# Introduction

Biblical scholars have published a great deal of literature on the Book of Job in recent years.[1] The problems inherent in the present arrangement of the book,[2] difficulties of translation arising from the frequent use of words with uncertain meanings, and the study of the presentation of the subject matter in itself, to name a few areas of interest, continue to attract the interest of both teacher and student alike.

One area of research, which is recently receiving attention, focuses on the possibility that Job and his friends actually respond to one another through their speeches despite a fairly widespread scholarly consensus to the contrary. This consensus is not too surprising as there is no clear point-by-point rebuttal in the speeches. Nor is there an obvious argument which is then resolved in the course of the debate, although W. A. Irwin has argued otherwise.[3] In the context of his rejection of Irwin's

---

[1] For a review of some of the publications on Job see R. J. Williams, "Current Trends in the Study of the Book of Job" in *Studies in the Book of Job* (Studies in Religion Supplements; Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University, 1985) 1-27.

[2] E.g., the dislocations of the third cycle of speeches, the purpose of the Yahweh speeches, and the integrity of the Elihu speeches.

[3] W. A. Irwin, "An Examination of the Progress of Thought in the Dialogue of Job,' *JR* 13 (1933) 150–64. Briefly, Irwin argues that in response to the friends' advice to repent, Job, who is convinced of his innocence, is driven to seek one who will represent him before God (19:23–29). Herein Irwin finds the climax to the book and the solution to the problem of Job's suffering. The major problem with Irwin's thesis is that the idea of a redeemer is a fleeting hope for Job which is dropped in favor of Job himself standing before God (23:3–7).

position, M. H. Pope speaks against the viewpoint that the speeches of Job and his friends respond to each other:

> Actually it is scarcely appropriate to call this section of the book a dialogue. There is not here the give-and-take of philosophical disputation aimed at the advancement of understanding and truth. Rather each side has a partisan point of view which is reiterated ad nauseam in long speeches. There is no real movement in the argument.[4]

The three standard works on wisdom literature in the OT present a similar argument. Von Rad writes:

> As they listen to each other, both partners in the dialogues scarcely have more than very loose connections with individual, characteristic hypotheses. In their own train of thought they do not adhere closely to that of the other. This means that, on one hand, the argument often fails to advance and that, on the other, the intellectual ground covered becomes more and more extensive. The speeches are repetitive and, to a certain extent, move forward only in a circular fashion.'

R. B. Y. Scott comments:

> Accusers and accused restate their respective positions with increasing vehemence, making little or no attempt to meet the arguments of their opponents.[6]

And J. L. Crenshaw advocates:

> . . . the various responses frequently ignore the addresses they purport to answer, giving the impression that Job and the friends talk past one another.'

In agreement with these scholars, the speeches do create a circular argument in which both sides consistently reiterate their own particular point of view. Thus it would appear at first that no effort was expended by the writer to engage the speakers in at least some measure of a response to each other. Nevertheless, every speech of the Book of Job is prefaced

[4] M. H. Pope, *Job* (AB 15; 3d ed.; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1973) lxxv.

[5] G. von Rad, *Wisdom in Israel* (London: SCM, 1972) 210.

[6] R. B. Y. Scott, The Way of *Wisdom in the Old Testament* (New York: Macmillan, 1971) 154.

[7] J. L. Crenshaw, *Old Testament* Wisdom: *An Introduction* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1981) 106.

with a brief statement which identifies the speaker and appears to mark the speech as a response to what was previously said.8 In chaps. 4-26 these statements are constant in form and consist of two verbs, *ʿānâ* ("to answer") followed by *ʾāmar* ("to say") with the "consecutive" **waw** prefixed to them both. These verbs frame the name of the speaker and in the case of the friends, their tribe as well. The pattern remains much the same for the Elihu speeches, the Yahweh speeches and Job's replies to God's part in the book.9

Job's complaint of chap. 3, however, is introduced with a relatively lengthy narrator's comment, "After this Job opened his mouth and cursed his day. And Job answered and said" (vv 1–2). The first verse forms a link with the prologue through the phrase "after this." Yet the second verse, "And Job answered and said," is curious, for it is written in 2:13 that no one spoke to Job. On this basis, and with the support of only extra-biblical references from Ugaritic writings, Fohrer concludes that

---

[8] On one occasion this type of statement announces the conclusion to Yahweh's first speech (40:1).

[9] In Elihu's last speech (36:1), the pattern is broken with the substitution of the verb *yāśap* ("to continue") for *ʿānâ,* perhaps to acknowledge that this speech is the fourth of a series. A minor variation occurs in 32:6; 34:1; 35:1. In his first speech (32:6), Elihu's father's name and tribe are listed alongside of the speaker's name, whereas in the latter two references only Elihu's name is recorded with the announcement of his speech. The statement prefacing the Yahweh speeches is identical in 38:1 and 40:6 and is similar to the corresponding verses of chaps. 4-26, yet more detailed as it indicates the addressee as well as the location from which God speaks. Similarly, in Job's replies (40:3; 42:1), the verbs *ʿānâ* and *ʾāmar* are used along with the name Yahweh which identifies the person addressed. The major exception to the above similarities is 27:1 and 29:1 where it is written, "And Job continued with his *māšāl* ("discourse") and said." The idea of continuity is probably expressed here as chaps. 27 and 29 immediately follow Job's speech of chap. 26 (see the assessment of 36:1 above). Also the verb *ʿānâ* is not present because chaps. 27 and 29 are intended for the court and not primarily as a response to the friends in particular. The term *māšāl* is used here of Job's oath to set it apart from his previous disputation speeches (cf. Habel, **The Book** *of Job* [OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1985] 379). The verbs *ʿānâ* and *ʾāmar* (in this sequence) are also used consistently for the Satan in his exchange with God in the prologue (1:7b, 9; 2:2b), whereas the verb *ʾāmar* is used solely for God (1:7a, 8, 12; 2:2a, 3, 6). On two occasions (1:12; 2:6) God's directives issued to the Satan could be read as replies to his requests. In this context, one might have expected to see the verb *ʿānâ* used in conjunction with *ʾāmar* as with the Satan. Perhaps *ʾāmar* is used alone to ensure that God is seen as the initiator of the dialogue with the Satan and that God is understood as responsible for what is about to happen to Job. As the Satan is presented as a respondent, he appears less accountable for Job's forthcoming misery.

the statement "And he answered and said" is simply a conventional intro-
duction to a speech.[10] A survey of OT texts, however, reveals that the verbs
'ānâ and 'āmar are commonly used to introduce direct speech in response
to conversation (e.g., Exod 4:1; Num 11:28; Deut 1:14; Josh 7:20).[11]

In addition, on at least three occasions (Gen 31:36; 1 Kgs 13:6; 1 Chr
12:18) these two verbs are used to introduce direct speech not in reply
to a spoken word but in response to an action or event. In 1 Kgs 13:1–6,
for example, there is recorded an incident involving a man who prophesied
against the altar at Bethel in the presence of Jeroboam. The king, on
ordering the man's arrest, put out his hand against him, and as a result
it is recorded that his hand was stricken. In response to this sudden ailment,
Jeroboam asks that his hand be healed. Interestingly enough, this request
is introduced with the statement, "And the king answered and said" (1 Kgs
13:6). The second example concerns David's response to the warriors who
came to join his ranks (1 Chr 12:17–18). According to this passage, David
is the first to speak when he goes to meet with some troops. Here he
issues a warning introduced with the words, "and he answered and said."

The remaining example is from Gen 31:36, where Jacob is said to have
become angry presumably as a result of Laban's search of Jacob's belong-
ings for his family gods. Consequently, the statement, "And Jacob answered
and said," which introduces his angry outburst (v 36), probably should
be understood as a reaction to Laban's invasion of his privacy and to the
fact that he was pursued. In the light of these three passages where the
clause, "And he answered and said," is used in response not to a spoken
word but to an action or event, it appears that Job 3:2 would best be
understood as introducing a response to: (a) his friends' expressions of
solidarity with him (2:12–13) and (b) the severity of his suffering.

In sum, the purpose of this formula ("And he answered and said") in
the Book of Job is threefold: (a) it indicates the beginning of a new speech
except on one occasion where it sets off the conclusion to a speech (40:1);
(b) it identifies the speaker; and (c) it marks the speech as a response
to the previous speaker's discourse or to a preceding action or event as

---

[10] G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob* (KAT 16; Giitersloh: Giitersloher, 1963) 115. The Ugaritic
texts Fohrer cites are: 51, II,20; IV,30; 129,16; and 'nt (pl. IX) 11,17.

[11] Cf. R. L. Harris *et al, Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament* (Chicago: Moody,
1980) 2. 681. The verb 'ānâ may also be used on its own to mark a response to direct
speech (e.g., Gen 23:5; Exod 19:8; Num 32:31; Judg 18:14). The same is true for 'āmar
*(e.g.,* 2 Sam 1:4; 1 Kgs 11:22; 2 Kgs 1:8; 2:13).

in the case of 3:1–2.[12] Thus the narrator's line at the beginning of each speech gives some warrant to reading the speeches primarily as a response to what was previously said. The fact that several scholars argue against such a possibility suggests that if the speeches do respond to one another it must be in a subtle, indirect and therefore easily overlooked manner. Such a feature might be part of the rhetorical aesthetic and intended not to advance any overall argument, but rather to create a bickering type of atmosphere for the debate in which one speaker would be understood as adopting a word, phrase or idea from a previous speaker in order to exploit it for his own purposes. Unfortunately, the consensus that there is no substantial relationship between the speeches of Job and his friends has, on the whole, discouraged scholars from researching the possibility of connections based on shared words, roots and recurrent themes. At the same time, some scholars have recently supported the idea that the speeches do, at least to some degree, interrelate. A critical review of their work is necessary to evaluate the quality of literature published on this subject. Of special interest are the flaws in the research which, when isolated, will hopefully be avoided in this work.

R. Gordis pursued the possibility of connections between the speeches in his illuminating chapter on the use of quotations in Job in his book, *The Book of God and* Man: *A Study of Job.*[13] The passages Gordis identifies as quotations are not marked as such but, as he observes, stand out from their context by virtue of providing a variant opinion or change in mood. Consequently, Gordis notes that a verb of speaking (e.g., "you said") or thinking (e.g., "I thought") needs to be supplied in the translation for purposes of clarity. Moreover, Gordis stresses that they are not word-for-word citations but are paraphrases of a previous speaker's thoughts.

Of the several kinds of quotations Gordis isolates in Job, the citation from the argument of an opponent is of particular interest. The most striking evidence of this kind put forward by Gordis is from the latter half of Job's seventh speech (21:19–34).[14] Three of his most astute obser-

---

[12] In recognition of the importance of "c" in particular to the argument such verses will be designated as an "announcement of response." As this type of verse belongs to the narrator, it will not be considered part of the introduction to a speech.

[13] R. Gordis, *The Book of God and* Man: *A Study* of *Job* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1965) 169-89. See also R. Gordis, "Virtual Quotations in Job, Sumer and Qurnran,' VT 31 (1981) 410–27.

[14] Gordis, *The* Book *of God* and Man, 185-186.

vations will be mentioned. First, Gordis notes that in 21:19a Job quotes the orthodox view of his friends that children are punished for the sins of their father (see 5:4; 18:12; 20:10) so as to reject it in 21:19b–21. Second, as Gordis points out, the friends have argued that God's wisdom is beyond the reach of humanity and therefore his treatment of humanity is above criticism (4:17; 11:6–12; 15:14, 18). Gordis, then, observes that Job quotes this view in 21:22 only to criticize it with his belief that God treats humanity poorly (21:23–26). Third, this scholar also presents the rhetorical question of 21:28, which assumes that the wealthy sinner will eventually experience his or her demise, as a citation based on the friends' teaching (see 5:3–7; 8:22; 11:20; 15:32–35; 18:5–21; 20:26) which is then refuted in vv 29-33. Gordis' work on quotations not only clarifies the meaning of obscure passages but also builds support for the idea that the speeches do interact with one another in a manner that is often unrecognized.

In addition, two dissertations which deal with the use of irony in Job make a significant contribution toward an appreciation of the connections between the speeches at a deeper level. The first, *A Study of* Irony *in the Book of Job*,[15] written by W. J. A. Power, explores the incidence of different types of irony in Job. Of the three types of irony discussed in this dissertation, Power's classification of "verbal irony," defined as that in which the author creates a meaning opposite to the literal sense, is most relevant to this study.[16] Within this category Power includes sarcasm, hyperbole and its opposite, understatement, as well as what he calls "ironic interplay."' This latter term Power uses to describe the various ironic connections which he argues exist between the speeches.

Power's most convincing evidence for ironic interplay may be seen in those cases in which he isolates a specific word shared by two passages and draws out the implications of his finding. The use of the verb ḥānan in 9:15b as a sarcastic response to Bildad's recommendation that Job appeal for mercy (ḥānan) to Shaddai (8:5b) is an example of Power's better

---

[15] W. J. A. Power, *A Study of Irony* in *the Book of Job* (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Toronto, 1961).

[16] The remaining two types of irony discussed by Power are: ( I) "Socratic irony" or feigned ignorance, a method of instruction used especially by the Greek philosopher, Socrates; and (2) "irony of events" in which the audience alone is made privy to information important for a character's true understanding of his or her situation (Power, *A Study of Irony in the Book of Job,* 20–21, 24-26).

[17] Power, *A Study of Irony in the Book of Job,* 22, 30.

evidence!* All too often, however, Power's evidence is rather weak. Further, the vague manner in which he sometimes presents his evidence does not strengthen his case.

In two texts separated by a number of speeches, for example, Power simply cites Bildad's question, "Can papyrus grow without marsh?" (8:11a), alongside of Job's statement, "He uproots my hope as a tree" (19:10b), which he identifies as a response. Beyond the shared image of plant life devoid of the necessary growing conditions, there is nothing obvious in these texts which indicates that the latter should be interpreted as a reply to the former. Yet Power makes no attempt to explain why 19:10b should be read as a response to 8:11a, nor does he state how this so-called response might be understood as ironic. In spite of such difficulties in many of his examples, Power's dissertation, on the whole, alerts the reader to the possibility that the speeches might in, in fact, respond to one another.

The second dissertation was written by J. C. Holbert[19] under the direction of Power. The focus of this work is on the incidence of formal and verbal irony which may be found in those passages influenced by the genre of complaint **(Klage).** Of special interest is the attention Holbert gives to "verbal irony" which he defines as:

> **. . .** a description of those instances where words and/or phrases occur in the mouths of different participants in the book to comment, usually ironically, on one of the other participant's use of the same word and/or phrase.[20]

Holbert makes an effort to concentrate on repeated words and phrases which are used in different speeches and pursues the significance of these connections in greater detail than Power did in his earlier study. Further, he does not argue every case with equal force but admits when an example may be less clear and inconclusive. The result of Holbert's attention is an argument which is generally more precise and convincing than that of Power. Holbert's treatment of the "verbal ironies" he finds in 4:7-11 of Eliphaz's speech is representative of his better evidence. He highlights

---

**18** Power, ***A Study of Irony in the Book of*** *Job, 65.*

**19** J. C. Holbert, *The* **Function and Significance of** *the* **"Klage" in the Book of "Job" with Special Reference to** *the* **Incidence of Formal and Verbal Irony** (Ph.D. Dissertation: Southern Methodist University, 1975).

**20** Holbert, ***The Function and Significance of*** *the* **"Klage," v.**

four words, three of which are significant from the standpoint of Job's complaint of chap. 3 and one which may be understood as ironic from the perspective of the prologue. [21] For Holbert these "ironies" indicate that Eliphaz has already condemned Job as a wicked person.[22] Nevertheless, there remain several examples of rather unconvincing evidence which could be presented in this review. One, however, will suffice. From 9:17–18 Holbert isolates the word for "storm" ($\acute{s}\check{e}\,{}^{\varsigma}\bar{a}r\hat{a}$) and relates it to Eliphaz's vision of 4:12–17 where this word is used with the meaning of "hair" (4:15b). The irony which Holbert sees in this supposed connection is that Eliphaz's "hair" which a "breeze" ($r\hat{u}a\d{h}$) has stood up on end has, in his words, "become God's 'awful storm.'"[23] This example is unconvincing as it is based on a connection between a word used in these two texts in a vastly different way. It is highly unlikely that the reference to a "storm" was even subtly intended to remind the reader of Eliphaz's "hair" upraised as a fearful reaction to a vision.

A further point might be raised over the understanding of "verbal irony" or "ironic interplay" as used in both Power's and Holbert's dissertations. Power speaks of this type of irony in terms of an intended meaning which is opposite to the literal sense. Similarly, Holbert clarifies in his conclusion that "verbal irony" exists in those "... instances where words and phrases mean something other than an obvious reading would yield."[24] Irony, understood in this fashion, is defensible yet prone to a certain amount of ambiguity. It is not altogether clear how several of the examples presented, especially by Holbert, may be understood as ironic because a meaning other than an "obvious" sense is a vague concept; and, as he concedes in his definition of "verbal irony," his purpose is to explore those repetitions which comment "usually ironically" on a previous speaker's words.[25] Although irony is a critical feature of Job, not every example

---

[21] The words or roots which Holbert *(The Function and Significance of the "Klage,"* **120-23)** treats as significant are: *'dbad,* "to perish" (used by Job in 3:3a and by Eliphaz in 4:7a, 9a, 11a), *'āmāl,* "trouble, misery" (used by Job in 3:10b and zoa, by Eliphaz in 4:8b), *ša'ăgât,* "groaning, roaring" (used by Job in 3:24b, and by Eliphaz in 4:10a), and *yāšār,* "upright" (used of Job in 1:8 and 2:3 of the prologue, and by Eliphaz in 4:7b).

[22] Yet in agreement with N. C. Habel *(The Book of job* [1985] *121)* Eliphaz is probably best understood as a friend rather than an accuser at this point in the book. Perhaps these indirect connections would be more accurately approached as doubts Eliphaz harbors concerning the moral character of Job which are, then, clearly stated later in the dispute.

[23] Holbert, *The Function and Significance of the 'Klage,"* 164–65.

[24] Holbert, *The Function and Significance of the "Klage,"* 281.

[25] Holbert, *The Function and Significance of the "Klage," v,*

of an interplay between speeches may be understood as ironic. Thus, in this study, proposals for connections between speeches will be examined simply as responses but without reference to irony unless it is obvious and requires comment.

Two articles published in Hebrew by N. Klaus are of direct interest for this study.26 His aim, as stated in the first article, is to discover "associative-verbal connections" which link the various speeches together.27 In these two articles, Klaus focuses on the speeches of the first cycle (chaps. 4-14). Both articles follow the same format. In terms of method, Klaus lays out the two related texts with the shared lexicographical items highlighted. Following this display, Klaus usually makes a brief comment on his interpretation of the correspondence, although on occasion he simply makes an observation of how the word(s) is used in each context and leaves the reader to draw his or her own conclusions. Many of Klaus' examples of responses are convincing28 but his strong examples are, on the whole, weakened by the presence of less convincing proposals which are given equal weight. In general, Klaus' arguments for a response based on word repetition are strongest, but there are several instances where his argument appears forced. Not every incidence of word repetition should be understood as purposeful. After all, the vocabulary of any given language is finite. Consequently, certain words may be repeated in different speeches as a matter of course. Two examples from Klaus' work illustrate this point. After highlighting the word *rûaḥ* from 4:15a and 7:7a, Klaus comments:

> Job uses an identical word that Eliphaz used in the description of his vision of the night. In both cases the word *rûaḥ* is given two meanings: "wind" (7:7a) and "spirit" (4:15a).29

---

26 I express my gratitude to Anna Urowitz who translated N. Klaus' first article, "Between Job and His Friends," **Beth Mikra 31** (1985/86) **152-68,** and to Ahouva Shulman for the translation of "Joban Parallels to Job," **Beth Mikra 32** (1986/87) **45-56.**

27 Klaus, "Between Job and His Friends," 153.

28 A sample of Klaus' better proposals might include: (a) the linkage of the word *ṣēl* ("shadow") which is given to Bildad in 8:9b after this word is used by Job in 7:2a (Klaus, "Between Job and His Friends," 162); (b) Zophar's use of the verb *šûb* ("to hinder, stop") in 11:10b which follows from 9:12a where this verb is put on Job's lips (Klaus, "Joban Parallels to Job," 47); and (c) Zophar's quip concerning a *pere'* ("wild donkey," 11:12b) which relates to Job's query about a *pere'* in 6:5a (Klaus, "Joban Parallels to Job," 48).

29 Klaus, "Between Job and His Friends," 159.

In this example, Klaus only informs the reader how the word is used in the context of each speech and falls short of explaining how he under-stands this word might function as a response to Job. Above all, the fact that this word is used with two different meanings in two very different contexts makes it quite unlikely that an interplay was ever intended. It is more logical to assume that this occurrence is simply a case of a common word coincidentally used in two successive speeches.

A second example of a weak proposal based on word repetition involves the expression *mî-yittēn ("0* that") as it occurs in 6:8a and 11:5a. On this correspondence, Klaus comments: "Zophar answers the challenge and says to him: 'May God grant your request, and then you will realize that your punishment is very small compared to your sin.'"[30] Klaus' explanation makes some sense but one is hesitant to ascribe such signifi-cance to two distant texts which are linked only by the words *mî-yitten.* If such a response was intentionally built into the text, then one would expect a better clue such as a partial quotation or a paraphrase which would link these two passages together in a more obvious manner. Previously, it was stated that the connections between the speeches are typically subtle, indirect and therefore easily overlooked. Yet there must be limits to this subtlety, especially when dealing with passages which are separated by intervening speeches.

Finally, in his most recent commentary on the Book of Job, N. C. Habel gives attention to the interrelationships between the speeches themselves and the links between the speeches and the prologue and epilogue, all of which he refers to as "literary connections." On this subject Habel writes:

> Contrary to the opinion of some scholars, the book of Job is not a disparate collection of narration and speech materials with relatively little internal cohesion or connection. We have argued above that the underlying narrative plot of Job provides an integrating framework for the book as a whole. To this argument can be added evidence from the author's technique of verbal allusion and motif repetition. The artist's way of integrating materials does not reflect a pedantic, point-for-point correspondence between argument and rebuttal, or between challenge and response. The approach is tangential; verbal associations are made by indirect allusion; and literary connections are often playful.[31]

[30] Klaus, "Joban Parallels to Job," 47.
[31] Habel, *The* Book *of Job* (1985) 50–51.

As Habel observes, the speeches do not follow the format of a modern debate where a speaker will quote systematically from an opponent to refute his or her arguments. Rather in this work subtlety and indirection are the norm for response, and for this reason the connections are easily and often overlooked. Unlike Power's and Holbert's sometimes loose and consequently weak examples of ironic interplay, Habel's examples are for the most part based on clear word repetition which carry more weight. From the many instances presented by Habel, the table of the various connections between the latter half of Zophar's first speech (11:13–20) and Job's previous speeches adequately illustrates his position.[32] In his subsequent section entitled, "Message in Context," Habel comments on the significance of these connections.[33] A typical example of Habel's approach is his observation concerning Zophar's assurance that Job will be able to lift (*nāśā'*) his face if he will turn to God (11:15a). In Habel's view, this comment stems from Job's previous complaint that he is not able to lift (n&i') his head due to his shame (10:15b).[34]

Habel's sensitivity to the presence of such connections and sound judgment, evident from his explication of their significance, makes his commentary the most solid work in this area of research. Although his verbal associations are not always accepted, and the implications he draws from accepted associations are not necessarily affirmed, his outlook and approach remain a positive influence on this study.

Over and above the manner in which the published findings have confirmed a suspicion of subtle links between the speeches themselves, and between the speeches and the narrative portions of the book, this review has isolated three of the pitfalls associated with this type of research. First, unless the evidence for a response is particularly strong an appeal to texts separated by one or more speeches should be avoided. Second, some proposals for a connection between texts will be clearer and stronger than others. If all the evidence is argued for with equal force, the less convincing examples will weaken the overall argument. In order to build the strongest possible argument, it is expedient to present the most convincing evidence first and to follow with examples which are less

---

[32] Habel, *The* Book *of Job* (1985) 205–6.
[33] Habel, *The* Book *of Job* (1985) 206–11.
[34] Habel, *The* Book *of Job* (1985) 210.

convincing on their own.[35] If a convincing case can be built on the strength of the clearest evidence, then it follows that the less obvious proposals might also be conceivable as part of the overall pattern of responses. Third, one must remain open to the possibility that a word repetition between two speeches may simply be coincidental. After all, every language has a limited vocabulary at a given time and biblical Hebrew has a relatively restricted number of words. Further, if a word occurs frequently throughout the disputation, then it is unlikely that a convincing case can be made for a specific connection unless it is one of two or more words which together form the response.[36]

In addition, one must guard against reading too much into a vague correspondence which requires an excessively complicated and unnatural explanation. One may argue that the poet purposefully and artfully composed each speech in view of what precedes it, but the significance of a specific response should be such that an alert reader, who is open to this possibility, would be able to make sense out of them in a straightforward manner.

As can be seen from the work of those scholars who tie the speeches together, connections are not restricted to any one subsection of the speeches. To identify and discuss the significance of every conceivable connection within the Book of Job would be an exhausting task and lies beyond the scope of this study. At the outset the researcher must make a choice as to what portions of the book will be covered. One could pursue the connections which might be uncovered within a major section of the book such as the first cycle of speeches, or one could examine a specific portion of each speech from the three cycles for the possibility of a response to previous texts. If the speeches do in fact show some measure of a response to each other, then it is conceivable that developments along these lines may present themselves in an approach which examines a larger

---

[35] If none of the examples from a given passage stands out as stronger than the others, then in this study they will be approached in sequential order.

[36] For this reason certain word repetitions will be rejected as insignificant and recorded as such in the footnotes. For the information of the reader, whenever word repetition is cited as evidence for a response, a note will follow indicating how often a word occurs in Job. Unless there is good reason to relate a word with an earlier occurrence of the same word separated by one or more speeches, the repetition will be treated as insignificant. However, as any words which occur in earlier chapters could, for argument's sake, affect the significance of a later occurrence of that word, these earlier references will be cited by chapter and verse.

portion of the book as opposed to one which is restricted to one particular cycle of speeches. With this possibility in mind, the focus of this research will be on a specific subsection from the speeches of chaps. 4-24.

In my preliminary research, several instances were observed where the opening lines of one speech related to something the speaker of the immediately preceding speech said in his opening lines. Job's wish that the friends would be "silent" (ḥāraš, 13:5a), for example, relates to Zophar's inference that Job's speeches have effectively "silenced" (ḥāraš, 11:3a) Eliphaz and Bildad. As the introductory verses of at least a few of the speeches provide some evidence of connections between the speeches, and as these verses may be isolated from their respective speeches as literary units, the focus of this study will be on these units with a view to how they might respond to previous statements or texts within the Book of Job. For practical purposes these introductory units or strophes will be referred to as "introductions." This designation, however, does not imply that these units have a common, predictable form or structure. It simply means they fall at the beginning of a speech or poem.[37]

This work builds on the research of Gordis, Power, Holbert, Klaus, and Habel. Consequently, some of the proposals put forward below will not be original to this study. Yet, as the introductory portions of the speeches or of the major subsections within a speech will be studied in greater detail than in the work by the above scholars, the reader will find that the majority of proposals for connections are new to this work. The appendix will show the connections made by the above scholars prior to this research as well as the connections proposed by the present writer.

Moreover, as this study will examine the speeches as responses to preceding speeches, chap. 3 will be dealt with indirectly as it is the opening discourse of the disputation, and only insofar as Eliphaz's first speech (chaps. 4 and 5) appears to offer a response to it. Also, the speeches of chaps. 25, 26 and 27 will not be studied as explained in chap. 4, as this portion of the book is problematic. In addition, no clear examples for a response are apparent in the sections of these speeches which might be approached as introductory units. In addition, so as not to overlook further possibilities of connections between texts, each introductory unit of a speech will be closely scrutinized for links to the whole of the

---

[37] Three of the speeches which will be dealt with (chaps. 4–5, 6–7, 12–14) may be divided into two or three subsections which will be called "poems!" It follows that each poem will have its own particular "introduction" or "introductory" strophe.