

believe to be an harmonious order. In this procedure *Torczyner* seems to me to be one of the most radical. *Duhm* has also made rearrangements and likewise *Dhorme*. Some have regarded the section as containing various interpolations, the principal one being ch. 28. It is thought to be unlikely that Job would have uttered the words of this chapter, since, if he had, there would be no need for the Divine message which follows (chs. 33-41). Also, if Job rose to such sublime heights in this chapter, how explain his lapse into complaining, 30: 20-23? Furthermore, how should we then explain the ironical tone of the Divine speeches (38ff.)? In the Analysis we shall discuss these arguments.

7. *The Speeches of Elihu* (chs. 32-37) are regarded as original and genuine by *Budde*, *Rosenmueller*, *Thilo*, *Wildeboer*, *Cornill*, *O'Neill*, and by conservative scholars. *Cornill* even went so far as to consider this section the crown of the book and as presenting the only solution of the problem that could be given from the Old Testament standpoint.

8. *The speeches of Elihu* are rejected by *Driver*, *Pfeiffer* and many others. The reasons usually adduced for this are: a.) These speeches exhibit an independent character and disturb the connection between the earlier poem and the Lord's discourses, b.) 38:1-2 and 40:6 presuppose that Job, not Elihu, has spoken, c.) This section exhibits far more Aramaisms than the remainder of the book, d.) The theoretical explanation of suffering presented in these speeches is said to be regarded as impossible by 38:1-42:6 and thus these speeches destroy the artistic structure of the book. These arguments will be discussed in the Analysis.

9. *The double speaking* of the Lord and Job's twice abasing himself are regarded as genuine by *Dillmann* and by conservative Protestant scholars.

a.) 38:1-40:2 is alone regarded as genuine by *Siegfried*.

b.) *The original form* of the Divine speeches is thought to be 38, 39 plus 40:2, 8-14 and 40:3-5 plus 42:2-5. So *Bickell*, *Budde*, *Duhm*. The reason for this is that these speeches are regarded as having been interpolated. Thus 39:13-18 is rejected by some, e.g., *Duhm*, *Cheyne*, *Hoelscher*. 40:15-24 (the section about the hippopotamus) is rejected, as is also 40:25-41:26 (the crocodile). It is contended that these two sections have an independent character and do not serve as illustrations of pride such as the context was discussing. c.) *The speeches of the Lord* are rejected in their entirety by *Cheyne*, *Volz*, *Hempel*, *Baumgaertel*.

d.) 40:1-4 is considered to be the conclusion of the book by *Hans Schmidt*, and 40:3-5 by *Fullerton*.

10. *The Age Of Solomon* is thought to be the time of composition, *Keil*, *Delitzsch*, *Haevernick*.

11. *The Eighth Century* (Before Amos). *Hengstenberg*.
12. *The Beginning Of The Seventh Century*. *Ewald*, *Riehm*.
13. *First Half Of Seventh Century*. *Staehelin*, *Noeldeke*.
14. *Time Of Jeremiah*. *Koenig*, *Gunkel*, *Pfeiffer*.
15. *The Exile*. *Cheyne*, *Dillmann* (1891).
16. *The Fifth Century*. *Moore*, *Driver* and *Gray*, *Dhorme*.
17. *The Fourth Century*. *Eissfeldt*, *Volz*.
18. *The Third Century*. *Cornill* at first held to this, but later became more indefinite.

The brief survey of critical opinion on Job which has just been given will show the student how varied are the viewpoints held. We believe that any view which would destroy the unity of the book must be rejected. If the unity of the entire book be granted, then it would seem that the Solomonic age was as fitting a time for its composition as any. At the same time it must be admitted that, as we have it, certain portions, e.g., the prologue, may exhibit a more recent linguistic revision. If so, this would account for some of the grammatical constructions of the chapter, which seem to be reflections of a later period. But this is difficult to determine.

There remains the further question as to the time when the action of the book took place. And in consideration of this problem we must note that Job was an historical personage, as is proven by Ezek. 14:14 and James 5:11. There are certain indications in the narrative which seem to point to a time before the giving of the Sinaitic legislation. Thus, the patriarchal description in ch. 1 seems to support this and also the absence of mention of any of the distinctively Israelitish institutions. Hence, it seems to me that Job was probably a contemporary of the patriarchs, but of this we cannot be certain.

I. The Prologue 1:1-2:13

3. ANALYSIS.

a.) 1:1-5. In the midst of great prosperity Job is a truly pious man. This section gives the setting of the narrative, which takes place east of Palestine in the Arabian desert. This Prologue is essential to the further understanding of the book. Job appears as the priest of the household, and offers an 'olah (burnt-offering), two factors which point to a pre-Mosaic age. In these remarkably direct verses we are introduced to the chief character. The introductory words (there was a man 'ish hayah) evidently show that this is not a narrative of a portion of the Israelitish history, but rather a beginning of an extra-Israelitish history.

b.) 1:6-12. The Lord determines to try Job. The scene now transfers to heaven and the truth is illustrated that whatsoever comes to pass upon