



Journal of Biblical Literature

VOLUME 120, No. 1

Spring 2001

- The Book of Esther and Ancient Storytelling
ADELE BERLIN 3–14
- Intermarriage, Social Complexity, and Ethnic Diversity
in the Genealogy of Judah
GARY N. KNOPPERS 15–30
- Job as Jobab: The Interpretation of Job in
LXX Job 42:17b–e
ANNETTE YOSHIKO REED 31–55
- Self-Contradiction in the IQP? A Reply to Michael Goulder
ROBERT A. DERRENBÄCKER, JR.
JOHN S. KLOPPENBORG VERBIN 57–76
- Urban Legends: Acts 10:1–11:18 and the Strategies of
Greco-Roman Foundation Narratives
WALTER T. WILSON 77–99
- Σπείρεται: Paul's Anthropogenic Metaphor in
1 Corinthians 15:42–44
JEFFREY R. ASHER 101–122
- Plausible Circumstances for the Prophecy of Habakkuk
WILLIAM L. HOLLADAY 123–130
- Ben Sira 38:24–39:11 and the *Egyptian Satire of the Trades*:
A Reconsideration
CHRIS A. ROLLSTON 131–139
- A Literary Encircling Pattern in 1 Maccabees 1
DAVID S. WILLIAMS 140–142

Book Reviews 143—Index 200

US ISSN 0021–9231

JOB AS JOBAB: THE INTERPRETATION OF JOB IN LXX JOB 42:17b–e

ANNETTE YOSHIKO REED

mail@annettereed.com

Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544-1006

After the end of the story of Job (42:17), LXX Job contains two additions with no equivalent in the MT, Peshitta, Qumran Targum (11QTgJob), or Rabbinic Targum of Job.¹ The first augments the canonical account of Job's death (Job 42:17) with a brief affirmation that he will be resurrected (LXX Job 42:17a). This addition seems to respond to questions raised by the denial of resurrection within the book of Job (e.g., Job 7:9; 14:7–12; see *b. B. Bat.* 16a). Consequently, it is generally thought to be a later gloss and to be independent from the lines that follow.²

While the first addition is brief and its motivation relatively transparent, the second addition (subsequently termed “the LXX Job appendix”) proves more intriguing. This addition begins by referencing an unnamed “Syrian” or Aramaic source. It then locates Job's land of origin “on the border of Idumea and Arabia” and identifies him with Jobab, the Edomite king of Gen 36:33 (LXX Job 42:17b). Subsequently, the passage combines information from Gen 36 and LXX Job in order to trace Job's heritage through Esau to Abraham (42:17c) and to locate him chronologically within a list of Edomite kings

I owe much gratitude to Martha Himmelfarb for reading and commenting on this paper at numerous stages in its development. It has also benefited much from the feedback of Albert Henrichs, Hanan Eshel, Richard Saley, Dove Sussman, Kirsti Copeland, and Adam Becker. Any errors that remain are solely my own.

¹ Since the term “LXX” does not adequately reflect the different stages in the formation of early Greek translations of Job, it will be used only before the stage of a certain portion of a text is determined or when the difference between the stages is less significant than the Greek texts' relationship to other traditions (e.g., MT, Aristeas the Exegete, *Testament of Job*).

² See, e.g., Henry Barclay Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1914), 256–57; G. Buchanan Gray, “The Additions in the Ancient Greek Version of Job,” *The Expositor* 19 (1920): 429–31; Peter Gentry, *The Asterisked Materials in the Greek Job* (SBLSCS 38; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 586.

(42:17d). Lastly, his three friends are listed, along with the lands over which they reigned (42:17e). The text of the appendix reads as follows:³

17b: Οὗτος ἐρμηνεύεται ἐκ τῆς Συριακῆς βίβλου ἐν μὲν γῆ κατοικῶν τῇ Αὐσίτιδι ἐπὶ τοῖς ὀρίοις τῆς Ἰδουμαίας καὶ Ἀραβίας, προὔπηρχεν δὲ αὐτῷ ὄνομα Ἰωβάβ·

17c: λαβὼν δὲ γυναῖκα Ἀράβισσαν γεννᾷ υἰόν, ᾧ ὄνομα Ἐννών, ἦν δὲ αὐτὸς πατὴρ μὲν Ζάρε, τῶν Ἡσαὺ υἰῶν υἱὸς, μητὴρ δὲ Βοσόρρα, ὥστε εἶναι αὐτὸν πέμπτον ἀπὸ Ἀβραάμ.

17d: καὶ οὗτοι οἱ βασιλεῖς οἱ βασιλεύσαντες ἐν Ἐδὼμ, ἧς καὶ αὐτὸς ἤρξεν χώρας· πρῶτος Βαλάκ ὁ τοῦ Βεώρ, καὶ ὄνομα τῇ πόλει αὐτοῦ Δεννάβα· μετὰ δὲ Βαλάκ Ἰωβάβ ὁ καλούμενος Ἰώβ· μετὰ δὲ τοῦτον Ἀσὸμ ὁ ὑπάρχων ἡγεμὼν ἐκ τῆς Θαιμανίτιδος χώρας· μετὰ δὲ τοῦτον Ἀδάδ υἱὸς Βαράδ ὁ ἐκκόψας Μαδιάμ ἐν τῷ πεδίῳ Μωάβ, καὶ ὄνομα τῇ πόλει αὐτοῦ Γεθθάμ.

17e: οἱ δὲ ἐλθόντες πρὸς αὐτὸν φίλοι· Ἐλιφᾶς τῶν Ἡσαὺ υἰῶν Θαιμανῶν βασιλεὺς, Βαλδάδ ὁ Σαυχαίων τύραννος, Σωφάρ ὁ Μιναίων βασιλεὺς

This passage proves significant both as a Septuagintal addition to the book of Job and as a Hellenistic Jewish interpretation of Job. On the one hand, it represents one of several additions in LXX Job, including the speech of Job's wife in 2:9, the identification of his friends as kings in 2:11, and the assertion of his resurrection in 49:17a.⁴ The fact that this passage was appended to the Greek translation of Job may point to an attitude toward this text as not completely fixed in its written form.⁵ On the other hand, the appendix presupposes the

³ “[17b] This man is interpreted in an Aramaic book as dwelling in the land of Uz, on the boundaries of Idumea and Arabia, and he previously bore for himself the name Jobab. [17c] After taking for himself an Arabian wife, he begot a son, whose name was Ennon. He himself was the son of his father Zare, from among the sons of Esau, and of his mother Bosorra, so that he was fifth from Abraham. [17d] And these were the kings who reigned in Edom, the country over which he also reigned: First was Balak, son of Beor, and the name of his city was Dennaba. After Balak was Jobab, who is called Job. After him was Hasom, who governed from the country of Thaiman. After him was Hadad, son of Barad, who destroyed Madiam in the country of Moab, and the name of his city was Gethaim. [17e] The friends who came to him were: Eliphaz, one of the sons of Esau, the king of the Thaimanites, Baldad the tyrant of the Sauchites, Sophar the king of the Minianites.” Note that all quotations of LXX Job and citations of variant readings are based on Joseph Ziegler's critical edition (*Iob* [Septuaginta, Vetus Testamentum Graecum 12.4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982]). For comments on my translation, please refer to the discussion below.

⁴ See Gray, “Additions,” 422–38.

⁵ In Vaticanus 1209, this addition is in no way demarcated from the text of LXX Job and thus appears as a conclusion, in the style of the epilogue of Qohelet (12:9–13), rather than a separate colophon or *finis* notation. See *Bibliorum Ss. graecorum Codex Vaticanus 1209 (cod. B) denovo phototypice expressus iussu et cura praesidum Bybliothecae Vaticanae* (Mediolani: Vtricum

necessity of locating the figure of Job within biblical history, consonant with the emerging conception of biblical texts as “Scripture” in Second Temple Judaism and the resultant proliferation of biblical interpretation. This harmonizing mode of exegesis assumes the unity and authority of a group of biblical texts, insofar as it uses the Edomite king list of Gen 36 to answer the silence of the book of Job on the issues of Job’s identity, ethnicity, and relation to the nation Israel.⁶

The LXX Job appendix thus is best examined in two contexts: (1) the text history of LXX Job and (2) the history of Jewish interpretation about Job. The first section of this inquiry will consider its relationship to various Greek translations and versions of the book of Job, as well as to the fragment about Job from Aristeas the Exegete (*Pr. Ev.* 9.25.1–4). Here the questions of the original language and approximate date of the appendix will be central. Turning then to the appendix’s biblical interpretation, the next section will explore its use of Gen 36 to associate Job with Edom/Idumea and will suggest that some of its extrabiblical details derive from this identification of Job’s ethnicity. The final section will aim to locate the LXX Job appendix within the history of interpretation of the book of Job. Comparing the LXX Job appendix to Aristeas the Exegete, the *Testament of Job*, Pseudo-Philo, and later rabbinic traditions, it will contextualize this approach to Job within the range of postbiblical Jewish traditions about his ethnicity, his connection to the patriarch Abraham, and his place within the chosen nation Israel.

I. The Original Language and Date of the LXX Job Appendix

Although it is present in all catalogued LXX manuscripts, there is some question as to the provenance of this addition. Much of the confusion arises from the complex text history of LXX Job itself. As currently extant, LXX Job reflects two discernible stages of composition: the Old Greek translation (OG), composed around 150 B.C.E., and the Greek version that is associated with

Hoepli, 1905). Note also that 11QtgJob does not contain even the MT Epilogue to Job (42:12–17)—possibly pointing to some fluidity concerning the ending of the book of Job; see John Gray, “The Massoretic Text of the Book of Job, the Targum and the Septuagint Version in Light of the Qumran Targum (11QtargJob),” *ZAW* 86, no. 3 (1974): 335.

⁶ In this, the approach of the appendix is similar to rabbinic traditions about Job, which are also concerned to locate Job in biblical history by finding lexical or thematic connections with other biblical texts. See J. Weinberg, “Job versus Abraham: The Quest for the Perfect God-Fearer in Rabbinic Tradition,” in *The Book of Job* (ed. W. A. M. Beuken; Belgium: Leuven University Press, 1994), 282; Judith Baskin, “Rabbinic Interpretations of the Book of Job,” in *The Voice from the Whirlwind* (ed. Leo G. Perdue and W. C. Gilpin; Nashville: Abingdon, 1992), 101–6; as well as the brief discussion below.

Theodotion (Θ'), composed in the early first century C.E.⁷ The earlier translation, OG Job, appears to have been approximately one-sixth the length of MT Job.⁸ Although some scholars have thus speculated that OG Job was based on a shorter Hebrew *Vorlage*,⁹ most have rejected this theory on both text-critical and stylistic grounds. Instead they have explained its brevity as the product of a relatively "free" approach to translation.¹⁰

Whatever its exact origin, the abbreviated Greek translation later served as the base text for the fifth column of Origen's *Hexapla*, which he redacted toward consonance with the MT through the addition of passages missing from the OG. These additions, demarcated from the OG by asterisks,¹¹ were primarily drawn from Θ' Job, a later and more literal translation of the book of Job, which Origen placed in the sixth column of the *Hexapla*.¹² The resultant "Hexaplaric" version of Job (i.e., the fifth column) appears to have significantly

⁷ See Henry Thackeray, *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909), 3–4; Homer Heater, *Septuagint Translation Technique in the Book of Job* (CBQMS 11; Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1982), 1–2.

⁸ The abbreviated nature of OG Job reflects the omission of verses from the Hebrew and the conflation of parallel Hebrew bi-colons (Heater, *Septuagint Translation Technique*, 3). For a chart of omissions, see Samuel R. Driver and George B. Gray, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Job* (ICC; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1921), lxxv. See also Harry M. Orlinsky, "Studies in the Septuagint of the Book of Job," *HUCA* 28 (1957): 53; Heater, *Septuagint Translation Technique*, 2; N. Fernandes Marcos, "The Septuagintal Reading of the Book of Job," in *Book of Job*, ed. Beuken, 251–52.

⁹ This theory was first proposed by Edwin Hatch (*Essays in Biblical Greek* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1889], 244–45) and later suggested by Frank Moore Cross (*Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text* [Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1975], 308–9).

¹⁰ For instance, OG Job often appends details absent from the Hebrew (e.g., Job's friends as kings in 2:11), includes several hellenized readings (e.g., Hades in 33:2; Amalthea's Horn in 42:14), and is written in rather elegant Greek, even using poetic and Homeric forms (see Thackeray, *Grammar*, 32, 83, 173, 249). For a summary of the debate on this issue and a survey of the reasons for the current scholarly consensus that the abbreviated form of OG Job does not reflect a notably different *Vorlage* from MT Job, see Orlinsky, "Studies"; and Gray, "Massoretic Text," 339–43. Also Donald H. Gard, *The Exegetical Method of the Greek Translator of the Book of Job* (JBLMS 8; Philadelphia: SBL, 1952), 2–3; Heater, *Septuagint Translation Technique*, 2, 3, 6, 131.

¹¹ Origen, *Commentary on St. Matthew* 15.14; Swete, *Introduction*, 255–56; Hatch, *Essays in Biblical Greek*, 215–16; Gentry, *Asterisked Materials*, 495; see also Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* 6.16. For an in-depth study of the asterisked passages, see Gentry, *Asterisked Materials*.

¹² In his *Commentary on St. Matthew*, Origen states that he added verses from "other versions" (i.e., A', Σ' and Θ') in the fifth column of the *Hexapla* (15.14)—though he nowhere specifies the source for his additions to Job. Some changes may also even be Origen's own. However, the attribution of these additions to Θ' was traditional among church fathers (e.g., Jerome, Eusebius) and is present in early sources with access to the *Hexapla* (i.e., Catena manuscripts and *Syro-Hexapla*; see Gentry, *Asterisked Materials*, 5). This view is also followed by the majority of modern scholars, including Thackeray (*Grammar*, 4), Swete (*Introduction*, 256), Hatch (*Essays in Biblical*

influenced subsequent Greek copies of this book, thus accounting for the composite nature of the present text of LXX Job.¹³

For our purposes, the presence of distinct strata in the extant LXX Job can help us to determine an approximate date for the addition of the LXX Job appendix. Hexaplaric notes state that Aquila (A´) and Symmachus (Σ´) follow the Hebrew in the ending of Job, while Θ´ contains the same additions as the OG, with only a few variants.¹⁴ Similarly, in a letter to Africanus, Origen notes that LXX Job 42:17a and the verses following it are “not present in the Hebrew’s version, and likewise not in Aquila’s version” (*Afr* 6[3]). He asserts, however, that these verses are “in the Seventy’s [i.e., LXX, presumably OG] and in Theodotion’s versions, agreeing with one another in sense” (*Afr* 6[3]).¹⁵ Since LXX Job 42:17a–e was extant in both OG and Θ´ at the time of Origen, we are presented with two possibilities. Θ´ Job may be dependent on the OG for the appendix, either because it was an original part of the OG translation of Job around 150 B.C.E. or because it was added to this version before the composition of Θ´ Job in the first century C.E. Alternatively, the appendix may originate with Θ´ Job and may have been added to OG Job at a later stage, possibly when Origen compiled the *Hexapla*. In order to resolve this issue and thus narrow our approximate date for this addition, it is necessary first to consider (1) the original language of the appendix, (2) its relation to the remainder of LXX Job, and (3) its connection to the fragment about Job by Aristeeas the Exegete (*Pr. Ev.* 9.25.1–4).

“The Aramaic Book” and the Original Language of the LXX Job Appendix

The possibility that this addition derives from a non-Greek source is raised by LXX Job 42:17b:

Greek, 215), Orlinsky (“Studies,” 55), Fernandos Marcos (“Septuagintal Reading,” 252), and Gentry (*Asterisked Materials*, 5–6, 12, 494, 497–98).

¹³ Gentry (*Asterisked Materials*, 7–9), Orlinsky (“Studies,” 4), Thackeray (*Grammar*, 4) and Hatch (*Essays in Biblical Greek*, 215) all hold that the present text of the LXX is Hexaplaric, while Swete suggests that the extant LXX “offers a text in which the lacunae are supplied (chiefly from Θ´) but which still falls short of the fullness of the Hexaplaric LXX” (*Introduction*, 256).

¹⁴ Following the second apparatus of Ziegler’s critical edition of LXX Job. MS 249, C´ and Olympiodor read: ἰστέον δέ, ὅτι μέχρι τοῦ πρεσβύτερος καὶ πλήρης ἡμερῶν α´ καὶ σ´ ἐλθόντες, συνεπέραναν τὸ βιβλίον, ὡς δὴ τῷ Ἑβραϊκῷ ἀκολουθοῦντες· ὁ δὲ Θ´ συμπεραίνει τοῖς σ´ [i.e. ἐβδομήκοντα]· (“One sees that Aquila and Symmachus, having as far as ‘old and full of days’ [i.e. the last words of Job 42:17], conclude the book, indeed following the Hebrew. But Theodotion concludes like the Seventy”).

¹⁵ The relevant passage reads as follows: ἄχρι τέλους οὐ κεῖται παρὰ τοῖς Ἑβραίοις, διόπερ οὐδὲ παρὰ τῷ Ἀκύλᾳ· παρὰ δὲ τοῖς ἐβδομήκοντα καὶ Θεοδοτίωνι τὰ ἰσοδυναμοῦντα ἀλλήλοις (*Afr* 6[3]).

Οὗτος ἐρμηνεύεται ἐκ τῆς Συριακῆς βίβλου ἐν μὲν γῆ κατοικῶν τῇ Αὐσίτιδι ἐπὶ τοῖς ὀρίοις τῆς Ἰδουμαίας καὶ Ἀραβίας, προὔπηρχεν δὲ αὐτῷ ὄνομα Ἰωβάβ.

Key here is the phrase ἐκ τῆς Συριακῆς βίβλου. The choice of the term βίβλος, instead of the more common βιβλίον, may be linked to the genealogical connotations of this term in LXX Genesis, where ἡ βίβλος γενέσεως twice renders תולדות (LXX Gen 2:4; 5:1).¹⁶ Similarly, the evidence of contemporaneous Jewish Greek texts suggests that Συριακῆς here specifies the linguistic, rather than geographic, origin of the book. For instance, the same term is used in 2 Macc 15:36 to denote the Aramaic language (τῇ Συριακῇ φωνῇ). Likewise, in 2 Esdr 4:7, the related term Συριστί renders סורית (MT Ezra 4:7), the Hebrew term commonly used for the Aramaic language (e.g., 2 Kgs 18:26; Isa 36:11; Dan 2:4).¹⁷

Consequently, some scholars have speculated that the subsequent verses were translated from an Aramaic source, such as an early Targum.¹⁸ Such an interpretation is consonant with Robert Doran's reading of this verse, which takes the demonstrative pronoun οὗτος as referring to all the lines that follow (i.e., 42:17b–e). Doran thus translates 42:17b: "This (i.e. the passage that follows) is translated from the Syriac book: Dwelling in the land of Austis on the borders of Idumea and Arabia, he was first named Jobab."¹⁹ As it now stands, however, the masculine nominative singular demonstrative οὗτος agrees with both the subsequent participle (κατοικῶν) and the implied subject of the following verb (προὔπηρχεν).²⁰ Thus, from a grammatical and syntactical stand-

¹⁶ All references to LXX Genesis follow the so-called Greater Cambridge Septuagint: A. E. Brooke and Norman MacLean, *The Old Testament in Greek*, vol. 1, *The Octateuch* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1917).

¹⁷ Notably, the term Συριακός, the adjectival form of Σύρος ("Syrian"), lacks the specific denotation of language of Συριστί, but it is a related term and more fitting to the syntax, since it here modifies βίβλος.

¹⁸ E.g., Robert Doran, "Aristeas the Exegete," *OTP* 2:857; Gentry, *Asterisked Materials*, 536; Paul Wendland, "Aristeas the Exegete," *JE* 2:92. B. Z. Wacholder goes so far as to suggest that this may refer to a lost apocryphon of Job, a Palestinian source that also may have influenced Aristeas the Exegete, the *Testament of Job*, b. B. Bat. 15b, Tg. Job 2:9, and Jerome ("Aristeas the Exegete," *EncJud* 1:438–40). For a brief survey of the scholarship, see Carl R. Holladay, *Fragments from the Hellenistic Jewish Authors*, vol. 1, *Historians* [Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983], 261–64.

¹⁹ Doran, "Aristeas the Exegete," 858.

²⁰ See Herbert Weir Smyth, *Greek Grammar* (rev. Gordon M. Messing; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1984), 307–8, §1248. This reading could be tenable were the text to read τοῦτου, ταῦτα, or even οὗτος instead. However, if we were to interpret οὗτος in this way, the syntactical structure of the rest of the sentence would be skewed. As is, the syntax of the sentence is a bit peculiar but comprehensible: a nominative masculine singular demonstrative with indicative verb, followed by a nominative masculine singular participial clause, linked with δε to a clause with an indicative verb with an implicit nominative masculine singular subject. To hold that the demon-

point, the demonstrative more likely refers to Job himself. The verse, then, is better rendered: “This man [i.e., Job] is interpreted in an Aramaic book as dwelling in the land of Uz, on the boundaries of Idumea and Arabia, and he previously bore for himself the name Jobab.”²¹

Although a seemingly small detail, this phrase proves critical for our understanding of the LXX Job appendix, insofar as it specifies the exact scope of its claims concerning its basis in an “Aramaic book.” Following Doran’s translation, the appendix alleges that it is translated directly from this book. Yet our reading suggests that the appendix may make a much weaker and more ambiguous claim, merely implying that its interpretation of Job is based on such a source. Strictly speaking, the only thing explicitly said to be “translated” about Job from the “Aramaic book” is the fact that he dwelt “in the land of Uz, on the borders of Idumea and Arabia” (42:17b). This further highlights the need for caution. Although the appendix may have referred to an Aramaic source for some of its information about Job, we must reject the tempting suggestion that the LXX Job appendix simply represents a Greek translation from an equivalent Aramaic *Vorlage*.

Dependence on LXX Genesis and the Remainder of LXX Job

Perhaps the strongest evidence against a non-Greek *Vorlage* is the appendix’s dependence on other LXX texts. As many scholars have noted, there is a strong correspondence between LXX Job 42:17b–e and Gen 36, the Edomite genealogy and king list (see Appendix 1). Orthographic and syntactic parallels suggest that the appendix may be specifically dependent on the Greek version of the Edomite genealogy and king list.²² However, some caution is raised by the fact that LXX Gen 36 represents a very literal rendering, corresponding almost exactly to MT Gen 36. Consequently, it is difficult to determine with any certainty whether the LXX Job appendix was based on LXX Genesis rather than on a proto-Masoretic Hebrew version.

Comparison between the LXX Job appendix and the rest of LXX Job

strative is generic would thus not only be syntactically counterintuitive, but would force one to ignore the conjunction and read the participle as linked to the final clause. The demonstrative thus has its antecedent in the nominative subject of 42:17 (Ἰὸβ)—an insight for which I am indebted to a conversation with Prof. Albert Henrichs.

²¹ Note that Lancelot Brenton, E. Dhorme, and Marvin Pope give similar readings of this verse (Lancelot Brenton, *The Septuagint with Apocrypha: Greek and English* [London: Samuel Bagster & Sons, 1851; repr., Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1986], 698; E. Dhorme, *A Commentary on the Book of Job* [trans. Harold Knight; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1984], xvii; Marvin H. Pope, *Job* [AB 15; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1964], 293; the latter is followed in Holladay, *Fragments*, 275). Gray notes that this is an “awkward Greek sentence” and presents both options (“Additions,” 429).

²² See Gray, “Additions,” 432.

proves more conclusive, because of the many differences between MT and LXX Job. For instance, the appendix's dependence on LXX Job is clear from its identification of Job's friends as kings (42:17e), an identification present in LXX Job 2:11, but absent from MT Job. Moreover, in LXX Job 42:17e, the description of Job's friends echoes LXX Job 2:11 almost verbatim, with the sole exception being the appendix's addition of the relationship of Eliphaz and Esau, as extrapolated from Gen 36:10, 15. Furthermore, LXX Job 42:17e repeats the metathesis of the Hebrew name of Sophar's land (הַנְּעִמְרִי, "the Naamanite") in LXX Job 2:11 (Μινιάτων, "Minianites"), and LXX Job 42:17b uses the same hellenized adjectival rendering of Job's land of origin (MT Job 1:1: עֲרֵץ) as LXX Job 1:1 (i.e., Ἀυσίτις).²³ Given the specific dependence on the Greek version of Job, it seems most likely that the LXX Job appendix was not translated from Aramaic, but rather composed in Greek.

Parallels with Aristeas the Exegete

Further evidence about the date and original language of the appendix is provided by the fragment of Aristeas the Exegete, which was quoted by Alexander Polyhistor in the middle of the first century B.C.E. (ca. 60 B.C.E.) and is now preserved in Eusebius's *Praeparatio Evangelica* (9.25.1–4).²⁴ In this fragment, Aristeas presents a summary of the story of Job that is heavily dependent on LXX Job.²⁵ Among the many parallels are significant links with the LXX Job appendix. Not only are there general affinities, such as the equation of Job with Jobab (*Pr. Ev.* 9.25.3; LXX Job 42:17b) and the assertion of Job's relation to Esau (*Pr. Ev.* 9.25.1; LXX Job 42:17c), but several lines are repeated virtually verbatim (see Appendix 2).²⁶ Although the fragment as a whole focuses on the piety of Job, there are only two significant differences in the verses about his genealogy, identity, and friends: (1) the statement that Eliphaz is one of the

²³ Doran ("Aristeas," 855) and Wacholder ("Aristeas," 438) treat this as a place-name ("Austitis," "Auis") rather than a transcription of the Hebrew עֲרֵץ. However, the form Ἀυσίτις clearly follows the common LXX pattern of hellenizing Hebrew names of countries or districts adjectivally in -τις, -τιδος (Thackeray, *Grammar*, 169–71).

²⁴ For a discussion of the probable date of Alexander Polyhistor's *On the Jews*, see Ben Zion Wacholder, *Eupolemus: A Study of Judaeo-Greek Literature* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, 1974), 51; Gregory Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition: Josephos, Luke-Acts, and Apologetic Historiography* (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 144–52. Note that all references to *Pr. Ev.* follow Karl Mras's 1954 edition.

²⁵ Doran, "Aristeas," 855; Holladay, *Fragments*, 261–62.

²⁶ For instance, the statement about Job dwelling in the land of Uz in *Pr. Ev.* 9.25.1 (lines 7–8) is almost identical to LXX Job 42:17b, the only differences being the word-order—much of which is due to the syntax of indirect speech—and the use of different words for "land" (χώρα, γῆς). Equally striking is the similarity between the descriptions of Job's friends in LXX Job 42:17e and *Pr. Ev.* 9.25.4.

sons of Esau is present in LXX Job 42:17e, but absent from Aristeas; and (2) Aristeas includes information about Elihu from LXX Job 36:10, whereas the LXX Job appendix mentions only the three friends from LXX Job 2:11.

What, then, is the relation between the two texts? One key to answering this question may lie in the differences between the two Joban genealogies. While LXX Job 42:17c asserts that Job is five generations removed from Abraham, Aristeas the Exegete states that Job is the son of Esau by Bosorra (*Pr. Ev.* 9.25.1). Ben Zion Wacholder proposes that Aristeas's abbreviated genealogy of Job is a result of his erroneous identification of Bosorra with Basemath, one of Esau's wives (Gen 36:3, 33). He then suggests that the LXX Job appendix was dependent on Aristeas the Exegete and was intended to correct his genealogical error.²⁷ However, Doran proposes that this truncated genealogy is a result of haplography, reconstructing the original text toward consistency with the Joban genealogy in LXX Job 42:17c.²⁸ Doran's argument seems more probable, especially since the extant portion of Aristeas is contained in a third-hand account and would thus more likely be corrupted. Accepting Doran's view, there is no urgent reason to assume that the LXX Job appendix was dependent on Aristeas, despite the fact that Aristeas clearly used the rest of LXX Job.

Another possibility is that both derive from a third source, a suggestion often raised in the context of the "Aramaic book" mentioned in LXX Job 42:17b.²⁹ While it is impossible to rule out these texts' mutual dependence on a nonextant source, the similarities between the two seem striking enough that such a source need not be posited. This caution is particularly warranted in positing an Aramaic source, since it is unlikely that the LXX Job appendix and Aristeas the Exegete would have arrived at nearly identical word choices and exhibit such orthographic similarities in the renderings of names, if they were separately translated.³⁰ Since Aristeas the Exegete is clearly dependent on the rest of LXX Job, it seems most reasonable to posit that he also used the appendix.³¹

²⁷ Wacholder, "Aristeas," 438–39.

²⁸ Doran, "Aristeas," 857. Holladay similar proposes: "It is not at all unlikely that the tradition preserved in Aristeas stemmed from the more elaborate form which occurs in the epilogue to Job in the LXX, and that the garbled form of the tradition is owing to Polyhistor's carelessness" (*Fragmentes*, 272). See also D'Orme, *Commentary*, xviii.

²⁹ E.g., Doran, "Aristeas," 857.

³⁰ See Nikolaus Walter, "Jewish-Greek Literature of the Greek Period," in *The Cambridge History of Judaism*, vol. 2, *The Hellenistic Age* (ed. W. D. Davies and L. Finkelstein; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 389.

³¹ How then can we explain the differences between the two? Aristeas's information about Elihu seems a likely addition (*Pr. Ev.* 9.25.4), especially in the context of a summary of the book of Job, while the omission of the Eliphaz's relation to Esau (*Pr. Ev.* 9.25.4) could be explained by Aristeas's dependence on LXX Job 2:11, as opposed to the appendix, for this portion.

The LXX Job Appendix and the Text History of LXX Job

Having surveyed the language of the LXX Job appendix and the influences on it, we may return to the question of whether it should be identified specifically with OG or Θ' Job.³² Most significant is the fact that all of the above-noted instances of the appendix's dependence on LXX Job presuppose clearly OG readings. For instance, in Job 1:1, Θ' lists the name of Job's land of origin as Οὐς, directly transcribing the Hebrew גר. LXX Job 42:17b, however, follows OG Job 1:1 in hellenizing the name of Job's land of origin as Αὐσίτις. Furthermore, in Job 2:11, OG and the appendix identify Job's friends as rulers, a detail absent from both Θ' and MT Job. Also notable is the fact that OG Job 2:11 and LXX Job 42:17e both exhibit a metathesis of the Hebrew name of Sophar's domain (Μινάϊων), while Θ' renders the name like the MT (Νωμαθίτη).

This dependence on OG suggests that the appendix was most likely copied from OG to Θ'. However, it is impossible to determine whether the appendix belonged to the original OG translation of Job. Indeed, the presence of at least one later addition to OG, namely, the speech of Job's wife (LXX Job 2:9a–e), raises the likely possibility that the appendix was added after the original OG translation.³³ Consequently, this addition is best dated between the OG translation of Job circa 150 B.C.E. and the translation of Θ' in the early first century C.E. Given the use of the appendix by Aristeas the Exegete, the *terminus ad quem* is the quotation of Aristeas by Alexander Polyhistor, circa 60 B.C.E.

II. The Interpretation of Job in the LXX Job Appendix

Having considered the date and original language of the LXX Job appendix, it remains for us to examine its content. As we have seen, this addition seeks to locate the figure of Job within biblical history in two ways: genealogically and geographically. Our exploration of its biblical interpretation will thus be twofold: first analyzing its harmonization of LXX Job and Gen 36 and then exploring the possible historical significance of its geographical references.

³² There are two differences between the LXX and Θ' versions of the appendix, both of which occur in the section about Job's friends (42:17e). In v. 17eb, Θ' replaces the name Eliphaz with "a son of Josephat" (υἱὸς Ἰωσαφάτ), while in 17ec Θ' lists "an Ammonite, son of Chobor" (υἱὸς Ἀμμὼν τοῦ Χωβὸρ) as the tyrant of the Sauchites, instead of Baldad. Both names are rather obscure and may even derive from another tradition about either the friends of Job or the rulers of these areas. That OG simply repeats the names from Genesis suggests it is the earlier.

³³ See Heater, *Septuagint Translation Technique*, 31–36, for a discussion of this addition.

*Locating Job Genealogically:
The Use of Genesis 36 in the LXX Job Appendix*

In addressing the identity of Job and his place in the history of Israel, the LXX Job appendix responds to the troublesome lack of detail concerning the protagonist of the biblical book of Job.³⁴ Other exegetes, as we will see, would fill these lacunae in various ways, reflecting different times and perspectives. For the author of the appendix, however, the answers were to be found in the figure of Jobab mentioned in Gen 36:33. In that verse, three pieces of information are given about Jobab: (1) he is a son of Zare; (2) he is “from Bosorra”; and (3) he is an Edomite king. Examination of the LXX Job appendix shows the method by which its author used and expanded on each of these data, as well as the assumptions underlying his use of Gen 36 to interpret LXX Job.

The first piece of information allows the author to reconstruct a genealogy of Job/Jobab that exposes his relationship to other biblical figures. Notably, Gen 36 does not explicitly describe the genealogy of Jobab. However, his lineage can be traced through his father Zare (Gen 36:33), whom the Edomite genealogy identifies as a son of Raguel (Gen 36:16–17), one of the sons of Esau by Ishmael’s daughter Basemath (Gen 36:10). Thus can the LXX Job appendix conclude that Job is “fifth from Abraham” (LXX Job 42:17b), locating the righteous Job within biblical history through his blood relation to the righteous patriarch.

As for the second piece of information, it is significant that the LXX Job appendix omits that Jobab is “from Bosorra” in its direct paraphrase of Gen 36:33 at LXX Job 46:17c, and this clause is replaced by the statement that Jobab is “the one called Job.” On a literary level, this serves to reemphasize the link between the two figures made in LXX Job 42:17b. Yet this omission is also necessary from an interpretative standpoint.³⁵ In the context of a list of kings that names the cities or regions of each, the statement in Gen 36:33 clearly specifies Jobab’s geographical origin as Bosorra (i.e., the Edomite city of Bozrah). Yet, if the author of the LXX Job appendix had included this information about Jobab when reproducing the chronology of the Edomite kings in Gen 36:31–35 (LXX Job 42:17d), it would have exposed the contradiction between the geographical origins of Job and Jobab, thereby shedding doubt upon his equation of two fig-

³⁴ The core problem is vividly articulated by Judith Baskin: “The problem of Job’s identity is inherent in the book itself. Other biblical narratives are rooted in time and place, but Job seems to exist outside of time. And if there was a Job who suffered cruelly for no apparent reason, where did he suffer?” (*Pharaoh’s Counselors: Job, Jethro, and Balaam in Rabbinic and Patristic Tradition* [BJS 47; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983], 7).

³⁵ Doran explains the addition’s genealogical interpretation by suggesting that this is based on a “special reading of the Greek” (“Aristeas,” 856–57), a conclusion he then uses to establish that the original language of both the LXX Job appendix and Aristeas was Greek. However, it is not clear that the Hebrew מְבֹרָרָה could not similarly be interpreted (see BDB 579, col. 2).

ures. Consequently, it appears that the interpreter omitted the statement that Jobab is “from Bosorra” from his paraphrase of Gen 36:33 (LXX Job 42:17d) and displaced it to an earlier section of the appendix (LXX Job 42:17b). In this manner, he could interpret this statement as a reference to Jobab’s mother, conveniently unnamed in Gen 36, while still being able to retain Uz as the geographical origin of Job, consistent with Job 1:1. The author of the appendix was thus able to avoid contradiction, while appearing to include every element in the description of Jobab in Gen 36:33.

Similarly, the appendix’s equation of Job and Jobab is underscored by the interpreter’s combination of information from Gen 36 with information from the remainder of LXX Job. For instance, the appendix’s paraphrase of LXX Job 2:11 (LXX Job 42:17e) is placed directly after its paraphrase of Gen 33:31–35 (LXX Job 42:17d). Thus, the identification of Job with the Edomite king Jobab (Gen 36:33) is implicitly demonstrated to be consistent with LXX Job, insofar as Job’s three friends are also rulers (LXX Job 2:11). A similar combination of the two source-texts is evident in the insertion of Eliphaz’s relation to Esau, a fact gleaned from LXX Gen 36:10–11, into the paraphrase of LXX Job 2:11 at LXX Job 42:17d.

*Locating Job Geographically:
“On the border of Idumea and Arabia”*

The LXX Job appendix contains two verses that are not wholly based on biblical texts—42:17b–c. These lines impart four pieces of information: (1) the connection with the Aramaic book, (2) the location of Uz on the border of Idumea and Arabia, (3) the fact that Job’s wife is Arabian and (4) the name of his son, Ἐβνών.³⁶ The first point has been discussed at some length in the context of the addition’s original language. However, the key to understanding the ramifications of the claim to an Aramaic *Vorlage*, as well as the significance of the added information about Job’s family, lies in the anachronistic reference to Idumea.³⁷

The historical situation of the Edomites/Idumeans changed greatly from the time of the formation of the book of Job to the time of the composition of the LXX Job appendix.³⁸ In the seventh through sixth centuries B.C.E., the Edomites gradually migrated into southern Judea under pressure from Arabian

³⁶ The final detail is difficult to identify with any certainty and will thus remain absent from this discussion.

³⁷ Note that a similar (and roughly contemporaneous) geographical anachronism occurs in the writings of Eupolemus, who asserts that King David fought against the Idumeans and Nabateans (*Pr. Et.* 9.30.3).

³⁸ Although the exact date of the book of Job is disputed, most scholars agree that its final form is postexilic, circa 500–300 B.C.E., while many of its composite parts are dated earlier.

tribes. By the time the Jews returned from Babylon, the Edomites had firmly established themselves in the area.³⁹ The resultant Jewish animosity toward them is reflected in the writings of exilic and postexilic prophets (e.g., Obad 18; Isa 34:5, 8, 9, 10; Ezek 35:15).⁴⁰ On the one hand, an increasing sense of the hostile encroachment of “the nations” upon the Jews intensified the symbolic power of Edom as an enemy.⁴¹ On the other hand, the denunciation of Edom was founded in more regular interaction between these two neighbors, with the prophetic equation of Edom’s destruction and Israel’s redemption partly reflecting economic realities.⁴²

The latter point is notable insofar as the association of Job with the Edomites in the book of Job would otherwise seem irreconcilable with the postexilic demonization of Edom by the prophets. Yet the very proximity of Edom and Judea allowed for the coexistence of negative and positive depictions in the biblical corpus. More positive depictions revolve around two major themes: (1) the brotherhood of Jacob/Israel and Esau/Edom (e.g., Gen 25; Deut 23:7) and (2) the association of Edom with wisdom (e.g., Jer 49:7; Obad 8). Both help to provide a context for understanding the allusions to Edom within the book of Job, which appears to integrate names from the Edomite genealogy and king list in Gen 36.⁴³ Together with its silence as to Job’s relation to the nation Israel, these seem to imply his Edomite origin—an implicit association that the LXX Job appendix would later make explicit.⁴⁴ In a general sense, the non-Israelite identity of the book of Job’s protagonist may reflect the text’s original literary milieu: the ancient Near Eastern wisdom tradition, as shared by

³⁹ Aryeh Kasher, *Jews, Idumeans, and Ancient Arabs: Relations of Jews in Eretz Israel with the Nations of the Frontier and the Desert during the Hellenistic and Roman Era (332 BCE–70 CE)* (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1988), 1–6.

⁴⁰ See Beth Glazier-McDonald, “Edom in the Prophetic Corpus,” in *You Shall Not Abhor an Edomite, For He Is Your Brother: Edom and Seir in History and Tradition* (ed. D. V. Edelman; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 24–29, 31; Kasher, *Jews, Idumeans*, 3. Note that this enmity was motivated also by the belief that the Edomites had collaborated with the Babylonians in the destruction of Jerusalem.

⁴¹ Glazier-McDonald, “Edom,” 31.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 24–25, 31.

⁴³ For more on the connection between the book of Job and Gen 36, see J. Day, “How Could Job Be an Edomite?” in *The Book of Job*, ed. Beuken, 393. Note also that the prose portions of this text include phrases or concepts unique to the depiction in Genesis of the patriarchal era, such as its reference to a type of coin only found in Genesis (קֶשֶׁטָה; Job 42:11; cf. Gen 33:19), Job’s extreme longevity (Job 42:16), the description of his death (Job 42:17), his sacrifice without a priest (Job 1:5), and the fact that his wealth is measured in livestock (Job 2:3; 42:12; cf. Gen 13; 26:12–14, 33). See also Driver and Gray, *Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, lxvi–lxvii; Dhorme, *Commentary*, xx–xxi.

⁴⁴ See Day, “How Could Job,” 393, 397–98. Note that Genesis associates Uz with Seir (Gen 36:20, 30), while the parallelism of Lam 4:21 associates Uz and Edom.

various cultures in the region.⁴⁵ More specifically, Edom's reputation for wisdom fits well with the book of Job's portrayal of a universal human challenge to the justice of a universal God. Nevertheless, the fact that the book of Job does not state outright that Job is Edomite may still reflect some animosity toward this people among its Judean audience.

By the period between 150 and 60 B.C.E., the era to which the LXX Job appendix belongs, the situation had drastically changed. With the transition from Persian to Hellenistic domination in the fourth century B.C.E., the Edomites were transformed from a tribal group into a politically organized and culturally cohesive entity, Idumea. Thereafter, the Idumeans exhibited increasingly less connection to Arabian tribes and more to Judea.⁴⁶ This cultural drift became religious assimilation in 111/112 B.C.E., when John Hyrcanus conquered Idumea and the Idumeans converted to Judaism.⁴⁷ Whether or not this conversion was compelled, it proved to be successful, and the Idumeans became politically and culturally integrated into Judea.⁴⁸ Although retaining their cultural identity, for the most part they abandoned their traditional wor-

⁴⁵ Day, "How Could Job," 397.

⁴⁶ Kasher, *Jews, Idumeans*, 6, 56.

⁴⁷ See Josephus, *Ant.* 13.257–58; 15.254; Strabo *Geographica* 15.2.34. Although traditionally dated to 125 B.C.E. on the evidence of Josephus, numismatic evidence from Marisa, Beer-Sheva, Mount Gerizim, Shechem, and Samaria suggests that John Hyrcanus's conquests should be dated later, to 112/111 B.C.E. (Dan Barag, "New Evidence on the Foreign Policy of John Hyrcanus I," *Israel Numismatic Journal* 12 [1992–93]: 1–12; Shraga Qedar, "The Coins of Marisa: A New Mint," *Israel Numismatic Journal* 12 [1992–93]: 27–28; Alla Kushnir-Stein and Haim Gitler, "Numismatic Evidence from Tel Beer-Sheva and the Beginning of Nabatean Coinage," *Israel Numismatic Journal* 12 [1992–93]: 16–17; Rachel Barkay, "The Marisa Hoard of Seleucid Tetradrachms Minted in Ascalon," *Israel Numismatic Journal* 12 [1992–93]: 21). I am indebted to Prof. Hanan Eshel for referring me to these new findings.

⁴⁸ There is still some debate about the exact nature of the Idumeans' conversion. Kasher proposes that their conversion was by choice, citing its obvious success and explaining its motivation through the political benefit to the Idumeans of joining the independent Judeans (*Jews, Idumeans*, 46–64). In contrast, Lester Grabbe remains cautious, due to the variance within the textual evidence (*Judaism from Cyrus to Hadrian*, vol. 2, *The Roman Period* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992], 328–31). In my view, Shaye Cohen's nuanced proposal seems to best account for the textual and archaeological evidence. He suggests that the conversion was probably voluntary among the anti-Hellenistic rural population, while it may have been compelled in the more hellenized cities (e.g., Maresha, Adora) where traditional Idumean practices such as circumcision had been abandoned (*The Beginnings of Jewishness* [Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999], 110–19). On the integration of Idumeans into Judean culture, see I. Ronen, "Formation of Jewish Nationalism among the Idumaeans," in Kasher, *Jews, Idumeans*, 223; Kasher, *Jews, Idumeans*, 62–64; also Joseph M. Baumgarten, "Exclusions from the Temple: Proselytes and Agrippa I," *JJS* 33, nos. 1–2 (1982): 221. The Jewish identity of the Idumeans is poignantly illustrated by the fact that even the hated Herod was considered a Jew during his lifetime, despite his Idumean heritage (Cohen, *Beginnings*, 13–24).

ship of Kos.⁴⁹ Indeed, even after Gabinius's partition of most of Idumea from Judea, the integration of the Idumeans into Jewish society is shown by their intermarriage with Jews and activity in the School of Shammai, as well as Idumea's participation in the Jewish Revolt against Rome (see, e.g., Josephus, *J.W.* 2.5.2–3; 7.4.13.3).⁵⁰

This historical background proves significant for our inquiry in two ways, corresponding to the geographical context and ethnic connotations of the appendix's association of Job with Idumea. First, it is important to consider the geography of Idumea at the time of the addition of the LXX Job appendix. As noted above, the term Ἀούσιτις in LXX Job 42:17b (see LXX Job 1:1) is not an independent place-name, as Wacholder assumes, but rather a hellenized rendering of the Hebrew עֹרֵי (MT Job 1:1).⁵¹ Recognizing the nature of this form exposes an intriguing possibility: In locating Job's 'Uz "on the border of Idumea and Arabia," the LXX Job addition may refer to the geography of Idumea at the time of its author.⁵²

Even before the reign of Herod, the southern border of Idumea seems to have been fortified by a series of towns and strongholds, stretching from the Dead Sea to Gaza.⁵³ Among these strongholds was Ḥorvat 'Uza (עֹרֵה), which was located south of Arad, on the border of Idumea and Nabatea between Malatha and Zo'ar.⁵⁴ Recent excavations at this site have shown that it was first settled in the seventh century B.C.E., then reoccupied in the Hellenistic period after three centuries of disuse.⁵⁵ Notably, this pattern of occupation coincides

⁴⁹ Ronen, "Formation," 225, 238. One especially notable exception is Costobar (Josephus, *Ant.* 15.253–55; 20.214; Ronen, "Formation," 214–20). Further, some Idumeans seem to have fled to Egypt and there continued their worship of Kos (see Kasher, *Jews, Idumeans*, 57; Cohen, *Beginnings*, 115).

⁵⁰ B. Kanael, "The Partition of Judea by Gabinius," *IEJ* 7, no. 1 (1957): 99–100, 103; Ronen, "Formation," 220, 236–37; Kasher, *Jews, Idumeans*, 64–65.

⁵¹ Thackeray, *Grammar*, 169–71; see Doran, "Aristeas," 855; Wacholder, "Aristeas," 438.

⁵² Day interprets the geographical statement in the LXX Job appendix as referring to the pre-exilic border of Edom and Arabia, which he places near Dedan and Teman. He thus cites the occurrence of the tribal name 'Aud in a Safaitic inscription, dated sometime between the fifth century B.C.E. and fourth century C.E., to place Uz near Baidan in Northwest Arabia ("How Could Job," 394–95). In my view, the evidence of this broadly dated inscription is not convincing. Furthermore, Day overlooks the significance of the anachronistic reference to "Idumea" in the LXX Job appendix, merely equating it with Edom. For other possible locations of the Uz of MT Job 1:1, see Pope, *Job*, 3–5; Driver and Gray, *Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, xxvi–xxx; Dhorme, *Commentary*, xxi–xxv.

⁵³ Kasher, *Jews, Idumeans*, 153–56; see M. Gihon, "Idumaea and the Herodian Limes," *IEJ* 17, no. 1 (1967): 29, 32–33.

⁵⁴ See Map 14 in Kasher, *Jews, Idumeans*, 155, and Map 1 in Gihon, "Idumaea," 28, for the exact location of 'Uza.

⁵⁵ The objects found there suggest that this reoccupation began during the second century B.C.E. and lasted until the first half of the first century B.C.E.; see Itzhaq Beit-Arieh and Bruce C.

with our rough dating of the LXX Job appendix, insofar as ʿUza would have been continuously occupied from 150 B.C.E. to 60 B.C.E.

However, before positing any connection between the two, it is crucial to address the issues that may caution against it.⁵⁶ First is the fact that the site now called Ḥorvat ʿUza has also been identified by Itzhaq Beit-Arieh and Bruce Cresson with Kinah. This town is cited in the list of Judea's southernmost sites in Josh 15:22 and in a seventh-century B.C.E. Hebrew inscription found at Arad (#24, line 12).⁵⁷ However, given the three-century gap after the Judean occupation of Ḥorvat ʿUza, the name of the stronghold in the First Temple period need not affect our equation of this site with the LXX Job appendix's identification of "Uz" in the Hellenistic or early Roman period. Indeed, it is plausible that the site was called Kinah before its abandonment by Judeans, then renamed ʿUza when it was reoccupied by Idumeans, with the later name surviving to the current day.⁵⁸

Second, one might raise the question of why the fortress town ʿUza would be called a "land" in LXX Job 42:17b. This apparent inconsistency can be explained as a result of the author's integration of biblical information with the geography of his time. Thus the phrase ἐν μὲν γῆ . . . τῆ Αὐσίτιδι merely echoes the phrase ἐν χώρῳ τῆ Αὐσίτιδι in LXX Job 1:1, rendering a different word with almost the same semantic field and virtually the same pattern of use in the LXX.⁵⁹

Third, one might ask whether a reader would recognize Αὐσίτις as ʿUza (עוּזָה), given the hellenized form of this place-name. On the one hand, the personal name ʿUz (עוּז) is transliterated in LXX Genesis as Ωξ (Gen 22:21) or Ως

Cresson, "Ḥorvat ʿUza: A Fortified Outpost on the Eastern Negev Border," *BA* 54 (1991): 129, 134–35.

⁵⁶ A fourth objection could also be raised, namely, that the idea of a border between "Idumea and Arabia" is anachronistic prior to Trajan's annexation of Nabatean lands under the name "Arabia" in 106 C.E. This is the least problematic of our cautions, since the LXX Job addition must date prior to 60 B.C.E., when Alexander Polyhistor quoted Aristeas the Exegete. Furthermore, the interchangeability of Nabatea and Arabia in the minds of Hellenistic writers is demonstrated by Diodorus's usage, e.g., in 19.94, where he refers to the Nabatea as τὴν χώραν τῶν Ἀράβων τῶν καλουμένων Ναβαταίων ("the land of the Arabs who are called Nabateans"); see also 19.96.

⁵⁷ Beit-Arieh and Cresson, "Ḥorvat ʿUza," 128. Note that Yohanan Aharoni previously identified Ḥorvat ʿUza with Ramat Negev (see 1 Sam 30:27; Josh 19:8; Arad inscription #24, line 13) and Ḥorvat Tov with Kinah (*Arad Inscriptions* [Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1981], 46–48, 146–47).

⁵⁸ For the longevity of place-names in this area, see Yohanan Aharoni, *The Land of the Bible: A Historical Geography* (trans. A. F. Rainey; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1967), 96, 106.

⁵⁹ For instance, both are used to translate the Hebrew עוּזָה and עוּז (see Edwin Hatch and Henry Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint* [Athens: Beneficial Book Publishers, 1983], 240–54, 1481–82). Moreover, the *Testament of Job*, which is clearly dependent upon LXX Job, also identifies Uz as a city (e.g., *T. Job* 28:7).

(Gen 10:23; 36:28),⁶⁰ while the name Uzzah (אֲזָח) is rendered as Οζα (LXX 2 Sam 6:3, 6, 7, 8; 2 Kgs 21:18, 26; 1 Chr 6:14; 13:7, 9, 10, 11).⁶¹ On the other hand, there is evidence that the LXX translators rendered personal names differently from geographical names. While personal names are usually not hellenized and decline only if they end in vowels, hellenized forms predominate in the rendering of geographical names.⁶² Here, it is interesting to note Josephus's comments about the origin of the name "Idumea" (*Ant.* 2.1–3). After explaining that the region owes its original name (i.e., "Edom") to Esau's nickname "Adom" (i.e., אָדָם; cf. Gen 25:25, 30), Josephus asserts that "the more dignified name of Idumea it owes to the Greeks." In his version of Gen 10, he similarly compares the "original" names of various peoples with the names given to them by the Greeks (*Ant.* 1.122–39), informing his Roman readers that his history will use hellenized forms for the sake of euphony. However, he notes that "the form in which they here appear is not that used in our country" (*Ant.* 1.129). Although Josephus's audience and context differ notably from the LXX Job appendix, this may suggest some sensitivity on the part of bilingual Jews in the Greco-Roman Era to the process by which native Semitic place-names were hellenized.⁶³

In the end, these cautions should be kept in mind, but the coincidence of our author's location of 'Uz on a border where in his time a town named 'Uza existed seems too great to be dismissed. It is most probable that the author associated these names, transposing the geography of his time onto the book of Job's obscure reference to the "land of 'Uz." This possibility is particularly strong in light of the anachronistic reference to "Idumea" in 42:17b, where the term "Edom" could have easily been used, as in 42:17d. Furthermore, the author's lack of knowledge of Edom in the preexilic age is starkly illustrated by his interpretation of "Bosorra" as the mother of Jobab, instead of Jobab's geo-

⁶⁰ Variant readings include Οζ, Ουζ, Ηζ (LXX Gen 10:23), Ουζ (22.21; 36:34), and Οζ (36:34). Vaticanus omits this name at 1 Chr 1:17, although variant readings include it, transliterated as Ουζ, Ωζ, and Ουζ (see A. E. Brooke and Norman MacLean, *Old Testament in Greek*, vol. 2, *The Later Historical Books* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1935]).

⁶¹ Variant readings include Οζαν (LXX 2 Sam 6:3, 6, 7, 8; 1 Chr 13:10), Οζια (1 Chr 6:29), Οζιας (1 Chr 6:29), Αζα (2 Sam 6:3; 1 Chr 6:29; 13:7), Αζζα (2 Sam 6:6, 8; 1 Chr 13:10), and Αζζαν (2 Sam 6:7). The name is absent from LXX 1 Chr 8:7. See Brooke and MacLean, *Old Testament in Greek*, vol. 2.

⁶² Thackeray, *Grammar*, 160–70. More specifically, Thackeray suggests: "The transliterated names of districts of or on the borders of Palestine (Εδώμ, Μοάβ, etc.) begin to be replaced by adjectives in [4] -αία or [5] -(ε)ῖτις, forms which appear to have come into use c. 200 BC" (pp. 169–70). Thus, the occurrence of both types of forms in the LXX Job appendix is consistent with the use of nonhellenized forms in the LXX translations of the pentateuchal books (because of influence from LXX Gen 36), as well as their predominance in other later LXX texts (such as LXX Job).

⁶³ Concerning the LXX, Thackeray also notes that "the translators, for the most part, had a fair knowledge of the geography, not only of Egypt, but also of other countries, and adopted the current Hellenized forms" (*Grammar*, 166).

graphical origin in Bozrah (Gen 36:33), the Edomite capital in the seventh century B.C.E.⁶⁴

Much may be gained by contextualizing the nonbiblical statements in the LXX Job appendix within the history of Idumea. For instance, this background could also help to explain its claim to be derived from an Aramaic source, inasmuch as Aramaic was indeed the language of the Idumeans at the time of the appendix.⁶⁵ Similarly, its identification of Job's wife as Arabian may reflect the close relations between the Nabateans and Idumeans. Strabo, for instance, identifies the Idumeans as Nabateans who later "joined the Judeans" (*Geographica* 15.2.34). Much like the relations between the Israelites and Edomites of the preexilic period, relations between these neighboring cultures were marked by both conflict and cultural closeness. Although the connection between the two was more marked prior to the Hellenistic age, their continued relations are illustrated by intermarriage between the two groups, as well as archaeological evidence of trade between them.⁶⁶

III. The LXX Job Appendix in the History of Interpretation of Job

This background illumines the unique historical circumstances that informed the identification of Job with the Edomite/Idumean Jobab in the

⁶⁴ Diana Vikander Edelman, "Edom: A Historical Geography," in *You Shall Not Abhor an Edomite*, ed. Edelman, 1–2, 10; Ernst Axel Knauf-Belleri, "Edom: The Social and Economic History," in *You Shall Not Abhor an Edomite*, ed. Edelman, 94, 109; Aharoni, *Land of the Bible*, 37; see Isa 34:6; Jer 49:7, 13, 20, 22, 27; Ezek 25:13; Obad 9; Amos 1:12. The non-Edomite/Idumean connotations of Bozrah in the Hellenistic era are shown by the fact that 1 Maccabees associates it with the Nabateans (5:26, 28). This is consistent with the archaeological evidence from Buseira, where Edomite occupation seems to have ended in the sixth century B.C.E. (see John Bartlett, "From Edomites to Nabateans: A Study in Continuity," *PEQ* 111 [1979]: 54).

⁶⁵ According to Kasher, Aramaic was the language of the Edomites from the eighth century B.C.E. (*Jews, Idumeans*, 2; see Bartlett, "From Edomites," 55–56). The Idumeans' continued use of Aramaic in the Hellenistic era is corroborated by archaeological finds—most notably the second-century B.C.E. Aramaic ostrakon of an Edomite marriage contract (see Esther Eshel and Amos Klöner, "An Aramaic Ostrakon of an Edomite Marriage Contract from Maresha, Dated 176 BCE," *IEJ* 46, no. 1 [1996]: 1–22).

⁶⁶ Kasher, *Jews, Idumeans*, 5–6; see also Bartlett, "From Edomites." Indeed, the mother of Herod himself was an "Arabian" woman (Josephus, *War* 1.181; *Ant.* 14.121). Furthermore, the Nabatean Syllaeus was engaged to Herod's sister Salome, though the marriage fell through because of his reluctance to convert to Judaism (*Ant.* 16.7.6; 17.1.1). For the archaeological evidence, see, e.g., Beit-Aryeh and Cresson, "Horvat 'Uza," 135; Crystal M. Bennett, "Excavations at Buseira, Southern Jordan, 1973: Third Preliminary Report," *Levant* 7 (1975): 1–19, 16. Another possibility is that this reference to Arabia presupposes that Jobab is a descendant of Esau and Basemath, the daughter of Ishmael (Gen 36:3, 10).

LXX Job appendix. Although early rabbinic midrashim contain no mention of this tradition, there is evidence that the association of Job and Edom was disputed by rabbinic exegetes.⁶⁷ In one of his letters, Jerome states that, in contrast to the Christians, the Jews of his time denied that Job was “of the descendants of Esau” (*Letter* 73; ca. 398 C.E.). Arguing explicitly against the LXX Job appendix, Jerome then asserts that Job’s lineage should be traced through ‘Uz, the son of Abraham’s brother Nahor (*Quaest. in Gen. ad Gen.* 22:20–22)—apparently following a rabbinic tradition about Job’s identity (see *Gen. Rab.* 57:4).⁶⁸ A similar rejection of the equation of Job and Jobab later occurs in Ibn Ezra’s commentary on Gen 36:33, further suggesting that this view was not wholly unknown within rabbinic tradition.

How then might we account for its absence? One possibility, suggested by Judith Baskin, is that the connection of Job with Edom/Idumea became problematic for later Jewish interpreters because of the common rabbinic interpretation of biblical references to Esau and Edom as symbolic allusions to Rome.⁶⁹ Although seemingly unlikely, this typology appears to derive from the biblical denunciation of Edom—especially the predictions of its fall in the prophetic corpus.⁷⁰ Just as the negative depiction of Edom originally arose in reaction to its perceived role in the Babylonian conquest, so its use as a metaphor for Rome seems to have developed when biblical texts about the destruction of the First Temple became newly relevant in the wake of the Roman destruction of the Second Temple.⁷¹ The Idumean ethnicity of Herod may have also played some part in the development of the motif, although this typology does not seem to have originated as early as the Herodian era.⁷² Moreover, the equation

⁶⁷ See Baskin, *Pharaoh’s Counselors*, 29.

⁶⁸ Specifically, Jerome refers to that which is “written at the end of the Septuagint (in the portion) not found in the Hebrew” (*Quaest. in Gen. ad Gen.* 22:20–22).

⁶⁹ Baskin, *Pharaoh’s Counselors*, 29. On this interesting exegetical motif, see Gerson Cohen, “Esau as Symbol in Early Medieval Thought,” in *Jewish Medieval and Renaissance Studies* (ed. Alexander Altman; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1967), 19–48; Mirelle Hadas-Label, “Jacob et Esau ou Israel et Rome dans le Talmud et le Midrash,” *RHR* 201, no. 4 (1984): 369–92; Irit Aminoff, “The Figure of Esau and the Kingdom of Edom in Palestinian Midrashic-Talmudic Literature in the Tannaic and Amoraic Periods” (Ph.D. diss., Melbourne University, 1981), 221–40.

⁷⁰ Other probable factors in the development of this motif include the rabbinic concept that the lives of the patriarchs preenact Jewish history (see Aminoff, “Figure of Esau,” 224–25) and the Christian identification of the unloved, firstborn Esau with the “elder” Jews, as superseded by the “younger” Christians (see Gen 25:32; Rom 9:6–13; Gal 4:22–31; Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* 4.21.2–3; Hippolytus of Rome as quoted by Jerome, *Letter* 36; Origen, *Hom. in Gen.* 12.3; Cohen, “Esau as Symbol,” 31–38).

⁷¹ Cohen, “Esau as Symbol,” 24–25; Aminoff, “Figure of Esau,” 224.

⁷² Aminoff, “Figure of Esau,” 223, 233; Cohen, “Esau as Symbol,” 23. Earlier the Romans were associated with the Kittim (e.g., 1QM; 4Q285; 4Q491; *Tg. Onq.* and *Tg. Ps-J.* Num 24:24; LXX Dan 11:30).

of Edom with Rome would seem more tenable in the absence of ethnic descendants of Edom and thus probably dates from after the dispersal of the Idumean culture subsequent to the Jewish Revolt.⁷³

This presents a striking contrast with the LXX Job appendix, whose identification of Job as an Edomite king presupposes close relations between Idumea and Judea, as well as a positive view of Idumeans, deriving more from the depiction of Esau in Genesis than from the prophetic demonization of Edom. Indeed, when taken together with the geographical location of Uz on the borders of Idumea and Arabia and the attribution of this information to an Aramaic book (42:17b), the equation of Job with the Edomite king Jobab serves to emphasize his Idumean ethnicity. However, the genealogical assertion that Job is five generations removed from Abraham (42:17c) simultaneously underlines his connection with the nation Israel. The significance of this interpretation of Job, as Idumean in ethnicity and Abrahamic in descent, becomes clear when we locate this Hellenistic Jewish text within the history of prerabbinic Jewish interpretation about the figure of Job.

In the primacy of genealogical concerns, the LXX Job appendix can be likened to the work of the Hellenistic Jewish “chronographer” Demetrius and to the Hebrew and Greek versions of the *Testament of Naphtali*. Demetrius, the earliest extant Hellenistic Jewish exegete (third century B.C.E.), evinces a tradition of interpreting biblical texts in order to resolve chronographical and textual incongruities.⁷⁴ This trend is evident also in the resolution of chronological problems by the LXX and may be linked to similar tendencies among contemporaneous Greek and Egyptian authors, such as Eratosthenes and Manetho.⁷⁵ Similarly, the *Testament of Naphtali* reflects the importance of genealogically connecting lesser-known figures with the family of Abraham in the late Second Temple period. The version of this text found at Qumran (4Q215) traces the lineage of Jacob’s concubines Zilpah and Billah to the house of Laban, through Rebekah’s nurse Deborah (see fragments 1-3).⁷⁶ The Greek version similarly traces their genealogies, but more explicitly links them to Abraham (*T. Naph.*

⁷³ Ronin, “Formation of Jewish Nationalism,” 235. Note that Cohen (“Esau as Symbol,” 22–23) and Hadas-Lebel (“Jacob et Esau,” 376–77) attribute the origin of this motif to Rabbi Akiva (see *Gen. Rab.* 65:21; *Lam. Rab. ad Lam* 2:2).

⁷⁴ J. Hanson, “Demetrius the Chronographer,” *OTP* 2:844; Walter, “Jewish-Greek Literature,” in *The Cambridge History of Judaism*, vol. 2, *The Hellenistic Age*, ed. Davies and Finkelstein, 387–88.

⁷⁵ John W. Wevers, “The Interpretative Character and Significance of the Septuagint Version,” in *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament*, vol. 1, *From the Beginnings to the Middle Ages*, part 1, *Antiquity* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 102–3; Folker Seigert, “Early Jewish Interpretation in a Hellenistic Style,” in *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament*, vol. 1, *From the Beginnings to the Middle Ages*, part 1, 190–91.

⁷⁶ Michael E. Stone, “Testament of Naphtali,” *JJS* 47 (1996): 313.

1:9–10).⁷⁷ The prevalence of such concerns is further illustrated by the genealogy of Jesus in the first two chapters of Matthew.⁷⁸

As for the specific connection between Job and the family of Abraham, two other early texts identify Job with Jobab: Aristeas the Exegete (*Pr. Ev.* 9.25.2) and the *Testament of Job* (*T. Job* 1:1). Although Aristeas paraphrases the Joban genealogy of the LXX Job appendix, he is primarily concerned to laud the patient endurance of Job (see also *Jas* 5:11). However, the *Testament of Job* explores the theological implications of the appendix's identification of Job and Jobab. What was a functional association of the two in the LXX Job appendix becomes for the *Testament of Job* a name change modeled on the paradigm of Abram/Abraham (*Gen* 17:5).⁷⁹ In *T. Job* 2–4, Job states that “I used to be Jobab” (2:1), then describes a night vision in which a “voice in the great light” encouraged his questioning of idolatry, in favor of the God of all creation. Insofar as he stresses to his children that “the Lord named me Job” (*T. Job* 2:1), Jobab's name change implies his conversion to Judaism, marking his transformation from a pagan king to the paradigm of a righteous man suffering for the sake of the One God.⁸⁰ Moreover, this text explains the suffering of Job as Satan's reaction to his destruction of an idolatrous temple (*T. Job* 3:1–4:9). In this it bears a striking resemblance to apocryphal tales about Abraham's departure from Ur (e.g., *Jub.* 12; *Gen. Rab.* 38:13), thus suggesting that the *Testament of Job* amplifies the theme of Job's Abrahamic lineage by paralleling the lives of these two righteous converts.⁸¹

Alongside the genealogical and thematic association of Job and Abraham,

⁷⁷ For the relation of these versions, see Stone, “Testament,” 312–13.

⁷⁸ See Benedict Viviano, “The Genres of Matthew 1–2: Light from Timothy 1:4,” *RB* 97 (1990): 50–51. Although these genealogical reconstructions may be characteristic of late Second Temple Judaism, it is important to note their thematic continuity within the wider history of biblical texts. Indeed, more generally, parallels may even be drawn with the Priestly writer of Genesis, whose interest in genealogy provided such fruitful material for both the book of Job and the LXX Job appendix.

⁷⁹ See C. T. Begg, “Comparing Characters: The Book of Job and the Testament of Job,” in *The Book of Job*, ed. Beuken, 436; I. Jacobs, “Literary Motifs in the Testament of Job,” *JJS* 21 (1970): 8–9. Jacobs goes so far as to conclude that this was the original motivation for the identification of Job with Jobab (p. 9)—an interesting hypothesis, but untenable in light of the exegetical approach and genealogical aims of the LXX Job appendix.

⁸⁰ Cees Haas, “Job's Perseverance in the Testament of Job,” in *Studies on the Testament of Job* (ed. Michael A. Knibb and Pieter van der Horst; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 136–38; Jacobs, “Literary Motifs,” 4–9.

⁸¹ See Haas, “Job's Perseverance,” 148–50; Jacobs, “Literary Motifs,” 4, 8–9. An interesting corollary to this implicit parallel is *T. Ab.* 15:5, which evokes God's praise of Job in *Job* 1:8 in order to assert explicitly that Abraham is even more righteous than Job. On rabbinic traditions that also compare or contrast the two figures (e.g., *Gen. Rab.* 49:9; 57:4; *b. B. Bat.* 15a, 16a), see Baskin, *Pharaoh's Counselors*, 18–19.

the *Testament of Job* asserts a marital connection between Job and the chosen, Abrahamic line, by citing a widespread exegetical tradition concerning his marriage to Dinah, the daughter of Jacob. This motif is also evinced in Pseudo-Philo (*Bib. Ant.* 8:8), the Targum to Job (2:9), and later rabbinic midrashim (e.g., *Gen. Rab.* 19:12; 76:9; *b. B. Bat.* 15b). In all these texts, the assertion that Job married Dinah simultaneously resolves the connection of Job with the nation Israel, the identity of Job's wife, and the fate of Dinah after her rape by Shechem (Gen 34)—all unspecified in the Bible. In the *Testament of Job*, this functions as an extension of the conversion theme, since Job marries Dinah after the death of his first wife, the infamous blasphemer of Job 2:9. Job's marriage to Dinah and his own descent from Esau also prove significant, insofar as his second set of children therefore belong to the "chosen and honored race from the seed of Jacob" (*T. Job* 1:5–6). A similar aim appears to inform Pseudo-Philo's version of this motif, in which the Israelite identity of the children of Job and Dinah is implied by their inclusion among those who descend into Egypt with Jacob (*Bib. Ant.* 8:11–14; cf. Gen 46:8–27).⁸² Like the genealogy of Job/Jobab in the LXX Job appendix and the parallel of Job with Abraham in the *Testament of Job*, the marriage of Dinah and Job here serves to assert this biblical figure's connection to Israel.

In these texts, both the association of Job with Abraham and the assertion of his marriage to Dinah have overtones of conversion.⁸³ This presents an interesting contrast to later rabbinic traditions. Like earlier sources, many midrashim depict Job marrying Dinah (e.g., *Gen. Rab.* 19:12; 57:4; 76:9; 80:4; *b. B. Bat.* 15b; *Tg. Job* 2:9–10).⁸⁴ However, they often stress that Job is neither circumcised nor a convert (e.g., *Gen. Rab.* 76:9; 80:4).⁸⁵ Rabbinic traditions about Job also differ from earlier postbiblical Jewish traditions, insofar as they address the apparently non-Jewish origin of this biblical figure in one of several ways: (1) by downplaying the biblical assertions of his perfection (e.g., *Tg. Job* 1:8;

⁸² As Howard Jacobson notes, no account is given of Job's own lineage in Pseudo-Philo, nor is it clear whether Dinah should be identified with the wife of Job 2:9. Interestingly, he also suggests that the names that Pseudo-Philo gives to Job's children may have been taken from the Edomite genealogy at Gen 36, thus speculating that Pseudo-Philo knew of the tradition associating Job with Edom (*A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*, vol. 1 [Leiden: Brill, 1996], 392). Similarly, A. Zeron cites the inclusion of this tradition by Pseudo-Philo as one example of the author's interest in biblical characters associated with Edom, a tendency that leads him to attribute that text to an Idumean convert ("The Swansong of Edom," *JJS* 31, no. 2 [1980]: 195, 197–98).

⁸³ See Baskin, *Pharaoh's Counselors*, 8–9, 13–14; Jacobs, "Literary Motifs," 3–10.

⁸⁴ Indeed, rabbinic versions of this motif present more negative depictions of both Dinah and Job. On the one hand, they link the use of נבלה in Job's speech to his wife (Job 2:10) with נבלה in Gen 34:7 (*Gen. Rab.* 19:12; *b. B. Bat.* 15b), thus identifying Dinah with Job's blasphemous first wife (also *Tg. Job* 2:9–10; contrast *T. Job* 1:6; 26:6; also 21–26).

⁸⁵ Interestingly, in not being circumcised, Job is here contrasted with Esau.

Gen. Rab. 57:4), (2) by lauding Job as a paradigm of the righteous Gentile, (3) by asserting Job's Jewish origin (e.g., *Gen. Rab.* 57.4; *b. B. Bat.* 15a), or (4) by questioning the historicity of the book of Job (e.g., *Gen. Rab.* 57.4; *b. B. Bat.* 15a).⁸⁶

Yet the overtones of conversion in prerabbinic interpretations of Job also raise an interesting possibility about the equation of Job and Jobab in the LXX Job appendix. If composed after the Idumean conversion in 112/111 B.C.E., the identification of Job with the Edomite Jobab may function to place Job both inside and outside the nation of Israel, as an Idumean convert to Judaism. Whether the LXX Job appendix presupposes the actual conversion of the Idumeans or merely the increased cultural connection between the Idumeans and the Judeans in the Greco-Roman era, it reflects a very specific historical context, in which there was less reason to question the place of an Edomite/Idumean Job in the chosen nation Israel.

APPENDIX I

LXX Genesis 36 and LXX Job 42:17b–e Compared

LXX Genesis 36

LXX Job 42:17b–e

A. *The Genealogy of Job/Jobab*

(36:10)

καὶ ταῦτα τὰ ὀνόματα τῶν υἱῶν
Ἡσαύ . . . Ραγουήλ υἱὸς Βασεμμάθ
γυναϊκὸς Ἡσαύ.

*And these are the names of the sons
of Esau . . . Ragouel, son of
Basemath, wife of Esau*

(36:13; cf. 36:17)

οὗτοι δὲ υἱοὶ Ραγουήλ· Νάχοθ,
Ζάρε, Σομέ καὶ Μοζέ· οὗτοι ἦσαν
υἱοὶ Μασεμμάθ γυναϊκὸς Ἡσαύ.

*These are the sons of Ragouel: Nachom,
Zare, Some and Moze; these are the
sons of Masemath, wife of Esau.*

(42:17c)

ἦν δὲ αὐτὸς πατὴρ Ζάρε, τῶν
Ἡσαύ υἱῶν υἱός, μητρὸς δὲ Βοσόρρας,
ὥστε εἶναι αὐτὸν πέμπτον ἀπὸ
Ἀβραάμ.

*He was a son of his father Zare, one
of the sons of Esau, and of his mother
Bossora, so that he was fifth from
Abraham*

⁸⁶ For an in-depth discussion of rabbinic theories about the ethnicity of Job, see Baskin, *Pharaoh's Counselors*, 7–43.

(36:33)

Ἰωβὰβ υἱὸς Ζάρα ἐκ Βοσόρρας

*Job, son of Zare from Bosorra*B. *The Kingship of Jobab*

(36:31–35)

Καὶ οὗτοι οἱ βασιλεῖς οἱ
 βασιλεύσαντες ἐν Ἐδῶμ πρὸ τοῦ
 βασιλεῦσαι βασιλέα ἐν Ἰσραήλ. Καὶ
 ἐβασίλευσεν ἐν Ἐδῶμ Βάλα υἱὸς τοῦ
 Δεννάβα. Ἀπέθανεν δὲ Βάλα, καὶ
 ἐβασίλευσεν ἀντ' αὐτοῦ Ἰωβὰβ υἱὸς
 Ζάρα ἐκ Βοσόρρας. Ἀπέθανεν δὲ
 Ἰωβὰβ, καὶ ἐβασίλευσεν ἀντ' αὐτοῦ
 Ἀσόμ ἐκ τῆς γῆς Θαιμάνων.
 Ἀπέθανεν δὲ Ἀσόμ, καὶ ἐβασίλευσεν
 ἀντ' αὐτοῦ Ἀδάδ υἱὸς Βαράδ, ὁ
 ἐκκόψας Μαδιάμ ἐν τῷ πεδίῳ Μωάβ,
 καὶ ὄνομα τῆ πόλει αὐτοῦ Γεθθαίμ

*And these were the kings who
 reigned in Edom, before a king
 reigned in Israel. And Bala, son of
 Beor, ruled in Edom, and the name
 of his city was Dennaba. Then Bala
 died and Jobab, son of Zara from
 Bossora ruled after him. And Jobab
 died and Hasom from the land of
 Thaiman ruled after him. Then
 Hasom died and Hadad, son of
 Barad, who destroyed Madiam
 in the country of Moab, ruled after
 him. And the name of his city was
 Gethaim.*

(42:17d)

Καὶ οὗτοι οἱ βασιλεῖς οἱ
 βασιλεύσαντες ἐν Ἐδῶμ, ἦς καὶ
 αὐτὸς ἤρξεν χώρας· πρῶτος Βαλάκ ὁ
 τοῦ Βεώρ, καὶ ὄνομα τῆ πόλει αὐτοῦ
 Δεννάβα· μετὰ δὲ Βαλάκ Ἰωβὰβ ὁ
 καλούμενος Ἰώβ· μετὰ δὲ τοῦτον
 Ἀσόμ ὁ ὑπάρχων ἡγεμὼν ἐκ τῆς
 Θαιμανίτιδος χώρας· μετὰ δὲ τοῦτον
 Ἀδάδ υἱὸς Βαράδ ὁ ἐκκόψας Μαδιάμ
 ἐν τῷ πεδίῳ Μωάβ, καὶ ὄνομα τῆ
 πόλει αὐτοῦ Γεθθαίμ.

*And these were the kings who reigned
 in Edom, the country over which he also
 reigned: First was Balak, son of Beor,
 and the name of his city was Dennaba.
 After Balak was Jobab, who is called
 Job. After him was Asom, who governed
 from the country of Thaiman. After him
 was Adad, son of Barad, who destroyed
 Madiam in the country of Moab, and
 the name of his city was Gethaim.*

C. *Eliphaz*

(36:10–11, cf. 15)

Ἐλιφᾶζ υἱὸς Ἀδάς γυναικὸς Ἡσαύ . . .
 ἐγένετο δὲ υἱοὶ Ἐλιφᾶς· Θαιμαν . . .

*Eliphaz, son of Adas, wife of Esau . . .
 The sons of Eliphaz are Thaiman . . .*

(42:17e)

. . . Ἐλιφᾶς τῶν Ἡσαύ υἱῶν Θαιμανῶν
 βασιλεὺς.

*Eliphaz, of the sons of Esau, king of the
 Thaimanites*

APPENDIX 2
 Parallels between LXX Job 42:17b–e
 and Aristeas the Exegete

Pr. Ev. 9.25.3–4

LXX Job 42:17b–e

(9.25.1, lines 6–7)

Αριστείας δὲ φησιν ἐν τῷ *Περὶ
 Ἰουδαίων τὸν Ἡσαῦ γήμαντα*
Βασσάραν υἱὸν ἐν Ἐδὼμ γεννηῆσαι
 Ἰάβ.

*Aristeas recounts in “Concerning the
 Jews” that Esau, after marrying
 Bassara, bore a son in Edom, Job.*

(42:17c)

ἦν δὲ αὐτὸς πατὴρ Ζάρε, τῶν
 Ἡσαῦ υἱῶν υἱός, μητὴρ δὲ Βοσόρρας,
 ὥστε εἶναι αὐτὸν πέμπτον ἀπὸ
 Ἀβραάμ.

*He himself was the son of his father Zare,
 from among the sons of Esau, and of his
 mother Bosorra, so that he was fifth from
 Abraham.*

(9.25.1, lines 7–8)

... κατοικεῖν δὲ τοῦτον ἐν τῇ
 Ἀυσίτιδι χώρα ἐπὶ τοῖς ὄροις τῆς
 Ἰδουμαίας καὶ Ἀραβίας

*This one dwelt in the country of Uz,
 on the boundaries of Idumea and
 Arabia.*

(42:17b)

ἐν μὲν γῆ κατοικῶν τῇ Ἀυσίτιδι ἐπὶ
 τοῖς ὄροις τῆς Ἰδουμαίας καὶ
 Ἀραβίας . . .

*. . . dwelling in the land of Uz, on the
 boundaries of Idumea and Arabia*

(9.25.4)

... Ἐλίφαν τὸν Θαϊμανιτῶν
 βασιλέα καὶ Βαλδάδ τὸν Σαυχαίων
 τύραννον καὶ Σωφάρ τὸν Μινναίων
 βασιλέα, ἐλθεῖν δὲ καὶ Ἐλιοῦν τὸν
 Βαραχιήλ τὸν Ζωβίτην.

*Eliphaz the king of the Thaimanites
 and Baldad the tyrant of the Sachi-
 nites and Sophar the king of the
 Minnianites, and also Elioun of
 Barachiel the Zobite came.*

(42:17e)

Ἐλιφᾶς τῶν Ἡσαῦ υἱῶν
 Θαϊμανῶν βασιλεύς, Βαλδάδ ὁ
 Σαυχαίων τύραννος, Σωφάρ ὁ Μινναίων
 βασιλεύς.

*Eliphaz, one of the sons of Esau, king
 of the Thaminites, Baldad the tyrant
 of the Sauchites, Sophar the king of
 the Minianites.*

56 = Ad #1