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ABSTRACT

The Book of Job is often criticized as raising the complex theological issue of innocent suffering and then ignoring this suffering in the Divine Speeches and the “tidy” Epilogue. This thesis argues that by analyzing the Book of Job through the theme of divine containment, both the Divine Speeches and the Epilogue not only gain relevance, but also provide the audience with a deeper understanding of God’s relationship to creation and humanity. By discussing Job 1:1-2:13 and 42:7-17 as an outer inclusio and Job 3 and 38:1-42:6 as an inner inclusio, this thesis argues that this double inclusio structure, coupled with the repetition of the keyword פְּתִיתוֹן / פְּתַיתוֹן (“to fence in”), further emphasizes the theme of the divine “fencing in” that is contained within these inclusio texts. Contrary to Job and the šātān’s depictions of God’s “fencing in,” God’s ultimate act of פְּתִיתוֹן / פְּתַיתוֹן is that of the parental, protective containment of all aspects of creation, while also allowing each being the freedom to exist and thrive. It is this new understanding of God’s relationship to creation that allows Job to set aside his counter-cosmic incantation and begin to emulate God’s version of “fencing in” in his relationships with his family and his community. It is through an analysis of the Book of Job as a double inclusio structure containing the theme of “fencing in” that the transformations that occur in the Divine Speeches and the Epilogue take on a new theological significance.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this thesis is two-fold. First, I will argue that the Book of Job contains a double inclusio structure, with Job 1-2 and 42:7-17 creating an outer inclusio and Job 3 and 38:1-42:6 forming the inner inclusio. Secondly, I will demonstrate that the presence of this consciously crafted double inclusio structure as well as the repeated use of the keyword רְפָא / רְפָע ("to fence in") highlight a prominent theme within the double inclusio: God’s act of “fencing in” aspects of creation. This theme is most prominent in the content of the inner inclusio, while the transformations of Job between the prologue and the epilogue of the outer inclusio show the implications of God’s “fencing in” and of Job’s understanding of this divine act. While the structure and keyword repetition within the double inclusio indicate the presence of this “fencing in” theme, in Chapters 3 and 4 I will specifically address how the content of the inclusios themselves reflect an emphasis on God’s divine “fencing in.”

Prior to addressing the intricate details of this argument, however, it is first important to look at the work of scholars in the field and their interpretations of the Book of Job. Within biblical studies, the Book of Job is widely contested, as it supports many interpretations and develops a variety of, at times, conflicting themes. Historical-critical research into the text has yielded a multitude of helpful hypotheses about the authors and redactors of different sections and their historical context. This thesis, however, subscribes to a synchronic approach to the Book of Job by looking at the structure and content of the text as we now have it; therefore, the following brief summary of scholarship will predominantly focus on similar methodologies.

The issues of innocent suffering and theodicy are prominent throughout the Book of Job. Many scholars discuss the expectation that God will explain Job’s suffering in the divine
speeches, and express their subsequent disappointment or confusion following the theophany. For instance, Crenshaw states that the disappointment felt by the reader following the divine speeches is three-fold: from a pastoral view, in no way is God’s response to Job’s suffering comforting; from a legal perspective, God simply shifts the blame from himself; and on a literary level, the language of nature wisdom simply sidesteps the two major issues of innocent suffering and the existence of disinterested righteousness.¹ Von Rad finds God’s speech scandalous for both what he says and what he chooses to omit.² Vawter sees the Book of Job as a pronouncement of the futility of human intellect in attempting to ensure well being in this world.³ As Wilcox concludes about the Book of Job, “its message is largely a counsel of silence.”⁴ Some scholars argue that perhaps the poet did not want God to provide a simplistic answer to such a complex issue.⁵ Still, the question remains why the author did not provide guidelines for appropriate human responses to innocent suffering like those found in works such as the Mesopotamian composition “I Will Praise the Lord of Wisdom.”⁶

With respect to these views, this thesis will show that the creation language that God employs in the Divine Speeches is not a way to side-step the issues of innocent suffering, but is actually in direct conversation with Job’s soliloquy in Job 3. This is not to say that innocent suffering and disinterested piety are not important topics in the Book of Job but,

³ Bruce Vawter, Job and Jonah: Questioning the Hidden God (New York: Paulist Press, 1983), 86.
⁵ Crenshaw, “When Form and Content Clash,” 77.
⁶ Ibid.
rather, that God addresses Job with the same language that Job first addresses to God. In Job 3, Job shifts the language to that of cosmology and mythology, and it is this language that God picks up again in order to answer Job.

A related area of Jobean theophany scholarship places a greater emphasis on the character of God in chapters 38-42 than on his answer to Job’s innocence. Habel and Mettinger see the speeches as the culmination of the book, moving from a God who is hidden to a God who is present and revealed.7 Not all would agree that this is a positive revelation, however, as some commentators argue that the God who is revealed in the speeches is a jealous tyrant who abuses his power over creation.8 Others, such as Brown, see God depicted as a loving parent, celebrating and encouraging the freedom of all his creation.9 It is this celebration of all creatures that many scholars find surprising, since the form and content of the speeches seem to have opposing messages: the very instance of theophany suggests a deepening of the relationship between God and human, but the content of the divine speeches erases any illusion that God favours humankind over the rest of creation.10

Again, it is important to note that while God does place emphasis on wild animals and the mythical chaos creatures Behemoth and Leviathan, this is also in direct relationship to Job’s speech in Job 3. Had Job simply spoken of his own suffering, the focus of God’s speeches might have been different. In Job 3, however, Job attempts to undo creation and

---


return the world to primordial chaos. In this context, God’s response of showing just how vast creation is and the divine power required to sustain this creation makes more sense. As will be seen later in this thesis, Job attempts to employ mythologies regarding a divine battle with chaos and therefore, God shows that this is not the relationship he has with these chaos beings, nor is it the relationship he has with Job.\(^\text{11}\)

Based on this emphasis on creation, many scholars analyze the Divine Speeches and the book as a whole in terms of creation theology. Saadia ben Joseph Al-Fayyūmī states that the speeches centre on the three themes of the grace of creation, the natures of things, and the provision for each creature.\(^\text{12}\) Focusing instead on the three themes of (1) the establishment of creation, (2) procreation, and (3) the place of humanity in creation, Schifferdecker relates the creation theology within the divine speeches to the creation theology throughout the rest of the book and in other biblical creation accounts.\(^\text{13}\) I will return to these three themes in Chapter 4 as an indication of the conscious paralleling of Job 3 and the Divine Speeches.

Albertz, following Westermann’s analysis of two creation traditions,\(^\text{14}\) discusses the presence of only one creation account in the divine speeches, again emphasizing the radical move away from an anthropocentric view of creation.\(^\text{15}\) Alter looks to the divine speeches’

\(^{11}\) See Chapter 4 of this thesis, specifically pp.73-76.


relationship to Job’s soliloquy in chapter 3, which is in keeping with my view that the two sections form an inclusio. Following Fishbane’s seminal work on Job’s counter-cosmic incantation, Alter cites the significant creation imagery in chapter 3 as an intentional reversal of the creation of the universe in Genesis 1:1-2:4. God’s speeches then restore order to the chaos that Job’s curse introduces into the book. Fishbane and Alter’s work will be addressed again in Chapter 4 in order to understand Job’s soliloquy and God’s response.

This concept of chaos within creation plays a major role in the divine speeches as well as in its conflicted reception by readers. Fyall sees the forces of chaos described in the theophany through a moral lens, taking them to be the embodiments of evil and death in the world, which must be overcome by God. Crenshaw describes the speeches as pointing out the continual battle between God and chaos, again criticising the anthropocentric beliefs of ancient sages. Newsom, in keeping with the image of God as a loving parent and nurturer of all aspects of creation, views God’s speeches as showing that his divine makes room for the forces of chaos within creation. Rather than attempting to exterminate them, God instead reins in these forces and sets boundaries for them. This image of God creating

---


19 Ibid.

20 See pp. 64-73.


22 Crenshaw, “When Form and Content Clash,” 83.


24 Ibid.
boundaries for forces of chaos will be picked up in later chapters in relation to the keyword שָׁרֹד.

In addition to these specific topics, there are a variety of methods employed by scholars for interpreting the Book of Job. Some scholars have focused on how the themes in the book and the metaphors for God develop.25 Many interpretations use narrative criticism to analyze the meaning of the Book of Job.26 Polzin and Seitz both apply analyses from structuralism, with Seitz demonstrating the merits of a full-structure approach for understanding the conclusion of the book.27 Others also focus on the structure of the book, but use this to create comparisons with comedy, thereby categorizing the book as comical, ironic, or absurd.28

This review of scholarship would be incomplete without the mention of Bar-Efrat. His discussion of the conscious parallels between structure and content in biblical works has greatly informed this thesis. In the following passage, he discusses the Priestly creation story and how its structure further develops its content and visa versa:


The Creation story in Gen. i-ii 3 is characterized by a very prominent structure. The unmistakable emphasis on structure and order in this case hints at the conception that the act of creation consisted chiefly in ordering, in making distinctions, in fixing boundaries, in arranging parts and establishing relations among them with the corollary that the universe is an ordered whole. In this respect the creation account in Gen. i-ii 3 differs markedly from the creation account in Gen. ii 4 ff. The second creation story neither displays a pronounced structure nor does it convey the idea that creation consists primarily in separating undifferentiated elements and arraying them in order.29

Just as the strict ordered structure of the first Genesis account hints at the importance of structure and order in the content of the text, so too does the double inclusio structure of the Book of Job hint at the importance of the concept of containment within the text. The argument for its importance is supported by the fact that the author has consciously repeated the rare term רַבִּסֶּה (“to fence in”) in each of the inclusios, hinting that this is, in fact, a significant theme in the Book of Job: the Joban double inclusio “fencing in” structure helps to emphasize further the divine act of “fencing in.” Similarly, the repeated mention of רַבִּסֶּה (“to fence in”) and the theme of divine containment present throughout both inclusios point to the importance of the passages that create this literary fence, thereby further differentiating the inclusios from their inner text. The structure further develops the content and visa versa. Therefore, I will proceed with the understanding that within biblical literature, structure and content can be used to comment on one another in order to strengthen themes within a text.

While by no means exhaustive, this overview demonstrates the varied nature of Joban scholarship, even among approaches that employ a similar methodology. With each turn of the page, the Book of Job surprises the reader with respect to its genre, plot, characters, moral lessons, author, and structure. Rarely does a pattern continue uninhibited throughout the text,
rarely does a character play the role the audience may expect, and rarely would a first time reader come to Job 42:17 without having some burning questions about what had just occurred in the preceding chapters. As such, interpretations of the book are not mutually exclusive, but often complement and inform one another.

With respect to my own interpretation, throughout the following chapters I will discuss the content, genre, and structure of the two *inclusios* as well as the varied presentations of שְׁוָיִם / שִׁבְּתִּים. I will show that within the double *inclusio* structure, which in itself points to an emphasis on containment, there is a prominent and repeated theme, namely the divine “fencing in.” Within the outer *inclusio*, the concept of “fencing in” is discussed with respect to humanity specifically, while in the inner *inclusio*, the scope is broadened to include all of creation. Throughout both *inclusios*, this theme is developed through repeated images, motifs, and keywords in order to provide a detailed picture of what the concept of divine containment means to the Joban author. The repeated term שְׁוָיִם / שִׁבְּתִּים then acts as both an additional indication of the importance of the “fencing in” theme, as well as a “signpost” of the various interpretations of God’s “fencing in” throughout the text. Rather than simply putting forward an argument for the true purpose and outcome of divine containment, the Joban author first has his characters propose varied interpretations of God’s actions in order to have God himself finally refute these proposals and provide the definitive word on שְׁוָיִם / שִׁבְּתִּים. By focusing on the act of divine “fencing in” and the various perceptions of what divine containment means for humans, the author of the Book of Job completely transforms the audience’s understanding of God’s role in creation and his perception of humanity and all creatures.

So how does this repetition of שְׁוָיִם / שִׁבְּתִּים achieve such an ambitious theological feat? In
the Book of Job, the author repeats the term סָתָן/סָתָן once in the outer inclusio and twice in the inner inclusio, each time with a completely different perspective concerning the intention and effect of God’s “fencing in” of aspects of creation. The repetition of this keyword and the subsequent conversations regarding cosmic containment have a greater impact than just addressing what God says the term סָתָן/סָתָן truly means. In the first instance, the סָתָן discusses God’s fencing in as a blessing, in the second instance, Job laments God’s fencing in as though it were a restrictive curse, and in the final instance, God completely reimagines the act of סָתָן/סָתָן as a loving act that provides necessary containment to all beings in order to sustain and protect creation. Therefore, this term not only acts as a keyword that helps to identify that the two sides of the inner inclusio repeat one another, but it also acts as a very condensed summary of the point of view of the character who utters it at that moment. The סָתָן, amid all his speeches and bets, views God as one who bestows favours on mortals in order to garner piety and worship. Job, in his attempt to undo creation and rally the forces of chaos, sees God imprisoning him unjustly as though he were a chaos monster himself. And finally, God, refusing to speak on either of these levels, elevates the conversation to include not only humans, but all creation, and shows that even the most chaotic of elements are cherished by him and kept within the same “fences” of necessary restriction. It is important to note, however, that even within these “fences,” the waves of the sea still surge—freedom is still granted, but it is a restricted freedom that ensures the continuation of the created world. Finally, while the epilogue does not explicitly mention the term סָתָן/סָתָן, I will argue that Job emulates God’s definition of סָתָן/סָתָן—the granting of freedom to those under his authority within necessary structures of containment.  

inner *inclusio*, the outer *inclusio* has the term שָׁוַר / שָׁוַר spoken (and misunderstood) in the prologue and *acted out* in the epilogue, paralleling Job’s shift from rote piety in the prologue to deeper, more relational faith in God in the epilogue. In the Conclusion I will discuss this nuanced understanding of שָׁוַר / שָׁוַר in the Joban epilogue in more detail.31

With this thesis’s emphasis on the double *inclusio* structure, keyword שָׁוַר , and the theme of God’s “fencing in” in mind, Chapter 2 deals with the *inclusio* literary device, its definition, purpose, and the requirements for identifying an *inclusio* in a text. Here, I address other repetition-based literary devices and discuss how the *inclusio*, as a structure that frames without requiring strict parallels, better fits the Joban text I will be discussing. Finally, I address lexical issues surrounding the term שָׁוַר ("to fence in") and provide a justification for identifying it as שָׁוַר rather than a סָפַר root. The purpose of this chapter is to introduce the keyword שָׁוַר and the literary device of an *inclusio* in order to show that the keyword’s definition and the *inclusio*’s function both separately reflect the theme of “fencing in” that the *inclusios’* content develops. Having established this link, Chapters 3 and 4 will address each *inclusio* separately in order to show how their content also reflects the structure’s “fencing in” theme.

Chapter 3 focuses on the outer *inclusio* of Job 1-2 and 42:7-17. In that chapter I discuss the outer *inclusio* as a frame narrative and the repetitions between the sides of the frame that prove conscious mirroring. I address scholarly attempts to impose strict structures on the Book of Job and argue that identifying the outer frame as an *inclusio* allows for the freedom to recognize the many conscious parallels between the sides of the frame. Finally, this chapter discusses the keyword שָׁוַר and its relationship to the seemingly strict

---

structure of the prologue. While this chapter will focus on the outer *inclusio* as a unit, the
Conclusion will address the transformations of Job’s character and of the audience’s
understanding of בְּרָוֹת/ברית in the epilogue. It is only through a discussion of the inner *inclusio*
that these transformations can be properly understood in the context of the divine “fencing
in.”

Chapter 4 then deals with the inner *inclusio* of Job 3 and 38:1-42:6. I address the
structure and genre of Job 3 before analyzing the inner *inclusio* in the context of creation. As
previously mentioned, creation acts as the arena in which Job and God’s conversation occurs
and also helps prove the presence of an *inclusio* between these two sections of the book.
Within this creation context, Chapter 4 addresses the repetitions between the two sides of the
frame in terms of Schifferdecker’s three themes: the establishment of creation, procreation,
and humanity’s role in creation.32 Through these three themes and the variety of repeated
keywords and motifs, I argue that Job 3 and 38:1-42:6 form a consciously crafted *inclusio*
and that this *inclusio* results in a variety of transformations both within the characters as well
as within the audience’s understanding of God, creation, and the divine בְּרָוֹת/ברית. It is within
the context of this chapter’s discussion of בְּרָוֹת/ברית that I will then analyze the
transformations in the epilogue.

With this in mind, I will now turn to Chapter 2 on *inclusio* literary devices and the
term בְּרָוֹת/ברית within the Book of Job.

---

CHAPTER 2: DEFINING THE FENCES: INCLUSIO AND סְחָרָה

Defining and Identifying an Inclusio

This thesis argues that Job 1:1-2:13 and 42:7-17 form an outer inclusio around the entire book and that Job 3 and 38:1-42:6 form a second, inner inclusio. Prior to addressing these Joban structures, their repeated keywords and motifs, and the implications of these repetitions, it is necessary to outline the variety of terms that can be used to describe what I have deemed an inclusio literary structure. Many of the following definitions are quite similar. In particular, other scholars also describe what I define as an inclusio as “encircling,” epanadiplosis,¹ or “enveloping figures.”² As such, the following definition of inclusio will be combined with definitions of these three terms. Following this will be an overview of other similar biblical literary devices that rely upon repetition, and a justification for not employing these terms with respect to Job 1:1-2:13; 42:7-17 and Job 3; 38:1-42:6. Having established the definition of inclusio that I will use throughout this thesis, it will then be possible to address the lexical issues surrounding the key term סְחָרָה / סְחָרָה, which is not only one of the keyword repetitions in the inner inclusio and links the two inclusios together, but acts as an additional indication that the structure and content of the Book of Job both point to the theme of “fencing in” that is reflected in the content of the double inclusio.

To begin, what is an inclusio and what is its purpose within a piece? As a general definition, an inclusio is a literary device that consists of a repeated keyword, phrase, theme,

or motif at the beginning and end of a literary text. Kessler lists the fourfold function of an *inclusio* as (1) creating a frame around a unit, (2) providing stability to the framed text, (3) emphasizing through repetition, and (4) creating a connection between the framing texts and the interior unit. Therefore, while the framing nature of an *inclusio* separates its text from the interior piece, the repetition within the frame helps to link the outer text with the inner by signalling underlying themes. Skehan lists a primary purpose of an *inclusio* as the summary of the interior text. While I agree that an *inclusio* can play this role, it is important not to downplay the significance of the passages that comprise the frame in their own right.

Similarly, Watson’s limited definition of an envelope figure as a literary structure that delimits a poem is strengthened by his subsequent citation of Kessler’s fourfold list. Fogle and Brogan add that an *inclusio* “has the effect of framing the enclosed material, giving it unity and closure: the reader recognizes the return to the original pattern after movement away in the interim.” By signalling to an audience that the end of the unit repeats the beginning in some way, it allows for a comparison between the two sides of the frame. Such a comparison will inevitably lead to an acknowledgment of both the similarities and differences in the two parallel texts. The differences then become another key to the interpretation, as they highlight transformations that have occurred in the course of the unit now that the unit has closure. Therefore, this thesis will discuss *inclusio* as a literary device

---


5 Skehan, “I Will Speak Up!” 86.


with the following functions within a text, taking into account that some functions may be more prominent than others in each inclusio’s respective context. An inclusio: (1) creates a frame around a unit, (2) provides stability to the framed text, (3) emphasizes through repetition, (4) creates a connection between the framing texts and the interior unit, (5) summarizes the interior text, (6) gives unity and closure, and (7) returns the reader to the beginning of the unit to highlight transformations.

Two issues at the root of most scholarly debate about the exact definition and identification of an inclusio are the appropriate lengths of the structure’s components, and the necessary requirements to prove intentional repetition. How long can each side of the frame itself be, how long can the interior text be, and what is the minimum requirement for a text to be considered consciously calling the audience back to its parallel at the beginning? Powell discusses an inclusio as the repetition of features at the beginning and end of a unit.8 Bullinger opts for less ambiguity by defining epanadiplosis or encircling, as the repetition of a word or words at both the beginning and end of a sentence.9 Watson enlarges the enveloping figure to be the repetition of a phrase or sentence at the beginning and end of a stanza or poem.10 While Kessler maintains what he calls a more “classical” definition of inclusio as requiring verbal identity at the beginning and end of a piece, with exceptions for differences in gender and number, he provides a variety of examples of broader definitions of the term from scholars such as Dahood, Ridout, and Zenger.11 These “approximate

8 Mark Allan Powell, What is Narrative Criticism? GBS (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990), 33.
9 Bullinger, Figures of Speech Used in the Bible, 245.
10 Watson, Classical Hebrew Poetry, 282.
if accepted, expand the definition to include an *inclusio* in which either one or both corresponding keywords is not present at the extreme part of the unit, synonyms or semantically related terms are present instead of identical words, and repeated structures, such as chiasms, create the *inclusio* rather than keyword repetitions. Based on this overview it is clear that biblical scholars are not in agreement about the exact requirements of an *inclusio*.

Therefore, Wyckoff has suggested that psycholinguistics may provide a useful tool for determining whether repetition within certain biblical texts should be termed an *inclusio*. He begins by pointing out an obvious yet important aspect of an *inclusio*. He states that the “convention of repetition must be sufficiently developed within the poem to enable auditors or readers to recognize the recurrence.” Therefore, while it is impossible to say with certainty whether an author intended specific instances of repetition within biblical texts to be seen as *inclusios*, the easier it is for an audience to recognize the repetition, the more likely it is that the repetition was intentional. Based largely on findings of psycholinguistic studies on memory, recall and recognition, Wyckoff provides a six-point tool to assess the likelihood of an *inclusio*’s presence within a text based on the likelihood of recognition. First, Wyckoff states that the more repeated elements within each side of the frame, the more likely
that an audience will recognize the *inclusio.* Second, when there is a limited repetition of elements, what Wyckoff calls a “weak *inclusio,*” repetition of the same vocabulary rather than semantic equivalents improves recognition. Third, within “weak *inclusios,*” the less the repeated elements are dispersed throughout the interior text, the more likely recognition will occur. If the elements necessary for proving an *inclusio* are present throughout the interior text as well, the so-called *inclusio* is in danger of blending into the passage it frames and becoming unrecognizable. Fourth, uncommon or “low-frequency” words are more likely to be recognized than words that are commonly used in the Bible. Fifth, the closer to the beginning of the text the opening frame of the *inclusio* is, the more likely it is that its corresponding end of the frame will be recognized. Finally, in addition to repeated terms and themes, word plays and puns can increase an *inclusio*’s strength by visually and aurally echoing words and syntax. While Wyckoff’s identification tool is still based on some subjectivity, the important emphasis on recognition forces scholars employing his method to consider whether a careful reader would notice the *inclusio* and, therefore, whether it was plausibly intended.

One necessary note with respect to Wyckoff’s argument is that his emphasis on recognition is based on studies of modern audiences. As such, it must be acknowledged that the recall skills of contemporary readers of the Bible are most likely different than those of the biblical authors’ contemporaries, and therefore, modern recall does not prove definitively

---

16 Wyckoff, “Have We Come Full Circle Yet?” 500.
17 Ibid.
18 Ibid.
19 Ibid.
20 Ibid.
21 Ibid.
a biblical author’s intention. Nevertheless, given that this thesis argues for a broader definition of *inclusio*, which sees chapters as frames around an entire book rather than words framing a sentence, Wyckoff’s criteria will help to prove that the parallels are present, and that recognition is not only likely, but also intended.

**Other Repetition-Based Literary Devices**

Having discussed the definition, purpose, and issues in recognizing an *inclusio*, it is important to address how the *inclusio* differs from other repetition-based literary devices, so as to understand why I have not labelled the specified chapters of Job with those terms.

The most likely term to be related to an *inclusio* is what Bullinger calls “correspondence.” Correspondence, similar to an “approximate *inclusio,*”\(^{22}\) is the repetition of subjects and paragraphs rather than lines or propositions.\(^{23}\) Additionally, the placement of these corresponding passages is not required at the extremities of a poem or book. This repetition can occur in one of three forms: alternate correspondence, introverted correspondence (chiasm or mirroring structure), or complex/combined correspondence, which is a combination of the first two.\(^{24}\)

Alternate correspondence can be broken down further into simple, extended, or repeated alternate correspondence.\(^{25}\) Simple alternate correspondence involves two series, similar to the sides of a frame in an *inclusio*, and two subjects within each series that correspond to each other. Therefore, if A and B represent the two subjects, the
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\(^{23}\) Bullinger, *Figures of Speech Used in the Bible*, 363.

\(^{24}\) Ibid., 365.

\(^{25}\) Ibid.
correspondence between the subjects would present itself as $A, B \ldots A^1, B^1$.\textsuperscript{26} Extended alternate correspondence still has two series, but each series has multiple subjects that correspond to each other in a pattern of $A, B, C, D \ldots A^1, B^1, C^1, D^1$.\textsuperscript{27} Repeated alternate correspondence, unlike \textit{inclusio}, has multiple series that can consist of two or more subjects each.\textsuperscript{28} Therefore, while an \textit{inclusio} has two sides of a frame that parallel each other in some way, in a repeated alternate correspondence the subjects can be repeated multiple times throughout the text in the same order, such as $A, B \ldots A^1, B^1 \ldots A^2, B^2 \ldots A^3, B^3$.\textsuperscript{29} While alternate correspondence is very similar to \textit{inclusio}, the strict ordering of the subjects is the key difference between the two devices. Even in the outer \textit{inclusio} of the Book of Job, which has a much more rigid structure, the repeated elements in each parallel frame cannot be said to occur in the same order without stretching the interpretation. For instance, while it is clear that the epilogue restores Job to some semblance of the man he used to be, the restoration occurs in a different order than the devastation, and not all that was taken from Job is returned to him (note that Job’s health is never explicitly restored). \textit{Inclusio} allows for the identification of repeated themes and elements without the necessity of ordering the repetition $A, B \ldots A^1, B^1$ and so forth.

Introverted correspondence, also known as a chiasm or mirroring structure, is similar to an \textit{inclusio} in that there are two series with corresponding subjects. The term chiasm comes from the Greek \textit{chiasmus} due to the device’s likeness to the Greek letter \textit{chi} ($X$).\textsuperscript{30} Similarly, mirroring structures are termed as such based on the two sides’ mirror reflections.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{26} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{27} Ibid., 368.
\item \textsuperscript{28} Ibid., 372.
\item \textsuperscript{29} Ibid., 373.
\item \textsuperscript{30} Ibid., 374.
\end{itemize}
of one another. Whereas the alternate correspondence has subjects repeating in the same order, introverted correspondence has subjects repeating in an inverted order, creating the following pattern:

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
A \\
B \\
C \\
C^1 \\
B^1 \\
A^1 \\
\end{array}
\]

Chiastic structures follow the same pattern; yet also have an unparalleled centre:

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
A \\
B \\
C \\
D \\
C^1 \\
B^1 \\
A^1 \\
\end{array}
\]

As is evident above, the centre of the chiastic structure, in this case D, has no parallel text, but instead is usually seen as the crux of the unit that gives the text its meaning.\(^{31}\)

Douglas sees this structure as less of a *chi* and more of a ring formation.\(^{32}\) In her depiction, the first and last parallel passages (A and A\(^1\)) create a complete circle with each subsequent parallel passage (i.e., B and B\(^1\), C and C\(^1\)) creating smaller concentric circles that finally zero in on the centre passage (D). Douglas provides seven commonly observed indicators of a long ring composition within a text that must be addressed since some of these markers are also present in the Book of Job. First, there is usually the presence of a prologue or introduction that anticipates both the central turning point and the ending. Second, there is a clear central point in which the text starts its journey back towards the beginning. Third, the


\(^{32}\) For details of the following, see Douglas, *Thinking in Circles*, chap. 3.
sections on either side of the central point correspond, often with an element of surprise or revelation. Fourth, there must be clear indicators that outline the beginning and ending of each section such as keywords or a refrain. Fifth, there is what Douglas calls “central loading,” as the centre section is critical in providing meaning, linking back to the beginning, and acting as the turning point of the text. Sixth, the unit contains rings within rings, with the exposition and its conclusion as the widest ring, and the central turning point as the interior core. Finally, there is a double closure in that the keywords from the beginning are repeated at the end to signal a return, and that whatever mission was initiated in the beginning is completed in some way.

Having proposed a structure for the Book of Job that consists of, in Douglas’ terms, a ring within a ring, or an inner and outer inclusio, it is important to address why this double inclusio should not be considered part of a long ring composition. Like Douglas’ definition, the Book of Job does contain an introduction that anticipates the ending and also contains a significant element of surprise with respect to God’s actions. The ending of the Book of Job does provide double closure and it is clear where the prose ends and the poetry begins, signalling the beginning and end of the sections. The most significant and ultimately decisive difference between the double inclusio proposed in this thesis and Douglas’ long ring composition, however, is that the meaning is not necessarily loaded in the centre of a series of rings. While the two inclusios do parallel one another, within them the text is not structured chiastically. Instead, the author of the Book of Job has sectioned off the
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33 Contra Michael F. Kolarcik, s.j., “The Wisdom Tradition and the Book of Job,” (lecture, Regis College, University of Toronto, September 2012), who sees the entire book as a chiasm. I will argue against seeing the entire Book of Job as a chiastic structure in Chapter 3. Kolarcik’s proposed chiastic structure is as follows:

A Job’s original state 1:1-5
B Dialogue between the satan and God 1:6-12
C First attack against Job’s family and wealth 1:13-21
dialogues of the friends, the hymn to wisdom, and Elihu’s speeches, suggesting that each of these sections provides its own meaning to the text and is in dialogue, rather than simply contributing to the central meaning.

Therefore, while correspondence, chiasm, mirror structure, and ring composition are all interrelated and are present within sections of the Book of Job, their strict structure prevents the sections discussed in this thesis from being classified as any of them. For instance, Cho argues for the presence of a ring composition within Job 1, but as previously stated it is less effective to argue for a ring composition in the entire outer prose section because the scenes do not correspond in an alternate or introverted pattern. Similarly, the interior inclusio of Job 3 and Job 38:1-42:6 does not correspond on a strictly structured level, but instead on the repetition of keywords, themes, and mutual allusions to the Priestly Genesis narrative. Therefore, the larger double frame structure within the Book of Job does not need to be in a strict order to be considered an intentional literary device.

In the following chapters, I will demonstrate that each inclusio contains significant repetition of keywords, themes, and allusions, which satisfies Wyckoff’s requirements for recognition. First, however, it is necessary to address one of the keywords that strengthen the case for the inner inclusio, and the scholarly debate surrounding its verbal root.

---

“To Fence In,”

As previously stated, the verb שָׁעֹר (to fence in; hedge about) is present within both the inner and outer inclusios of the Book of Job. It acts as a keyword repetition within the inner inclusio and links the two inclusios together. In addition to assisting the recognition of the parallel texts in the book, however, the repetition of this verb also signals the importance of the divine act of “fencing in” that is present within the content of the two inclusios. The significance of God’s enveloping act is not only highlighted by the repetition of שָׁעֹר throughout the inner and outer inclusios, but also by the author’s creation of a double inclusio structure. Combined, this structure and keyword repetition strengthen the overarching theme of divine containment present within the double inclusio. Therefore, it is necessary to analyze this verbal root prior to addressing each individual inclusio within the Book of Job.

The verb is present in Job 3:23 and 38:8, with a variation in Job 1:10. In Job 1:10, it is written שָׁעֹר, with a sin, and in 3:23 and 38:8 it is שׁוּר, with a samech. The point of contention with each of these related verbs is the middle radical in the verbal root. Some scholars favour the view that the roots of these verbs are from שָׁעֹר (I-III), while the majority of modern scholars instead derive the verbs from שָׁעֹר. In both cases, however, in their Joban context, they have the meaning of “fencing in” or “hedging in” and are widely recognized as being related.35 While the derivative verbal root may, therefore, seem irrelevant to this discussion of Joban inclusios if the meaning remains unaltered, the importance is tied to two of Wyckoff’s criteria for determining plausible recognition.

Wyckoff argued that the more frequent a keyword is throughout the entire unit, the less likely
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an audience will recognize the repetition within the *inclusio* itself.\textsuperscript{36} Additionally, he pointed out that uncommon or “low-frequency” words stand out more to audiences because of their uniqueness.\textsuperscript{37} Based on Wyckoff’s argument, the determination of the accurate verbal root drastically affects an audience’s ability to recognize the keyword’s repetition, thereby altering the strength of the *inclusios* themselves. In our case, this is related to the fact that the root *סַרְסֶר* is more frequent both within the interior chapters of the Book of Job as well as throughout the Hebrew Bible. What follows is an overview of the two most prominent views of the verb’s derivation and the frequency of these verbs within the Book of Job and the Hebrew Bible as a whole.

The derivation of *סַרְסֶר* in Job 1:10 is relatively uncontested as the *qal* perfect 2ms of *סַרְסֶר*.\textsuperscript{38} BDB 926b defines this verb as “to hedge” or “fence up, or about” and relates it to הָנוֹן II. This verb is also present in Hosea 2:6[8] with a similar meaning (BDB 926b). *HALOT*, however, argues that *סַרְסֶר* comes from the root *סָרָר* I in the *qal*,\textsuperscript{39} which means, “to shut off as protection, and lists an additional 12 occurrences of this verb in the Old Testament, including Job 40:22 (*HALOT* I 754). Kronholm argues that there are actually a total of 22 occurrences of *סָרָר* (I-III) in the Old Testament.\textsuperscript{40} Of these, Kronholm lists Job 3:23; 10:11; 29:4 and 38:8, as well as derivatives in Job 27:18; 38:40 and 40:22. Kronholm omits Job 1:10 from the list because, unlike Job 40:22, the term in 1:10 does not begin with a *samech*.

*HALOT*, however, glosses over this discrepancy by its identification of *סַרְסֶר* as *סָרְרָא* (*HALOT* I 754).

\textsuperscript{36} Wyckoff, “Have We Come Full Circle Yet?” 500.

\textsuperscript{37} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{38} See also T. Kronholm, “*סָרָר*,” *TDOT* 10:238; *BDB* 962b; *GHCLOT* 785d.

\textsuperscript{39} See also Kronholm, *TDOT* 10:238.

\textsuperscript{40} Kronholm, *TDOT* 10:238.
In addition to this issue with the first radical in HALOT’s derivation, מִּיתְךָ is a normal conjugation of the qal perfect 2ms hollow verb, מִיתְךָ, whereas the geminate qal perfect 2ms, מִיתְךָ, would most likely present as מִיתְךָ instead. It is possible that the identification of מִיתְךָ as a הִפִּיל root is an attempt to link this verb to what HALOT has identified as a הִפִּיל verb in Job 3:23 and 38:8 (HALOT I 754). Nevertheless, due to the above arguments and the overwhelming consensus of biblical scholars, I view מִיתְךָ in Job 1:10 as deriving from the root מִיתְךָ. As such, Kronholm’s identification of הִפִּיל in Job 10:11 and 29:4 does not weaken the argument for מִיתְךָ in Job 1:10 as a “low-frequency” term only present in the inclusios, since they derive from two different roots. We can now turn to the “fencing in” term in Job 3:23 and 38:8, that Kronholm has identified as הִפִּיל.

While most scholars readily agree upon the root of מִיתְךָ, the root for the word מִיתְךָ in Job 3:23 and 38:8 is a point of contention. This is because it fits into the normal preterite paradigms for both a geminate and a hollow verb. A geminate such as הִפִּיל, in what appears to be the הִפִּיל preterite verbal form, would present as מִיתְךָ. This has caused lexicons and dictionaries such as GHCLOT, TDOT, and HALOT to identify the word מִיתְךָ in Job 3:23 and 38:8 as the הִפִּיל preterite 3ms of הִפִּיל, (“to fence; fence around”) (HALOT I 754; GHCLOT 586c). According to Kronholm, if Job 3:23 and 38:8 are included, הִפִּיל occurs 7 times in the הִפִּיל within its total 22 occurrences in the Hebrew Bible.

Yet, while the הִפִּיל preterite of הִפִּיל is a plausible parsing of מִיתְךָ, a combination of factors point toward the likelihood that the same root is being used in both Job 1:10 and 3:23.

41 See also Kronholm, TDOT 10:238.
42 Ibid.
43 Ibid. In the following paragraphs I argue against including Job 3:23 and 38:8 in this list.
In both Job 1:10 and 3:23, the verb that means “to fence” is followed by the preposition עִבְרָה-כַּסּ ("round about") (GHCLOT 130b). It is likely that the combination of a term, which means “to fence,” and the repeated preposition was an intentional parallel. If we take this repetition as an intentional authorial device, it is likely that the author would have chosen a root aurally linked to that of Job 1:10, which we have already identified as רבע. It is most likely for this reason that many scholars have accepted an alternate verbal root for רבע, that of רע ("to hedge, fence about, or shut in") (BDB 691a).

Despite being largely cited as the accurate root, identifying רבע as רע requires some work. This is because a hollow ayin-waw verb such as רע would also normally present as רבע with the qamets-chatuph tonic vowel rather than the segol that is present in Job 3:23 and 38:8. However, רבע can be parsed as a hollow root in qal but this requires the root to be רע, a hollow ayin-yod verb. This is because the middle radical presents as the i-class vowel hireq-yod, which would then reduce to the tonic segol. Therefore, BDB acknowledges that the root of רבע is most plausibly parsed as qal preterite 3ms of רע, but it lists the root as רע /רבע II, rather than just רע itself (BDB 691a). Job 3:23 and 38:8 are the only two verses that BDB lists for this root. This means that the identification of this verb as a general hollow root rather than either רע or רע specifically, must be as a result of these two verses.

44 Seow, Job 1-21, 370.


46 Not to be confused with רע /רבע I, which is related to the act of anointing. See BDB 690d as well as Seow, Job 1-21, 370.
Therefore, it is likely that BDB lists the root as a general hollow in order to highlight the link between the verb in 3:23 and 38:8 and that of ḫōš in Job 1:10. This implies that although the root appears to be ṣīq, it should most likely be identified as ṣāq instead, in imitation of Job 1:10.

It is also significant that if we take the root to be ṣāq II, the parallel with Job 1:10 is even stronger, as in all three cases the verb appears in the qal. If Job 3:23 and 38:8 were from ṣāq, it would mean that the author had chosen to repeat, and presumably highlight, the theme of fencing in and the preposition ḫāṣ, but had chosen to change the root from ḫōš to ṣāq and change the stem from qal to hiphil. This is even more unlikely if one remembers that the verbal root ḫōš (“to fence in”) only occurs twice in the Hebrew Bible, in Job 1:10 and Hos 2:6[8] (BDB 962b), while ṣāq occurs 22 times. Keeping Wyckoff’s argument in mind, it is unlikely that the author would have chosen to highlight and repeat a theme in three sections of the book, but then change the root from an extremely uncommon, or “low-frequency” root to a more common, higher-frequency root.

Taking this into account, Kronholm’s view seems to argue that ṣāq is indeed the correct root but that the parallel to ḫōš in Job 1:10 was either not intentional or not paramount in the author’s mind. However, it is unlikely that the author unintentionally repeated the theme of God’s fencing in within the book if one takes into account the rhetorical significance of this repetition. In Job 1:10, the sātān discusses God’s fencing in of Job (Ḥōš) as a blessing that keeps chaos and the evil of the world out of Job’s life. In Job 3:23, Job bemoans God’s act of fencing in (Ḥōš), describing it as a curse that imprisons

---

47 *BDB* 691a states that ḫōš/Ḥōš II is the parallel of ḫōš.

48 Kronholm, *TDOT* 10:238, if we include Job 3:23 and 38:8.
humankind. Finally, in Job 38:8, God describes his fencing in of the sea (תְּרַע), overturning the previous interpretations of God’s תּוֹרֵה / גּוֹם and contributing to the section’s reversal of Job’s curse in chapter 3. These three chapters are linked by the “fencing in” theme, keyword repetition, and prepositional repetition (in the case of Job 1:10 and 3:23), in addition to the variety of thematic and keyword parallels that will be discussed in the following chapters.

That this level of repetition was unintentional seems highly unlikely. Rather, it is more plausible that the author intentionally paralleled the sections, and therefore chose verbal roots that were aurally and thematically linked so as to strengthen the audience’s ability to identify the repetition. Therefore, this thesis will discuss the keyword in Job 1:10 as a תּוֹרֵה root and that of Job 3:23 and 38:8 as aדּוֹ II root. This means that while these three instances of the “fencing in” keyword are related to the additional instances of the תּוֹרֵה root Kronholm identifies in the interior chapters of the Book of Job, their relationship does not weaken the recognisability of the inclusio since they derive from different roots.

To summarize, I have argued for the use of the term inclusio to identify the parallel and related chapters Job 1:1-2:13 and 42:7-17 plus Job 3 and 38:1-41:34. The inclusios that I will argue for in this thesis demonstrate a broader understanding of the term, as they are parallel chapters enveloping an entire book rather than parallel words enveloping a sentence or stanza. Because of the subjectivity related to identifying inclusios within a text, Wyckoff’s criteria for establishing the presence of an inclusio based on recognition will be employed in this thesis, particularly with respect to the inner inclusio, and are as follows:

1. the more repeated elements in an inclusio, the greater likelihood of recognition;
2. repeated vocabulary creates stronger recognition than semantic equivalents;
3. *inclusios* are stronger when their repeated elements are not dispersed throughout the interior text;

4. low-frequency terms are more recognizable than common words;

5. *inclusios* that are present closer to the beginning increase recognition at the end of a text;

6. and, word-plays and puns strengthen *inclusios*.\(^{49}\)

In this chapter I also discussed the repeated keyword of נָרָה / נָרָה within Job 1:10, 3:23, and 38:8 and argued for this verbal root over that of נִסָך. This root not only strengthens the likelihood of an intentional repetition of the fencing in theme, but its low-frequency also increases its recognition and thereby strengthens the *inclusio*.

Finally, I argued that the literary function of an *inclusio* mirrors the definition of the keyword נָרָה / נָרָה —“to fence in.” This parallel between the structure of the Joban text and a repeated keyword will become even more significant in the following chapters as I will address the content’s emphasis on God’s “fencing in” creation and the implications of this divine act. Having established the link between *inclusio* and “fencing in,” it is now be possible to look more closely at the two *inclusios* and how each section’s structure, content, and repetition of נָרָה / נָרָה emphasizes the importance of God’s “fencing in.”

---

\(^{49}\) Wyckoff, “Have We Come Full Circle Yet?” 500.

An *inclusio* is the recognizable repetition of themes and keywords in a structure that can be as small as parallel words at the beginning and end of a sentence and as large as parallel chapters enveloping a book. With this definition in mind, it is now possible to address the specific *inclusios* within the Book of Job. The first of these structures to analyze is the outer *inclusio*, Job 1:1-2:13 and 42:7-17.

**The Outer Inclusio as a Frame Narrative**

While the frame of Job 3 and 38:1-42:6 is closer to Kessler’s “approximate inclusio,” that of Job 1:1-2:13 and 42:7-17 falls under another category, the frame narrative. A frame narrative is an *inclusio* that encircles an inner story or stories.\(^1\) Therefore, while the parallel chapters contain repeated keywords and themes, they also tell their own narrative that brackets the interior passages. For this reason, Wyckoff’s criteria will not be necessary to prove the outer *inclusio*, as its narrative continuity demonstrates the correspondence between the frames.

Like most literary devices, the frame narrative has been used for a variety of purposes, spanning hundreds of years within a multitude of literary genres. Some frame narratives act as an orienting voice, surrounding multiple inner stories told by separate narrators. One contemporary example of this is Shelley’s *Frankenstein*, in which the epistolary frame encapsulates both Victor Frankenstein and his creature’s separate narratives. Many frame narratives, however, are like the Book of Job in that they encircle one interior narrative. The purpose of these single-story frame narratives can vary depending on the
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author’s intention. Some have a minor voice, orienting or qualifying the central story in order to guide the audience toward a particular interpretation. Ecclesiastes would fall under this category, with a narrative voice introducing, concluding, and commenting on the main body of the book without demanding a central role in the plot. Other frames constitute the main story, which is enhanced in some way by the inner narrative. This function of a frame narrative is the same as the play within a play in Shakespeare’s *Hamlet*. Hamlet enlists actors to perform *The Murder of Gonzago*, which, through its parallels with Hamlet’s father’s murder, will help Hamlet determine his uncle’s culpability. *The Murder of Gonzago* is by no means the main story within *Hamlet*, but it does dramatically contribute to the story within which it is framed.

The Book of Job is different from both these single-story frame narratives in that the outer frame acts as both a major and minor voice within the book. On the one hand, the narrative frame seems simply to introduce the setting for the intense theological debates contained inside, and then neatly wraps up the chaotic debate at the close of the book. The prose folktale writing style employed in the outer *inclusio* strengthens an initial assumption that it is simply an introductory frame for the beautifully constructed poetic chapters within. On the other hand, upon closer inspection, the narrative frame raises serious theological questions about God’s role in, and rule of, the world, questions that are integral to the interpretation of the book as a whole. True to the form of the whole book, the outer frame refuses to be seen as either less significant or more significant—each section demands to be

---


3 Ibid.

4 Ibid.

considered and analyzed in its own right, making the Book of Job a unique example of frame narrative.\

While the presence of a frame narrative is itself proof of the presence of an inclusio structure within a text, further evidence is required to substantiate the claim that the frame narrative is part of a double inclusio structure and that this structure points to the importance of the theme of the divine fencing in (ךֵּסֵא) within the Book of Job. Therefore, this chapter will address the structure of Job 1:1-2:13 and 42:7-17 to prove that rather than acting as a minor frame for the interior poetic section, the sides of the outer inclusio consciously parallel each other with respect to important themes, theological ideas, and keywords—many of which will be repeated and reimagined in the inner inclusio. After arguing for the conscious construction of an outer inclusio as part of a double inclusio structure that repeats and continually alludes to the “fencing in” theme, it will then be possible to understand the significance ofךֵּסֵא within a structure that acts as a literary fence.

**The Structure of the Outer Inclusio**

The first indication that the outer inclusio is a separate section is, as previously stated, that it forms a frame narrative. This frame narrative structure is particularly effective in sectioning off the prologue and epilogue because the passages it frames are written in poetry while the outer narrative frame is written in prose. Therefore, while Job 3:1-42:6 continues the narrative and retains characters and themes introduced in Job 1:1-2:13, the change in writing style signals the end of one section and the beginning of another.

---

Just what this change in writing style signifies, however, is a matter of scholarly debate. Cho lists the four most common scholarly interpretations of the division between the poetry and prose sections, to which he adds his own fifth interpretation. First, a single author composed the entire Book of Job with the prologue being intentionally crafted to serve as an introductory frame for the central poetic piece. Second, an author wrote the poetic speeches independently, with another author later constructing the prose framework around them. Third, separate authors independently wrote the prose and poetry sections, which an editor later compiled into a single text. Fourth, an author employed an ancient, possibly well-known, didactic folktale as a narrative frame for his interior poetic section. Fifth, Cho argues for Alt’s conclusion that the author of the poetic dialogues used the older prose folktale contained in Job 1:1-22 and 42:11-17 and mimicked its writing in the prose passages Job 2 and 42:7-10 in order to introduce the author’s own poetic writings. This view is very similar to the fourth except that it holds that the prose narrative should really be seen as an inner and outer narrative, with the inner prose of Job 2 and 42:7-10 being artificially archaized in order to create a more seamless movement from folktale frame to poetic centre.

---


9 Cho, “The Integrity of Job 1 and 42:11-17,” 231; thus Bernhard Duhm, *Das Buch Hiob*, KHAT 16 (Freiburg: Mohr, 1897), viii, 1-11.


find the fourth view to be the most persuasive, and will discuss Cho’s argument and some of its weaknesses in greater detail below.\textsuperscript{12}

Given that Ezek 14:14 and 20 mention Job as an example of righteousness alongside Noah and Danel, it seems fair to assume that there existed an ancient story of a man named Job who was so known for his piety that he became a byword for it.\textsuperscript{13} How much of that original story was used in the Book of Job as it now stands and to what extent it was altered to fit the final author’s intentions is beyond the scope of this thesis. What does seem clear based on the double \textit{inclusio} structure and the repeated theme of the divine “fencing in” is that a final author or redactor’s hand is visible in both the interior poetic texts and the outer prose frame. It is this authorial hand that has woven in a meditation on God’s encasement of his creation (\textit{תֵּמָן} /\textit{תֵּמָן}) within a framework that doubly encases the entire text.

Regardless of the compositional history, the structure of the prologue is widely recognized as containing 6 narrative scenes:\textsuperscript{14} Job 1:1-5; 1:6-12; 1:13-22; 2:1-6; 2:7-10; 2:11-13. With the exception of the final scene in Job 2:11-13 the settings alternate between heaven and earth with only the \textit{šāṭān} (and the narrator) travelling between the two realms. There is some discrepancy between the division of the fourth and fifth scenes: some scholars end scene four at Job 2:6,\textsuperscript{15} while Balentine ends it at Job 2:7a.\textsuperscript{16} This discrepancy is due to the fact that scene 2 ends with “so [the] \textit{šāṭān} went out from the presence of the LORD” (NRSV, Job 1:12), whereas this same phrase is repeated in Job 2:7a as the \textit{beginning} of the sentence:

\textsuperscript{12} See pp. 36-44.


\textsuperscript{16} Balentine, “Job, Book of,” 325.
“so [the] šāṭān went out from the presence of the LORD, and inflicted loathsome sores on Job from the sole of his foot to the crown of his head.” Therefore, some scholars choose to place the dividing marker between God’s permission and the šāṭān’s action, whereas Balentine places the dividing marker based on the repetition of a phrase acting as a sort of repeated inclusio.  

Clines argues for a five-scene structure based on the introductory marker “one day,” (םֹוֹיַּהֲנָיִּים) in Job 1:6; 1:13; 2:1, which is conspicuously missing in Job 2:7. He argues that Job 1:1 does not need this introductory marker because it is the beginning of the book, and that Job 2:7 is intentionally missing this marker. To him, the author blurred scenes 5 and 6 (what is more commonly described as scenes 4 and 5) to signal the encroachment of the heavenly realm and its figures upon earth. While in the first set of trials the author does not explicitly state that the šāṭān caused the disasters, in Job 2:7 it is the šāṭān himself who inflicts the sores upon Job, thereby leaving heaven and entering the mortal world on earth. Clines also does not acknowledge Job 2:11 as signalling a new scene because of the absence of the “one day” (םֹוֹיַּהֲנָיִּים) marker. Instead, he identifies this as a linking scene between the prologue and dialogues. Patrick, citing Gray, Habel, and Steinmann, argues for a fourfold structure of scenes in the prologue (Job 1:6-12; 1:13-22; 2:1-7a; 2:7b-10) with Job 1:1-5 and

---


19 Ibid.

20 Ibid.

2:11-13 acting as the prelude and conclusion.22 While I subscribe to the view that the prologue is composed of 6 scenes, I follow Clines in seeing scenes 4 and 5 as being blurred together intentionally by the author. Despite this blurring, I would make scene divisions based on the movement from one setting to another, and therefore, I divide scenes 4 and 5 as Job 2:1-6 and 2:7-10. The author’s creation of two distinct settings and the alternating movement between the two seems to be the overarching structure of the Joban prologue. The author then uses lexical markers such as the “so [the] šāṭān went out from the presence of the LORD” phrase and the “one day” phrase to indicate that this strict structure is dissolving and blurring before the readers’ eyes.

As was described in the previous chapter, unlike the inclusio literary device, identifying the presence of a chiastic or correspondent structure requires the identification of a strict ordering of scenes. The division of the prologue into scenes as well as the alternation between heavenly and earthly settings has led many scholars to look for a chiastic or correspondent literary structure within the prose narrative. This section will address the structures observed within the prologue alone as well as chiastic and correspondent structures across the prologue and epilogue. While I will be arguing throughout this chapter that both inclusios resist being fit into a strict chiastic or correspondence structure, the following arguments are helpful in seeing the vast number of repetitions between the two sides of the inclusio frame. In particular, I find Cho’s arguments regarding the complexity and literary genius of scene 1 to be very persuasive, but his overall argument is weakened by the fact that the epilogue does not fit into the structure he claims exists. In each argument below, related terms and images are identified between the prologue and epilogue as each author attempts to
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impose a chiastic or correspondence structure upon the text. By viewing the prologue and epilogue as an *inclusio* instead, we are able to identify and acknowledge each of these repetitions without needing to excise passages or rethink the compositional history.

As previously mentioned, Cho subscribes to the view that the prologue and epilogue of the Book of Job should be divided into two compositional stages, with Job 1:1-22 and 42:11-17 as the outer original ring and Job 2 and 42:7-10 being a later addition. Cho discusses the prologue of the Book of Job as a ring composition, which is another way of discussing a chiastic structure or mirror pattern. Unlike Patrick’s four-scene view of the prologue, Cho places great emphasis on scene 1 and the complexity hidden within its surface simplicity.23 He sees the repeated phrase “that man” (אַחַיָּיו אַחַיָּיו) in Job 1:1b, 3b as marking off an *inclusio*, dividing scene 1 into two sections. The first section of scene 1 (Job 1:1-3) provides two characterizations of Job: “Job the Pious” (Job 1:1), and “Job the Rich” (Job 1:2-3).24 The second section of scene 1 then describes the tension between these two versions of Job as the feasts indicate his family’s great wealth, but his lack of participation and preemptive sacrifices suggests his discomfort with these celebrations.25 Thus, for Cho, scene 1 cannot be taken as a simple introduction, regardless of the necessity of identifying the fourfold alternation in scenes 2-5, because it sets the scene, introduces significant themes, and foreshadows the drama that is about to unfold.26

Scene 2 then mirrors scene 1 as the two characterizations of Job the Pious and Job the Rich are discussed by God and the šāṭān, this time with respect to Clines’ “act-consequence
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24 Ibid.
25 Ibid., 234.
26 Ibid., 233.
nexus.” The šāṭān questions whether the existence of Job the Pious is the result of the existence of Job the Rich or visa versa. He introduces the topic of disinterested piety and whether Job, and by extension all mortals, is capable of piety without the promise or hope of a divine reward. The šāṭān first introduces כָּלֹם to the Book of Job in Job 1:10, as he here accuses God of “fencing in” Job, thereby ensuring his piety through divine protection and reward. Therefore, in this first instance, the author presents the concept of the divine “fencing in” as a favour meant to ensure piety and worship from humans. God accepts the šāṭān’s wager that Job will remain pious despite being stripped of all God’s favour. Based on this presentation of scenes 1 and 2, Cho discusses the parallels between the scenes as a simple alternate correspondence:

**Scene 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Job Introduced</th>
<th></th>
<th>Job Debated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1:1-3</td>
<td>A²</td>
<td>1:8-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>1:1</td>
<td>a²</td>
<td>1:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>1:2-3</td>
<td>b²</td>
<td>1:9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1:4-5</td>
<td>B²</td>
<td>1:11-12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scene 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Job the Pious</th>
<th></th>
<th>Job the Rich</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Job the Pious</td>
<td>a²</td>
<td>Job the Pious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Job the Rich</td>
<td>b²</td>
<td>Job the Rich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Job acts out of curiosity about the children cursing God</td>
<td>B²</td>
<td>God acts out of curiosity about Job cursing God</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cho then describes scene 3 as the mirror image of scene 1 in that it begins with the children feasting (Job 1:13), relists Job the Rich’s possessions as they are destroyed (Job 1:13b-18) and ends with Job the Pious enacting ritual expressions of grief and worship (Job 1:20-22). The narrator affirms that this is the reappearance of Job the Pious by stating “in all this Job did not sin or charge God with wrongdoing” (Job 1:22). Therefore, while Cho sees scene 2 as a simple alternate correspondence to scene 1, he also sees scene 1 and scene 3 as forming a ring composition:
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29 Ibid., 237.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scene 1</th>
<th>1:1</th>
<th>A Job the Pious</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(earth)</td>
<td>1:2-3</td>
<td>B Job the Rich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:4-5</td>
<td>C Job’s Children Feasting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scene 2</td>
<td>1:6-12</td>
<td>D Divine Debate (about Job)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(heaven)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scene 3</td>
<td>1:13b (18b)</td>
<td>C Job’s Children Feasting, Undone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(earth)</td>
<td>1:14-19</td>
<td>B Job the Rich, Undone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:20-22</td>
<td>A Job the Pious, Unveiled</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By identifying Job 1 as a ring structure, Cho is arguing that scene 2 is the theological crux of the section or “central loading” of the ring composition. In the context of an argument for Job 2 and 42:7-10 as later additions, this would suggest that the original author created a ring that emphasized the divine debate regarding disinterested piety, making this the focus of the original folktale. The secondary author then would have opened up this closed ring composition in order to bridge the gap between the original folktale and his new poetic addition.

Job 2 begins the secondary narrative addition, mirroring Job 1 but showing a different theological emphasis and overall structure. Like Job 1, Job 2 is divided into 3 scenes, Job 2:1-6 (scene A), Job 2:7-10 (scene B), and Job 2:11-13 (scene 3). On the surface, scene A mimics scene 2 and scene B parallels scene 3, although to a lesser extent. Cho lists the order of both scene A and scene 2 as the šāṭān entering (Job 1:6; 2:1), God asking the šāṭān where he has come from (Job 1:7a; 2:2a), the šāṭān answering that he has been roaming the earth (Job 1:7b; 2:2b), God presenting Job the Pious (Job 1:8; 2:3), the šāṭān calling this characterization into question and proposing a test of Job (Job 1:9-11; 2:4-5), God giving the
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30 Ibid., 238.
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śāṭān permission to test Job (Job 1:12a; 2:6), and the śāṭān exiting the scene (Job 1:12b; 2:7a).\textsuperscript{34}

It is interesting that in the śāṭān’s second argument against Job’s piety, he picks up a theme word from Job 1:10 which was also mentioned in the previous chapter of this thesis: fence.\textsuperscript{35} In Job 1:10, the śāṭān accuses God of putting a “fence” (ולא) “around” (והב) Job, which causes his piety. Here, if Cho’s argument is correct, the new author picked up this preposition and placed it within the śāṭān’s idiom “skin והב skin.” Cho posits that perhaps this repetition is meant to suggest, “if the first test peeled off the first layer of Job’s defense, the hedge formed by his children and wealth, the second test peels off the final layer of defense, his skin.”\textsuperscript{36} The preposition is consciously repeated here, then picked up again in Job 3:23 with the וַדּ ord term, which is then repeated in the divine speech in Job 38:8, yet conspicuously missing from the epilogue. If Cho is correct, this suggests that the author of the inner narrative and poetic dialogues introduced a new theme into the overall book through this repetition. Again, despite the fact that the epilogue lacks the repetition of the וַד ord term, in the Conclusion I will address how the theme of “fencing in” is present and significant in both sides of the outer inclusio of the Book of Job.

Cho then moves on to the repetitions between scene 3 and scene B, pointing out that the parallels are more strained than those between scene 2 and scene A. First, the śāṭān carries out the trial of Job (Job 1:14-19; 2:7b). Next Job responds physically to the tests with a ritual form of mourning in the first instance and with a potsherd for scratching in the ashes in the second instance (Job 1:20; 2:8). Third, and this is the most tenuous link, a human agent

\textsuperscript{34} Ibid., 239.

\textsuperscript{35} See p. 25.

\textsuperscript{36} Ibid., 244.
speaks to Job (Job 1:14-19; 2:9). In scene 3, the human agents are the messengers sharing the news of the calamities with Job, whereas in scene B the human agent is his wife urging Job to curse God and die. Job then verbally responds to the tragedies (Job 1:21; 2:10a), although in scene 3 Job seems to be proclaiming this pious speech almost as a monologue, whereas in scene B he is responding to his wife. Finally, the narrator comments on Job’s actions and words, the first time stating that he “did not sin or charge God with wrongdoing,” while the second time the narrator simply states “in all this Job did not sin with his lips” (Job 1:22; 2:10b). This pointed change is due to the fact that in this second test Job’s rhetorical question suggests that both good and bad come from God, which is drastically close to charging God with wrongdoing.

For Cho, while the repetition of scenes and themes between Job 1 and 2 shows a conscious attempt by the author to bridge the gap between the two chapters, Job 2 undermines the complex literary structure of Job 1. Scenes A and B do not show the same parallels that scenes 1 and 2 demonstrated in Job 1 and, more importantly, Job 2 as a whole does not show the same ring composition as the previous chapter. Similar to Clines, Cho notes the inconsistencies in the “one day” (יָוֵן) introductory phrase as well as the unclear beginning and ending of certain scenes within Job 2. Whereas the ring of Job 1 had closure, Job 2 opens this ring back up and signals the beginning of the theological debate in the poetic sections. By reopening the closed unit of Job 1 to discuss not only piety but also the value of human life, the author bridges the gap between Job 1 and Job 3, in which Job attempts to unravel creation.

37 Ibid., 240.
38 Ibid.
Cho then moves to the epilogue to prove the presence of the inner and outer narrative frames. First, he points out that the characters introduced in the secondary narrative, Job’s three friends, are dealt with in the inner frame of the epilogue, Job 42:7-10.\(^{39}\) Although Job’s wife is introduced in the inner prologue and is not mentioned again in the epilogue, God’s mention of folly (תְּשֵׁלֶל) in Job 42:8 echoes Job’s rebuke of his wife speaking as foolish women (תְּשֵׁלֶלֶת) do in Job 2:10.\(^{40}\) Additionally, he cites examples of unresolved issues in the inner frame as proof that it was written by a secondary author. While Job is restored with respect to the tragedies that befell him in Job 1 (acknowledging that new children do not detract from the loss of his original children), the physical affliction from Job 2 is not mentioned again in the epilogue.\(^{41}\) This may be due to the fact that the proposed secondary author was less intent on restoring Job to his former self and more interested in presenting a theological debate between Job, his divine retribution-believing friends, and God. Cho then sees Job 42:10 as an attempt to bridge the gap between the inner and outer prose narratives by linking Job’s friends from the inner secondary narrative to the restoration of Job’s fortune in the outer original narrative.\(^{42}\)

The validity of Cho’s argument relies upon his assertion that Job 1 and 42:11-17 demonstrate clear authorial structuring that seemed unaware of the inner narrative or poetic sections. He argues that Job 42:11-17 repeats the structure of scene 3 (Job 1:13-22), which returns the reader to scene 1 (Job 1:1-5), since scene 1 and 3 form a chiasm. While the ordering of events in the scenes of the prologue was strictly structured in order to form a

\(^{39}\) Ibid., 247.

\(^{40}\) Ibid., 247.

\(^{41}\) Ibid., 248.

\(^{42}\) Ibid.
chiasm, this is not the case in the epilogue. Nevertheless, Cho argues for the following relationship between scene 3 and the original epilogue of Job 42:11-17:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scene 3</th>
<th>Epilogue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job’s Children Feasting, Undone</td>
<td>Job Feasting, Restored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job the Rich, Undone</td>
<td>Job the Rich, Restored Double</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock, Undone</td>
<td>Livestock, Restored Double</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children, Undone</td>
<td>Children, Restored Double</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job the Pious, Undone</td>
<td>Job the Pious, Blessed43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cho presents an interesting and, at times, very persuasive argument for the separation of Job 1 and 42:11-17 from Job 2 and 42:7-10. The presence of the ring composition within Job 1 and its breaking up in Job 2 is suggestive of a second authorial hand, but the latter part of his argument with respect to the epilogue is weakened by the fact that the epilogue is not as clearly divided, nor as strictly structured. The simple alternate correspondence that Cho perceives between scene 3 of the prologue and the epilogue of the Book of Job is necessarily more vague with respect to specific lexical repetitions and intertextual echoes because they do not relate correspondently or chiastically. The epilogue does not proceed in a series of structured scenes like the prologue, but instead, focuses on more personal details of Job’s life. Rather than simply listing all Job’s possessions and citing Job’s sacrifices, the epilogue discusses Job’s relationship with God as one of prayer, and describes the emotional bonds Job has with his family and friends. This flowing description of Job’s life post-theophany is impossible to break down into a structured prologue-like list, and therefore, it is also difficult to bracket passages as interpolations.

An additional weakness in Cho’s argument is that he bases his theory partially on inconsistencies within the “inner narrative.” This leaves many unanswered questions for two reasons: (1) the hand of a secondary author still does not adequately explain why that author
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would not mention Job’s wife and the healing of Job’s boils in the epilogue; and (2) the outer narrative has its own inconsistencies, such as the absence of the śāṭān in the epilogue and the absence of Job’s brothers and sisters and all who had known him before in the prologue. Nevertheless, the corresponding topics that Cho perceives do strongly suggest that the prologue and epilogue are consciously related to one another—an argument that is strengthened by the fact that they combine to create a frame narrative. In the Conclusion of this thesis I will discuss how the repetitions and commonalities that Cho perceives point to the transformative effects of an inclusio rather than to the strictly structured ring composition that Cho argues for and how these transformations strengthen the argument for an overarching theme of divine “fencing in.”

While Cho uses structural patterns to reconstruct the compositional history of the Book of Job, other scholars identify structural patterns in an attempt to understand the meaning behind the book. Patrick focuses on the narrator as a key to understanding the authorial intention of the book. By doing so, he finds a pattern of four that is apparent both in the structure as well as the content of the book. As mentioned above, Patrick sees Job 1:1-5 as a narrative introduction that gives the reader the background information before moving into the four scenes that alternate between heavenly and earthly settings, followed by a conclusion. Within the second scene (Job 1:13-22), which takes place on earth, Patrick identifies an additional emphasis on the number four: there are four messengers, who tell of four tragedies that alternate between earthly and heavenly destruction. Whereas the fourfold pattern in the prologue begins with the heavenly realm, in scene 2 earthly destruction is the
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first to befall Job with the raid of the Sabeans in Job 1:14-15. This is followed by the heavenly destruction by the fire of God from heaven (Job 1:16), the earthly raid of the Chaldeans (Job 1:17) and the final heavenly destruction by the great wind across the desert (Job 1:18-19). Similarly, Job’s attributes are listed in a fourfold pattern of two pairs in Job 1:8 and 2:3 when God describes Job as “blameless,” “upright,” “fearing God,” and “turning away from evil.”

Patrick extends this fourfold structural understanding to the epilogue, creating the following tenuous complex correspondence structure:

A Introduction to Job (1:1-5)
   a Job himself (1:1)
   b Children (1:2)
   c Possessions (1:3)
   d Activities (1:4-5)
      B Introduction to the Three Friends (2:11-13)
      B⁻ Conclusion to the Three Friends (42:7-9)
A⁻ Conclusion to Job (42:10-17)
   d⁻ Activities (42:10-11)
   c⁻ Possessions (42:12)
   b⁻ Children (42:13-15)
   a⁻ Job himself (42:16-17)⁴⁹

An interesting point Patrick makes is that B and B⁻ are not only both about the three friends, but they also repeat the number 7. In Job 2:13, the three friends sit in silence with Job for 7 days and 7 nights and in the epilogue this pattern of 7 and 7 is repeated in God’s command that the three friends make a burnt offering of 7 bulls and 7 rams (Job 42:8).⁵₀
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⁴⁵ Ibid., 188.
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⁴⁸ This is the combination of a simple alternate correspondence and a chiasm. See E. W. Bullinger, *Figures of Speech Used in the Bible: Explained and Illustrated* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1978), 380.
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Patrick lists an additional fourfold structure within d as the lines alternate between divine and human activity: in Job 42:10 and 42:12 God is the agent and in Job 42:11 and 42:13-17 Job, his family and friends are the agents.\textsuperscript{51}

There does seem to be a repetition of four within the prologue and epilogue, which Andersen describes as “an artificial pattern, which reveals a propensity of the author for the number four.”\textsuperscript{52} The extent to which this repetition exists and the likelihood that this should be taken as an indication of the overall structure, however, is less obvious. In seeking out this fourfold structure between the prologue and epilogue, Patrick has followed Steinmann in omitting Job 1:6-2:10 from the structure without giving adequate justification for this omission.\textsuperscript{53} Steinmann, in noting the parallels between Job 1:1-5 and 42:10-17 as well as between Job 2:11-13 and 42:9, states that Job 1:6-2:10 are “without parallel in the rest of the book.”\textsuperscript{54}

While this interpretive model brings new parallels to light, I prefer to see the outer inclusio as an inclusio precisely because its flexibility does not require parts of the frame narrative to be excised or sectioned off. By identifying the frame narrative of Job 1:1-2:13 and 42:7-17 as an inclusio, it allows the freedom to recognize the repetitions, thematic parallels and transformations without doing damage to the final form of the text. Both Cho and Patrick demonstrate that there is significant repetition between the two sides of the inclusio frame in addition to the narrative that binds the two; however, the strict structures

\textsuperscript{51} Ibid., 190.
they impose on the text restrict the freedom needed to see the variety and depth of parallels in the text.

As a simple example of this freedom and its interpretive effect, Choi has noted that in both the prologue and epilogue consolations are mentioned. In Job 2:11, the three friends come to console or comfort Job, with the consolation term נחב in the piel infinitive.\(^{55}\) In Job 42:11, the family and friends of Job go to his house, share a meal with him, and comfort or console him with the same term, נחב, this time in the piel imperfect.\(^{56}\) Additionally, this term is repeated in Job’s response to God in Job 42:6, once again linking the inner and outer inclusio. In Patrick’s fourfold structure, Job 2:11 and 42:11 are unrelated, and therefore this parallel was not highlighted. In Cho’s compositional history, this would mean that the secondary author had added the attempted consolation of the friends in Job 2 so as to anticipate the later effective consolation of Job’s family in Job 42. It is difficult to argue for such foresight and literary creativity while also identifying this author’s presence through his or her authorial clumsiness and forgetfulness. By focusing on this narrative frame as an inclusio rather than as a stricter literary structure, it is possible to focus on the transformations that occur in the characters by allowing for more dialogue between lines and passages. Regardless of what compositional history one ascribes to, this bracketing off while still allowing for freedom within the frame is exactly the type of divine נָחָשׁ/רֹז that God describes in the divine speeches, as will be described in the following chapter. It is in this manner that the content and structure of the Book of Job can be seen as complementing and highlighting each other.
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and the Theme of “Fencing in” in the Prologue

Thus far in this chapter I have discussed the structure of the outer inclusio and argued for its categorization as an inclusio frame narrative rather than a stricter correspondence or chiastic structure. Having associated the outer chapters of the Book of Job with this inclusio structure, I demonstrated that there are many corresponding images and themes between the two sides of the frame, proving that they relate to one another beyond the epilogue’s continuation of the prologue’s narrative. It is now necessary to understand how the verb וַיִּיבְדֶּא / וַיַּכְפֹּר and the content of the outer inclusio further develop the theme of “fencing in” within Job 1:1-2:13 and 42:7-17.

Scene 1 (Job 1:1-5) begins with the description of Job, his family, and his possessions. The audience is presented with an orderly catalogue of all that Job has and does, leaving us with the impression that while Job may not explicitly state a belief in Divine Retribution, his actions suggest that he sees a strong correlation between act and consequence. For example, in Job 1:5, we are told that Job makes burnt offerings on behalf of his children as a safeguard against their possible cursing of God in their hearts. On the whole, then, scene 1 ends with a picture of Job’s orderly life in which he acts righteously and is blessed by God.

Scene 2 (Job 1:6-12) begins the alternation between the heavenly and earthly scene locations, taking the audience from Job’s earthly life to the heavenly assembly. While this alternation continues unimpeded for two additional scenes (Job 1:13-22 and 2:1-6), scene 2 foreshadows the eventual breakdown or “blurring” of this structure. It is within this scene that the audience is introduced to the character of the sāfān, who, while being present in the
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heavenly court, informs God and the audience that he has come from “going to and fro on the earth, and from walking up and down on it” (Job 1:7). Just as the author is beginning to lull the reader into a sense of security that this is an ordered story in which everything and everyone has its own place and all experiences are a direct consequence of one’s actions, the šātān subtly plants a seed of doubt in the audience’s mind—perhaps the divisions between the two realms are not quite as strict as one had previously expected. To put this into the language of this thesis, perhaps the fences that limit each realm do not limit the šātān as well.

The author also chooses to place the first instance of the keyword בתוקף/תוקף (“to fence in”) in the mouth of this character. In Job 1:10 the šātān counters God’s claim that Job is a “blameless and upright man who fears God and turns away from evil” (Job 1:9), by stating that God has “put a fence around him and all that he has, on every side.” So what is the significance of the author’s choice to have the šātān utter בתוקף/תוקף first? Firstly, the šātān’s perception of God’s fencing in action casts a light on scene 1, and suggests to the audience that perhaps Job’s existence and relationship with God is not as simple as it seems. Job’s life and relationship with God are ordered and blessed, but the šātān’s comment introduces a new element to the story: the understanding that outside the invisible fences protecting Job, there exist beings or forces that could potentially push him to curse God. Secondly, the šātān has now verbalized his understanding of God’s divine act of בתוקף/תוקף, providing the audience with the first of three separate interpretations on the divine “fencing in,” one from the šātān (Job 1:10), one from Job (Job 3:23), and God’s final statement on the subject (Job 38:8).

What is important to note, however, is that God does not simply agree with the šātān that he has “fenced in” Job, or that Job’s piety is a result of this alleged “fencing in.” Instead, God allows the šātān the freedom to test Job while providing specific restrictions, namely,
that Job’s body be spared (Job 1:12). This is especially significant if one remembers that
śāṭān’s function in the heavenly realm is to act as the “tempter” or “accuser.” Rather
than silencing the śāṭān or punishing him for his arrogant accusations against God, God, instead,
acknowledges that the śāṭān is acting in his role as accuser and seeking to test the piety of
Job in order to testify accurately for or against him in the heavenly tribunal. God’s
restrictions on the śāṭān ensure the safety of Job, another creature within his creation, while
allowing the śāṭān the freedom to function in his role.

Taken in the light of God’s description of רָצוֹן / רָצוֹן in Job 38:8, his actions and
speeches in this section are incredibly significant. Rather than simply gambling with a man’s
life in the prologue, God is, instead, silently contradicting the śāṭān’s accusation against him.
As I will discuss in the next chapter, in Job 38:8, God describes creation as a wild universe
in which the existence and flourishing of some creatures comes at the peril of others. God
reigns in each of these creatures in order to ensure the continuation of creation, but he allows
all beings the freedom to function within their role in creation. The fences that God erects
within creation are not blessings bestowed upon a select few, but necessary structures to keep
all creatures in check while allowing them the freedom to exist and thrive. Therefore, the
eagle’s young thrive on the blood of only what the eagle can prey upon (Job 39:27-30), and
the sea was “fenced in” when it burst forth from the womb, but it is not quelled or dried up
(Job 38:8). So too does God deal with the śāṭān, allowing him the freedom to act as heavenly
accuser while also providing him with specific restrictions to ensure Job’s continued
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śāṭān’s accusation is not silent assent or merciless curiosity. Instead, it is an acknowledgement that despite the śāṭān’s erroneous assumption, in accordance with God’s ḥaṭār, the śāṭān too should be granted the freedom to be the śāṭān.

The author uses this same principle in his presentation of ḥaṭār. Rather than simply stating “this is the purpose of God’s divine ‘fencing in’ and these are the theological implications,” the author allows the reader the freedom to consider each proposed interpretation before being presented with God’s ultimate word on the subject. Therefore, the repetition of ḥaṭār signifies that this is a significant topic throughout the double inclusio, while also inviting the reader to consider carefully each presentation of God’s “fencing in” action in light of the different perspectives and contexts.

With respect to the content of the prologue, just as the author has created two literary fences around the entire Book of Job, he or she also uses a two-step process for taking down the “fence” that surrounds Job and the “fence” that divides the heavenly and earthly realm. The first step takes place within the śāṭān’s first set of tests (Job 1:13-19). Job’s possessions and family are destroyed, but, as Clines points out, the author does not explicitly state here that the śāṭān has caused these catastrophes. Instead, the death of his family and destruction of all his possessions are attributed to the Sabean (Job 1:15), the fire of God (Job 1:16), the Chaldeans (Job 1:17), and a great wind (Job 1:19). At this point in the prologue, the possessions of Job that the author described in scene 1 have been taken from him, but he is still in good health. Similarly, the beings within the heavenly realm have not yet explicitly entered the earthly realm, but they have begun to act upon earthly beings.

The second step in the removal of Job’s fence and the prologue’s structural fence between heaven and earth takes place in Job 2:7. Here, the śāṭān himself inflicts “loathsome
sores on Job from the sole of his foot to the crown of his head.” At this point, the heavenly realm has now fully encroached upon earth and the “fences” dividing these two scene settings are now completely down.\(^6\) Similarly, the protective “fence” surrounding Job has been completely removed and he has lost all of his possessions as well as his health. What is important to remember, however, is that these divine fences not only protect the creatures within them from the chaos and dangers of the outside world, but also protect the rest of creation from the destruction of which the enclosed beings are capable. Therefore, just as the removal of the “fences” in Job 38:8 would result in the surging of the waves over creation, the removal of the “fence” surrounding Job allows for his destructive counter-cosmic incantation in Job 3. We may now turn to this incantation and God’s response in the inner inclusio.
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\(^6\) Clines, “False Naivety in the Prologue to Job,” 129.

In this chapter, I will address the inner inclusio of Job 3 and 38:1-42:6. Within the inner inclusio, Job continues the prologue’s blurring of the lines between the human and inhuman realms, attempting to rebel against God’s imprisoning שׁוֹך by summoning chaos to undo creation. Therefore, the theme of “fencing in” in this inclusio is very much about the forces of chaos and divine order and just how these two forces relate within creation.

While the outer inclusio is very anthropocentric, focusing on the impact of the heavenly realm on humanity, the inner inclusio widens the reader’s gaze to include a cosmological view of all of creation. Similarly, the strict ordered repetitions and scene changes present in the outer inclusio are swapped for recurring overarching themes and motifs. If the outer inclusio is intended to zero in on one man’s strictly ordered life and break down all the fences protecting him, the inner inclusio intends to remove all the fences enclosing creation so as to provide a panoramic view of how each creature interacts in God’s created world.

Within this chapter we will finally be looking at God’s description of how he maintains his creation and we will therefore finally be able to see just how he describes his own act of שׁוֹך. God creates limits for all of creation but, as Fretheim humorously describes it, God is not a divine micromanager. ¹ As was mentioned in the introduction, the structure of a text often bolsters the content, and such is the case with the Book of Job. The author has created a double inclusio structure with a series of smaller inner compartments that contain dialogues, wisdom hymns, laments, and lawsuits. This inner inclusio, however,

does not show a strict correspondent or chiastic structure, nor do the sides of the frame exactly repeat one another. Instead, God takes the essence of Job’s soliloquy in Job 3 and subverts and reimagines it. God does not discuss Job’s curse point by point, but blows down the “fences” that Job thinks imprison him and shows Job just how grand the created world is. God celebrates the wild beauty of his creation and calls Job similarly to recognize the wonder in it. In this context, it would not have been possible for the author to write in a tidy whirlwind in which God rebuts each of Job’s comments in order and concludes with a neat summary. In this way, the structured freedom in the content of the inner inclusio mirrors the inclusio’s parallels, which follow no strict order but are contained within a stable frame.

Prior to discussing the theme of “fencing in” within the inner inclusio, however, it is important to establish that Job 3 and 38:1-42:6 do, in fact, form an inclusio. The discussion of Job 3 and 38:1-42:6 as an inclusio is different than that of Job 1-2 and 42:7-17 because this inner inclusio is not also a frame narrative. Therefore, while the frames of the outer inclusio, regardless of inconsistencies, continue the outer prose story, the relationship between Job’s soliloquy in Job 3 and God’s response in the Divine Speeches is thematic and lexical rather than narrative. That is to say that the inner inclusio participates within the entire poetic narrative rather than existing above the narrative. The inner inclusio is not commenting on the poetic dialogue inside its frame, it is simply enveloping it through repetition of themes, keywords, and images. As such, I will be employing Wyckoff’s criteria for determining an inclusio’s recognisability in this chapter. As noted previously, Wyckoff argued that for greatest recognition, there should be (1) a high frequency of repetitions between sides of the frame, (2) repeated vocabulary rather than semantic equivalents, (3) limited distribution of elements throughout the central text, (4) uncommon words, (5)
placement of *inclusio* frames at the extremities of the text, and (6) the addition of word-plays and puns to increase graphic and aural echoes.\(^2\) With the exception of point 3, I will demonstrate that the inner *inclusio* meets all these requirements, thereby proving that there is conscious and extensive repetition. With respect to the third requirement, while the prominent theme of creation is present throughout the inner text,\(^3\) the most significant keyword repetition, יִדּוּ /יִדּוּ, is only present in the *inclusio* frames.

I will also be using Schifferdecker’s three themes of the establishment of creation, procreation, and humanity’s place in creation in order to demonstrate the vast number of keywords, motifs, and themes that are repeated between the two sides of the *inclusio* frame, thereby satisfying the first of Wyckoff’s criteria.\(^4\) The purpose of this approach will be to analyze the transformations that occur between the two sides of the frames with respect to these themes and how these transformations relate to the author’s portrayal of God’s “fencing in.”

**The Separation of Job 3 From its Surrounding Texts**

Prior to addressing the repetitions and transformations that prove the *inclusio*’s presence, it is necessary to discuss the division of Job 3 from the poetic dialogues that begin in Job 4. Wyckoff rightly points out that an *inclusio* is greatly weakened by a blurring of its structural lines.\(^5\) The previous chapter argued for the division between Job 1-2 and 3 based
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\(^4\) These three themes are proposed in Kathryn Schifferdecker, *Out of the Whirlwind: Creation Theology in the Book of Job*, HTS 61 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2008), 65.

\(^5\) Wyckoff, “Have We Come Full Circle Yet?” 500.
on the change from prose to poetry and Job 1-2’s frame narrative structure. In order to view Job 3 as the introductory frame of the inner *inclusio*, it must first be established that it should also be separated from Job 4, rather than being taken as the first speech of the dialogues.

Job 3 is the beginning of the poetic dialogue section of the Book of Job since, after this initial speech by Job, his friends are compelled to respond to him and engage in a theological debate. Many scholars, however, recognize that this initial speech of Job is different from the following speeches for a variety of reasons. Dhorme describes Job 3 as forming “a whole which may be isolated from the rest.” This argument is similar to Cho’s argument regarding Job 1 in that its unified structure allows for its separation from the surrounding text. Holland points out that in order to have “won” the debate, Job would need to be the responding party, suggesting that the debate proper was actually started by the friends who were picking up on Job’s lament. He adds that Job 3 is a culmination of the prologue, with Job finally voicing his indictment.

Patrick argues for the separation of Job 3 from Job 4 and the following chapters on the basis of Job 3’s ascription. Patrick notes that each speech of Job and his friends from Job 3-26 begins with the ascription, “and [speaker] answered and said” (וַיַּעַן וַיָּמַר). While this ascription is present in Job’s speech in Job 3 as well, it occurs in verse 2 instead. Patrick argues that this is due to the fact that Job 3:1 is the actual beginning of the ascription, 
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distinguishing it from those of the rest of the speeches in Job 4-26 and thereby separating this chapter from the rest.\textsuperscript{13}

Westermann notes that there is no mention of the friends in this chapter, suggesting that this is strictly a “lament,” similar to that in Job 29-31.\textsuperscript{14} Steinmann picks up on Westermann’s identification of these parallel chapters, stating that just as Job 3 acts as the prompt for the friends’ speeches, Job 29-31 incites Elihu to speak out.\textsuperscript{15} Andersen and Parsons also agree with Westermann’s division, but discuss them as curses rather than laments, with Job 29-31 acting as a self-curse.\textsuperscript{16} While Job 3 and 29-31 do surround the dialogues and share a number of similarities, viewing these chapters as parallel sides of an \textit{inclusio} frame is less convincing. First, if one is arguing that Job 3 is separate from the dialogues based on its unified structure and different genre, this would either need to be mimicked or reversed in Job 29-31 in order to show true parallels and avoid Wyckoff’s “blurring.” While Job 3:1 begins with Job opening up his mouth and the repeated ascription of “and [speaker] answered and said,” Job 29:1 begins with “Job again took up his discourse and said” (וַיְהִי אֵלֶלֶֽא יְהֹוָה וַיָּסֶף יִבְרָעֵל), demonstrating that it is clearly part of the dialogues rather than its own separate section. The exact ascription from Job 29:1 also begins Job’s speech in Job 27:1, suggesting that, instead, Job 27 and 29 form an \textit{inclusio} around the hymn to wisdom in Job 28. Additionally, if we were to see Job 3 and 29-31 as an \textit{inclusio}, this would suggest that Job 29-31 had provided some conclusion to the unit that would then be picked up again by God in the divine speeches. Rather than speaking in terms of the self-

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{13} Ibid.
  \item \textsuperscript{15} Andrew E. Steinmann, “The Structure and Message of the Book of Job,” \textit{VT} 46 (1996): 94.
\end{itemize}
curse that Andersen and Parsons discuss, however, God seems to pick up the curse of creation that Job proclaims in Job 3, suggesting that it is these two sections that are being consciously paralleled. Therefore, while Job 29-31 might act as a culmination of the dialogues, which then leads into Elihu’s speeches, it does not have the same transformative power through its parallels as the inner *inclusio* of Job 3 and 38:1-42:6.

I find Patrick’s use of the ascriptions to be a more useful indication of separate sections within the poetic dialogues, as they do seem to argue that Job 3 is separate from Job 4-31. On a much more basic level as well, Job 4 seems to suggest that Job did not intend to begin a discussion with his friends through his curse in Job 3. Following the ascription, Eliphaz the Temanite timidly asks Job, “if one ventures a word with you, will you be offended” (Job 4:2). Combined with the variation in ascriptions, this seems to suggest that Job 3 acts as a soliloquy or monologue that Eliphaz responds to, thereby initiating the poetic debate between Job and his friends. On this basis, it seems fair to assume that Job 3 is its own separate section, allowing for the following discussion of the parallels of the inner *inclusio* frame and their effect on the Book of Job as a whole.

**Repeated Keywords, Themes, and Motifs**

Given, then, that Job 3 is its own separate section, we can now look to the repeated themes, keywords, and motifs that suggest the Divine Speeches *intentionally* parallel Job’s soliloquy. While there are many repetitions between the two sides of the *inclusio* frame, I find Schifferdecker’s three themes of the establishment of creation, procreation, and the role of humanity in creation to be the most useful.\(^{17}\) The theme of the divine “fencing in” is

\(^{17}\) Schifferdecker, *Out of the Whirlwind*, 65.
prominent and consciously woven throughout the content and structure of both Joban
inclusios. These three themes, however, are significant in the inner inclusio specifically due
to its creation and mythological context, and help to highlight the inner inclusio as a unique
section, while also satisfying Wyckoff’s first and second criteria.

The following chart is an adaptation and expansion of Parke’s table of keywords that
link the Divine Speeches and Job 3.\textsuperscript{18} I have chosen to divide the terms based on their
identification with repeated themes and motifs throughout the inner inclusio. The subsequent
discussion of Schifferdecker’s three themes will highlight the difficulty of categorizing terms
or images into just one of the themes, given God’s tendency to reimagine completely Job’s
language. Therefore, this chart will focus on more specific motifs and terms that are present
within Schifferdecker’s three broader inner inclusio themes and within the theme of the
divine “fencing in.”

Table 1: Repeated Vocabulary in the Inner Inclusio Frames

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme/Motif</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Forms and References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Light vs. Dark</td>
<td>Light</td>
<td>Light</td>
<td>לֹא (3:9a, 16b, 20a; 38:19a, 24a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ענן</td>
<td>Darkness/ be dark/ darken</td>
<td>חֹשֵׁך (3:4a, 5a; 38:19b); שֶׁשֶׁךָ (3:9a); צֶמֶשׁ (38:2a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>שִׁישֶׁךָ</td>
<td>Deep shadow/ gloom/ shadow of death</td>
<td>שֶׁשֶׁךַּס (3:5a; 38:17b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom vs. Containment</td>
<td>Door</td>
<td>Door</td>
<td>בֶּטֶן (3:10a; 38:8a, 10b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>חֹפֶשָׁה</td>
<td>Free/ freedom</td>
<td>חֹפֶשָׁה (3:19b; 39:5a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>שַׁמֵּךְ</td>
<td>Hide/ hidden/ secret</td>
<td>שַׁמַּק (3:16a; 40:13b); שַׁמַּק (40:13a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>מים</td>
<td>Waters</td>
<td>מים (3:24; 38:30, 34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>נגש</td>
<td>Taskmaster/ driver</td>
<td>נָגֵשׁ (3:18b; 39:7b)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme/Motif</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Hebrew Term</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Procreation</td>
<td>בטן</td>
<td>Womb/ belly</td>
<td>(3:10a); (3:11b); (3:29a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>מספר ירח</td>
<td>Number months</td>
<td>(3:6); (39:2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death/Rest</td>
<td>מות</td>
<td>Death</td>
<td>(3:21a); (3:17a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>שפך</td>
<td>Lay down</td>
<td>(3:13a); (40:21a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Skies</td>
<td>כוכב</td>
<td>Star</td>
<td>(3:9a); (3:7a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ענן/ענן</td>
<td>Cloud</td>
<td>(3:5b); (38:9a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portrayal of Humanity</td>
<td>אדם</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>(3:3b); (3:23a); (3:3a); (40:7a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>כליל</td>
<td>Curse/ make light of</td>
<td>(3:1); (40:4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leviathan</td>
<td>לויתן</td>
<td>Leviathan</td>
<td>(3:8b); (40:25a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>יער</td>
<td>Rouse/ stir up</td>
<td>(3:8b); (41:2a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>עפעף</td>
<td>Eyelids of dawn</td>
<td>(3:9b); (41:10b)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As this chart demonstrates, there is a large amount of repeated vocabulary between the two sides of the frame, suggesting that God is employing Job’s exact wording within his divine response. This correlation, however, is actually much greater than the chart demonstrates, because God responds to Job with exact repetition, but also with pointed reversals of Job’s speech that I will discuss below. Additionally, God crafts many of his reversals by completely transforming Job’s images and metaphors into something radically different, making it difficult to link certain images to one specific theme. Therefore, while I will divide the inner inclusio into three general themes of the establishment of creation, procreation, and humanity’s role within creation, certain motifs and parallels will blur the lines between these themes.
The Genre of Job 3

Given that I argue that Job 3 and the Divine Speeches create an inclusio, the identification of Job 3’s genre is important in order to understand the context of God’s response. The issue of genre with respect to Job 3 is centred on intention. Are Job’s cries simply part of Job’s mourning ritual, or is there a specific goal that Job has in mind by voicing these complaints and wishes? I subscribe to the view that Job’s soliloquy, and by extension, God’s response, have a creation and mythological context, since Job attempts to rally the forces of chaos by uttering a counter-cosmic incantation. This view is largely based on the argument first presented by Fishbane and picked up by Alter and Perdue. Fishbane wrote the seminal work on the link between Job 3, the Genesis creation accounts, and Ancient Near Eastern (ANE) mythology. Fishbane sees Job 3 as an ordered and pointed reversal of the first creation account in an attempt to undo creation. He describes Job 3:3-13 as a counter-cosmic incantation within a magical context.

This is not to say, however, that Job 3:3-13 should be divided from the rest of the chapter with respect to the inclusio structure. Many scholars acknowledge that 3:3-13 create a curse or magical incantation while 3:14-26 form a lament. They also acknowledge, however, that there is a significant parallel between the two sections of the chapter based on
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repeated keywords and motifs. For instance, Hartley argues for a division between Job 3:3-13 and Job 3:14-26 based on the parallel imagery and language of inner rest in both 3:13 and 26.\textsuperscript{24} This would then create a similar alternate correspondence of 3:3-10 and 3:14-23 having Job searching for death with 3:11-13 and 3:24-26 having Job describing his sad state.\textsuperscript{25} The presence of this conscious structuring is also supported by the fact that the chapter following the ascription would then be divided into two 13-line sections.\textsuperscript{26} Fishbane notes that lexical assonance also integrates the two sections through the following repetitions: בְּרִיתֶךָ in 9b and 16b; דְּבֵר in 6b and 18; עַצֶּל in 10b and 20a; נִבְּרָא in 3b and 23a; and רָא in 5c with the cognate רָא in 20b.\textsuperscript{27}

In contrast to Fishbane, many scholars discuss Job 3 as a lament, although Westermann takes this further by identifying it as part of Job’s dramatized lament psalm throughout his speeches in Job 3-31.\textsuperscript{28} Fretheim sees Job’s discussion of creation in Job 3 as an attempt to universalize his situation and show that the entire world is in the same state of ongoing cursedness.\textsuperscript{29} Others divide Job 3 into sections with separate, yet related, genres.

Yu’s division of Job 3 into a curse and lament leads him to the conclusion that the chapter is in a genre of its own, that of the non-literal death wish.\textsuperscript{30} Yu examines a variety of biblical passages in order to distinguish between literal and non-literal death wishes. In literal death wishes (Judg 9:54; 16:30; 1 Sam 31:4; Jon 1:12) the audience’s response makes clear

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{24} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{25} Ibid., 89.
\item \textsuperscript{26} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{27} Fishbane, “Jeremiah IV 23-26 and Job III 3-13,” 164.
\item \textsuperscript{28} Westermann, \textit{The Structure of the Book of Job}, 4.
\item \textsuperscript{29} Fretheim, \textit{God and the World in the Old Testament}, 229.
\end{itemize}
that the death wish has been taken literally, the speaker specifies exactly how he wishes to
die, and the speaker also discusses the intended outcomes of his death.\textsuperscript{31} The circumstances
of the biblical non-literal death wishes, however, are quite different (Gen 46:30; Exod 16:3;
Num 14:2; 1 Kg 19:4; Jon 4:3, 9; Jer 20:14-18). Within a non-literal death wish no plausible
or specific means of death is described, and the death wish is not motivated by any positive
or negative outcome (other than death).\textsuperscript{32} Additionally, these wishes are usually expressed as
a way to criticize those responsible for their dissatisfaction with their situation.\textsuperscript{33} Therefore,
the function is more in line with a call to action than an actual statement of one’s intention to
die.\textsuperscript{34} Yu then concludes with respect to Job 3 that the response of Job’s friends and God
suggests that his death wish should not be taken literally, but that it is a criticism of God and
his rule of creation.\textsuperscript{35}

Langton agrees that Job 3 should not be taken literally, but rather than a death wish,
she sees Job 3:1-10 as a satirical reversal of a Babylonian birth incantation.\textsuperscript{36} She argues that
just as Job attempted to control the future with pre-emptive sacrifices in Job 1:5, so too does
he attempt to control the future with his incantation in Job 3.\textsuperscript{37} Job’s wish for the doors of his
mother’s womb to be shut in Job 3:10 is an image from Babylonian birth incantations meant
to prevent difficult childbirth, and God takes up this image again in Job 38:8 with the sea

\textsuperscript{31} Ibid., 203.
\textsuperscript{32} Ibid., 208-9.
\textsuperscript{33} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{34} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{35} Ibid., 211-12.
\textsuperscript{36} Karen Langton, “Job’s Attempt to Regain Control: Traces of a Babylonian Birth Incantation in Job
\textsuperscript{37} Ibid., 467.
being shut in the womb.\textsuperscript{38} Additionally, Job’s continual wish for darkness parallels the Babylonian birth incantation’s description of unborn children who sit in darkness before seeing the “light of the sun.”\textsuperscript{39} Based on Job’s mention of returning to the womb in Job 1:21, this darkness he calls for might not be that of oblivion but, instead, that of the womb from which he wishes he had never emerged.\textsuperscript{40} Since in the Babylonian incantations it is necessary to name the gods or powers in order to gain control over them, Day and Night might instead be personifications of these beings.\textsuperscript{41} Langton sees Job 3 pushing the Babylonian birth incantation to the point of hyperbole. By placing an obviously impossible spell in the mouth of a deadly serious Job, the author is ridiculing the hubris of humanity in attempting to control fate.\textsuperscript{42}

While I agree with Langton that birth imagery is prominent in Job 3 and will again be prominent in the divine speeches, I follow Yu’s logic that the response of Job’s audience in the text gives a good indication of Job’s intentions.\textsuperscript{43} Within an inclusio structure, God, rather than the three friends, would be the audience whose response gives us a gauge of Job’s intention. As such, neither the non-literal death wish nor the reverse birth incantation seem to be the orienting paradigms for Job’s soliloquy. Perdue and Alter have each contributed to the persuasive argument that Job 3 and the divine speeches are oriented around a discussion of


\textsuperscript{39} Marten Stol, Birth in Babylonia and the Bible: Its Mediterranean Setting (Groningen: Styx, 2000), 10; see Langton, “Job’s Attempt to Regain Control,” 465-66.

\textsuperscript{40} Langton, “Job’s Attempt to Regain Control,” 466.

\textsuperscript{41} Ibid., 467.

\textsuperscript{42} Ibid., 464.

\textsuperscript{43} Yu, “To Comfort Job,” 202. Although Yu does not specifically address the real possibility that an audience might misinterpret a speaker’s intention, given that the audience in the Book of Job that I am discussing is God, I am proceeding with the belief that God has not completely misunderstood Job’s intention in his response.
God continually uses creation imagery in his response to Job, suggesting that this response is appropriate to the intention of Job’s speech. As such, it is most useful to classify Job 3 as partaking in a genre largely focused on creation.

Therefore, this chapter will proceed with the view that Job 3 is a counter-cosmic incantation, which makes creation the orienting paradigm for the inner inclusio. The specific parallels between Job 3 and the Genesis creation narrative will be addressed below, as well as God’s response to Job’s use of creation theology. Once I have established that the two sides of the inclusio frame are, in fact, in dialogue with one another and intentionally paralleled, I will discuss the role of הָרָע / נָשִׁיב and the theme of “fencing in” within the inner inclusio.

**Theme One: The Establishment of Creation**

**Background to Theme One: ANE Mythologies**

Fishbane’s analysis of Job 3 as a counter-cosmic incantation relies on a knowledge of both the allusions to the Genesis creation accounts, Gen 1:1-2:4 in particular, as well as a variety of ANE mythologies regarding anti-cosmological forces. Understanding the mythological background of Job’s soliloquy and some of the images he invokes strengthens Fishbane’s argument that Job 3 and Genesis 1:1-2:4 are closely related and intentionally oppositional. Through the following summary of some of the more prominent mythologies employed by Job and picked up by God in his response, we can see that Job 3 does not take place in a vacuum, but in a rich history of cosmological mythologies.

Fishbane discusses mythologies that centre upon Leviathan as an anti-cosmological force.45 Within the *Ba‘al Cycle*, Lotan, the Ugaritic Leviathan figure, and the Canaanite deity
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Yām are juxtaposed, since both are mythological beings related to the sea.\textsuperscript{46} This link has led scholars to recognize that Job 3:8 contains a play on words, since ים can be referring to both Day, דָיָם, and the sea deity, Yām.\textsuperscript{47} Fishbane notes a prominent image in ANE mythology of the Dragon swallowing the sun or moon, creating an eclipse and thereby plunging the world into darkness.\textsuperscript{48} This wordplay on ים, then, links to two mythological stories, as Leviathan is both related to Yām and to the darkening of the day.\textsuperscript{49} The difficulty surrounding this word play, however, is whether “those who curse ים” in Job 3:8 should be taken as “cursers of the day” or “cursers of the sea/ Yām.” Dhörme, for instance, sees this verse as describing cursers of the day who, like Job, curse the day of their birth, thereby representing another chaotic force within the text.\textsuperscript{50} Similarly, picking up on the occult ritual of rousing Leviathan in the same verse, Smick likens these cursers to the professional curser Balaam (Numbers 22-24).\textsuperscript{51} Pettys, following Pope, acknowledges the likelihood of this professional status of the cursers, but argues that these are most likely those who cursed Yām and defeated Leviathan so as to prevent chaos from reigning.\textsuperscript{52}

\textsuperscript{45} Fishbane, “Jeremiah IV 23-26 and Job III 3-13,” 158.
\textsuperscript{48} Fishbane, “Jeremiah IV 23-26 and Job III 3-13,” 159.
\textsuperscript{49} Ibid., 161.
\textsuperscript{50} Dhörme, A Commentary on the Book of Job, 29.
The most relevant ANE mythological cluster related to Leviathan as an anti-cosmological force in the Book of Job takes place within a context of a temporal cycle. This myth is common among many ANE communities such as the Sumerians, Babylonians, Egyptians, Hittites, and Israelites, with a general frame consisting of a chaos monster being subdued immediately prior to creation.\textsuperscript{53} However, this is a temporary containment, requiring the repeated battle and suppression at the same time in the cycle in order for regeneration to occur.\textsuperscript{54} This cycle may occur daily, as is the case with the Egyptian mythology regarding the Sun-God, Re, who must risk being swallowed by the dragon each night after providing light for the earth each day.\textsuperscript{55} This daily battle with chaos to maintain order was often accompanied by an incantation.\textsuperscript{56} Alternatively, this may be a yearly cycle with a New Year’s Day setting for the repeated battle between the chaos creatures, such as Leviathan, and the deity.\textsuperscript{57} In the Babylonian \textit{Enuma Elish}, Marduk defeats Tiamat.\textsuperscript{58} Within the Ugaritic literature, Ba’al battles with Yām as well as Nāḥār in order to restrain temporarily these beings so that regeneration may occur within the season.\textsuperscript{59} Ba’al’s triumph is only possible because of Kothar’s incantation over his weapons, thereby linking this mythology to the “cursers of Yām” in Job 3:8.

\textsuperscript{53} Fishbane, “Jeremiah IV 23-26 and Job III 3-13,” 159.
\textsuperscript{54} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{56} Pettys, “Let There Be Darkness,” 98.
\textsuperscript{57} Perdue, \textit{Wisdom & Creation}, 134.
\textsuperscript{59} Fishbane, “Jeremiah IV 23-26 and Job III 3-13,” 159.
Behemoth, which is mentioned in the divine speeches, has mythological roots that link it to Leviathan and Yām within the Book of Job. Perdue notes that as early as the First Dynasty in the Egyptian religion, at the enthronement of kings, the mythic battle between Horus and Seth would be re-enacted. In this myth, Horus, represented by the king, hunted Seth, the god of chaos who was in the form of a red hippopotamus. The defeat of the red hippopotamus by harpooning its nose, preventing it from submerging, symbolized the defeat of chaos so as to ensure prosperity in the new king’s kingdom. Therefore, Behemoth’s role in this mythology is similar to Leviathan and Yām in that it is an embodiment of chaos that needs to be subdued in order to bring about creation or recreation on some temporal cycle.

Taking this mythological cluster’s popularity into account, many scholars have argued that Job 1-2 takes place within this context. Pope, for instance, argues that in Job 1:6, the heavenly beings are presenting themselves to God on New Year’s Day so that God may assess what chaotic forces need to be contained to ensure recreation. If this interpretation is accurate, the Book of Job consciously places God in the role of the warrior who must battle chaos, making Job’s subsequent speech in Job 3 especially significant. By calling upon Leviathan and possibly Yām in his soliloquy, Job 3 is invoking the ANE mythologies regarding a cosmological battle between the deity and chaos. However, Job’s incantation aligns him with the forces of chaos rather than with God. This is a radically different version of Job than we saw in the prologue and it is also a radically different Old Testament character.
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than we see anywhere else in the canon. Even Ecclesiastes’ pessimism cannot compare to Job’s employment of chaos monsters in the attempted undoing of creation.

Now that Leviathan, Yām, and Behemoth’s roles as anti-cosmological beings in the ANE mythologies are understood, we can look at Fishbane’s correspondence between Job 3:1-13 and Genesis 1-2:4a to understand how Job attempts to undo creation.

The Establishment of Creation in the Inner *Inclusio*

As Langton discussed with respect to Babylonian birth incantations, magical incantations were often prefaced with an invocation of either the gods or cosmologies in order to harness their power.64 Fishbane states, “imitation of and assimilation to the prototypic event activates the power of origins. Magical acts, then, are efficacious both because of this imitation in form, and because of the analogy, in time and space, to the archetypal pattern.”65 Therefore, Job’s use of the Genesis creation account in his magical incantation is in keeping with this tradition. What is radically different in Job’s incantation, however, is that rather than invoking the cosmology, Job is consciously subverting it in an attempt to undo the creative act altogether and return the world back to primeval chaos. The following table is a reproduction of Fishbane’s comparison of Job 3:3-13 and Genesis 1:1-2:4a. Fishbane demonstrates through this chart that Job 3 consciously parallels the first Genesis creation account by systematically reversing God’s creative acts in order.
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Table 2: Comparison between Job 3:3-13 and Genesis 1:1-2:4a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Genesis 1:1-2:4a</th>
<th>Job 3:3-13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st day</td>
<td>Let there be light (Gen 1:3)</td>
<td>Let there be darkness (Job 3:4a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd day</td>
<td>God divided... between the water that is above the firmament (Gen 1:7)</td>
<td>Let God not seek it from above (Job 3:4b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th day</td>
<td>Let there be light to divide night... for days and years (Gen 1:14)</td>
<td>Let it not join in the days of the year; let it not come into the number of the months (Job 3:6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th day</td>
<td>And God created the great Tannînim (sea monsters) (Gen 1:21)</td>
<td>Let those curse it who curse Yām, those who are skilled to rouse Leviathan (Job 3:8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th day</td>
<td>Let us create man/Adam (Gen 1:26)</td>
<td>Why did I not die from the womb (mortality) (Job 3:11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th day</td>
<td>He rested...for in it he rested (Gen 2:2-3)</td>
<td>For now I would be laying down and quiet; I would be asleep; then I would be at rest (Job 3:13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pettys argues that Job intentionally omitted the third day from his reversal due to its relationship to gathering the waters into the seas (Gen 1:9-13). In Job 7:12, Job accuses God of guarding him as though he were the sea (Yām). Additionally, in 3:23 Job describes God’s “fencing him in” (יהיו), the term that God will pick up in 38:8 to describe his containment of the sea. Therefore, perhaps Job refuses to discuss the third day since it reflects God’s treatment of him. As such, Job moves beyond the Genesis creation account and into the realm of anti-cosmological mythologies to break free from the barriers he perceives around him.

Job not only utilizes the content of the creation accounts in his incantation, however, but also their structure. Job’s use of the phrase יִהְיֶה אֻגּוֹר (“let there be darkness”) in Job 3:4a
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instantly indicates to the audience that he is attempting to undo creation as it reverses God’s command, "let there be light," in Gen 1:3. He utters 16 jussives, 7 against “that day,” and 9 against “that night,” which might be an attempt to overpower the 15 jussives of God’s 8 creation commands in Genesis 1-2:4. The 6 negatives within these lines highlight Job’s anti-cosmological efforts as they mimic God’s 6 positive days of creation. Job shifts his seventh negative from רצוי to נוח as he envisions his own version of the Genesis Sabbath—death within the womb.

Job likens death and the grave to the Sabbath throughout his speech through the motif of rest. Perdue lists the 8 terms Job uses to describe his morbid version of rest: שֵׁנָה (Job 3:13, 17, 26), שֵׁשָׁה (Job 3:13), שֵׁשָׁה (Job 3:13, 26), שֵׁש (Job 3:18), and שֵׁש (Job 3:26). While Job does not use the term שֵׁש, he does use the term שֵׁנָה, which is paralleled with שֵׁש in Exod 20:11; 23:12, and Deut 5:14. While God’s version of Sabbath in Genesis is a rest that sustains life after a creative act, Job’s rest is one that ends life, providing the quiet and solitude of the tomb. In order to subvert this motif, God responds with images of life and sounds of joyful exultation (38:7). Alter describes Job 3 as a “relentless drilling inward toward that unbearable core of Job’s suffering,” whereas God expands Job’s view by showing him a panoramic vision of the life and pulsating energy of
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creation. In God’s vision there is no room for the rest of death or the silence of the tomb, there is only the sound of the wild animals and the joyous cries of the celestial beings. What is interesting to note, however, is that while Job is “drilling inward” in a focus on his own suffering, by invoking creation imagery as well as ANE mythology, Job opens the door for God to define not only in terms of his relationship to Job, but to all of creation.

Although Job does present an ordered reversal of the Priestly creation account, the motif of darkness is prominent throughout his entire soliloquy, a stark reversal of God’s introduction of light into the world. Job employs a variety of terms to describe the darkness he wishes to engulf: יָהָּשׁ ("darkness"), צֵלֶמות ("death’s shadow"), עַלְמָות ("thick cloud"), מֵאֵרֵי יוֹם ("heavy darkness of the underworld"), מִשְׁכַּת יָהָּשׁ ("bitterness of day"/ "eclipse"), and לִילָה ("night"). He accompanies this list with a variety of terms for light—only to blot them out with primordial darkness: אור ("daylight"), כוכבי ליל ("stars of twilight"), נַחַר ("light"), and יָם ("day"). If we take יָם in 3:8 to be “day” rather than יָם or "sea," the phrase “cursers of the day” introduces another level of this wish for blackness. The word for cursers in the phrase יָהָּשׁ/קְצָר בְּיוֹם is aurally linked to the word for light, אֵר, creating an echo between the agent of destruction and its intended victim, the day. Job intends to blot out the stars and the “eyelids of dawn” so as to engulf all of creation in primordial darkness (Job 3:9b). He calls upon the mythological Leviathan, the being of both eclipse and primordial chaos to aid him in this quest (Job 3:8).
God, acknowledging Job’s attempts, addresses him as one “darkening counsel (Job 38:2a),” a repetition of the root יֶחְשְׁכוּ used in Job’s command “let the stars be darkened” (יֶחְשֹׁךְ) (3:9a) as well as a link to Job’s many attempts to bring about the various forms of darkness listed in the previous paragraph. Rather than responding on the same level of incantation, God presents Job with a series of rhetorical questions aimed at altering his view of creation. Job attempted to blot out the constellations and eliminate all forms of light but God, instead, asks him whether he can even find the dwelling places of these dark and chaotic elements of creation. Job asked for gloom (צלמות) to engulf the day of his birth (Job 3:5a) but God’s questions signal that the gates of צלמות are inaccessible to human eyes (Job 38:17). Similarly, God picks up the phrase “eyelids of dawn” (עַפְעַפֵּי שָׇחַר) to undo Job’s curse of the night of his conception. Job 3:9 and Job 41:10 are the only two instances of this phrase in the Old Testament, again satisfying Wyckoff’s requirement for “low-frequency” repetitions. While Job used the phrase to bring about darkness and self-obliteration, God uses it to undermine his attempts at bringing about chaos. God likens Leviathan’s eyes to the “eyelids of dawn” in their brightness, and points out that no one dares rouse Leviathan. Therefore, through this repetition of Job’s phrase, God not only shows the futility in Job’s attempt to blot out the light of creation, but he also shows the inaccuracy of these mythologies. God need not combat Leviathan in order to bring about creation and recreation; he instead celebrates Leviathan as part of creation. In the Divine Speeches, Leviathan is not a
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threat to the light as the dragon of the eclipse, but instead possesses eyes as bright as the “eyelids of dawn.”

The intricate details of Job 3’s relationship to Genesis 1:1-2:4 and God’s response to this relationship are beyond the scope of this thesis. What is evident through this brief summary, however, is that Job employed the ANE mythologies regarding the forces of chaos in order to undo creation and return the world to primordial darkness. Job placed his incantation on the level of the battle between the deity and chaos, aligning himself with the chaos forces in an attempt to tip the scales and undo God’s creative act. In the discussion of the next theme, procreation, however, we see that God does not respond to Job on this same level, but instead uses Job’s imagery and terminology in order to reshape the conversation in parental rather than cosmic battle terms.

Theme Two: Procreation

Perhaps the best image to illustrate the subversive and transformative powers of the Divine Speeches is God’s use of the term הָרְשָׁע / שִׂיח. As I discussed in the previous chapter, in Job 1:10, the שִׂיח discussed God’s “fencing in” of Job as a blessing, which ensured Job’s continued piety. In Job 3:23, Job instead describes God’s act of הָרְשָׁע as a curse, as these divine “fences” are restrictive and imprison those within them. These opposing views of the same divine act seem to be mimicking the prologue’s six alternate uses of הָרְשָׁע to mean blessing and curse. If Pettys’ view of Job’s perception of himself as the chaotic sea is correct, Job’s use of הָרְשָׁע would be in keeping with the cosmological battle mythologies in Job 3. God, however, refuses to speak about הָרְשָׁע in terms of either a blessing or a curse, nor does he speak on the level of a battle with chaos. Instead, God completely reimagines his role in
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creation and his divine act of “fencing in” by using imagery of himself as a divine parent, nurturing his creation. This imagery is pushed past the boundaries of Job’s imagination, however, by placing an element of chaos, rather than humanity, in the role of the swaddled child. In Job 38:8, God employs the term יָרָך in the exact form Job uses it in 3:23 to describe his loving containment of the sea in swaddling bands. Brown writes, “Yahweh as a caring mother or midwife wraps chaos with a cumulus swaddling band (38:9b) [...] Yahweh nurtures as well as sets limits to chaos and conflict.”

This image is far from that of the mythological divine battle with the creatures of the sea, as well as the Genesis portrayal of humanity being the centre of God’s creation and attention. Instead of attempting to defeat or imprison the sea, Behemoth, and Leviathan, God makes room for these forces of chaos within creation and provides them with freedom within the confines he creates for them.

This is the radical new view of יָרָך / יָרָך that God provides: the divine “fencing in” of creation while still allowing for freedom to exist and thrive within the boundaries set. Each aspect of creation is given its own space while being prevented from infringing upon the space of others.

In fact, even as God describes his divine “fencing in” he is also exemplifying it. Just as God provided the śāṭān the freedom to test Job while also creating restrictions for his tests, so too has God allowed Job the freedom to voice his complaint while also ensuring that Job’s counter-cosmic incantation was reversed through God’s speech. Rather than banishing or punishing Job for his words, God allows him the freedom to speak while also protecting the rest of creation from his attempts to invoke chaos. This concept of “fencing in” while also
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allowing freedom is also in keeping with the literary structure that the author chose since, as previously mentioned, an *inclusio* is a much freer and less strictly structured literary device, allowing for many correspondences to be identified.

Throughout his soliloquy, Job portrays procreation in a solely negative light and attempts to employ mythic powers to bring about creation-wide sterility. Perdue relates Job’s use of the terms Night and Day in Job 3 to the Canaanite mythical personifications of Dusk and Dawn, who possess the power of conception and birth, respectively. In Canaanite mythology, these fertility deities created life within the womb, protected the unborn child, and ensured a safe birth. Job 3 might then be addressing Day and Night as personified fertility deities, naming them in order to gain control over them for the incantation. Perdue likens Job’s curse of sterility to that of Gen 3:17 in which God curses the soil, although God does not need to employ an incantation or deity personification in order to do so.

Job describes the womb as a grave from which he wishes never to have been born and he curses both the night of his conception and the day of his birth. He calls for clouds (עננה) and darkness to engulf and blot out the day of his birth and for the forces of chaos to curse the night of his conception. God responds by once again subverting the meaning of Job’s words. He completely undoes Job’s attempts to curse creation with sterility, showing him that he does not have the power or understanding to stop the vast level of procreation.
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occurring at every moment. In keeping with this, the clouds that Job commands to darken his
day (Job 3:5) are reimagined as a garment for the swaddled sea.  

God continues to reimagine Job’s language as procreation imagery through his
repetition in 39:2 of Job’s phrase "let it not come into the number of months" in Job 3:6. Although God shifts the word “number” from a noun to a verb, it is clear that he is
repeating the phrase intentionally in his phrase , this time relating it to procreation. While Job used this phrase to attempt to curse the night of his conception by erasing it from the calendar, God here uses these temporal measurements to discuss the pregnancy and birth of animals within creation.

Again, the purpose of this section is to prove that Job 3 and 38:1-42:6 do form an
inclusio, this time in relation to the theme of procreation, and that through each of these three themes the inclusio transforms Job and the audience’s understanding of creation and the term . Job sees creation and his existence as a prison and envisions the happiness of dying within the tomb of his mother’s belly. God expands and brightens Job’s dark image in order to show the necessity of the “fences” that contain creation as well as the vast freedom and pulsing life that exists throughout the animal kingdom. He shifts the conversation from one of cosmic battle to one of divine parentage in order to show Job that he is not being treated as a chaos monster in an ANE myth and that, in fact, God cherishes those forces of chaos instead of battling them.
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Theme Three: The Place of Humanity in Creation

God’s portrayal of the place of humanity in creation is a radical reversal not only of Job’s vision in Job 3, but also of the vision of humanity in the Genesis creation accounts. In Job 3, Job discusses egalitarianism among humans in death (Job 3:19). In both Genesis creation accounts, the creation of humanity is the pinnacle of God’s creative efforts. In Gen 1:26 God makes humankind in his image and in Gen 2:19 God creates every animal in order to find a mate for man and gives him dominion over all creatures.

In the Divine Speeches, however, God implies equality between humanity and the wild animals and, in the case of Behemoth and Leviathan, the superiority of certain creatures over humanity. This image of creation is radically non-anthropocentric with no indication that humanity is made in God’s image. God graces land “empty of human life” with the life-giving rains in Job 38:25-26 and repeatedly draws Job’s attention to the various habitats and regions that are inaccessible to humans, such as the gates of death, the dwelling place of light and darkness, the storehouse of snow and hail, and the homes of animals and mythical creatures. While Job sees humans as only being free from the voice of the taskmaster (בָּכָה) in the grave (Job 3:18), God sets the wild ass free so it does not have to hear the shouts of the taskmaster (Job 39:5-7).

Fretheim sees this reversal of the typical anthropocentric creation theologies mimicked in God’s parading of the animals before Job in the Divine Speeches just as he

---

96 Schifferdecker, Out of the Whirlwind, 87.
97 Ibid., 97.
98 Ibid., 90.
paraded the animals before Adam in Gen 2:7; 18-20 so that he may name them. Here, rather than giving Job dominion over these creatures and the power to name them, however, God is showing Job the wild nature of these animals and the inability of humanity to tame them. In fact, Leviathan, rather than Job or any human, is the “king over all that are proud,” only answering to God (Job 41:34).

In this chapter, I have used these three themes of the establishment of creation, procreation, and the place of humanity in creation from Schifferdecker to illustrate the fact that the Divine Speeches in Job 38:1-42:6 are a pointed reversal of Job 3’s counter-cosmic incantation. Job attempts to employ the anti-cosmological forces of Leviathan and Yām as well as a reverse cosmology in order to undo God’s creative act and return the world to primordial darkness and chaos. Job’s speech is in the context of cosmological battles between God and chaos in order to bring about creation. God, rather than discussing creation in these terms, shifts the image to the theme of procreation and portrays himself as a divine midwife and loving parent of the very forces Job tried to call into battle. He subverted Job’s views of the divine act of יָמָה / יָמָה by showing that the “fences” are not a curse, but rather a necessary aspect of creation in order to sustain the life of all creatures within the world. God does not simply focus in on one human and curse him with restrictive “fences” but, with the strict love of a parent, contains each aspect of creation in its domain, creating a place for everything.

This care for all aspects of creation, however, is radically different than Job and Genesis’ views of humanity in creation. Job saw all humanity on the same level in death, but did not realize that humanity did not hold the primary or solitary place in God’s heart.
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God’s vision of the world as presented in the Divine Speeches, all aspects of creation, even the chaotic elements, bring joy to their creator. In this way, God broadened Job’s view of creation and of the creator God. These radically altered views of creation, God’s relationship to Creation, and humanity’s role in creation are the transformations that occur within the inner inclusio.

Having looked at the inner inclusio of Job 3 and 38:1-42:6, we can now return to Wyckoff’s criteria in order to determine whether this can truly be categorized as a recognizable and intended literary inclusio. First, there are a large number of repeated elements both in terms of keywords, motifs such as light/dark and life/death, and themes such as the three discussed above and “fencing in.” Second, Table 1 above demonstrates that many of these repetitions are exact vocabulary parallels in addition to the many semantic equivalents and pointed reversals. Third, while the theme of creation and creation theology is present throughout the interior text as well as in the inner inclusio of the Book of Job, the keywords שַׁלְׁחָן (“fence in”) (Job 3:23; 38:8), תֵּאָתָּם, (“eyelids of dawn”) (Job 3:9; 41:10), and נֶעְנֶה (“taskmaster”) (Job 3:18; 39:7) are only present in the inclusio frames. These keywords, in addition to the other repetitions, demonstrate that while creation is prominent throughout the Book of Job, these specific ways of addressing creation are strictly confined to the inclusio texts. Fourth, both שְׁרוֹר and שֵׁרָה, are low-frequency terms throughout the Old Testament, greatly increasing the ability of an audience to recognize their repetition in the inclusio. Fifth, Job 3 and 38:1-42:6 are at the extremities of the poetic sections, only being enveloped by the outer inclusio of Job 1-2 and 42:7-17, thereby
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increasing recognition. And sixth, God’s constant use of Job’s words in completely new contexts and ways act as word-plays that shock the audience by taking a stock image or metaphor and turning it on its head. Therefore, based on Wyckoff’s six requirements for recognisability, it can be firmly argued that Job 3 and 38:1-42:6 form an intentional and highly recognizable inclusio frame.

Having argued for Job 1:1-2:13 and 42:7-17 as an outer inclusio and Job 3 and 38:1-42:6 as an inner inclusio, it is now possible to discuss what transformations have occurred through the author’s use of this double inclusio structure and how these transformations relate to the repeated keyword הָלַע/לִשֵׁן and theme of the divine “fencing in.”
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION

In this thesis, I have argued two major points. First, the Book of Job contains a double inclusio structure in which Job 1:1-2:13 and 42:7-17 create an outer inclusio and Job 3 and 38:1-42:6 create an inner inclusio. The literary function of this inclusio device is to act as a frame or “fence.” Secondly, through both the content and סינון/שון keyword of this double inclusio structure, the theme of the divine “fencing in” is repeatedly highlighted. Through the combination of this structure and content, the Joban author emphasizes the importance of the theme of “fencing in,” urging the reader to understand the exact definition of God’s divine סינון/שון. In the previous chapter, I fully described just what God’s definition of this divine “fencing in” is, and I will now address how Job’s newly acquired understanding of סינון/שון from the Divine Speeches informs his actions in the epilogue.

In Chapter 2, I mentioned that one of the key purposes of an inclusio is to signal a return to the beginning in order to highlight transformations.¹ These transformations not only indicate that the two sides of the inclusio are related, but also help to demonstrate how the characters and situations have changed throughout the course of the intervening passages. Since this thesis subscribes to a synchronic approach to the Book of Job, the observable transformations between the prologue and epilogue must be considered in light of the intervening passages; namely, the inner inclusio.

Kolarcik describes the Book of Job through the metaphor of a chick being hatched.² Job begins the book within a shell, fenced in and protected by God and is violently “hatched” into the greater, less comforting world. While this is a terrifying and painful experience, it

¹ See p. 14.
also broadens Job’s perspective of the world, creation, and God. Kolarcik finds evidence of this transformation through a comparison between the epilogue and prologue of the book. First, while in the prologue Job does not feast with his children, as evident from the fact that he and his wife were not present when his children were killed (Job 1:4-5, 19), in the epilogue Job eats bread in his house with his brothers, sisters, and all who knew him (Job 42:11). Second, in the prologue Job interacts with God through pre-emptive sacrifices for his children (Job 1:5), whereas in the epilogue he prays directly to God for his friends while they are told to make a burnt offering (Job 42:8). The third transformation is related, in that Job previously showed concern for his sons (Job 1:5), and later extends his concern to include his friends despite their previous accusations (Job 42:8-9). This transformation is less obvious, however, given that Job describes himself helping the needy in Job 29:12-17, although perhaps the difference here is related to prayer rather than good works. Fourth, while the prologue describes Job as “the greatest of all the people of the east” (Job 1:3), in the epilogue the focus shifts to the next generation, as his daughters are described as being more beautiful than any other women in all the land (Job 42:15). Finally, the prologue describes the tradition of the sons each throwing a feast in turns (Job 1:4), whereas in the epilogue Job breaks from tradition in providing his daughters with an inheritance along with their brothers (Job 42:15).

In each of these transformations, Job is not a symbol of righteousness, separate and above the community, but rather a fully involved member of his community and his family.

---

3 Ibid.
4 Ibid.
5 Ibid.
6 Ibid.
Kolarcik emphasizes that by being broken out of his shell, Job has become more fully human and his relationships and interactions with members of his family, community, and God most clearly demonstrate this transformation.\(^7\)

Given that the term יַסְבַּל /נַשָּׁב is not repeated in the epilogue, it might be suggested that it is not actually a significant keyword nor theme. I would argue, however, that based on the transformations just mentioned, the Joban concept of God’s “fencing in” is prominent throughout the epilogue and, therefore, throughout both inclusio frames. Having given God himself the opportunity to weigh in on the definition and function of the divine יַסְבַּל /נַשָּׁב, the author has provided the definitive word on the subject in the Divine Speeches. Therefore, in the epilogue Job does not need to voice another interpretation, or reiterate that יַסְבַּל /נַשָּׁב is God’s parental containment of creation while allowing each creature the freedom to exist and thrive. Instead, Job *exemplifies* this approach in his own parenting style and in his interactions with society. In light of the Divine Speeches, Davis suggests that God’s shift to the theme of procreation acts as an interpretive clue to the epilogue. Just as God celebrates the beauty of his creatures, so too does Job celebrate his daughters, whose beauty the narrator mentions (Job 42:15).\(^8\) Just as God praises the freedom of the wild animals and the freedom he bestows upon all aspects of creation, Job uses that same freedom to break from tradition and grant his daughters inheritances as well.\(^9\) Just as the waves “burst out of the womb” (Job 38:8), so too does Job burst forth from the “fences” that God took down and engage his new broader existence. God’s panoramic view of creation with its wild beauty and contained

\(^7\) Ibid.


freedom shows Job that the cosmos is not a strictly ordered world in which evil is always punished and good is always rewarded. In fact, much of the wild animals’ behaviour that God praises involves hunting in order to feed their children (Job 38:39-41). God’s created world is one in which all creatures are free to ensure the survival of their young with the knowledge that God will provide the “fences” necessary for the continuation of the created world, just as he does with the ostrich’s eggs (Job 39:14-17). God does not attempt to explain Job’s suffering or eradicate it in the Divine Speeches. Instead, he shows that each animal exists and continues to procreate in this world full of pain, death, hunter, and prey.

Just as Kolarcik’s chick that initially feared and hated the hatching experience and the cruel world now interacts with the world and thrives, so too does Job thrive in the world that he now understands. He accepts that there are “fences” around him, but sees them as protective and now looks for ways to thrive and “surge” within the protective barriers that God has created, just as the waves of the sea surge. Now Job interacts with those around him and feasts with family and friends. Now he names his daughters and takes pride in their beauty, granting them an inheritance. Now he prays to God rather than simply pre-emptively sacrificing to him.

God’s discussion of his parental love for all creatures shows Job that the continuation of creation through procreation regardless of the pain is the most important and rewarding part of life. This is the most subtle and significant transformation that occurs in the epilogue: Job in the prologue sits in the ash heap in silence and follows this silence with a chapter-long soliloquy about his wish to close up his mother’s womb and undo creation. In the epilogue, Job and his wife have chosen to procreate again, despite the pain that they have endured and might endure once again. As Schifferdecker points out, “[Job] isn’t just given children, he
and his wife decide to try it all over again.”

He understands the protection of God’s around him and is willing to take the risks necessary to broaden that contained world, push the boundaries of his comfort, and participate in God’s creation.

When considering the transformations of the definitions of in each inclusio, separately, the author’s literary skill in weaving the theme of “fencing in” into the Book of Job is readily apparent. In the outer inclusio, the writing style is that of a didactic folktale. In the world of the didactic tale, truth is “stable and unambiguous,” meant to provide a better understanding of life by presenting general morals and models to emulate. As such, within the outer inclusio, the dialogues are not of a poetic nature, but are straightforward and largely act as an explanation for the actions of the characters. The author here tells the audience of Job’s piety and shows us examples of his pious actions, but poetic images and literary motifs are not at the forefront of the text. In such a setting, then, the outer inclusio’s discussion of is perfectly understandable. The prologue presents in the mouth of the šāṭān as he argues that Job’s pious words and actions are a result of God’s “fencing in.” The suggestion here is that Job’s is a rote piety, subscribing to a belief in Divine Retribution. The epilogue, then, counters this claim by showing Job in a radical new relationship with God. Job does not simply state that he was wrong or that God is good (although I do discuss what he does say below), but he shows his new understanding in a way that allows him to be a model of the loving parenthood that God has called for. In a literary section focused on the physicality of alternating scenes and straightforward prose text to describe deep theological


12 See p. 86-87.
concepts, Job’s actions in the epilogue follow suit by providing a simple, physical example of the complex concept of the divine שׂאול/שׁאול.

Similarly, God’s discussion of שׁאול/שׁאול in the Divine Speeches is fitting considering Job’s initial presentation of the term as well as the literary context of the inclusio. In Job 3, Job paints a picture of a claustrophobic imprisonment in which God acts as an ever-watchful jailer, forcing humanity into the life of a captive. Job’s language here is incredibly poetic as he searches for new words and ways to express the darkness and freedom for which he longs. God’s presentation of שׁאול/שׁאול, then, stands in stark contrast to Job’s. While Job sees שׂאול/שׂאול as a prison, God describes— in just as poetic and evocative language—the freedom of all creatures in his creation with images of animals running and soaring and meteorological forces brewing and swirling overhead. Rather than the image of a human waiting to die in the prison of God’s “fences,” God paints the portrait of the wild waves surging within them. This image of שׁאול/שׁאול is not one that would make sense had it been in response to the שָׁטָן’s assertion that God’s “fences” are protective and meant to ensure piety. This image that God creates of שׁאול/שׁאול is meant to counteract directly Job’s image of God’s imprisoning fences, while also providing Job with the understanding possible to act in the epilogue in a way that directly contradicts the שָׁטָן’s definition of שׁאול/שׁאול.

It is due to this new understanding of שׁאול/שׁאול that Job says in Job 42:6

I follow Patrick in translating this line “Therefore I recant and change my mind concerning dust and ashes.”13 Andersen connects the “dust and ashes” to Abraham’s discussion of humanity’s created nature in Gen 18:27 as well as to the dust that

Adam and Eve were created from and to which they will return. Therefore, in changing his mind concerning dust and ashes, Job is telling God that he is reconsidering humanity’s role in creation in general. Job, who previously considered humanity as prisoners of God’s שׂד and now understands that they are not the only focus of creation, nor are they God’s enemy. Instead, humans are one aspect of the vast created world. This is the shift in understanding that makes Job’s physical embodiment of שׂד in the epilogue possible. Therefore, while the Book of Job begins and ends with a seemingly simple didactic folktale, the transformations that have occurred in the character of Job and in the audience’s understanding of God’s role in creation are immense.

It is important to include one final note on the double inclusio structure in the Book of Job and its interpretive implications. In Chapter 3, I discussed that the Joban frame narrative—and, by extension, the inner inclusio as well—is unique in that it is neither the most important section, nor any less important than the other sections of the text. As such, while I have focused on the double inclusio texts and their relationship to the divine “fencing in,” more work is necessary in order to understand if and how the interior poetic sections of the Book of Job contribute to this theme as well. I am by no means arguing that the outer inclusios are the only significant texts for interpreting the Book of Job, and while I do see the book as a whole as having a double frame structure, I do not lump the interior chapters together as a single, less significant, portion. This is why I have opted out of viewing the entire book as a chiastic structure, as I believe that the interior poetic sections should each be addressed in their own right based on their individual genres.

By viewing the entire Book of Job through a synchronic lens, however, interpretive clues are perceptible in the beginning and end of the text. This is especially true given the author’s use of an *inclusio*, a literary device that in itself forces the reader to notice transformations between its two frames. It is these transformations that highlight not only the importance of the theme of “fencing in,” but also provide the reader with an ultimate model in the epilogue of how we should incorporate this new understanding of God’s שָׁנוּשׁ/שָׁנוּשִׁי into our own lives.
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