

## Intratextuality in Job

Michael A. Lyons

Simpson University

### 1.0 Introduction

When we speak of “intertextuality,” we often think of relationships between discrete literary works or references by the author of one literary work to a different literary work.<sup>1</sup> The book of Job, however, affords many opportunities for examining relationships or references between its own text-segments because of the differences (between speech cycles, between the narrative and the frame, between compositional layers) within the book itself. Yet even though the book is complex and composite, it is a single literary entity, so perhaps the term “intratextuality” or “innertextuality” would be a more appropriate label for the phenomena considered here.<sup>2</sup>

In this essay I will examine quotation and allusion as two kinds of text-referencing techniques that occur within the book of Job itself—that is, instances where the author refers (or creates the illusion of referring) to another text-segment within the book. These two techniques play a significant role in characterization, plot development, argument structure, and the creation of cohesion between sections of the book.

---

<sup>1</sup> For a definition of “intertextuality,” see Kristeva (1980: 65–66). As Kristeva and others use the term, it can refer to relationships between not just texts but any “signifying systems”; see Kristeva (1984: 60) and Culler (1981: 103).

<sup>2</sup> For the term “intratextuality,” see Carr (1998: 97); for “innertextuality,” see Meyers and Meyers (1993: 33–34).

While “intertextuality” is typically not defined with reference to an author’s deliberate interaction with another text, this notion is central to how I approach textual relationships in this essay. My methodology could be characterized as “author-oriented” insofar as I treat the book of Job as a literary product of a historical communication situation in which some textual phenomena (viz., quotation and allusion) can be attributed to the deliberate design of the author as part of a communicational strategy. The term “deliberate design” should not be taken to imply that we have access to the author’s mental state, but simply that authors both ancient and modern intend to communicate and utilize certain techniques to further their goals. Yet my methodology could also be understood as “reader-oriented” inasmuch as all texts must be construed by readers: meanings do not “reside in” texts, but exist only in the heads of authors and readers. Of course, it is possible—under certain conditions—for the meaning construed by readers to closely approximate that of the author, if the two share the same linguistic and literary conventions.

## 2.0 Definitions

A quotation is a reference to an earlier text or utterance that replicates material from that source while calling attention to the *act* of referencing, to the *speaker or author* of the quoted material, or to the *source* being referenced.<sup>3</sup> It is this “calling attention” that constitutes the markedness of

---

<sup>3</sup> On the marking of quotation, see Plett (1988: 315, 321–22) and Helbig (1996: 17–57). In this essay I do not include a treatment of hypothetical reported speech (e.g. “if / lest [you / I] say”: Job 7:13; 22:29; 19:28–29; 32:13) or quotations attributed to real or hypothetical characters not actually present in the story line of the book (Job 4:16–17; 9:12; 20:7; 21:14; 22:17, 19–20; 34:31–32, 34–37; 35:10–11; 36:23).

quotation.<sup>4</sup> Of course, the quoted source text or speech may be summarized or changed in various ways.<sup>5</sup>

It stands to reason that in the speeches of the book of Job the characters would appeal to traditional wisdom or take up each others' sentiments to dispute them. It is even possible that Job could (for various reasons) be made to utter statements that agree with positions taken by the friends. However, not all of these are instances of quotation. According to the definition I use here, quotation must be marked in some way.<sup>6</sup> Quotation has a rhetorical function that is different from allusion or from simply taking up and interacting with the sentiments of another: it

---

<sup>4</sup> In the Hebrew Bible, the usual marker for quotations of a text is *rpsb bwtkk* (e.g., 2 Kgs 14:6 → Deut 24:16). Quotations of speech are typically marked with a *verbum dicendi* (e.g. *rm*), Gen 26:9 → 26:7); for other markers, see Fox (1980: 421–23) and Talstra (1994: 331–32). On the variety of verbs with which speech may be introduced, see Miller (1996) and Jacobson (2004).

<sup>5</sup> See Clark and Gerrig (1990: 795–96).

<sup>6</sup> Some have claimed that there are “unmarked” or “virtual” quotations in Job (e.g., Gordis 1939: 123–47; 1949: 157–219; 1965: 169–89; cf. comments on Job 21:19 in Habel 1985: 321, 328; Hartley 1988: 316–17; Newsom 1996: 493). However, this claim has been strongly—and in my view, rightly—disputed; see Fox (1980); Talstra (1994); Ho (2009).

invokes (and can therefore subvert) notions of authority and testimony, and allows the quoter to frame another character in a particular way.<sup>7</sup>

A textual allusion is a kind of referencing in which an author uses material from another source (or from another text-segment in the same literary work), but without mention of the act of referencing, of the speaker or author of the quoted material, or of the source used.<sup>8</sup> It is this feature that distinguishes allusion from quotation; allusion lacks the marking present in quotation, and presumes the reader's knowledge of the source referred to.<sup>9</sup> In the book of Job, most allusions occur in the speeches (though they may also be found in the narrative sections),<sup>10</sup> and they display great diversity in both form<sup>11</sup> and function.

---

<sup>7</sup> On the evidential and evaluative functions of quotation, see Galatolo (2007: 207–20); on quotation as distortion and manipulation, see Sternberg (1982: 108–109, 130–31) and Lane-Mercier (1991: 199–214).

<sup>8</sup> See Miner (1994: 13–14). Note the distinction in Savran (1988: 7) between “quoted direct speech” and “allusions, summaries, and oblique references to other words and phrases.” For a broader discussion, see Hebel (1991: 135–64) and Irwin (2001: 287–97).

<sup>9</sup> See Miner (1994: 14); Irwin (2001: 288); Ben-Porat (1976: 108–109). It is the act of referencing another context that distinguishes allusion from simple repetition.

<sup>10</sup> Elihu's speeches contain most of the quotations and allusions; cf. Dhorme (1967: c–cii) and Habel (1984: 94–95).

<sup>11</sup> For example, there are instances in which the alluding text is an inversion of the source text (e.g., Job 34:21 → 31:4, or Job 25:4 → 15:14), or a conflation of two source texts (e.g., Job 34:21–23 → 22:13 + 24:23).

Allusion may consist of the repetition of a single word,<sup>12</sup> a cluster of words,<sup>13</sup> or an entire locution. Obviously it is easier to identify allusions that replicate large amounts of the source material. In the case of Job the detection of allusion is simplified by the fact that the author is utilizing repetition in dialogues created within a single literary work, where characters are made to explicitly respond to each other. While the direction of dependence and awareness of context are major issues in the study of allusion in other books, these are less significant in the book of Job. The challenges here lie in distinguishing probable allusions from other kinds of lexical repetition (i.e., repetition due to coincidence, to the author’s unconscious recall of a word or phrase from an earlier context, to the use of fixed expressions,<sup>14</sup> or to the fact that the word is

---

<sup>12</sup> The negative use of  $\text{Kw\#}/\text{KwS}$  in Job 3:23 is possibly an ironic allusion to the positive use in 1:10, and the (deliberately?) non-anthropocentric use of the word in 38:4 might allude to the previous occurrences; see Schifferdecker (2008: 73–74). See also the use of  $\text{hr}$  (“adversity” in Job 42:11 (“all the adversity which Yhwh brought upon him”) as an allusion to 2:10–11 (where Job says it is right to accept “adversity” from God as well as good), and the use of  $\text{hr}(\text{s}/\text{hr}(\text{\#}$  “stormwind” in Job 38:1; 40:6 as an allusion to its occurrence in 9:17.

<sup>13</sup> See e.g. Habel’s treatment of how Elihu in ch. 33 takes up Job’s words from ch. 13 (Habel 1985: 460–61), or Pyeon’s treatment of repetition in the speeches of the characters in chs. 3–14 (Pyeon 2003: 106–111). I do not find all of Pyeon’s examples (e.g., the repetition of the presentative  $\text{hnh}$  and the divine name  $\text{hw1}$ ) to be convincing instances of allusion.

<sup>14</sup> For example, the use of  $\text{rm}$   $\text{yw} + \text{PN} + \text{N}$  ( $\text{yw}$  (Job 4:1; 6:1; 8:1; 9:1; etc).

part of the author's idiolect<sup>15</sup>), and in explaining how the author is using the alluding text-segment to interact with the source text-segment.<sup>16</sup>

### 3.0 The Functions of Quotation and Allusion in the Book of Job

#### 3.1 Cohesion

By using allusion to link speeches to other speeches and speeches to the narrative frame (both to the prologue<sup>17</sup> and the epilogue<sup>18</sup>), the author creates cohesion between the sections of the book.<sup>19</sup> These linkages are created even when the characters (and narrator) refer to the *fact* of another character's earlier utterance (e.g. Job 32:11–12, 14; 38:2; 42:7, 8).<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> Examples of the author's idiolect in Job include the use of *hlm* (62x in the Hebrew Bible; 34x in Job) and *√llm* (5x in the Hebrew Bible, all in Job).

<sup>16</sup> On criteria for the detection and analysis of allusion, see Sommer (1998: 20–31, 152–65); Schultz (1999: 211–15, 222–27, 231); Carr (2001: 107–140); Leonard (2008: 241–65); Lyons (2009: 59–75, 76–109).

<sup>17</sup> Bildad's statement in Job 8:4 is likely an allusion to the events described in the prologue (Job 1:5, 18–19). The statement about fearing God and turning from evil in Job 28:28 may allude to the description of Job in the prologue (Job 1:1, 8; 2:3); cf. Newsom (2003: 181) and Schifferdecker (2008: 48).

<sup>18</sup> The description of Job's reversal of fortune in Job 42:10, 12 may also be an ironic allusion to the comment of Bildad in Job 8:7, though this does not involve verbal repetition.

<sup>19</sup> On the relationship between allusion and coherence, see Nasciscione (2010: 107–120). This relationship could also be explained using the categories of anaphora and reiteration (Halliday and Hasan 1976: 31–34, 51, 277–82).

### 3.2 Plot Development

The following two examples demonstrate how the author uses allusion to shape the plot line of the book. First, the description of events and dialogue in ch. 2 is an allusion to an earlier scene in ch. 1 (Job 2:1–3 → 1:6–8 and Job 2:10 → 1:22). The repetition in these allusions causes the reader to reflect on similarity and difference, on what changes (God’s admission of involvement, the heightening of affliction, the response of Job’s wife) and what does not (the opposition of the Satan, God’s confidence in Job, Job’s integrity).<sup>21</sup>

Second, there are allusions in the epilogue that point back to the prologue (Job 42:10, 12 → 1:3 and Job 42:13 → 1:2). These are cases of reversal: Job’s possessions and sons described as lost in the prologue are replaced and exactly doubled in the epilogue, while Job’s daughters—who are replaced but not doubled—are heightened in beauty and in legal status. This reversal is the means by which the author makes a distinction between the concepts of a reward for piety and a bribe to elicit piety (cf. Job 1:9–12).

### 3.3 Argument Structure

The characters in the book are made to argue with each other—about Job’s condition, about the connection between suffering and human behavior, about divine justice—and the author uses

---

<sup>20</sup> As Miner (1994: 14) notes, “although poetic allusion is necessarily manifested in words, what it draws on in another work need not be verbal. The words of the alluding passage may establish a conceptual rather than a verbal connection with the passage or work alluded to.”

<sup>21</sup> See Habel (1985: 28) and Newsom (2003: 60–62).

quotation and allusion to coordinate the arguments of the characters. In doing so, he replicates the actual dynamics of hostile conversation (sarcasm, misunderstanding, misrepresentation).

In a few instances, a speaker is made to allude to the words of another in order to agree, or to use the words in the same way.<sup>22</sup> An example would be Elihu's allusion (Job 34:12) to Bildad's statement (Job 8:3, framed as a rhetorical question) that God will not "pervert justice" [+p#m tw (y)].<sup>23</sup> Yet even here the allusion functions as an argument against Job.

More frequently, a speaker alludes to the words of another in order to contradict them, or to arrive at a different conclusion from them.<sup>24</sup> An example would be Job's allusion (Job 9:10) to the words of Eliphaz (Job 5:9) that God "does great things that are unsearchable, wonders without number."<sup>25</sup> Eliphaz's statement occurs in the context of his argument that God's greatness should motivate Job to seek God (Job 5:8). However, when Job utters the same words that Eliphaz used, Job is arguing that God is so great that he could *not* successfully communicate with God (Job 9:11–12, 14–16). In another instance of contradiction, Job seems to be depicted as *arguing that* a "stormwind steals away [hpws wtbnq]" the wicked (Job 27:20). This is an allusion to the use of the same locution in Job 21:18, where Job *questions whether* the

---

<sup>22</sup> See also (a) Job 34:12 → 8:3; (b) 34:35; 35:16; 36:12 → 38:2; 42:3a; (c) 37:4–5 → 40:9–10; (d) 42:3a → 38:2.

<sup>23</sup> Job 8:3 and 34:12 are the sole occurrences of this locution.

<sup>24</sup> See also (a) Job 9:10 → 5:9; (b) 27:20 → 21:18; (c) 34:21–23 → 24:23; 22:13; (d) 36:6 → 21:7; (e) 36:11 → 21:13.

<sup>25</sup> Job 5:9 may be an allusion to Ps 145:3, 5.

“stormwind steals away” the wicked. This contradictory allusion is one of many features in Job 27:13–23 that challenges a reader’s ability to understand this section as a straightforward argument by Job.<sup>26</sup>

There are a number of allusions that cannot be defined as simple agreement or contradiction. For example, Elihu alludes (Job 34:7) to the words of Eliphaz (Job 15:16), but turns Eliphaz’s general reference (“one who is abominable and corrupt”) into a more specific one by explicitly naming Job. A character may allude to an earlier speech in order to derive a different implication from the same words or use the same image in a different way (cf. Job 18:4 → 14:18; 9:5; or Job 41:2, 10 → 3:8, 9), or to ironically reformulate the words of an earlier speech (Job 15:14–15 → 4:17–18 and 7:17)<sup>27</sup>, or to change a sarcastic challenge into a non-sarcastic statement (Job 42:4b → 38:3; 40:7).

In several cases, we see multiple allusions to the same passage.<sup>28</sup> In Job 33:12–13, Elihu argues that because God is greater than humanity, Job has no legitimate reason to “contend” [byr, v.

---

<sup>26</sup> Gordis (1978: 536), Habel (1985: 385), and Clines (2006: 663) treat Job 27:13–23 as a displaced speech of Zophar; Hartley (1988: 355, 359) treats it as a displaced speech of Bildad. Newsom (1996: 524) argues that Job is imitating the speech of his friends to mock them; see the more developed argument in her later monograph (2003: 161, 167–68).

<sup>27</sup> On these verses, see particularly Fishbane (1992: 93–98).

<sup>28</sup> See the following complex network of allusions: Job 25:4–6 → 9:2 (1) –

M( #wn) qdcy hm) and 25:4–6 → 15:14–16 (h#) dwly + qdcy . . . hkzy + #wn) + hm);

13] with God; God is not bound to “answer” [hn (].<sup>29</sup> This is an allusion to Job 9:3, in which Job expressed his fear that if one desired to “contend” [byr] in a lawsuit with God, he could not “answer [hn (].”<sup>30</sup> Elihu transforms Job’s concern about his *inability* to conduct a lawsuit with God into a statement that Job has *no reason to expect* an answer from God. But we find another allusion to Job 9:3 in God’s statement in Job 40:2: “Shall the one who contends [byr] with the Almighty reprove? The one who argues with God must answer [hn (] it!” God transforms Job’s *statement of concern* about his inability to answer God into a *challenge* to answer what God has been saying in the divine speeches.

### 3.4 Characterization

The author uses allusion to depict Job as respectfully submissive (though as some read Job’s words, as ironically submissive or even resistant<sup>31</sup>) after God’s challenge, and uses quotation to depict the speakers as hostile to each other and to each others’ statements.<sup>32</sup> This hostility is

---

Job 15:14–15 → 4:17–18 (Nym) y ) l + qdcy + #wn); Job 15:14 → 7:17 (. . .

yk #wn) hm); and possibly Job 9:2 → 4:17 (hw1) m / l) -M ( + qdcy + #wn) ).

<sup>29</sup> The verbs byr and hn ( occur in proximity only in Gen 31:36; Job 9:3; 33:13; 40:2.

<sup>30</sup> The syntax of Job 9:3 is ambiguous; see Hartley (1988: 167), Clines (1989: 227–28), and Newsom (1996: 409).

<sup>31</sup> These different interpretations of Job arise from how readers construe his words in Job 42:1–6. See Habel (1985: 577–83); Morrow (1986: 211–25); Fox (2005: 355–56, 364–66); Krüger (2007: 217–29); Ho (2009: 711–14).

<sup>32</sup> For linguistic and pragmatic analyses of reported speech, see Coulmas (1986) and Holt (1996, 2009). On the specifically adversarial use of quotation, see Goodwin (1980: 674–95); Sternberg

manifested in outright misrepresentation: the book contains four quotations falsely attributed to Job (I include these because the formal features and rhetorical function of quotation are still employed in falsely attributed statements).<sup>33</sup> Even though it could be argued that the statements in Job 34:9 and 35:3 are legitimate *implications* of Job’s speeches, the words that are put in his mouth are clearly designed to depict him in the worst possible—even contradictory<sup>34</sup>—light. For example, in Job 11:4, Zophar represents Job as saying, “My teaching [xq1] is pure [Kz], and I am clean [rb] in your eyes.” Most commentators take Zophar’s quote as an accurate representation of Job’s claim to innocence (e.g., Job 9:20, 21; 10:7; 16:17b) that is nevertheless a distortion of Job’s words,<sup>35</sup> turning his heartfelt complaint into abstract theologizing and reconfiguring his claim of innocence into a claim that what he is saying about God, justice, and suffering is “pure.”

Even where a speaker quotes another character’s speech using the character’s own words (with minor modifications) and accurately represents his sentiments, the quotation may be meant to

---

(1982: 108–109, 130–31); Lane-Mercier (1991: 206, 208); Matoesian (2000: 879–914); Antaki and Leudar (2001: 467–88); Galatolo (2007: 207–20).

<sup>33</sup> Job 11:4; 22:13–14; 34:9; 35:3.

<sup>34</sup> In two cases Elihu juxtaposes a quote of Job’s *claim* to be righteous with a (falsely attributed) quote *questioning* the value of righteousness (Job 34:5–6, 9; 35:2–3). Analyses of reported speech in modern courtroom testimony show notable similarities to this use of quotation in Job; see Matoesian (2000). On the forensic qualities of the book of Job, see e.g. Habel (1984) and Magdalene (2007).

<sup>35</sup> Habel 1985: 206; Hartley 1988: 194; Clines 1989: 260; Newsom 1996: 419.

oppose and accuse the speaker.<sup>36</sup> Ironically, the use of quotation is usually taken to represent a claim to neutrality and honesty (“I’m just repeating what you said!”).<sup>37</sup> This allows characters to accuse their opponents from a higher ground by framing them negatively and using their own speech against them.<sup>38</sup> This is in fact what Job fears God will do to him (Job 9:20). Quotation therefore plays a key role in the author’s strategy of characterization: the author presents the friends and Elihu as unsympathetic and unreliable characters, and Job as set in his opposition to them.

### 3.5 Effects on the Reader

---

<sup>36</sup> Job 21:28 (*Job, quoting friends; source: Job 8:22; 15:28, 34; 18:14, 21; 20:28*); 33:8–9 (*Elihu, quoting Job; source: Job 16:17; 13:23; cf. 9:20, 21; 13:18*); 33:10–11 (*Elihu, quoting Job; source: Job 13:24, 27*); 34:5–6 (*Elihu, quoting Job; source: Job 9:15; 27:2; cf. 6:4, 28; 13:23*); Job 35:14 (*Elihu, quoting Job; source: uncertain. For similar sentiments, see Job 9:11; 23:9 [not seeing God]; 23:4 [setting case before God]; 31:35 [waiting for God]. For identical vocabulary, see Job 7:8; 17:15 [rw#]; 19:29 [Nyd]; 6:11; 13:15; 14:14 [lxy]*). Job 35:2 (*Elihu, quoting Job; source: uncertain; cf. Job 13:18; 27:6?*) may be either an accurate paraphrase or an implication of Job’s speech. Commentators differ on how Job 35:2 is to be understood: is Job’s righteousness “before God” (possibly an allusion to Eliphaz’s words, Job 4:17) or is Job “more in the right than God”? See Gordis (1978: 400); Habel (1985: 491); Hartley (1988: 463); Newsom (1996: 580); Clines (2006: 795–96).

<sup>37</sup> Galatolo 2007: 207.

<sup>38</sup> Galatolo (2007:213–219) speaks of the “moral function” of direct reported speech, particularly in assigning blame.

The quotation and allusion in the book of Job have the effect of inviting the reader to read more closely and inquire: “Did I see these words before somewhere? Does this character represent the other fairly? Did the character being quoted really say *that*?” Then too, there is a sense of “aesthetic appreciation” when one recognizes an allusion.<sup>39</sup>

#### 4.0 Conclusion

What, if anything, is unique about the text-referencing in the book of Job? It is not the techniques that are employed, or the local effects produced by individual examples of referencing. After all, we can find examples of irony and contradiction in allusion, or modifications of speech in quotation (whether to misrepresent or not) in other ancient Israelite texts. It seems to me that what is unique about quotation and allusion in the book of Job is the extent to which they are used, the scope across which they are employed, and the atmosphere of relentless disagreement they create throughout the entire composition. The ambiguity, irony, and indirectness that are characteristic of the way quotation and allusion are employed in the book (see Habel 1985: 51) seem to be reflected in the argument structure of the book itself.

It seems to me that part of the reason for the enduring appeal of the book of Job lies in its mimetic qualities. Even today, victims of disaster really do speak as Job speaks, creating explanation after explanation in an attempt to provide a rationale for what has befallen them. Onlookers really do point their fingers and explain disaster as divine judgment. People really do argue in the way Job and the friends do, accusing and misrepresenting each other, reveling in the triumph of successfully wielding an opponent’s words as weapons. In short, the book of Job is

---

<sup>39</sup> Gordis 1965: 203.

perceived as relevant because it reflects universal human experience. The use of quotation and allusion in the book plays an essential role in creating this mimetic realism.

## Works Cited

Antaki, C., and I. Leudar. 2001. Recruiting the Record: Using Opponent's Exact Words in Parliamentary Argumentation. *Text* 21.4: 467–88.

Ben-Porat, Ziva. 1976. The Poetics of Literary Allusion. *PTL: A Journal for Descriptive Poetics and Theory of Literature* 1: 105–28.

Carr, David. 1998. Intratextuality and Intertextuality—Joining Transmission History and Interpretation History in the Study of Genesis. Pages 97–112 in *Bibel und Midrasch: zur Bedeutung der rabbinischen Exegese für Bibelwissenschaft*. FAT 22. Edited by Gerhard Bodendorfer and Matthias Millard. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2001. Method in Determination of Direction of Dependence: An Empirical Test of Criteria Applied to Exodus 34,11–26 and its Parallels. Pages 107–140 in *Gottes Volk am Sinai. Untersuchungen zu Ex 32–34 und Dtn 9–10*. Edited by Matthias Köckert and Erhard Blum. Gütersloh: Chr. Kaiser, Gütersloher Verlaghaus.

Clark, H. H., and R. R. Gerrig. 1990. Quotations as Demonstrations. *Language* 66: 764–805.

Clines, David J. A. 1989. *Job 1–20*. WBC 17. Waco, Tex.: Word Books.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2006. *Job 21–37*. WBC 18A. Nashville: Thomas Nelson.

Coulmas, Florian, ed. 1986. *Direct and Indirect Speech*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Culler, Jonathan. 1981. *The Pursuit of Signs: Semiotics, Literature, Deconstruction*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Dhorme, Édouard. 1967. *A Commentary on the Book of Job* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson).

Fishbane, Michael. 1992. The Book of Job and Inner-Biblical Discourse. Pages 86–98 in *The Voice from the Whirlwind: Interpreting the Book of Job*. Edited by W. C. Gilpin and L. Perdue. Nashville: Abingdon Press.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2000. Types of Biblical Intertextuality. Pages 39–44 in *Congress Volume. Oslo 1998*. VTSup 80. Edited by A. Lemaire and M. Sæbø. Leiden: Brill.

Fox, Michael V. 1980. The Identification of Quotations in Biblical Literature. *ZAW* 92.3: 416–31.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2005. Job the Pious. *ZAW* 117.3: 351–66.

Galatolo, Renata. 2007. Active Voicing in Court. Pages 195–220 in *Reporting Talk*. Edited by Elizabeth Holt and Rebecca Clift. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goodwin, M. H. 1980. He-said-she-said: Formal Cultural Procedures for the Construction of a Gossip Dispute Activity. *American Ethnologist* 7.4: 674–95.

Gordis, Robert. 1939. Quotations in Wisdom Literature. *JQR* 30.2: 123–47.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1949. Quotations as a Literary Usage in Biblical, Oriental and Rabbinic Literature. *HUCA* 22: 157–219.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1965. *The Book of God and Man: A Study of Job*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1978. *The Book of Job: Commentary, New Translation and Special Studies*. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America.

Habel, Norman. 1984. The Role of Elihu in the Design of the Book of Job. Pages 81–98 in *In the Shelter of Elyon: Essays on Ancient Palestinian Life and Literature in Honor of G. W. Ahlström*. JSOTSS 31. Edited by W. Boyd Barrick and John R. Spencer. Sheffield: JSOT.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1985. *The Book of Job: A Commentary*. OTL. Philadelphia: Westminster Press.

Halliday, M. A. K., and Ruqaiya Hasan. 1976. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.

- Hartley, John. 1988. *The Book of Job*. NICOT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Hebel, Udo J. 1991. Towards a Descriptive Poetics of Allusion. Pages 135–64 in *Intertextuality*.  
Research in Text Theory 15. Edited by Heinrich F. Plett. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Helbig, Jörg. 1996. *Intertextualität und Markierung: Untersuchungen zur Systematic und  
Funktion der Signalisierung von Intertextualität*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C.  
Winter.
- Ho, Edward. 2009. In the Eyes of the Beholder: Unmarked Attributed Quotations in Job. *JBL*  
128.4: 703–16.
- Holt, Elizabeth. 1996. Reporting on talk: the use of direct reported speech in conversation.  
*Research on Language and Social Interaction* 29.3: 219–45.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2009. Reported Speech. Pages 190–205 in *The Pragmatics of Interaction*. Edited by  
Sigurd D'hondt, Jan-Ola Östman, and Jef Verschueren. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John  
Benjamins.
- Irwin, William. 2001. What is an Allusion? *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 59.3:  
287–97.

Jacobson, Rolf A. 2004. *'Many are Saying': The Function of Direct Discourse in the Hebrew Psalter*. JSOTSup 397. New York: T&T Clark.

Kristeva, Julia. 1980. Word, Dialogue, and Novel. Pages 64–91 in *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*. Edited by Leon S. Roudiez. Translated by Thomas Gora, Alice Jardine, and Leon S. Roudiez. New York: Columbia University Press.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1984. *Revolution in Poetic Language*. Translated by Margaret Waller. New York: Columbia University Press.

Krüger, Thomas. 2007. Did Job Repent? Pages 217–29 in *Das Buch Hiob und seine Interpretationen. Beiträge zum Hiob-Symposium auf dem Monte Verità vom 14.–19. August 2005*. Edited by T. Krüger, M. Oeming, K. Schmid, and C. Uehlinger. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich.

Lane-Mercier, Gillian. 1991. Quotation as a Discursive Strategy. *Kodikas/Code Ars Semeiotica* 14: 199–214.

Leonard, Jeffery M. 2008. Identifying Inner-Biblical Allusions: Psalm 78 as a Test Case. *JBL* 127.2: 241–65.

Lyons, Michael A. 2009. *From Law to Prophecy: Ezekiel's Use of the Holiness Code*. LHBOTS 507. New York: T&T Clark.

Magdalene, F. Rachel. 2007. *On the Scales of Righteousness: Neo-Babylonian Trial Law and the Book of Job*. Providence: Brown Judaic Studies.

Matoesian, G. 2000. Intertextual authority in reported speech: Production media in the Kennedy Smith rape trial. *Journal of Pragmatics* 32.7: 879–914.

Mettinger, Tryggve N. D. 1993. Intertextuality: Allusion and Vertical Context Systems in Some Job Passages. Pages 257–80 in *Of Prophets' Visions and the Wisdom of Sages: Essays in Honour of R. Norman Whybray on his Seventieth Birthday*. JSOTSup 162. Edited by H. A. McKay and D. J. A. Clines. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Meyers, Carol L., and Eric M. Meyers. 1993. *Zechariah 9–14: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible. New York: Doubleday.

Miller, Cynthia L. 1996. *The Representation of Speech in Biblical Hebrew Narrative: A Linguistic Analysis*. HSM 55. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

Miller, Geoffrey D. 2010. Intertextuality in Old Testament Research. *CBR* 9.3: 283–309.

Miner, Earl. 1994. Allusion. Pages 13–15 in *The New Princeton Handbook of Poetic Terms*.

Edited by T. V. F. Brogan. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Morrow, William. 1986. Consolation, Rejection, and Repentance in Job 42:6. *JBL* 105: 211–25.

Nasciscione, Anita. 2010. *Stylistic Use of Phraseological Units in Discourse*.

Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Newsom, Carol A. 1996. The Book of Job: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections. Pages

317–637 in *The New Interpreter's Bible*, vol. 4. Edited by L. E. Keck et al. Nashville:

Abingdon.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2003. *The Book of Job: A Contest of Moral Imaginations*. Oxford: Oxford University

Press.

Plett, Heinrich F. 1988. The Poetics of Quotation. Pages 313–34 in *Von der verbalen*

*Konstitution zur symbolischen Bedeutung – From verbal constitution to symbolic*

*meaning*. Edited by János S. Petöfi and Terry Olivi. Hamburg: Helmut Buske.

Pyeon, Yohan. 2003. *You Have Not Spoken What Is Right about Me: Intertextuality and the*

*Book of Job*. Studies in Biblical Literature 45. New York: Peter Lang.

- Savran, George W. 1988. *Telling and Retelling: Quotation in Biblical Narrative*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Schifferdecker, Kathryn. 2008. *Out of the Whirlwind: Creation Theology in the Book of Job*. HTS 61. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Schultz, Richard L. 1999. *The Search for Quotation: Verbal Parallels in the Prophets*. JSOTSup 180. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Sommer, Benjamin D. 1998. *A Prophet Reads Scripture: Allusion in Isaiah 40–66*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Sternberg, Meir. 1982. Proteus in Quotation-Land: Mimesis and the Forms of Reported Discourse. *Poetics Today* 3.2: 107–56.
- Talstra, Eep. 1994. Dialogue in Job 21: ‘virtual quotations’ or text grammatical markers? Pages 329–48 in *The Book of Job*. BETL 114. Edited by W. A. M. Beuken. Louvain: Leuven University Press and Peeters.
- Tull, Patricia K. 2000. The Rhetoric of Recollection. Pages 71–78 in *Congress Volume*. Oslo 1998. VTSup 80. Edited by A. Lemaire and M. Sæbø. Leiden: Brill.

van Wolde, Ellen. 1989. Trendy Intertextuality? Pages 43–49 in *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings: Essays in Honor of Bas van Iersel*. Edited by Sipke Draisma. Kampen: J. H. Kok.