator is generally consistent. Without consistency, thoroughgoing analysis would not be possible. But from his small particles to his larger choices, the translator is understood to be a "big-picture" translator. Aside from some early assumptions of arbitrary changes or externally-motivated ones (say, due to boredom), LXX-Job's translator fits into the milieu of LXX translators, whose translation techniques are different from modern translators but are still valid approaches to the text itself.

Fourthly, the exploration of the translator's specific attitudes toward the text are just barely beginning. Much of the scholarship has focused on macro-level, determining the framework with which the text can be analyzed. Cox, Gorea, Cimosà & Bonney, and Bertrand have all been instrumental in explicating specific features of the text. Further studies are doubtless in progress.

I. This Dissertation

To integrate these advancements, my methodology will be twofold, based in the Hebrew text and the Greek text. The first half is focused on the Hebrew text because the translation is grounded in Job's Hebrew text. Because of the focus on patterns in the Greek translation, we will explore the Hebrew text's own patterns, particularly exploring the diversity of the animals in the original text, organized in terms of the speakers in the text. We will illustrate the challenges faced by the translator in translating this universe of terminology. The second half focuses on the Greek translation. These chapters are organized to display the translator's multifaceted approach to his translation, ranging from exact translations to his various near-equivalents and creative substitutions.

This method avoids some of the problems latent in previous attempts. It takes the Hebrew text as normative for the shape of the LXX translation; it also assumes the Hebrew text exercises control over the features of the text. From these "independent" moments, in which the translator's own creativity is established, the further assumption is that he continued to aim toward a readable text. Only when all other options are exhausted is a more abstract reason presented. By utilizing a measured approach, and always keeping the Hebrew text in view, we can avoid solutions that are too fanciful; but, on the other hand, the translator's toolkit is considered complex and sophisticated, not simple-minded or slavish.

This dissertation will highlight the varied methods with which the LXX-Job translator translated the animals from the original text, discussing his possible rationale, context, and motivations for these changes. Chapter 2 is an analysis of the Hebrew text of Job. The purpose of this chapter is various. First, and most obviously, it lays out a

standard of comparison for all the subsequent chapters, exploring the animals that are in the Hebrew text. Structurally, this chapter examines animals grouped according to the speaker in the narrative, beginning with the narrator and moving through Job, the Three Friends, Elihu, and finally, God. For each speaker, I look at the animals used and the contexts in which they are used. The purpose of this material in the context of the dissertation is to outline possible opportunities and challenges to the LXX translator.

Chapters 2, 3, and 4 are all focused on the LXX text itself. Chapter 2 focuses on vocabulary-level differences between the Hebrew and Greek texts, the “positive” technique. Although some of the words chosen by the translator are exact correspondences, the majority require some degree of adjustment to fit the target language, Greek. Beyond fine-tuning for grammatical reasons, the translator needs to depend upon *near equivalents* and *creative substitutions*. “Near equivalents” are terms in the same semantic sphere of the original term, while “creative substitutions” are terms that do not seem to reflect the term that they are translating. Creative substitutions are drawn primarily from two sources: Greek biblical translations and secular Greek literature.

Chapter 3 applies the same “positive” paradigm to longer passages. This chapter highlights how he used the tools outlined in specific vocabulary to deepen the implications of the passage, redirect or tighten biblical references, introduce new references to non-biblical material, and made stylistic and aesthetic adjustments. No broad patterns appear amongst this material, implying a careful, albeit eclectic, approach to long passages. In other words, changing the material beyond vocabulary seems to be something the translator is reticent to do.

Chapter 4 highlights the “negative” technique, in which the translator eliminates material in order to shape it. In contrast with the technique described in chapters 4 and 5, the eliminative technique was used extensively by the translator. I surmise that this is because it is actually a technique that conserves the contours of the original text; it is, therefore, an inherently conservative technique. Despite this conservative bent, its flexible application in LXX-Job is rather noteworthy and speaks to the translator’s ingenuity. Through elimination, the translator is able to take ownership of the translation. It is through this technique that the translator fully comes into his own.

Chapter 5 is the capstone of this dissertation. Three trends are spelled out. First, elimination is the primary tool to accomplish the translator’s ends. Secondly, the translator is uninterested in associating wisdom and animals, making sometimes drastic moves to widen the gap between them. Finally, despite some protestations to the contrary, the translator is comfortable with the original text’s mythological undertones.

What this dissertation hopes to illustrate by its end is the complexity of the LXX-Job translator, by using one particular frame through which to view the text. His opinions on the text are more nuanced than usually credited; he seems to have a sense of balance, standing between changing the text, adding to it, and preserving it. He is comfortable with the various oddities in the text, including mythologies, but is far more worried about the nature of wisdom as a human, not animal, endeavor. His literary sense is operative, but never overwhelms his sense of propriety. Overall, the translator that emerges is not a man of contradiction, but one of even-handedness; one who is strong-willed and strongly opinionated, but not arbitrarily so.

CHAPTER I: THE HEBREW TEXT

A. Introduction

Animals in Job have both literal and symbolic meanings. Literal meanings describe the animal on a surface level. More prominent, however, are the symbolic qualities of the animals. Most are in the poetic section of the book (chs. 3–41). Each speaker in the book uses animal imagery in a different way, presenting different challenges to a potential translator. The narrator presents animals as “facts” in the story, lacking much symbolic valence. Job himself, meanwhile, draws from a bevy of different sources, ranging from his life experience to mythical creatures. The three friends – Eliphaz, Bildad, and Zophar – show more interest in creatures at the beginning than at the end, with the fourth, Elihu, nearly entirely lacking specific details. God, meanwhile, entirely reverses course and demonstrates a pair of speeches that are filled with animals.

This assortment presents several challenges to the LXX translator when approaching the text. Each group of speakers in the book has a character to their use of animals. This character is sometimes easy to see, as in most of the divine speeches at the end of the book, while others are more difficult to discern, especially when they are spread out amongst the arguments made by Job and his three (and eventually, four) friends. In this chapter, I will look at the character of each speaker’s use of animals: the narrator, Job, his three friends, Elihu, and finally, God. This sets up the contrast between the goals of the LXX translation and the original author’s tendencies.

B. The Narrator

Most of the animal content found in the narrative frame of the book (chapters 1–2, 42) is relatively straightforward. Since much of this is expository material, its purpose is simple. Animals lack multiple layers of symbolism: they appear in the narrative referring to the animals they describe.

Job’s holdings at the beginning and end of the book are prime examples: sheep (צֹאן), camels (גְּמָלִים), oxen (בָּקָר), and she-asses (אֲתוֹן).⁷¹ For instance, Job 1:3 records that Job owned “seven thousand sheep” (שֶׁבַע עָלְפֵי-צֹאן). צֹאן can reference flocks collectively, sheep and goats together, or sheep individually.⁷² Here, they are clearly individual animals and not flocks, since the list already begins with a collective noun (“possessions,” מְקַנָּה [1:3]).⁷³ By way of comparison, Nabal is called “a very great man” (1 Sam 25:2), yet he only owns four thousand sheep and goats together.⁷⁴ At Job 1:16, however, a servant reports that he has lost them: “The fire of God fell from heaven and burned up the sheep and the servants, and consumed them; I alone have escaped to tell you” (אֵשׁ אֱלֹהִים נִפְלְאָה מִן-הַשָּׁמַיִם וַתִּבְעַר בְּצֹאן וּבְנַעֲרָיִם וַתֹּאכְלֶנּוּ וְאִמְלִטָה רַק-אֲנִי לְבַדִּי לְהַגִּיד לְךָ).⁷⁵ At

⁷¹ David J.A. Clines, *Job 1–20* (WBC 17; Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1989), 14. “His possessions were” (וַיְהִי מְקַנָּהוּ) begins a list with the number of the animals in Job’s possession. Most modern translations of the verse use “possessions” or a similar formulation. Gray and Driver translate the entire phrase as “his cattle came to be...” to indicate Job’s growth in possessions from his lowly beginnings to the numbers that follow to demonstrate his divine blessing.

⁷² Driver and Gray, *Job*, 5. Nowhere is it used collectively with an exact number, without some other term to accompany it: Gen 29:2, for instance, removes the ambiguity by inserting עֶדְרָה, “flock” alongside צֹאן: “As [Jacob] looked, he saw a well in the field and three flocks of sheep [שְׁלֹשָׁה עֶדְרֵי-צֹאן] lying there beside it.”

⁷³ All biblical translations from Hebrew are taken from the NRSV, unless otherwise indicated. Although מְקַנָּה on its own usually indicates bovines, here it introduces the possessions of the indicated person or group, as at Gen 26:14: “He had possessions of flocks (מְקַנָּה-צֹאן) and [possessions of] herds (מְקַנָּה בָּקָר).”

⁷⁴ Driver and Gray, *Job*, 5.

⁷⁵ “Fire of God” (אֵשׁ אֱלֹהִים), or “great fire,” is supernaturally-strong lightning (Robert Alter, *The Wisdom Books: Job, Proverbs, and Ecclesiastes: A Translation with Commentary* [New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2010]; Edouard Dhorme, *A Commentary on the Book of Job* [trans. Harold Knight; London: Nelson, 1967], 10; Driver and Gray, *Job*, 17). Despite the use of אֱלֹהִים, there is no implication that God played a direct role in the disaster; rather, אֱלֹהִים is adjectival and the frame narrative implicates Satan (D. Winton Thomas, “A Consideration of Some Unusual Ways of Expressing the Superlative in Hebrew,” *VT* 3

the end of the story, this is doubled to “fourteen thousand sheep” (אַרְבָּעָה עָשָׂר אֲלֶף צֹאן), 42:12), because “the Lord restored the fortunes of Job when he had prayed for his friends; and the Lord gave Job twice as much as he had before” (וַיְהִי וַיָּשָׁב אֶת־שִׁבְיַת אִיּוֹב בְּהִתְפַּלְלוֹ בְּעַד (42:10). רַעְיָהוּ וַיִּסְּף יְהוָה אֶת־כָּל־אֲשֶׁר לְאִיּוֹב לַמְּשֻׁנָּה

The pattern repeats for his other animals. He owns “three thousand camels” (שְׁלֹשָׁת אֲלָפֵי גַמְלִים), Job 1:3), whose presence indicates the setting is during the time of the patriarchs.⁷⁶ He loses them at Job 1:17 and regains twice the number (six thousand) at 42:12.⁷⁷ Job owns “five hundred yoke of oxen” at the beginning (חֲמִשׁ מֵאוֹת צִמְד־בָּקָר), Job 1:3) and doubled to “one thousand yoke of oxen” (אֶלְפֵי־צִמְד בָּקָר).⁷⁸ Although the list does not include Job’s lands, the oxen, which are draught animals, are a proxy.⁷⁹ They perish in Job 1:14–15.⁸⁰ “Five hundred she-asses” (חֲמִשׁ מֵאוֹת אֶתְרוֹנוֹת), Job 1:3) are the last of Job’s possessions mentioned in the text.⁸¹ Job eventually gets “one thousand she-asses” (אֲלֶף

[Jul. 1953]: 210; Clines, *Job 1–20*, 32; Driver and Gray, *Job*, 17).

⁷⁶ A “chief wealth of the nomad,” the camel (גַּמְלָה) is especially frequent in the stories of the patriarchs (Dhorme, *Job*, 3; Clines, *Job 1–20*, 14). Half the appearances of the camel in the Hebrew Bible (22 of 54) are in Genesis; the highest concentration is in Gen 24, the meeting and subsequent marriage of Isaac and Rebekah.

⁷⁷ “The Chaldeans formed three columns, made a raid on the camels and carried them off, and killed the servants with the edge of the sword; I alone have escaped to tell you” (עוֹד זֶה מְדַבֵּר וְזֶה בָּא וַיֹּאמֶר כְּשָׂדִים שָׁמוּ (Job 1:17) שְׁלֹשָׁה רְאשִׁים וַיִּפְשְׁטוּ עַל־הַגַּמְלִים וַיִּקְחוּם וְאֶת־הַנְּעָרִים הֵכִיפוּ לְפִי־חֶרֶב וְאִמְלִטָה רַק־אֲנִי לְבָדִי לְהַגִּיד לָךְ:

⁷⁸ בָּקָר refers to cattle or herds of cows or oxen (HALOT, s.v. בָּקָר).

⁷⁹ Driver and Gray, *Job*, 5

⁸⁰ “The oxen were ploughing, and the donkeys were feeding beside them and the Sabeans fell on them and carried them off and killed the servants with the edge of the sword; I alone have escaped to tell you” (הַבָּקָר הָיָה חֹרְשׁוֹת וְהָאֶתְרוֹנוֹת רְעוּת עַל־יְדֵיהֶם: וַתִּפֹּל שָׂבְאָה וַתִּקְחוּם וְאֶת־הַנְּעָרִים הֵכִיפוּ לְפִי־חֶרֶב וְאִמְלִטָה רַק־אֲנִי לְבָדִי לְהַגִּיד לָךְ: Although unmodified by “yoke,” צִמְד, the הַבָּקָר in this passage are the previously-mentioned “yokes of oxen.” The unusual feminine חֹרְשׁוֹת, “plowing,” has led some to indicate that Tema plowed with cows rather than oxen, strengthened by the connection in Job between Sabeans and Tema (Job 6:19) (Marvin H. Pope, *Job* [Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1985], 12; Ernst Axel Knauf, “Tema (Place),” in *Anchor Bible Dictionary*, 6:8641–3). Daniel Bertrand prefers “cow” (*vache*) based upon the feminine direct objects (“Le bestiaire de Job,” 220). “Oxen” (בָּקָר), however, can refer to males and females together. Furthermore, the feminine is not uniform, since עַל־יְדֵיהֶם, “beside them [that is, the oxen],” contains a masculine direct object (Dhorme, *Job*, 9).

⁸¹ אֶתְרוֹן refers to a female donkey, or “she-ass.” She-asses are mentioned because a much smaller number of males would be needed for breeding purposes (Pope, *Job*, 7; Clines, *Job 1–20*, 14). Its value lay mostly in its “milk and fecundity,” as well as being better for riding purposes (Dhorme, *Job*, 3; Pope, *Job*, 7; Clines, *Job 1–20*, 14).

Job's dour evaluation of humanity is usually more abstract. He sometimes uses animals to replace human relationships to illustrate his loneliness. At Job 17:14–15, he places himself in the role of being a “son” of a “maggot” (רִמָּה) to illustrate his despondency: “[I]f I say to the Pit, ‘You are my father,’ and to the worm, ‘My mother,’ or ‘My sister,’ where then is my hope? Who will see my hope?” (לִשְׁחַת קָרָאתִי אָבִי אֶתְּהָ אָמִי) (וְאַחֲתִי לְרִמָּה: וְאִנִּי אֶפֶס תִּקְנֹתִי וְתִקְנֹתִי מִי לְשִׁירָהּ). This perverted relationship is unique to Job, which already contains the largest concentration of the word.⁸⁵

A similarly broken relationship appears later in the book. He refers to the jackal (תָּן) and ostrich (בְּנוֹת יַעֲנָה), a common biblical pair, as his only friends at Job 30:29: “I am a brother of jackals and a companion of ostriches” (אָחַי הֵייתִי לְתַנִּים וְרֵעַ לְבְנוֹת יַעֲנָה).⁸⁶ As Norman Habel points out, the verse underscores the damage to his relationship that these debates have had with his former friends. He is alone with only the sympathies of nature as he calls out fruitlessly to God for a confrontation.⁸⁷ Although traditionally translated “ostrich,” בְּנוֹת יַעֲנָה (lit. “daughter of greed” or “the daughter of the wilderness”) is disputed.⁸⁸ Instead of the ostrich, the term might refer to the eagle owl, a common desert owl that dwells amongst mountain sides or ruins. The Peshitta translates the same word at Mic 1:8 as *bat yârôrâ* “daughter of the vomiter,” which best describes the habits of an owl, vomiting up pellets after meals.⁸⁹ As I will demonstrate later, the LXX translator was indeed confused by this bizarre pair—along with most other LXX translators.

⁸⁵ Hatch and Redpath, *Concordance*, s.v. רִמָּה.

⁸⁶ “Jackal” (תָּן) is occasionally confused with תַּנִּין, “sea monster,” as in Vg (*frater fui draconum*) and KJV (“I am a brother to dragons”).

⁸⁷ “‘Only the Jackal Is My Friend’: On Friends and Redeemers in Job,” *Interpretation* 31.3 (1977): 236.

⁸⁸ G.R. Driver, “Birds in the Old Testament II: Birds in Life,” *PEQ* 87 (1955): 12.

⁸⁹ Driver, “Birds in Life,” 13.

Throughout the book, the primary focus of Job's anger is the wicked, which he claims are not only avoiding punishment but reaping rewards. He uses a variety of animals to illustrate this. The maggot, previously used to discuss the lowly state to which he was cast, he recycles to angrily condemn the wicked man's lack of punishment at Job 21:26: "They [both the prosperous and destitute] lie down alike in the dust, and the worms cover them" (יָחַד עַל-עֶפֶר יִשְׁכְּבוּ וְרִמָּה תִכְסֶּה עֲלֵיהֶם). However, he then reverses the sentiment at 24:20: "The womb forgets them; the worm finds them sweet; they are no longer remembered; so wickedness is broken like a tree" (יִשְׁכַּחְהוּ רְחֵם | מְתִקּוֹ רִמָּה עוֹד לֹא-). Job's unexpected reversal lends credence to the idea that the speech as been confused in its transmission. Some, following the LXX, change all the verbs to jussives.⁹⁰ Clines assigns the verses to Zophar.⁹¹ In either case, however, the worm is a shorthand for mortal decay.⁹²

Job mockingly highlights the prosperity of the wicked, comparing their fecundity with "sheep" (צֹאן) at Job 21:11: "They send out their little ones like a flock, and their children dance around" (יִשְׁלַחוּ כְצֹאן עֹוִלֵיהֶם וְיִלְדֵיהֶם יִרְקְדוּן). Emphasis on the wicked men's children, especially in comparison to a "flock" (כְצֹאן), plays upon the connection between fecundity and God's blessing, as well as their happiness.⁹³ Here, Job takes an animal that he had owned and uses it as a point of comparison with the proliferation of wicked men. The successful offspring of the bull (שׁוֹר) and cow (פָּרָה), at Job 21:10, emphasizes the

⁹⁰ Wolfers, "Speech-Cycles," 386.

⁹¹ David J.A. Clines, *Job 21–37* (WBC 18A; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2006), 667.

⁹² "The worm finds them sweet" (מְתִקּוֹ רִמָּה) contains some complexity, not merely due to the unusual but not unknown mismatch between the feminine "worm" and the masculine direct object on the verb. Instead, the action ascribed to the worm is unusual and unclear: מְתִק normally means "to be sweet," not any direct idea of consumption (Clines, *Job 21–37*, 656). KJV combines the implication and the vocabulary and may better represent the duality of the Hebrew: "shall feed sweetly on him."

⁹³ Clines, *Job 21–37*, 526.

same point: “Their bull breeds without fail; their cow calves and never miscarries” (שׁוֹרָו) (עֵבֶר וְלֹא יִגְעַל תִּפְלֹט פִּרְתּוֹ וְלֹא תִשְׁכַּל). The wicked, far from experiencing reproof from God, often prosper. שׁוֹר refers to a bovid, without specific reference to sex, but is more often a male ox than a female cow.⁹⁴ Even though it does not imply sex, the context makes it clear that it is male here, being set in parallel with פָּרָה, “cow.” Male bulls impregnate and cows give birth. Although neither animal was noted in the opening frame narrative, it is likely that Job would have had experience with both.

He further describes the habits of the wicked, who exploit the orphan (יְתוֹם) and widow (אַלְמָנָה), two groups considered particularly vulnerable to exploitation: “They [the wicked] drive away the donkey of the orphan; they take the widow’s ox for a pledge” (תָּמֹר יְתוֹמִים יְנַהֲגוּ יְחַבְּלוּ שׁוֹר אַלְמָנָה) (Job 24:3).⁹⁵ The ass (תָּמֹר) in this passage is the male counterpart of the she-ass (אֲתוֹן) of the frame narrative.⁹⁶ Its specification as a he-ass highlights the meagerness of their possession: the male ass cannot produce milk like the female as was therefore less valuable.⁹⁷ The wicked men were in a position more like Job, owning large numbers of valuable livestock; taking the livestock of the impoverished is an unnecessarily cruel move.

At Job 30:1, Job expresses that he would not trust his friends’ fathers with his sheep dogs (כְּלָבֵי צֹאנִי): “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” (וְעַתָּה אֲשַׁחֲקוּ עָלַי) (כְּלָבֵי צֹאנִי). Comparison with a dog (כְּלָבֵי) in

⁹⁴ HALOT, s.v. שׁוֹר.

⁹⁵ F. Charles Fensham, “Widow, Orphan, and the Poor in Ancient Near Eastern Legal and Wisdom Literature,” *JNES* 21.2 (1962): 129; Richard D. Patterson, “The Widow, Orphan, and the Poor in the Old Testament and the Extra-Biblical Literature,” *Bibliotheca Sacra* 130 (July 1973): 228; Cyril S. Rodd, “The Family in the Old Testament,” *The Bible Translator* 18.1 (1967): 26.

⁹⁶ HALOT, s.v. תָּמֹר.

⁹⁷ Pope, *Job*, 7.

many instances was an insult.⁹⁸ This usually refers to feral dogs that had no role in the speaker's life.⁹⁹ "Sheep dogs" were noteworthy for their loyalty and efficiency, working in pairs to help the shepherd and guide the flock.¹⁰⁰ Herding was impossible without them: they often had to face animals such as wolves, hyenas, wild dogs, and other beasts.¹⁰¹ Dogs of all sorts, including sheep-dogs, have been buried in a manner that suggests an emotional attachment.¹⁰² However, "it would be extremely difficult to prove such relationships" that transcended their duties.¹⁰³ In either case, the comparison of people to dogs—whether Job trusted his dogs more than those men, or whether worse than dogs—is insulting.

Job angrily uses animals as a self-image to highlight what he believes to be God's attitude toward him. The lion appears at Job 10:16, where Job is responding to Bildad's assertions by speaking past his friend to challenge God directly: "Bold as a lion you hunt me; you repeat your exploits against me" (וַיִּגָּאֶה כַּשֹּׁמֵל תִּצְוֶדְנִי וְתִשָּׁב תַּתְּפֹּלְאֵי-בִי).¹⁰⁴ "Hunt" (צִוֶּד) strongly suggests violence, and the violent imagery illustrates how Job sees his situation. The lion was a commonly-featured animal in ancient Israel and appears throughout Scripture, usually in a metaphorical way.

⁹⁸ D. Winton Thomas, "Kelebh 'Dog': Its Origin and Some Usages of It in the Old Testament," *VT* 10, Fasc. 4 (Oct 1960): 427.

⁹⁹ Geoffrey David Miller, "Attitudes Toward Dogs in Ancient Israel: A Reassessment," *JSOT* 32.4 (2008): 500.

¹⁰⁰ Miller, "Attitudes Toward Dogs," 489–90; Joshua Schwartz, "Dogs in Jewish Society in the Second Temple Period and in the Time of the Mishnah and Talmud," *JJS* 55.2 (September 2004): 256.

¹⁰¹ Schwartz, "Dogs in Jewish Society," 255.

¹⁰² Miller, "Attitudes Toward Dogs," 493.

¹⁰³ Schwartz, "Dogs in Jewish Society," 266.

¹⁰⁴ Several grammatical issues in the verse prompt proposals to delete: "Not improbably 16a is out of place [...] the presence of which is the cause of an apparent tristich" (Driver and Gray, *Job*, 102). Others emend to first-person וָאֲנִי, "(if) I am proud..." Still others, who wish to keep the third-person singular of the verb, make the implied subject "my head," invoking the similar phrase in the previous verse (לֹא-אֶשָּׂא רֹאשִׁי, "I shall not lift up my head") (Driver and Gray, *Job*, 102).

The mythological creature “Rahab” (רָהַב) appears in Job to demonstrate God’s primeval power. “Rahab” refers to a mythical creature, but curiously has no parallels in wider Semitic literature.¹⁰⁵ It appears that it was an ancient foe of God’s who was either “chopped into pieces” (חָצַב, Isa 51:9) or “crushed” (דָּכָא, Ps 89:11). It is also identified with “the dragon” (תַּנִּינִן, Isa 51:9). Both passages are typical of the *Chaoskampf* motif, either discussing the foundation of the world (Ps 89:11) or the crossing of the sea (Isa 51:9).¹⁰⁶ John Day also notes that some have supposed, though without much evidence, that it is a female monster.¹⁰⁷ At Job 9:13, Job accuses God of stonewalling him and treating him like an agent of chaos: “God will not turn back his anger; the helpers of Rahab bowed beneath him” (אֱלֹהֵהּ לֹא-יָשִׁיב אַפּוֹ תַחְתּוֹ שְׂקָחוּ עֲזָרֵי רָהַב). One difference between the other biblical passages involving Rahab is that it is destroyed there but here its “helpers” are “bowed down” (שְׂקָחוּ).¹⁰⁸ Hermann Gunkel theorizes upon the otherwise mysterious helpers, noting that Tiamat is also said to have “helpers” of its own, and described at length in the *Enuma elis*.¹⁰⁹ Likewise, Job describes how God “stilled the Sea” and “struck down Rahab by his understanding” (בָּכַחוּ רִגְעֵהֶם וּבְתוֹכְבָּנָתוֹ מָחַץ רָהַב), Job 26:12). Rahab’s presumptive mythological background is further reinforced here, as the content clearly alludes to a primeval event in which God demonstrated the strength of “understanding” and “power” by defeating Rahab. It also therefore illustrates the

¹⁰⁵ K. Spronk, “Rahab” in *Dictionary of Demons and Deities of the Bible* (Pieter Willem van der Horst, Bob Becking, Karel van der Toorn, eds.; 2nd ed.; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1999), 684. Although often identified with Tiamat and Leviathan, Rahab’s radically different name suggests separate origins. Media *h* militates against the possibility that it is an Akkadian loan word and although likely Canaanite, its absence from Ugaritic texts means that it originates from a different time and place.

¹⁰⁶ Jeremy M. Hutton, “Isaiah 51:9–11 and the Rhetorical Appropriation and Subversion of Hostile Theologies,” *JBL* 126, No. 2 (Summer, 2007): 282–3n50.

¹⁰⁷ John Day, *God’s Conflict with the Dragon and the Sea: Echoes of a Canaanite Myth in the Old Testament* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 6–7.

¹⁰⁸ Hermann Gunkel, *Schöpfung Und Chaos In Urzeit Und Endzeit: Eine Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung Über Gen 1 Und Ap Joh 12* (Göttingen: Vanderhoeft & Ruprecht, 1895), 38.

¹⁰⁹ *Schöpfung Und Chaos*, 38; see also Spronk, “Rahab,” 685.

subservience of Rahab in relation to God. Rahab's rarity in the Hebrew Bible obscures the precise meaning of the allusion given by Job, but its context provides some general guidance.

One creature placed in parallel with Rahab, which helps later authors puzzle out its original meaning, is the נָחָשׁ, "serpent." Job 26:13 talks about the "fleeing serpent" (נָחָשׁ בָּרִיחַ): "By his wind the heavens were made fair; his hand pierced the fleeing serpent" (בְּרוּחוֹ שָׁמַיִם שָׁפָרָה הִלְלָה יָדוֹ נִתְּשׁ בָּרִיחַ).¹¹⁰ This phrase is found parallel to Leviathan at Isa 27:1, where the Lord "will punish Leviathan the fleeing serpent, Leviathan the twisting serpent" (וְהִחַזְקָה עַל לִוְיָתָן נִתְּשׁ בָּרִיחַ וְעַל לִוְיָתָן נִתְּשׁ עֲקָלְתָוּן). The Isaiah parallel indicates that the "twisting serpent" alludes to a preexisting story and has nearly exact verbal parallel to the dragon Lotan in Ugaritic mythology.¹¹¹ Most commentators connect the term בָּרִיחַ to the root בָּרַח, "to flee," and translate as they do in Isa 27:1, "the fleeing serpent." Others have extended the term into metaphorical realms as a parallel to "twisted" in Isa 27:1, implying moral twistedness. The use of בָּרִיחַ to accompany נָחָשׁ, alongside the Isaiah parallel, makes it clear that Bildad is talking about a primeval event that illustrates God's ultimate control over the order of the world from its very foundation.¹¹²

Unlike Rahab, "sea monster" (תַּנִּינִי) has a stronger pedigree in the biblical text, appearing, for instance, in God's creation of the world in Gen 1:21. In the book of Job, it appears at 7:12, where Job is lamenting how he feels "guarded": "Am I the Sea, or the Dragon, that you set a guard over me?" (הֲגַם־אֲנִי אִם־תַּנִּינִי כִּי־תִשָּׂם עָלַי מִשְׁמָר) (תַּנִּינִי is set in

¹¹⁰ HALOT, s.v. נָחָשׁ I.

¹¹¹ Jakob H. Grønbaek, "Baal's Battle With Yam—a Canaanite Creation Fight," *JSOT* 33 (1985): 31.

¹¹² Clines, *Job 21–37*, 625.

parallel with “The Sea” (יָם), a possible allusion to the dragon Tiamat that was closely aligned with the primeval abyss.¹¹³ Its linguistic origins are disputed, but the primary linguistic avenue of interest to scholars is the Ugaritic corpus. In several instances, the Ugaritic equivalent of *tnn* is used to talk about a primeval battle that was undertaken by Anat or other gods. Its appearance in biblical texts is a combination of demythologized material and historical material.¹¹⁴

The evaluation of the natural world and its creatures is not uniformly positive. He does seem to believe that the natural world often fails finding wisdom. “Bird of prey” (עֵיט) is a generic term that encompasses an entire class of carnivorous birds and is used both generically and specifically to mean individual birds in the category.¹¹⁵ It appears, along with falcon (אֵיבָה), at Job 28:7: “That path no bird of prey knows, and the falcon’s eye has not seen it” (נִתְיַב לֹא יִדְעוּ עֵיט וְלֹא שׁוֹפְתוּ עֵין אֵיבָה). In other words, even the sharp-sighted birds of prey fail to find wisdom.

The same issue appears for another set of animals. Explaining the difficulty in finding the path for wisdom, Job asserts (Job 28:8): “The sons of pride have not trodden it; the lion has not passed over it” (לֹא הִדְרִיגְהוּ בְנֵי־שָׁחַץ לֹא עָדָה עָלָיו שָׁחַץ).¹¹⁶ “Lion” (שָׁחַץ) is parallel with “sons of pride” (בְנֵי־שָׁחַץ), implying that both are carnivorous.¹¹⁷ More importantly, both are likely to be land animals, a suspicion further bolstered by the use of “trodden” (דָּרַךְ) and “passed over” (עָדָה), which are used referring to land movement.¹¹⁸

¹¹³ Driver and Gray, *Job*, 71.

¹¹⁴ G.C. Heider, “Tannin,” in *Dictionary of Demons and Deities in the Bible*, 834–5.

¹¹⁵ G.R. Driver, “Birds in the Old Testament I: Birds in Law,” *PEQ* 87 (1955): 5–6.

¹¹⁶ NRSV modified.

¹¹⁷ שָׁחַץ, “pride,” only appears in Job (HALOT, s.v. שָׁחַץ).

¹¹⁸ Scott Jones has raised the possibility that שָׁחַץ are serpents (or serpentine), drawing especially on its appearance at the end of the book (Job 41:34) (“Lions, Serpents, and Lion-Serpents,” *JBL* 130.4 (2011): 682). Most evidence establishes that שָׁחַץ regularly refers to lions, a fact that Jones himself admits (Jones, “Lions, Serpents, and Lion-Serpents,” 686). Furthermore, in this instance, the pattern established by 28:7

Animals have “raw” knowledge, but in this verse, they are not able to obtain true wisdom.¹¹⁹

Both sets of animals in this passage are unable to use their natural talents to “get wise.” The birds are metonyms for the world of “the heavens,” while the lions are metonyms for the land animals, excluding humans. The author points out the limitations of the natural world. Yet, paradoxically, the ignorance of the creatures is still presented as somehow more “inspired” than humankind’s own ignorance. The “king” over the “sons of pride” is not humanity, as one might assume, but the monstrous Leviathan (Job 41:26[34])!¹²⁰ More starkly, Job 12:7–8 makes clear that humanity must submit to the animals for knowledge: “Ask the animals, and they will teach you; the birds of the air, and they will tell you; ask the plants of the earth, and they will teach you; and the fish of the sea will declare to you” (וְאוֹלָם שְׂאֵל־נָא בְהִמּוֹת וְתַרְבֵּךְ וְעוֹף הַשָּׁמַיִם וְיַגְד־לְךָ: אֹר שֵׁים לְאַרְצֵךְ וְתַרְבֵּךְ (וְיִסְפְּרוּ לְךָ דְגַי הַיָּם:)). Although the animals have not yet achieved the status of “wise” creatures, Job states that the “hand of the Lord” (יַד־יְהוָה, 12:8) is obvious to even the creatures of the world, of the land (בְּהֵמוֹת, “cattle”), air (עוֹף הַשָּׁמַיִם, “birds of the air”), and sea (דְּגַי הַיָּם, “fish of the sea”).

The author also sometimes uses animals to describe human behavior in general.

At Job 6:5, Job speaks of his natural need to express his discontent, like an ox (שׂוֹר)

(“That path no bird of prey [עֵיט] knows, and the falcon’s [אַיָּה] eye has not seen it”) militates against this reading. There, the broad category in the first stich—עֵיט, which refers to all birds of prey—is narrowed to a specific species in the second, the falcon. By implication, בְּנֵי־שָׂחָף is the general category and שָׂחָף a specific instance, meaning בְּנֵי־שָׂחָף is a category of mammalian predators—not, as Jones purports, “serpents.” LXX and Targum both specify water creatures when they reappear at Job 41:26(34) (πάντων τῶν ἐν τοῖς ὕδασι, בני כוורי, extrapolating from the perception that Leviathan is aquatic (David J.A. Clines, *Job 38–42* [WBC 18B; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2017], 1176).

¹¹⁹ At Prov 26:13, the lion (אַרְיֵ/שָׂחָל) is used as an excuse for a lazy man (עָצֵל) to avoid working toward Wisdom: “The lazy person says, ‘There is a lion in the road! There is a lion in the streets!’” (אָמַר עָצֵל שָׂחָל (בְּהַרְבֵּי אָרֶץ אֲרִי בְּיַד הַרְחֻבוֹת).

¹²⁰ Clines, *Job 38–42*, 1201.

“lowing” or a wild ass (פָּרָא) “braying”: “Does the wild ass bray over its grass, or the ox low over its fodder?” (הֲיִנְהַק־פָּרָא עַל־דְּשָׂא אִם יִנְעָה־שׂוֹר עַל־בָּלִילֹו). Later, at Job 30:7, Job uses “bray” (נָהַק) to describe the sounds of indigent people that he had previously ignored, further cementing its use as social commentary on human actions.¹²¹ He also compares the swift passing of a human’s life to the movement of an eagle (נָשָׂר) at Job 9:26: “[My days] go by like skiffs of reed, like an eagle swooping on the prey” (תִּלְפֹו עַם־אֲנִיּוֹת אֶבֶה) (כְּנָשָׂר יְטוֹשׁ עַל־אֵכָל).¹²²

The one exception to Job’s uniformly negative understanding of the world is the one time he talks about the good works he used to perform. Specifically, at Job 31:20, he talks about how he “warmed” the poor with the “fleece of [his] sheep” (מִגֵּז כֶּבֶשׂי): “Whose loins have not blessed me, and who was not warmed with the fleece of my sheep” (אִם־לֹא אֶמְחַמָּם). Giving food to the hungry and clothing to the poor is a common biblical injunction for proper action; making Job heed this call speaks well of his virtue.¹²³ It also stands in contrast with what he earlier accused the wicked of doing to the poor and the widow (Job 24:3). Like the other creatures mentioned there, it is implied that he is drawing from his own experience.

It is not easy to characterize the diversity of creatures that Job draws upon for his diatribes. Some of them stem from his previous life experience as a wealthy nomad:

¹²¹ Kathryn Schifferdecker, *Out of the Whirlwind: Creation Theology in the Book of Job* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Theological Studies, 2011), 71.

¹²² נָשָׂר is variously translated as “eagle” or “vulture” depending upon the context. S.R. Driver contends that its primary sense is the vulture, and specifically mentions the griffon-vulture as a possibility (Driver, “Birds in Law I,” 8). Its characteristics match well with those of the נָשָׂר detailed in Scripture, such as cliff-dwelling, tremendous wingspan, bald patch, its habit of attacking soft parts of the body, and tendency to congregate rather than live a solitary life. He admits that the match with a vulture is not absolute and occasionally an eagle is meant, especially those passages that allude to its speed. He derives it from onomatopoeia, “sonant *n* prefixed to a basic *sr* representing a gleaming flash or rushing sound,” modeled upon the hunting habits of the bird of prey (Driver, “Birds in Law I,” 8).

¹²³ Clines, *Job 21–37*, 1023. Ezek 18:7; Isa 58:7; Prov 22:9, 25:21.

sheep (צֹאן), oxen (שׁוֹר), cattle (בְּהֵמֹת), ass (חֲמֹר), cow (פָּרָה), and sheep dogs (כְּלָבֵי צֹאן). These animals are not unusual in the biblical record. He also evokes wild animals, beyond those of his livestock, including “birds of the air” (עוֹף הַשָּׁמַיִם), “fish of the sea” (דְּגַי הַיָּם), birds of prey (עֵיט), falcon (אַיָּה), wild ass (פָּרָא), jackal (תָּן), and ostrich (בְּנוֹת יַעֲנָה). Most of these animals are common in the Hebrew Bible, carrying with them symbolic baggage. So too with the animals for which the nomad was on the lookout for to protect his holdings, both livestock and plants: lions (שִׁחַל) and maggots (רִמָּה). Both of these creatures are mostly found in Job and are a blend of symbolic animals and real-life threats. The most unique creatures that he mentions, however, are the mythological ones: Leviathan (לְוִיָּתָן), Rahab (רָהַב), the sea monster (תַּנִּינִן), and “the fleeing serpent” (נָחָשׁ פָּרִיחַ). These are primeval creatures, and rare in the wider biblical corpus. For a translator, they present a challenge.

D. Eliphaz

Eliphaz, the elder of the Three Friends, speaks three times in the book: Job 4–5, 15, and 22. Humans only last for a brief period on the earth, and his existence during that time is fragile and lowly. The moth (עֵשׂ) comments on man’s fragility. At Job 4:19, the comparison is explicit: “How much more [than his angels can he trust] those who live in houses of clay, whose foundation is in the dust, who are crushed like a moth” (אֲףִי שֶׁכֶּבֶדִּי). The presence of לְפָנַי (“before,” but here translated “like”) has caused consternation amongst commentators. James Rimbach argues that if translated “before” as לְפָנַי warrants, then the interpretation is that “the man is destroyed

by the onslaught of the moth.”¹²⁴ N. Herz changes the verse to read “they are crushed from before their Maker” (ידכאו מלפני עשה), drawing the concluding ם from the end of the following verse.¹²⁵ Rimbach reaches the same conclusion by a different route, focusing on the verse’s disproportionate scansion.¹²⁶

While these arguments are strong, concluding the meaninglessness of the original text is unconvincing. לִפְנֵי does occasionally have a comparative sense, as at Job 3:24 (“For like my food [לִפְנֵי לֶחְמִי] is my sighing”).¹²⁷ Furthermore, the moth elsewhere describes the frailty of man (Isa 50:9, 51:8, Job 13:28). Its hyperbolic nature is proper for Eliphaz’s speech, explaining how the fragile state of humankind can lead to “being crushed like a moth.”¹²⁸ Although translating לִפְנֵי-עַשׂ as “like a moth” is unusual, it would be incorrect to argue that the moth is inappropriate for Eliphaz’s metaphor. Job, the character, makes the same comparison at 13:28: “One wastes away like a rotten thing, like a garment that is moth-eaten” (וְהוּא כְרֻקָּב יִבְלֶה כְּבִגְדֵי אֲכָלוּ עֵשׂ).¹²⁹ Clines notes the parallel between Job 13:23–25 and Job 13:26–28: “The former strophe means ‘Why do you think I am your enemy when I am something so weak?’; the second, ‘Why do you take such close note of me when I am something so worn out and worthless?’”¹³⁰ Job also uses moths to attack the fragility of humankind’s works at 27:18: “They build their houses like a moth, like moths made by sentinels of the vineyard” (בְּנֵה כְעֵשׂ בֵּיתוֹ וְכִסְפָּה)

¹²⁴ James Rimbach, “‘Crushed Before the Moth’ (Job 4:19),” *JBL* 100 (1981): 244–5.

¹²⁵ N. Herz, “Some Difficult Passages in Job,” *ZAW* 20 (1900): 160.

¹²⁶ Rimbach, “Crushed Before the Moth,” 244.

¹²⁷ Clines, *Job 1–20*, 135.

¹²⁸ Clines, *Job 1–20*, 135.

¹²⁹ While its grammar is not under dispute, its position in the chapter is questioned (Driver and Gray, *Job*, 126). Its logical connection with the preceding material is unclear. Job had been praying to God, using primarily second- and first-person pronouns (Job 13:24: “Why do you hide your face, and count me as your enemy?”). However, this verse begins with “And he...” (וְהוּא). Some move the verse to Job 14:2, whether after the first stich or the second, since both refer to the subject “man,” אָדָם, in 14:1.

¹³⁰ Clines, *Job 1–20*, 323.

נָצַר (עֲשֵׂה נָצַר). “Like a moth” (כְּעֵשׂ) is the source of controversy. Aron Pinker, in his study of this verse, lays out the difficulty: “It is difficult to see the logic in these metaphors and identify the objects of comparison or reference. Obviously, the moth is not a house builder, and the parallelism of ‘moth’ with ‘booth’ is rather strange.”¹³¹ Moths are not known for “building.” Because of the incongruity, other suggestions have been proposed, the most noteworthy of which is that עֵשׂ is a bird’s nest.¹³² Driver and Gray provide another option, assuming עֵשׂ is the result of עֲכָבִישׁ, “spider” losing its central letters (כב): “He builds his house as the spider (עֲכָבִישׁ).”¹³³ This would be consonant with the LXX and Peshitta.¹³⁴ Pinker, however, presents a solution that retains the present text. He emphasizes that moths deposit their larvae in various crevices, from which the larvae watch for passing prey.¹³⁵ Applying this behavior to the metaphor, the wicked wait in ambush for those who are righteous and just, but they fail (v. 19).

Certain creatures also illustrate God’s sovereign rule over the animals. At Job 4:10–11, Eliphaz emphasizes God’s kingship over animals with a litany of diverse lion terms: “The roar of the lion (אֶרְיָה), the voice of the fierce lion (שִׁחַל), and the teeth of the young lions (כְּפִירִים) are broken. The strong lion (לִישׁ) perishes for lack of prey, and the whelps of the lioness (בְּנֵי לְבִיא) are scattered.” Each of these lion terms describes a different type of lion.¹³⁶ More important than the different nuances of the terms is the

¹³¹ Aron Pinker, “The Wicked in Ambush (Job 27:18–19),” *BBR* 25.3 (2015): 295. See also Clines, *Job 21–37*, 659.

¹³² Pinker, “The Wicked in Ambush,” 296.

¹³³ Driver and Gray, *Job*, 230.

¹³⁴ Pinker, “The Wicked in Ambush,” 300.

¹³⁵ Pinker, “The Wicked in Ambush,” 308.

¹³⁶ Brent A. Strawn, *What is Stronger Than a Lion?: Leonine Image and Metaphor in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East* (Fribourg: Academic Press, 2005), 300.

overall impression of the verses, which illustrate God’s absolute power over the fiercest members of the natural world.

Eliphaz speaks about the natural world in a number of different ways, usually aligning with rhetorical points. The most prominent example is Job 4:10–11, whose diversity of lion terms is a rhetorical flourish. The difficulties of this passage will be dealt with in chapter 5, alongside the LXX translator’s creative solutions. Likewise too Job 5:22–23, which talks how the speaker will be at peace with “wild animals of the earth” (חַיֵּית הַאֲרֶזִי) and “wild animals of the field” (חַיֵּית הַשָּׂדֶה). This verse is handled somewhat differently by the LXX translator than the original author. He also mentions the moth (שָׁרָף), another passage adjusted by the LXX translator. The high concentration of passages that are rhetorical flourishes in his first speech demonstrates the challenges presented by the author.

E. Bildad

Bildad, who speaks in Job 8, 18, and 25, uses comparatively few animal images in his speeches. He uses a maggot (תּוֹלְעָה) to emphasize the lowliness of humankind at Job 25:6: “How much less a mortal, who is a maggot, and a human being, who is a worm!” (אֵף כִּי־אֲנוֹשׁ רִמָּה וּבְנֵי־אָדָם תּוֹלְעָה). It alludes to Ps 8:5: “What are human beings [אֲנוֹשׁ] that you are mindful of them, mortals [בְּנֵי־אָדָם] that you care for them?” Bildad presumptuously frames this from the perspective of God, not from his own. Instead of having a proper sense of humility, he aggrandizes himself by “step[ping] outside the frame” and identifying himself with God. He takes the perspective of the only character

who could potentially identify the problems at the core of the narrative—without seeing how he himself fits into the picture.¹³⁷

He also indignantly illustrates Job’s apparent unwillingness to submit to the arguments of his friends, like cattle (בְּהֵמָה). According to Bildad, Job is pretending that his friends are as dull as cattle at Job 18:3: “Why are we counted as cattle? Why are we stupid in your sight?” (מִדּוּעַ נִחְשָׁבְנוּ כַּבְּהֵמָה נִטְמִינוּ בְּעֵינֶיכֶם). Bildad is increasingly aggravated by Job’s unwillingness to answer his assertions. He thinks that Job is placing them into a sub-intellectual category, presenting arguments that are not worth considering. Although the term נִטְמִינוּ is ambiguous, the most common option (“to be considered dumb/stupid”) is the most logical, especially with manuscript, consonantal, and contextual support.¹³⁸

In Job 8:14, Bildad makes a comparison between the hope of a man who has abandoned God and a spider’s web (בֵּית עֲכָבִישׁ). The LXX translator adjusts this reference to better fit the context, so it will be discussed in chapter 6.

Bildad’s use of animal imagery is small, but two of those three involve small “creepers,” the maggot and spider (תּוֹלְעָה and עֲכָבִישׁ) and the third is a generic animal (בְּהֵמָה, “cattle”). His language does not present much difficulty, with all the terms referring to commonly-referenced animals in the bible.

¹³⁷ Stuart Lasine, “Bird’s-Eye and Worm’s-Eye Views of Justice in the Book of Job,” *JSOT* 42 (1988): 32–3.

¹³⁸ נִטְמִינוּ is an ambiguous term, translated “we are considered stupid,” shrouds the meaning of the verse. LXX renders σεσιωπηκαμεν (“we have kept silent”), reading נִטְמִינוּ. Joseph Reider sees נִטְמִינוּ as a metathesis of נִטְמִינוּ and connects to Arabic “to urge a beast,” translating as “to consider a nag” (“Some Notes to the Text of the Scriptures,” *HUCA* 3 [1926]: 113–4). Clines offers טָמָא, “be unclean.” Dhorme argues also that the original verb is דָּקָה, “to be compared with.” (Clines, *Job 1–20*, 404–5) Most other commentators connect it to Talmudic טָמָא and read “we are stupid,” a reading that has support in three manuscripts (Reider, “Some Notes,” 113).

F. Zophar

Unlike his friends, Zophar only makes two speeches, at Job 11 and 20. At Job 11:12, Zophar uses an “ass” (עִיר) and “wild ass” (פָּרָא) indicate the unbridgeable gap between human stupidity and true wisdom: “But a stupid person will get understanding, when a wild ass is born human” (וְאִישׁ נְבוֹב יִלְבֵּב וְעִיר פָּרָא אָדָם יוֹלֵד). Zophar does not think highly of the intellectual gifts of humankind.

The metaphor does require unpacking. Problematic is the relationship between עִיר (“ass”) and פָּרָא (“wild ass”). The most obvious parallel is the description of Ishmael in Gen 16:12 as “wild ass of a man” (אָדָם פָּרָא). This would be incongruous here. As Clines points out, the traditional translation for the phrase is also grammatically suspect: “[T]he phrase usually translated “a wild ass’s colt” (וְעִיר פָּרָא) can mean no such thing, since עִיר is always used for the domesticated ass (e.g. Gen 32:15; Judg 10:4; Zech 9:9) and does not indicate the *young* animal while פָּרָא is always used for the wild ass (e.g., Job 24:5; Isa 32:14; Jer 2:24).”¹³⁹ He proposes reading אָדָם as אֶדְמָה, “ground,” and thus reading the resulting phrase as “wild ass of the steppe.” Mitchell Dahood argues that אָדָם is a masculine substantiative for אֶדְמָה.¹⁴⁰ What Dahood and Clines gain in grammatical clarity they lose in hyperbole: a “wild ass of the steppe” (reading פָּרָא אֶדְמָה with Clines) being born a “domesticated ass” (עִיר) is surely less striking than one being born human (אָדָם)! However, the parallel stiches support this reading. In the first stich, the comparison is between a “stupid man” (אִישׁ נְבוֹב) and the result of his “gain[ing] understanding” (יִלְבֵּב): a

¹³⁹ Clines, *Job 1–20*, 266

¹⁴⁰ Mitchell Dahood, “Zacharia 9,1, 'en ' adam,” *CBQ* 25, No. 2 (April 1963): 124.

“wise man.” Its category stays the same while its qualities differ. So too would the comparison between a tame and a wild version of the same creatures.

The viper (פֶּתֶן) and asp (אֶפְעָה) appear in Zophar’s fiery condemnation of the wicked and God’s punishment of them: “Yet their food [of the wicked] is turned in their stomachs; it is the venom of vipers (פֶּתֶן) within them. They swallow down riches and vomit them up again; God casts them out of their bellies. They will suck the poison of asps (פֶּתֶן); the tongue of a viper (אֶפְעָה) will kill them” (לְחֶמּוֹ בְּמַעְיוֹ נִהְפֶּה מְרוֹרַת פְּתָנִים בְּקִרְבּוֹ:) (חֵיל בָּלַע וְנִקְאָנוּ מִבֶּטְנוֹ יוֹרְשָׁנוּ אֵל: רֵאש־פְּתָנִים יִינֵק תַּהַרְגֶהוּ לְשׁוֹן אֶפְעָה: ¹⁴¹ פֶּתֶן is used adjectivally in both cases to describe the poison.¹⁴² In the first part, Zophar contrasts the pleasure experienced by the wicked in committing their misdeeds (“wickedness is sweet in their mouth” [20:12]) with the effect of those actions, which turn into a fatal poison, the “venom of vipers” (מְרוֹרַת פְּתָנִים). As David Clines points out, this is a common biblical motif where the sweetness of the initial encounter turns bitter.¹⁴³

Zophar uses imagery that is much more condemnatory of humanity. His metaphors contain multiple animals in close proximity, arranged in unique and rich ways.

G. Elihu

Despite the fact that Elihu speaks for six chapters straight (Job 32–37), he mentions a comparatively low number of animals in his speech. In a probable allusion to Job’s own statement at Job 12:7–8, at Job 35:11 Elihu states: “Who teaches us more than

¹⁴¹ HALOT *s.v.* פֶּתֶן.

¹⁴² A detailed overview of its etymological origins is in Leonid Kogan, “Animal Names of Biblical Hebrew: An Etymological Survey,” in *Babel und Bibel 3: Annual of Ancient Near Eastern, Old Testament and Semitic Studies*, eds. Leonid Kogan, et al. (University Park, PA: Eisenbrauns, 2007), 295–6.

¹⁴³ Clines, *Job 1–20*, 489.

the animals of the earth, and makes us wiser than the birds of the air?” (מִלְפָּנֵי מִבְּהֵמוֹת אֲרֶץ (and וּמֵעוֹף הַשָּׁמַיִם יִחְכְּמֵנוּ). The term בְּהֵמוֹת אֲרֶץ, “beasts of the earth,” refers to a group of animals that neither flies nor swims. So too עוֹף הַשָּׁמַיִם, “birds of the heavens.” This term is a catch-all term for any animal that flies, without any specific referent. Elihu is not invoking any single animal but contrasting humankind’s superiority over the other domains. He emphasizes the special providence he sees God having for humans, as endowing them with a special wisdom (יִחְכְּמֵנוּ) and teaching them (לְפָנֵינוּ). In contrast to the idea of nature as a pitiless world with its own intelligence and abilities as Job has been arguing, Elihu returns to the status quo that the three friends had been arguing: humankind is protected and preserved by God.

At Job 37:8 he uses חַיָּה, “living thing,” which refers to living creatures in general: “Then the wild animals go into their lairs and remain in their dens” (וַתָּבֹא חַיָּה בְּמוֹ-אֲרָב (and וּבִמְעוֹנֹתֶיהָ תִשְׁכֵּן). The use of “lair” (אֲרָב) and “den” (מְעֹנָה) suggests wild animals.

Other than those two generic passages, Elihu does not depend upon animal terms to make his various points. Their vocabulary and formulation are generic and in line with other biblical passages. This fits with the general nature of Elihu’s speech, which is a reiteration of normal biblical wisdom.

H. God

Outside of the dialogue in the frame narrative at the beginning and end of the book, God’s speeches begin in Job 38 and continue until the end of Job 41. In that stretch of chapters – two speeches with a brief interlude at 40:1–5 – a plethora of creatures are

presented, beginning at 38:39. These creatures are uniquely described and serve a distinct narrative purpose: to illustrate the features of the natural world that Job himself lacks.

In Job 38:39b, God asks whether Job can “satisfy the appetite of the young lions” (וַחַיֵּית כְּפִירִים תִּמְלֵא). The eagle (נֶשֶׁר) pericope, Job 38:27–30, emphasizes God’s ability to provide for the eagle and its offspring.¹⁴⁴ The same is said of the raven (עֹרֵב) at 38:41: “Who provides for the raven its prey, when its young ones cry to God, and wander about for lack of food?” (מִי יִכִּין לְעֹרֵב צִידוֹ כִּי יִלְדָּיו אֶל-אֵל יִשְׁגְּעוּ וַתַּעַו לְבָלִי-אֶכֶל). Some commentators eliminate the bird entirely. Duhm supposes the term might be read as “evening” (עֶרֶב) and folded into the preceding verse.¹⁴⁵ The argument depends on the use of צִידוֹ, “its prey,” whose root צוּד appears in the earlier verse, referring to the action of the lion. To Duhm, צוּד refers to game animals caught for food, while ravens are not “hunters” (they consume carrion). Hence, by eliminating the bird, the thought would read: “...who provides its [that is, the young lion] prey in the evening...?”¹⁴⁶

However, there are issues with Duhm’s reading of the verse.¹⁴⁷ First, צִיד is not used only of game, but of provisions in general (Neh. 13:15, Josh 9:5,14, etc.). Secondly, the opening of the verse (מִי, “who...?”) connects to the structural technique adopted by the author for the entire pericope, as at 38:39, 39:1,5,9, etc. Thirdly, although a scavenger, the raven’s meat-eating habits are “hunting” in an analogous sense. Finally, this change would be gratuitous, since “raven” makes sense in the context.

¹⁴⁴ G.R. Driver interprets כִּי as not a conjunctive but the *ky*-bird, drawing upon Arabic *kuy* (“ibis, bustard, pelican”); the habits are wrong, by his own admission, but “clearly” was a kind of raptor (“Job 39:27–28: The *ky*-bird,” *PEQ* 104 [1974]: 65). He also notes metrical difficulties. But the lexical evidence for this is scant.

¹⁴⁵ Bernhard Duhm, *Das Buch Job erklärt* (KHC XVI; Freiburg im Breisgau: J.C.B. Mohr, 1897), 183–4, 188.

¹⁴⁶ Duhm, *Das Buch Job*, 188.

¹⁴⁷ Clines, *Job 38–42*, 1068.

The stich in the middle of the verse “when its young cry out to God” (כִּי־יִקְלוּ אֶל־), further reinforces the overall message taken by the author about the relationship between God and his Creation.¹⁴⁸ שָׁוַע, “to cry out,” is never used elsewhere to describe animal behavior in Scripture; when used with אֶל, “to,” as here, the object is nearly always God.¹⁴⁹ Job himself uses it several times throughout, referring to his own requests of God.¹⁵⁰ Because of the prevalence of the term for Job’s own action, the appearance here is undoubtedly an ironic reversal: the young ravens cry out (שָׁוַע) to me and I take care of them; you cry out to me (שָׁוַע) and I am finally answering you now. God takes more speedy care of the natural world than Job, perhaps because he knows that Job will survive and needs less “help.” The young birds, lacking food, wander around (יִתְעוּ), trying to fend for themselves, before God gives them food. The comparison is denigrating: ravens are unclean animals (Lev 11:15 and Deut 14:14).

Why the raven is paired with the lion is not clear. The closest parallel, both verbal and conceptual, is Ps 147:9: “He gives to the animals their food (לְבֵהֵמָה לְהִמָּה), and to the young ravens when they cry (לְבִנֵי עֹרֵב אֲשֶׁר יִקְרָאוּ).” Usually “beast” (בְּהֵמָה) refers to cattle, but Prov 30:30 calls “the lion (לִישׁ)...the mightiest of the beasts (בְּהֵמָה).” The raven and the lion may be synecdoche for the entirety of the animal kingdom, with the large lion as a representative of the land animals—בְּהֵמָה, “beast”—with the shorthand for the flying animals, the raven.¹⁵¹ The author makes clear the thrust of the comparison, both parts use צוּד (“to hunt”).

¹⁴⁸ The passage looks like a gloss, since it turns a comprehensible bicolon into a tricolon, or could indicate a missing fourth stich.

¹⁴⁹ Ps 28:2, 30:2, 31:22, 88:13, etc.

¹⁵⁰ Job 19:7, 24:12, 29:12, 30:20,28, 35:9, 36:13.

¹⁵¹ עֹרֵב can cover two related birds, the common raven (*Corvus corax*) or the hooded crow (*Corvus cornix*). In Scripture, it can both refer to a specific animal and a class of animals (Richard Whitekettle, “The Raven

The mountain goat (יַעֲלִי־טֹלַעַ) and deer (אַיִלָה) appear together in the same pericope in Job 39:1–4, in which God asks whether Job is aware of the times and seasons of their lifecycle.¹⁵² The focus of much of this pericope is related to time, with God asking Job whether he knows “when” (עַתָּה) the mountain goat gives birth (39:1), “number” (תִּסְפֹּר) their months, and know the time they give birth (39:2). At the end, the young animals grow up and “go forth” (יֵצְאוּ). This is the tenderest description of the אַיִל/אַיִלָה, which is usually a shorthand for God’s relationship with a faithful individual and the gifts that such a relationship brings.¹⁵³ This is the most extended biblical description of the deer, which otherwise is only mentioned in terms of its cleanliness (and once to describe Solomon’s possessions).¹⁵⁴ The description is tender, almost caring, and illustrates well the overall focus on God’s providential care the passage wishes to illustrate.

Many pericopes illustrate God’s providential care for the animals of the wild and, as a result, their virtues. An entire pericope describes the wild ass (פָּרָא, Job 39:5–8). It contrasts Job’s troubled life with the unrestrained, free-roaming animal. It lives unconcerned with haranguing and civilization, while Job has been troubled by his friends and with the concerns of the world.¹⁵⁵ Alongside the פָּרָא is the עֲרוּד (“wild ass”), which are functionally equivalent to one another. This passage gives a substantial explication of the author’s understanding of the habits and habitat of the פָּרָא. First, it is said to live in

as Kind and Kinds of Ravens: A Study in the Zoological Nomenclature of Leviticus 11,2–23,” ZAW 117.4 [January 2006]: 513–4).

¹⁵² “Do you know when the mountain goats give birth? Do you observe the calving of the deer? Can you number the months that they fulfil, and do you know the time when they give birth, when they crouch to give birth to their offspring, and are delivered of their young? Their young ones become strong, they grow up in the open; they go forth, and do not return to them.”

¹⁵³ Ps 18:33, 42:1, Isa 35:6, Hab 3:19.

¹⁵⁴ Deut 12:15, 12:22, 14:5, 15:22; 1 Kings 4:23.

¹⁵⁵ “Who has let the wild ass go free? Who has loosed the bonds of the swift ass, to which I have given the steppe for its home, the salt land for its dwelling-place? It scorns the tumult of the city; it does not hear the shouts of the driver. It ranges the mountains as its pasture, and it searches after every green thing.”

the “steppe” (עֲרָבָה)—that is, the desert land—set in parallel to the “salt land” (מְלַחָה), both of which are useless for farming or living, in Job 39:6. It also mentions the “mountains” (הָרִים) in 39:8 as a place where it “ranges” (יָתוּר) but does not live, in order to “search after every green thing [to eat]” (אָחַר כָּל־יֵרוֹק יִדְרוֹשׁ). Steppe and “salt land” emphasize the hardness of the wild ass, while the mountains tell how it roams for food. Secondly, the passage emphasizes the isolation of the פָּרָא, “scorn[ing] the tumult of the city” (יִשְׁחַק) (לְהִמּוֹן קִרְיָה) and “not hear[ing] the shouts of the driver” (תִּשְׁאֹת נוֹגֵשׁ לֹא יִשְׁמָע) (Job 39:7). Finally, the pericope emphasizes the absolute freedom of the פָּרָא, as the opening lines discuss how God has “let [it] go free” (שָׁלַח...הִפְשִׁי).

The auroch (אֲרוֹחַ) is a difficult-to-tame animal that appears in Job 39:9–12.¹⁵⁶ The identification with the wild ox is generally accepted, specifically the auroch, a now-extinct species of bull with long, curved horns (mentioned at Num 23:22 and Deut 33:17).¹⁵⁷ It was largely considered untamable, excluding the more approachable antelope.¹⁵⁸ According to Norman Habel, this pericope presents a challenge to Genesis’s “mandate to dominate.”¹⁵⁹ The contradiction in the pericope is between the “mandate” in Genesis and the obvious fact that humankind does not control wild animals. God taunts Job to tame the ox.

¹⁵⁶ “Is the wild ox willing to serve you? Will it spend the night at your crib? Can you tie it in the furrow with ropes, or will it harrow the valleys after you? Will you depend on it because its strength is great, and will you hand over your labor to it? Do you have faith in it that it will return, and bring your grain to your threshing-floor?”

¹⁵⁷ Paul Haunt, “The Mountain-Bull,” *JBL* 36 (1917): 249.

¹⁵⁸ United Bible Societies, *Fauna and Flora of the Bible* (London: United Bible Societies, 1980), 63.

¹⁵⁹ Norman C. Habel, “‘Is the Wild Ox Willing to Serve You?’ Challenging the Mandate to Dominate,” in *The Earth Story in Wisdom Traditions* (ed. Norman C. Habel; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 187.

One animal acts as an example whose lack of wisdom is evident, and yet seems to be favored (and protected) by God: the ostrich (רַנְנִים) at Job 39:13–18.¹⁶⁰ No other animal passage in the divine speeches of the book of Job has occasioned more skeptical discussion. The first difficulty is the term used here for “ostrich” (רַנְנִים). Etymologically, it derives from רָנַן, “to cry out.” As S.R. Driver writes:

The Heb. *renânîm* “cries of joy” is another name for the ostrich (Vulg.), probably the female ostrich, like the Arab. *na ‘âmu(n)* “ostriches; desert” and *na ‘âmatu(n)* “joy; ostrich,” given to it perhaps on the principle of *lucus a non lucendo* as reflecting its hard desert life or perhaps directly in consequence of its carefree exultation in its speed, which is described in the only passage in which the word occurs.¹⁶¹

Against the position of the identification of this animal with the ostrich are the arguments given by Hans-Peter Müller.¹⁶² Broadly put, they boil down to four primary pieces of evidence: (1) the root רָנַן elsewhere — even in Job, such as 3:7 and 20:9 — is only used to talk of “exultation” or “joy”; (2) there are other terms for ostrich used throughout Scripture (רַנְנִים and רַנְנִים) that are more solidly identified; (3) the zoological features found in Job 39:13–18 cannot be accurately applied to the ostrich; and (4) the first translation to make the identification was Jerome and thus may be influenced unduly by Christian literature.¹⁶³

These concerns are not to be taken lightly. Of the arguments he rallies, the weakest is the third, for the imperfect match between poetic description and animal

¹⁶⁰ “The ostrich’s wings flap wildly, though its pinions lack plumage. For it leaves its eggs to the earth, and lets them be warmed on the ground, forgetting that a foot may crush them, and that a wild animal may trample them. It deals cruelly with its young, as if they were not its own; though its labour should be in vain, yet it has no fear; because God has made it forget wisdom, and given it no share in understanding. When it spreads its plumes aloft, it laughs at the horse and its rider.”

¹⁶¹ Driver, “Birds in Life,” 138.

¹⁶² Hans-Peter Müller, “Die sogenannte Straussenperikope in den Gottesreden,” ZAW 100, no. 1 (1988): 90–105.

¹⁶³ Müller, “Die sogenannte Straussenperikope,” 91.

should not be dispositive. Theory number one is stronger, but still fails, since the context of these occurrences are fundamentally different from the root's occurrence here, implying a difference in meaning. Trying to discern the meaning behind the Job-author's use of this term instead of others is not insignificant but does not seem to be easy to do.

The fourth theory posits that the Greek translations found in the Hexapla propose abstract nouns based on the root רגן (τερπομένων [θ], αινούντων [α], and ἀγλαΐσμοῦ [σ]).¹⁶⁴ The Peshitta likewise uses תשבח, “praise,” and the Targum uses “grouse” (תרנגול).¹⁶⁵ The confusion amongst the ancient translations is understandable, but the evidence can only take us so far: translations based on abstract nouns are self-evidently incorrect, considering the context in Job — and it goes on to describe an animal — and the author reconstructs that the Targum translation is based upon metathesis.¹⁶⁶

Identifying the animal with an ostrich specifically does find its earliest written attestation in Jerome, who he claims may have been influenced by “an ancient Christian cycle of edifying descriptions of nature, to which a section περί ἀσίδος καὶ στροθοκαμήλου [the stork and the ostrich] was added later.”¹⁶⁷ He plausibly posits that the stork and the ostrich were confused with each other based upon the appearance of the ἀσιδᾶ (stork) in both Jer 6,7 and Job 39:13b and importing phrases from Job 39 into the chapter; from here, the stork and the ostrich were associated with one another and from there, Jerome made his terminological choice.¹⁶⁸ However, this does not rule out that it is correct, only that its origin is specious.

¹⁶⁴ Müller, “Die sogenannte Straussenperikope,” 92.

¹⁶⁵ Müller, “Die sogenannte Straussenperikope,” 93.

¹⁶⁶ Müller, “Die sogenannte Straussenperikope,” 93.

¹⁶⁷ Müller, “Die sogenannte Straussenperikope,” 94.

¹⁶⁸ Müller, “Die sogenannte Straussenperikope,” 95.

Arthur Walker-Jones posits that the animal described is not an ostrich but instead is a sand-grouse. His strongest argument is Job 39:15. Some translations, such as the NRSV, see the subject of 39:15 as the eggs, collectively referred to by the singular feminine suffix, which are in danger of being stepped on, as a result of 39:14: “For it leaves (תַּעֲזֹב) its eggs on the earth (לְאֶרֶץ), and lets them be warmed on the ground (תִּתְחַמֵּם)” (NRSV). Walker-Jones, however, argues that the feminine suffix refers to the bird, and not the eggs: “She forgets that a foot might crush her (תִּזְוֶרְהָ), a wild animal trample her (תִּדְוֶוּשָׁהּ).”¹⁶⁹ With that assumption, the bird would be a small one. The ostrich, by contrast, is an extremely large bird, not in danger of being trampled by any other animal.

While the grammatical argument rallied by Walker-Jones is strong, the context weakens it. The first stich of Job 39:14 describes how she “leaves” (תַּעֲזֹב) her eggs on the ground, which Walker-Jones merely translates as “lays.” He defends his choice by pointing to its range of meanings and, since it is in parallel with “broods,” can mean “lay.”¹⁷⁰ However, עָזַב, “leaves,” although it has a range of meaning, the overwhelming majority of them are negative, leaning more toward abandonment. Hence, the sense of the verse is that the ostrich leaves the eggs alone (39:14), at which point they are vulnerable (39:15) – a reasonable progression that does not necessitate his re-reading of 39:15 as a small animal. Ultimately, though the specifics of the animal discussed in this pericope are not zoologically-precise, the traditional association with the ostrich is adequate for our purposes.

¹⁶⁹ Arthur Walker-Jones, “The So-called Ostrich in the God Speeches of the Book of Job (Job 39,13–18),” *Biblica* Vol. 86, No. 4 (2005): 495.

¹⁷⁰ Walker-Jones, “Ostrich,” 504.

The author includes details that emphasize its teaching value. Job 39:16a discusses the temperament of the bird: “It deals cruelly with its young, as if they were not its own” (הַקְּשִׁיחַ בְּנִיָּהּ לְלֹא-לֵהָ). This description is negative and provides an immediate distinction from human behavior (which generally cares for its young). It also sums up the ignorance described when it leaves its eggs unattended. The stich that follows – “though its labor should be in vain, yet it has no fear” (לְרִיק יִגְיַעַה בְּלִי-פֶסֶד, 39:16b) – can be understood in two ways.¹⁷¹ The first is that she is fearless in every situation because she is ignorant (i.e. “she is fearless despite her vain work”); the second is that she does not worry that her work is useless.¹⁷² In either case, the negative trait of the first stich is balanced with a statement about its natural gifts, or lack thereof. Other natural gifts described are its laughing call, which sounds like carefree and worry-free existence, and its plumage.¹⁷³

The reason for its inclusion in this speech, and its “lesson value” to Job, becomes clear by Job 39:17: “God has made it forget wisdom, and given it no share in understanding” (כִּי-הִשְׁכַּח אֱלֹהִים חֻכְמָהּ וְלֹא-תָלַק לָהּ בְּבִינָה). Wisdom and understanding would

¹⁷¹ Clines, *Job 38–42*, 1077

¹⁷² Clines, *Job 38–42*, 1077.

¹⁷³ The final line in the pericope (39:18) is a source of much debate. The verb תִּמְרִיא has been translated as “flap,” “strike,” “strut,” “rebel,” “go aloft,” or “to spread plumage,” the latter of which is adopted by the NRSV (reflected above) and others. Considering the creature that is being described, options are limited, especially since the associated term (“aloft,” בְּמָרוֹם) cannot refer to flight, as ostriches are flightless. Therefore, either its body or its feathers “go up.” If its body “goes up,” she goes from sitting to standing; if the latter, “its feathers,” the bird could either be preparing herself to run or just showing off. A synthesis is possible, which is the most appealing option: “The only time an ostrich is high is when it is not sitting on the ground, so we may suspect that the image is of the female bird rising from her nest, spreading her feathers, and running off at great speed” (Clines, *Job 38–42*, 1078). The ostrich’s “laughing” (תִּשְׁחַק) at the horse and its rider probably reflects the fact that the call of the ostrich sounds like laughing. As with the earlier description of a “lack of fear,” however, this doubles not only as a natural observation but also underscores the carefree nature of the ostrich, “laughing” at the oncoming danger. Carol Newsom observes: “That the ostrich laughs at the pursuit of horse and rider is of particular significance, since it evokes the scene of the hunt, that symbolic enactment of the opposition between culture and nature and the defense of human order against the chaotic” (*The Book of Job: A Contest of Moral Imaginations* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003], 247).

have provided a bulwark against the rashness of the abandonment of its young and the overall stupidity with which it deals with the world. This also recapitulates the theme of Job 28:7–8: true wisdom cannot be found by animals but is entirely at the mercy of God’s desire to grant or withhold it.

This unusual bird, lacking intelligence but possessing bravery, is a contradiction for Job’s edification. Because the animal lacks sense, God implies that he must constantly keep watch over it. This analogy is extended to humanity, whom God also protects and watches. However, unlike the animals, Job and other humans ask questions. On the other hand, the animal has virtues that Job seems to lack. It is an unsubtle comment on Job while God also boasts about his creation.

At Job 39:19–25, the war-horse (רֹסֵס) is given a lengthy, lavish, and admiring description, admired for its own traits.¹⁷⁴ This animal is described as anticipating a battle: Job 39:21–23 describe its potential for a future battle, not his participation in a current one.¹⁷⁵ It is brave (“going out to meet the weapons” [39:21], “laughing at fear” and “not turning back from the sword” [39:22]) and its rider is well-prepared (“Upon it rattle the quiver, the flashing spear, and the javelin” [39:23]). Yet it is also eager and hard to control: “It paws violently, exults mightily” (39:21) and “it swallows the ground” (39:24). No humans are in view; the attributes of the horse are the sole focus of the passage.

¹⁷⁴ “Do you give the horse its might? Do you clothe its neck with mane? Do you make it leap like the locust? Its majestic snorting is terrible. It paws violently, exults mightily; it goes out to meet the weapons. It laughs at fear and is not dismayed; it does not turn back from the sword. Upon it rattle the quiver, the flashing spear, and the javelin. With fierceness and rage it swallows the ground; it cannot stand still at the sound of the trumpet. When the trumpet sounds, it says ‘Aha!’ From a distance it smells the battle, the thunder of the captains, and the shouting.”

¹⁷⁵ David Odell, “Images of Violence in the Horse in Job 39:18–25,” *Prooftexts* 13.2 (May 1993): 166.

At the lengthy pericope at the end of the book (40:15–41:26[34]), two mythological creatures appear: “Behemoth” (בְּהֵמוֹת) and “Leviathan” (לְוִיָּתָן).¹⁷⁶ The closing pericope is an intensified version of the other animal pericopes in that it highlights God’s might and the qualities of his creation. The Behemoth part of the pericope spans from 40:15–24.¹⁷⁷ Samuel Bochart, in the seventeenth century, argued that it was a hippopotamus, a suggestion followed by some modern interpreters: “Job xl.10, בְּהֵמוֹת, *Behemoth*: not an elephant, as supposed, but a hippopotamus.”¹⁷⁸ Clines summarizes the qualities of the hippo that seem to be found in Job: “They are both herbivorous (v. 15), amphibious (vv. 22–23), remarkable for the strength of their body (v. 16), with solid bones (v. 18); they live in swamps, among reeds, and seek shade (vv. 21–22)...The male hippopotamus weighs up to 7000 pounds, and stands about 5 feet high (the female weighs up to 5000 pounds, and is almost as tall).”¹⁷⁹

The hippopotamus is not the only suggestion that has been made. In the thirteenth century, Thomas Aquinas identified the animal as an elephant: “Among all land animals, the elephant excels in size and strength... Thus the name Behemoth, which means ‘animal’, is referred to the elephant, which among other land animals, who are more

¹⁷⁶ The term בְּהֵמוֹת is simply a plural of בְּהֵמָה, “cattle,” but is used in a singular way here (and Ps 73:22).

¹⁷⁷ “Look at Behemoth, which I made just as I made you; it eats grass like an ox. Its strength is in its loins, and its power in the muscles of its belly. It makes its tail stiff like a cedar; the sinews of its thighs are knit together. Its bones are tubes of bronze, its limbs like bars of iron. It is the first of the great acts of God—only its Maker can approach it with the sword. For the mountains yield food for it where all the wild animals play. Under the lotus plants it lies, in the covert of the reeds and in the marsh. The lotus trees cover it for shade; the willows of the wadi surround it. Even if the river is turbulent, it is not frightened; it is confident though Jordan rushes against its mouth. Can one take it with hooks or pierce its nose with a snare?”

¹⁷⁸ Samuel Bochart, *Hierozoicon, sive Bipertitum opus de animalibus sacrae scripturae* (London: Excudebat Tho. Roycroft, impensis Jo. Martyn & Jac. Allestry, 1663), 2:753–69.

¹⁷⁹ Clines, *Job 38–42*, 1186. See also: Michael V. Fox, “Behemoth and Leviathan,” *Biblica*, 92 vol. 2 (2012): 261; Eberhard Ruprecht “Das Nilpferd im Hiobbuch: Beobachtungen zu der Sogenannten Zweiten Gottesrede,” *VT* 21 vol. 2 (1971): 211.

commonly called animals, has a certain preeminence because of the size of his body.”¹⁸⁰

Reading the book through a symbolic lens, Aquinas saw Behemoth as representing

Satan.¹⁸¹ In the mid-twentieth century, B. Couroyer advocated the view that the animal was actually a water buffalo. According to Couroyer, the term includes hooved animals (which the hippopotamus is not) that are grazing ruminants (eating grass like oxen).

Unlike the hippopotamus, the description of the beast’s tail seems to describe the tail of the water buffalo. Some of the water-related behavior seems more reminiscent of the water buffalo than the hippo as well.¹⁸² This suggestion has not gathered much in the way of followers, and O. Keel’s criticisms of the thesis inflict critical damage that even his follow-up article is unable to overcome.¹⁸³

Although Behemoth is clearly a non-human beast, the author draws parallels with Job. The opening of the speech (40:15) compares the two: “Behold Behemoth, whom I made with you” (הַגֵּה־נָא בְהֵמוֹת אֲשֶׁר־עָשִׂיתִי עִמָּךְ). Whether referencing the time of creation (“at the same time as you”) or manner (“as I made you”), the creature is a lesson directed to Job. Behemoth is meant to show God’s love of his creation, in direct contrast to his love of humanity. Its “strength is in its loins” (כַּחוּ בְמַתְנִיחוֹ, 40:16a), which may echo God’s call to Job to “gird his loins like a man” at the beginning of the speech (40:7), as “loins” relate to male combat ability.¹⁸⁴ Behemoth’s physical features are prominent and help to provide an outline of this creature. Job 40:17 describes its tail (זָנָב) like a cedar (אַרְזִי) and

¹⁸⁰ Thomas Aquinas, *Commentary on the Book of Job* (trans. Brian Mulladay; Lander, WY: The Aquinas Institute, 2016), 405.

¹⁸¹ Aquinas, *Commentary on Job*, 405.

¹⁸² B. Couroyer, “Qui est Béhémoth: Job 40:15–24?” *RB* 82, no. 3 (1975): 418–43.

¹⁸³ For Keel, see: *Jahwes Entgegnung an Ijob: Eine Deutung von Ijob 38–41 vor dem Hintergrund der zeitgenössischen Bildkunst* (FRLANT 121; Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht: Göttingen, 1978), 127–31. For Couroyer’s response: “Béhémoth = Hippopotame ou Buffle?” *RB* 94 (1987): 214–21.

¹⁸⁴ Clines, *Job 38–42*, 1052. In a parallel phrase of 40:16b, its “strength” (אֵץ) is found in its belly (בֶּטֶן)—specifically, the muscle (שָׂרִיר), although שָׂרִיר is a *hapax* (Clines, *Job 38–42*, 1150).

the “sinews of its thighs” (גִּידֵי פִתְדָיו) as “intertwined” (שָׁרָג).¹⁸⁵ Job 40:18 describes its bones as “tubes of bronze” and its “limbs” as “bars of iron.”¹⁸⁶ Its size is indirectly suggested at Job 40:21–22.¹⁸⁷ Finally, the passage (40:23–24) gives a description of the creature’s disposition, unperturbable and unrestrainable: “Even if the river is turbulent, it is not frightened; it is confident though Jordan rushes against its mouth. Can one take it with hooks or pierce its nose with a snare?” (הֲנִי יַעֲשֶׂה לָּהּ נֶזֶק לֹא יִתְפּוֹז וְכַטַּח | כִּי־יִגִּיעַ יַרְדֵּן אֶל־פִּיהוּ:) (בְּעֵינָיו יִקְחֻנוּ בְּמִוְקָשִׁים יִקְבְּצֻהָ).

In contrast with the ambiguous status of Behemoth, Leviathan’s (לוֹיִתָּן) mythological pedigree is unquestionable. It appears twice in the book, briefly at 3:8 and more fulsomely at 40:25(41:1)–41:26(34). Its appearance at 3:8 is couched in much more symbolic language, since Job specifically invokes the name to “undo” the day of his birth: “Let those curse it who curse the Sea, those who are skilled to rouse up Leviathan” (יִקְבְּהוּ אַרְרֵי־יָוִם הַעֲתִידִים עָרַר לִוְיָתָן). “Day-cursers” and “Leviathan-rousers” are placed in parallel with each other. I must therefore disagree with Clines’s suggestion that “rousing Leviathan is a second skill that Job would have wished employed” because of his lament (Clines, *Job 1–20*, 87). The passage is subject to normal rules of Hebrew parallelism. The day/sea-cursers and the Leviathan-rousers are the same group. We must begin with the idea that each clause conveys roughly the same idea, strengthened by the distribution of

¹⁸⁵ The action the tail is said to take (תִּקְפֵּץ) is not entirely clear, but usually translated as “stiffens,” whose sexual undertones are obvious (Clines, *Job 38–42*, 1151). If the tail is “like a cedar,” advocates of a real creature such as the hippopotamus are left perplexed, as the hippo’s tail is hardly worth noticing—but they also note that ancients also had the same view of the hippopotamus (Fox, “Behemoth and Leviathan,” 261–2). The intertwining of its sinews indicates a mass of muscles (Driver and Gray, *Job*, 355).

¹⁸⁶ “Its bones are tubes of bronze, its limbs like bars of iron” (עֲצָמוֹתָיו אֶפְקִי נְחוּשָׁה גְרָמָיו כַּמְטִיל בְּרֹזָל). Though here rendered “limb,” רֵם more properly means “bone” (Driver and Gray, *Job*, 356).

¹⁸⁷ “Under the lotus plants it lies, in the covert of the reeds and in the marsh. The lotus trees cover it for shade; the willows of the wadi surround it” (תַּחַת־צִאֲלִים יִשְׁכֵּב בְּסֹתֵר קַנָּה וּבִצְהָה: יִסְבְּהוּ צִאֲלִים צִלְלוֹ יִסְבְּוהוּ עַרְבֵי־נֶחֱל:). Three plants are mentioned: lotus (צִאֲלִים), reed (קַנָּה), and the “willows of the wadi” (עַרְבֵי־נֶחֱל).

the verb (“curse”) to both stiches. The passage heightens Job’s angst, describing him calling upon a powerful sorcerer (powerful enough to summon Leviathan, whether to bind him or defeat him) to erase him from the world.

More important is the appearance of the creature at the end of the book. For a series of thirty-four verses, Leviathan gets an extensive description.¹⁸⁸ God makes the reason behind this pericope clear at the beginning of the passage at 41:4(12): “I will not keep silence concerning its limbs, or its mighty strength, or its splendid frame” (לֹא-אֶתְקַרֵּי שׁוֹ). Congruent with this stated purpose, the author mostly focuses on its face and its outer covering, often providing poetic descriptions. Its teeth are described at 41:6[14], colorfully explained to have “terror” (אִימָה) around them. Job 41:7–9(15–17) covers in detail the outer covering of the animal. The text reads “pride” (גִּאווֹן), but most emend to “back” (גִּוֹן), which better matches the context, though “its rows of shields [i.e. its scales] are its pride” can be said to make sense.¹⁸⁹

¹⁸⁸ “Can you draw out Leviathan with a fish-hook, or press down its tongue with a cord? Can you put a rope in its nose, or pierce its jaw with a hook? Will it make many supplications to you? Will it speak soft words to you? Will it make a covenant with you to be taken as your servant for ever? Will you play with it as with a bird, or will you put it on a leash for your girls? Will traders bargain over it? Will they divide it up among the merchants? Can you fill its skin with harpoons, or its head with fishing-spears? Lay hands on it; think of the battle; you will not do it again! Any hope of capturing it will be disappointed; were not even the gods overwhelmed at the sight of it? No one is so fierce as to dare to stir it up. Who can stand before it? Who can confront it and be safe?—under the whole heaven, who? I will not keep silence concerning its limbs, or its mighty strength, or its splendid frame. Who can strip off its outer garment? Who can penetrate its double coat of mail? Who can open the doors of its face? There is terror all around its teeth. Its back is made of shields in rows, shut up closely as with a seal. One is so near to another that no air can come between them. They are joined one to another; they clasp each other and cannot be separated. Its sneezes flash forth light, and its eyes are like the eyelids of the dawn. From its mouth go flaming torches; sparks of fire leap out. Out of its nostrils comes smoke, as from a boiling pot and burning rushes. Its breath kindles coals, and a flame comes out of its mouth. In its neck abides strength, and terror dances before it. The folds of its flesh cling together; it is firmly cast and immovable. Its heart is as hard as stone, as hard as the lower millstone. When it raises itself up the gods are afraid; at the crashing they are beside themselves. Though the sword reaches it, it does not avail, nor does the spear, the dart, or the javelin. It counts iron as straw, and bronze as rotten wood. The arrow cannot make it flee; slingstones, for it, are turned to chaff. Clubs are counted as chaff; it laughs at the rattle of javelins. Its underparts are like sharp pots; it spreads itself like a threshing-sledge on the mire. It makes the deep boil like a pot; it makes the sea like a pot of ointment. It leaves a shining wake behind it; one would think the deep to be white-haired. On earth it has no equal, a creature without fear. It surveys everything that is lofty; it is king over all that are proud.”

¹⁸⁹ Pace Clines, *Job 38–42*, 1164.

These various features are reinforced by its opening and closing descriptions, which provide visuals of its perceptions and attitude. Job 40:25–41:3(41:1–11) is composed of a series of rhetorical question, all of which have the implicit answer of “no.” This is followed by descriptions of how hard it would be to capture (40:25b–26[41:1b–2]), and if captured, would not be tamed (40:27–30[41:3–5]). Other verses underscore the incredible danger Leviathan presents to Job.¹⁹⁰ No one “under the whole heaven” (תַּחַת כָּל־הַשָּׁמַיִם) can meet (קָרָא) him. The closing of the pericope draws the same sorts of conclusions. Job 41:25–26(33–34) states that “On earth it has no equal,” that it is “without fear” and “king over all that are proud.”

What is the purpose of showing Job this terrifying creature? Most of the preceding animals either demonstrated cunning or skill (such as the birds of prey or the war-horse) or demonstrated the need for God to care directly for them (ostrich, raven, lion). God’s speech clearly heightens the profile of this mythical creature, so has more in common with the war-horse pericope than the others. The further implication, with the salvo of rhetorical questions at the beginning of its description, is that God is the only one capable of restraining Leviathan. Indeed, Leviathan is implied to be more powerful than Job, and perhaps more important to God, considering the lavish descriptions. Those descriptions, too, are mythical and implicate that Leviathan is not merely a crocodile but a *sui generis* creature that lives in the deep sea, is covered in impenetrable armor, and at whose mere presence any other creature ought to show terror. God does not “nickname”

¹⁹⁰ “Any hope of capturing it will be disappointed; were not even the gods overwhelmed at the sight of it? No one is so fierce as to dare to stir it up. Who can stand before it? Who can confront it and be safe?—under the whole heaven, who?”

other animals as Behemoth and Leviathan—any parallels with real animals are by comparison, not by exact description.

At the end of the book, at Job 42:8, God instructs Job’s friends to sacrifice seven bulls and seven rams in contrition.¹⁹¹ פָּר, “bull,” mostly appears in sacrificial contexts referring to a bull, as does the ram (אֵיל).¹⁹² This number of seven bulls and seven rams has sacrificial parallels elsewhere.¹⁹³

To be expected, the speeches of God contain the highest number, and most dense, descriptions of animals. Furthermore, although the other speakers in the book sometimes depend upon animals for illustration, the animals in God’s speeches are integral to their message. The overwhelming number of animals is unparalleled elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible, and their unique vocabulary and details further raises them to prominence.

I. Conclusion

Out of all the various speakers in the book of Job, God uses animals in the most complex and detailed way. He often points out direct parallels to features that Job and others seem to ignore in animals or downplay. Job is the second most-likely to use his animals, but is the most eclectic in his sources, ranging from normal pastoral life to

¹⁹¹ “Now therefore take seven bulls and seven rams, and go to my servant Job, and offer up for yourselves a burnt-offering; and my servant Job shall pray for you, for I will accept his prayer not to deal with you according to your folly; for you have not spoken of me what is right, as my servant Job has done” (וְעַתָּה קְחוּ-לְכֶם שִׁבְעֵה-פָּרִים וְשִׁבְעֵה אֵילִים וּלְכוּ | אֶל-עַבְדִּי אִיּוֹב וְהִעֲלִיתֶם עֹלָה בְּעֵדְכֶם וְאִיּוֹב עַבְדִּי יִתְפַּלֵּל עֲלֵיכֶם כִּי אִם-פָּגְיוֹ אֲשָׂא לְבַלְתִּי (עַשׂוֹת עִמָּכֶם נִבְלָה כִּי לֹא דִבַּרְתֶּם אֵלַי נְכוֹנָה כְּעַבְדִּי אִיּוֹב).

¹⁹² HALOT, s.v. פָּר.

¹⁹³ Ezek 45:23 (describing Passover sacrifices); Num 23:1,29 (Balaam’s orders to Balak); 1 Chr 15:26 (the ark’s installation); 2 Chr 29:21 (Hezekiah’s temple cleansing) (Clines, *Job 38–42*, 1232; Driver and Gray, *Job*, 374; Dhorme, *Job*, 648). Most of these examples are communal penances, not individual, meaning that the expiation demanded here is high for a small group of three, underscoring the egregiousness of their sin. It is “no mere trivial verbal fault, but a fundamental wrong, which needs the most strenuous sacrificial effort to expunge” (Driver and Gray, *Job*, 374; Clines, *Job 38–42*, 1232).

primeval, foundational legends. His three friends – Eliphaz, Bildad, and Zophar – are often more conventional in their use of animals. Elihu, by contrast, rarely draws on animals to illustrate his point. Each speaker tailors their use of particular animals. From mundane creatures to world-destroyers, the book’s animals are intriguingly diverse.

When approaching these animals, as we will see, the translator had different methods for unpacking their symbolism. Sometimes it is translated in a straight, literal way; other times, it is excised; still others are translated using new symbols. It is clear that the author’s use of the animal kingdom was a challenge for the translator, but one that he was well able to meet.

Each of these groups of speakers has a different agenda in their use of animal imagery. They present different levels of challenge to the translator, especially since, along with his primary goal of translating the text, he can also translate the “sense” of the passage, via more creative means. In other words, the character of the passage is often only properly translated by using a different means than word-for-word translation. Elihu’s passages, considering the dearth of animals in them, present the lowest hurdle. The narrative portions, whose animals correspond to the story’s figures, also offer little impediment to the translation of the book. However, the remaining figures provide unique challenges, either due to the complexity of the metaphors employed or the animal itself. As we will see in the upcoming chapters, his approach to these diverse issues was often contextually-sensitive and creative.

CHAPTER II: LXX-JOB'S "POSITIVE" TECHNIQUE I: VOCABULARY-LEVEL

A. Introduction

Evaluating the LXX-Job translator involves understanding the difference between when he adds material, and when he eliminates it. In some cases, he adds new material to adjust or fill verses. When he does, he often demonstrates reliance upon two sources for his translation: previous Greek biblical translations and secular Greek literature. He uses both sources in similar, albeit limited, ways. In contrast to his infrequent use of supplementary new material, he quite frequently uses abridgment and omission. These two sets of techniques work in concert with each other. Omissions are a "negative" technique, since they remove material, while the use of other Greek material and biblical material is a "positive" technique. He uses the negative technique more than the positive, especially for the animal passages under analysis.

Together, these two techniques demonstrate a translator who: (a) perceives that omission is not as obtrusive to the message and purpose of the book, especially the divine speeches at the end of the book; (b) sees additive and expansive material as disruptive and therefore to be employed with care; and (c) understands that there is some information that needs updating or clarification referencing more recent material. The translator's imperfection, when he is grappling with a difficult text or misreading the material, nonetheless indicates that he (d) tries to make a coherent text even when it does not seem to make sense to him, indicating that this is a motivation for the wider text.

The next two chapters will explore the positive technique. I will start by exploring the gaps between the Hebrew vocabulary and the Greek vocabulary, move to larger

semantic units, of sentences and phrases, then to broader translational patterns throughout the entire translation. This movement from fundamental units of vocabulary to larger units of thought allows for a careful movement upward to larger abstractions. This chapter will discuss the translator's vocabulary-level changes, while the next one will discuss larger semantic units, like sentences and phrases. After discussing this positive technique, the chapter after that tackles the thorny question of his frequent abridgment, which is meant to shape the text, closing with an analysis of his mistakes as a translator.

B. Literal translations

Typically, translations are expected to deliver direct, word-for-word correspondence. However, describing these “formal” moments says little about the translator's understanding of the text, since they primarily identify the features of the original text.¹⁹⁴

Take as an example Job's livestock (מִקְנֵה), listed at Job 1:3: “Seven thousand sheep, three thousand camels, five hundred yoke of oxen, and five hundred donkeys” (שִׁבְעֵהָ אֶלְפֵי־צֹאן וְשָׁלֹשָׁת אֶלְפֵי גַמְלִים וְחֲמִשׁ נְחֹמֶשׁ מֵאֹת צִמְד־בָּקָר וְחֲמִשׁ מֵאֹת אֲתוֹנוֹת). The original Hebrew writer chose his numbers carefully to reinforce Job's prosperity and connect to the symbolic use of three, five, seven, and ten.¹⁹⁵ There is also balance in Job's loss thereof

¹⁹⁴ “The purpose of an F-C translation is to enable the receptor to identify and to appreciate those linguistic features by which the cognitive content or the emotive response of the original text was communicated” (Eugene Nida, “The Nature of Dynamic Equivalence in Translating,” *Babel* 23:3 [1977]: 103).

¹⁹⁵ Yair Hoffman, *A Blemished Perfection: The Book of Job in Context* (JSOT 213; Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 47; Paul Kang-Kul Cho, “The Integrity of Job 1 and 42:11–17,” *The CBQ* 76.2 (April 2014): 233.

(Job 1:13–19), in both pairs of two and a pattern of three plus one.¹⁹⁶ The exact doubling at the end of the book (42:12) further speaks of this literary instinct.

In addition to their amounts, these animals are also significant to the original author because of his cultural context. Camels (למָא) are the “chief wealth of the nomad,” useful for load-carrying and riding, and are especially frequent in the stories of the patriarchs, an association known by the author of Job.¹⁹⁷ She-asses (יִתְנָס) are mentioned because a much smaller number of males would be needed for breeding purposes.¹⁹⁸ Their value lay mostly in “milk and fecundity” and they were better for riding.¹⁹⁹ The same could be said of the remaining animals.

However, the choices made by the original author have no bearing on the words chosen by the translator. “Sheep” (יֵשֶׁבֶט) was translated as πρόβατα, “sheep,” not for literary reasons but because they refer to the same animal.²⁰⁰ So too with למָא and κάμηλος (“camel”).²⁰¹ The unity between the LXX and the Hebrew text at these points comes from their referent (the original animal). This is the case for some of the individual animals throughout the book.

¹⁹⁶ Jan P. Fokkelman, *The Book of Job in Form: A Literary Translation with Commentary* (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 200.

¹⁹⁷ Dhorme, *Job*, 3; Clines, *Job 1–20*, 14. Half the appearances in the Hebrew Bible (22 of 54) are in Genesis; the highest concentration is in Gen 24, the meeting and subsequent marriage of Isaac and Rebekah. The -αι ending on the adjective τρισχίλια (“three thousand”) at 1:3 seems to indicate that these particular camels are female, despite the ostensibly masculine ending of the noun (κάμηλοι). Codex Alexandrinus (A) draws the same conclusions and reads τρισχίλιοι instead.

¹⁹⁸ Pope, *Job*, 7; Clines, *Job 1–20*, 14.

¹⁹⁹ Dhorme, *Job*, 3; Pope, *Job*, 7; Clines, *Job 1–20*, 14.

²⁰⁰ Though sometimes πρόβατα can refer to flocks rather than individual sheep, there is no indication that this is the case. It can refer to a mixed group of sheep and goats; later biblical usage (mostly NT) restricts it to “sheep” alone (Lucy Lincoln, “Translating Hebrew and Greek Terms for Sheep and Goats,” *The Bible Translator (Ja, Jl Technical Papers)* 47, no. 3 [1996]: 323).

²⁰¹ יֵשֶׁבֶט and λέων (“lion”), κόραξ (“crow”) and בִּרְעָ also reflect this same 1:1 comparison.

C. Grammatical adjustment

Occasionally, the translator makes slight adjustments, either for grammar or consistency. Technically, these are “changes” to the original text, but the material effect is minimal. For instance, throughout the opening chapters, the LXX uses ζεύγη βοῶν consistently to translate יִקְרָב־דְּמִצֵּי, “yoke of oxen.” At Job 1:4, the Hebrew text only reads “the oxen” (יִקְרָבֹה), but the LXX harmonizes the passage with LXX-Job 1:3, reading τὰ ζεύγη τῶν βοῶν, “the yoke of oxen.”²⁰²

Clarification of gender when the original text contains ambiguity is another small adjustment. In the LXX, יָתֵשׁ, “ass,” is usually translated as ὄνος (“ass”).²⁰³ However, in their appearance in the “narrative” portions of LXX-Job (1:3,14; 42:12), it is given the adjective θῆλυς (“female”). The term is used exclusively to indicate domesticated asses. Within the body of the story, by contrast, the term is paired with other adjectives (ἄγριος, “field” / ἐν ἀγρῷ, “in the field” / ἐρημίτης “desert”) to differentiate them as onagers, or wild asses. Once again, while θῆλυς is an “addition,” the difference it makes is minimal, and draws an implicit contrast with the animals that appear elsewhere. Nor is the clarification entirely excluded by the term itself.

D. Creative substitutions and near equivalents

Translators are rarely faced with clean equivalences. Sometimes the LXX-Job translator lacks the precision of the source language, forcing him to classify the terminology into imprecise categories. He deals with these imprecisions in two ways,

²⁰² Heater, *Translation Technique*, 17–8.

²⁰³ Hatch and Redpath, *Concordance*, s.v. “ὄνος.”

which will be discussed for the remainder of this chapter: near-equivalent terms and creative substitutions. “Near equivalents” are words that fall into the same semantic sphere with minor adjustments. “Creative substitutions” are words that do not, on the surface, seem to reflect the term that they are translating. These translate the effect of the passage without translating its content, what is sometimes termed “dynamic equivalence.”²⁰⁴

One of the densest passages illustrating this conundrum for the translator is Job 4:10–11. The passage, occurring in Eliphaz’s opening speech, makes a sweeping statement about divine providence. Eliphaz uses five different lion terms:

10 שְׁאֵגַת אַרְיֵה וְקוֹל שֹׁחַל וְשׁוֹנֵי כַפְיָרִים נִתְעָוּ:
11 לִישׁ אֲבָד מִבְּלִי-טֶרֶף וּבְנֵי לְבִיא יִתְפָּרְדּוּ:

10 The roar of the lion (אַרְיֵה), the voice of the fierce lion (שֹׁחַל), and the teeth of the young lions (כַּפְיָרִים) are broken.

11 The strong lion (לִישׁ) perishes for lack of prey, and the whelps of the lioness (וּבְנֵי לְבִיא) are scattered.

The translator, however, faced a problem: Greek does not have the same number of lion terms that are present in Hebrew. Even modern translators are unclear about the distinctions between the various terms.²⁰⁵ What resulted from the translator is a mixture of exact and inexact terminology:

10 σθένος λέοντος, φωνή δὲ λεαίνης, γαυρίαμα δὲ δρακόντων ἐσβέσθη· 11 μυρμηκολέων ὄλετο παρὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν βοράν, σκύμνοι δὲ λεόντων ἔλιπον ἀλλήλους.

10 The strength of the lion (λέων) and the voice of the lioness (λεάινα) and the pride of dragons (δράκων) was extinguished, 11 the ant lion (μυρμηκολέων) perished for lack of food, and lions’ whelps (σκύμνοι λεόντων) abandoned one another.

²⁰⁴ “The purpose of the D-E translation with integral time-space elements is to enable the receptor to understand how the original receptors must have perceived the message. The purpose of D-E translation of a text lacking integral time-space elements is to enable the receptors to understand the implications of the cognitive content for themselves or to make a corresponding emotive response to the text, all without relation to the original communication” (Nida, “Dynamic Equivalence,” 103).

²⁰⁵ Alter, *The Wisdom Books*, 24n10.

Only two terms in this passage arguably connect to the same referent as the Hebrew term they translate: λέων and λέων, “lion,” and σκύμνοι λεόντων, “lion’s whelps,” for אֲרִי־לְוִיָּהּ, “sons of the lion.”²⁰⁶ The remaining terms, μυρμηκολέων, “ant-lion,” and δράκων, “dragon,” have some degree of difference from the Hebrew text.

The translator used a near-equivalent term and a creative substitution. First, after using the translation λέων for λέων, he uses a near-equivalent λέαινα, “lioness,” for λέων, “lion.” Λέαινα still describes what even a modern reader would identify as a lion, even if it inappropriately genders the term. The remaining two terms (μυρμηκολέων and δράκων), however, are unexpected because they do not read as lions. Instead, they are creative substitutions that imperfectly translate the diverse Hebrew terms because of limitations present in the target language.

E. The Sources of LXX-Job’s Vocabulary

Both of these methods require asking the further question of the vocabulary’s source. The sources can tell what material he read to “fill” the translation. It comes largely from two places: other LXX passages and secular Greek literature.

²⁰⁶ Strawn, *What is Stronger Than a Lion?* 300, 318. Out of the lions in the Hebrew Bible, אֲרִי־לְוִיָּהּ has the least fixed definition. An association with female lions (i.e. lioness) probably arose as a result of the Vulgate rendering *leæna*. Modern evidence is mixed: “The grammatical, syntactical, and comparative evidence is clearly *against* such an interpretation,” including as it does evidence that it derives from a Semitic root that covered both genders, including feminine and masculine forms that appear elsewhere” (318).

1. LXX sources

Some animals are clearly influenced by other Greek biblical passages. In LXX-Job, this applies to the unicorn (μονόκερωζ), the siren (σειρήν) and ostrich (στρουθός), the bull-calf (μόσχος), and the lamb (ἀμνάς).

Μονόκερωζ, “unicorn,” appears at LXX-Job 39:9–12 and translates מִיָּדָה, (which probably refers to an auroch or wild ox).²⁰⁷ It is a unique LXX term, and an instance of “translation Greek,” being a mixture of classical and biblical models.²⁰⁸ This term is rarely used to describe the single-horned equine that the English term “unicorn” evokes. In his study on the messianic symbolism of the unicorn in the Greek Bible, J.L.W. Schaper argues that the μονόκερωζ “acts as a reference to the benevolent power of God and to the might of kings.”²⁰⁹ But even he admits that the appearance in LXX-Job does not seem to share in that network of texts and allusion.²¹⁰ Also, in no classical authors is this creature given the proper name “unicorn.”²¹¹ Aristotle uses the related term

²⁰⁷ HALOT, s.v., “מִיָּדָה.”

²⁰⁸ Hatch and Redpath, *Concordance*, s.v. “μονόκερωζ”; G.B Caird, “Towards a Lexicon of the Septuagint. II,” *JTS* 20.1 (April 1969): 22–3. Also variously spelled מִיָּדָה and מִיָּדָה. The English derivative “unicorn” derives from the Latin calque on the Greek term (μονό = *uni* + κερως = *cornus*). Sometimes, “unicorn” (i.e. *Posterior Analytics* 92b8 or *Prior Analytics* 49a25) is the τραγέλαφος, the “goat-deer,” an animal he explicitly refers to as imaginary. Aristotle uses the related adjective μονοκέρατος, “single-horned,” to describe two animals, the Indian ass and the oryx (*Hist. an.* 499b18–9; *Part. an.* 663a23–5). Pliny the Elder, writing in the first century, echoes the same description in his *Nat. XI.xlv.128, asino Indico qui uno armatus est cornu*. In the LXX, the μονόκερωζ “acts as a reference to the benevolent power of God and to the might of kings,” frequently in a messianic context. Their horns are a “positive symbol of God’s saving power,” and applied to “an individual or tribe as coming from God” and “praising the splendor and majesty of Zion” (J.L.W Schaper, “The Unicorn in the Messianic Imagery of the Greek Bible,” *JTS* 45.1 [April 1994]: 136). Ctesias (fl. 5th c. BCE) describes how the “wild ass” possesses a single, giant horn and a nasty temperament that may have bled into the LXX understanding of the unicorn (excerpts found in Phot. *Bibl.* 72, 45a21–50a4). These creatures, “the size of horses and even bigger,” possessed a striking appearance: “They have a white body, crimson head, and deep blue eyes” (Ctesias, *On India* 45 [trans. Andrew Nichols; London: A&C Black, 2013], 56).

²⁰⁹ “The Unicorn in the Messianic Imagery of the Greek Bible,” *JTS New Series* 45 No. 1 (April 1994): 136.

²¹⁰ Schaper, “The Unicorn,” 131.

²¹¹ Sometimes what is translated “unicorn” (i.e. *Posterior Analytics* 92b8 or *Prior Analytics* 49a25) is the τραγέλαφος, the “goat-deer,” an animal he explicitly refers to as imaginary.

“μονοκέρατος” (“single-horned”) as an adjective, not as a substantial noun, to describe two different animals, the Indian ass and the oryx.²¹² He echoes a lengthy section from Ctesias’ description of a wild ass, from his 5th c. BCE *Ἰνδικά* (On India).²¹³

Similarly, the siren (σειρήν) and ostrich (στρουθός) translate *הַיָּבִיטִים* (“ostrich”) and *הַיָּבִיטִים* (“jackal”) at LXX-Job 30:29: “I have become a brother of sirens and a companion of ostriches” (ἀδελφὸς γέγονα σειρήνων, ἑταῖρος δὲ στρουθῶν).²¹⁴ By the time of the LXX, this pair was nearly inseparable in translation and interchangeably translated either “jackal” or “ostrich.”²¹⁵ One proposal argues that the transition happened in several stages. The first passage to make the association was LXX-Isa 34:13–14.²¹⁶ From that original pairing, the other passages of the LXX were revised or read with that pairing, leading to the confusion as to whether “siren” translates “jackal” or “ostrich.”²¹⁷ The

²¹² Aristotle, *Hist. an.* 499b18. This description is repeated in *Part an.* 663a.23–5. Pliny the Elder, writing in the first century, echoes the same description in his *Nat.* XI.xlv.128, *asino Indico qui uno armatus est cornu.*

²¹³ Ctesias: *On India, and Fragments of His Minor Works* (trans. Andrew Nichols; New York: Bloomberg, 2011), 56–7.

²¹⁴ Homer’s *Odyssey* is the earliest source mentioning σειρήν, bewitching creatures whose songs lure sailors to their death (Gerald K. Gresseth, “The Homeric Sirens,” *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 101 [1970]: 205; Homer, *Odyssey* XII.39–46). Noteworthy in Homer is the lack avian characteristics that would come to be associated with them. The first writer to mention the Sirens’ ornithological features is possibly Euripides (5th c. BCE), but their bird-like nature is remarkably consistent across its visual and literary appearances (Gresseth, “The Homeric Sirens,” 211, 213–4; Eugenio Luján and Juan-Pablo Vita, “The etymology of Greek σειρήν revisited,” *Glotta* 94 [2018], 234). Στρουθός refers to the ostrich but can also paradoxically refer to a small songbird. Clarifying adjectives like μεγάλη, “great,” often accompany στρουθός to differentiate it from the smaller bird (Geoffrey Arnott, *Birds in the Ancient World from A to Z* [The Ancient World from A to Z; New York: Routledge, 2007], 333). Hatch and Redpath, *Concordance*, s.v. “σειρήν.”

²¹⁵ Manolis Papoutsakis proposes the association happened in several stages, beginning with LXX-Isa 34:13–4 (“Ostriches Into Sirens: Towards an Understanding of a Septuagint Crux,” *JJS* 55.1 [2004]: 32). Other passages of the LXX were conformed to this pair, causing confusion as to whether “siren” translates “jackal” or “ostrich”: “Not without oddity, the Hebrew name of the jackal is even translated twice as ‘ostrich’ (Jeremiah 10, 22; 49, 33 [30, 28]), while that of the ostrich is rendered three more times by ‘siren’ (Isaiah 13, 21; Jeremiah 50 [27], 39; Micah 1: 8): clues that these animal names are sometimes interchangeable, especially in the literary evocation of scenes of desolation” (“Le bestiaire de Job,” 236).

²¹⁶ Papoutsakis, “Ostriches into Sirens,” 32.

²¹⁷ “Not without oddity, the Hebrew name of the jackal is even translated twice as ‘ostrich’ (Jeremiah 10, 22; 49, 33 [30, 28]), while that of the ostrich is rendered three more times by ‘siren’ (Isaiah 13, 21; Jeremiah 50 [27], 39; Micah 1: 8): clues that these animal names are sometimes interchangeable, especially in the literary evocation of scenes of desolation” (Bertrand, “Le bestiare de Job,” 236).

LXX-Job translator was heir to this LXX tradition; his use of this pair does not come from his independent understanding of the mythological background of the siren and the ostrich.

Ἀμνάς, “lamb,” also reflects a frozen LXX lexical meaning. At Job 42:11, Job’s brothers and sisters give him gifts to console him. In the Hebrew, they bring him “a piece of silver and a gold ring” (אִישׁ קִשְׁיָטָה אֶחָת וְאִישׁ נָזָם זָהָב אֶחָד); in the LXX, קִשְׁיָטָה (a monetary unit) is translated instead as ἀμνάς. While it might seem a surprise, קִשְׁיָטָה is a rare monetary term, obscure in its precise meaning, that is always translated as ἀμνάς in the LXX.²¹⁸ Despite the unusual appearance of the “lamb” in LXX-Job, it is driven by LXX-centered consistency rather than the Job translator’s own idiosyncrasies.

Likewise, the translator’s use of μόσχος (“bull calf”) reflects Old Testament usage in order to make Job more righteous, making him follow prescribed Levitical laws.²¹⁹ In LXX-Lev and LXX-Num, פָּר is also often translated as μόσχος.²²⁰ At the beginning of Job, Job presents burnt offerings (עֹלֹת) daily to correct the potential sins of his children (Job 1:5), which appears in LXX-Job 1:5 as “one bull calf” (μόσχος ἓνα).²²¹ Likewise, at the end of the book (Job 42:8), Job sacrifices seven bulls (פָּרִים), which LXX-Job translates using the same term (ἑπτὰ μόσχους, “seven bull calves”).²²² The most apparent reason is also the most likely: considering his allusive translation technique, LXX-Num and LXX-Lev are the sources for these details.²²³

²¹⁸ Hatch and Redpath, *Concordance*, s.v. “ἀμνάς.”

²¹⁹ *Hist. an.* 545a19; Hatch and Redpath, *Concordance*, s.v. “μόσχος.”

²²⁰ Hatch and Redpath, *Concordance*, s.v. “μόσχος.”

²²¹ G.B. Gray suggests that this addition may reflect a now-lost original *Vorlage* (“The Additions in the Ancient Greek Version of Job,” *The Expositor* 19 [1920]: 428n1). Edouard Dhorme argues that this addition is a gloss that “imputes to the children of Job a fault which is hypothetical only,” but it is difficult to see how the verse is “hypothetical.” (*Job*, 4).

²²² HALOT, s.v. פָּר.

²²³ Heater, *Translation Technique*, 14, 16.

This use of LXX-allusive terminology is a natural consequence of the translator's choice to contribute a Greek translation of biblical literature. Some words, such as $\eta\psi\psi\eta$ /ἀμνάς, lost their original meanings and had become clear equivalents. Others, like $\mu\sigma\sigma\eta$ /μυρμηκίον, are a translational pair that referred to similar animals. Still others ($\mu\sigma\sigma\eta$ /μόσχος) are meant to highlight a character feature of the central character, serving a literary purpose.

2. Secular Greek literature

The other source of the translator's vocabulary is secular Greek literature, including the ant-lion (μυρμηκολέων), the vulture (γύψ), and maggot (σκώληξ), as well as unusual details associated with the lion (λέων) and the dragon (δράκων)

The classical precedent that is most noteworthy is the “ant-lion” (μυρμηκολέων), which translates $\psi\eta\lambda$, “lion,” at LXX-Job 4:11.²²⁴ He seems to have understood the μυρμηκολέων as a type of lion because it is surrounded by other lion terms.²²⁵ The literary inspiration for the μυρμηκολέων (the μύρμηξ, “ant”) is different from the modern “ant-lion.” Agatharchides (2nd c. BCE), in his *On the Erythraean Sea*, describes “those [lions] called ‘ants’” (τῶν καλουμένων μυρμηκῶν) after a section on Arabian lions: “For the most part they do not differ from the notion of the other [lions]; they, however, have

²²⁴ $\psi\eta\lambda$ is a rare term for “lion” (HALOT, s.v. $\psi\eta\lambda$).

²²⁵ Mia Gerhardt, “The Ant-lion: Nature Study and the Interpretation of a Biblical Text, from the Physiologus to Albert the Great,” *Vivarium* 3 (1965): 2. Fitting the LXX tendency to develop animal hybrids, it is probably an LXX neologism combining “ant” (μύρμηξ) and “lion” (λέων) (Anna Angelini, “Biblical Translations and Cross-Cultural Communication: A Focus on the Animal Imagery,” *Semitica et Classica* 8 [2015]: 35).

reversed genitalia, one opposite the other.”²²⁶ Strabo and Aelian repeat this tradition.²²⁷ Other authors describe these “ants.”²²⁸ Herodotus (fl. 5th c. BCE) writes about “a desert in which ants abound in size somewhat less than dogs but larger than foxes,” digging up sand possessing gold.²²⁹ Nearchus compares the ant-skins to leopard-skins and Megasthenes describes how the ants zealously guard their gold to the point of killing any intruder.²³⁰ George Druce argues the translator relies on a tradition that the ant-lion could eat neither meat nor herbs, therefore dying of starvation.²³¹ As Mia Gerhardt points out, however, those stories emerge from exegesis of LXX-Job 4:11.²³² Even without an exact verbal parallel, the classical model’s influence can be clearly seen on the translator’s choices.

Some Greek textbooks helped the translator make a general term more specific. Job 5:7 expresses the somewhat vague idea that “sparks” (or “sons of Resheph”) “fly[] upward” (עוֹף יַגְבִּיהוּ בְּגַי־רֶשֶׁף). The LXX translator produces a sensible translation of the passage: “a human being is born to hardship, whereas the vulture’s young soar on high” (ἀλλὰ ἄνθρωπος γεννᾶται κόπῳ, νεοσσοὶ δὲ γυπὸς τὰ ὑψηλὰ πέτονται).²³³ The sense of the passage seems to be that humankind cannot escape hardship, but the natural world is

²²⁶ οἱ μὲν πλεῖστοι κατὰ τὴν ἰδέαν τῶν λουπῶν οὐδὲν παραλλάτουσι, τὴν δὲ τῶν αἰδοίων φύσιν ἀπεστραμμένην ἔχουσιν, ἐναντίαν τοῖς ἀλλοῖς (Agatharchides, *De Mari Eurythraeo* XXXIV.lxix.5–8). Translation mine.

²²⁷ Strabo, *Geographica* XVI.15; Aelianus, *De Natura Animalium* VII.47, XVII.42.

²²⁸ D. Newbold, “The Ethiopian Ant-lion,” *Sudan Notes and Records* 7 (July 1924): 134; George Druce, “An Account of the Μυρμηκολέων or Ant-lion,” *The Antiquaries Journal* III.4 (October 1923): 360–1.

²²⁹ Herodotus, *Histories*, III.102. Druce, “An Account of the Μυρμηκολέων,” 354.

²³⁰ Strabo, *Geographica* XV.i.44. Druce, “An Account of the Μυρμηκολέων,” 355.

²³¹ Because the verse states that “the ant-lion perished for lack of food” (μυρμηκολέων ὄλετο παρὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν βοράν) (Druce, “An Account of the Μυρμηκολέων,” 361).

²³² Gerhardt, “The Ant-Lion,” 3.

²³³ The translator shows a logical pattern in his rendering. יַגְבִּי, “sons of,” is rendered with νεοσσοί, “offspring” or “young”; τὰ ὑψηλὰ, “high,” maps to ἡγῆ, “upward.”

born removed from it. Γύψ, “vulture,” however, uniquely corresponds with *הַפֶּיָּר*.²³⁴ Faced with a phrase that includes “sons of” and “flying upward,” it is understandable why the translator decided to choose a bird, but it is not a stock animal for the Greek translators, as γύψ is a rare LXX term.

The first question is whether LXX-Job’s translator is referencing its double appearance in LXX-Leviticus, considering his penchant for associative translation. However, the LXX-Leviticus passage only provides the barest distinctions. Not only does LXX-Lev use γύψ twice in the same verse, translating two different terms (*סִפְּרָה* and *הַפֶּיָּר*), but it does not provide any further details about them.²³⁵ More common is the generic term ἀετός, applied to all flying birds of prey. The vulture’s major distinguishing feature was its carrion consumption, not apparent when the bird is merely flying in the air.²³⁶

In contrast, Aristotle provides the following information about the vulture:

The vulture builds (Ὁ δὲ γύψ νεοττεύει) on inaccessible rocky cliffs; hence one seldom sees either its nest or its young. And hence Herodorus, father of Bryson the sophist, says that vultures come from some other country unknown to us, citing as evidence that no one has ever seen a vulture’s nest, and that vultures suddenly appear in large numbers in the wake of armies. It is certainly difficult to get a sight <of the nest>, but still it has been seen.²³⁷

He repeats this information later in the book.²³⁸ The LXX-Job passage contrasts the proximity of humans to trouble with the distance obtained by the vulture’s young.

Likewise, Aristotle emphasizes that the bird and its offspring originate and live in areas well-removed from where humans live.

²³⁴ However, as John Burnight notes, “the ‘bird’ interpretation is found also in [the LXX] rendering of Deut 32:34, where *הַפֶּיָּר* [‘devoured by pestilence’] is rendered βρώσει ὀρνέων (‘devouring birds’)” (“Job 5:7 as Eliphaz’s Response to Job’s ‘Malediction’ (3:3–10),” *JBL* 133.1 (Spring 2014): 78n4).

²³⁵ “And they shall not be eaten; they are an abomination: the eagle and the vulture and the osprey and the vulture” (τὸν ἀετὸν καὶ τὸν γρύπα καὶ τὸν ἀλαιοῖτον, καὶ τὸν γύπα καὶ ἰκτίνα καὶ τὰ ὅμοια αὐτῶ).

²³⁶ L. J. Topel, “What Kind of a Sign are Vultures? Luke 17,37b” *Biblica* 84 (2003): 404–5.

²³⁷ *Hist. an.* 563a5–12.

²³⁸ *Hist. an.* 615a9–15.

Other elements of the Job passage provide a further satellite of terminology that may have encouraged the translator's use of "vulture" here. Aristotle's offhand comment about the habit of following armies was later interpreted as being connected to the corpses that often followed clashes.²³⁹ Similarly, in LXX-Job, several verses preceding the translator's mention of the vulture dwell on the fate of wicked individuals: that their "way of living" would be "devoured" and that their children would be far from safety. Furthermore, the verse immediately before the mention of the vulture mentions how trouble does not come from the "mountains," which is where the vultures were rumored to live, far from the troubles of humankind.

In conclusion, Eliphaz's unusual use of the term רֶשֶׁת at Job 5:7 forced the LXX translator to look at the wider context of the verse, draw his own conclusions. It is likely that the context put him in mind of something that flies; the term בֶּן ("son") drew his mind to offspring; and the contrast with the troubled life of the human made him think of an animal usually described in contrast. Eliphaz's overall tone of death and destruction, to which the $\gamma\acute{o}\psi$ was generally connected, narrowed his choice from the more generic $\acute{\alpha}\epsilon\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$. The biology textbooks, especially Aristotle, provided our translator with the tools to make a distinction that other biblical translators seem uninterested or unable to make.

Certain other passages are slightly adjusted in ways that conform to Aristotle. Near the end of the prologue, there is an additional creature that the Hebrew lacks. In the middle of the first of two major additions at LXX-Job 2:9, Job's wife disgustingly describes how he sits outside "in the refuse of maggots ($\sigma\kappa\acute{\omega}\lambda\eta\xi$)" ($\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \sigma\alpha\pi\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha\ \sigma\kappa\omega\lambda\acute{\eta}\kappa\omega\nu\ \kappa\acute{\alpha}\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\iota$, 2:9h). LXX-Job 2:9c only refers to $\sigma\alpha\pi\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha$ ("refuse"), but an earlier verse

²³⁹ Arnott, *Birds in the Ancient World*, 91.

(LXX-Job 2:8) refers to Job sitting “upon the *dung-heap* outside of the city,” (ἐπὶ τῆς κοπρίας ἔξω τῆς πόλεως).²⁴⁰ On this basis, Timothy Johnson argues that 2:9c describes the same dung-heap, not just a “pile of refuse.”²⁴¹ This would also conform to Aristotle’s understanding of the σκώληξ. He describes how “flies come out of the larvae (ἐκ τῶν σκωλήκων) found in dung (ἐν τῇ κόπρω),” referring to larvae like maggots, not merely “worms.”²⁴² His language seems more overtly scatological. The LXX-Job passage better reflects the Aristotelian view of the origin of the σκώληξ (from manure).

Aristotelian writings also explain an unusual addition to Job 6:5. The Greek translator takes several liberties with the text: “So my life cannot cease, for I loathe my food like the smell of a lion” (οὐ δύναται γὰρ παύσασθαι μου ἡ ψυχή· βρόμον γὰρ ὀρῶ τὰ σῖτά μου ὥσπερ ὀσμὴν λέοντος). Various elements can be traced back to the underlying Hebrew, at least for the first clause.²⁴³ The second stich, βρόμον γὰρ ὀρῶ τὰ σῖτά μου, literally translated “I perceive my food to be foul,” follows Hebrew’s וְיִרְאֶה אֲנִי כְּסִיטָה לֶחֶם אֲנִי אֹכְלִים, “they are like food that is loathsome to me,” in broad strokes. However, the end of the verse as it appears in the LXX, ὥσπερ ὀσμὴν λέοντος, “like the smell of the lion,” does not correspond with any element of the Hebrew. Nothing that could be construed as a comparison, nor a lion, is found in the MT.

What better describes its origin is Aristotelian literature. Aristotle states: “[The lion] also imparts a heavy smell (ὀσμὴν βαρεῖαν) to what it is eating, by breathing on it

²⁴⁰ The Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek, s.v. “κοπρία.”

²⁴¹ Timothy J. Johnson, “Critical Note on Job 2:8: Ash-Heap or Dung-Heap?,” *BIOSCS* 36 (2003): 88.

²⁴² *Hist. an.* 552a20–21.

²⁴³ The main verb of the Hebrew, נִרְאֶה (“[it] refuses”) is translated as οὐ δύναται, “to be unable.” Μου ἡ ψυχή corresponds with וְיִרְאֶה, which here seems to mean something closer to “appetite” rather than “life.” LXX-Job’s “cease” (παύσασθαι), however, does not seem to come from the Hebrew, translating וְיָגַח, “to touch.” Part of this seems dictated by the translator’s choice to start the sentence as “my life cannot...,” for which “touch” would be an inappropriate term.

(καταπνέων); in fact when it is opened up its inside emits a heavy vapour.”²⁴⁴ Because of the closeness of the tradition to the verse’s formulation, it is reasonable to assume that the LXX-Job author was familiar with the idea.

Medical textbooks clarify some of the terminology used to describe physical features on the δράκων at the end of the book. At Job 40:17, its hindquarters are described:

יִקְפֹּץ זַנְבּוֹ כְּמוֹ־אַרְז גִּידֵי פְתָלוֹ יִשְׁרָגוּ:

It makes its tail (זַנְבּוֹ) stiff like a cedar; the sinews of its thighs (גִּידֵי פְתָלוֹ) are knit together.

In Hebrew, this passage is filled with euphemisms. The verb translated “to make stiff,” קָפַץ, only holds this meaning in this passage.²⁴⁵ More regularly, יָפַץ means “desire.”²⁴⁶ Combined with the obvious sexual valence of “tail” (זַנְבּוֹ), the euphemistic nature of the passage becomes clear.²⁴⁷ The description of its “thighs” (פְתָלוֹ) may refer to its testicles, by modern and medieval commentators.²⁴⁸ The translator uses terms whose connotation in Greek literature is similarly sexual. Hesychius, in his 5th century AD *Lexicon*, defines οὐρά, “tail,” as τὸ αἰδοῖον (“the genitals”).²⁴⁹ Likewise, when it speaks of “its sinews” (τὰ νεῦρα), the sexual aspect is present in the Greek term as well, but usually in the singular (νεῦρον).²⁵⁰ In another verse, at 40:16, the δράκων’s strength (ἰσχὺς) is described as located “around/from its loins” (ἐπ’ ὀσφύϊ). Normally, under the influence of the Hebrew,

²⁴⁴ The same is found in later authors, such as Pliny (*Natural History* VIII.viii) and Aelian.

²⁴⁵ Clines, *Job 38–42*, 1150.

²⁴⁶ HALOT, s.v. יָפַץ.

²⁴⁷ David Bernat, “Biblical Wašfs Beyond Song of Songs,” *JSOT* 28 (2004): 335–6.

²⁴⁸ Clines, *Job 38–42*, 1151; Bernat, “Biblical Wašfs,” 336.

²⁴⁹ Hesychius, *Hesychii Alexandrini lexicon* (ed. Moritz Schmidt; Jena: Sumptibus F. Maukii, 1867), 1163.

²⁵⁰ For example, the comic poet Platon describes the red mullet: “[It] does not tend to be helpful to the penis (νεῦρον), for she belongs to the maiden Artemis and hates erections” (Xenophon, *Frag.* 189.20). LXX-Lam 1:14 also describes the sinews as “interwoven” (συνεπλάκησαν). Vg. makes explicit with *nervi testicularum*.

it is rendered “in its loins.” Cimoso and Bonney argue that “the Greek term ἰσχὺς is a euphemism to indicate the sexual organs of the beast.”²⁵¹ Its meaning with ἐπί is less clear. Ὀσφῶς occurs with the ἐπί, but never as a genitive; likewise, the form ὀσφύι never appears with ἐπί. Outside of biblical literature, however, ὀσφύι with ἐπί is found in Hippocrates’ *Περὶ Σαρκῶν* (*On Flesh*), describing how the blood vessels branch off from the loins (καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ ὀσφύϊ σχίζεται).²⁵² Hence, it may more logically be translated “around its loins” (like a belt) or “from its loins.” This collection of physical terms, many of which are only here in LXX-Job, are best understood with reference to classical models rather than biblical ones.

Classical models for several prominent animals in the translation, especially ones that are found only in LXX-Job, demonstrate both creativity on the part of the translator and his knowledge of other sources. Some are subtle and may merely indicate a common literary world without specific literary dependence, as with the vulture. Others, however, are much more clearly indebted to other classical authors, as is the case with the ant-lion and the lion’s scent-imparting abilities.

3. Mixed Influence

The distinction between the two sides of the model – LXX-influenced vocabulary and Greek literature – is not always clean. His choices of κῆτος and δράκων demonstrate how he intermixes those two influences.

²⁵¹ “The Mystery of God in Nature,” 30.

²⁵² Hippocrates, *On Flesh* II.303.

The term κῆτος covers both mythical and real aquatic life.²⁵³ Aristotle connects the κῆτος to the whale and describes its mouth: “The moustache-whale (μυστακόκητος) lacks teeth in its mouth and has instead hairs similar to pigs’ bristles.”²⁵⁴ This description influenced later descriptions of the κῆτος. A whale’s bristle-filled mouth developed into a mouth full of teeth and their eating habits (swimming forward with an open mouth to catch plankton), body mass (bigger than nearly all other whales), and disproportionately large head all contributed to the assimilation of the κῆτος into sea-monster mythology.²⁵⁵ Although the term κῆτος is applied to various natural creatures, the literary world was fascinated by the mysterious descriptions of the whale and their unusual habits.

In the LXX, the κῆτος does not lose its monstrous connotations. It translates four different terms in three books: LXX-Gen, LXX-Jonah, and LXX-Job.²⁵⁶ All three translations modify κῆτος with μέγα, “great.”²⁵⁷ LXX-Job, the latest of these translations, clearly alludes to both LXX-Genesis and LXX-Jonah.²⁵⁸ LXX-Job 3:8 describes “he who is about to subdue the great sea-creature” (ὁ μέλλων τὸ μέγα κῆτος χειρώσασθαι). The creature to be subdued τὸ μέγα κῆτος, “the great sea-creature,” translating יְהִיָּל,

²⁵³ In the *Odyssey*, it is a synonym for the seal (φώκη) (*The Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek*, s.v. “κῆτος”; Homer, *Odyssey* IV.448). Arcestratus, a 4th c. BCE gourmand, likewise notes that the term is a synonym for “tuna” (θύννος) and “orkus” (ὄρκος) (Arcestratus, *The Learned Banqueters* VII.301).

²⁵⁴ *Hist. an.* 505b30–31; 519a23–24. Although emended to μυστακόκητος, the manuscripts read a variation of μυστόκητος/μυστοκῆτος/ὁ μῦς τὸ κῆτος, “mouse-whale” (*Hist. an.* 519a23–24, note *in loc.*)

²⁵⁵ K.M. Coleman, “Manilius’ Monster,” *Hermes* 111.2 (1983): 230. Even prior to Aristotle, the term referred to a destructive monster. *Iliad* 20.147 refers to a κῆτος sent by Poseidon to kill Heracles and destroy a city. So too *Odyssey* 5.421 contrasts the κῆτος with the smaller dolphin (δελφινάς) or (sea-)dog (κύννας) (*The Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek*, s.v. “κῆτος”). Even if these appearances began as a reference to a natural animal, the creatures in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* are hybrids of fact and fiction (Alexander Jaffee, “Sea Monsters in Antiquity: A Classical and Zoological Investigation,” *Berkeley Undergraduate Journal of Classics* 1.2 [2013]: 3).

²⁵⁶ Hatch and Redpath, *Concordance*, s.v. “κῆτος.”

²⁵⁷ LXX-Gen 1:21 translates יְהִיָּל וְיִבְרָא, “the great sea creatures,” as τὰ κῆτη τὰ μέγала, “the great sea monsters.” Likewise, LXX-Jonah 2:1 uses κῆτος μέγα, “great sea monster,” to translate לִיָּהּ אִי, “great fish,” instead of the more common ἰχθύς, “fish” (Scott B. Noegel, “Jonah and Leviathan: Inner-Biblical Allusions and the Problem with Dragons,” *Henoch* 37.2 [2015]: 239).

²⁵⁸ Noegel, “Jonah and Leviathan,” 242.

“Leviathan.”²⁵⁹ Instead of κῆτος alone, the translator adds τὸ μέγα, whose extraneous presence increases the likelihood that it is an intentional allusion.

Its next appearance is at LXX-Job 9:13: “For he has not turned away from anger; the sea-monsters under heaven were bowed down by him” (αὐτὸς γὰρ ἀπέστραπται ὀργὴν, ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ ἐκάμφθησαν κήτη τὰ ὑπ’ οὐρανόν).²⁶⁰ Κήτη τὰ ὑπ’ οὐρανόν, “the sea-creatures under heaven,” translates “the helpers of Rahab” (בְּהַרְיִרָעָה).²⁶¹ The plural κήτη appears to allude to the “great sea creatures,” τὰ κήτη τὰ μεγάλα, at LXX-Gen 1:21.

Finally, Job describes one of the primeval acts of God at LXX-Job 26:12, translating בְּהַרְיִרָעָה, “Rahab,” as κῆτος: “By force he calmed the sea, and by knowledge he struck down the sea-monster” (ἰσχύι κατέπαυσεν τὴν θάλασσαν ἐπιστήμη δὲ ἔτρωσε τὸ κῆτος).²⁶² In the book of Job, κῆτος is a threatening creature like the great sea monsters of LXX-Genesis or the great fish of LXX-Jonah. While “Rahab” and “Leviathan” appear under a common species name, it is neither eliminated nor made any less monstrous.

The “dragon” (δράκων) is also a mixture of classical and biblical influence. The word “δράκων” is often used to describe snakes more than the fantastical dragon the term usually invokes.²⁶³ Δράκων at LXX-Job 26:13, translating שֶׁרֶפֶד, “serpent,” probably reflects this non-fantastic sense of the term.²⁶⁴ However, other writers demonstrate δράκων was more than just a normal snake.²⁶⁵ In mythological contexts, the δράκων was

²⁵⁹ Elsewhere, most notably in God’s second speech, he chooses δράκων, “dragon.”

²⁶⁰ In Hebrew, Job describes how “Eloah [God] will not turn back his anger” (אֵלֹהִים לֹא יָשִׁיב אַפָּי) and that God caused “the helpers of Rahab” (בְּהַרְיִרָעָה) to bow in submission

²⁶¹ Κῆτος translates בְּהַרְיִרָעָה, “Rahab,” not רָעָה, “helper.”

²⁶² “By his power he stilled the Sea; by his understanding he struck down Rahab” (בְּכֹחוֹ רָגַע הַיָּם וּבְתוֹכָהּ מָחַץ) (בְּהַרְיִרָעָה).

²⁶³ Aristotle, speaking of natural animals, uses the term ὄφις (“snake”) and δράκων as equivalents (*Hist. an.* 609a4; Kenneth Kitchell, *Animals in the Ancient World from A to Z* [Abingdon, UK: Taylor & Francis Group, 2009], 61).

²⁶⁴ Hatch and Redpath, *Concordance*, s.v. “δράκων.” Its adjective, “fleeing” (ἄποστατήν), is uniquely translated as ἀποστάτην, “rebellious.” A δράκων ἀποστάτης does not appear in the LXX or Greek literature.

²⁶⁵ Kitchell, *Animals in the Ancient World*, 61: “Philoumenos, closely following Nicander, offers the

frequently connected to the depths of the earth.²⁶⁶ They acted as guards, connected with the term *το δέρκομαι*, “to watch” (aorist participle: *δράκων*).²⁶⁷ Their role as “watchers” sometimes overrode traditional reptilian associations: Cerberus, one of the most famous guardians of the underworld in Greek myth, sometimes obtained *δράκων*-like features.²⁶⁸ This more mythological valence is clearly present in the *δράκων* at the climax of the book (LXX-Job 40–41). In short, at its most routine, the word is used as a synonym for a mere snake, as in Aristotle; in mythology, it is chiefly associated with the underworld.

Δράκων translates *רַפְּיָר*, “young lion,” at LXX-Job 4:10 and LXX-Job 38:39.²⁶⁹

This unique recurring translation for LXX-Job may reflect influence from other LXX passages. LXX-Ezek 32:2 places *λέων* and *δράκων* in parallel to describe the Pharaoh.²⁷⁰ “Pride of the dragons” (*γαυρίαμα δρακόντων*) may have been inspired by LXX-Num 23:24, which describes how a people will “bear itself proudly like a lion” (*καὶ ὡς λέων γαυριωθήσεται*). Also worthy of note is the Ancient Near East connection between

following: they are not poisonous, but kill with sheer strength; numerous in Aethiopia and Libya; they differ in color (black, yellowish-red, ashen) and size (from 5 to over 40 cubits); they have projections resembling eyebrows and a ‘beard’ beneath the chin; gaping maw with large teeth. Early Greek and Etruscan depictions of snakes show them with beards. Lucan says they are harmless elsewhere but in Libya are deadly and golden colored, with the ability to draw birds down from the sky with their breath. He mentions their ability to conquer elephants, a belief very popular in medieval bestiaries.’

²⁶⁶ Daniel Ogden, “Katabasis and the Serpent,” *Les Études Classiques* 83 (2015): 194. He lists several illustrations of this relationship: “When interpreting an omen Herodotus’ Telmessians were to declare, ‘the snake (*ophis*) to be the child of the earth,’ whilst centuries later Artemidorus was to observe that ‘the *drakōn* itself is of the earth and makes its life within it.’ The great *drakontes* of myth were often projected as the children of Earth. Earth is given as mother to, amongst other great serpents: Ladon; the (eventually) anguiform ‘earthborn’ (*gēgeneis*) Giants, whom she accompanies in their iconography from the sixth century BC; Python; the Serpent of Ares; the Serpent of Nemea; and the pet *drakōn* that Heracles deployed against the Nemean Lion” (240)

²⁶⁷ Ogden, “Katabasis and the Serpent,” 197.

²⁶⁸ Ogden, “Katabasis and the Serpent,” 199n39.

²⁶⁹ LXX-Job 4:10: “The pride of the dragons is extinguished” (*γαυρίαμα δὲ δρακόντων ἐσβέσθη*); LXX-Job 38:39: “Will you hunt prey for the lions and satisfy the appetite of dragons?” (*θηρεύσεις δὲ λέουσιν βοράν ψυχὰς δὲ δρακόντων ἐμπλήσεις*).

²⁷⁰ You [Pharaoh] were likened to a lion of nations, and you were like a dragon that is in the sea” (*Λέοντι ἐθνῶν ὁμοιώθης καὶ σὺ ὡς δράκων ὁ ἐν τῇ θαλάσσει*) (John G. Gammie, “The Angelology and Demonology in the Septuagint of the Book of Job,” *HUCA* 56 [1985]: 15).

dragons and lions. One Mesopotamian account of a primeval battle between Tishpak and the “*labbu*” (CT 13.33–3) uses a combination of leonine and serpentine imagery.²⁷¹ Other ancient sources depict lions with serpentine features and *vice-versa*.²⁷² Both δράκων and κῆτος have a complicated pedigree, both of which are operative in the translator’s choices.

F. Conclusion

In these cases, the translator was creative with the sources of his vocabulary. While broad generalizations contain exceptions, the translator seems to draw primarily from two sources when choosing his vocabulary: other Greek translations of Scripture and Greek zoological textbooks, such as those from Aristotle. Some terms are more clearly influenced by one source than another, such as the μυρμηκολέων’s classical influences, but several terms, such as δράκων and κῆτος, are “mixed” in their sourcing, showing influence from both biblical and literary models.

In the following chapter, I will be discussing larger semantic units, focused on sentences and paragraphs, and discerning whether the same sources are at play. As we will see, the sources are indeed primarily similar, but their use and distribution differ from the word-level equivalencies shown in this chapter.

²⁷¹ Theodore J. Lewis, “CT 13.33–34 and Ezekiel 32: Lion-Dragon Myths,” *JAOS* 116.1 (Jan–Mar 1996): 33–4.

²⁷² Lewis, “Lion-Dragon Myths,” 35–6.

CHAPTER III: LXX-JOB'S "POSITIVE" TECHNIQUE II: LARGER LITERARY

UNITS

A. Introduction

While the translator more freely alludes to his biblical and classical predecessors at the word-level, as shown in the previous chapter, he is much more reticent to make verse- or passage-length additions to these passages. The relative dearth of long additions to this material provides circumstantial evidence that his translation philosophy leans toward other methods of adjusting the text. If this were not the case, more extensive changes would be expected, especially if his motivation were to make the book's content his own.

For the passages in which more extensive additions can be found, the translator does not have a uniform approach. The added material in each passage is idiosyncratic in both its source and how it is added to the passage; nor is it easily generalized, unlike the plethora of vocabulary-level changes already documented. Nonetheless, they contain clues that point to his sophisticated understanding of each passage and how his changes moved beyond simply changing a word or two. It is also clear that the two categories outlined previously (Greek biblical translations and secular Greek literature) are still operative here, despite their lesser prevalence.

For each passage, I will present and briefly discuss the original Hebrew passage; from there, I will present and explain the LXX translation, pointing out relevant differences.

B. Greek biblical translations

The translator's tendency toward alluding to other Greek biblical translations is one of his most distinctive qualities. He uses it much more sparingly in large sections and makes generalized connections than pointed, clear, and specific references.

1. Job 9:26

Sometimes, the translator takes the overall meaning of the passage and deepens its implications with a biblical allusion.

i. Hebrew

חָלְפוּ עִם־אֲנִיּוֹת אֶבֶה כְּנֹשֶׁר יָטוּשׁ עָלַי־אֶקֶל

[My days] go by like skiffs of reed, like an eagle swooping on the prey.

This statement is embedded in a longer complaint about Job's inability to get God's attention. 9:25–31 present a unit wherein Job refuses to set aside his complaint because of his brief mortal life, largely because he does not want to ignore that God will render him guilty.²⁷³ The brevity of his life is given a predatory gloss: "like an eagle" (כְּנֹשֶׁר) about to kill an animal for its own consumption (אֶקֶל).²⁷⁴ Placed in parallel with the much more passive "skiffs of reed" (אֲנִיּוֹת אֶבֶה), the eagle imagery is clearly an intensification of the first stich. It is a negative, if not outright hostile, framing of the relationship between himself and God.

²⁷³ Clines, *Job 1–20*, 239–40. Katharine J. Dell argues that the context makes it a parody of traditional assertions of the burdens of the prophets, where the prophet is compelled to speak on God's behalf (as in Jer 20:7–9); in Job, trouble comes if he were to try to hold back his suffering to "enjoy" his transitory life.

²⁷⁴ The נֹשֶׁר, though commonly translated "eagle," is probably the griffon-vulture in some circumstances—which may explain the LXX rendering—and the eagle in others (Driver, "Birds in Law," 9).

ii. Greek

ἦ καὶ ἔστιν ναυσὶν ἵχνος ὁδοῦ ἢ ἀετοῦ πετομένου ζητοῦντος βοράν;
 Is any trace at all left of a way taken by ships or of an eagle flying in search of prey?

The context of this verse differs from its original incarnation. While Job originally complains that God is trying to make him focus on forgetting his troubles, LXX-Job is more focused on God's attempts to make him drop his "suit" (cf. 9:27: "For if in fact I say, 'I will forget about speaking,' ...I will groan").

As a result of this streamlining, the translator is more interested in playing up how his legacy would disappear should he dismiss his complaint rather than press onward. Hence, at LXX-Job 9:26, he asks a rhetorical question, aimed at illustrating that transience, rather than painting God as an implicit adversary. Although the original passage compared his days to an eagle's impending collision with its prey, the translator places the emphasis on the path *behind* the eagle (ἀετός) during its search for prey. The impermanence of his path is the primary focus of the verse, with some rhetorical distance established by the use of a question.

Aiding that rephrasing of the question is the opportunity taken by the translator to make an allusion to another biblical verse. Probably confused by the *hapax* קֶבֶד, "reed," the translator focused more on the major noun pair (ναῦς, "boat," and ἀετός, "eagle") and elaborated on it. The form of his alterations seem inspired by LXX-Prov 30:19[25:19]: in which the speaker finds "impossible to understand" (ἀδύνατά νοῆσαι) the "path of a flying eagle" (ἵχνη ἀετοῦ πετομένου), alongside other mysteries, culminating in the mystery of human love. The strength of the allusion for LXX-Job is to heighten the

unknowability of the path left by the eagle. Alluding to a poem makes the reference more profound in its effect.

2. Job 4:18–19

Other times, the translator makes a general reference and makes it more specific and concrete by referencing an episode from elsewhere in Scripture.

i. Hebrew

הַן בְּעַבְדָּיו לֹא יִאֱמִין וּבְמַלְאָכָיו יִשִּׁים תְּהִלָּה:
אֶרְוּ שִׁכְנֵי בְּתִיחָמָר אֲשֶׁר-בְּעֶפְרָס יִסֻּדָּם וְדַכְאוֹם לִפְנֵי-עָשׂ:

18 Even in his servants he puts no trust, and his angels he charges with error; 19 how much more those who live in houses of clay, whose foundation is in the dust, who are crushed like a moth.

Throughout Eliphaz’s opening diatribe, his focus has been on the transitory existence of humankind, and particularly humanity’s basic inability to lead a good life. Job 4:17–21 is framed as a supernatural revelation from a “spirit” (רוּחַ, 4:15) whose appearance he cannot describe (לֹא-אֶפְיָר מִרְאֹהוּ). Its content, however, underwhelms: it is a trivial pronouncement that God is greater than humankind.

Couched in this speech is a comparison between humankind and moths. It concludes a mixed metaphor, since the verse begins by drawing a parallel between “houses of clay” and “foundation in the dust.” The subsequent verses (vv. 20–21) continue the overall sense of the passage, since they “die devoid of wisdom” (v. 21) and “perish...between morning and evening” (v. 20). The moth comparison, then, seems out-of-place as an image, leading to all sorts of emendation attempts.²⁷⁵ As it stands, despite

²⁷⁵ Rimbach, “Crushed before the Moth,” 244.

the incongruity of the metaphor, the meaning is clear: any individual human could be crushed as easily as a moth.

ii. Greek

18 εἰ κατὰ παίδων αὐτοῦ οὐ πιστεύει, κατὰ δὲ ἀγγέλων αὐτοῦ σκολιόν τι ἐπενόησεν, 19 τοὺς δὲ κατοικοῦντας οἰκίας πηλίνας, ἐξ ὧν καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ πηλοῦ ἐσμὲν, ἔπαισεν αὐτοὺς σητὸς τρόπον·

18 Whether he believes charges against his servants, who knows, but he took note of any crookedness in his angels. 19 But as for those that inhabit houses of clay—being their offspring, we ourselves too are of the same clay—he struck them like a moth!

The LXX translation of this passage contains many of the same elements as the Hebrew passage, except with several strange alterations. The “house” metaphor is maintained, but the statement goes from a general statement about the fragility of humankind to a specific incident in the past. “We” come from the same stock (ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ πηλοῦ), presumably meaning humanity, as a hypothetical group that “inhabit houses of clay” (τοὺς δὲ κατοικοῦντας οἰκίας πηλίνας), whom he “struck like a moth” (ἔπαισεν αὐτοὺς σητὸς τρόπον).²⁷⁶ The same issues as in the Hebrew exist here: moths are usually framed as consumers of clothes.²⁷⁷

The difference between the two is the role of the house metaphor. In the Hebrew text, the intervening phrase “whose foundation is in the dust” (אֲשֶׁר-רִבְעָהּ-בְּעָפָר יְסוּדָהּ) applies the house metaphor to the individuals who “inhabit” the house, as “dust” refers to the transience of humankind. With the LXX’s deletion of this phrase, the passage is tighter, referring more specifically to “those who inhabit houses of clay” and calling his

²⁷⁶ See LXX-Job 10:9, 13:12, 30:19, 33:6, 38:14 – all of these passages, in Greek, allude to humankind’s creation from the mud, esp. 38:14. The LXX allusion is very likely to the flood myth broadly.

²⁷⁷ *The Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek*, s.v. “σής”; LSJ, s.v. “σής.” In the LXX, the term appears a handful of times and indicates the transience of humankind (Hatch and Redpath, *Concordance*, s.v. “σής”). Wider LXX usage portrays the σής as a cause of weakness and decay. LXX-Prov 14:30 describes how “a sensitive heart [is] a moth (σής) in the bones” and LXX-Prov 25:20a (an LXX addition) compares the corruption of a man’s heart to “a moth (σής) to a garment and a worm is to wood (σκόληξ ξύλω).”

contemporaries “their offspring.” The focus, then, is much more on the individuals to whom the passage now alludes.

The translator’s shift to a historical point in the past (“we ourselves are of the same clay”) stands as a curiosity. His phrasing, focused on the very nature of humankind and its shared origin (“clay”) implies distant ancestors. Not being angels, they are obviously meant to be human, not of supernatural origin. Finally, although the candidates for this are theoretically infinite, the implications of the passage suggest the flood story in Gen 4–8. It would be appropriate for Eliphaz, focused as he is on the fate of the wicked men, to have in mind the most catastrophic punishment God inflicts on a sinful people.

3. Job 5:22–23

At other times, the translator tightens allusions that are already in the original text.

i. Hebrew

לְשֹׂד וּלְכַפֵּן תִּשְׂחָק וּמִסִּיַּת הָאָרֶץ אֶל־תִּירָא:
כִּי עִם־אֲבְנֵי הַשָּׂדֶה בְּרִיתְךָ וְסִיַּת הַשָּׂדֶה הִשְׁלַמָּה־לְךָ:

22 At destruction and famine you shall laugh, and shall not fear the wild animals of the earth. 23 For you shall be in league with the stones of the field, and the wild animals shall be at peace with you.

This continues Eliphaz’s condemnation of Job. In Job 5:17–27, Eliphaz rhapsodizes about the benefits of Job admitting his wrong and submitting himself to the judgment of God. One of these benefits is the above-mentioned ability to be unmolested by wild animals. Two key terms are used: “wild animals of the earth” (חַיַּת הָאָרֶץ) and “wild animals of the field” (חַיַּת הַשָּׂדֶה). The latter phrase is much more common than the former, acting as a generic description of “land animals.” Most importantly, it appears in

the context of describing non-human animals in the Genesis creation story (Gen 2:20; 3:1,14). Indeed, the context of Eliphaz’s speech implies that the man who admits his wrong will return to an Edenic state of existence, where all is “right” with the world.

ii. Greek

22 ἀδίκων καὶ ἀνόμων καταγέλαση, ἀπὸ δὲ θηρίων ἀγρίων οὐ μὴ φοβηθῆς· 23 θῆρες γὰρ ἄγριοι εἰρηνεύσουσίν σοι.

22 At the unjust and lawless you shall laugh, and you shall not fear wild animals—23 for wild animals shall be at peace with you.

The Greek translation is a faithful translation. He translates “wild animals of the earth” (עַמְּאֵרֵי הָאָרֶץ) and “wild animals of the field” (עַמְּאֵרֵי הַשָּׂדֶה) and “beasts of the field” (θηρίων ἀγρίων) and “wild animals of the field” (θῆρες ἄγριοι).²⁷⁸ The first clause is changed from “destruction and famine” to “the unjust and lawless,” which has the effect of aiming the rhetoric toward people rather than concepts.²⁷⁹ The focus fits better with the overall passage, since it concerns individuals (wild animals and people) rather than just ideas like “destruction” and “famine.” Further proof that the translator aimed toward keeping the focus on these entities is that he eliminates the incongruous phrase about the “stones of the field” (אֲבָנֵי הַשָּׂדֶה בְּרִיחָה). While speculation on the reasons for the translator’s elimination is fraught with danger, stones are the only item on the list that are inanimate. The biblical background of the LXX is identical to the Hebrew. It also contains the same valences, particularly regarding Genesis.

What do these changes tell us? The most important takeaway is that the LXX translator took the underlying reference and streamlined it. The high-minded, paradisaical

²⁷⁸ LSJ, s.v. “θηρίον.”

²⁷⁹ Kyle C. Dunham, *The Pious Sage in Job: Eliphaz in the Context of Wisdom Theodicy* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2016), 24.

rhetoric espoused by Eliphaz in his original speech – setting up an Edenic world in which the righteous man lives – is made even more tightly, once the “stones” are removed.

C. Greek literature

Even less prevalent than lengthy biblical allusions are potential references to Greek literature in these animal passages. I can only find one potential reference, of dubious quality.

1. Job 24:5

Sometimes the translator adjusts the passage using loaded vocabulary drawn from classical Greek literature, and concepts drawn from it as well.

i. Hebrew

הֵן פְּרָאִים | בְּמִדְבָּר יֵצְאוּ בִפְעֻלָּם מִשְׁחָרֵי לַטֶּרֶף עֲרֵבָה לֹו לָחֶם לְנַעֲרִים:
Like wild asses in the desert they go out to their toil, scavenging in the wasteland food for their young.

Job 24 describes Job’s complaint about the behavior of wicked men. At Job 24:3, he describes how “they drive away the donkey of the orphan (תֹּמְאִים)” and “take the widow’s ox (שֹׁר אֶלְמָנָה) for a pledge”; they are also said to “thrust the needy off the road” (24:4a). At Job 24:4b, he switches to talking about the victims: “the poor of the earth all hide themselves” (24:4b). By the time of verse 5, Job has moved to speaking about the victims and what they are forced to do. It is clear that “they” are the widow and orphan (not the wicked men) who scavenge the wasteland for their children.

The comparison to wild asses is meant to portray the widow and orphan as scavengers, wandering around the desert. Their role is reversed with their previous description, wherein they were valued by their animal ownership.²⁸⁰ They are far away from the civilized world, cast there because of the selfish actions of the wicked men. Divested of their livestock, they lose what little capital allows them to be equals with others in society.

ii. Greek

ἀπέβησαν δὲ ὡς περ ὄνοι ἐν ἀγρῷ ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ ἐξελθόντες τὴν ἑαυτῶν πράξιν
And they proved to be like donkeys in a field, because of me doing their own thing.

The translator makes a critical adjustment to the context of this verse that changes its overall meaning. In the original context, the immediately-preceding verse, 24:4b, adjusted the referent from the wicked men to the victims of his actions. However, the LXX-Job translator removed this verse, meaning that the referent does not change. Hence, LXX-Job 24:5 refers to the actions of the wicked men.

This changes the dynamics of the verse and also the tenor of the inclusion of the “wild ass” in the description. Where the original reference to the wild ass (אֲרָפָה) was one of pity and exclusion from society, it is unlikely that the same ideas are meant to apply to the “wild asses” (ὄνοι ἐν ἀγρῷ) of the LXX text.

Part of this involves the proximity of the wild ass to the subject being described. In the Hebrew text they are “like” wild asses by analogy to their action (scavenging). By contrast, the Greek translator uses ἀποβαίνω, which, for most of LXX-Job, means “to

²⁸⁰ Katharine J. Dell, “The Use of Animal Imagery in the Psalms and Wisdom Literature of Ancient Israel,” *SJT* 53 (2000): 278.

turn out to be.”²⁸¹ Job is therefore more closely aligning the nature of the wicked men to the nature of the wild asses as a negative comparison.

The remainder of the verse seems confused. Orlinsky, however, argues that the various clauses were subject to corruption; considering the incomprehensible state of the text, his proposal is a reasonable one. According to his theory, the corruption happened in several stages. The conspicuous phrase ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ (“for me”), entirely disconnected from the Hebrew text, was originally ἐπ’ ἐρήμου, “in the wilderness,” corresponding to רַבְרַבִּים, “in the wilderness.”²⁸² This was read as “επερημου” (or “υπερημου”) and separated into “ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ.”²⁸³ The phrase ὄνοι ἐν ἀγρῷ, “donkeys in the field,” is also unusual, with the more normal construction being ὄνοι ἄγριοι for “wild asses” (אִשְׁרָפִים). By Orlinsky’s theory, ἐν ἀγρῷ arose *after* the insertion of ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ, to correspond with רַבְרַבִּים.²⁸⁴ This would make the corrected verse to read: ἀπέβησαν δὲ ὡσπερ ὄνοι ἄγριοι ἐπ’ ἐρήμου ἐξελθόντες τὴν ἑαυτῶν πρᾶξιν, “They proved to be as wild asses in the wilderness, going out for their own work.”

The phrase τὴν ἑαυτῶν πρᾶξιν NETS translates as “their own thing.” Πρᾶξις, however, has a more laden meaning than “thing,” meaning more like “work” or “everyday activity.”²⁸⁵ The phrase τὴν ἑαυτῶν πρᾶξιν has no LXX parallel. Instead, it may have a classical parallel in Plato’s *Republic*. Socrates posits that justice is “to possess and work with one’s own person and property” (ἡ τοῦ οἰκείου τε καὶ ἑαυτοῦ ἔξις

²⁸¹ Harry M. Orlinsky, “Ἀποβαίνω and ἐπιβαίνω in the Septuagint of Job” *JBL* 56 (1937): 363

²⁸² Harry M. Orlinsky, “Studies in the Septuagint of the Book of Job: Chapter IV: The Present State of the Greek Text of Job,” *HUCA* 33 (1962): 145.

²⁸³ Harry M. Orlinsky, “Studies in the Septuagint of the Book of Job: Chapter IV: The Present State of the Greek Text of Job.” *HUCA* 33 (1962): 145.

²⁸⁴ Orlinsky, “Studies IV,” 145.

²⁸⁵ *The Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek*, s.v. “πρᾶξις”; LSJ, s.v. “πρᾶξις.”

τε καὶ πρᾶξις).²⁸⁶ He describes how a society can be thrown off-balance by people reaching beyond their station in life.²⁸⁷ “One’s own work” is therefore synonymous with the idea of “working to maintain a just society.” Therefore, in this verse, Job is labeling the wicked men as societal problems, doing their daily work (ἐξελθόντες τὴν ἑαυτῶν πρᾶξιν) and leaving behind society they ought to build up. As such, they no longer live in a just society of humankind but are feckless animals in the wild (ὄνοι ἐν ἀγρῶ). This interpretation would also fit with Job’s characterization of the animal world as outside the bounds of the human world. It is not until God’s speeches at the end of the book that the animal world gains a more positive sense. A simple natural reference in the Hebrew becomes social commentary.

D. Literary adjustments

Other times, there is a literary adjustment that the translator makes to change the characterization present in the story. Beyond the accidental turns of phrase that mistakes generate, there are some fortuitous moments in the translation that are simply rhetorical touches. In one case he shows his sense of literary balance that goes beyond the original text.

1. Job 8:14

i. Hebrew

אֲשֶׁר-קוּט פִּסְלוֹ וּבֵית עֲפָבִישׁ מִבֵּטְחוֹ:

Their confidence is gossamer, a spider’s house their trust.

²⁸⁶ Plato, *Resp.* 433e12–13.

²⁸⁷ Samuel Scolnicov, *Plato’s Method of Hypothesis in the Middle Dialogues* (Sankt Augustin: Academia Verlag, 2018), 124; Charlotte Murgier, “Oikeion and Justice in Plato’s Republic,” *FONS* II (2017): 80.

Bildad’s first speech to Job is, at the end, a harsh speech, focused on reinforcing God’s justice.²⁸⁸ It comes off as a condemnation of his framing of the central contentions to God. In the middle, he talks of what happens to people who forget about God and desert his path: “the hope of the godless shall perish” (Job 8:13b). He expands on the image in 8:14, describing the trust that the wicked man has in other gods a “spider’s house” (בֵּית עֲרַבִּי), or spider-web. It is obviously meant to convey the fragility of their trust.²⁸⁹ The details are confirmed in the subsequent verse, which glosses the verse: “If one leans against its house, it will not stand; if one lays hold of it, it will not endure” (8:15).²⁹⁰ The use of the spider-web is a striking image drawn from nature. A spider-web is easily destroyed, both purposefully and accidentally.

ii. Greek

ἀοίκητος γὰρ αὐτοῦ ἔσται ὁ οἶκος, ἀράχνη δὲ αὐτοῦ ἀποβήσεται ἢ σκηνή
 For his house will be uninhabited, and his tent will prove to be a spider’s web.

The differences between the original passage and this translation are obvious. Most important is the adjustment of the image from a metaphor about faith and confidence to a metaphor about his life and livelihood (“his house” [αὐτοῦ ὁ οἶκος] and “his tent” [αὐτοῦ ἡ σκηνή]). Whereas the original text compares two abstract qualities (confidence/trust), the translation compares two similar metaphors.

The second half reads literally that “his tent [σκηνή] will prove to be a spider [ἀράχνη]” rather than explicitly “web” of a spider. Ἀράχνη is, however, used on its own to indicate “spider-web,” as Hippocrates does in *De Corde* to describe the various

²⁸⁸ Clines, *Job 1–20*, 212; Driver and Gray, *Job*, 75.

²⁸⁹ Driver and Gray, *Job*, 81.

²⁹⁰ Clines, *Job 1–20*, 208–9.

membranes of the heart.²⁹¹ The text also uses the term ἀράχνη instead of the alternative, φαλάγγιον, which refers to venomous spiders (and a few others).²⁹² Unlike the non-venomous term, φαλάγγιον is not used to mean “spider-web.”

The new passage makes a similar point to the original passage, except more strongly: the wicked man who does not put his trust in God will lose his livelihood. Driver and Gray’s comments on the original Hebrew passage seem to apply more readily to the LXX: “‘House’ is naturally to be taken here in a broad sense, including his family, establishment, and the resources implied in the possession of an estate.”²⁹³ An “uninhabited house” (ἀοίκητος) would imply the loss of all such connections. In fact, it sounds suspiciously parallel to the experience through which Job went, which would make Bildad’s speech a more vicious attack on Job’s righteousness than the original speech.

Hence, the LXX-Job translator takes an opportunity for Bildad to make a pointed reference to Job’s specific situation, as an insult to him. He increases Bildad’s unobvious suspicion of Job’s self-defense by making him more directly question Job’s culpability for his position in life. He builds upon and alters the metaphor to fit his characterization needs.

2. Job 1:16

In at least one instance, the translator makes an aesthetic adjustment, making the passage flow more smoothly in Greek, while maintaining the content in the passage.

²⁹¹ Hippocrates, *De Corde* 10.

²⁹² Kitchell, *Animals in the Ancient World*, 177.

²⁹³ Driver and Gray, *Job*, 81.

i. Hebrew

עוד | תה מדבר וזה בא ויאמר אש אלהים נפלה מן השמים ותבער בצאן ובנערים ותאכלם ואמלטה רק אנכי לבדי להגיד לך:

While he was still speaking, another came and said, “The fire of God fell from heaven and burned up the sheep and the servants, and consumed them; I alone have escaped to tell you.”

The destruction of Job’s sheep is described at Job 1:16. Both “burned” (תבער) and “consumed” (תאכל) have the same objects, “sheep” (צאן) and “servants” (נערים), first explicitly, then with a pronominal suffix (ם-).

ii. Greek

ἔτι τούτου λαλοῦντος ἦλθεν ἕτερος ἄγγελος καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς Ἰωβ πῦρ ἔπεσεν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ κατέκαυσεν τὰ πρόβατα καὶ τοὺς ποιμένας κατέφαγεν ὁμοίως καὶ σωθεὶς ἐγὼ μόνος ἦλθον τοῦ ἀπαγγεῖλαι σοι

While he was still speaking, a further messenger came and said to Job, “Fire fell from heaven and burned up the sheep, and it likewise consumed the shepherds, and when I alone escaped, I came to tell you.”

LXX-Job 1:16 describes the same events in a slightly different way. He rearranges the sentence and divides the verbs between the two subjects. His re-arrangement is deliberately balanced (verb-object-καὶ-object-verb). As a *coup de grace* at the end of this clause, he adds ὁμοίως, “likewise,” purposefully breaking the balance.

E. Conclusion

The longer excerpts in the LXX translation of Job are a broader window into the translator’s mindset, beyond individual words. The translator uses biblical allusions in different ways. One way is when he deepens the passage’s sentiment; other times, he adds an allusion in an opportune location; still others, he tightens the existing allusion. He

also occasionally adjusts phrases in opportune ways to make it conform to Greek usage. However, all these moments are eclectic and case-by-case. They still fit into the Greek literature/Greek biblical translation paradigm described earlier, but only as reflections, not as structurally-important elements.

The translator seems to prefer small additions rather than large ones. Crucially, none of these passages is “plot-relevant,” which may explain his unwillingness to insert new material, especially in comparison to his large addition at LXX-Job 2:9a–e: the most narratively-important section involving animals is Job 38–41, which he deals with via large-scale *elimination*. Addition is not his preferred approach to increasing the profile of these beasts.

The next chapter will demonstrate the technique in which large scale changes are a core feature (and the technique for which he is best known): his “negative” technique, where he eliminates material to shape its meaning. Throughout these past two chapters, its presence has been unavoidable in passing. Unlike this chapter, the translator displays no resistance to forcing large-scale changes by excising large swathes of material, pointing toward a conceptual difference between them.

CHAPTER IV: LXX-JOB'S "NEGATIVE" TECHNIQUE

A. Introduction

All the techniques described above are "positive" techniques, where its material is primarily additive. However, the more prominent technique in LXX-Job, featured especially in the divine speeches in chapters 38–41, is a "negative" technique. In this technique, the translator removes material, sometimes reintegrating that excised material. This most often has the effect of sharpening the focus of the affected passage. His more frequent use of elimination implies his comfort with this technique, particularly in contrast with the more limited use of the additive or alterative technique.

Although it often results in large-scale changes for the passages, it is, counterintuitively, a conservative or "retentive" approach. This is because it works within the boundaries set by the passage, either hollowing it out but retaining its shell or by recycling deleted material. The additive technique explained in the foregoing chapters draws on material from outside the book itself, whether extensively or narrowly. The focus of this chapter is its foundational technique that gets used by the translator with more regularity and for longer segments of the text.

B. Job 30:1

Sometimes the technique focuses on a single passage if the original passage is obscure and awkward.

1. Hebrew

וְעַתָּה הוֹשֵׁקוּ עָלַי צִעִירִים מִמֶּנִּי לְגֵמִים אֲשֶׁר־מֵאַסְתִּי אֲבוֹתָם לְשִׁית עִם־כְּלָבֵי צֹאנִי:

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.

In this passage, Job indicts the patriarchs of his former peers, who now despise him. As Driver and Gray state, however, the verse is “badly articulated.”²⁹⁴ The majority of the passage describes the people who make fun of him (younger than he is [צִעִירִים מִמֶּנִּי]; more than that, in an awkward aside, he describes their worthless fathers.²⁹⁵ The comparison between dogs and people is supremely insulting.²⁹⁶ The insult fits in with other disparaging canine references, normally directed at the speaker or his immediate audience.²⁹⁷ The phrase “[my] sheep-dogs” (כְּלָבֵי צֹאנִי), however, is unique here.²⁹⁸

2. Greek

νυνὶ δὲ κατεγέλασάν μου, ἐλάχιστοι νῦν νουθετοῦσίν με ἐν μέρει, οὐς οὐχ ἠγησάμην εἶναι ἀξίους κυνῶν τῶν ἐμῶν νομάδων.

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!

At LXX-Job 30:1, Job describes his sheep-dogs (“the sheep of my flock,” κύων τῶν ἐμῶν νομάδων).²⁹⁹ The translator makes a few adjustments to the passage to make it flow more logically. First, he creates a parallel structure within the first stich: “now...now” (νυνὶ...νῦν), each paired with a verb and a pronoun direct object (laughed

²⁹⁴ Driver and Gray, *Job*, 252.

²⁹⁵ Clines, *Job 21–27*, 996.

²⁹⁶ Clines, *Job 21–27*, 996.

²⁹⁷ See 1 Sam 17:43; 2 Sam 3:8,9:8,16:9; 2 Kings 8:13; Isa 56:11; Prov. 26:11.

²⁹⁸ Tova Forti, “‘Who Teaches Us More Than the Beasts of the Earth, and Makes Us Wiser Than the Birds of the Heaven’ (Job 35:11),” in *PECUS: Man and Animal in Antiquity, Proceedings of the Conference at the Swedish Institute in Rome, September 9-12, 2002* (ed. Barbro Santillo Frizell; Rome: The Swedish Institute in Rome, 2004), 122.

²⁹⁹ LSJ, s.v. “κύων.”

me [κατεγέλασάν μου]...reprove me [νουθετοῦσίν με]). Secondly, he removes the reference to age, reading רָעִיר, “insignificant,” without the chronological marker (לְיָמַי, “in days”) in the Hebrew, translating ἐλάχιστοι, “the least ones.” Finally, one of the central phrases that contributes to the awkwardness of the passage, “whose fathers I would have disdained to set...,” he deletes. This makes the canine comparison immediately about the people laughing and jeering at him, rather than indirectly about their fathers, despite producing a similar meaning. The translator, much like a modern reader, may have felt the lengthy verse to be overly complicated in its execution and needed focusing.

C. Job 39:1–4

More commonly, he uses this combination of shortening and alteration on longer passages, especially those in the latter half of the book.

1. Hebrew

הַיְדֹעֶת עֵת לֵדַת יְעֲלִי-סֹלֶעַ חֲלָל אֵילֹת תִּשְׁמֹר:
 תִּסְפֹּר יָרְחִים תִּמְלֹאנָה יְדֹעֶת עֵת לְדַתָּהּ:
 תִּכְרַעַנָּה יְלֹדֶיהָ תִּפְלֹחַנָּה תִּבְלִיָּהֶם תִּשְׁלַחַנָּה:
 יִחַלְמוּ בְּגִיָּהֶם יִרְבּוּ בְּכָר יִצְאוּ וְלֹא-יָשׁוּבוּ לָמוֹ:

Do you know when the mountain goats give birth? Do you observe the calving of the deer? Can you number the months that they fulfil, and do you know the time when they give birth, when they crouch to give birth to their offspring, and are delivered of their young? Their young ones become strong, they grow up in the open; they go forth, and do not return to them.

Beginning in Job 38, God finally responds to Job’s pleadings.³⁰⁰ Throughout the speech, lengthy pericopes describe natural phenomena and (beginning at 38:39) various

³⁰⁰ Clines, *Job 38–42*, 1088; Driver and Gray, *Job*, 324.

animals, usually paired together. Here, his focus is on the “mountain goat” (עֵלִי־סֶלֶעַ) and the “deer” (אַיִלָּהָ).³⁰¹

Structurally, the pericope focuses mainly on questions (vv. 1–3), but transitions to statements (v. 4), progressing from early pregnancy to independent living.³⁰² Structurally, the section moves both temporally and according to what Job himself might know: whether he knows about when these animals give birth and what happens to them after they have already grown up. By the end of the strophe, God is no longer directly addressing Job; rather, he observes the fate of the young animals, that they “grow strong,” “grow up in the open” and eventually “go forth,” beginning the cycle over again.

While a simple moral cannot be drawn from this passage, it seems to serve the same rhetorical purpose as many of the zoological speeches: to emphasize God’s knowledge of Creation and his providential ordering thereof. The panoply of details in the passages are not significant in themselves – that is to say, there is no direct and obvious connection between each animal feature and the character of God – but each speech does open with God’s direct address to Job.³⁰³

2. Greek

1b And did you protect the birth pangs of the deer? 2 And did you check off their months full of pregnancy, and did you relieve their birth pangs? 3a And did you rear their young without fear?

³⁰¹ The two animals are also associated with each other at Prov. 5:19. The identification as a deer is traditional, but may be doubtful, as their biblical habits center around mountains rather than the more deer-like plains and because the term is often paired with the mountain-goat (Stanley Gevirtz, “Naphtali in ‘The Blessing of Jacob,’” *JBL* 103.4 [Dec. 1984]: 514.)

³⁰² Driver and Gray, *Job*, 337–8.

³⁰³ Clines argues that the descriptions are meant to “expound the diversity of life forms brought into being by Yahweh” instead of being object-lessons (Clines, *Job 38–42*, 1121). But the difficulty with this view is that he reads the passage as disconnected from the character of God and more focused on the qualities of the animals themselves. Structurally, the placement of the speeches make them an answer to Job’s concerns and ought to be read as such.

1b ἐφύλαξας δὲ ὠδῖνας ἐλάφων; 2 ἠρίθμησας δὲ αὐτῶν μῆνας πλήρεις τοκετοῦ ὠδῖνας δὲ αὐτῶν ἔλυσας; 3a ἐξέθρεψας δὲ αὐτῶν τὰ παιδιά ἔξω φόβου;³⁰⁴

LXX-Job 39:1–4 has undergone extensive alteration by the translator to customize its contents. The translator eliminates repetition and also alters the pericope’s focus.³⁰⁵ It still describes the common deer, the ἐλάφος.³⁰⁶ However, while the original passage mentions both the “wild goat” (עֲלִי־לְעִי) and the “deer” (תִּי־לְאַ), only the ἐλάφος remains, translated as a collective singular (ἐλάφων).

In addition to the elimination of the second animal, the translator takes control of the shape of the pericope through strategic elimination and reshuffling. Although the verses are gone, the translator does not drop their information.³⁰⁷ In eliminating part of the first verse and part of the last verse, the pericope becomes focused solely around questions: “Did you protect...?” (ἐφύλαξας) “Did you count...?” (ἠρίθμησας) “Did you relieve...?” (ἔλυσας) “Did you rear...?” (ἐξέθρεψας), the last of which is a creation of the translator. This question is also given a balanced structure: verb-αὐτῶν-direct-object-direct-object-αὐτῶν-verb. Furthermore, while the Hebrew text closes the passage with adult animals, LXX-Job stays in view of young, vulnerable offspring.

³⁰⁴ ἔξω φόβου, “without fear” likely reflects בָּרָבּוּ בְּרָרָה, read as בָּרָרָה בְּרָבּוּ, lit. “fear outside,” according to Dhorme (*Job*, 599).

³⁰⁵ Maria Gorea, *Job Repensé ou Trahi? Omissions et raccourcis de la Septante* (Paris: J. Gabalda et Cie, 2007), 204.

³⁰⁶ The identification is not consistent in many ancient authors (LSJ, *s.v.* “ἐλάφος”; Kitchell, *Animals in the Ancient World*, 45). Throughout the LXX, it translates several related terms, though mostly לְאַ and תִּי־לְאַ, a male and female deer respectively, and עֲלִי, “goat,” in at least two instances (Hatch and Redpath, *Concordance*, *s.v.* “ἐλάφος”).

³⁰⁷ LXX-Job 39:2b, “did you relieve their birth pangs?” (ὠδῖνας δὲ αὐτῶν ἔλυσας) translates Job 39:3b, “delivered of their young” (נָתַתְּ לָהֶן מִיָּדָיָהּ). “And did you rear their young without fear?” (ἐξέθρεψας δὲ αὐτῶν τὰ παιδιά ἔξω φόβου, LXX-Job 39:3a) is a paraphrase of Job 39:4a (instead of Job 39:3a), “Their young ones become strong, they grow up in the open...” (Gorea, *Repensé ou Trahi?*, 205; Dhorme, *Job*, 397–8).

This adjustment makes the purpose of the passage clearer. The translator seems less interested in the birthing habits of the deer than the original passage, and more interested in the rhetorical force of the passage, against Job.

D. Job 39:19–25³⁰⁸

Not every passage is as ambitious as his alteration of the deer above, but still demonstrates the abridging/supplementing instinct.

1. Hebrew

Among the animals that the writer describes is the horse (סוס), in a lengthy six-verse pericope. It is a description not solely of a horse but of a war-horse, as the details end up making clear. As one of the longest sustained animal descriptions in the book, its length is matched only by its poetry.³⁰⁹

The pericope opens with questions to Job, like the others, highlighting its “might” (גבורה, 39:19a), its “mane” (רעמה, 39:19b, a *hapax*), and its ability to “leap like a locust” (רעש כצארכה, 39:20a).³¹⁰ From there, the pericope is filled with poetic images of the horse’s behavior. Its bravery is such that it “goes out to meet the weapons” (יצא לקראתן, 39:21b) and “laughs at fear” (ישחק לפחד, 39:22a). It is adorned with “the quiver, the flashing spear, and the javelin” (אשפה להב חנית וכידון, 39:23). The horse eagerly awaits the battle: “From a distance it smells the battle, the thunder of the captains, and the shouting” (ומרחוק גרית מלחמה רעם שרים ותרועה, 39:25b–c).

³⁰⁸ Due to the length of the pericope, I will not reproduce the entirety of it here.

³⁰⁹ Clines, *Job 38–42*, 1127.

³¹⁰ The meaning of both רעמה and רעש are in dispute (Clines, *Job 38–42*, 1078).

2. Greek

In another passage describing the horse (ἵππος, LXX-Job 39:19–25), his major targets are incidental details.³¹¹ He adjusts the translation of particular words as well. The first two verses have undergone streamlining for different reasons. He makes some concrete features abstract. While the Hebrew text opens speaking of its “mane” (הַזָּעַר, 39:19), the translator chooses φόβος, “terror.”³¹² Driven partly by a familiar Hebrew root (הַזָּעַר, “thunder”) in an unusual location, he also alludes to the providentially-similar φόβη, “mane.”³¹³

He also chooses to enhance its nature as a war-horse. No longer is its leaping described; instead, LXX-Job 39:20 describes its πανοπλία (“full armor”) and “courage” (τόλμα). Altering the common “locust” (הַזָּרְחָד) to πανοπλία is not a change born of confusion, given the commonality of the term in the Hebrew Bible.³¹⁴ Πανοπλία, by contrast, is a rare term, appearing only one other time in the LXX, 2 Sam 2:21, during Asahel’s pursuit of Abner, translating הַזָּרְחָד (“spoils”). Since πανοπλία is a military term, it enhances the martial sense of the passage. The same instinct appears when he replaces the description of its “snorting” with the “majesty” (δόξας) of its “chest” (στηθέων) at 39:20a, a much more dignified description.³¹⁵ Similarly, Job 39:21, where he describes its

³¹¹ ἵππος refers to a horse and is used as a synonym for a horse-drawn chariot as well (LSJ, s.v. “ἵππος”). In the LXX, ἵππος mostly translates חֵסֶד/הֵסֶד, “horse,” along with other terms, including שָׂרָף, “horse” and כֶּרֶב, “chariot.”)

³¹² The meaning of the term הַזָּעַר is unclear (HALOT, s.v. הַזָּעַר); LSJ, s.v. “φόβος.”

³¹³ LSJ, s.v. “φόβη.”

³¹⁴ 21x in the Hebrew Bible.

³¹⁵ Fernando Martin De Blassi, “Considerations on the Concept of Audacity (τόλμα) in Plotinus,” *International Philosophical Quarterly* 57.1 (March 2017): 19.

“pride” (γαυριᾶ) instead of its “exultation” (שׂשׂוֹן), a term which he earlier had translated περιχαρῆς, “joyful” (3:22).

Finally, he eliminates and readjusts certain details to focus the sense of the passage. Job 39:23 names three weapons: the quiver (קַיִטָּה), the “flashing spear” (לֶהֶב תִּנְתֵּן), and the javelin (יִדִּיָּן). By contrast, LXX-Job 39:23a lists only the “bow and dagger” (τόξον καὶ μάχαιρα), reducing the verse to a single stich. Similar condensation occurs in the pericope’s final verse, mentioning only that “from afar it scents battle with leap and cry” (πόρρωθεν δὲ ὀσφραίνεται πολέμου σὺν ἄλματι καὶ κραυγῇ) instead of the extra details in the Hebrew.

The translator makes several tactical changes to the passage to increase the militarism of the passage and tighten the image. While the overwhelming detail that stretches the author’s poetic muscles is lost, the passage gains clarity and focus. He eliminates the extra details and adds thematically-appropriate vocabulary to make the war-horse more militaristic. The translator demonstrates that he understands the purpose of the passage and keeps it tightly focused.

E. Job 39:26

Sometimes the alterations are more drastic.

1. Hebrew

הֲמִבִּינְתָּהּ יִצְרָר־גִּזְיָהּ יִפְרֹשׁ כַּנְּפוֹ לְתֵימֹן:

Is it by your wisdom that the hawk soars, and spreads its wings towards the south?

Job 39:26–30 focuses on two animals: the hawk (גִּזְיָהּ) and the eagle (נֶשֶׁר). Unlike some of the previous examples, the second animal appears in the second verse of the

pericope, rather than the parallel stich (as in other examples). While there are many aspects of the hawk in verse 26 that are noteworthy, two features of the verse provide contrast with the LXX translation that we will analyze shortly. The first is the *hapax* רָבַח, “to fly.”³¹⁶ Second, the phrase לְתֵימָן, “to the south,” implies migration.³¹⁷

2. Greek

ἐκ δὲ τῆς σῆς ἐπιστήμης ἔστηκεν ἰέραξ ἀναπετάσας τὰς πτέρυγας ἀκίνητος καθορῶν τὰ πρὸς νότον;
Is it by your understanding that the hawk stops still, having spread its wings, motionless, eyeing what lies to the south?

LXX-Job 39:26 describes a ἰέραξ, “hawk.” The ἰέραξ is a hawk or falcon.³¹⁸

According to Aristotle, the ἰέραξ includes eleven (or by some counts, ten) birds, all of which he names.³¹⁹ He primarily describes its hunting patterns.³²⁰

In the LXX, ἰέραξ appears five times, translating γῆ (“falcon”). For the Hebrew *hapax* “fly” (רָבַח), the translator chose ἔστηκεν, “stands,” which does not describe an aerial motion. A non-aerial motion is further suggested by ἀκίνητος, “motionless.” What in Hebrew describes its migration habits (שִׁפְרָו שֶׁנִּפְרָו לְתֵימָן, “spreads its wings to the south”), the translator would seem to be describing other habits. The addition of “motionless” implies that “having spread its wings” (ἀναπετάσας τὰς πτέρυγας) no longer describes migration, but rather some sort of physical action of the hawk itself. The closing of the verse, “that which lies to the south” (τὰ πρὸς νότον), suggests this description applies to its hunting habits rather than the direction it plans to fly.

³¹⁶ Clines, *Job 38–42*, 1082.

³¹⁷ Clines, *Job 38–42*, 1082–3; Driver and Gray, *Job*, 346.

³¹⁸ *The Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek*, s.v. “ἰέραξ.”

³¹⁹ *Hist. an.* 620a18–24.

³²⁰ *Hist. an.* 620a23–7.

The amount of adjustment made to this passage is unseen in many other, similar passages. It actively reverses the image in the original passage and reifies the poetic method by which its migration was described. Here it shows no particular influence, either in other biblical models or Aristotelian.

F. Job 40–41

One of the most noteworthy uses of elimination to shape the narrative is the consolidation of Behemoth and Leviathan into one single animal, the δράκων. While the Hebrew text describes two separate animals, I argue that the Greek text implies the presence of only one, for a multiplicity of reasons: the translator’s approach to other animals, a prominent *inclusio*, the recurrence of unique vocabulary in strategic locations, and the weakening of Behemoth’s name.

First, at least two other pericopes in the first divine speech reduce the animals from pairs to single animals. The יַעֲלִי־סֵלַע, “wild goat,” and אֵילָה, “deer” (Job 39:1) are reduced to the ελάφος, “deer,” at LXX-Job 39:1, and the פָּרָא and עֲרוֹד, both “wild ass” (Job 39:5) are combined into the single ὄνος ἄγριος, “onager” (LXX-Job 39:5). The same has been done to Behemoth and Leviathan. Already, the space between the two is reduced, since the closing verses of the Behemoth pericope (Job 40:23b–24) have been excised by the translator. This is not dispositive by itself since it is not an unbroken pattern. The speech’s opening (LXX-Job 38:39–40) retains the lion and the dragon, and its conclusion (LXX-Job 39:26–30) adds an animal that is not found in the Hebrew text (from נָץ, “hawk,” and נֶשֶׁךְ, “eagle,” to the ἰέραξ, ἀετός, and γὺψ [“hawk,” “eagle,” and “vulture,” respectively])

Second is the appearance of an *inclusio* in the translation that is not in the original, at LXX-Job 40:19b and LXX-Job 41:25(33)b. The Hebrew text in both places has little similarity with each other. The Hebrew at Job 40:19b is obscure when describing Behemoth: “It is the first of the great acts of God—only its Maker can approach it with the sword” (הוא ראשית דרכי־אל העשו יגש חרבֹו). The precise meaning of the verse is unclear, but it is clearly meant to introduce a note of danger and malice to the description of Behemoth.³²¹ Likewise, at Job 41:25(33)b, the Hebrew reads “On earth it [Leviathan] has no equal, a creature without fear” (אין־על־עפר מְשֹׁלוֹ הָעֵשׂוֹ לְבַלְי־הַת). Much like the verse above, it acts as a climax for the terrifying image of the beast, Leviathan: “If Behemoth was God’s masterpiece, Leviathan is king of beasts, without a peer on earth, fearsome to others but above all fearless itself.”³²²

In the LXX, both verses vary wildly from their Hebrew archetypes. At LXX-Job 40:19b, the translation bears only surface similarity to the underlying Hebrew: “This is the chief of what the Lord created, made to be mocked at by his angels” (τοῦτ' ἔστιν ἀρχὴ πλάσματος κυρίου, πεποιημένον ἐγκαταπαίξασθαι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀγγέλων αὐτοῦ). The first stich of the translation is close to the Hebrew text. However, the second half of the verse is unrelated to the original text, perhaps born of confusion about the meaning of the phrase.

Somewhat startlingly, the latter phrase reappears *verbatim* elsewhere in the same speech, at LXX-Job 41:25[33]b, the penultimate verse of the entire speech: “There is nothing on earth like it, made to be mocked at by my angels” (οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδὲν ἐπὶ τῆς

³²¹ Despite Clines’ misguided demythological tendencies, he is correct to note that it would be a mistake to over-interpret the content as an allusion to a primeval “struggle between Behemoth and God” (Clines, *Job* 38–42, 1188).

³²² Clines, *Job* 38–42, 1200.

γῆς ὅμοιον αὐτῷ πεποιημένον ἐγκαταπαίζεσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀγγέλων μου). While the Greek text is duplicated for both passages (with the only difference being the pronoun attached to τῶν ἀγγέλων), the Hebrew text of both verses are entirely different, with the only similarity being the similar appearance of וְשַׁן in the consonantal text.³²³ The identical wording of the verses reinforces that the creature at the beginning of this speech is the same as the one at the end of the speech, unlike the Hebrew text. The drastic alteration of the original verses, coupled with the exact verbal match of the two passages, further combined with the extreme dissimilarity of the two original passages, leaves no doubt that the connection was purposeful.

Third, unusual vocabulary within this *inclusio* further advocates for its unity. Both ἐγκαταπαίζεσθαι (“mocked”) and πλάσματος (“formed”) appear in LXX-Job 40:19b and LXX-Job 41:25(33)b. Elsewhere in the LXX, both of these terms are used in connection with one particular creature, the δράκων, specifically at LXX-Ps 104:26: “This dragon that you formed to mock at him” (δράκων οὗτος, ὃν ἔπλασας ἐμπαίξειν αὐτῷ).³²⁴ The psalm’s δράκων is “formed” (ἔπλασας) for “mocking” (ἐμπαίξειν) – as in the LXX-Job passage. Similar vocabulary implies a similar subject.

In addition to the vocabulary in the previously-mentioned *inclusio*, another unique piece of vocabulary appears in close proximity to the same verses. “Tartarus” (ταρτάρως) also appears twice, once at the beginning of the pericope and once at the end, first at LXX-Job 40:20 and again at LXX-Job 41:24(32)a. LXX-Job 40:20, a verse immediately following the previously-mentioned *inclusio*, reads: “But when it went up on a steep

³²³ וְשַׁן at 40:19b and וְשַׁן at 41:25(33)b.

³²⁴ Heater, *Translation Technique*, 126. The LXX is a match for the Hebrew, which reads “Leviathan that you formed to sport in it [the sea]” (וְשַׁן לְיָמֵי הַיָּם אֲשֶׁר יָצַקְתָּ לָּהּ מַעֲשֵׂה יָדָיִךְ).

mountain, it brought gladness to the quadrupeds in Tartarus” (ἐπελθὼν δὲ ἐπ' ὄρος ἀκρότομον ἐποίησεν χαρμονὴν τετράποσιν ἐν τῷ ταρτάρῳ).³²⁵ Later, near the end of the pericope, Tartarus appears again at LXX-Job 41:24(32)a (which, much like the other verse, is immediately before the end of the *inclusio*): “[It regards] Tartarus of the deep as a captive” (τὸν δὲ τάρταρον τῆς ἀβύσσου ὡσπερ αἰχμάλωτον).³²⁶ The word διήτη (“deep”) is given a double-translation, ὁ τάρταρος τῆς ἀβύσσου, “Tartarus of the deep.” This vocabulary is unique to the *inclusio*, appearing nowhere else in the book.

Finally, another suggestive piece of evidence is the weakening of the proper name “Behemoth” (תַּמְהוֹם) at LXX-Job 40:15: ἀλλὰ δὴ ἰδοὺ θηρία παρὰ σοί· χόρτον ἴσα βουσὶν ἐσθίει.³²⁷ NETS translates this verse as follows: “But look now, you are familiar with ‘monsters’; they eat grass like cows.” However, this is a flawed translation that obscures the underlying Greek. No issues are raised with regards to its translation of θηρία, “beasts” (or “monsters” as NETS). “Behemoth,” nothing compels reading θηρία as a proper noun.³²⁸ Just as in the Hebrew text, singular verbs follow the plural subject θηρία, beginning with ἐσθίει, “he/it eats.” However, pairing θηρία with ἐσθίει falls within the rules of standard Greek usage where neuter plural subjects can take singular verbs and still be plural. As evidence, the other occurrence of θηρία as the subject in LXX-Job (LXX-Job 37:8: “the wild animals came in under shelter,” εἰσηλθεν δὲ θηρία ὑπὸ σκέπη) follows the same rule. NETS’ choice to translate παρὰ σοί as “you are familiar

³²⁵ Job 40:20 is another difficult passage, “For the mountains yield food for it, where all the wild animals play” (כִּי-בֹוֹל הַרִים יִשְׂאוּ-לוֹ וְכָל-חַיַּת הַשָּׂדֶה יִשְׁתַּקְּוּ-בָּהֶם).

³²⁶ LXX-Job 41:24[32]b is omitted. This translates Job 41:24[32]b: ἡθὴσ ἴσησ ἡθὴσ, “one would think the deep to be white-haired” (NRSV), but the translator understood ἡθὴσ (“gray-haired”) as deriving from ἡθὴσ, “to take captive.”

³²⁷ In Hebrew, the verse reads: “Look at Behemoth, which I made just as I made you; it eats grass like an ox” (הִבְהֵמָה כַּאֲשֶׁר-עָשִׂיתִי עִמָּךְ תִּצְיֵר כַּבָּקָר יֹאכַל).

³²⁸ Robert Gordis acutely calls it an “impossible rendering” (“Job and Ecology (and the Significance of Job 40:15),” *HAR* 9 [1985]: 197).

with,” however, is less defensible. Although it derives from the underlying Hebrew (עִמָּךְ, “with you”), *παρὰ σοί* elsewhere in the LXX appears to explain a difference between two subjects. Considering these points, the verse is better translated as follows: “But behold the beasts [that are] beside you; they eat grass like cattle.” God is telling Job to look at the “ordinary” creatures (*θηρία*) around him (reading *παρὰ σοί* in the wider Septuagint usage). These consume grass and are passive and harmless.

Combining the two animals into a single *δράκων* is a clear advantage for the translator. First, he bypasses the difficult vocabulary in the passage (often specialized physical terminology that is a mystery even to modern translators) and the obscure grammar. Secondly, the translator only must connect the mythical monsters to one Greek equivalent rather than two. While he does not seem to shy away from drawing on biblical references and creating new creatures, in this instance, he seems to have avoided that path.

The translator uses elimination as a focusing technique, redirecting the language of the original passage toward a new creature or idea. The freedom with which he employs this technique implies his comfort with it, as opposed to the more limited situations of his positive techniques. The culmination of this technique is the creation of a new *δράκων* out of both Behemoth and Leviathan—a combination that allows the translator to avoid having to manufacture a second mythical creature.

G. Miscellaneous Features

Analyzing his “error-correction”—when he misreads or misunderstands the text in front of him—can provide a complementary insight into his thought-process. He is not a perfect translator, showing some lapses in his understanding of the Hebrew text.

1. Job 21:11

A certain *hapax legomenon* causes him problems: the rare עויל, “child.” At Job 21:11, Job describes how the wicked men seem to prosper: “They send out their little ones like a flock, and their children dance around” (יִשְׁלְחוּ בְצֹאן עוֹלֵיהֶם וְיִלְדֵיהֶם יִרְקְדוּן). However, at LXX-Job 21:11, Job describes the wicked as “remain[ing] as ageless sheep, and their children play about” (μένουσιν δὲ ὡς πρόβατα αἰώνια, τὰ δὲ παῖδια αὐτῶν προσπαίζουσιν). “Eternal” (αἰώνια) is the result of misreading עוֹלֵיהֶם, “their children,” as עוֹלָם, “eternal.”³²⁹ This is not an isolated incident: at 19:18, he also reads עוֹלֵל as αἰῶνα, and at LXX-Job 16:1, he produces ἄδικος, “unjust,” likely by reading עוֹל, “injustice.”³³⁰

2. Job 32:22

Typical reading mistakes also occur, such as *homoioteleuton*. At Job 32:22, Elihu states that he does “not know how to flatter” (כִּי לֹא יָדַעְתִּי אֶכְבֹּדָה), with the cryptic follow-up “or else my Maker would put an end to me” (כִּמְעַט יִשְׂאַנִּי עֲשֵׂנִי), with no special animal present. The translator renders the second stich as “if that is not so, moths will eat me!”

³²⁹ HALOT, s.v. עוֹלֵל.

³³⁰ HALOT, s.v. עוֹלֵל.

(εἰ δὲ μή, καὶ ἐμὲ σῆτες ἔδονται). Moths do not have the reputation, in either the ancient or modern world, of consuming people as well as clothes and papyrus.³³¹ However, Job 32:22 ends with יְשׁוּעַ יְנַחֵם, “my Maker will put an end to me.” There are clear orthographic similarities between יְשׁוּעַ, “my Maker,” and the Hebrew word for “moth” (שׁוּעַ), which is likely where the translator’s σῆς, “moth,” came from.

F. Conclusion

The breadth of these passages speaks to the flexible application of this technique. He clearly uses it more frequently in Job 38–41 than in earlier portions of the book, though it gets use elsewhere in the book. And yet, with this eliminative technique, he makes the passage leaner and more direct. He further tightens some passages by recycling its former content, instead of non-biblical or biblical material from another book. Hence, by the end of the passage, it does not stray too far from the boundaries of the passage and retains the “shell” of the original. Even several of his error-corrections speak to a certain degree of fidelity to the text. Relying so heavily on the original text is a more conservative technique, albeit in a strangely unintuitive way.

Throughout these chapters, I have walked from the vocabulary-level to the ideological level, to better spell out the translator’s mental framework for approaching the text. He is clearly a confident translator, but he also attempts to reconcile two different textual worlds, not always successfully. Our next step, and my next chapter, will be a synthesis of these insights to spell out in more detail his underlying assumptions about translating LXX-Job.

³³¹ Kitchell, *Animals in the Ancient World*, 123.

CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION: WHAT CAN WE SAY ABOUT THE TRANSLATOR?

A. Introduction

In the foregoing chapters, we have looked at all the many ways in which the translator shaped, adjusted, changed, and accommodated the Hebrew text as he was translating it into Greek. Many of these changes are “positive” (additive) changes, but most of them are “negative” (eliminative) techniques. He made these changes in a conscious way, in a deliberate direction, rather than either randomly or because of a different base Hebrew text. Here, I will summarize the various trends that earlier analysis has brought to the fore. Three major trends are evident: the translator’s use of elimination was a tool by which this was accomplished, which had the additional benefit of making the book’s self-presentation tighter; he translates in such a way as to guide a wedge between wisdom and animals with more force than the original text; and finally, it is clear that he experienced no discomfort with the extensive mythologies that underlaid the original text, but did feel that its impact would be better felt by carrying them into his immediate biblical and cultural contexts.

B. The translator was a reader of Hellenistic literature and earlier biblical translations

The influence of other literature on the translator’s vocabulary has been well-documented elsewhere. What this investigation has uncovered, however, is that the translator borrowed concepts from those same pieces of writing. While in some cases the difference is simply vocabulary-level, other alterations are deeper and tap into a set of ideas that differ from those of the original text.

Non-biblical Greek literature, especially natural history writing, is one vein tapped by the translator. The most obvious is the appearance of the μυρμηκολέων, “ant-lion,” at LXX-Job 4:11. Although there is no animal explicitly termed the μυρμηκολέων in Hellenistic literature, the μύρηξ, “ant,” was often classified as a lion by many ancient writers. It is almost unquestionable that the translator was influenced by these descriptions of the μύρηξ in his unique fusion. Likewise, the addition at LXX-Job 6:7, “...like the smell of a lion” (ὥσπερ ὀσμὴν λέοντος), is attributable to the translator in its entirety. Lacking clear or even tangential connection to the underlying Hebrew of the verse, its strongest parallel is Aristotle. It is highly unlikely that it is merely coincidental. Other small examples abound of his “massaging” the text to bring it into conformity with other Greek texts, including γύψ (“vulture”) and σκόληξ (“maggot”), and certain elements of the δράκων at the end of the book, such as the οὐρά (“tail”) and ἐπ’ ὀσφύι (“from its loins”).

The translator also drew from other Greek biblical translations. Frequently noticed in both this investigation and earlier ones are his allusions to, and use of, other LXX biblical texts. Job’s sacrifice in the LXX at 1:5, “one bull calf” (μόσχος ἓνα), is an addition that relies directly on LXX-Leviticus and LXX-Numbers. So too does the translation of Chaldeans as “horsemen” at LXX-Job 1:17 seem to be influenced by LXX-Habakkuk 1:6, 8. It is his reading of LXX-Deut from which the “wrath of dragons” (θυμὸν δὲ δρακόντων) in LXX-Job 20:16 comes. The κῆτος in both LXX-Genesis and LXX-Jonah, along with classical precedents, influenced the κῆτος at LXX-Job 3:8. Likewise, Leviathan’s transformation into the δράκων is, at points, influenced by its other Greek appearances, such as its description in LXX-Psalms.

Overall, the translator was well-integrated with his literary sources. He quotes them in both direct and indirect ways and borrows more than just their terminology. They are especially useful for plugging gaps that arise due to the cultural and linguistic differences between Hebrew and Greek. The translator uses both subtle and obvious material, implying his full knowledge of the sources at hand.

C. The translator uses elimination as a means of preventing an unfocused text

This tendency has been most extensively explained by Maria Gorea, who concludes that “the translator seems won over by the temptation of simplifying shortcuts [...to produce] more concise expression.”³³² Focusing on the animal world specifically, his tendencies are similar. The prime example of this is the first speech of God at the end of the book (LXX-Job 38:39–39:30). Two different pericopes reduce their central animals from two to one: the wild goat (LXX-Job 39:1) and the wild ass (LXX-Job 39:5). No reduction happens in the opening pericope with the raven and lion (LXX-Job 38:39–41) and the closing one with the birds of prey (LXX-Job 39:26–30), probably because of their more compact and focused nature. Smaller sections also speak to the same approach. LXX-Job 5:22–23, which eliminates 5:23a, keeps the focus of the verse of wild animals, removing the confusing statement about the “stones of the field.”³³³

This pattern repeats with Behemoth and Leviathan in God’s second speech, which shows the author wished to combine the creatures. Originally, Job 40:23b–24 acts as a transition between Behemoth and Leviathan. It asks the same question as 40:25(41:1):

³³² Gorea, *Job Repense ou Trahi?*, 226. See also Johann Cook on Job 28, the “Hymn to Wisdom” (“Were the LXX Versions of Proverbs and Job Translated By the Same Person?” 148).

³³³ Gorea, *Job Repense ou Trahi?*, 17.

whether Job can capture the mythological creature at issue in the pericope. However, because the distinction between the two is no longer operative and therefore unnecessary, the translator removes Job 40:23b–24 to avoid repetition as well as smooth out any differences.³³⁴ A bevy of minor details are adjusted, but all keep the creature’s mystique.³³⁵

All these changes suggest that the translator meant for his text to be a work without “distractions.” The scale of the missing material unavoidably affects the shape and pacing of the narrative; the translator’s deliberate hand in this large-scale change suggests that this was his intention. Hence, he moves beyond a naïve role of merely presenting the original work in another language, and into the realm of being an editor, or even acting as a second author.

This could further imply at least two views of the original text. Either the original text is deficient and needs changing or the original text is open to change without altering its biblical character. The difference between the two views is one of outlook, whether they view the text negatively or positively. Although this question cannot be answered

³³⁴ Gorea, *Job Repense ou Trahi?*, 211.

³³⁵ At 40:31b(41:7b), it is possible that MT-Job’s inclusion of Leviathan’s head (שׂאֵר) was viewed as a distraction from the other body part that is being described (the skin of its tail), which has a substantial addition by the translator, perhaps to compensate (Gorea, *Job Repense ou Trahi?*, 212). LXX-Job omits 41:4(12), which in the Hebrew is grammatically confusing. The material does not break the progression of the material, so ideological reasons do not likely underlie the change. Omitting 41:8(16)a, which describes the tightness of the seal, may have been prompted by the sense that it does not add to the material; the verses transition straight from “its ligament is like emery stone” to describing how “no puff of air will ever pass through it,” without any interrupting phrase in between. Unlike the previous verse, linguistic difficulties are difficult to imagine, since the phrase דָּבַר דְּבָרָיו וְשִׁבְעָה does not contain particularly obscure vocabulary. For the same reason, the next verse (41:9[17]) is missing, as it continues to describe the scales. MT-Job 41:15(23)b falls into a similar category, describing how “firm” the scales are cast. A similar omission occurs at 41:21[29]a. The term שָׁקַד begins both verses in the Hebrew and, as Gorea argues, may have caused some consternation in the translator (Gorea, *Job Repense ou Trahi?*, 217). The final omission of the speech, at 41:24[32]b, is less an omission in content (as what stays is clearly influenced by the consonantal text of 24b) and more a condensation into one singular line (Gorea, *Job Repense ou Trahi?*, 212).

“empirically,” an answer can be suggested holistically. On the one hand, the translator’s impetus toward readability implies the translator’s view about the deficiency in the original text: that it is too long and unfocused. On the other hand, he does not change the overall book; the differences are not so radical as to morph the book into an entirely different literary creation.

It is this last element that suggests to me that the translator had a fundamentally positive view of the original book, or at least did not feel as though he could make large-scale structural changes to make it fundamentally different book. The slavish literalism of the LXX-Pentateuch is not the approach of the LXX-Job translator, but it is more likely that he saw his approach as respectful of the original text. The later creation of the Hexaplaric text, an amalgamation of the original translator’s text and the Theodotion’s, came out of the flawed assumption that the brevity of the original translation was a deficiency. In short, while the translator’s impulse to make the text shorter seems on its face to disrespect the original text, the overall pattern is more focused and intentional.

D. The translator’s allusions may have unified his writing with the greater biblical canon

The substantial allusions and usage of non-Job texts by the translator are clearly a product of his erudition and his understanding of those other texts. The larger question looming over these actions, however, is about what motivations the translator had for pulling from these sources. Like the possibilities raised to discern the translator’s view of the text through his use of elimination, there are three possibilities for his view of the supplemental material: it is inferior, equal, or neutral, or better than the original text.

The first possibility can be eliminated entirely out of hand. Although there is a limited amount of data, the introduction of material that decreases the quality of the book would run counter to the purpose of translation and authorship. Such an effort would take a unique amount of antipathy.

More challenging would be making the determination whether the quality would be equal or superior to the book he was translating. Several facts can help narrow this down. (1) As mentioned at the outset of this chapter, the translator saw a degree of flexibility to the text. The material added into those “joints” are important enough to the translator to undertake that stretching, implying that at the very least, they are equal to the original text in value. (2) The addition of non-biblical literature is bolder than the addition of biblical sources, by its very nature. (3) His non-biblical additions are slightly more noticeable than his biblical additions. (4) The threshold for non-biblical sources is higher than biblical sources.

All this together is that the presumption of his seeing the Greek sources that he chose as superior to their surrounding literature, while the threshold is lower for the biblical books to which he alludes. However, once he does choose the non-biblical literature, he likes to show it off, making it obvious. The suppositions underlying this conclusion depend on drawing from the general to the specific: assumptions about his view of biblical literature, non-biblical literature, and the book of Job, bolstered by observations about his translation choices.

E. The translator does not want to associate wisdom and animals

One unusual pattern that is distinctive to LXX-Job is the way in which he widens the gap between wisdom and the natural world. His antagonism and separation are present in the Hebrew text as well, but the LXX translator is more thoroughgoing in this project.

For instance, there is a verbal change in LXX-Job 35:11. In the original Hebrew, Elihu argues that people are not adequately submissive in their requests to God, and ought to say statements more along the lines of the following: “Who teaches us more than the animals of the earth, and makes us wiser than the birds of the air?” (מִלִּפְנֵי מִבְּהֵמֹת אֲרֶצַּח (וּמֵעוֹרף הַשָּׁמַיִם יִחַזְקֵנוּ). In the Greek translation, however, Elihu simply takes the opportunity to praise God. He makes the following observation (35:11, 12b): “He it is that sets me apart from earth’s four-footed animals and from the birds of the air, and from the insolence of the wicked” (ὁ διορίζων με ἀπὸ τετραπόδων γῆς ἀπὸ δὲ πετεινῶν οὐρανοῦ, καὶ ἀπὸ ὕβρεως πονηρῶν).³³⁶ While the original Hebrew text focuses on the wisdom that God gives to people (יִחַזְקֵנוּ), the LXX translator uses the phrase “sets me apart” (διορίζων με). More important is that which the speaker is “separated” from: the quadrupeds of the earth (ἀπὸ τετραπόδων γῆς), the birds of the air (πετεινῶν οὐρανοῦ), and the insolence of the wicked (ὕβρεως πονηρῶν)! Hence, the translator places in Elihu’s mouth – a speaker who does not use animals often – the idea that the animal kingdom has more in common with the wicked and needs to be separated from. Missing from the entire discussion is wisdom.

³³⁶ 12a is asterisked.

Yet, as explained earlier, the author does not particularly sympathize with Elihu and his outlook. Is Elihu being set up as a foil to be proven wrong? Other passages, however, suggest the same impetus: disassociating animals and “wisdom” more starkly. One of the most extended tracts on wisdom in the original text (Job 28) is no longer as animal-heavy in its association with animals. In the Hebrew text, there are four different animals mentioned in this pericope: bird of prey (טֹרֵף), falcon (אֵיָהּ), “sons of pride” (בְּנֵי־זָדוֹן), and lion (לֵוָיִט). None of those animals survive the LXX translation, along with twenty-eight lines (a little less than half the entire pericope). The passage is now focused exclusively on human behavior and God’s domination of wisdom. Although the context of the passage in the original *is* negative (wisdom is not discoverable in the natural world), the LXX translator removes the question entirely.

Another one lies in the omission of the ostrich pericope (Job 39:13–18). At first, the pericope seems like it should be suitable candidate, considering what was mentioned above: God “has made it forget wisdom, and given it no share in understanding” (בְּיָהֳשָׁהּ אֵלֶיךָ וְלֹא־תִלְקֶהָ בְּבִינָהּ, 39:17). However, “forget” (נָשָׁח) implies the ostrich, at one point, had wisdom (חֵכְמָה). This is also the only passage that uses “wisdom” (חֵכְמָה) and “understanding” (בִּינָה) explicitly to discuss the qualities of the animal. The other passages simply discuss the explicit qualities of the animal in naturalistic ways.

The passages altered by the translator suggest more than an unwillingness to give animals wisdom, especially since the passages in question do not go so far. Instead, the translator is wary of suggesting that true wisdom can even be found amongst animals. His respect for them seems to stop at emphasizing their natural skills and traits.

F. The translator does not cut mythological overtones, but merely alters them

As a gross matter, the elimination of swaths of Behemoth and Leviathan material could suggest antagonism toward the origins of these mythical animals. So too could the disappearance of their distinctive names signal the same impetus. Likewise, the restriction of other mythological creatures, most notably Rahab, could potentially signal the same thing.

However, as the foregoing analysis has shown, this would be a simplistic understanding of the translator's agenda for these creatures. What might seem like an "elimination" of the animals misunderstands the valence of terms with which they were replaced. Δράκων's overtones are primeval and mythological; likewise, κῆτος, more than just a "whale," reflects not only its Greek literary history but also its prominent usage in Scripture. Secondly, their context do not downplay its fantastic features. The δράκων, for instance, still is of a tremendous size, breathes fire, has impenetrable scales, and so forth. The κῆτος also is "under heaven," and was "bowed down" by God, actions that suggest its primeval origins.

This suggests the translator does not have a "naturalizing" impulse. The original text does not imply that these creatures possess wisdom and therefore they do not run afoul of his instinct to separate the two. Their appearance also tends to play the narrative role of highlighting God's dominion over the natural world, which is a view that the translator is extremely comfortable with.

G. Conclusion

The translator of Job was moderately uncomfortable with the text of Job as it stood. This was for several reasons. First, the prevailing trend of LXX Wisdom literature was reflectiveness, in that it stood upon the completed canon and looked backwards. Unlike the original Job's critique of common Hebrew wisdom positions, LXX-Job's "sparring partners" were Hellenistic wisdom along with the Greek-language translations. As a result, the internal critiques of Hebrew wisdom are tempered and the integration with Greek material is permitted: the book ends up with a softened message, one that "holds its fire" on traditional wisdom literature. Secondly, his primary mode of "softening" is through the removal large swaths of material, which also beneficially tightens the arguments made in the original text. Thirdly, although the original author is comfortable keeping wisdom and animals in the same breath, the translator is not. He subtly guides the text as a wedge between wisdom and animals. Finally, the translator does not show discomfort with the mythological overtones of the book, but attempts to adapt them to the legendary creatures that suffuse the biblical and cultural contexts that surrounded him.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alter, Robert. *The Wisdom Books: Job, Proverbs, and Ecclesiastes: A Translation with Commentary*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2010
- Angelini, Anna. "Biblical Translations and Cross-Cultural Communication: A Focus on the Animal Imagery." *Semitica et Classica* 8 (2015): 33–3.
- Aquinas, Thomas. *Commentary on the Book of Job*. Translated by Brian Mulladay. Lander, Wyo.: The Aquinas Institute, 2016.
- Aristotle. *History of Animals, Volume I: Books 1–3*. Translated by A. L. Peck. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965.
- . *History of Animals, Volume II: Books 4–6*. Translated by A. L. Peck. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970.
- Arnott, Geoffrey. *Birds in the Ancient World from A to Z*. The Ancient World from A to Z. New York: Routledge, 2007.
- Bernat, David. "Biblical Wašfs Beyond Song of Songs." *JSOT* 28 (2004): 327–49.
- Bertrand, Daniel. "Le bestiaire de Job. Notes sur les versions grecques et latines. Index des noms des animaux." Pages 215–58 in *Le livre de Job chez les Pères*. Edited by Pierre Maraval. Strasbourg: Centre d'Analyse et de Documentation Patristiques, 1996.
- Bickell, Gustav. *De indole ac ratione versionis alexandrinæ in interpretando libro Jobi* [On the Nature and Method of the Alexandrian Version in Translating the Book of Job. Marburgi: Pfeilii, 1862.

- Bochart, Samuel. *Hierozoicon, sive Bipertitum opus de animalibus sacrae scripturae*. 2 Vols. London: Excudebat Tho. Roycroft, impensis Jo. Martyn & Jac. Allestry, 1663.
- Burnight, John. "Job 5:7 as Eliphaz's Response to Job's 'Malediction' (3:3–10)." *JBL* 133.1 (Spring 2014): 77–94.
- Caird, G.B. "Towards a Lexicon of the Septuagint. II." *JTS* 20.1 (April 1969): 21–40.
- Cheyne, T.K. "Dillmann on the Text of Job," *The Expositor* 4, no. 10 (1891): 142–5.
- Cho, Paul Kang-Kul. "The Integrity of Job 1 and 42:11–17." *CBQ*, 76.2 (April 2014): 230–251.
- Cimosa, Mario and Gillian Bonney. "Job LXX and the Animals. The Mystery of God in Nature." Pages 25–39 in *La cultura scientifico-naturalistica nei Padri della Chiesa, I-V sec.: XXXV Incontro di studiosi dell'antichità cristiana, 4-6 maggio 2006*. Roma: Institutum patristicum Augustinianum, 2007.
- Clines, David J.A. *Job 1–20*. WBC 17. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1989.
- . *Job 21–37*. WBC 18A. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2006.
- . *Job 38–42*, WBC 18B. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2017.
- Coleman, K.M. "Manilius' Monster." *Hermes* 111.2 (1983): 226–32.
- Cook, Johann. "Were the LXX Versions of Proverbs and Job Translated by the Same Person?" *HS* 51 (2010): 129–156.
- Couroyer, B. "Béhémoth = Hippopotame ou Buffle?" *RB* 94 (1987): 214–21.
- . "Qui est Béhémoth: Job 40:15–24?" *RB* 82, no. 3 (1975): 418–43.

- Cox, Claude E. "Elihu's Second Speech According to the Septuagint." Pages 36–53 in *Studies in the Book of Job*. Edited by W. E. Aufrecht. Waterloo: Wilfred Laurier, 1983.
- . "Job." Pages 385–400 in *The T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint*. Edited by J. K. Aitken. New York: T&T Clark, 2015.
- . "Tying it all Together: The Use of Particles in Old Greek Job." *BIOSCS* 38 (2005): 41–54.
- Ctesias. *On India*. Translated by Andrew Nichols. London: A&C Black, 2013.
- Ctesias: On India, and Fragments of His Minor Works*. Translated by Andrew Nichols. New York: Bloomberg, 2011.
- Dahood, Mitchell. "Zacharia 9,1, 'en ' adam." *CBQ* 25, No. 2 (April 1963): 123–4.
- Day, John. *God's Conflict with the Dragon and the Sea: Echoes of a Canaanite Myth in the Old Testament*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Dell, Katharine J. "The Use of Animal Imagery in the Psalms and Wisdom Literature of Ancient Israel." *SJT* 53 (2000): 275–91.
- Dhorme, Edouard. *A Commentary on the Book of Job*. Translated by Harold Knight. London: Nelson, 1967.
- Dines, Jennifer M. *The Septuagint*. Edited by M. A. Knibb. New York: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Driver, S.R. "Birds in the Old Testament I: Birds in Law." *PEQ* 87 (1955): 5–20.
- . "Birds in the Old Testament II: Birds in Life." *PEQ* 87 No. 2 (1955): 129–40.
- . "Job 39:27–28: The *ky*-bird." *PEQ* 104 [1974]: 64–66.
- and G. B. Gray, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Job*. New York: Scribner, 1921.

- Druce, George. "An Account of the Μυρμηκολέων or Ant-lion." *The Antiquaries Journal* III.4 (October 1923): 347–64.
- Duhm, Bernhard. *Das Buch Job erklärt*. KHC XVI. Freiburg im Breisgau: J.C.B. Mohr, 1897.
- Dunham, Kyle C. *The Pious Sage in Job: Eliphaz in the Context of Wisdom Theodicy*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2016.
- Eisen, Robert. *The Book of Job in Medieval Jewish Philosophy*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Fensham, F. Charles. "Widow, Orphan, and the Poor in Ancient Near Eastern Legal and Wisdom Literature." *JNES* 21.2 (1962): 129–39.
- Fokkelman, Jan P. *The Book of Job in Form: A Literary Translation with Commentary*. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Forti, Tova. "'Who Teaches Us More Than the Beasts of the Earth, and Makes Us Wiser Than the Birds of the Heaven' (Job 35:11)." Pages 120–4 in *PECUS: Man and Animal in Antiquity, Proceedings of the Conference at the Swedish Institute in Rome, September 9-12, 2002*. Edited by Barbro Santillo Frizell. Rome: The Swedish Institute in Rome, 2004.
- Fox, Michael V. "Behemoth and Leviathan." *Biblica*, 92 vol. 2 (2012): 261–7.
- Gammie, John G. "The Angelology and Demonology in the Septuagint of the Book of Job." *HUCA* 56 (1985): 1–19.
- Gard, Donald H. "The Concept of Job's Character According to the Greek Translator of the Hebrew Text." *JBL* 72.3 (1953): 182–6.

- . "The Concept of the Future Life According to the Greek Translator of the Book of Job." *JBL* 73 (1954): 137–8.
- Gehman, Henry. "The Theological Approach of the Greek Translator of Job 1–15." *JBL* 68 (1949): 231–40.
- Gentry, Peter John. "The Place of Theodotion-Job in the Textual History of the Septuagint." Pages 199–230 in *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments: Papers Presented at the Rich Seminar on the Hexapla, Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies, 25th July-3rd August 1994*. Edited by Alison Salvesen. Tübingen: Mohr, 1998.
- . *The Asterisked Material in the Greek Job*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.
- Gerhardt, Mia. "The Ant-lion: Nature Study and the Interpretation of a Biblical Text, from the Physiologus to Albert the Great." *Vivarium* 3 (1965): 1–23.
- Gevirtz, Stanley. "Naphtali in 'The Blessing of Jacob.'" *JBL* 103.4 (Dec. 1984): 513–21.
- Gordis, Robert. "Job and Ecology (and the Significance of Job 40:15)." *HAR* 9 (1985): 189–202.
- Gorea, Maria. *Job Repensé ou Trahi? Omissions et raccourcis de la Septante*. Paris: J. Gabalda et Cie, 2007.
- Gray, G.B. "The Additions in the Ancient Greek Version of Job." *The Expositor* 19 (1920): 422–38.
- Gresseth, Gerald K. "The Homeric Sirens." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 101 (1970): 203–18.
- Grønbaek, Jakob H. "Baal's Battle With Yam—a Canaanite Creation Fight." *JSOT* 33 (1985): 27–44.

- Gunkel, Hermann. *Schöpfung Und Chaos In Urzeit Und Endzeit: Eine Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung Über Gen 1 Und Ap Joh 12*. Göttingen: Vanderhoef & Ruprecht, 1895.
- Habel, Norman C. “‘Is the Wild Ox Willing to Serve You?’ Challenging the Mandate to Dominate.” Pages 179–89 in *The Earth Story in Wisdom Traditions*. Edited by Norman C. Habel. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- . “‘Only the Jackal Is My Friend’: On Friends and Redeemers in Job.” *Interpretation* 31.3 (1977): 227–36.
- Hatch, Edwin, and Henry A. Redpath. *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (Including the Apocryphal books)*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1998.
- Haupt, Paul. “The Mountain-Bull.” *JBL* 36 (1917): 249–53.
- Heater, Homer Jr. *A Septuagint Translation Technique in the Book of Job*. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1982.
- Heider, G. C. “Tannin.” Pages 834–6 in *Dictionary of Demons and Deities in the Bible*. Edited by Pieter Willem van der Horst, et al. 2nd edition. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1999.
- Herz, N. “Some Difficult Passages in Job.” *ZAW* 20 (1900): 160–3.
- Hesychius. *Hesychii Alexandrini lexicon*. Edited by Moritz Schmidt. Jena: Sumptibus F. Maukii, 1867.
- Hippocrates. *Coan Precognitions. Anatomical and Minor Clinical Writings*. Edited and translated by Paul Potter. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010.

- . *On Flesh*. Translated by Paul Potter. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995.
- Hoffman, Yair. *A Blemished Perfection: The Book of Job in Context*. JSOT 213. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996
- Houston, Keith. *Shady Characters: The Secret Life of Punctuation, Symbols, and Other Typographical Marks*. New York: Norton, 2013.
- Hutton, Jeremy M. "Isaiah 51:9–11 and the Rhetorical Appropriation and Subversion of Hostile Theologies." *JBL* 126, No. 2 (Summer, 2007): 271–303.
- Illman, Karl-Johan. "Theodicy in Job." Pages 304–33 in *Theodicy in the World of the Bible*. Edited by Antti Laato and Johannes C. de Moor. Leiden: Brill, 2003
- Jaffee, Alexander. "Sea Monsters in Antiquity: A Classical and Zoological Investigation." *Berkeley Undergraduate Journal of Classics* 1.2 (2013): 1–12.
- Johnson, Timothy J. "Critical Note on Job 2:8: Ash-Heap or Dung-Heap?" *BIOSCS* 36 (2003): 87–92.
- Jones, Scott. "Lions, Serpents, and Lion-Serpents," *JBL* 130.4 (2011): 663–86.
- Jung, Carl. *Answer to Job: Researches into the Relation between Psychology and Religion*. Translated by R. F. C. Hull. London: Routledge, 1954.
- Kutz, Karl V. "The Old Greek of Job: A Study in Early Biblical Exegesis." Ph.D. diss., Wisconsin-Madison, 1997.
- Katz, P. "Notes on the LXX." *JTS* 47 (1946): 168–9.
- Keel, O. *Jahwes Entgegnung an Ijob: Eine Deutung von Ijob 38–41 vor dem Hintergrund der zeitgenössischen Bildkunst*. FRLANT 121. Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht: Göttingen, 1978.

- Kitchell, Kenneth. *Animals in the Ancient World from A to Z*. Abingdon, UK: Taylor & Francis Group, 2009.
- Knauf, Ernst Axel. "Tema (Place)." Pages 8641–3 in *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by D. N. Freedman. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Kogan, Leonid. "Animal Names of Biblical Hebrew: An Etymological Survey." Pages 257–300 in *Babel und Bibel 3: Annual of Ancient Near Eastern, Old Testament and Semitic Studies*. Edited by Leonid Kogan, et al. University Park, PA: Eisenbrauns, 2007.
- Lange, Armin. "Texts of Jeremiah in the Qumran Library." Pages 280–302 in *The Book of Jeremiah: Composition, Reception, and Interpretation*. Edited by Jack R. Lundbaum, et al. Leiden: Brill, 2018.
- Lasine, Stuart. "Bird's-Eye and Worm's-Eye Views of Justice in the Book of Job." *JSOT* 42 (1988): 29–53.
- Lewis, Theodore J. "CT 13.33–34 and Ezekiel 32: Lion-Dragon Myths." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 116.1 (Jan–Mar 1996): 28–47.
- Luján, Eugenio and Juan-Pablo Vita. "The etymology of Greek σειρήν revisited." *Glotta* 94 (2018): 234–42.
- MacLeish, A. *JB: A Play in Verse*. London: Samuel French, 1956.
- Miller, Geoffrey David. "Attitudes Toward Dogs in Ancient Israel: A Reassessment." *JSOT* 32.4 (2008): 487–500.
- Müller, Hans-Peter. „Die sogenannte Straussenperikope in den Gottesreden.“ *ZAW* 100, no. 1 (1988): 90–105.
- Murgier, Charlotte. "Oikeion and Justice in Plato's Republic." *FONS II* (2017): 65–85.

- Newbold, D. "The Ethiopian Ant-lion." *Sudan Notes and Records* 7 (July 1924): 133–5.
- Newsom, Carol. *The Book of Job: A Contest of Moral Imaginations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Nida, Eugene. "The Nature of Dynamic Equivalence in Translating." *Babel: International Journal of Translation*. 22.3 (1977): 99–103.
- Noegel, Scott B. "Jonah and Leviathan: Inner-Biblical Allusions and the Problem with Dragons." *Henoch* 37.2 (2015): 236–60.
- O'Hara, Mary L. "Truth in Spirit and Letter: Gregory the Great, Thomas Aquinas, and Maimonides on the Book of Job." Pages 47–79 in *From Cloister to Classroom: Monastic and Scholastic Approaches to Truth: The Spirituality of Western Christendom*. Edited by E. Rozanne Elder. Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, 1986.
- Odell, David. "Images of Violence in the Horse in Job 39:18–25." *Prooftexts*. Vol. 13, No. 2 (May 1993): 163–173.
- Ogden, Daniel. "Katabasis and the Serpent." *Les Études Classiques* 83 (2015): 193–210.
- Orlinsky, H. M. "Some Corruptions in the Greek Text of Job." *JQR* 26 (1935–36): 133–45.
- . "Studies in the Septuagint of the Book of Job." *HUCA* 28 (1957): 53–74.
- . "Studies in the Septuagint of the Book of Job: Chapter II: The Character of the Septuagint Translation of the Book of Job." *HUCA* 29 (1958): 229–71.
- . "Studies in the Septuagint of the Book of Job: Chapter III: On the Matter of Anthropomorphisms, Anthropopathisms, and Euphemisms." *HUCA* 30 (1959): 153–67.

- . "Studies in the Septuagint of the Book of Job: Chapter III (Continued)." *HUCA* 32 (1961): 239–68.
- . "Studies in the Septuagint of the Book of Job: Chapter IV: The Present State of the Greek Text of Job." *HUCA* 33 (1962): 119–51.
- . "Studies in the Septuagint of the Book of Job: Chapter V: The Hebrew "Vorlage" of the Septuagint of Job: The Text and the Script." *HUCA* 35 (1964): 57–78.
- . "The Hebrew Vorlage of the Septuagint of the Book of Joshua." *VTS* 17 (1969): 187–95.
- . "Ἀποβαίνω and ἐπιβαίνω in the Septuagint of Job." *JBL* 56 (1937): 361–7.
- . "The Hebrew Vorlage of the Septuagint of the Book of Joshua." *VTSup* (1969): 187–95.
- Papoutsakis, Manolis. "Ostriches Into Sirens: Towards an Understanding of a Septuagint Crux." *JJS* 55.1 (2004): 25–36.
- Patterson, Richard D. "The Widow, Orphan, and the Poor in the Old Testament and the Extra-Biblical Literature." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 130 (July 1973): 129–39.
- Pietersma, Albert, and Benjamin G. Wright, eds. *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- . "Review of *Iob*." *JBL* 104 (1985): 305–311.
- Pinker, Aron. "The Wicked in Ambush (Job 27:18–19)." *BBR* 25.3 (2015): 295–310.
- Plato. *Republic*. Translated by Christopher Emlyn-Jones and William Preddy. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2013.
- Pope, Marvin H. *Job*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1985.

Reed, Annette Yoshiko. "Job as Jobab: The Interpretation of Job in LXX Job 42:17b–e."

JBL 120.1 (Spring, 2001): 31–55

Reider, Joseph. "Some Notes to the Text of the Scriptures." *HUCA* 3 [1926]: 109–16.

Rimbach, James. "'Crushed Before the Moth' (Job 4:19)." *JBL* 100 (1981): 244–6.

Roberts, Alexander and James Donaldson, eds. *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*. 1885–1887. 10 vols. Reprint. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1994.

Rodd, Cyril S. "The Family in the Old Testament." *The Bible Translator* 18.1 (1967): 19–26.

Ruprecht, Eberhard. "Das Nilpferd im Hiobbuch: Beobachtungen zu der Sogenannten Zweiten Gottesrede." *VT* 21 vol. 2 (1971): 209–31.

Sarot, Marcel. "Theodicy and Modernity: An Inquiry into the Historicity of Theodicy." Pages 1–26 in *Theodicy in the World of the Bible*. Edited by Antti Laato and Johannes C. de Moor. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Schaff, Philip, editor. *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, 7 vols. Reprint. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968.

Schaper, J.L.W. "The Unicorn in the Messianic Imagery of the Greek Bible." *JTS* 45.1 (April 1994): 117–36.

Schifferdecker, Kathryn. *Out of the Whirlwind: Creation Theology in the Book of Job*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Theological Studies, 2011.

Schwartz, Joshua. "Dogs in Jewish Society in the Second Temple Period and in the Time of the Mishnah and Talmud." *JJS* 55.2 (September 2004): 246–77.

Scolnicov, Samuel. *Plato's Method of Hypothesis in the Middle Dialogues*. Sankt Augustin: Academia Verlag, 2018

Spronk, K. "Rahab." Pages 684–6 in *Dictionary of Demons and Deities in the Bible*.

Edited by Pieter Willem van der Horst, et al. 2nd Edition. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1999.

Strawn, Brent A. *What is Stronger Than a Lion?: Leonine Image and Metaphor in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East*. Fribourg: Academic Press, 2005.

Swete, Henry Barclay. *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1902.

Thackeray, Henry St. John. *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek*. Reprint. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2008.

Thomas, D. Winton. "A Consideration of Some Unusual Ways of Expressing the Superlative in Hebrew." *VT* 3 (Jul. 1953): 209–224.

Thomas, D. Winton. "Kelebh 'Dog': Its Origin and Some Usages of It in the Old Testament." *VT* 10, Fasc. 4 (Oct 1960): 410–427.

Topel, L. J. "What Kind of a Sign are Vultures? Luke 17,37b." *Biblica* 84 (2003): 403–411.

Ulrich, Eugene. "Origen's Old Testament Text: The Transmission History of the Septuagint to the Third Century C.E." Pages 3–33 in *Origen of Alexandria: His World and His Legacy*. Edited by Charles Kannengiesser and William L. Petersen. Notre Dame, IN: Notre Dame University Press, 1988.

United Bible Societies. *Fauna and Flora of the Bible*. London: United Bible Societies, 1980.

Van der Zwaan, Pieter. "Some psychoanalytical meanings of the skin in the book of Job." *Verbum et Ecclesia* 38(1): 1–8.

- Walker-Jones, Arthur. "The So-called Ostrich in the God Speeches of the Book of Job (Job 39,13–18)," *Biblica* Vol. 86, No. 4 (2005): 494–510.
- Whitekettle, Richard. "The Raven as Kind and Kinds of Ravens: A Study in the Zoological Nomenclature of Leviticus 11,2–23." *ZAW* 117.4 (January 2006): 509–28.
- Witte, Markus. "The Greek Book of Job." Pages 33–54 in *Das Buch Hiob und seine Interpretationen: Beiträge zum Hiob-Symposium auf dem Monte Verita vom 14.-19. August 2005*. Edited by Thomas Krüger, et al. Zurich, Switzerland: TVZ, 2007.
- Xenophon. *Fragments of Old Comedy, Volume III: Philonicus to Xenophon. Adespota*. Edited and translated by Ian C. Storey. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2011.
- Yocum, John. "Aquinas' Literal Exposition on Job." Pages 21–42 in *Aquinas on Scripture: An Introduction to His Biblical Commentaries*. Edited by Thomas Weinandy. New York: T&T Clark, 2005.
- Ziegler, Joseph. "Der Textkritische Wert der Septuaginta des Buches Job." *Miscellanea Biblica* 2 (1934): 277–296.
- , editor. *Iob: Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum*. XI/4. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982.