VULGATA IN DIALOGUE • 10 (2026) 183–197

Sebastian Castellio's Latin Translation of the Old Testament

Job 40–41 as a Case Study

Martijn Jaspers

Research Foundation – Flanders (FWO) and KU Leuven

Martijn.Jaspers@kuleuven.be • https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4432-1151

FWO grant 1248126N: "Saint Jerome Working Two Jobs: Theological and Stylistic Transformations in Jerome's Latin Translations of Job iuxta Graecos and iuxta Hebraeos".

ABSTRACT • This article examines Sebastian Castellio's Latin translation of Job 40–41 as a case study in sixteenth-century humanist biblical scholarship. After situating Castellio and the publication history of his Latin Bible, it compares his rendering with the Masoretic Text and Jerome's Vulgate. The analysis identifies a consistent preference for classical idiom over Hebraizing literalism, including subordinate syntax, idiomatic expressions, poetic and technical vocabulary, Greek loanwords, and deliberate variation. Castellio also heightens the literary character of the text through alliteration, hyperbaton, polyptoton, paronomasia, and carefully arranged word order. Although his version often avoids verbal echoes of the Vulgate, several lexical choices indicate that Jerome's translation remained an important point of reference. Castellio nevertheless corrects the Vulgate where he considers it distant from the Hebrew and draws on contemporary exegesis, especially in identifying Behemoth as an elephant and Leviathan as a whale. These choices support his historical understanding of Job and show that his translation combines philological independence, exegetical tradition, and a distinctly humanist ideal of elegant Latin.

KEYWORDS • Sebastian Castellio – Book of Job – Latin Bible – Vulgate – humanist translation – Neo-Latin – biblical exegesis – Behemoth – Leviathan – Jerome

ZUSAMMENFASSUNG • Der Beitrag untersucht Sebastian Castellios lateinische Übersetzung von Ijob 40–41 als Fallstudie zur humanistischen Bibelphilologie des 16. Jahrhunderts. Nach einer Einordnung Castellios und der Publikationsgeschichte seiner lateinischen Bibel wird seine Fassung mit dem masoretischen Text und der Vulgata des Hieronymus verglichen. Die Analyse zeigt eine konsequente Bevorzugung klassischer Idiomatik gegenüber hebraisierender Wörtlichkeit: hypotaktische Syntax, idiomatische Wendungen, poetischer und technischer Wortschatz, griechische Lehnwörter sowie bewusste Variation. Durch Alliteration, Hyperbaton, Polyptoton, Paronomasie und sorgfältige Wortstellung verstärkt Castellio zudem den literarischen Charakter des Textes. Obwohl er direkte Anklänge an die Vulgata häufig vermeidet, lassen mehrere lexikalische Entscheidungen erkennen, dass Hieronymus ein wichtiger Bezugspunkt blieb. Zugleich korrigiert Castellio die Vulgata dort, wo sie ihm vom Hebräischen abzuweichen scheint, und greift auf zeitgenössische Exegese zurück, besonders bei der Deutung Behemots als Elefant und Leviathans als Wal. Diese Entscheidungen stützen seine historische Auffassung des Ijobbuches und verbinden philologische Eigenständigkeit, exegetische Tradition und das humanistische Ideal eines eleganten Lateins.

SCHLAGWORTE • Sebastian Castellio – Buch Ijob – lateinische Bibel – Vulgata – humanistische Übersetzung – Neulatein – Bibelexegese – Behemot – Leviatan – Hieronymus

© 2026 The Author(s)
This article is licensed under CC BY 4.0

https://doi.org/10.25788/vidbor.v10i1.1619

Introduction

Since January 1, 2026, new regulations in the Vatican no longer require official curial documents to be formally composed in Latin. As such, Pope Leo XIV has effectively ended the official status of Latin in the Vatican, and, by extension, in the Catholic Church—a language that, in practice, had already become only marginal. This has not always been the case, however. For many centuries—indeed, for more than a millennium and a half—Latin was one of the most important languages, not only in the Vatican but throughout European Christendom. The Latin Bible was therefore pivotal for the Church, especially in the form of the Vulgate as translated by Jerome of Stridon (ca. 347–420), on whose work the dedicatee of this Festschrift has published a monumental *Handbook* that is now indispensable within Vulgate Studies.

In this contribution, I focus on a period during which both Biblical Studies and Latin Studies (and thus also the study of the Latin Bible) flourished: the sixteenth century. More specifically, I examine an exemplary specimen of Latin and biblical scholarship: Sebastian Castellio's Bible translation into "classical" Latin.[1] As a case study, I analyse Castellio's rendering of chapters 40–41 of the Book of Job. These chapters form part of God's final speech, in which he challenges some of the theological views expressed throughout the book, humbles Job and his friends, and confronts them with their shortcomings and limitations. God does so by describing the formidable Behemoth (ch. 40) and the untamable Leviathan (ch. 41), creatures that, according to the narrative, can be subdued only by God's almighty power.

Sebastian Castellio (1515-1563) as a translator of the Bible

Sebastian Castellio (or Châteillon) was born in 1515 in the east of France, in the village of Saint-Martin-du-Fresne. This village lies near the Swiss city of Geneva, which later became one of the strongholds of the Reformation, particularly of Calvinism.[2] He later moved to Basel, where he spent most of his life and died in 1563. Castellio was a prolific author, school rector, translator, and advocate of religious tolerance, which brought him into a well-known conflict with John Calvin (1509–64). One of the enigmas of Castellio's life is his confessional indeterminacy: he left Catholicism, broke with the Calvinists, was not a Lutheran, and, although he knew some Anabaptists, he never appears to have joined them.[3]

---

1 It is often said that Castellio's translations are written in *Ciceronian* Latin; yet he also makes extensive use of vocabulary, idioms, and turns of phrase drawn from other authors. The label *Ciceronian* seems inadequate, in my view, to capture the literary range of Castellio's Latin.

2 The most complete biography of Castellion is still Ferdinand Buisson, *Sébastien Castellion. Sa vie et son oeuvre (1515-1563)*, Hachette, Paris 1891 (published in two volumes). It was revised and republished in 2010 by Max Engammare (Droz).

Castellio produced not one but two translations of the Bible: one in French, and one in Latin. His French translation, *La Bible nouvellement translatée*, was published in two volumes in Basel by Johann Herwagen (in 1555). Because of its importance for the French Reformation, this translation has attracted considerable scholarly attention.[4] While this French translation was intended for "idiots" (that is, ordinary people without knowledge of the sacred languages), Castellio's Latin Bible was clearly aimed at a different audience.[5]

His Latin translation of the Pentateuch appeared in 1546 under the title *Moses Latinus ex Hebraeo factus* (with Johannes Oporinus in Basel). The title itself signals Castellio's approach to translation: the Pentateuch is not simply rendered from Hebrew into Latin; rather, here the reader encounters a Moses who has been "made Latin" from the Hebrew. On the title page, Castellio addresses the reader with the promise: "You will see, reader, that Moses now at last speaks Latin as well, and clearly so."[6] One year later, the *Moses Latinus* was followed by Castellio's translation of the Psalms, likewise rendered in classical Latin.[7] In 1551, he published the entire Bible in Latin, again with Oporinus. Castellio appears to have devoted all his time and energy to this *magnum opus*, as he had published nothing in the years between his Psalter and the complete Bible.[8] The Latin Bible was republished in 1554, this time together with fragments of Flavius Josephus, and in 1556 with an index. Subsequently, the translation was reprinted nu-

---

[3] Roubaud, Jacques, "Traduire pour les idiots: Sébastien Castellion et la Bible", *RevScRel* 3 (2001), 353–76, 358–60.

[4] For a recent edition of this French bible, see *La Bible, nouvellement translatée par Sébastien Castellion (1555)*, préface Pierre Gibert et Jacques Roubaud, notes et commentaires Marie-Christine Gomez-Géraud, Bayard, Paris 2005. For Genesis, Proverbes, Ecclesiastes, and Song of Songs in particular, see *La Genèse (1555)*, édité, introduit et annoté par Jacques Chaurand, Nicole Geunier, Carine Skupien Dekens, avec la collaboration de Max Engammare (Collections textes littéraires français 553), Droz, Geneva 2003; *Les livres de Salomon : Proverbes, Ecclésiaste, Cantique des cantiques (1555)*, édités, introduits et annotés par Nicole Geunier et Max Engammare (Collections textes littéraires français 595), Droz, Geneva 2008. The original edition can be found here: https://books.google.fr/books?id=aShJAAAAcAAJ&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=false (last access April 22, 2026).

[5] Gomez-Géraud, Marie-Christine, "Qui parle encore de Sébastien Castellion? Does Anybody Still Talk about Sebastian Castellio?" *Australian Journal of French Studies* 52.3 (2015), 261–72, here 268. For the term "idiots", see, e.g., Castellio's own prefaces in which he uses this term in this sense, as well as modern articles, such as Roubaud, Jacques, "Traduire pour les idiots : Sébastien Castellion et la Bible", and Gomez-Geraud, Marie-Christine, "Quand la Bible parle aux 'idiots'. Sébastien Castellion et ses deux traductions de l'Écriture." in Ortola, Marie-Sol, and Miranda, Marie (eds.), *Langues et identités culturelles, Europe XVI-XVII*, vol. II, Groupe XVIe et XVIIe siècles en Europe, Nancy 2005, 217–27.

[6] *Videbis, lector, Mosem nunc demum & Latine loquentem, & aperte.*

[7] *Psalterium, reliquaque sacrarum literarum Carmina et Precationes, cum argumentis, et brevi difficiliorum locorum declaratione. Sebastiano Castalione interprete* (Johannes Oporinus, Basel 1547): https://play.google.com/books/reader?id=ifI7AAAAcAAJ&pg=GBS.PP4&hl=en (last access January 19, 2026). A modern, machine-readable version can be found here: https://archive.org/details/CompleteClassicalLatinPsalterCastelioAndPianumVersions/mode/2up (last access January 19, 2026).

[8] Buisson, *Castellion*, 247. Nevertheless, Castellion wrote in a letter to Francisco de Enzinas, dated on June 20, 1549, that he was close to finishing his Latin Bible and wanted to start his French translation. See Roubaud, "Traduire", 364.

merous times from the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries. However, in the decade following its publication, the Bible met with harsh criticism from some Genevan reformers, most notably Theodore Beza (1519–1605). By contrast, the English philosopher John Locke (1632–1704) expressed admiration for Castellio's translation.[9]

Today, the Latin Bible is predominantly associated with (Roman) Catholicism, whereas the Reformation is more commonly linked to the emergence and dissemination of vernacular Bible translations. Yet this opposition obscures a more complex historical reality, at least in the sixteenth century. Indeed, Catholic circles produced new editions of the Vulgate. The most notable is probably Santes Pagnino's *Veteris et Novi Testamenti nova translatio*, published in Lyon in 1527/28, as well as, of course, the Sixto-Clementine Edition of the Vulgate, issued in multiple editions at the end of the same century. At the same time, however, many early reformers were far from hostile to the Latin Bible; on the contrary, they edited, printed, and revised Vulgate versions (e.g., Hieronymus Froben and Nicolaus Episcopius in Basel, 1538), annotated them (e.g., Andreas Osiander in Nuremberg, 1522), published vernacular translations alongside the Vulgate (such as Paul Eber's *Biblia Germanolatina*, published in 1565 in Wittenberg), or even composed entirely new Latin translations of the Bible (like Sebastian Münster in Basel, 1534–35).[10]

In contemporary scholarship, Castellio's Latin translation remains underexplored.[11] In my view, one of the main reasons for this neglect lies in its uneasy fit within contemporary academic disciplines. The translation is written in classical Latin, but does not date from the classical period, placing it outside the traditional scope of classical philology. It is a product of the Reformation, yet composed in Latin, whereas Reformation studies tend to prioritize vernacular translations. It was written by a humanist scholar, but it is a biblical translation, a genre often marginal to Neo-Latin studies. It is an annotated biblical text, yet a humanist rather than a patristic one, and thus falls outside Patristics. Lastly, it was printed too late to attract sustained interest from codicologists or historians specialized in Renaissance book production.

---

[9] For an overview of the reception history of Castellio's Latin Bible and their reprints, with further references, see Irena Backus, "Moses, Plato and Flavius Josephus. Castellio's Conceptions of Sacred and Profane in His Latin Versions of the Bible", in Gordon, Bruce, and McLean, Matthew (eds.), *Shaping the Bible in the Reformation: Books, Scholars, and Their Readers in the Sixteenth Century* (Library of the Written Word: The Handpress World 20.14), Brill, Leiden 2012, 143–44.

[10] For an overview of these Protestant Latin Bibles, see Noblesse-Rocher, Annie, "Protestant Latin Bibles", in Houghton, Hugh (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Latin Bible*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 2023, 320–32; Eskhult, Josef, "Latin Bible Translations in the Protestant Reformation: Historical Contexts, Philological Justification, and the Impact of Classical Rhetoric on the Conception of Translation Methods", in Gordon, Bruce, and McLean, Matthew (eds.), *Shaping the Bible in the Reformation: Books, Scholars, and Their Readers in the Sixteenth Century* (Library of the Written Word: The Handpress World 20.14), Brill, Leiden 2012, 167–86.

[11] In 2015, Marie-Christine Gomez-Géraud regretted that Castellio's Latin Bible translations were so little studied, despite their enormous significance (see "Qui parle encore de Sébastien Castellion?" 270–71). More than a decade later, I can only repeat her complaint. See also *idem*, "Quand la Bible parle aux 'idiots'", footnote 6.

Job in Castellio's *Biblia*

His edition of the new Latin translation of Scripture includes not only the biblical text itself but also rich paratextual materials. For example, Castellio's translation of Job is preceded by a preface written by the translator himself. The opening sentence of this prologue firmly establishes his position in the debate over the historicity of the Book of Job (cols. 693–94):[12]

> Qui hanc Jobi narrationem & disputationem fictam esse putant, id mihi nulla ratione facere videntur. Nihil enim potest esse in vera historia, quod non sit in hac: ut qui hanc neget, omnes negare possit. Quod si putant hoc absurdum esse, quod in hoc libro Deus cum homine colloquitur: cogitent, & cum multis aliis olim colloquutum, cum Noa, Abrahamo, & caeteris.
>
> Those who think that this narrative and debate of Job is fictional seem to me to do so without any good reason. For nothing can be in a true history that is not in this one; so that whoever denies this can deny all history. And if they think it absurd that in this book God converses with a human being, let them consider that he conversed with many others, too: with Noah, with Abraham, and others.

Castellio explicitly challenges a widespread view held not only by his contemporary Christian exegetes but also by prominent Jewish thinkers, such as Maimonides (*Guide of the Perplexed* 3.22), namely that the book of Job is a parable, a fictional narrative, and that Job himself is therefore a fictional character. In Castellio's assessment, the narrative constitutes a genuine and truthful account of a historical person. This conviction may also have influenced his identification of the creatures Leviathan and Behemoth with the whale and elephant, respectively—a matter to which I will return below.

Castellio's preface is followed by a general summary of the book (*Argumentum in totum Jobum*, cols. 695–96). Rather than outlining the narrative structure or specific details of the text (e.g., the summary does not name one of Job's friends), Castellio provides an overview of the principal theological and philosophical issues raised in the book (*Jobi angor, questus, vita vanitas. Nulla humana probitas. Principum conditiones. Resurrectio.*, etc.). This approach demonstrates that, despite his conviction that Job was a historical person, Castellio's engagement with the Book of Job went beyond purely antiquarian and philological interests and reflects a pronounced theological focus. Following this summary, the Latin translation itself is presented, accompanied by marginal and footnote annotations.

I have transcribed Castellio's translation of Job 40–41 and present his Latin version (C) in parallel with the Masoretic Text (MT) and the Vulgate (V).[13]

---

[12] For the edition of Castellio's translation, see footnote 13. English translation is mine and generated into idiomatic English with the help of AI (Claude.ai, ChatGPT).

[13] Editions of MT and V accessed via the Accordance Bible Software: Elliger, Karl, Rudolph, Wilhelm, and Schenker, Adrian, *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, Stuttgart 1997; Weber, Robert, and Gryson, Roger (eds.), *Biblia Sacra iuxta Vulgatam versionem*, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, Stuttgart [5]2007. Castellio's translation is transcribed by me via the Transkribus Software (Transkribus.org, last access January 15, 2026) and based on the 1697 edition: *Biblia sacra ex Sebastiani Castellionis interpretatione, eiusque postrema recognitione. Cum annotationibus eiusdem, et historiae svpplemento ab esdra ad Machabaeos, et inde vsqve ad Christvm, ex Iosepho, accessere in nova hac editione eivsdem delineatio*

MT 40:6-41:26	V 40:1-41:26	C 40:1-41:26
6 וַיַּעַן־יְהוָה אֶת־אִיּוֹב מִן סְעָרָה וַיֹּאמַר׃	**1** *respondens autem Dominus Iob de turbine ait*	**1** *Et Jova Jobum ex turbine alloquens:*
7 אֱזָר־נָא כְגֶבֶר חֲלָצֶיךָ אֶשְׁאָלְךָ וְהוֹדִיעֵנִי׃	**2** *accinge sicut vir lumbos tuos interrogabo te et indica mihi*	**2** *Accingere sane, ut viro dignum est, inquit, & mihi quae ex te quaeram declarato.*
8 הַאַף תָּפֵר מִשְׁפָּטִי תַּרְשִׁיעֵנִי לְמַעַן תִּצְדָּק׃	**3** *numquid irritum facies iudicium meum et condemnabis me ut tu iustificeris*	**3** *Tune mihi jus meum extorquebis? me condemnabis ut absolvaris ipse?*
9 וְאִם־זְרוֹעַ כָּאֵל לָךְ וּבְקוֹל כָּמֹהוּ תַרְעֵם׃	**4** *et si habes brachium sicut Deus et si voce simili tonas*	**4** *Quod si lacertos habes ut Deus: & voce tonas ut idem,*
10 עֲדֵה נָא גָאוֹן וָגֹבַהּ וְהוֹד וְהָדָר תִּלְבָּשׁ׃	**5** *circumda tibi decorem et in sublime erigere et esto gloriosus et speciosis induere vestibus*	**5** *Ornare sane excelsitate ac sublimitate, & majestatem atque decus indue.*
11 הָפֵץ עֶבְרוֹת אַפֶּךָ וּרְאֵה כָל־גֵּאֶה וְהַשְׁפִּילֵהוּ׃	**6** *disperge superbos furore tuo et respiciens omnem arrogantem humilia*	**6** *Sparge irae tuae saevitiam, & omnes aspiciens elatos deprime,*
12 רְאֵה כָל־גֵּאֶה הַכְנִיעֵהוּ וְהַדְרֹךְ רְשָׁעִים תַּחְתָּם׃	**7** *respice cunctos superbos et confunde eos et contere impios in loco suo*	**7** *Aspiciens elatos omnes deturba, & impios contunde protinus.*
13 טָמְנֵם בֶּעָפָר יַחַד פְּנֵיהֶם חֲבֹשׁ בַּטָּמוֹן׃	**8** *absconde eos in pulvere simul et facies eorum demerge in foveam*	**8** *Eos humi simul obrue, eorum facies in obscurum demerge.*
14 וְגַם־אֲנִי אוֹדְךָ כִּי־תוֹשִׁעַ לְךָ יְמִינֶךָ׃	**9** *et ego confitebor quod salvare te possit dextera tua*	**9** *Ita fatebor ego tua te posse dextra teipsum tueri,*
15 הִנֵּה־נָא בְהֵמוֹת אֲשֶׁר־עָשִׂיתִי עִמָּךְ חָצִיר כַּבָּקָר יֹאכֵל׃	**10** *ecce Behemoth quem feci tecum faenum quasi bos comedet*	**10** *Ecce tibi elephas quem una tecum feci, qui foeno boum ritu pascitur,*
16 הִנֵּה־נָא כֹחוֹ בְמָתְנָיו וְאֹנוֹ בִּשְׁרִירֵי בִטְנוֹ׃	**11** *fortitudo eius in lumbis eius et virtus illius in umbilicis ventris eius*	**11** *Is inquam vires & robur habet in lateribus, & ventris umbilico.*
17 יַחְפֹּץ זְנָבוֹ כְּמוֹ־אָרֶז גִּידֵי פַחְדָּיו יְשֹׂרָגוּ׃	**12** *constringit caudam suam quasi cedrum nervi testiculorum eius perplexi sunt*	**12** *Stringit caudam tanquam cedrum, ramosis summae caudae nervis.*
18 עֲצָמָיו אֲפִיקֵי נְחוּשָׁה גְּרָמָיו כִּמְטִיל בַּרְזֶל׃	**13** *ossa eius velut fistulae aeris cartilago illius quasi lamminae ferreae*	**13** *Ejus membra tubi sunt aenei, ossa vectes ferrei,*
19 הוּא רֵאשִׁית דַּרְכֵי־אֵל הָעֹשׂוֹ יַגֵּשׁ חַרְבּוֹ׃	**14** *ipse principium est viarum Dei qui fecit eum adplicabit gladium eius*	**14** *Denique is est opificii divini caput, eumque armis aggredi solus is audeat qui condidit.*
20 כִּי־בוּל הָרִים יִשְׂאוּ־לוֹ וְכָל־חַיַּת הַשָּׂדֶה יְשַׂחֲקוּ־שָׁם׃	**15** *huic montes herbas ferunt omnes bestiae agri ludent ibi*	**15** *Nam ei pabulum ferunt montes, ludentibus ibi cunctis bestiis terrestribus.*

reipvblicae ivdaicae ex iosepho, nota prolixior in capvt IX. Epistolae ad Romanos, nec non defensio versionis novi foederis contra Th. Bezam. Frankfurt, Thomas Fritsch, 1697. (https://books.google.be/books/about/Biblia_sacra_Ex_Sebastiani_Castellionis.html?id=Em5JHcxzKhkC&redir_esc=y, last access January 15, 2026). Castellio's *editio princeps* of 1551 is difficult to find online.

MT 40:6-41:26	V 40:1-41:26	C 40:1-41:26
21 תַּחַת־צֶאֱלִים יִשְׁכָּב בְּסֵתֶר קָנֶה וּבִצָּה:	**16** *sub umbra dormit in secreto calami et locis humentibus*	**16** *Sub umbrosis cubat arboribus, in arundinis latebra ac palude,*
22 יְסֵכֻּהוּ צֶאֱלִים צַלְלוֹ יְסֹבְבוּהוּ עַרְבֵי־נָחַל:	**17** *protegunt umbrae umbram eius circumdabunt eum salices torrentis*	**17** *Vmbra tectus opacarum arborum, fluvialibusque circumfusus salicibus:*
23 הֵן יַעֲשֹׁק נָהָר לֹא יָחְפּוֹז יִבְטַח כִּי־יָגִיחַ יַרְדֵּן אֶל־פִּיהוּ:	**18** *ecce absorbebit fluvium et non mirabitur habet fiduciam quod influat Iordanis in os eius*	**18** *Adeoque flumen sorbet intrepidus, ut se Jordanem faucibus hausturum confidat,*
24 בְּעֵינָיו יִקָּחֶנּוּ בְּמוֹקְשִׁים יִנְקָב־אָף:	**19** *in oculis eius quasi hamo capiet eum et in sudibus perforabit nares eius*	**19** *Tantum abest ut se capi cernat nare laqueis perforata.*
25 תִּמְשֹׁךְ לִוְיָתָן בְּחַכָּה וּבְחֶבֶל תַּשְׁקִיעַ לְשֹׁנוֹ:	**20** *an extrahere poteris Leviathan hamo et fune ligabis linguam eius*	**20** *An tu balaenam hamo trahes, aut ejus linguam fune comprimes?*
26 הֲתָשִׂים אַגְמוֹן בְּאַפּוֹ וּבְחוֹחַ תִּקּוֹב לֶחְיוֹ:	**21** *numquid pones circulum in naribus eius et armilla perforabis maxillam eius*	**21** *Scilicet ejus rostro uncum admovebis, & buccam cuspide perforabis?*
27 הֲיַרְבֶּה אֵלֶיךָ תַּחֲנוּנִים אִם־יְדַבֵּר אֵלֶיךָ רַכּוֹת:	**22** *numquid multiplicabit ad te preces aut loquetur tibi mollia*	**22** *Scilicet multis illa tibi supplicabit, aut te molliter alloquetur?*
28 הֲיִכְרֹת בְּרִית עִמָּךְ תִּקָּחֶנּוּ לְעֶבֶד עוֹלָם:	**23** *numquid feriet tecum pactum et accipies eum servum sempiternum*	**23** *Paciscetur credo tecum, ut tu eam in aeternum servitium abducas:*
29 הַתְשַׂחֶק־בּוֹ כַּצִּפּוֹר וְתִקְשְׁרֶנּוּ לְנַעֲרוֹתֶיךָ:	**24** *numquid inludes ei quasi avi aut ligabis illum ancillis tuis*	**24** *Ludes videlicet ea quasi avicula, eamque tuis ligabis puellis:*
30 יִכְרוּ עָלָיו חַבָּרִים יֶחֱצוּהוּ בֵּין כְּנַעֲנִים:	**25** *concident eum amici dividentillum negotiatores*	**25** *Eam socii mercatores concident atque dividentt.*
31 הַתְמַלֵּא בַשְּׂכוֹת עוֹרוֹ וּבְצִלְצַל דָּגִים רֹאשׁוֹ:	**26** *numquid implebis sagenas pelle eius et gurgustium piscium capite illius*	**26** *Scilicet ejus pelle everriculum, & capite nassam replebis piscatoriam.*
32 שִׂים־עָלָיו כַּפֶּךָ זְכֹר מִלְחָמָה אַל־תּוֹסַף:	**27** *pone super eum manum tuam memento belli nec ultra addas loqui*	**27** *Consere cum ea manum, memineris non repetendum praelium,*
41:1 הֵן־תּוֹחַלְתּוֹ נִכְזָבָה הֲגַם אֶל־מַרְאָיו יֻטָּל:	**28** *ecce spes eius frustrabitur eum et videntibus cunctis praecipitabitur*	**28** *Adeoqua spes tua fallax erit, ut vel ad ejus conspectum consternere.*
2 לֹא־אַכְזָר כִּי יְעוֹרֶנּוּ וּמִי הוּא לְפָנַי יִתְיַצָּב:	**41:1** *non quasi crudelis suscitabo eum quis enim resistere potest vultui meo*	**41:1** *Nemo tam ferox est ut illam excitet, tantum abest ut mihi resistere quis possit.*
3 מִי הִקְדִּימַנִי וַאֲשַׁלֵּם תַּחַת כָּל־הַשָּׁמַיִם לִי־הוּא:	**2** *quis ante dedit mihi ut reddam ei omnia quae sub caelo sunt mea sunt*	**2** *Quis me officiis antevertit, ut ei gratiam referam? quod usquam sub coelo est, meum est.*
4 לֹוֹ־אַחֲרִישׁ בַּדָּיו וּדְבַר־גְּבוּרוֹת וְחִין עֶרְכּוֹ:	**3** *non parcam ei et verbis potentibus et ad deprecandum conpositis*	**3** *Non silebo ejus membra, viriumque rationem, & compositionis elegantiam.*
5 מִי־גָלָה פְּנֵי לְבוּשׁוֹ בְּכֶפֶל רִסְנוֹ מִי יָבוֹא:	**4** *quis revelavit faciem indumenti eius et in medium oris eius quis intrabit*	**4** *Quis ejus summum vestitum patefaciat? Quis geminum rostrum subeat?*

MT 40:6-41:26	V 40:1-41:26	C 40:1-41:26
6 דַּלְתֵי פָנָיו מִי פִתֵּחַ סְבִיבוֹת שִׁנָּיו אֵימָה׃	**5** *portas vultus eius quis aperiet per gyrum dentium eius formido*	**5** *Faciei fores quis aperiat? ejus dentibus formidine circundatis.*
7 גַּאֲוָה אֲפִיקֵי מָגִנִּים סָגוּר חוֹתָם צָר׃	**6** *corpus illius quasi scuta fusilia et conpactum squamis se prementibus*	**6** *Superbe clypeata squamis est, arcta compagine conclusis,*
8 אֶחָד בְּאֶחָד יִגַּשׁוּ וְרוּחַ לֹא־יָבוֹא בֵּינֵיהֶם׃	**7** *una uni coniungitur et ne spiraculum quidem incedit per eas*	**7** *Quae inter sese commissae ne aurae quidem pervia junctura,*
9 אִישׁ־בְּאָחִיהוּ יִדָּבָקוּ יִתְלַכְּדוּ וְלֹא יִתְפָּרָדוּ׃	**8** *una alteri adherebunt et tenentes se nequaquam separabuntur*	**8** *Adeo aliae aliis compactim cohaerent, ut sint indissolubiles.*
10 עָטִישׁוֹתָיו תָּהֵל אוֹר וְעֵינָיו כְּעַפְעַפֵּי־שָׁחַר׃	**9** *sternutatio eius splendor ignis et oculi eius ut palpebrae diluculi*	**9** *Ejus sternutatio splendore collucet, oculique sunt tanquam aurorae lumina.*
11 מִפִּיו לַפִּידִים יַהֲלֹכוּ כִּידוֹדֵי אֵשׁ יִתְמַלָּטוּ׃	**10** *de ore eius lampades procedunt sicut taedae ignis accensae*	**10** *Ex faucibus prodeunt faces, absilientibus, tanquam stricturis igneis.*
12 מִנְּחִירָיו יֵצֵא עָשָׁן כְּדוּד נָפוּחַ וְאַגְמֹן׃	**11** *de naribus eius procedit fumus sicut ollae succensae atque ferventis*	**11** *Ex naribus prodit fumus tanquam aheni ferventis ac undantis.*
13 נַפְשׁוֹ גֶּחָלִים תְּלַהֵט וְלַהַב מִפִּיו יֵצֵא׃	**12** *halitus eius prunas ardere facit et flamma de ore eius egreditur*	**12** *Flatus ardet carbonibus, manante ex ejus ore flamma*
14 בְּצַוָּארוֹ יָלִין עֹז וּלְפָנָיו תָּדוּץ דְּאָבָה׃	**13** *in collo eius morabitur fortitudo et faciem eius praecedet egestas*	**13** *Collo tanta vis inest, ut ab ea quaevis difficultas perrumpatur.*
15 מַפְּלֵי בְשָׂרוֹ דָּבֵקוּ יָצוּק עָלָיו בַּל־יִמּוֹט׃	**14** *membra carnium eius coherentia sibi mittet contra eum fulmina et ad locum alium non ferentur*	**14** *Corporis toros habet immobili soliditate compactos.*
16 לִבּוֹ יָצוּק כְּמוֹ־אָבֶן וְיָצוּק כְּפֶלַח תַּחְתִּית׃	**15** *cor eius indurabitur quasi lapis et stringetur quasi malleatoris incus*	**15** *Cor & saxo & inferiore mola firmius.*
17 מִשֶּׁתּוֹ יָגוּרוּ אֵלִים מִשְׁבָּרִים יִתְחַטָּאוּ׃	**16** *cum sublatus fuerit timebunt angeli et territi purgabuntur*	**16** *Ea se commovente formidant? divi, fractique labefactantur.*
18 מַשִּׂיגֵהוּ חֶרֶב בְּלִי תָקוּם חֲנִית מַסָּע וְשִׁרְיָה׃	**17** *cum adprehenderit eum gladius subsistere non poterit neque hasta neque torax*	**17** *Ejus congressum non enses sustinent, non hastae, non missilia, non loricae.*
19 יַחְשֹׁב לְתֶבֶן בַּרְזֶל לְעֵץ רִקָּבוֹן נְחוּשָׁה׃	**18** *reputabit enim quasi paleas ferrum et quasi lignum putridum aes*	**18** *Ferrum pro palea, chalybem pro putri ligno ducit.*
20 לֹא־יַבְרִיחֶנּוּ בֶּן־קֶשֶׁת לְקַשׁ נֶהְפְּכוּ־לוֹ אַבְנֵי־קָלַע׃	**19** *non fugabit eum vir sagittarius in stipulam versi sunt ei lapides fundae*	**19** *Non eam fugaverint sagittae, ei vertuntur in stipulam fundarum silices.*
21 כְּקַשׁ נֶחְשְׁבוּ תוֹתָח וְיִשְׂחַק לְרַעַשׁ כִּידוֹן׃	**20** *quasi stipulam aestimabit malleum et deridebit vibrantem hastam*	**20** *Pro stipulis habentur catapultae, ridetque vibratam lanceam.*
22 תַּחְתָּיו חַדּוּדֵי חָרֶשׂ יִרְפַּד חָרוּץ עֲלֵי־טִיט׃	**21** *sub ipso erunt radii solis sternet sibi aurum quasi lutum*	**21** *Sub ea sunt aculeati murices, prosternit in limum scopulos.*

MT 40:6-41:26	V 40:1-41:26	C 40:1-41:26
23 יַרְתִּיחַ כַּסִּיר מְצוּלָה יָם יָשִׂים כַּמֶּרְקָחָה׃	**22** *fervescere faciet quasi ollam profundum mare ponet quasi cum unguenta bulliunt*	**22** *Fervefacit ollae ritu gurgites, utens mari pro mortario.*
24 אַחֲרָיו יָאִיר נָתִיב יַחְשֹׁב תְּהוֹם לְשֵׂיבָה׃	**23** *post eum lucebit semita aestimabit abyssum quasi senescentem*	**23** *Post se relinquit lucidum vestigium, ut pelagi canos putes esse*
25 אֵין־עַל־עָפָר מָשְׁלוֹ הֶעָשׂוּ לִבְלִי־חָת׃	**24** *non est super terram potestas quae conparetur ei qui factus est ut nullum timeret*	**24** *Ei nihil par est in terris, facta est impavida.*
26 אֶת־כָּל־גָּבֹהַּ יִרְאֶה הוּא מֶלֶךְ עַל־כָּל־בְּנֵי־שָׁחַץ׃	**25** *omne sublime videt ipse est rex super universos filios superbiae*	**25** *Altissima quaeque despicit, ea regina est in omne genus ferarum.*

Discussion of Castellio's translation and comparison with the Vulgate

Even after an initial reading, it is immediately apparent that Castellio's translation reads far more smoothly than Jerome's Vulgate. In the following paragraphs, I will examine these distinctive aspects of Castellio's translation in greater detail.

Classical idiom instead of Hebraizing literalism

The first characteristic of Castellio's translation is the humanist's preference for classical idiom over the Vulgate's Hebraizing literalism and postclassical language.[14] Castellio's version exhibits less parataxis and instead makes greater use of subordinating constructions, such as *participia conjuncta* and the ablative absolute (e.g., 40:15, 41:5–6). On the lexical level, Castellio frequently opts for a classical variant where the Vulgate uses a "postclassical" term or non-idiomatic construction. Thus, in 41:13, Vulgate *fortitudo* in the sense of "bodily strength" (which is rare, see L&S s.v. "fortitudo") is replaced by the classical *vis*. In 40:27, Castellio uses the idiomatic Latin *repetere* to express repetition, instead of Jerome's *addere*, which is a Hebraism.[15]

Castellio's avoidance of syntactic and idiomatic Hebraisms can also be seen in 41:4: the Vulgate refers to the "face" of a garment (*facies indumenti*, for פני לבוש) to denote the outer layer of clothing, but Castellio corrects this to the classical *summum vestitum*.

[14] Many of the characteristics listed in this paragraph are also found in Castellio's translation of IV Esdras, see Metzger-Rambach, Anne-Laure, and Gomez-Géraud, Marie-Christine, "Reformuler la Vulgate? Castellion devant le IVe livre d'Esdras", in Gomez-Géraud, Marie-Christine (ed.), *Biblia. Les Bibles en latin au temps des Réformes*, Presses de l'Université Paris-Sorbonne, Paris 2008, 157–72. For an example of Castellio avoiding Hebraisms in his *French* translation of Job 6:2, see Gomez-Géraud, Marie-Christine, "Traduire et Translater. La Bible de Sébastien Castellion", *Camenae* 3 (2007), 3.

[15] For a survey of the secondary literature on this Hebraism, see Lang, Bernhard, *Handbook of the Vulgate Bible and Its Reception/Handbuch der Vulgata und ihrer Rezeption*, The Vulgate Institute, Chur 2023, 384–85.

Castellio's use of particles and adverbs, such as *sane* ("then pray, if you will") for Hebrew נא in 40:2, 5, as well as *scilicet* and *videlicet* in 40:21, 22, 24, 26, and the addition of *credo* in 40:23, not only brings the Latin translation closer to the intended meaning of the Hebrew (especially in rhetorical questions), but also contributes to a more natural Latin style.

Poetic Latin, high register, rare words

At times, Castellio selects words that are not only classical but also possess a distinctly poetic resonance and/or enhance the imagery of the text. Thus, in 41:14, he employs *toros* ("muscles") to describe the limbs of the Behemoth, thereby emphasizing the creature's physical strength, in contrast to the Vulgate's more neutral *membra*. Similarly, when depicting God's power in 40:4, Castellio uses *lacertos* ("strong upper arms") instead of the Vulgate's generic *brachium*, and *rostrum* ("beak" or "snout" of an animal) instead of *os*.

The humanist also demonstrates a confident command of technical vocabulary. This is evident in terms such as *murices* (41:21), a technical word for a caltrop or spike (L&S s.v. *murex*), and *clypeatus* (41:6), the perfect passive participle of a rare verb meaning "to arm with a shield" (L&S s.v. *clipeo*). He further employs the diminutive *avicula* in 40:24 (from *avis*, "bird"), which is seldom attested in classical Latin (TLL s.v. *avicula*), as well as *everriculum* in 40:26 ("drag-net," L&S), a term that may seem oddly specific but is in fact attested twice in Cicero.

Castellio moreover displays a particular fondness for Greek loanwords, such as *chalybs* ("steel," from Greek χάλυψ) in 41:18 and *scopulus* ("rock," from Greek σκόπελος) in 41:21. Possibly Castellio selected these terms not only to display his command of Latin but also to demonstrate his knowledge of Greek. He does not coin new loanwords, however: all these terms are already attested in classical Latin authors.

Figures of speech, rhetorical devices, vivid imagery and wordplay

On the stylistic level, Castellio frequently introduces rhetorical devices and figures of speech where the Vulgate offers a more straightforward rendering. Chapter 40 opens with the striking juxtaposition and alliteration *Jova Jobum*, which immediately foregrounds the climactic confrontation between the protagonist and God. Another illustrative case appears in 41:8, which features a polyptoton of *alius* and a double alliteration with *a* (3x) and *co* (*adeo aliae aliis compactim cohaerent*), whereas the Vulgate only includes a polyptoton and a single alliteration of *unus* (*una uni coniungitur*). This may be seen as a case of *aemulatio* in Castellio's text, where Castellio intensifies a feature of Jerome's version in his own translation. Numerous further examples of alliteration and assonance can be identified, and remarkable sound patterns recur throughout Castellio's

version, such as *quae ex te quaeram* in 40:2, *faucibus prodeunt faces* in 41:10 (which may even be identified as a paronomasia), *faciei fores* in 41:5, and *vis...quaevis...* in 41:13. Euphony was clearly a central concern for Castellio.

Castellio is particularly fond of hyperbaton (e.g., *tuis ligabis puellis* 40:24), which often serves to reinforce the meaning of the verse. For example, *sub umbrosis cubat arboribus* (40:16) vividly evokes the Behemoth lying in the shadow of the trees, and *fluvialibusque circumcumfusus salicibus* (40:17) shows that he is surrounded by fluvial willows. Castellio pays close attention to word order in general. In 40:3 (*me condemnabis ut absolvaris ipse*?), the word order supports the sense of the verse: God reproaches Job for trying to condemn him, and Castellio's positioning of *me* at the beginning of the second hemistich and *ipse* at the end underscores the fundamental alienation between God and Job. The translator regularly manipulates word order to avoid monotony, as in 41:4–5, where he varies the order of the questions introduced by *quis*.

His effort to avoid repetition is also evident in his variety of grammatical forms, including the (slightly unexpected) third-person singular imperative *declarato* among second-person forms in 40:2. *Varietas delectat* is likewise Castellio's guiding principle at the lexical level, as in 41:16–17, where the notion of "shady" is first expressed by *umbrosus* and then by *opacus*. Again, in many such cases, this can be seen as an *aemulatio* of Jerome, who likewise favoured variation, but applied it more sparingly than Castellio.[16]

Some stylistic devices in Castellio's translation are more subtle, and it is harder to demonstrate that these are deliberate and intentional. For example, alliteration occurs in *utens mare pro mortario* in 41:22, but this may be coincidental as these are all literal equivalents of MT (ים ישׂים כמרקחה), albeit with a slight rearrangement in word order. The phrase *oculique sunt tanquam aurorae lumina* in 41:9 may be identified as a wordplay, since *lumen* means both "ray of sunlight" and "eye" and thus plays with *oculi* earlier in the verse. In 41:23, Castellio uses *ut pelagi canos putes esse* to describe the path of white wake left by the Leviathan as it moves through the water, imagining it as *cani* ("white hair"). In classical Latin, the noun *pelagus* for "sea" is mostly used in poetic texts (L&S s.v. *pelagus*), and Castellio's word order *ut pelagi canos putes esse* seems artfully constructed as a paronomasia, since *pelagi canos* sounds similar to *pelicanos* ("pelicans"). The Leviathan is thus imagined as so immense that the line of white waves it leaves behind resembles not only white hair but also a flock of white pelicans following the monstrous creature.

[16] On *variatio* in Jerome's translations, see Condamin, Albert, "Un procédé littéraire de St Jérôme dans sa traduction de la Bible," in *Miscellanea Geronimiana. Scritti varii pubblicati nel XV centenario dalla morte di San Girolamo*, Tipografia poliglotta vaticana, Rome 1920, 89–96; Keller, Dorothea, *Gattung und Stil in der Vulgata des Hieronymus* (Vertumnus. Berliner Beiträge zur Klassischen Philologie und zu ihren Nachbargebieten 14), Ruprecht, Göttingen 2022.

Vulgate under his eyes

Although Castellio's version diverges markedly from V, it often appears that the humanist had V before his eyes when he was translating the Hebrew text.[17] Paradoxically, this is especially evident in those passages where he seems to make a conscious effort *not* to echo the Vulgate. When the Hebrew text allows for two equivalent or near-synonymous Latin renderings, he seems deliberately to avoid the one option in the Vulgate. For example, in 40:18, the Vulgate uses the compound verb *absorbere*, whereas Castellio selects the simple verb *sorbere*. The reverse occurs in 40:12, where Castellio uses *stringit* and the Vulgate *constringit*. In 41:11, Castellio and the Vulgate convey the same sense, yet Castellio introduces a series of subtle modifications: he changes the preposition from *de* to *ex*, the verb from *procedit* to *prodit*, the conjunction from *sicut* to its quasi-synonym *tanquam*, and he alters the position of *ferventis*. His lexical choices in 41:9, such as *sternutatio* and *splendor*, echo Jerome's translation, yet again he rearranges the word order so that the final result is not overly reminiscent of the Vulgate. Comparable cases can be observed in 40:25 and 41:22a.

Another instructive example concerns the weapons שריה and מסע mentioned in 41:17. Both are hapax legomena in the Hebrew Bible (although מסע may also occur in 1 Kings 6:7), and Castellio clearly infers their meaning from Jerome, who renders them as *hasta* ("javelin, spear") and *thorax* ("breastplate"). In his own translation, however, Castellio employs two quasi-synonyms—*missile* and *lorica*—most likely to avoid too close a verbal echo of the Vulgate. A similar strategy is visible in 41:20, where the precise meaning of the weapon כידון is uncertain: Jerome again translates it as *hasta*, but Castellio opts for *catapultae*.

Corrections towards the Hebrew

Castellio does not always blindly agree with all of Jerome's interpretations. Often, he brings his translation into closer alignment with the Hebrew source text. Notably, Castellio does not accept Jerome's rendering *angeli* ("angels") for אלים in 41:16, instead choosing *divi* ("divine [beings]"). Fully aware of the possible theological implications of this translation and its potential suggestion of polytheism, Castellio appends a note clarifying that *divi* is to be understood as "remarkable humans" (*homines primarii*).[18] Thus,

[17] In the case of at least one biblical book, we know for certain that Castellio had the Vulgate before him when he was working on the *Biblia*: 4 Esdras. The reason for this is clear: this apocryphon was transmitted primarily in Latin (although other versions also exist, they are not relevant for Castellio), and the Hebrew source text—if any—has been lost. Castellio's "translation" of 4 Esdras is therefore, in fact, a "rewriting" of the Vulgate version. For Castellio's version, see Metzger-Rambach and Gomez-Géraud, "Reformuler la Vulgate?". For 4 Esdras in general, see Lang, *Handbook*, 716–17.

[18] Similarly, Castellio adds a footnote in his translation *deorum filii* in Gen 6:10, also explaining that this should not be seen as a suggestion of polytheism. See Gomez-Géraud, Marie-Christine, "Sébastien Castellion et l'hébreu. Les Annotationes de la Biblia (1551): un discours sur la langue", in Masse, Marie-Sophie, and Pouey-Mounou, Anne-Pascale (eds.), *Langue de l'autre, langue de l'auteur*, Droz, Paris 2012, 247;

Castellio does not interpret these אלים as celestial beings but rather as humans, which also points to his historical reading of the text.

Castellio furthermore does not hesitate to depart from traditional (Vulgate) interpretations when they departed too far from the Hebrew. In 41:15, for example, the heart of the Leviathan is compared to a פלח תחתית, which indeed is a lower millstone, as Castellio translates accurately (*inferiore mola*), rather than a smith's anvil, as in the Vulgate (*malleatoris incus*).[19] In 41:17, the Vulgate omits one of the weapons listed, which Castellio restores (*non hastae, non missilia, non loricae*, with an anaphora of the negation *non* which is not there in the Hebrew text). Likewise, Castellio's *irae tuae* ("your anger") in 40:6 is closer to MT עברה than Jerome's *superbos*, as is *geminum* for the Hebrew כפל in 41:4 (Vulgate: *medium*).

The humanist also advances a different interpretation of the expression "son of the bow" (בן קשת) in 41:19. For Castellio, this does not refer to a bowman, as in the Vulgate (*vir sagittarius*), but rather an arrow (*sagitta*), which agrees with the Targum (without the need to posit direct influence in this case). In one case he is more consistent than Jerome: in 41:25, Castellio translates שחץ as "wild animals" (*ferarum*), aligning with his translation of Job 28:8, where this enigmatic term indeed seems to denote an "animal". Jerome appears less certain about this word, rendering it as *superbia* in 41:25 and *institor* in 28:8.

Castellio's translation informed by contemporary exegesis: the case of Behemoth and Leviathan

Translating the names of the mythological monsters Behemoth (בהמות; MT 40:15, V/C 40:10) and Leviathan (לויתן; MT 40:25, V/C 40:20) posed a particular challenge for Castellio. Jerome simply transcribed these names as *Behemoth* and *Leviathan*, treating them as proper names for mythological creatures, comparable to *Cerberus* or *Chimaera*. He explicitly counts the *Behemoth* and *Leviathan* among mythological creatures in *Contra Vigilantium* 1,1 (CCSL 79C, p. 5). Jerome was furthermore the first to introduce these transcriptions into Latin literature; whereas the Septuagint—and, by extension, the Old Latin versions derived from the Septuagint—used equivalents such as θηρίον ("wild

Roubaud, "Traduire", 364–65. Many modern commentators also take אלים to be derived from איל ("chief") rather than אל (for an overview, see Clines, David J. A., *Job* 38-42 (*World Biblical Commentary* 18B), Zondervan, Grand Rapids 2017, 1169). Although the resulting interpretation may be similar to Castellio's explanatory note *homines primarii*, it is unlikely that he read the variant reading אילים in his Hebrew *Vorlage*, because this hypothesis cannot explain *divi* in his main translation.

[19] In V Judg 9:53; 2 Sam 11:21, Jerome is able to correctly identify פלח as "millstone" (*mola*). The image of the heart of the Leviathan being a smith's anvil was later linked to popular imagery of eternal damnation in the underworld, where sinners are tortured without end (e.g., Gregory the Great, *Moralia in Iob* 34,6 CCSL 143B l. 8). Lawrence of Brindisi (Laurentius a Brundusio, *Opera omnia*, vol. II, 1, 1930, *Additamentum* 7, p. 378) uses V Job 41:15 to describe Luther's unceasing attacks on the Catholic Church.

beast"), δράκων ("dragon"), or κῆτος ("sea monster", in Job 3:8). For Castellio, the transcriptions *Behemoth* and *Leviathan* posed two distinct problems. First, they are unattested in natural, classical Latin prior to Jerome. Second, they carry mythological connotations that conflict with Castellio's historically grounded reading of the narrative.

Castellio therefore chose to translate בהמות as *elephas* ("elephant") and לויתן as *balaena* ("whale"). In doing so, Castellio reflected a longstanding exegetical tradition that identified Leviathan as a whale—a view attested both in Catholic (e.g., Thomas Aquinas) and Protestant circles (e.g., Calvin).[20] Similarly, the identification of Behemoth as an elephant was widespread from medieval exegesis onwards.[21] By rendering בהמות as *elephas* and לויתן as *balaena*, Castellio not only employed natural lexical equivalents attested in classical Latin literature, but also aligned his translation with an exegetical tradition that understood these creatures as concrete animals. At the same time, this choice increased the historicity of the Book of Job by presenting these beings as real animals, rather than as mythological creatures (as in Jerome) or even as personifications of the Devil.[22]

Conclusion

This brief case study of Job 40–41 in Castellio's translation reveals several key facets of his translation technique. His commitment to rendering the Bible in classical Latin is evident in multiple respects, most notably through his consistent use of classical vocabulary—even resorting to niche words drawn from poetic or technical Latin.

Although Jerome's translation of Job is generally regarded as one of his freer translations, it nonetheless retains several Hebraisms. Castellio pushes this further, opting for an overtly free translation technique and strongly avoiding Hebraisms. He regularly selects suitable Latin idiomatic expressions and turns of phrase that are not only intelligible but also stylistically appropriate for a classically trained readership. His note on the *divi* as *homines primarii* as well as his concrete identification of mythological creatures such as Leviathan and Behemoth conform to contemporary exegetical traditions. This choice not only mirrors the intellectual climate of his time but also contributes to a more

[20] For Aquinas, see Sneed, Mark R., *Taming the Beast: A Reception History of Behemoth and Leviathan*, De Gruyter, Berlin 2021, 188 and *passim*. The author also explains how the giant fish in the Book of Jonah is also often identified as the Leviathan. This conflation of the two giant sea creatures (the fish in Jonah, and the Leviathan in Job, both being a giant whale) can also be seen in the famous novel Moby Dick by Herman Melville, in which the giant whales are called "Leviathans" (see Sneed, *Taming the Beast*, 51, 146). For Calvin, see Sneed 192. The author mentions on page 197 that Castellio's Genevan contemporary and adversary Beza saw the Leviathan as a crocodile rather than a whale.

[21] Sneed, *Taming the Beast*, 188. Some exegetes like Samuel Bochart criticized this view and instead saw the Behemoth as the hippopotamus (197).

[22] For examples of Leviathan as Satan in medieval exegesis and iconography, see Seow, Choon-Long, *Job 1–21: Interpretation and Commentary* (World Biblical Commentary 18A), Eerdmans, Grand Rapids 2013, 211–12.

concrete and historicized interpretation of the biblical text, which he advocates in the preface to his Job translation.

Castellio's refinements extend well beyond vocabulary, syntax, and idiom. He displays a marked concern for stylistic elegance, introducing a wide array of rhetorical devices and figures of speech. His meticulous attention to word order is exemplified by his deliberate use of hyperbaton. Furthermore, he skillfully employs techniques such as polyptoton, paronomasia, alliteration, homoioteleuton, and other stylistic devices. All these underscore his agility and expertise as a Latin stylist, which aligns with the stylistic ideals of humanism.

The Renaissance translator appears to have had the Vulgate version before his eyes during his translation process. This is shown not only by occasional echoes of Jerome's word choices but mostly, and paradoxically, by his deliberate efforts to ensure his translation would differ from the Vulgate. He achieves this by substituting simple verbs for compound verbs and vice versa, by rearranging word order, and by carefully selecting quasi-synonyms to avoid direct parallels with the Vulgate text.

This contribution shows that every age is fortunate to have erudite specialists of the Latin Bible. Just as the fourth and fifth centuries were blessed with Jerome, so the sixteenth century had Castellio. And we? We are fortunate to live in the age of Bernhard Lang.