Caring for the Sufferers Among Us: Job 3 Through the Lens of Classical Rhetorical Theory and Modern Psychological Trauma Studies

Abstract:

A lack of engagement with the theology of evil and suffering leads to immature responses when tragedy strikes our congregations and alienates the sufferers among us. I believe the best path forward is an interdisciplinary approach that is both intellectually honest and spiritually whole. In this article, I explore the first speech of Job through the lens of classical rhetorical studies and modern psychological trauma theories in order to demonstrate how Job’s deep lament offers the Church an example of how to give sufferers the space to work through their grief as they walk their path towards healing and hope.
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Introduction

The presence of evil has been behind the arguments against the existence of a good God since (at least) the Enlightenment. In his Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion David Hume argues that evil proved that God is indifferent to his creation and therefore, is not good (Peterson 2016b: 3). Almost 200 years later, evil was the basis of J. L. Mackie’s logical argument against theistic belief. He contended that God cannot be both omnipotent and good while evil is present in this world. A good God would not allow evil and an omnipotent God would be powerful enough to eliminate it (Mackie 1955). Since then philosophers and theologians have offered points and counter points for and against theistic belief based on this problem of evil.

Unfortunately, this ongoing debate tends to be an academic endeavor that the average person tries to avoid. This is at least partly due to a Western culture that desperately wants to avoid suffering. N. T. Wright calls this the new problem of evil. We largely pretend that the world is good until evil hits us squarely in the face. Then, because we have no well-formed theology of evil, we are surprised and respond in immature ways (Wright 2014: 24–25). Like the philosophical debate, the theology of evil tends to be an academic pursuit that rarely trickles down to the pews. For example, the Christian faith does not advocate for universal salvation and yet at funerals we almost always hear people say the deceased “is in a better place.” Likewise, most Christians do not believe God is distant and aloof, ready to smite humans for poor decisions. Why then do we tell our suffering brothers and sisters that God has allowed their suffering to strengthen them or that their misery is part of God’s good plan? Rabbi Harold Kushner, in his book When Bad Things Happen to Good People, rightly argues that these shallow explanations may defend God, but they do not comfort the sufferer (Kushner 1981: 23). This line of thinking heaps shame on victims – if they had stronger faith, this would not have happened; if they were good enough, the pain would end. The sufferers among us are isolated and shamed; they have no one to turn to in order to ask difficult questions. Maybe that is why sufferers for centuries have turned to another man who lost everything and had no one to turn to—Job.

I do not believe that Job simply offers us an example of how to suffer well. Like theological bumper stickers, those arguments often heap blame on suffers and allow the Church to dismiss grief. Instead, I believe the book of Job teaches the Church how to interact with trauma and suffering
in a way that is both intellectually honest and spiritually whole. Through the lens of classic rhetorical criticism and modern psychological trauma studies, I will look at the first speech of Job in order to demonstrate how Job’s deep lament offers the Church an example of how to give sufferers the space to work through their grief as they walk their path towards healing and hope.

**Methodology**

*Classic Rhetorical Criticism*

Rhetoric was defined by Aristotle as “the faculty of observing in any given case the available means of persuasion” (Yu 2011: 5). Similarly, George Kennedy, described rhetoric more recently as “that quality in discourse by which a speaker or writer seeks to accomplish his purpose” (Dozeman 1992: 715). Against his contemporary’s focus on the literary style of a text, Kennedy developed a method for New Testament studies attuned to the editor’s intent and the perception of the audience (Dozeman 1992: 715). Ryan Cook adapted Kennedy’s methodology for use in the analysis focuses on two primary questions. First, what is the intended effect of the poem? Second, how is that achieved? Similar to Cook’s work in Psalms, I believe the poems of the book of Job can also be rhetorically analyzed in order to posit its effect.

Not all poems are so clear-cut, though. Barbara Hernstein Smith (1968: 131-132) rightly posits that an argument can “develop informally and irregularly through analogies, examples, and inferences, and ... be interrupted by digressions or elaboration.” Therefore, it is also in the irregularities of Job’s first speech that we are able to discern his purposes and greater rhetorical aims – for his own grief process and as an example for the audience.

*Modern Psychological Trauma Research*

According to modern research, there are typical patterns people follow in reaction to a traumatic event. First, the victim experiences an overwhelming disruption of their mental processes. They are often left in shock or speechless. Second, they experience an inability to express emotion. Third, defense mechanisms leave a victim stuck in a distorted view
of the past with no avenue to move forward. Finally, victims experience a decreased ability to trust other people or to trust God (O’Connor 2011: 4).

It takes more than just time to move beyond the traumatic events and one never fully heals. Instead, victims integrate their trauma into their lives by reinterpreting the events to fit into a larger narrative that they can understand (O’Connor 2011: 47). This requires processing the events and accepting the consequences of the trauma. Additionally, victims must reengage their emotions by allowing themselves to grieve. Grief “involves living in the present with knowledge of the self and of the world as they are” (O’Connor 2011: 68). Lack of emotion de-humanizes the world, but grief opens the heart to feel and experience life again.

For a deeply religious person, studies have shown that asking difficult spiritual questions after a trauma experience is more beneficial than glossing over the events with shallow, pious responses. In general, victims who search for deeper answers experience negative results initially, but the long-term results are significantly greater. For example, one study showed higher levels of depression, suicidal thoughts, and PTSD symptoms than victims who do not question their spirituality (Wortmann, Park, and Edmondson 2011: 443), but greater success in the long term (Wortmann, Park, and Edmondson 2011: 447). Another study analyzed a process called “meaning-making” (Currier et al. 2015: 29) placing them at risk for burnout and trauma-related problems (e.g., posttraumatic stress disorder [PTSD]), where victims find a framework to explain their traumatic experience. The study also found that those who struggle to find a religious framework take longer to report positive moods, but once they do, the moods reported are far more positive than those who never assigned a spiritual framework to their trauma (McCann and Webb 2012: 150). Therefore, these studies wrestling with God and experiencing a full range of emotions is better than bypassing those emotions for quicker, but superficial recovery.

Analysis of Job 3

A careful analysis of the three stanzas of Job 3 through the lens of classical rhetorical studies and modern psychological trauma theories illuminates the depth of Job’s trauma and demonstrates the early stages of his integration process.
1 After this Job opened his mouth and he cursed his day.
2 Job answered and he said:

3 May the day perish [that] I was born into; 
   and the night [that] he said, “a man was conceived.”

4 That day may it be darkness; 
   May God not seek it from above; 
   May light not shine upon it.
5 May darkness and deep darkness redeem it; 
   May a cloud settle upon it; 
   May the glooms of the day terrify it.

6 That night, may darkness seize it; 
   May it not rejoice among the days; 
   Among the number of months, may it not come.

7 Behold, that night may it be barren; 
   May a cry of joy not enter it; 
8 May the cursers of the day curse it; 
   Those ready to rouse Leviathan.
9 May the stars of its twilight grow dark; 
   May it hope for light, but there is none; 
   May it not see the eyelashes of dawn.

10 Because it did not shut the doors of 
   my womb; 
   And therefore, hide trouble from my eyes.

11 Why is it not from the womb [that] I would die? 
   From the belly had I come forth I could have perished.

12 Why did knees meet me? 
   Why breasts that I could suckle?
13 Because if I had laid down, I would be at peace; 
   I would have slept, then I would be at rest.
14 With kings and advisors of the land; 
   Those who rebuild desolate places for themselves.
15. Or [I would be] with leaders who have gold;
   Those who fill their houses with silver.
16 Or like a hidden miscarriage, I would not exist.
   Like children who do not see light, [I would not exist].
17 There the wicked have ceased agitation;
   There the weary of strength will have rest.
18 Altogether prisoners sleep;
   They do not hear the voice of an oppressor.
19 Small and great are there;
   The servant is free from his master.
20 Why did he give light to the laborer,
   And life to the bitter of soul?
21 They are waiting for death, but it is not.
   Therefore, they search for it more than hidden treasures.
22 They are joyful concerning rejoicing;
   For they shall rejoice when they find the grave.
23 [Why did he give light] to the man whose path is hidden?
   Therefore, God hedges around him.
24 For before my bread my groans come;
   My roarings flow like water.
25 For fear I trembled, and it came to me;
   That which I feared came to me.
26 I am not at ease. I am not at peace.
   I am not at rest because agitation has come.

After the introductory lines in vv. 1-2, Job begins his curse of the day of his birth and night of his conception in the first stanza. This topic is introduced in v. 3, particularized in vv. 4-9, and explained in v. 10. Beginning with v. 3, we are introduced to an important word pair – לָיָל (day) and לָיָה (night). While some commentators quibble over the implication of the use of these two words, I believe this is an example of James Kugel’s notion that “A is so, and what’s more, B is so.” The day and night are
neither individual entities of disdain, nor do they mean the same thing. Instead we hear Job trying to effectively express the deepest agony of his soul. Kugel paraphrases it well, “my whole life is a waste! Blot out the day of my birth, in fact, go back to the very night I was conceived and destroy it (Kugel 1998: 9).”

This desire for wholesale destruction of Job’s origins, begs a further question, though. Why does Job desire the day of his birth to perish, not the day of his misfortune? Rhetorically, Job is trying to express that he is not merely saddened at the loss of his livelihood and family but is in such deep agony that he wishes he would have never been born at all. This skewed view of reality introduces us to the depth of Job’s trauma right from the start.

Verses 4-5 particularize Job’s desire to curse the day of his birth. The use of personification of the day heightens Job’s lament. For example, v. 4 describes his abstract day as something concrete to be sought and shined upon. In v. 5, Job personifies darkness as a potential redeemer of his wayward day. Furthermore, the darkness is being personified as one who terrifies, and the day is being personified as someone who can be terrorized. The rhetorical effect is that his grief does not just surround him, it lays claim to him and attacks him.

Next, Job turns in vv. 6-9 to the particularization of the curse of the night of his conception. Where Job’s day was dark in v. 4, here Job proclaims that his night is worse than dark—it is barren. The extension of darkness to barrenness is a metonymy that highlights the sadness surrounding infertility. Job sees his life as the deepest kind of darkness and wishes not to go back to his old life, but that he had never existed in the first place.

Job continues with vain requests and unfulfilled hopes. He desires the professional cursers of v. 8 to undo his conception. Of course, this is impossible as the events have already happened. In v. 9 he expresses the desire of his night to remain dark without light ever entering it. Clearly, the impossibility of Job being un-conceived is as impossible as preventing daylight from eclipsing each night. Only God could be capable of fulfilling Job’s astronomical requests and yet, strangely, that is the one person Job does not reach out to.

Verse 10 finally answers the reader’s burning question, “why?” Although we can understand that Job is sad, why does he insist on non-existence rather than just having his pain alleviated? In Job’s mind, the only way to find true reprieve from his condition is to have never been born. In fact, he accuses the day of his birth and the night of his conception of
having failed to protect him. This blame of inanimate objects for failing at an impossible task highlights Job’s warped view of reality. The trauma he has experienced is so profound that he cannot possibly imagine integrating it into his life narrative.

Furthermore, Job’s elevated language in this stanza gives insight into his process of wrestling with God. Joseph Dodson (2008: 41) explores the rhetorical power of figurative language and suggests metaphor is often used to deflect attention away from a difficult topic. Job gives human characteristics and expectations to the day and night, but is there an underlying metaphor at work as well? Is there a something or a someone that has failed to protect Job? Someone who Job wants to blame, but maybe is not ready to address head on? As the speeches continue, we discover that Job does blame God for not protecting him, but here, in the early stages of wrestling with reality, Job is not direct, maybe not yet comfortable to make such a bold accusation.

The second stanza continues to highlight Job’s struggle to integrate his trauma into his life. Rather than admit he is hurt or angry, Job fixates his mind on death and the ease he would have experienced had he never been born or had died right after birth. The intimate wording of vv. 11-12 should bring connotations of love and comfort that newborns receive from their parents. Instead, Job has juxtaposed these concepts with death and lament. Rather than being grateful for loving parents, Job cries out, “Why did good things have to happen to me?” This rhetorical reversal dramatically illustrates both the depth of Job’s lament and his warped view of reality.

After expressing grief that he was born, Job goes on in vv. 13-19 to idealize the rest he could have found if he had died. In fact, he believes his life is currently so awful that only death upon entry into the world could provide him with real relief. Job goes beyond describing this rest and begins to list the kinds of people he would be with—kings, leaders, the wicked, prisoners, and the like. While many commentators use the word pair פָּּוַּפָּו and פָּּוַּפָּו in v. 19 as the lens to read the whole of the section through, I am unconvinced. First, the classification of פָּּוַּפָּו or פָּּוַּפָּו is not always straightforward. For example, Alter (1985: 81) posits that the פָּּוַּפָּו are listed first, but then why is a hidden miscarriage listed between rich leaders and the wicked? Furthermore, why is the servant listed after the word pair? Rather than a categorization, this word pair should be understood as a merism used to idealize death. In short, the kind of rest that death provides is such that all people—no matter their lot in life—will experience it.
Job clearly has an overly romantic view of death in this stanza. In his mind, to have never been born at all is his best possible life and he would rather throw away his many years of happiness than to continue to experience his deep agony. It is worth emphasizing again—Job does not desire death now, but to have never existed. Oddly, although the variety of people listed would find rest in death after their long lives, Job appears to not believe it is possible for himself. Only death immediately following birth could relieve his pain. This warped view of reality and fantasy life Job is playing out in this stanza again illuminate the depths of his agony and reveal his inner process of wrestling—really avoiding—reality. He would rather have never had life than to find a way to integrate this experience into his life narrative.

Job begins to make a shift, though, in the last stanza of the poem. Rather than hiding behind personifications or idealizing death, Job begins to ask real questions about God. This shift is significant for his integration process. First, Job is stepping back into reality. One way we see this shift is in the repetition of the word light (light) throughout the poem. In v. 9 the personified day hopes for light but finds none. In v. 16 the miscarried children are described as those who do not see the light. In each of these verses light represents life that is not actualized. In v. 20, though, light does not simply represent life but is overtly connected to it by metonymy. Further, in this statement, Job is finally admitting reality. This is a far cry from integrating his trauma into his life narrative, but he has shifted from the world of imagination and fantasy to asking tough questions about the reality he now experiences.

Second, this shift reveals that Job is wrestling with God and conventional wisdom. Proverbs 2 promises that if someone seeks after understanding as if it were a hidden treasure, they will find it. In Job 3:21, though, Job claims that when no relief is found from a bitter life, people will seek after death as if it were a hidden treasure. It could be posited that Job is claiming that wisdom matters little for a life filled with misery. These seemingly impious claims are not exclusive to Job, though, as Ecclesiastes has similar themes. This impious talk is shocking on the lips of Job, though, as his previous words were perfectly aligned with conventional wisdom. For example, after Job received the news that everything he had was gone, his response in 1:21 was, “The Lord gives, and the Lord takes. Let the name of the Lord be blessed.” Likewise, after being struck with horrible boils, he said in 2:10, “Must we only take good from God and not take the bad?”
Even in his deep laments in the first two stanzas of the poem, Job avoids directly blaming God or questioning his plan. Here, though, Job is finally willing to voice his deepest concerns. Piety is no longer more important that finding the truth. Job is taking a step into the ring to really begin his wrestling match with God.

Verse 24 brings another important shift in Job’s integration process. In the first two stanzas the use of first person was only in reference to the past\(^9\) or in a fantasy,\(^{10}\) but in vv. 24-26 Job openly admits his present reality. He confesses that his complaints spew forth with no real direction, that he is surrounded by fear, and that he can find no peace in the agitation. With no clear recipient, his complaints avoid blaming God, but also leave behind the fantasy world of the second stanza. His last line is significant because it echoes v. 13. There, Job believed that only in non-existence could he find peace (נשא), sleep (ניש), and rest (מנ). Here, Job admits that he is not at ease ( anda), not at peace (נשא), and not at rest (מנ). By admitting where he really is—rather than dreaming about where he wants to be—Job is stepping back into reality, which is essential to integrating his trauma into his life narrative.

This shift is encouraging for the reader. Through honest inner dialogue, Job finds words to begin accepting the reality of his trauma. Hope and integration seem just around the corner for Job – and his example can be a roadmap for the sufferers among us. In fact, in the overarching rhetoric of the book, the honesty of the introduction allows the reader to empathize with Job in a way the friends cannot. We know that Job is innocent and did not deserve his plight. We are invited to sit next to Job with our deepest grief and allow his harrowing lament speak words we are unable to articulate ourselves. The first speech of Job becomes a safe space to process grief and begin the process of integration. Sadly, we know that Job’s friends do not create a safe space for Job to continue processing his trauma. But for a moment the eyelashes of dawn appear on the horizon to bring a ray of light to the darkest soul.

**Conclusion**

Through the lens of rhetoric and trauma studies, I have tried to illuminate key themes and topics in each stanza of Job 3 that can help the modern reader better understand the intended effect of the poem. In the first stanza (vv. 3-9), Job cloaks his mistrust in the personification of the day of his birth and night of his conception. Rhetorically, Job is both attempting to put words to his deep anguish and avoiding facing his reality.
The audience begins to understand how the traumatic events of chapters 1-2 are really affecting Job. Rather than working through his grief, though, Job places unrealistic expectations on inanimate objects and insists that non-existence is his only relief.

Job continues these themes in the second stanza where his desire for non-existence becomes an elaborate fantasy about how wonderful his life would have been had he never been born. Rhetorically, Job is not criticizing those who are well-off in the world, but rather emphasizing that everyone—small or great—finds rest in death. Ironically, Job does not suggest death now would be his relief, but only death at birth. This romanticizing of death and non-existence only heightens the fact that Job is not yet willing to wrestle with his reality.

This changes though, in the final stanza (vv. 20-26). While Job is not yet willing to fully admit his circumstances or integrate them into his life narrative, he makes strides in that direction. First, his probing questions in vv. 20-23 imply an admittance of reality. Like the author of Ecclesiastes, Job admits that the world is not fair and asks why. Against conventional wisdom, Job is willing to wrestle with God. Second, the switch to the first person in vv. 24-26 further reveal Job's shift in mindset. In the beginning of the poem Job distrusted everyone and hid his pain behind the personified day and night, but here, in the last stanza, he begins to look at his reality more directly even if he cannot yet directly blame God for his situation. The tone of the last stanza indicates that his distrust and pessimism towards God are just below the surface and his admission of reality is a step toward direct confrontation with God.

These subtle allegations are not missed by the friends who interrupt Job's lament to bring a full attack in the following chapters on Job's lack of piety. Unfortunately, the friends miss Job's deep emotional plea and are seemingly ill-equipped to help Job process his trauma. They offer intellectual solutions that sound good but fall flat on Job's grief-stricken ears. It is only after his face-to-face meeting with God that his understanding of suffering is realigned and he finds rest for his soul.11

Sadly, the Church often follows the path of the friends—a path that leads to frustration, blame, and broken relationships. How would the book of Job been different if the friends had been what modern researchers call “trauma-informed?” (Bath 2008) which has, in turn, led to a focus on the treatment of trauma-related conditions. Much of the recent literature describes different approaches to therapy. However, there are a few
consistent propositions arising from the research and clinical literature which suggest that much of the healing from trauma can take place in non-clinical settings. There is some evidence to suggest that trauma-informed living environments in which healing and growth can take place are a necessary precursor to any formal therapy that might be offered to a traumatised child. It stands to reason that the treatment of children exposed to complex trauma will itself be complex and long-lasting. However, there appears to be a remarkable consensus about the key prerequisites for healing--those critical factors or therapeutic pillars that need to be in place if healing is to take place. Although there is debate about the number of critical factors, there are three that are common to most approaches. This article outlines the three pillars of trauma-informed care: (1) What if they had realized that integrating the traumatic event into one's life narrative was essential for moving forward? What if they knew distancing yourself from reality and wrestling with God were helpful steps in that process? Fortunately, the Church has access to this knowledge. Through careful integration of modern trauma research into biblical narratives such as the book of Job, the Church can find a better path—one that offers intellectually honest answers to the problem of evil and spiritually whole responses to the sufferers among us.

End Notes

1 Most scholars researching the intersection of trauma studies and the Bible work in the world of literary criticism—focusing on the story as created by the author for a specific purpose. While an insightful endeavor, I find this approach misses the nuances of how the individual characters (real or presented) experience and process trauma. Therefore, I will follow the path of psychological trauma research as laid out by Christopher Frechette and Elizabeth Boase in the introduction of The Bible Through the Lens of Trauma. They state that “within the field of psychology, the study of trauma focuses on the range of responses evoked by an experience perceived to pose an extreme threat and that overwhelms an individual’s ordinary means of coping” (Boase and Frechette 2017: 4). Clearly, these experiences and responses are recorded for us as literary material, but my focus will not be the way trauma is encoded in the text for a specific audience, but in Job, the individual as recorded in the literature.

2 O’Connor (2011: 3) is not a trauma specialist, but I have found her research to be extensive and in line with other sources I have found. Therefore, I will rely on her general explanations of trauma that are cast in the context of biblical studies.
3 PTSD symptoms include three categories: reexperiencing (nightmares, flashbacks), emotional numbness, and hyperarousal. See Catherall (2004: 264).

4 Clines, for example, insists that day be a 24-hour period, but night is just a night (Clines 1989: 17:81), while Hartley explores the magical quality of these two events that both represent his origin (Hartley 1988: 92). Berlin notes the contrast between the definite נuit and indefinite זי, but I do not think much can be made of this considering there is only one possible day Job was born into (Berlin 1985: 51).


7 The knees could either refer to lap or be related to blessing (ܪܲܒ) a newborn child based on Gen 48:12 and 50:23 (Longman 2012: 103). The adoption language is associated with knees and suggests the reference points to acceptance and concern for the newborn child by mother or father (Stade 1886: 143–65).

8 See Eccl 4:3 and 7:1.

9 See v. 3, 10.

10 See v. 11, 12, 13, 16.

11 These conclusions are largely based on the work of Matitiahu Tsevat (1966) and Michael Peterson (2016a).
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