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ABSTRACT

This article will demonstrate aspects of the unique profile of OGJOB. The theological implications of this profile will be determined based upon a contextual analysis of chs. 1, 14, 19 and 42. The OG of Job is one sixth shorter than the Masoretic text. Scholars differ as to the reasons for this shorter text. Some argue that it is the result of a differing Hebrew Vorlage – unfortunately there is no external evidence available. Others ascribe the differences to the translator. OGJob is one of the more freely translated units in the corpus of Septuagint translations. In Cox’s words “OGJob is one of a kind in the Septuagint corpus.”(2007:667) Since the translator interpreted his parent text, it opens the possibility to determine theological aspects concerning this unit. In the past, scholars (Gard, and others) have overstated their case in this regard and were criticised by Orlinski (and others). What is clear is that OGJOB has a unique and different profile compared to the MT and other textual witnesses. In Job 1, for example, the translator renders the parent text creatively. On the one hand, he clears God from direct involvement in the maltreatment of Job. In conjunction with this the fundamental goodness and omnipotence of God is stressed. On the other hand, Job is depicted as a saint, he is blameless, genuine, religious, keeping away from every evil thing (v. 8). In chapter 2 Job is questioned in a unique manner by his unbelieving wife.

A INTRODUCTION

1 The Problem

The OG of Job is one sixth shorter than the Masoretic text and is one of the more freely translated units in the corpus of Septuagint translations. Because the translator also interpreted his parent text, this opens the possibility to determine some
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1 This contribution is based on research conducted during 2009 in conjunction with Prof. Arie van der Kooij of the University of Leiden. I acknowledge financial and other assistance from the University of Stellenbosch, SANRF, NWO and the Oppenheimer Memorial Trust.
theological aspects of this unit. As is the case with LXX Proverbs, another less faithful translation, this Greek version also has a unique and different profile compared to, for example, the MT version. In Job 1, for example, the translator renders the parent text creatively. On the one hand, he clears God of direct involvement in the maltreatment of Job. In conjunction with this, the fundamental goodness and omnipotence of God are stressed. On the other hand, Job is depicted as an astute saint, he is blameless, genuine, religious, staying away from every evil thing (v. 8).

This article will demonstrate the unique profile of OGJOB identified in chs. 1, 14, 19 and 42. Some theological implications of this profile will be determined. A contextual approach will be followed. One example to be discussed is the theological question of whether references to life after death and to resurrection are in fact found in this book. But first some methodological issues need to be addressed.

2 Textual basis of this research

The research into Job is based on the critical edition prepared by Joseph Ziegler. There are a few divergences from this edition made in the light of suggestions put forward by Pietersma in his review of Ziegler’s edition and by Gentry.

3 Translation technique and interpretation

There is consensus that the Greek versions of Proverbs and Job exhibit a rather free translation technique. According to Cox, the usual categories for
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4 Joseph Ziegler, Job (vol. 11.4 of Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum: Auctoritate Scientiarum Gottingensis Editum; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982).
characterising a translation are less helpful for assessing OGJOB. “It is not just free or paraphrastic, it is also something of an epitome of the longer and often difficult original. OGJOB is one of a kind in the Septuagint corpus (my italics – JC). We can typify it as among the least literal, both in its attitude toward abbreviating the parent text and in the way the translator worked with that portion of the text for which we have a translation.”9 OGJOB is thus a shortened, abbreviated text. The OG is substantially shorter than the MT. According to Cox,10 this tendency towards abbreviation increases as one works through the book. The description “shortened text” does not apply consistently to the Greek version of Job. Even though the text as a whole provides evidence of conscious shortening, there are also various additions.11 The major ones are the diatribe of Job’s wife in 2:9a-d and 42:17aa-ea.

A significant issue is the relationship between the Greek text and its supposed parent text. In the past some scholars have proposed that Greek Job is based upon an equally shorter Hebrew parent text.12 However, according to Cox,13 “on the basis of what we can establish about the translator’s technique, i.e. his rather free, even paraphrastic approach, it seems likely that the shorter text is to be attributed to the time of the translation.” Fernández Marcos14 shares the view put forward by Cox. However, see Orlinsky,15 who is sceptical of ascribing all sorts of wilful changes to the translator. To him stylistic changes were foremost in LXX Job. The discovery of fragments of the Hebrew of Job in the Dead Sea Scrolls has unfortunately not thrown any light on this issue.16

9 Cox, “Job,” 667.
10 Cox, “Job,” 667.
12 Cox, “Job,” 667.
15 Harry M. Orlinsky, “The Hebrew and Greek Texts of Job 14.12.,” JQR New Series 28 (1937) 64: “It is sufficient at this point to indicate that if our translator were so horrified by passages that denied resurrection or that placed God in an unfavourable light that he felt himself compelled to omit about one-sixth of the Book, not only would he not have reproduced in his translation most of the passages throughout the book that denied resurrection (7.7, 9 and 10; 10.21 and 22; 15.22 and 20.7 and 8 and 16.22), but he would most certainly have either deleted or in some way distorted the first stichos in this verse itself.”
16 There are only a few smaller fragments of Job available. See 4QpaleoJobc in Patrick W. Skehan et al. Qumran Cave 4 IV Palaeo-Hebrew and Greek Biblical Manuscripts
4 Translation profile of the Greek of Job

Though the Hebrew text of Job has for the most part been composed in poetry, it includes three sections in prose as well, namely, 1:1-2:13; 32:1-5 and 42:7-17.\textsuperscript{17} In the Greek the entire book is in prose, even though arranged stichometrically, in the manuscript tradition.\textsuperscript{18}

According to Cox,\textsuperscript{19} the OGJOB is a work of good literary quality. The usual Hebraisms that are the tell-tale signs of translation Greek in much of the Septuagint corpus are absent – this applies to LXX Proverbs too. There can be no doubt that the translators of LXX Proverbs and the OGJOB were both steeped in Greek and Jewish culture.\textsuperscript{20}

Another general characteristic of the translation consists of transferring passages from elsewhere in Job or from other parts of the Septuagint into the translation, so-called inter-/intra-textual rendering.\textsuperscript{21} This phenomenon was detected by Dhorme\textsuperscript{22} and Ziegler and studied by Heater, who calls it “the anaphoric translation technique.”\textsuperscript{23}

Finally, the translator’s competence in the Greek language is observed from his application of particles. According to Kitto, “Greek is well stocked with little words, conjunctions that hunt in couples or in packs, whose sole function is to make the structure clear. They act, as it were, as signposts.”\textsuperscript{24} Moreover, “This
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\textsuperscript{17} Cox, “Job,” 667.
\textsuperscript{18} Cox, “Job,” 667.
\textsuperscript{19} Cox, “Job,” 667.
\textsuperscript{22} Edouard Dhorme, \textit{A Commentary on the Book of Job} (trans. Harold Knight; Nashville: Westminster, 1967), ccxcvi.
\textsuperscript{23} Cf. Homer Heater, \textit{A Septuagint Translation Technique in the Book of Job} (CBQMS 11; Washington: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1982).
seems to be the translator’s intent in Job, i.e. to give the rather loosely linked Hebrew text a connectedness. So the translation is heavily salted with particles: … In short, unlike most other Septuagintal translators, Job uses particles more in accord with standard Greek discourse.”25

4a Examples of OGJOB’s profile

• Job chapter 1 - The Prologue

Chapter 1 acts as an introduction to the whole Greek book of Job. It is a relatively literal translation in the sense that it does not contain any obvious additions or minuses. From the analysis it has become clear that the Greek version of Job 1 has a different profile from the MT. It is, in van der Kooij’s words on the Greek book of Isaiah, “a translation and an interpretation.”26 Firstly, the translator’s translation technique in this ch. 1 is dealt with in general terms.

• The translator’s approach

The unique approach of the translator is observed on two levels. On the micro level of the lexemes and on the more macro level of the syntax. Each chapter exhibits unique textual and other grammatical phenomena. As to be expected of a freely rendered text, it contains *hapax legomena*, neologisms and individual lexemes that are used uniquely. Gerleman27 and Orlinsky28 have already revealed the richness of the vocabulary of LXX Job. I did not make as systematic a study of this issue in Job as I have done with Proverbs,29 but it is striking that the translator of Job exhibits similar trends.

Here I discuss only a small, hopefully representative, number of cases. As stated earlier, I use a contextual approach.

Micro level:

There are only 8 occurrences of εὐγενής in the LXX; v. 3 contains the only example in the OG. The verb συνετελέω occurs 10 times in Job and it translates various Hebrew lexemes. In Job 1:5 (יְהוָה), 14:14 (יְהוָה), 15:4 (יְהוָה), 19:27 (יְהוָה) and (יְהוָה), 21:13 (יְהוָה) (יְהוָה), 33:27 (יְהוָה), 35:14 (יְהוָה) and 36:11 (יְהוָה). This diverse way of rendering parent readings is a pertinent characteristic of LXX Job, as well as of LXX Proverbs. The noun μόσχος is used frequently in the LXX, but only in Job 1:5 and 42:8. The noun ἡγγελος occurs 16 times in Job and represents diverse renderings. It acts as equivalent for a number of lexemes. In 1:6, 2:1 and 38:7 it is related to the construction ἡγγελος. In 1:14, 4:18 and 33:23 it acts as equivalent for μόσχος. In 20:15 it renders ἡγγελος and in 1:16 and 17, 5:1, 9:7 and 41:24 there is no parent text according to HR. In one instance HR uses the siglum ⌁. This bears witness to the free translation technique of this translator. It is used 5 times in Proverbs. The noun ὁ διάβολος is used almost exclusively in Job, always as equivalent for πράγμα. All 13 cases in Job appear in the first two chapters.

The description of Job in this chapter is highly significant. On the one hand, he is called a πατις. This noun occurs in Job 1:8, 15 and 17, 4:18, 29:5 and 42:8 and in Prov 1:4, 4:19:14 and 28, 20:7 and 29:15 and 21. The translator does not follow the exact pattern of words and word order that appears in the MT in vv. 1 and 8. The word order in the Greek of this verse differs and δίκαιος is missing in the present verse. Assuming that the same parent text was used in both verses, this could be evidence of the interpretative approach of the translator. As in vv. 1 the translator added the explicative rendering παντίς “every” (evil) in conjunction with πράγμα in v. 8.

On the other hand, Job is also called a θεράπων. This is true for 1:8 (in A), 3:19, 7:2, 19:15 and 16, 31:13 and 42:7 and 8 (3x). In the LXX it practically always translates the noun תַּבַּשֶׂר. Van der Kooij has made the insightful comment on the Pentateuch that θεράπων refers to “particular servants of a king,” a “confidential attendant.” It is clear from the opening two chapters that Job is not an ordinary servant of the Lord, but a confidant.

Clearly the researcher has to take account of each individual lexical item; this applies also to the way the translator rephrased his story on the macro level.
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The translator told his own story and tied the Greek text neatly by means of the application of Greek particles and phrases. In some instances he explicated unclear concepts and he added phrases when needed. The interjection ἵδιο in v. 6 has no equivalent in the Hebrew and serves to stress the moment of surprise more than it does in the Hebrew. This also applies to v. 14. This process is inverted in v. 11, where the Greek has no obvious equivalent for the interjection ἄξον. It is, of course, possible that the nuance of urgency is part of the Greek translation. In v. 19 ἥτις is not rendered by means of ἵδιο, but with the adverb ἐξαιρομένης.

The translator is creative in his application of particles. Waw is not rendered consistently with one equivalent. In vv. 2, 4 and 9 the particle δὲ is applied. In vv. 3, 13, 14 and 15 καί is used in conjunction with ἔν to render ὡς. The conjunction καί is used also in vv. 7 and 8 to render waw. However, in v. 12 τότε is employed, and in v. 11 ἀλλά. In v. 20 οὕτως is the equivalent of waw. In v. 21 the Greek has no equivalent for waw.

**Conclusions**

The Greek text of ch. 1 clearly has a profile of its own. The translator seems to reveal two intentional tendencies in this passage. On the one hand, there is an attempt to clear God from direct involvement in the maltreatment of Job. In conjunction with this is the fact that the fundamental goodness and omnipotence of God are stressed. The words in vv. 5 (“Perhaps my sons thought bad things in their mind toward God”), 7 (what lies beneath heaven), 12 (I am giving), 16 (Fire - not the fire of God), 21 (as it seemed good to the Lord, so it turned out) and 22 (that happened to him) bear witness to this profile. On the other hand, Job is depicted as an astute saint – he keeps away from every evil thing (vv. 1 and 8). He is blameless, genuine, religious, avoiding every evil thing (v. 8). The translator does not follow the exact pattern of words and word order that appears in the MT in vv. 1 and 8. The word order in the Greek of this verse differs and δίκαιος is missing in v. 8. Assuming that the same parent text was used in both verses, this could be evidence of the interpretative approach of the translator. As in v. 1 the translator added the explicative rendering παντὸς “every” (evil) in conjunction with πράγμα.

Job is also depicted as having extensive activities in the land, and that man was well-born among those of the east (v. 3). There are also other prominent characteristics in this chapter; the translator explained unclear statements such as at pasture in v. 3; both what is within his household as well as what is outside of in v. 10; the phrase against us in v. 17; the phrase the hair of (his head) in v. 20 and the
addition *that happened to him* in v. 22. These additions have no equivalent in the Semitic parent text.

Other significant trends appear, as stated already, in the references to angels and Satan. Fernández Marcos is of the opinion that the reference to the divine court with the sons of God and Satan among them is in fact deliberately transformed into angels and Satan, which he thinks is part of the process of deliberate Hellenization.

In some cases the translator either misunderstood a Hebrew/Aramaic word or had a different Vorlage; see, for example, the word *folly* in v. 22. The Greek noun ἀφοσία is used in Job 1:22, 4:6 (κακληθή) and 21:23 (†). From a contextual analysis it is clear that the parent text in 1:22 either read κακληθή, or was understood as such by the translator. The translator seemingly had problems with ἱστορήσατε in v. 15. The participle form οἱ ἀρχαιολογούντες is a repetition of the verbal form ἀρχαιολογεῖον. It is probably related to the root ἱστορέω “taken captive” (KB). “Horsemen” (οἱ ἰππεῖς) for “Chaldeans” (כְּשָׁלְדֶּנים) in v. 17 could be an interpretation. In the Habakuk Pesher the Chaldeans are indeed described as “horsemen” coming from afar. ἐγκολογεῖον appears eight times in Job, mostly in connection with the Pi‘el form of מָשָׁל. In Proverbs it is used seven times with the same parent text. The equivalent of the phrase “as it seemed good to the Lord, so it turned out (v. 21)” does not appear in the Hebrew. It is probably an explicative rendering, underlining the fact that what seemed in order to the Lord indeed happened.

B THEOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVES

1 Chapter 14 – Life after death?

This chapter contains some passages in the Hebrew and the Greek that have been related to life after death. This applies especially to vv. 10-14.

1a The translator’s approach

The unique approach of the translator is again observed, but primarily on the level of lexical items. There are fewer additions and abbreviations than in some other chapters.

---

**1b  The micro level**

This chapter contains no *hapax legomena*; however, on a lexical level there are interesting phenomena, in line with earlier tendencies. In the first stich in v. 2 the Greek does not provide an equivalent for the *waw*. In v. 3 the process is reversed. Whereas in the previous verse a *waw* is discarded, in this verse its equivalent is added.\(^{35}\) The adjective *καθαρ/uni1F78ς* appears 21 times in Job. In three instances, including v. 4, it renders יָפֶת. In total in Job it relates to 14 Hebrew parent readings, bearing witness to the translator’s unique approach. The noun *ράδομος* (v. 7) occurs only in Job (4x) in the LXX. The verb ἀποστάζω also appears exclusively in Job, namely in 8:20, 14:15, 15:4, 19:18, 36:5 and 40:3. In the present chapter it renders כַּסַף, which has the nuance of “to long for” in its semantic field. This is different from “to reject, do away with.”

**1c  The macro level**

There are not as many examples on the macro level; however, cases of abbreviated texts do occur. There are no OG readings in vv. 18 and 19. It is striking that the same tendency to avoid natural phenomena, as is the case in chapter 28, occurs here as well. Verse 12 also seems to be an example of an abbreviated text.

**1d  Verses 10-14**

The most conspicuous differences appear in vv. 10-14. These five verses will now be discussed contextually. According to some scholars, the Hebrew and Greek texts indeed refer to the concept of life after death. Schnocks\(^ {36} \) is one example and adopts what I would call a “dogmatic” approach in this regard. He does not deal with the important v. 12 but with the pericope 13-17. He reconstructs a “mental background” to this text and presupposes that “concepts of rebirth, resurrection or a last judgment must have been known to some extent.”\(^ {37} \)

Verse 10

נָבְרָנָה יְהוָה וּרְאוֹתָנָה אָדָם אֶת אָלֵי

But mortals die, and are laid low;

---

\(^{35}\) See Cox, “Tying it All Together,” 44.


humans expire, and where are they? \(^38\)

\[\text{ἀνήρ δὲ τελευτήσας ωχετο,}
\]

\[\text{πεσών δὲ βροτὸς οὐκέτι ἐστίν.}\]

But a man, once dead, is gone,
and a mortal, once fallen is no more.

The verb οὐχόμαι is used in Job 14:10 and 20, 19:10 and 30:25. In Job 14 it renders ἔλης and ἔλλη respectively. ἔλης has the nuance of “to lose all power (die).” According to Muraoka (2009:491), οὐχόμαι may refer to “to leave the place and go” or “to disappear.” It is therefore difficult to determine whether the Greek has something different in mind: death or disappearance? What is clear, however, is that the LXX does not render the interrogative ποι. Instead of asking where the fallen humans are, it clearly states that such a mortal “is no more” (οὐκέτι ἐστίν), no longer exists. On the face of it this seems to be a statement on non-existence. Therefore it seems in order to conclude that this verse in the Greek does not refer to life after death at all.

Verse 12:

\[\text{Ἀνιστήθητι ἕνας ἡμερὰς ἐν σομινο καὶ ἐν ἑαυτῷ ὕπατος,}\]

so mortals lie down and do not rise again;
until the heavens are no more, they will not awake or be roused out of their sleep.

\[\text{ἀνθρωπος δὲ κοιμηθεὶς οὐ μὴ ἀναστῇ,}
\]

\[\text{ἔως ἂν ὁ σύραπτω οὐ μὴ συρραφῇ,}\]

but a person, once lying down, shall never rise again until the sky become unstitched.

The verb κοιμᾶω occurs 12 times in Job and in the current verse renders שבע. The verb ἀνίστημι in Job primarily translates שומס. The verb συρράπτω occurs only twice in the LXX, here in Job and in Ezek 13:18.

Orlinsky \(^39\) provides several intricate perspectives on this verse. He follows a multidimensional methodology. He firstly deals with the Hebrew, then with the

\(^{38}\) The English translation of the Hebrew is from the NRSV and of the Greek from NETS.

\(^{39}\) Orlinsky, “The Hebrew and Greek Texts,” 57-68.
Greek and finally searches for perspectives from cognate languages. Orlinsky finds no link between ἔκεις ἐκεῖνος ὑμῖν οὖν μὴ σφραγίζῃ, and ἀλλὰ ἔσται μὴ μαθηματικῶς for “Both can hardly be accepted as original; either one or both must have been subject to change after leaving the hands of their respective authors.” The problem is that he does not provide any substantiating arguments for this hypothesis. In a way that is methodologically more sound, he then goes on, firstly, to discuss problems in the Hebrew (Masoretic) phrase. He finds “anomalies” in connection with the application of the particle בְּלֵי, which is, according to him, unusually used here to express a negative attribute with a following substantive. Secondly, the phrase רַעְאָה יְדֵי, אֵין is problematic, according to him, especially the application of the plural form. Finally, he finds that the meter of this Hebrew passage is out of the ordinary. His conclusion in this regard is: “We may safely assume that לָא מָשְׁתַּחְתָּה, which disturbs the meter and adds nothing whatever to the context, was not reproduced in the OG simply because it did not exist in the HT and is therefore to be excised as a gloss of לָא מָשְׁתַּחְתָּה.”

With regards to the Hebrew and Greek texts, he fruitfully searches for perspectives from cognate languages, especially Arabic. He argues that לָא מָשְׁתַּחְתָּה is an Arabism and then adds the following enlightening observation: “on a number of occasions our translator rendered a Hebrew word by a Greek word having precisely the opposite meaning, then added או or μη to neutralize the Greek word, thus squaring the Greek with the Hebrew text so far as the sense was concerned; or else he combined a negative particle in the Hebrew with another word to form but one word in Greek.” This is exactly what has happened in the case of the phrase או μη σφραγίζῃ.

In the final analysis Orlinsky is directive in his conclusion as to whether Job LXX refers to life after death. He consulted an Arabic Lexicon and compared appropriate passages from Job to conclude that this verse in the Greek can have only one meaning: “it can only mean that man, once dead, will never rise.”

I think Orlinsky’s conclusion is acceptable, the LXX does not refer to life after death in this verse. However, I wonder whether it is necessary to adopt such

40 Orlinsky, “The Hebrew and Greek Texts,” 61.
43 Orlinsky, “The Hebrew and Greek Texts,” 61.
46 See also Schnocks, “The Hope for Resurrection in the Book of Job,” 298.
an intricate theoretical model? To me it seems as if this verse is yet another example of the abbreviating approach of the translator. Stichs b and c in the Hebrew are combined and in the process interpreted and hence shortened. The equivalent of the phrase “they will not awake” in stich b of MT is omitted, since it is implied in stich a. Moreover, the heavens are referred to in stich b in the LXX, which ends off with the amazing statement that οὐ μὴ συρραφῇ “will not be stitched together,” or as NETS translates it: “Until the sky becomes unstitched.”

Verse 13

O that you would hide me in Sheol,
that you would conceal me until your wrath is past,
that you would appoint me a set time, and remember me!

εἰ γὰρ φείλων ἐν ᾠδῇ με ἐφύλαχας,
ἐκρυψάς δὲ με, ἐὼς ἄν παῦσηται σοι ἡ ὀργή
kai ῥάξη μοι χρόνον, ἐν ὦ μνείαν μου ποιήσῃ.

O that you had kept me in Hades
and had concealed me until your anger had ceased,
and you had set me a time, when you would remember me.

The verb ὀφείλω occurs in Job 6:20, 14:13 and 30:24. In the present verse it translates the interrogative phrase τὴν ὑπὸ. According to HR, φυλάσσω is an interpretation in this verse. The rest of the stichs are rendered relatively literally. There is some intra-textual relationship between vv. 13 and 5.

VERSE 14

If mortals die, will they live again?
All the days of my service I would wait
until my release should come.

ἐὰν γὰρ ἀποθάνῃ ἄνθρωπος, ζήσεται
συντελέσας ἡμέρας τοῦ βίου αὐτοῦ,

υπομενῶ, ἕως ἄν πάλιν γένωμαι.

For, if a person died, then would live again,
when he has completed the days of his life,
I would endure until I would be born again.

Stichs b and c are interpreted by the translator. Stich b has no reference to the waiting game. The subject is different and the reference to “days of his life” has a different person and interpretation from “days of my service.” Stich c has a totally different content: “until I would be born again!” Some scholars indeed have taken this verse as proof of life after death. ⁴⁸

This is one of the classical verses from the ancient world on the expectation of life after death. Various scholars have interpreted this text to refer to the concept of resurrection, or a new life after death. ⁴⁹ Others are vehemently opposed to this interpretation. Concerning the Hebrew text, Gerleman ⁵⁰ expresses this view as follows: “The description of the kingdom of death in which these words are introduced gives clear expression to the classical view in the OT regarding the state of death as final and hopeless. It is not possible to regard Job’s kingdom of death as a provisional resting-place, from which he may one day be raised. Death is definitive, without a prospect of resurrection. The change Job is speaking of is the release from sickness and suffering.”

However, as far as the OG translation is concerned, he finds the contrary: “Here Job expresses, no doubt, his belief in a continued existence after death, in a resurrection. For, however meagre the material is, the belief in a resurrection flashes through this passage.” ⁵¹ As stated above, not all scholars agree with this point of view, but this issue cannot be exhaustively pursued in the context of this chapter only. Chapters 19 and 42 contain significant perspectives that will be dealt with later. Especially the final stich in the present verse “I would endure until I

---

⁴⁸ Eg. Schnocks, “The Hope for Resurrection in the Book of Job,” 295: “This text obviously is presupposing that there is a life after death.”
⁵⁰ Gerleman, Job, 61.
⁵¹ Gerleman, Job, 61.
would be born again” has to be discussed in the light of the larger context of the whole book. On the face of it, it does seem to refer to “life after death.”52

2 Chapter 19 – Resurrection?

Chapter 19 contains the classic passage in vv. 25-26a that has been interpreted by some scholars53 as an indication of the concept of resurrection/life after death in the LXX book of Job and in the Hebrew Bible. This passage has to be dealt with contextually.

2a The translator’s approach

The unique approach of the translator is again observed, but, as is the case of ch. 14, primarily on the level of the lexical item. There are fewer additions and abbreviations than in some other chapters. This chapter contains no hapax legomena; however, on a lexical level there are interesting phenomena, in line with earlier trends. There are not as many examples on the macro level; however, cases of abbreviated texts do occur.

2b Resurrection (vv. 25-26)?

As is the case with other passages about this one, scholars also differ in their opinions. Cavallin54 has no doubt that this passage indeed refers to the resurrection. Van der Kooij55 is more reserved on this issue.

Verse 25

ονίδα γὰρ ὅτι ἀέναος ἀστίν ὁ ἐκλάειν με μέλλων ἐπί γῆς.

For I know that my Redeemer lives, and that at the last he will stand upon the earth;

53 Remblay, Job 19,25-27 dans la septante et chez les pères grecs, 206.
54 Hans C. C. Cavallin, An Enquiry into the Jewish background (part 1 of Life After Death: Paul’s Argument for the Resurrection of the Dead in I Cor 15; ConBNT 7,1; Lund, Sweden: C.W.K Gleerup, 1974), 103-111.
55 Van der Kooij, “Ideas About Afterlife,” 95.
To be sure, I know that he who is about to undo me on earth is everlasting.

The adjective ἀέναος occurs only in Gen 49:26, Deut 33:15 and 27, Job 19:25, Wis 11:6, Bar 5:7 and 2 Macc 7:36. In Job it translates הַיָּהָ. Gen 49:26 and the present verses are classic passages concerning the issue of the resurrection/life after death, although opinions are divided. This adjective has the nuance of “everlasting” in its semantic field. The verb μέλλω appears in Job 3:8, 19:25 and 26:2. It occurs once in Proverbs. The verb ἐκλώ is used in Job 19:25; 20:28 and 30:16. In the present verse it renders Ἠγέ.

The OG seems to be an abbreviation of the Hebrew. There is no reference to “standing” in the Greek.

Verse 26

May my skin, which patiently endures these things, rise up; for these things have been accomplished on me by the Lord –

The verb ἀνιστημι is used 10 times in Job. In the verse under discussion it is difficult to determine what the parent text is. It could be לָמָה, which has “destroy” in its semantic field. However, it is also possible that לָמָה is an interpretation of הָמָה. The verb συντελέω occurs 10 times in Job and 4 times in Proverbs. In the present verse it is an interpretation.

One of the problematic phrases is found in v. 26: “May my skin, which patiently endures these things, rise up;” The issue is that skin is taken as representing the body that will then arise. This is untenable, since the Greek words δέρμα and σώμα both appear in LXX Job, the latter 13 times, of which one example is 19:26, albeit in mss A and S2. Van der Kooij, moreover, correctly mentions that the skin is a reminder of Job 2, where Satan is allowed by God to smite Job. Hence according to Van der Kooij, the current stich is a reference to the idea that his skin

56 See the exhaustive analysis of this phrase by Remblay, Job 19,25-27 dans la septante et chez les pères grecs, 193-201.
57 Van der Kooij, “Ideas About Afterlife,” 95.
will be recovered and has nothing to do with the resurrection from the death.\(^{58}\)

Significant is the reading of Ms A, where σώμα is used instead of δέρμα in Job 19:26. This is clearly a later revision to underscore the interpretation of the resurrection.\(^{59}\) In his interpretation of Job 14:14 “to be born again,” Van der Kooij takes as a reference the fact that his skin will be recovered from “the sore boils,”\(^{60}\) which has nothing to do with the resurrection.

In the light of this discussion it is clear that this chapter does not refer to the resurrection nor to life after death.

### 3 Chapter 42 - The epilogue

The final chapter naturally acts as epilogue for the book. As stated already, it is significant for this paper since it contains crucial additions which, inter alia, refer to the issue of resurrection/life after death.

#### 3a The translator’s approach

The unique approach of the translator is again observed.

#### 3b The micro level

This chapter contains two hapax legomena, διπλασιασμός, in v. 10 and προϋπάρχω in v. 17b. On a lexical level there are again significant features. There are significant differences between the Greek and the Hebrew of v. 8. Firstly, the phrase “and offer up for yourself a burnt offering” (ложение в убо́ть) is rendered by means of “he will make offerings for you” (καὶ ποιήσει κάρπωσιν περὶ ύμων). The Greek stresses the fact that Job must bring about reconciliation. Secondly, the phrase “and my servant Job shall pray for you, for I will accept his prayer not to deal with you according to your folly;” is translated by means of “and Job, my attendant, will pray for you, for, if not for him, I would have destroyed you;” The intercessory role of Job again comes out more clearly in OGJOB. Finally, the phrase “for you have not spoken of me what is right” is rendered by means of “for what you spoke against my attendant Job.” Job, thus, has a different role in the Greek compared to the Hebrew.

---

\(^{58}\) This is contrary to Schnocks, “The Hope for Resurrection in the Book of Job,” 298, “that it (the Greek rendering – JC) presents a reading which could be interpreted as a certainty of resurrection revealed to the patiently suffering Job.”

\(^{59}\) Van der Kooij, “Ideas About Afterlife.” 95. But see Remblay, *Job 19,25-27 dans la septante et chez les pères grecs*, 147-150 for a different interpretation. He takes σώμα as the OG, which then leads him in a different direction.

\(^{60}\) Van der Kooij, “Ideas About Afterlife,” 95.
In connection with v. 9, Job’s intercessory role is again more prominent in the Greek. The phrase καὶ ἐλύσεν τὴν ἀμαρτίαν αὐτοῖς διὰ Ἰωβ (and he absolved them of their sin on Job’s account) is markedly different from the Hebrew. The Hebrew has no reference to “sin” and the preposition διὰ expresses “instrument.”

3c The macro level

This chapter contains a list of additions in connection with vv. 16 and 17, some of which will be discussed below.

3d The Old Greek Text

NETS TRANSLATION

This chapter in the OG has a different profile from the Hebrew and/or Hexaplaric text.

16. Now Job lived after his calamity one hundred and seventy years,

NETS: 16b and all the years he lived were two hundred and forty-eight years.

17. aα And it is written that he will rise again with those the Lord raises up.

17.bα This man is interpreted from the Syriac book as living in the land of Ausitis, on the borders of Idumea and Arabia, and previously his name was Iobab.

17.cα Now he took an Arabian wife and fathered a son, whose name was Ennon, and he in turn had as father Zare, a son of the sons of Esau, and as mother Bosorra, so that he was the fifth from Abraam.

17. dα And these are the kings who reigned in Edom, which country he too ruled: first Balak the son of Beor, and the name of his city was Dennaba, and after Balak, Jobab, who is called Job, and after him Hasom, who was a leader from the Thaimanite country, and after him Hadad son of Barad, who cut down Madiam in the plain of Moab, and the name of his city was Geththaim.

eα Now the friends who came to him were: Eliphaz, of the sons of Esau, king of the Thaimanites, Baldad, the tyrant of the Sauchites, Sophar, the king of the Minites.

The additions clearly need concentrated attention.
And Job died, old and full of days.

It is remarkable that the LXX does not have an OG equivalent for the Hebrew of this verse. In connection with chapter 2, the translator indeed added the OG version of v. 9 in the addition 9e. It was interpreted as an indication that the additions concerning the wife of Job indeed came from the hand of the translator.\(^{61}\) The situation is markedly different here in v. 17. It is possible, of course, that the translator deemed the statement on Job’s death as tautological, since it is implied in v. 16. This is in line with the abbreviating, condensing tendency of the Greek text that was demonstrated above.

The verb γράφω appears only twice in Job, namely in 19:23, where it translates בָּֽקִל, and in the present context, where it is an addition. The adverb πάλιν occurs 11 times in Job. Significantly, of these examples six cannot, according to HR, be related to a parent text which points in the direction of interpretation. As stated already, the verb ἀνίστησι occurs 10 times in Job (twice in this verse). In 7 of the cases in Job the parent text is ἡμῶν. The current examples are part of a plus and consequently an interpretation. This addition is naturally a significant one for the purposes of understanding the issues at stake in this article. However, it is difficult to reach a conclusion on the basis of the lexical items in this addition. They were clearly known to the translator. The verb γράφω is evidently a significant lexeme and it probably refers to some writing where this statement is found. Could it be the Bible, and if so, which specific passage? It is difficult to reach a definite conclusion from the present context.

---

\(^{61}\) See Johann Cook, “Are the Additions in LXX Job 2,9a-e to be Deemed as the Old Greek Text?” *Biblica* 19/2 (2010): 275-284.
It is clear that the intention of the addition is to underline the issue of the resurrection and is interpreted variously by scholars. Swete\textsuperscript{62} was of the opinion that it was either added by a Pharisee or a Christian in conjunction with Job 25:25-27. Reed,\textsuperscript{63} for one, thinks that it represents a different plus from the rest of the additions in this verse. Accordingly, it represents a reaction against the denial of the resurrection in the book of Job, inter alia 7:9, 14:7-12 and 19:25 and 26 (see discussion above). When this took place and whether it is the result of the translator’s intervention is not easy to determine. According to Ziegler, this reading represents the OG and hence it must have been part of the LXX tradition early on. The problem is that the uncials B and S are already late mss, even though they represent “die älteste uns erreichbare Textform.”\textsuperscript{64} Hence, theoretically they could also include hexaplaric readings.\textsuperscript{65} The earliest external reference to Job OG is by Aristeas the Historian from circa 60 B.C.E..\textsuperscript{66} Naturally the OG text would have been translated earlier. On the face of it, this addition sounds rather like a later Christian(?) interpolation. Fernández Marcos indeed thinks this is the case: “I do not consider as original Old Greek the colophon of Job 42,17 where the doctrine of resurrection is clearly stated. It is lacking in the Sahidic version and, apparently, in the Pap. Oxyr. No. 3522, 1\textsuperscript{st} century A.D.. Also it is asterixed in the Syro-Hexapla and derives probably from Theodotion. Anyway, a systematic study of the conception of life beyond death in the LXX is a desideratum.”\textsuperscript{67} Van der Kooij\textsuperscript{68} has indeed addressed the issue of the afterlife in the Septuagint systematically and agrees with Fernández Marcos on this count.

C CONCLUSION

It has become clear that the OG of Job indeed has a unique profile that can be translated into theological perspectives. Chapter 1 has a unique profile and theology aimed at clearing God of any involvement in tempting Job. As demonstrated

\textsuperscript{62} Henry B. Swete, \textit{An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1912), 256-57 and Gentry, \textit{The Asterisked Materials in the Greek Job}, 586.
\textsuperscript{64} Cf. Ziegler, \textit{Job}, 60.
\textsuperscript{65} In any case Gentry, \textit{The Asterisked Materials in the Greek Job}, 7-9 argues that LXX Job contains hexaplaric material.
\textsuperscript{67} Marcos, “The Septuagint Reading of the Book of Job,” 265 fn 52.
\textsuperscript{68} Cf. Van der Kooij, “Ideas of Afterlife,” 95.
above, it is imperative to determine the OG text. Hence the first addition to LXX Job 42 cannot be deemed the work of the translator, but of a later revisor. In my opinion this is the sole clear piece of evidence of a belief in the resurrection in the Greek version of the Septuagint, but it is not the Old Greek. Therefore my conclusion is that OGJOB does not refer to life after death and/or the resurrection.
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