

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_expositor-series-1.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php)

THE BOOK OF JOB AND ITS LATEST  
COMMENTATOR.

PART I.

THE difficulties of the Book of Job are commensurate with its importance. It is the chief merit of Prof. Budde's important work on Job that it recognises these difficulties, and makes a new and determined effort to overcome them. The course which the author takes shows him to be altogether up to date. He gives the chief prominence to questions of text, knowing that problems of the higher criticism and of Biblical theology depend ultimately on the trustworthiness and intelligibility of the text. Interesting therefore as it would be to treat of the Book of Job as one of the great masterpieces of religious literature, I am debarred from giving myself this pleasure. Unless we have a sound text, we cannot be sure of not distorting the thought of the ancient poet or poets. I must therefore, in the first instance, follow the author into text-critical discussions, and only regret that the character of this magazine prevents as complete a discussion as might be desirable.

Three scholars have within the last few years rendered special services to the text of Job—Bickell, Siegfried, and Beer. The brilliant pioneering work of Bickell cannot be disregarded even by those who think, with Dillmann,<sup>1</sup> that he has exaggerated the value of the Sahidic version of the LXX. This version, of which we possess nearly the whole

<sup>1</sup> *Textkritisches zum Buche Ijob* (1890). Cf. my notice in *EXPOSITOR*, 1891 (ii.), pp. 142 ff.

(xxxix. 9b-xl. 7 is the only lacuna) does indeed represent the pre-Origenian LXX. text, but it does not appear that it corresponds to the Hebrew MS. which the translator used. According to Dillmann and Budde, it is rather a recast of the text in the interests of Greek readers than a faithful translation, and with some reservations I am compelled to share this view. This does not however exclude the possibility that some or even many of the omissions of the earlier LXX. text may be justifiable on grounds of internal criticism, and that the translator may have been partly guided by marginal signs indicating the non-originality of certain passages, which signs, as, *e.g.*, in the case of xxviii. 15-19<sup>1</sup> (one verse too little, and one verse too much), he may not always have rightly understood. Each omission of the LXX. must therefore be carefully considered. Bickell's metrical theory (that nearly all the poetical part of Job falls into tetrastichs or quatrains) has also to be examined, and, in fact, Budde spares no pains in performing this duty. Siegfried and Beer have also done good service by their careful use of the versions; the former also by his zealous hunt for glosses, and both by conjectural but not therefore arbitrary emendations.

Budde too has no objection to pointing out glosses, and he shows more judgment than Siegfried in doing this. I think, however, that his prejudice against Bickell (whose metrical theory is as uncongenial to Budde as his estimate of the Sahidic version) has hindered him from recognising some that really exist. In chaps. iii.-vi. this is notably the case. Budde sometimes defends the indefensible, and produces an unsatisfactory text.<sup>2</sup> In chap. iii. the only correc-

16; in chap. iv., those in *vv.* 2, 6, 19; in chap. v., those in *vv.* 3, 5, 7, 15, 27; in chap. vi., those in *vv.* 4, 7, 17, 21. Of these the most important are those relating to v. 7 and 15. The former verse is rendered thus in the Revised Version,—

“But man is born unto trouble,  
As the sparks fly upward.”

This rendering is accepted even by the cautious Dillmann. But is it satisfactory? It requires this exegesis,—trouble is inherent in human nature, and is as inevitable as the upward movement of sparks. The previous verse however appears to state the very opposite of this, viz., that trouble is not a natural growth like weeds, which spring up unplanted. Dillmann therefore asks us to supply mentally “being sinful” between “man” and “is born.” This no doubt harmonizes the statement with the ideas of Eliphaz; but would not such a stylist as the author have expressed himself more intelligibly? Hence Budde suggests taking *לְעַמֵּל* as the accusative, and pointing *יֹלֵד*, which gives this sense: “For man *begets* trouble” (Beer also adopts this view). The second line he explains quite differently from Dillmann and from our Bible. He retains the rendering “sparks” for *בְּנֵי רֶשֶׁף*, but makes “sparks” a figurative expression for the troubles “begotten” by sinful man. But I fear even this acute interpretation is hardly tenable. Budde’s grammatical view of line 1 is almost as unnatural as his exegetical view of line 2. He proposes indeed to omit *ל* before *עַמֵּל*, but is there cause enough for this boldness? Is the condensed expression, “man begets trouble,” a probable one? In Job xv. 35 a fuller phrase is used. Not less serious are the objections to Budde’s view of line 2. Is it probable that “sparks” is equivalent to “troubles begotten by sinful man”? And, to go further back, is the prevalent rendering “sparks” correct? *רֶשֶׁף*

(*resheph*) is, so far as I know, only used of a supernatural flame, such as lightning (Ps. lxxviii. 48; Ecclus. xliii. 17, Heb. text), or the flame which was thought by the Hebrews to produce fever (Deut. xxxii. 24). This is in accordance with the fact that a Phœnician god was called Resheph, and excludes all interpretations of בְּנֵי רֶשֶׁף but two,<sup>1</sup> viz., (1) "God's fiery ministers of punishment" (as proposed by me in Stade's *Zeitschrift*, 1891, p. 184), and (2) "the angels," who, according to the later Jewish theology, were made of fire (cf. Ps. civ. 4b). I suspect that the latter interpretation is correct. Verses 2-6 should probably be omitted,<sup>2</sup> and verses 1 and 7 brought close together. This is what Eliphaz probably means to say: "Seek, if you will, for some one of the heavenly beings to take your part (the 'holy ones,' he calls them). It will be in vain. Your request is unreasonable, for trouble is natural to man; and besides, the angels are entirely occupied with super-terrestrial matters ('the sons of fire fly on high'—on the wings of the wind)."

On the whole, Budde's criticism of the text of chaps. iii.-vi. is disappointing. It is no doubt much in advance of Dillmann's; but, in spite of occasional good suggestions (*e.g.*, at iii. 3 and v. 15<sup>3</sup>), he does not sufficiently recognise the faultiness of our present text. In iii. 5, for instance, he keeps כְּמַרְרִי, rendering it "darkening (of the day)"; so Revised Version, "all that maketh black (the day)." But I greatly fear that the root כְּמַר, "to be black," is non-

<sup>1</sup> The attempt of Bateson Wright to justify the meaning "eaglet" (*Job*, 1883, p. 145) is at most ingenious. But how can Siegfried dream of correcting בְּנֵי רֶשֶׁף קָשָׁר? Tradition explained בְּנֵי רֶשֶׁף of birds. Cf. Driver, *Deut.*, p. 368, and see LXX., Ecclus. xliii. 17.

<sup>2</sup> *Vv.* 3-5 are perhaps a variant to iv. 8-11. The author may have rejected this passage and placed it in the margin, and the editor may have given it the best place he could find, linking it with its present context by *vv.* 2 and 6. Note in v. 3 the characteristic אֲנִי ("I") of Eliphaz.

<sup>3</sup> The former had already been made (after LXX.) by Bickell (1886) and Beer (1895).

existent; and even were it otherwise, Budde's view makes the passage tautological. It is therefore worth proposing two possible corrections. The first is the bolder one, but, as I think, hits the mark. It is to read *בְּמוֹ אֲרָרִי יוֹם*, "let them (viz., darkness and gloom) affright it like the cursers of the day." This seems to be a modification of a variant of *v. 8a*, formed by the addition of *בְּמוֹ*, to adapt the line to its present position. The line was inserted in error, and ought therefore to be omitted in a corrected text. There is a trace of the right reading in LXX. The alternative is to read *בְּמַרְדֵּי־יוֹם*, "as those who rebelled against [the God of] the day" (cf. *מַרְדֵּי־אֹר*, Job xxiv. 13), or *בְּמַרְדֵּי־יָם*, "as the rebels of the ocean." In this case the line can be retained, though its position will have to be changed. Whichever view we adopt—I have indicated my own strong preference—there is a mythological allusion to the fate of the dragon *Tiāmat*, which defied the Divine Creator, and of that dragon's "helpers" (Job ix. 13), for which see the Babylonian creation-story, fourth tablet, lines 110 ff. To this dragon and to similar monsters there are several allusions in Job, and notably in iii. 8, where Budde has, after consideration, rejected what Gunkel, Beer, and myself believe to be a sound as well as easy correction.

Job iii. 8 runs thus in Rodwell's version,—

"Let those who curse days lay their ban upon it,  
Those who are of skill to rouse up Leviathan!"

Now "those who curse days" is not a natural phrase where a night is spoken of. And if it be said to mean magicians who have skill to produce eclipses, the answer is that from books of folklore we only know of a magic which could keep off eclipses. Besides, this version of the passage makes an incomplete parallelism. And when we recollect the references in a late prophecy and a late psalm to a dragon or dragons in the sea (Isa. xxvii. 1; Ps. lxxiv. 13),

and in Amos (ix. 3—the only pre-Exilic passage in which an allusion to the dragon-myth exists in our Old Testament) to a serpent at the bottom of the sea which, at Jehovah's bidding, could destroy a multitude of men, and then throw upon this the bright light of Babylonian mythology, it becomes natural to admit Schmidt's and Gunkel's correction "sea" (ים) for "day" (יום), and give this revised rendering of the distich,—

"Let those who lay a ban upon the ocean, curse it,  
Who are appointed<sup>1</sup> to rouse up Leviathan."

It may originally have been the waters of heaven to which the conquered monster was assigned ("there was war in heaven," says the Apocalypse of John); but the writer of Job more probably thinks of the lower ocean, which, like the other forces of nature, is under the charge of angelic beings.<sup>2</sup> Budde's opposite view can of course be maintained, but it seems to me to make an unnecessary inconsistency in the Hebrew dragon-myth.

I have been thus minute, because this is a matter of some importance. The opening speech of Job is a specimen of the higher rhetoric which deserves to be seen in all its beauty, and the revival of a mythological interest in the later period is a phenomenon (by no means denied by Budde) which requires investigation. And lastly as to כמריר: it is really time that we began to purify the Hebrew Lexicon. To assume a root כמר, "to be black," in order to support a modern view of a very suspicious-looking group of letters, is no better, and is perhaps even worse, than assuming a root עיק, "to straiten," or "to

<sup>1</sup> On עתיר, see Driver's excellent note, *Deut.*, p. 374, to which a reference to Job xv. 28 might be added.

<sup>2</sup> Originally the dragon was the personification of the primeval ocean (תהום). See Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos*, p. 59; and cf. my review, *Critical Review*, July, 1895.

vociferate," in order to justify עקת in Ps. lv. 4, and a root נוף, "to be elevated," to defend, נוף, in Ps. xlvi. 2.

I will only mention two more passages in chaps. iii.-vi., which I would ask Budde to reconsider. One is iii. 14, which he renders thus,—

"With kings and counsellors of the land,  
Who built themselves palace-tombs."

With Ewald and others he finds here a reference to the pyramids, and thinks that הַרְבֹּת (hōrābōt) may be a distorted form of *hirām* or *ahrām*, the word used for the pyramids by early Arabic historians, which may, as Delitzsch thinks, be a Semitized form of *amr*, "an old Egyptian name for the pyramids." This looks very dubious. Must one give reasons? Must one refer to Jablonski's errors about Behemoth and Remphan? Or quote Pierret (*Dict. d'arch. ég.*, p. 465), who gives the Egyptian name as *ab-mer*? May one not simply say that theories like this are not strictly critical? הַרְבֹּת means "ruined places," and neither "tombs" nor "pyramids." Is it not clear that Olshausen was right in correcting אַרְמֹנֹת, "palaces" (cf. v. 15b)? The other passage is v. 3b, which Rodwell renders thus,—

"I myself have seen the impious striking root,  
But at once I cursed his dwelling."

Clearly "I cursed" must be wrong; it makes the judgment on the impious man the effect of the curse of Eliphaz. Feeling this, Budde suggests, for וַיִּפְקֹד, וַאֲקִיב, "stood empty." Both reading and translation seem to me too bold. Should we not read וַיִּקַּב? Siegfried and Beer would read וַרְקַב, appealing to LXX. But וַרְקַב, or rather וַיִּרְקַב, is not less corrupt than וַאֲקִיב. The same corruption seems to occur in the Massoretic text of Prov. x. 7, where for יַרְקַב we should probably (with Krochmal) read יִקַּב. Render therefore, "But suddenly his habitation was cursed" (viz., by God).

I have still to consider Budde's relation to the strophic theory of Bickell, as applied to these three chapters. In many parts of his volume Budde exposes, without any difficulty, the arbitrariness of the great metrist. But there are not a few other parts in which Budde's arrangement of the text is inferior to Bickell's, and chaps. iii.-vi. supply an instance of this. There certainly is here, and more especially in chap. iii., a strong tendency to four-line stanzas. I admit indeed (see above) that Bickell is wrong in omitting iii. 8*b* as "an addition suggested by xli. 2." But this scholar is perfectly right, in my opinion, in all his other omissions. It is true, we thus get one stichus too much, viz., *v.* 9*a*, which Bickell, against parallelism, substitutes for *v.* 8*b*. The remedy is a simple one, and it will, I am sure, be congenial to Budde. It is to make a five-line stanza out of verses 9 and 10. The poet is not to be kept too strictly to rule, though the extraordinary long lines in iii. 26 and vii. 4, and the extraordinary short lines in ix. 21, xvii. 1, which seem to Budde to give such admirable expression to the thought, are (as a keener critic could probably show) illusory.

The reader will see from this specimen how numerous are the problems which Budde opens, but hardly settles. It is his great merit to have opened them; and however disappointed I may be at the frequent inadequacy of his treatment of them, I must not be supposed to think lightly of his book. Few indeed could have written it. But I am bound, as a humble fellow-worker, to ask the author to reconsider much that he has said. I cannot here say a twentieth part of what calls for expression. But I will ask leave in passing to mention a few things more relative to the undisputed portion of the speeches in Job. Budde sees that viii. 15 is a later insertion, but overlooks the probability that it has taken the place of an illegible passage which introduced the parable of the creeping plant. He also

spoils the parable by rejecting Merx's admirable corrections of *v.* 17. The heap of stones and the house of stones are, as I believe, purely imaginary.<sup>1</sup> On vii. 12, ix. 13 (xxvi. 12), the correct mythological interpretation is given.—vii. 17. Budde misses the best explanation of the superfluous לִי. The scribe began to write לַיְלֹת, "nights" (see *b*), instead of יָרְחֵי, "months."—ix. 23. For the impossible לְמַסַּת, read לְמַבַּת (Grätz).—x. 15. Here Budde is right against Bickell. A tristich (Budde), or rather a pentastich, seems unavoidable: Budde rightly corrects רִיבָה עָנִי (cf. Geiger, Lagarde). But in *v.* 17 he can hardly be right. Of the third stichus only a forced rendering can be given: Revised Version renders, "Changes and warfare are with me" in the text, and (boldly) "Host after host is against me" in the margin. Surely it is a corrupt gloss on the first stichus, and should be corrected תַּחֲלִיף זַבְאֵיךָ עָמָי, *i.e.*, "thou bringest fresh hosts against me." The first stichus also needs correction; for עָרִיךָ read מְעַרְדֶּיךָ, and render "thou bringest more and more troops against me."—x. 22c is certainly "dittographed" from *v.* 22a (Bickell, Grätz).—xi. 12. Here Budde has contributed a valuable correction. Every one knows and has been puzzled by the words ascribed to Zophar in the Authorized Version,—

"For vain man would be wise, though man be born like a wild ass's colt,"

for which Davidson substitutes, without any dogmatism,—

"But an empty man will become wise,  
When a wild ass colt is born a man,"—

<sup>1</sup> Render therefore,—

"His roots twine themselves together about a fountain,  
He looks with delight on a luxuriance of fresh growths."

Budde however errs in excellent company. For יְחֻזָּה he reads יְחֻזָּה, for which Houbigant might have been cited. I find a pencil note of my own to the effect that this was also supported by Robertson Smith. Siegfried's יְחֻזָּה (LXX., Ἰχουζαί) goes back to Cappellus; Grätz also accepts it. For my own part I still adhere to יְחֻזָּה, which fits in with מְשֻׁשׁ דְּרָכָו (v. 19).

remarking that Zophar adds further brilliancy to his picture of God's omniscience by contrasting it with the brutishness of man. Budde however separates *v.* 12 from the preceding description, and makes it an introduction to the encouraging address to Job in *vv.* 13-19. No one should take too hopeless a view of his fellow-man. "Even the most senseless man may come to understanding, and even a wild ass colt may be tamed." He omits אָדָם, "man," which may have come in from Gen. xvi. 12, and corrects יוֹלֵד, "is born," into יִלְמַד, "is tamed." Grätz comes very near this with his suggestion יִלְכָד, "is taken"; and since Budde has not quite justified the word יִלְבַּב (in *a*), I would propose to correct יִלְבַּב into יִלְמַד, and יוֹלֵד into יִלְכָד, thus obtaining the excellent sense (I reproduce the assonance of the Hebrew),—

"But (even) senseless man may be taught,  
And a wild ass colt may be caught."

The result is quite defensible palæographically, and is an acquisition not only to the exegete, but, may I not add? to the religious teacher.

Completeness in a review of this sort is, for reasons of space, impossible. I therefore leap to xix. 25-29, upon which Budde has bestowed great and not ineffectual pains. No one can be indifferent to the fate of this famous passage, which introduces one of the most solemn services in the Prayer-Book, and which in the German Revised Version (a work marked by considerable caution) runs thus: "For I know that my redeemer lives; and as the last he will arise above the dust; and after this my skin has been smitten to pieces, without my flesh I shall see God, etc." The English Revised Version, it is true, retains "from my flesh," but places "without my flesh" in the margin. Here is one grave question to settle. If "from my flesh" is wrong, it would seem to be the duty of the Church of England to

substitute the right rendering, and so harmonize the statement of the old Hebrew poet with that of the apostle in 1 Cor. xv. 36, 37, 49, 50.<sup>1</sup> For my own part, I agree with Budde in preferring the rendering "from my flesh," and I think that he might have expressed his opinion with rather more decision. For, as Dr. Charles Taylor has shown (*Journal of Philology*), there is no complete parallel for the rendering "without my flesh" for *בְּבִשְׂרִי*,<sup>2</sup> in connection with *אֶחָדָה*. But the question is not a simple one. The LXX. translator evidently found in the passage the doctrine of the resurrection of the body, and it is very possible that, though he may have added definiteness to the reference, he did but proceed on the path which an earlier student had marked out. The analogy of several passages in the Psalms favours this view, and in spite of Budde's very attractive exegesis,<sup>3</sup> the form of the Massoretic text strongly suggests that the passage xix. 25-29 has passed through more than one phase. Bickell and Siegfried both go too far for me in their "restorations," but I cannot share Budde's confidence in the present text. This is how he renders it, permitting himself a few very moderate corrections,—

"But I know (that) my Goel lives,  
 And as a last one will arise on the dust,  
 And behind my skin which has been thus mangled,  
 Yea, out of my flesh I shall see God;  
 Whom I shall see favourably inclined to me,  
 And mine eyes will behold, and not as a stranger,—  
 The reins in my body faint (with longing).  
 When ye say, 'How we will persecute him!  
 The root of the matter we will find in him,'

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Spitta's reverently meant proposal for a modification of the words of J. M. Bach's Choral motette, "Ich weiss, dass mein Erlöser lebt," *Monatschrift für Gottesdienst*, 1896, pp. 59 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Neither of the two passages of Job quoted by Dillmann and Budde (xi. 15, xxi. 9) is quite in point; indeed, in xi. 15, *בְּבִשְׂרִי* is a corruption of *בְּכַסְיִם* in v. 15b, which has intruded into the text (Bickell, Beer).

<sup>3</sup> Budde himself recognises that there is a serious corruption in v. 26, though he does not attribute this to doctrinal influences.

Be afraid because of the sword,  
 For the like are offences for the sword,  
 That ye may find out, 'There is a judge.'"

The first two and the last four of this passage are very plausibly translated, and the justification of the new readings is perhaps adequate. At any rate, I have no mind to dispute about them with the learned and acute author. But I am very sure that *מבשרי* in line 4 is wrong, and that this false reading has led to the insertion of lines 5 and 6.<sup>1</sup> For *מבשרי*, we should most probably read with Merx *משדי* (LXX., *παρὰ κυρίου*), *i.e.*, "from Shaddai." In line 3 *נקפוזאת* has probably sprung out of *נקפוזתי*, "I am shrivelled up" (see Beer, *ap.* Budde), and this again out of *נקמתתי*, or *צדקתי*. The reading *עורי*, "my skin," was presumably influenced by *בשרי*, "my flesh" (*cf.* *v.* 20); *ואחר* (not expressed in LXX.) seems written by an error of the eye, such as often occurs, owing to *ואחרון* in the previous line. We are therefore perfectly free in dealing with *ואחר*, but less so in correcting *עורי*; for the true word ought not to be very dissimilar to *עורי*. One expects for *v.* 26 something like this,—

"And my righteousness shall come forth as the light,  
 And through Shaddai I shall see his redemption."<sup>2</sup>

But the care which Budde has bestowed both on the text and on the exegesis deserves cordial recognition. He is very confident of the general accuracy of his view, has apparently no misgivings as to the rendering "behind my skin" = "while still enclosed by my skin," and finds

<sup>1</sup> The second *אחזה* (*v.* 27) is one very suspicious point.

<sup>2</sup> *יציא כבוד צדקתי ומשדי אחזה נאקיו*. *יציא אלוה* in Mas. text looks rather like a corruption of *נאקיו* = *נאקיו*, *cf.* Isa. lxiii. 4. According to my arrangement, Job's great declaration falls into a pentastich and a tetrastich (*v.* 25 correct possibly as it stands, *v.* 26 needing correction, *v.* 28 and 29 needing slight corrections, and the excision of the last line, "That ye may know," etc.).

nothing extraordinary in the expression “(from) out of my flesh I shall see God.” As to the time when this vision of God shall be granted to the embodied spirit of Job, he thinks (with all modern Protestant critics) that it must be before Job’s death; and since Job expects his death within a few years at most (xvi. 22), the revelation of God cannot be far distant. And certainly, if the text has been correctly read and rendered by Budde, this view of the time of that great favour must be correct.

No less care has been bestowed on other disputed chapters. Siegfried thinks that xxiv. 13-24 is one of a series of interpolations made in the interests of the orthodox doctrine of retribution. Bickell, that *vv.* 5-24 is a passage from some other poem in a different metre from the true Job, which has taken the place of about seven lost stanzas. Dillmann admits that *vv.* 13-17 and *vv.* 18-24 have been doubted by Merx upon grounds which deserve consideration. Budde too grants that in its present form the chapter is very difficult to comprehend. But he thinks that the text can be greatly improved by emendation, and that a few interpolations have to be recognised. It is very evident that here, as throughout the second part of our Book of Job, Budde’s textual criticism is on the whole sounder than that of Bickell. There is still room, however, for discussion, especially as to the details, and it should be noted that Budde’s willingness as a text-critic to learn from others has helped him quite as much as his own talent.

Chap. xxviii. presents more attractive problems. The first part gives us our only information as to mining in or near Palestine; the second is a fine rhetorical but deeply felt declaration of the inaccessibility of all wisdom but the fear of God. The connection of this passage with its context is by no means obvious, and the elaborateness of the description in both parts is surprising in a speech of the afflicted Job. Both Bickell and Budde however are very

unwilling to assign it (as a later insertion) to another poet, and this unwillingness has sharpened their eyes as textual critics. Budde omits no fewer than eighteen stichi, and Bickell (assisted by the LXX.) even more. I cannot think that, from his own point of view, Budde's abridgment is sufficient. It would be more plausible to omit in the first part all but *vv.* 1-3*b* (*i.e.* as far as חִיִּיקָר); I do not say that it would be correct.

With a mere glance at Budde's unsatisfactory view of *xxix.* 18, of which I will venture to speak elsewhere, and his brilliant suggestion for *xxix.* 21-25, I hasten on to the speeches of Elihu, which our author, strange to say, regards as an integral part of the original poem. About 23 verses are rejected as interpolations, and not a few corrections are made in the text. The speeches gain considerably by the alterations, which I am myself generally able to accept (in *xxxvii.* 22 for קָהָב read קָהָר, and so do with less help from archæology). More interest, however, attaches to the speeches of Jehovah. Here again the corrections are often excellent. As elsewhere, Budde does justice to a too much neglected English scholar, Bateson Wright (see *eg.* on *xxxviii.* 27, *xxxix.* 18). His own correction, נִבְעִי for נִבְכִי, in *xxxviii.* 16 is very good (but נִבְעִי would surely be better). Special care has been devoted to the descriptions of Behemoth and Leviathan, and it would be ungrateful not to admit that the text has on the whole benefited. Still I have an uneasy feeling that the difficulties have not always been resolutely met. For instance, the correctness of the first line of *xl.* 20 is not perfectly clear to me. As commonly explained, it is not in parallelism to the second, and, as Budde himself points out, the preceding line (which, as the particle כִּי, "for," at the head of *v.* 20 shows, was closely connected with *v.* 20*a*, and might have assisted us in interpreting or correcting it) is corrupt. As to *v.* 19, I admit that from Budde's point of view it is beyond correc-

tion. But those who do not share his objections to certain newer lights (see Part II. of this article) will, I think, agree that *הַעֲשׂוֹי לְשֵׁר הַרְבּוֹת* ("which is made to be prince of dry places") is a form of text out of which both our existing readings *הַעֲשׂוֹי יְגֵשׁ חֲרָבוֹ* (Mas. text) and *הַעֲשׂוֹי לְשַׁחַק בּוֹ* (presupposed by LXX.) can easily have arisen.<sup>1</sup> Thus the second line of *v.* 19 will correspond with the poet's last words on Leviathan in xli. 26*b*. Even if xli. 4–26 be a later insertion (of which I am by no means convinced) the correspondence need not be accidental. On xli. 1–3 see Part II.

Once more, the reader is intreated not to suppose that these criticisms are meant unfavourably. Books like Job may be compared to paintings which skilled hands endeavour to restore to their original beauty. Some may prefer that the paintings should be allowed to fade—a sad fate, but better than that of a misinterpretation, which misrepresents and so perverts the artist's work. But no such objection can be made to corrections such as those of Budde and his colleagues. For the traditional text is ever with us, and we can always go back to it if we will. Nor can we avoid the attempt to correct the text, for this is a necessary aid to critical and exegetical work.

I conclude with a specimen of Budde's translation. The passage is the description of Behemoth (xl. 15–24). In Part II. of this article I shall find occasion to refer to it,—

"Lo, the hippopotamus which I made with thee;  
 Grass, like the ox, doth he eat.  
 Lo, his might is in his loins,  
 And his strength in the muscles of his belly;  
 He stiffeneth his tail like the cedar,  
 The sinews of his thighs are firmly knotted;  
 His bones are tubes of brass,  
 His spine is like a bar of iron.  
 He is the firstling of the ways of God;

\* \* \* \* \*

<sup>1</sup> *הַרְבּוֹת* may have been written *הַרְבּוֹ' (i.e., with a mark of abbreviation after ו)*. So Gunkel; cf. Perles, *Analekten*.

For (their) fruit must mountains bring him,  
 While all the beasts of the field sport themselves there,  
 Under lotus trees lieth he down,  
 In cover of reed and fen,  
 Hedged in by shady lotus trees,  
 Surrounded by willows of the brook.  
 Though the stream sink,<sup>1</sup> he heedeth not;  
 Light-hearted is he when it<sup>2</sup> gusheth up to his mouth,  
 Who<sup>3</sup> will seize him by the teeth,<sup>4</sup>  
 And pierce his<sup>5</sup> nose with a snare?"

T. K. CHEYNE.

*THE PLACE OF THE CROSS IN THE WORLD.*

(REVELATION XIII. 8.)

THERE have been two extreme views of the destiny of this world—optimism and pessimism. The optimist looks upon all things as working for the highest good; the pessimist regards them as tending to the utmost evil. Neither can deny the presence of the sacrificial element in the existing system of things; but they differ as to the position which it holds. The pessimist looks upon the design of life as essentially malignant; everything in his view is constructed so as to bring man to a sense of his limitation and his nothingness; the cross is with him the goal. The optimist, on the other hand, regards the goal as individual happiness; but, before reaching the paradise of self-gratification, he holds that man has a dark avenue to tread either by way of discipline or by way of penalty; the cross is with him an interlude.

The representatives of these two tendencies are respectively the Brahmanic and the Jewish creeds. To the

<sup>1</sup> Reading ישקט for יששק.

<sup>2</sup> Omitting ירר.

<sup>3</sup> Reading מיהורא.

<sup>4</sup> Reading בישניו.

<sup>5</sup> Reading ישן.