

Something must come to lull the cares if the work is to keep pace with the thought. Therefore it is that to St. John the future life is not a miracle, but something which annuls a miracle. It is not a supernatural state, but a state which restores the broken law of nature. It is the present life which has interrupted the natural order. Man has an ideal beyond his capacity. He has a work to do which he cannot finish; he leaves it behind him on the wayside. Another life must take it up and carry it through. Another state of being must restore the balance between the demand for outward service and the power to supply it. Here the human soul is restless ere it begins its toil; it has not a fresh start even in the morning. There must be found an environment for man in which rest shall be itself the starting point, and the movement of the hand shall be accelerated by the unruffled repose of the spirit.

GEORGE MATHESON.

*THE BOOK OF JOB AND ITS LATEST
COMMENTATOR.*

PART II.

THE text of Job as presented to us by Prof. Budde differs in very many points from the Massoretic, and if not the best that we may reasonably hope to get, yet supplies a far better basis for criticism and exegesis than we have hitherto had. The exegetical results of the author must for the most part be left here untouched. It is necessary, however, to give a sketch of the view of the origin of the Book of Job which the introduction to the present work supplies. It is to a certain extent retrogressive criticism which it gives us. Prof. Budde thinks that critics have been too analytic, and that it is desirable, after reviewing the subject in a more or less new light, to return to the belief in the

venture to say that I now fully admit that the Epilogue as well as the Prologue belonged to the (second) Book of Job. Budde's belief in an earlier *Volksbuch* has of course long been my own.

2. In the speeches of Job himself, some passages have been thought to be inconsistent with Job's expressed ideas, or to interrupt the development of his thought to such an extent that they either needed to be cut out or to be placed at some other point or to be assigned to other speakers. (a) The difficulties connected with chaps xxvii., xxviii., Budde seeks (skilfully enough) to overcome by placing xxvii. 7 (a very difficult verse) after vv. 8-10, by omitting from chap. xxviii. nine somewhat rhetorical distichs which can well be dispensed with, and by a subtle discussion of the connection implied in the particle 'פ, "for," which opens the chapter on Wisdom. Briefly, he thinks that chap. xxvii. brings out more glaringly than ever the incapacity alike of Job and of his friends to solve the problem of his sufferings, and that by prefixing to chap. xxviii. the particle referred to, Job means to say, "Your inability, O my friends, and my own, to solve my enigma comes from the fact that wisdom is reserved by God for Himself; what He has given to man under this name is a practical substitute for wisdom—not wisdom itself." Those who would appreciate Budde's capacity for subtle and delicate reasoning should read the essay in the well-known magazine of Old Testament lore, edited by Stade, vol. ii. (1882) pp. 193-274. One is tempted to wish that his great gifts of exposition could be devoted to a poem less compassed with critical controversy than Job. What a fine Shakespeare commentator he would have made!

(b) The difficulty caused by the want of a third speech of Zophar, and by the extreme shortness of the third speech of Bildad, has led some critics to transfer portions of Job's long speech in chaps. xxvi.-xxviii. to these two interlo-

cutors. Budde, however, offers reasons for not venturing on this step, and is content to accept the phenomena (the word seems to me appropriate) as he finds them. The argumentative break-down of the three friends is thus forcibly brought out by the poet. And "a striking proof that the poet meant the speech of Bildad to be as it now stands is also furnished by the introduction of the following speech of Job" (xxvi. 2-4).

(c) The speeches of Elihu have been generally regarded as a late insertion even by those who in other respects were conservative critics. But Budde seems to have produced a considerable impression by that early work to which I have referred, and which shows by statistics that these speeches have linguistically many more points of contact with the other parts of the book than has been generally supposed. He is, in fact, not altogether isolated in the views which he holds. Possibly enough he will make some more converts by his treatment of Elihu in the present work, in which, by correcting textual errors and removing probable interpolations, he has certainly given an improved basis to his earlier critical view that chaps. xxxii.-xxxvii. belonged to the original poem. It will no doubt impress some readers that, after twenty years of further study, he is still able to say that the connection of the speeches with the rest of the book is perfect. Budde even tells us (and his argument is vigorous, if not to myself convincing) that the poet wrote these words at the end of the last speech of Job,—“The words of Job were at an end, and those three men ceased answering Job because he was righteous in his own eyes.” Into Budde’s arguments I cannot here enter. I could wish to find some point of contact with him, but, except in the textual criticism of these chapters, I do not know where to find it. But I think that I can admire and receive wholesome stimulus from much with which I do not agree.

(d) The speeches of Jehovah (Yahwè) have also been

questioned by some scholars. No one, however, has failed to recognise their manifold beauties, and the position of the separatists is here much weaker than in the speeches of Elihu. All depends on the view formed by the critic as to the object of the original poet and the importance of consistency in essentials, and the present writer would be perfectly contented with the admission that chaps. xxxviii.-xlii. 6 formed no part of the original poem. The poet may, in fact, like Goethe, have kept his poem by him, and made later insertions which by no means harmonize with his original plan. We, with our modern ideas, are naturally inclined to suppose a Hebrew poet to have had little else to do than to touch up his poem. I quite understand this, though critical sobriety seems to me to be somewhat deficient in such a theory.

(e) The description of the two monsters Behemoth and Leviathan (xl. 15-xli. 34) must, at any rate, as most critics have held, be denied to the author of the original poem, and, as the text has come down to us, he can hardly be thought to have lost much. Budde, however, has done much to make a conservative view more possible. First of all, he rearranges a good deal, placing xl. 15 ff. after xxxix. 30, and xl. 2, 8-14 after the Leviathan passage (see below). Next, he has revised the text very carefully, continuing the work of his predecessors. Next, he has made it plausible to hold that the strangest part of the whole disputed passage (A.V. xli. 12-34) is a later insertion. In this case the contrast between the picture of the monsters and the delightful descriptions of natural objects which have preceded still remains, but it has become less glaring, and Budde would, I think, deny its existence. And the verses in which, according to Budde, the speaker turns to Job to impress the lesson of Leviathan (*i.e.* xli. 9-11) become a suitable conclusion of the whole Leviathan-passage. I must here beg permission to criticise the author's views

somewhat more freely. I accept Gunkel's and Budde's correction of xli. 9a, 11a (=Heb. xli. 1a, 3a). But, like Gunkel, I fail to see that this correction involves the excision of the rest of the Leviathan passage. The appearance of Behemoth is minutely described; why should not Leviathan's be so too? It is true that xli. 2, 8-14 comes in very well according to Budde's new arrangement (see above), but the words,—

“Who has uncovered the face of his garment?
Or who can venture into his double jaw?”—

are an appropriate continuation of xli. 9-11, if we only use Gunkel's clue to their meaning.

It is true that Gunkel's readings are bold, but they take due account of the habits of scribes, and the text is undeniably corrupt. Budde himself questions לֹא אֶכֶזֶר in xli. 2 (Heb.), and admits the corruptness of parts of vv. 1, 3, 4. I will not follow Gunkel altogether. In v. 1b I prefer to read גַּם אֱלִים מָרְאוּ יִטִּיל (cf. xli. 17, Heb.), and at the beginning of v. 2, מִלֵּאדָּי יִשְׁעַר, and in v. 3, וַיִּשְׁלֹם, וְהִקְדִּימוּ, and (for לֵי הוּא) לֹא אֶחָד. Thus a far more acceptable sense than Budde's can perhaps be obtained,—

“Surely thy self-confidence proves itself vain;
Even divine beings his fear lays low.
An angel shudders when he would arouse him;¹
Who then (among mortals) would dare to meet him as a foe?
Who ever confronted him and came off safe?
Under the whole heaven not one.”

After vv. 1-3 had become corrupted and so misunderstood, v. 4 was inserted as a link between what was supposed to be an aside of Jehovah and the following description.

But even accepting Budde's shortened form of the Leviathan passage, and admitting that it does not seem so

¹ Cf. the references to angels with special ministries in Job iii. 8, xv. 24, xxxiii. 23; Eccles. v. 6.

far removed from the usual manner of the speeches of Jehovah as the excised passage, can we therefore assign it to the writer of these speeches? What of the description of Behemoth? Can the writer of xxxix. 19-25 have written xl. 15-18? I trow not.

I believe that Budde's assignment of the Behemoth and Leviathan passages to the poet of Job is a great mistake. But I only criticise him thus because he has connected with his theory a very trenchant criticism of a writer to whom archæological criticism is, as I conceive, under great obligations. I have elsewhere pointed out¹ what I think grievous faults both in the theories of Gunkel and in his treatment of other scholars (including Budde and myself). But I am convinced that he is on the right lines, and Budde's attitude towards him is, I think, deeply to be regretted. In a word, the Book of Job is a monument, as I have been among the first to show, of that revival of mythology among the Jews which marks the Exilic and post-Exilic periods. Rahab and Leviathan are two of the names of the dragon of chaos and darkness who, with other monsters, opposed the God of light and order, and whose destruction was the initial act of creation. The Babylonian myth, as all who will may know, is the chief source of the purified cosmogony in Gen. i.; it has also affected, more or less distinctly, other Old Testament passages, including Job iii. 8, vii. 12, ix. 13, xxvi. 12, 13 (cf. Part I. of this article), and strong reason has to be shown why Behemoth and Leviathan in Job xl.-xli. should not be regarded as pale reflexions of the original mythic monsters. I have no desire to deny that Behemoth and Leviathan are to the poet monsters which exist somewhere, and that, never having seen them himself, he adopts

¹ See *Critical Review*, July, 1895; *Academy*, April 27, 1895. I wish that Budde could have transferred his controversy with Gunkel to a periodical. This book loses much by its too controversial spirit.

features from the two huge creatures of the Nile—the hippopotamus and the crocodile. But if he had meant to introduce these animals, apart from any mythic reference, just as he (or another poet) introduces the horse and the wild goat, he would have given them proper descriptive names. The former he would probably have called “the swine of the Nile” (“the swine from the Nile”¹ actually occurs, according to Ginsburg and Grätz, in Ps. lxxx. 14). The latter he would have been puzzled how to describe; perhaps he would have called it **תַּבְּנִין בַּיָּאֵר**. The view of Budde, Ewald, and most recent critics, that Behemoth is a Hebraized form of *p-che-môu*,³ “water-ox,” is a mere fancy. Few have taken the trouble to look up the work (republished in *Opera*, i. 52) in which Jablonski († 1757) first proposed it. Had they done so, they would have hesitated to commit themselves to this uncritical scholar’s guidance. The derivation of Behemoth from a falsely imagined Egyptian word (which, by the way, leaves the final letter of Behemoth unaccounted for) is not the only specimen of Jablonski’s misdirected acuteness. But I need not build too much on the impression which Jablonski’s writings have produced upon me. Feeling the responsibility of setting myself in opposition to a consensus of the most able critics of the day, I applied to Sir P. le Page Renouf and Dr. Budge for their opinions. Both Egyptologists agree with F. C. Cook in the *Speaker’s Commentary*, and regard Jablonski’s theory as baseless. “Neither Jablonski nor Ewald,” wrote the former, “had more than a smattering

¹ Reading **תַּבְּנִין בַּיָּאֵר** for **תַּבְּנִין**. The original text had **תַּבְּנִין**; **ע** and **א** were sometimes omitted by Hebrew writers (Ginsburg, *Introd. to Masoretic-critical Bible*, pp. 338 ff.).

² The Talmud invents the form **תַּבְּנִין בַּיָּאֵר** = *κροκόδειλος* (Delitzsch).

³ Prof. Davidson attaches a final *t* (*Job*, p. 279). This is defended by Delitzsch (*Jesaja*, p. 331) as the affixed feminine article. Lepsius, however, remarks (Herzog-Plitt, *Prot. Realenc.*, i. 169) that the termination *-th* in Behemoth is difficult to explain on Jablonski’s theory. Nor is there any reason why a female hippopotamus should be referred to.

of Coptic, and they knew absolutely nothing of the older forms of the language." Birch, to whom students owe so deep a debt, sought for a sounder view. "He wanted to find Behemoth in a group of characters which he read *Bekhama*. The word, which undoubtedly means hippopotamus, is to be read Kheb (Ḥeb). Birch justified his meaning. . . . But when fresh texts were published, the variants settled the question." Jablonski, however, had made no attempt to discover an Egyptian name for the crocodile in Job xli. This was reserved for Ewald, who, in his Hebrew Grammar (7th ed., p. 791), made this remark in a footnote, "May the unusual omission of the interrogative ה before תַּכְּשֶׁךְ (xl. 25) have been designed to bring out a play upon the Egyptian word for the crocodile *temsāh*, which passed over into Arabic as *timsah*?" Delitzsch adopted this, substituting the more defensible *p-emsah* for *temsah*, and Budde even thinks that the poet actually wrote the word which in Arabic means crocodile, and that this produced תַּכְּשֶׁךְ תַּכְּשֶׁךְ, *i.e.* the same group of letters written twice over, but with a different meaning; he suggests further that a scribe, unacquainted with the word *timsāh* (?), left out the second תַּכְּשֶׁךְ as a mere repetition, and substituted לוֹיִתָן, Leviathan. This took place, he adds, before Ps. civ. 26 was written, since that passage alludes (but is this at all certain?) to our passage. Now it can be no discredit to err in the company of Ewald and Delitzsch. All this is a mere fancy, and, as I am assured, and believe too that I can see for myself, an impossible one. Sir P. le Page Renouf writes: "The Egyptian for crocodile is *m̄-s-h-u*, and is of the masculine gender. The Arabic, if it has really been borrowed, has been treated as if it were a native word, without any regard to its true etymology. There is no reason for dating the borrowing, if borrowing there was, at an earlier period than the Saracen conquest. The preformative *ti* never could have come from an

Egyptian source, and to an Egyptian scholar a preformative *pi* would be quite as ridiculous." I may say that the only names I mentioned to my informants were those of Jablonski and Ewald. I am bound to add that I do not believe that Prof. Budde would have followed Ewald (by no means the safest guide in philology) except under the pressure of strong necessity.¹

Perhaps, as I have unwillingly objected to Prof. Budde's philology as on these two points extravagant, I ought to say that Gunkel (whom as an ally, with all his faults, I value greatly) has ventured on this very wild rendering of Ps. xl. 5, "Happy is the man who makes Jehovah his confidence, and does not turn to the Rahabs" (*i.e.* Rahab the dragon and his "helpers"—see Job ix. 13, R.V.). The *ἀπ. λεγ.*, מִבְּרִיָּה (E.V., the proud) is, as Giesebrecht has pointed out, a corruption of מְלִיָּה, "vanities," *i.e.* idols (LXX., *ματαιότητας*); cf. Ps. xxxi. 7. There are many such errors in the text of the Psalms. Controversial need—nothing else—suggested Gunkel's wild idea.

To return to Behemoth and Leviathan. No one now questions that there are elements in the descriptions which remind us of the hippopotamus and the crocodile. That was only to be expected. How could a poet describe the monsters of an imperfectly known mythology without filling up the gaps in his account from some visible creatures? He naturally chose the hippopotamus and the crocodile, which were both closely connected in Egypt with the powers of evil. In primeval times these Typhonian monsters had opposed the good god Osiris, and they still continued to lie in wait for Ra, the sun-god, as he sailed the heavenly ocean. Nothing was more real to educated Egyptians than this; and if it was

¹ I do not myself deny the possible connection of Ar. *timsāh* with Egypt. *em-suh*. The Arabs might prefix *t*, just as Herodotus prefixes χ ("they are called, not crocodiles, but $\chi\alpha\mu\psi\alpha\iota$," Herod. ii. 69).

known to Plutarch (*De Is. et Osir.*, 50), we may well believe that it was familiar to the later Jewish wise men. Positive proof of this familiarity does not, it is true, exist (apart from Job xl.) with regard to the hippopotamus, but we have it for the crocodile as a symbol of the powers of evil in Ezek. xxix. 3-6a, xxxii. 2-8 (note, in passing, the parallelism, real though imperfect, between Ezek. xxix. 4a and Job xli. 2a), and Ps. Solom. ii. 28b-34.

But, while frankly conceding that Behemoth and Leviathan may, up to a certain extent, be identified with the hippopotamus and the crocodile, it must be maintained that they are not the ordinary creatures which bear these names. If in 1887 I slightly underrated the element of actuality in the poet's descriptions,¹ it must, I fear, be stated that Budde overrates it, and that this error is the more unfortunate one. It was right to refer to the Egyptian monuments for parallels to Behemoth and Leviathan; only I should have looked, not to purely fantastic forms (griffins and the like), but to the idealization of the ordinary monsters of the Nile in the mythic narratives of Ra and Osiris. There are supernatural as well as natural hippopotamuses and crocodiles, and it is a specimen of these which the poet has given us. The descriptions are hyperbolic² and unpleasing if referred to the real monsters of the Nile; they are not so if explained of the "children of defeat," with the dragon Apôpi at their head,³ which the poet, by a fusion natural to the times, identifies with the monsters of Babylonian

¹ *Job and Solomon*, pp. 56, 57.

² I am afraid Prof. Budde is under a misapprehension. Prof. Spiegelberg's quotation from the triumphal ode addressed to Thothmes III. (known to most through Brugsch's *Hist. of Egypt*) does not justify the question supposed to be put by Jehovah to Job, whether he can catch Leviathan. I have long admired this fine ode, but am surprised to find it used to prove that Job could be asked a question which, if he knew Egypt, he would answer in the affirmative.

³ I have collected abundant evidence; it is enough, however, to refer the reader to the *Book of the Dead* and to Maspero's *Struggle of the Nations*.

origin, called elsewhere Rahab and his helpers (Job viii. 13). And even in the uncorrected but still more in the corrected text there are expressions and statements which are hardly explicable except on the mythological theory.

That Leviathan is a mythological monster—the Tiamat of Babylonia—is clear from Isa. xxvii. 1, Ps. lxxiv. 14, Job iii. 8; that Behemoth is another, we learn from Job xl., Enoch lx. 7-9, 4 Esdr. vi. 49-52. In saying this, I lay myself open to be regarded as a follower of Budde's *bête noire*—Gunkel. That is not the case; Gunkel has supplemented the work of his predecessors, who are entitled to take what suits them from him, and to leave the rest. Time forbids me to criticise Gunkel here, but I see no reason to deny that among other grounds of an exceptional character the writers of Enoch lx. and 4 Esdr. vi. drew, though very indirectly, from a Babylonian or Egyptian source. Certainly such a theory seems necessary to account for Job xl. 19*b*, if the proposed correction be accepted.¹

But enough of this. The reader to whom these things are unfamiliar may by this time be weary. I break off, therefore, with the request that he will look further, and then return to these remarks. Whatever result he ultimately arrives at will have ulterior critical and exegetical consequences. For my part, I have fully faced them, and I find them not grievous to be borne. For instance, even if the passages on Behemoth and Leviathan are later additions, are they therefore, from a Hebrew point of view, unedifying? I regret extremely that Prof. Budde, who has done so much to advance the criticism of the historical

¹ Dendain (connected by Zimmern with Ass. *daminu*, "earth"), the name of the desert where Behemoth dwells in Enoch lx., suggests an ultimate Babylonian source for Enoch. But an Egyptian is equally possible for Job xl. 19. Set, with whom the hippopotamus is identified, is the Egyptian god of the desert.

books, should have shown so strange an unprogressiveness in this and other parts of the criticism of Job.

An important section of the introduction deals with the object or purpose of the poet. With the opening sentence I heartily concur. "The surest opinion which can be stated is, that the poet had not the same purpose as the written folk-tale which he utilised." I think it would be worth some one's while to translate this section for some theological review. It is a fine piece of work, revealing some of the author's most interesting characteristics, and giving a view of the book which, if not correct, is yet worthy of a great poet. I fear to condense its contents, for, while not yielding to the author in the love of literature in general and of the Book of Job in particular, I do not share his critical presuppositions, and may easily misapprehend him.

Two more sections remain, relating respectively to the period when the book was written, and to the condition of the text. The date of the book is placed about 400 B.C. Earlier it can hardly be; the possibility of a later date depends on the result of certain discussions which are still unfinished or have even not yet begun. The date of Prov. i.-ix. is still unsettled, and, though we have a fragment of the Hebrew text of Ecclesiasticus, we do not yet know with precision what conclusions for the history of the Hebrew language have to be drawn from it. This is true. But if Job xxviii. is later than Prov. viii. (so Budde), it seems to me at present scarcely possible to place this chapter in the Persian period.

The due consideration of the last section would carry us too far. It is excellent and full of instruction, and can therefore, though on at least one point¹ it seems open to criticism, be highly recommended. Once more, many thanks are due to

¹ See the opening pages of Part I. of this article.

Prof. Budde for this original and suggestive commentary, which, even when it does not convince us, seldom fails to place the subject in a new light, and in textual criticism marks a turning-point.

T. K. CHEYNE.

THE SIGN OF THE PROPHET JONAS.

NOT one of us probably can remember a time when he was not conscious of an internal protest against the interpretation which is to be found in all commentaries of the words in which our Lord speaks of the sign of the prophet Jonas. It has been clearly impossible to accept it, because three days and three nights did not intervene between the Crucifixion and the Resurrection—and yet, if we must needs reject it, what other could we adopt? There seemed to be no alternative. For the violent course suggested by some, to assume the words about “the fish’s belly” and “the heart of the earth” to be a later interpolation, was manifestly inadmissible, and even if it were otherwise the difficulty would remain the same.

The object of the present paper is to consider the question, whether there is really no alternative; whether there is not another interpretation both possible and probable, which is simple and free from difficulty.

The difficulties which attend the interpretation of our Lord’s words with reference to the comparison between Himself and the prophet Jonah, difficulties which are by no means confined to the period of three days and three nights, are of course wholly distinct from any difficulties which beset the narrative in the book of Jonah itself; and into these last we do not now propose to enter at all.