KE
19530

Digitized by Google

Original from
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

KE
19530
406

H406

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

LIBRARY OF THE

~~Semitic Department~~,

SEVER HALL.

1891.

Digitized by Google
Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Original from
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Digitized by Google

Original from
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Digitized by Google

Original from
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

THE WISDOM

OF

THE OLD TESTAMENT

Digitized by Google

Original from
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Digitized by Google

Original from
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

JOB AND SOLOMON

OR

THE WISDOM OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

BY THE

REV. T. K. CHEYNE, M.A., D.D.

ORIEL PROFESSOR OF INTERPRETATION AT OXFORD

CANON OF ROCHESTER

NEW YORK

THOMAS WHITTAKER

2 AND 3 BIBLE HOUSE

1889

Digitized by Google

Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

KE19535

Digitized by Google

Original from
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

TO

THE VERY REVEREND

GEORGE GRANVILLE BRADLEY, D.D.

DEAN OF WESTMINSTER

IN HIGH APPRECIATION OF HIS LONG-PROVED INTEREST IN EXEGESIS

AND OF HIS HAPPILY CONCEIVED LECTURES ON ECCLESIASTES

Digitized by Google

Original from
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Digitized by Google

Original from
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

PREFACE.

THE present work is a fragmentary realisation of a plan which has been maturing in my mind for many years. Exegesis and criticism are equally necessary for the full enjoyment of the treasures of the Old Testament, and just as no commentary is complete which does not explain the actual position of critical controversies, so no introduction to the criticism of a book is trustworthy which does not repose, and show the reader that it reposes, on the basis of a thorough exegesis. In this volume I do not pretend to have approached the ideal of such students' manuals as I have described; I have not been sufficiently sure of my public to treat the subject on the scale which I should have liked, and such personal drawbacks as repeated changes of residence, frequent absence from large libraries, and within the last two years a serious eye-trouble, have hindered me in the prosecution of my work. Other tasks now claim my restored strength, and I can no longer withhold my volume from those lovers of the sacred literature who in some degree share the point of view from which I have written.

The Books of Job and Ecclesiastes are treated somewhat more in detail than those of Proverbs and Ecclesiasticus. The latter have a special interest of their own, but to bring this into full view, more excursions into pure philology would have been necessary than I judged it expedient to allow myself. I had intended to make up for this omission so far as Proverbs is concerned at the end of the volume, but have

Digitized by Google
Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

been interrupted in doing so. Perhaps, however, even in the Appendix such detailed treatment of special points might have repelled some readers, and I hope that the Appendix is on the whole not unreadable. The enlarged notes on Proverbs in the forthcoming new edition of Messrs. Eyre and Spottiswoode's Variorum Bible may enable the student to do for himself what I have not done. As for Ecclesiasticus, the light which Prof. Bickell's and Dr. Edersheim's researches are sure to throw on the text may enable me some day to recast the section on this book; at present, I only offer this as an illustrative sequel to the section on Proverbs. It should be added that the canonicity of Ecclesiasticus is handled in conjunction with that of Ecclesiastes at the close of the part on the latter book.

The interest of Job and Ecclesiastes is of a far deeper and more varied kind. Even from a critical point of view, the study of these books is most refreshing after the incessant and exciting battles of Pentateuch-criticism. But as monuments of the spiritual struggles of a past which is not wholly dead, they have been to me, as doubtless to many others, sources of pure delight. If I appreciate Job more highly than Ecclesiastes, it is not from any want of living sympathy with the philosophic doubter, but because the enjoyment even of Scriptures is dependent on moods and impulses. De Sanctis has pointed out (*Storia della letteratura italiana*, i. 80) how the story of Job became the favourite theme of the early Italian moralists, and everyone knows how the great Latin doctors (Gregory the Great, Bede, Aquinas, Albertus Magnus) delighted to comment on this wonderful book. In our own day, from perfectly intelligible causes, Ecclesiastes has too much drawn off the attention of the educated world, but there are signs that the character-drama of Job will soon reassert its old fascinating power.

In conclusion, will earnest students, whether academical or not, grant me two requests? The first is, that they will

Digitized by Google Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

meet me with confidence, and gather any grains of truth they can, even where they cannot yield full assent. The problems of Hebrew literature are complex ; herein partly lies their fascination ; herein also is a call for mutual tolerance on the part of all who approach them. There is nothing to regret in this complexity ; in searching for the solution of these problems, we gain an ever fresh insight into facts and ideas which will never lose their significance. My second request is, that the Appendix, which, short as it is, contains something for different classes of readers, may not be neglected as *only an Appendix.*

I would add that the 'much-desired aid' in the critical use of the Septuagint referred to on p. 114 has already to a large extent been given by Gustav Bickell's essay (see p. 296), which I have now been able to examine. His early treatise (1862) is at length happily supplemented and corrected. We shall know still more when P. Ciasca has completed the publication of the fragments of the Sahidic version. It is clear however that each omission in the pre-Hexaplar Septuagint text (represented by this version) must be judged upon its own merits, nor can I estimate the value of the text of the Septuagint quite as highly as some critics.

It is hoped that the present work may be followed by a volume on the Psalms, the Lamentations, and the Song of Songs.

Digitized by Google

Original from
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Digitized by Google

Original from
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

CONTENTS.

PAGE

INTRODUCTION 1

THE BOOK OF JOB.

CHAPTER

I. JOB'S CALAMITY; THE OPENING OF THE DIALOGUES (Chaps. i.–xiv.) 11

II. THE SECOND CYCLE OF SPEECHES (Chaps. xv.–xxi.) . . 30

III. THE THIRD CYCLE OF SPEECHES (Chaps. xxii.–xxxi.) . 37

IV. THE SPEECHES OF ELIHU (Chaps. xxxii.–xxxvii.) . . 42

V. THE SPEECHES OF JEHOVAH (Chaps. xxxviii.–xlii. 6) . 48

VI. THE EPILOGUE AND ITS MEANING 58

VII. THE TRADITIONAL BASIS AND THE PURPOSE OF JOB . 60

VIII. DATE AND PLACE OF COMPOSITION 71

IX. ARGUMENT FROM THE USE OF MYTHOLOGY . . . 76

X. ARGUMENT FROM THE DOCTRINE OF ANGELS. . . . 79

XI. ARGUMENT FROM PARALLEL PASSAGES 83

XII. ON THE DISPUTED PASSAGES IN THE DIALOGUE PORTION, ESPECIALLY THE SPEECHES OF ELIHU . . 90

XIII. IS JOB A HEBRÆO-ARABIC POEM? 96

XIV. THE BOOK FROM A RELIGIOUS POINT OF VIEW . . 102

XV. THE BOOK FROM A GENERAL AND WESTERN POINT OF VIEW 106

Note on Job and the Modern Poets 112

Note on the Text of Job 112

Aids to the Student 115

Digitized by Google

Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

THE BOOK OF PROVERBS.

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	HEBREW WISDOM, ITS NATURE, SCOPE, AND IMPORTANCE	117
II.	THE FORM AND ORIGIN OF THE PROVERBS	125
III.	THE FIRST COLLECTION AND ITS APPENDICES	130
IV.	THE SECOND COLLECTION AND ITS APPENDICES	142
V.	THE PRAISE OF WISDOM	156
VI.	SUPPLEMENTARY ON QUESTIONS OF DATE AND ORIGIN	165
VII.	THE TEXT OF PROVERBS	173
	Note on Prov. xxx. 31	175
VIII.	THE RELIGIOUS VALUE OF THE BOOK OF PROVERBS	176
	Aids to the Student	178

THE WISDOM OF JESUS THE SON OF SIRACH.

I.	THE WISE MAN TURNED SCRIBE. SIRACH'S MORAL TEACHING	179
II.	SIRACH'S TEACHING (*continued*). HIS PLACE IN THE MOVEMENT OF THOUGHT	188
	Aids to the Student (see also *Appendix*)	198

THE BOOK OF KOHELETH; OR, ECCLESIASTES.

I.	THE WISE MAN TURNED AUTHOR AND PHILOSOPHER	199
II.	'TRUTH AND FICTION' IN AN AUTOBIOGRAPHY	207
III.	MORE MORALISING, INTERRUPTED BY PROVERBIAL MAXIMS	213
IV.	FACTS OF CONTEMPORARY LIFE	218
V.	THE WISE MAN'S PARTING COUNSELS	222

Digitized by Google
Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

CHAPTER		PAGE
VI.	KOHELETH'S 'PORTRAIT OF OLD AGE;' THE EPILOGUE, ITS NATURE AND ORIGIN	229
VII.	ECCLESIASTES AND ITS CRITICS (FROM A PHILOLOGICAL POINT OF VIEW)	236
VIII.	ECCLESIASTES AND ITS CRITICS (FROM A LITERARY AND PSYCHOLOGICAL POINT OF VIEW)	242
IX.	ECCLESIASTES FROM A MORAL AND RELIGIOUS POINT OF VIEW	248
X.	DATE AND PLACE OF COMPOSITION	255
XI.	DOES KOHELETH CONTAIN GREEK WORDS OR IDEAS?	260
XII.	TEXTUAL PROBLEMS OF KOHELETH	273
XIII.	THE CANONICITY OF ECCLESIASTES AND ECCLESIASTICUS	279
	Aids to the Student	285
	APPENDIX (*see* Special Table of Contents)	287
	INDEX	303

Digitized by Google

Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Digitized by Google

Original from
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

JOB AND SOLOMON.

INTRODUCTION.

HOW IS OLD TESTAMENT CRITICISM RELATED TO CHRISTIANITY?

THE point of view represented in this volume is still so little recognised and represented in England and America that the author ventures to prefix a short paper delivered as an address at the Church Congress held at Reading in October 1883. It is proverbially more difficult to write a thin book than a thick one, and the labour involved in preparing this twenty minutes' paper, with its large outlook and sedulously understated claims, was such as he would not willingly undertake again for a like purpose. The subject was not an ephemeral one and the attitude of the Churches towards it has not materially altered within the last three years. The present volume is pervaded by the spirit which breathes, as the author trusts, in every line of this paper. It relates, indeed, only to a small section of the Old Testament, but no part of that 'library' (as mediæval writers so well named it) can be studied in complete severance from the rest. And if a high aim is held forward in one of the opening sentences to the Church of which the writer is a son, those who are connected with the other historic communions will easily understand the bitter-sweet feeling of hope against hope with which those lines were penned.

'My own conviction,' said the late Dr. Pusey, 'has long been that the hope of the Church of England is in mutual

Digitized by Google
Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

tolerance.'[1] That truly great man was not thinking of the new school of Old Testament critics, and yet if the Anglican Church is ever to renovate her theology and to become in any real sense undeniably the Church of the future, she cannot afford to be careless or intolerant of attempts to modernise our methods of criticism and exegesis. It would no doubt be simpler to content ourselves with that criticism and exegesis, and consequently with that theology, which have been fairly adequate to the wants of the past; but are we sure that Jesus Christ would not now lead us a few steps further on towards 'all the truth,' and that one of His preparatory disciplines may not be a method of Biblical criticism which is less tender to the traditions of the scribes, and more in harmony with the renovating process which is going on in all other regions of thought? Why, indeed, should there not be a providence even in the phases of Old Testament criticism, so that where some can see merely the shiftings of arbitrary opinion more enlightened eyes may discern a veritable progress, leading at once to fresh views of history, and to necessary reforms in our theology, making this theology simpler and stronger, deeper and more truly Catholic, by making it more Biblical?

Some one, however, may ask, Does not modern criticism actually claim to have refuted the fundamental facts of Bible history? But which *are* these fundamental facts? Bishop Thirlwall, twenty years ago, told his clergy 'that a great part of the events related in the Old Testament has no more apparent connection with our religion than those of Greek and Roman history.' Put these events for a moment on one side, and how much more conspicuous does that great elementary fact become which stands up as a rock in Israel's history—namely, that a holy God, for the good of the world, chose out this people, isolating it more and more completely for educational purposes from its heathen neighbours, and interposing at various times to teach, to chastise, and to deliver it! It is not necessary to prove that all such recorded interpositions are in the strictest sense historical; it is enough if

[1] 'Toleranz sollte eigentlich nur eine vorübergehende Gesinnung sein; sie muss zur Anerkennung führen.'—*Goethe*.

Digitized by Google
Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

the tradition or the record of some that are so did survive the great literary as well as political catastrophe of the Babylonian captivity. And I have yet to learn that the Exodus, the destruction of Sennacherib's army, the restoration of the Jews to their own land, and the unique phenomenon of spiritual prophecy, are called in question even by the most advanced school of Biblical criticism. One fact, indeed, there is, regarded by some of us as fundamental, which these advanced critics do maintain to be disproved, and that is the giving of the Levitical Law by Moses, or if not by Moses, by persons in the pre-Exile period who had prophetic sanction for giving it. Supposing the theory of Kuenen and Wellhausen to be correct, it will no doubt appear to some minds (1) that the inspiration of the Levitical Law is at any rate weakened in quality thereby, (2) that a glaring inconsistency is introduced into the Divine teaching of Israel, which becomes anti-sacrificial at one time, and sacrificial at another, and (3) that room is given for the supposition that the Levitical system itself was an injurious though politic condescension to popular tastes, and consequently (as Lagarde ventures to hold) that St. Paul, by his doctrine of the Atonement, ruined, so far as he could, the simple Gospel of Jesus Christ.

But I only mention these possible inferences in order to point out how unfair they are. (1) The inspiration (to retain an often misused but indispensable term) of the Levitical Law is only weakened in any bad sense if it be maintained that the law, whenever the main part of it was promulgated, failed to receive the sanction of God's prophetic interpreters, and that it was not, in the time of Ezra, the only effectual instrument for preserving the deposit of spiritual religion. (2) With regard to the inconsistency (assuming the new hypothesis) between the two periods of the Divine teaching of Israel, the feeling of a devout, though advanced critic would be that he was not a fit judge of the providential plan. Inconsistent conclusions on one great subject (that of forgiveness of sins) might in fact be drawn from the language of our Lord Himself at different periods of His ministry, though the parallel may not be altogether complete, since our Lord never used

Digitized by Google
Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

directly anti-sacrificial language. And it might be urged on the side of Kuenen, that neither would the early prophets have used such language—at any rate in the literary version of their discourses—if they had foreseen the canonical character which this would assume, and the immense importance of a sacrificial system in the post-Exile period. (3) The theory that the law involves an injurious condescension is by no means compulsory upon advocates of the new hypothesis. Concessions to popular taste have, indeed, as we know but too well, often almost extinguished the native spirit of a religion ; but the fact that some at least of the most spiritual psalms are acknowledged to be post-Exile ought to make us all, critics and non-critics alike, slow to draw too sharp a distinction between the legal and the evangelical. That the law was misused by some, and in course of time became spiritually almost obsolete, would not justify us in depreciating it, even if we thought that the lesser and not the greater Moses, the scribe and not the prophet, was mainly responsible for its promulgation. Finally, the rash statement of Lagarde has been virtually answered by the reference of another radical critic (Keim) to the well-attested words of Christ at the institution of the Eucharist (Matt. xxvi. 28).

I have spoken thus much on the assumption that the hypothesis of Kuenen and Wellhausen may be true. That it will ever become universally prevalent is improbable—the truth may turn out to lie between the two extremes—but that it will go on for some time gaining ground among the younger generation of scholars is, I think, almost certain. No one who has once studied this or any other Old Testament controversy from the inside and with a full view of the evidence can doubt that the traditional accounts of many of the disputed books rest on a very weak basis, and those who crave for definite solutions, and cannot bear to live in twilight, will naturally hail such clear-cut hypotheses as those of Kuenen and Wellhausen, and credit them with an undue finality. Let us be patient with these too sanguine critics, and not think them bad Churchmen, as long as they abstain from drawing those dangerous and unnecessary inferences of which I have

Digitized by Google
Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

spoken. It is the want of an equally intelligent interest which makes the Old Testament a dead letter to so many highly orthodox theologians. If the advanced critics succeed in awakening such an interest more generally, it will be no slight compensation for that 'unsettlement of views' which is so often the temporary consequence of reading their books.

One large part, however, of Kuenen and Wellhausen's critical system is not peculiar to them, but accepted by the great majority of professed Old Testament critics. It is this part which has perhaps a still stronger claim to be considered in its relation to Christian truth, because there is every appearance that it will, in course of time, become traditional among those who have given up the still current traditions of the synagogue. I refer (1) to the analysis of the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua into several documents, (2) to the view that many of the laws contained in the Pentateuch arose gradually, according to the needs of the people, and that Ezra, or at least contemporaries of Ezra, took a leading part in the revision and completion of the law book, and (3) to the dating of the original documents or compilations at various periods, mostly long subsequent to the time of Moses. Time forbids me to enter into the grounds for the confident assertion that if either exegesis or the Church's representation of religious truth is to make any decided progress, the results of the literary analysis of the Pentateuch must be accepted as facts, and that theologians must in future recognise at least three different sections, and as many different conceptions of Israel's religious development, within the Pentateuch, just as they have long recognised at least three different types of teaching in the Old Testament as a whole. On the question as to the date of these sections, and as to the Mosaic origin of any considerable part of them, the opinions of special scholars within the Church will, for a long time yet, be more or less divided. There is, I know, a belief growing up among us, that Assyrian and Egyptian discoveries are altogether favourable to the ordinary English view of the dates of the historical books, including the Pentateuch. May I be pardoned for expressing the slowly formed convic-

Digitized by Google
Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

tion that apologists in England (and be it observed that I do not quarrel with the conception of apologetic theology) frequently indulge in general statements as to the bearings of recent discoveries, which are only half true? The opponents of whom they are thinking are long since dead; it is wasting time to fight with the delusions of a past age. No one now thinks the Bible an invention of priestcraft; that which historical critics doubt is the admissibility of any unqualified assertion of the strict historicalness of all the details of all its component parts. This doubt is not removed by recent archæological discoveries, the critical bearings of which are sometimes what neither of the critical schools desired or expected. I refer especially to the bearings of Assyrian discoveries on the date of what are commonly called the Jehovistic narratives in the first nine chapters of Genesis. I will not pursue this subject further, and merely add that we must not too hastily assume that the supplement hypothesis is altogether antiquated.

The results of the anticipated revolution in our way of looking at the Pentateuch strike me as fourfold. (1) Historically. The low religious position of most of the pre-Exile Israelites will be seen to be not the result of a deliberate rebellion against the law of Jehovah, the Levitical laws being at any rate virtually non-existent. By this I mean, that even if any large part of those laws go back to the age of Moses they were never thoroughly put in force, and soon passed out of sight. Otherwise how can we account for this, among other facts, that Deuteronomy, or the main part of it, is known in the reign of Josiah as '*the* law of Moses'? We shall also, perhaps, get a deeper insight into the Divine purpose in raising up that colossal personage who, though 'slow of speech,' was so mighty in deed—I mean Moses—and shall realise those words of a writer specially sanctioned by my own university: 'Should we have an accurate idea of the purpose of God in raising up Moses, if we said, He did it that He might communicate a revelation? Would not this be completely to misunderstand the principal end of the mission of Moses, which was the establishment of the theocracy, and in so far as

Digitized by Google Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

God revealed through him the revelation was but as means to this higher end?'[1]

(2) We shall, perhaps, discriminate more between the parts of the Old Testament, some of which will be chiefly valuable to us as bringing into view the gradualness of Israel's education, and as giving that fulness to our conceptions of Biblical truths which can only be got by knowing the history of their outward forms; others will have only that interest which attaches even to the minutest and obscurest details of the history of much-honoured friends or relatives; others, lastly, will rise, in virtue of their intrinsic majesty, to a position scarcely inferior to that of the finest parts of the New Testament itself.

(3) As a result of what has thus been gained, our idea of inspiration will become broader, deeper, and more true to facts.

(4) We shall have to consider our future attitude towards that Kenotic[2] view of the person of Christ which has been accepted in some form by such great exegetical theologians as Hofmann, Oehler, and Delitzsch. Although the Logos, by the very nature of the conception, must be omniscient, the incarnate Logos, we are told, pointed His disciples to a future time, in which they should do greater works than He Himself, and should open the doors to fresh departments of truth. The critical problems of the Old Testament did not then require to be settled by Him, because they had not yet come into existence. Had they emerged into view in our Lord's time, they would have given as great a shock to devout Jews as they have done to devout Christians; and

[1] See essay on 'Miracles' in *Christian Remembrancer* (list of works recommended to theological honour-students in Oxford).

[2] The self-humiliation of Christ is described (need I remark?) by St. Paul as a κενωσις (Phil. ii. 7). How far this κένωσις extended is a theological problem which in the sixteenth century, and again in our own, has exercised devout thinkers. For the modern form of the Kenotic view or doctrine the English reader will naturally go to Dorner's *History of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ*, vol. iii., in Clark's *Library*. Dorner's opposition to this view is a weighty but not, of course, a decisive fact. We must be loyal to the facts of Christ's humanity reported in the Gospels. The question as to the extent of the κένωσις is an open one.

Digitized by Google Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

our Master would, no doubt, have given them a solution fully adequate to the wants of believers. In that case, a reference to some direction of the law as of Mosaic origin would, in the mouth of Christ, have been decisive; and the Church would, no doubt, have been guided to make some distinct definition of her doctrine on the subject.

Thus in the very midst of the driest critical researches we can feel that, if we have duly fostered the sense of Divine things, we are on the road to further disclosures of religious as well as historical truth. The day of negative criticism is past, and the day of a cheap ridicule of all critical analysis of ancient texts is, we may hope, nearly past also. In faith and love the critics whose lot I would fain share are at one with many of those who suspect and perhaps ridicule them: in the aspirations of hope their aim is higher. Gladly would I now pass on to a survey of the religious bearings of the critical study of the poetical and prophetical books, which, through differences of race, age, and above all spiritual atmosphere, we find, upon the whole, so much more attractive and congenial than the Levitical legislation. Let me, at least, throw out a few hints. Great as is the division of opinion on points of detail, so much appears to be generally accepted that the number of prophets whose works have partly come down to us is larger than used to be supposed. The analysis of the texts may not be as nearly perfect as that of the Pentateuch, but there is no doubt among those of the younger critics whose voices count (and with the pupils of Delitzsch the case is the same as with those of Ewald) that several of the prophetical books are made up of the works of different writers, and I even notice a tendency among highly orthodox critics to go beyond Ewald himself and analyse the Book of Daniel into portions of different dates. The result is important, and not for literary history alone. It gives us a much firmer hold on the great principle that a prophet's horizon is that of his own time; that he prophesied, as has been well said, into the future, but not directly to the future. This will, I believe, in no wise affect essential Christian truth, but will obviously modify our exegesis of certain Scripture proofs of Christian

Digitized by Google
Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

doctrine, and is perhaps not without a bearing on the two grave theological subjects referred to already.

Bear with me if, once again in conclusion, I appeal to the Church at large on behalf of those who would fain modernise our criticism and exegesis with a view to a not less distinctively Christian but more progressive Church theology. The age of œcumenical councils may have passed; but if criticism, exegesis, and philosophy are only cultivated in a fearless and reverent spirit, and if the Church at large troubles itself a little more to understand the workers and their work, an approximation to agreement on great religious questions may hereafter be attained. What the informal decisions of the general Christian consciousness will be, it would be impertinent to conjecture. It is St. John's 'all truth' after which we aspire—'all the truth' concerning God, the individual soul, and human society, into which the labours of generations, encouraged by the guiding star, shall by degrees introduce us. But one thing is too clear to be mistaken—viz. that exegesis must decide first of all what essential Christian truth is before a devout philosophy can interpret, expand, and apply it, and Old Testament exegesis, at any rate, cannot be long separated from its natural ally, the higher criticism. A provisional separation may no doubt be necessary, but the ultimate aim of successive generations of students must be a faithful exegesis, enlightened by a seven-times tested criticism.

Digitized by Google

Original from
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Digitized by Google

Original from
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

THE BOOK OF JOB.

CHAPTER I.

JOB'S CALAMITY; THE OPENING OF THE DIALOGUES.

(CHAPS. I.–XIV.)

THE Book of Job is not the earliest monument of Hebrew 'wisdom,' but for various reasons will be treated first in order. The perusal of some of the pages introductory to Proverbs will enable the student to fill out what is here given. The Hebrew 'wisdom' is a product as peculiar as the dialectic of Plato, and not less worthy of admiration; and the author of *Job* is its greatest master. To him are due those great thoughts on a perennial problem, which may be supplemented but can never be superseded, and which, as M. Renan truly says, cause so profound an emotion in their first naïve expression. His wisdom is that of intuition rather than of strict reasoning, but it is as truly based upon the facts of experience as any of our Western philosophies. He did not indeed reach his high position unaided by predecessors. The author of the noble 'Praise of Wisdom' in Prov. i.–ix. taught him much and kindled his ambition. Nor was he in all probability without the stimulus of fellow-thinkers and fellow-poets. The student ought from the outset to be aware of the existence of discussions as to the unity of the book—discussions which have led to one assured and to several probable results—though he ought not to adopt any critical results before he has thoroughly studied the poem itself. The student should also know that the supposed authors of the

Digitized by Google

Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

(as I must believe) inserted passages belong to the same circle as the writer of the main part of the book, and are therefore not to be accused of having made 'interpolations.' I need not here distinguish between passages added by the author himself as afterthoughts (or perhaps *paralipomena* inserted by disciples from his literary remains) and compositions of later poets added to give the poem greater didactic completeness. A passage which does not fall into the plan of the poem is to all intents and purposes the work of another poet. The philosophic Goethe of the second part of *Faust* is not the passion-tossed Goethe of the first.

All the writers who may be concerned in the production of our book are, however, well worthy of reverent study; they were not only inspired by the Spirit of Israel's holy religion, but in their various styles true poets. In some degree we may apply to *Job* the lines of Schiller on the *Iliad* with its different fathers but one only mother—Nature. In fact, Nature, in aspects chiefly familiar, but not therefore less interesting, was an open book to these poets, and 'Look in thine heart and write' was their secret as well as Spenser's for vigorous and effective expression.

I now proceed to give in plain prose the pith and substance of this great poem, which more than any other Old Testament book needs to be brought near to the mind of a Western student. I would entitle it THE BOOK OF THE TRIAL OF THE RIGHTEOUS MAN, AND OF THE JUSTIFICATION OF GOD.

In its present form the Book of Job consists of five parts—

1. The Prologue, written in prose (ch. i.–ii.), the body of the work in the Hebrew being written in at any rate an approach to metre;[1]

2. The Colloquies between Job and his three friends (ch. iii.–xxxi.);

3. The Discourses of Elihu (ch. xxxii.–xxxvii.);

[1] Jerome already saw this. He represents the Book of Job as composed mainly in hexameters with a dactylic and spondaic movement (*Præf. in Job*). Does he mean double trimeters?

Digitized by Google Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

4. Jehovah's Reply to Job (ch. xxxviii.–xlii. 6) ;
5. The Epilogue, in prose (ch. xlii. 7–17).

There are some differences in the arrangement which will presently be followed, but these will justify themselves in the course of our study. Let us first of all examine the Prologue, which will bear to be viewed by itself as a striking specimen of Hebrew narrative. The idyllic manners of a patriarchal age are delineated with sympathy—no difficult task to one who knew the early Hebrew traditions—and still more admirable are the very testing scenes from the supernatural world.

It may perhaps seem strange that this should be only a prose poem, but the truth is that narrative poetry was entirely alien to the Hebrew genius, which refused to tolerate the bonds of protracted and continuous versification. Like that other great hero of parallelistic verse Balaam, Job is a non-Israelite ; and in this the unknown author shows a fine tact, for he is thus absolved from the embarrassing necessity of referring to the Law, and so complicating the moral problem under consideration. Job, however, though an Arabian sheich [1] (as one may loosely call him), was a worshipper of Jehovah, who declares before the assembled 'sons of the Elohim' that 'there is none like Job in the earth,' &c. (i. 8). Job's virtue is rewarded by an outward prosperity like that of the patriarchs in Genesis : he was a great Eastern Emeer, and had not only a large family but great possessions. His scrupulous piety, which takes precautions even against heart-sins, is exemplified to us by the atoning sacrifice which he offers as head of his family at some annual feast (i. 4, 5). Then in ver. 6 the scene is abruptly changed from earth to heaven. The spirit of the narrative is not devoid of a de-

[1] Where is the 'Uz' spoken of in Job i. 1? The 'land of *Uzza*' seems to have been not far from the Orontes (Shalmaneser's Obelisk ; see Friedr. Delitzsch's *Paradies*, p. 259). Tradition places the home of Job in the fertile volcanic region called the Haurân (see the very full excursus in Delitzsch's *Job*). But the 'land of Uz' *might* be farther south, nearer to Edom, in connection with which it is mentioned, Lam. iv. 21, Gen. xxxvi. 28 (comp. ver. 21). This is supported by the curious note appended to the Book of Job in the Septuagint. It is true that Uz is called a son of Aram (Gen. x. 23), but 'Uz' may have had several branches, or the use of Aramaic may have extended far beyond the limits of Aram proper.

Digitized by Google Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

lightful humour. In the midst of the 'sons of the Elohim' —supernatural, Titanic beings, who had once been at strife with Jehovah (if we may illustrate by xxi. 22, xxv. 2), but who now at stated times paid Him their enforced homage —stood one who had not quite lost his original pleasure in working evil, and who was now employed by his Master as a kind of moral and religious censor of the human race. This malicious spirit—'the Satan' or adversary, as he is called—had just returned from a tour of inspection in the world, and Jehovah, who is represented under the disguise of an earthly monarch, boldly and imprudently draws his attention to the meritorious Job. The Satan refuses to give human nature credit for pure goodness, and sarcastically remarks, 'Does Job serve God for nothing?' (i. 9.) Jehovah therefore allows His minister to put Job's piety to as severe a test as possible short of taking his life. One after another Job's flocks, his servants, and his children are destroyed. His wife, however, by a touch of quiet humour, is spared; she seems to be recognised by the Satan as an unconscious ally (ii. 9). The piety of Job stands the trial; he is deeply moved, but maintains his self-control, and the scene closes with a devout ascription of blessing to Jehovah alike for giving and for recalling His gifts.

Before passing on the reader should notice that, according to the poet, the ultimate reason why these sufferings of Job were permitted by the Most High was that Job might set an example of a piety independent of favouring outward circumstances. The poet reveals this to us in the Prologue, that we may not ourselves be staggered in our faith, nor cast down by sympathy with such an unique sufferer; for after the eulogy passed upon Job in the celestial court we cannot doubt that he will stand the test, even if disturbed for a time.

A second time the same high court is held. The first experiment of the Adversary has failed, and this magnified earthly monarch, the Jehovah of the story, begins to suspect that he has allowed a good man to be plagued with no sufficient motive. Admiringly he exclaims, pointing to Job, 'And still he holds fast his integrity, so that thou didst incite

Digitized by Google Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

me against him to annihilate him without cause' (ii. 3). Another sarcastic word from the Adversary ('Touch his bone and his flesh, and then see . . . .'), and once more he receives permission to try Job. The affliction this time is elephantiasis, the most loathsome and dangerous form of leprosy. But Job's piety stands fast. He sits down on the heap of burnt dung and ashes at the entrance of the village, such as those where lepers are still wont to congregate, and meets the despairing counsel of his wife (comp. Tobit's wife, Tob. ii. 14) to renounce a God from whom nothing more is to be hoped but death with a calm and pious rebuke. So baseless was the malicious suggestion of the Satan! Meantime many months pass away (vii. 3), and no friend appears to condole with him. Travelling is slow in the East, and Job's three friends[1] were Emeers like himself (the Sept. makes them kings), and their residences would be at some distance from each other. At last they come, but they cannot recognise Job's features, distorted by disease (as Isa. lii. 14). Overpowered with surprise and grief, they sit down with him for seven days and seven nights (comp. Ezek. iii. 15). Up to this point no fault can be found with his friends.

> I never yet did hear
> That the bruised heart was pierced through the ear.
> (*Othello*, act i. scene 3.)

It was their deep, unspoken sympathy which encouraged him to vent his sorrow in a flood of unpurified emotion (chap. iii.) The very next thing recorded of Job is that he 'opened his mouth and cursed his day' (i.e. his birthday; see ver. 3). This may at least be the poet's meaning, though it is also possible that the prologue and the body of the poem are not homogeneous. Not to mention other reasons at present, the tone of Job's speech in chap. iii. (the chapter read by Swift on his birthday) is entirely different from the stedfast

[1] Of the three friends Eliphaz comes from the Edomitish district of Teman, so famous for its wisdom; Bildad from the land of Shuah ('Suḥu' lay, according to the inscriptions, between the mouths of the Belich and the Khabur, confluents of the Euphrates); Zophar from Naamah, some unknown district east of the Jordan. How well these notes of place agree with the Aramaic colouring of the book!

Digitized by Google Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

resignation of his reply to his wife, which, as Prof. Davidson has said, 'reveals still greater deeps in Job's reverent piety' than the benediction at the end of chap. i., the latter being called forth not by the infliction of positive evil, but merely by the withdrawal of unguaranteed favours.

How strangely vivid were the sensations of the race to which the author of Job belonged! How great to him must have been the pleasures of existence, and how great the pains! Nothing to him was merely subjectively true: his feelings were infallible, and that which seemed to be was. Time, for instance, had an objective reality: the days of the year had a kind of life of their own (comp. Ps. xix. 2) and paid annually recurring visits to mankind. Hence Job, like Jeremiah (Jer. xx. 14–18), in the violence of his passion [1] can wish to retaliate on the instrument of his misery by 'cursing his day.'

> Perish the day wherein I was born,
> and the night which said, A man has been conceived.
>
> (iii. 3; comp. 6);

i.e. let my birthday become a blank in the calendar. Or, if this be too much and the anniversary, so sad to me, must come round, then let magicians cast their spell [2] upon it and make it an unlucky day (such as the Babylonians had in abundance).

> Let them curse it that curse days,
> that are skilful to rouse the leviathan (iii. 8);

i.e. the cloud dragon (vii. 12, xxvi. 13, Isaiah li. 9, Jer. li. 34), the enemy of the sun (an allusion to a widely spread solar myth). So fare it with the day which might, by hindering Job's birth, have 'hid sorrow from his eyes!' Even if he must be born, why could he not have died at once and escaped his ill fortune in the quiet phantom world (iii.

[1] Bishop Lowth (*Prælect.* xxxiii.) admires the dramatic tact with which the poet makes Job err at first merely by the exaggeration of his complaints, thus inviting censure, which in turn leads to bold misstatements on Job's part.

[2] For a late Egyptian incantation of this class see Ancessi, *Job et le Rédempteur*, pp. 240–1; for the dragon myth itself see Cheyne's note in the *Prophecies of Isaiah* (on Isa. xxvii. 1) and in the *Pulpit Comm. on Jeremiah* (on Jer. li. 34).

Digitized by Google Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

13–19)? Alas! this melancholy dream does but aggravate Job's mental agony. He broods on the horror of his situation, and even makes a shy allusion to God as the author of his woe—

> Wherefore gives he light to the miserable,
> and life to the bitter in soul? (iii. 20.)

And now Job's friends are shaken out of their composure. They have been meditating on Job's calamity, which is so difficult to reconcile with their previous high opinion of him; for they are the representatives of orthodoxy, of the orthodoxy which received the high sanction of the Deuteronomic *Tōra*, and which connected obedience and prosperity, disobedience and adversity. Still it is not a stiff, extreme orthodoxy which the three friends maintain: calamity, as Eliphaz represents their opinion (v. 17; comp. 27), is not always a punishment, but sometimes a discipline. The question therefore has forced itself upon them, Has the calamity which has befallen our friend a judicial or a disciplinary, educational purpose? At first they may have leaned to the latter alternative; but Job's violent outburst, so unbecoming in a devout man, too clearly pointed in the other direction, and already they are beginning to lose their first hopeful view of his case. One after another they debate the question with Job (Eliphaz as the depositary of a revelation, Bildad as the advocate of tradition, Zophar as the man of common sense)—the question of the cause and meaning of his sufferings, which means further, since Job is not merely an individual but a type,[1] the question of the vast mass of evil in the world. This main part of the work falls into three cycles of dialogue (ch. iv.–xiv., ch. xv.–xxi., ch. xxii.–xxxi.) In each there are three pairs of speeches, belonging respectively to Eliphaz and Job, Bildad and Job, Zophar and Job. Eliphaz opens the debate as being the oldest (xv. 10) and the most experienced of Job's friends. There is much to admire in his speech; if he could only have adopted the tone of a sympathising friend and not of a lecturer—

[1] See Chap. VII. (end of Section 2).

Digitized by Google Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Behold, this have we searched out ; so it is ;
hear thou it, and know it for thyself (v. 27)—

he might have been useful to the sufferer. At the very beginning he strikes a wrong key-note, expressing surprise at his friend's utter loss of self-control (*vattibbāhēl*, ver. 4), and couching it in such a form that one would really suppose Job to have broken down at the first taste of trouble. The view of the speaker seems to be that, since Job is really a pious man (for Eliphaz does not as yet presume to doubt this), he ought to feel sure that his trouble would not proceed beyond a certain point. 'Bethink thee now,' says Eliphaz, 'who ever *perished*, being innocent?' (iv. 7.) Some amount of trouble even a good man may fairly expect ; though far from 'ploughing iniquity,' he is too weak not to fall into sins of error, and all sin involves suffering ; or, as Eliphaz puts it concisely—

Man is born to trouble,
as the sparks fly upward (v. 7).

Assuming without any reason that Job would question this, Eliphaz enforces the moral imperfection of human nature by an appeal to revelation—not, of course, to Moses and the prophets, but to a vision like those of the patriarchs in Genesis. Of the circumstances of the revelation a most graphic account is given.

And to myself came an oracle stealthily,
and mine ear received the whisper thereof,
in the play of thought from nightly visions,
when deep sleep falls upon men,
a shudder came upon me and a trembling,
and made all my bones to shudder,
when (see !) a wind sweeps before me,
the hairs of my body bristle up :
it stands, but I cannot discern it,
I gaze, but there is no form,
before mine eyes (is) . . . .
and I hear a murmuring voice.[1]

[1] The translation follows Bickell's text. The correction in line 2 of ver. 16 is from the Septuagint ; the transposition in line 4 is suggested by 1 Kings xix. 12.

Digitized by Google Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

'Can human kind be righteous before God?
can man be pure before his Maker?
Behold, he trusts not his own servants,
and imputes error to his angels'[1] (iv. 12–18).

There is no such weird passage in the rest of the Old Testament. It did not escape the attention of Milton, whose description of death alludes to it.

If shape it could be called that shape had none,
Distinguishable in member, joint, or limb;
Or substance might be called that shadow seemed.
(*Par. Lost*, ii. 266.)

A single phrase ('a murmuring voice,' ver. 16) is borrowed from the theophany of Elijah (1 Kings xix. 12), but the strokes which paint the scene, and which Milton and Blake between them have more than reproduced, are all his own. The supernatural terror, the wind betokening a spiritual visitor, the straining eyes which can discern no form, the whispering voice always associated with oracles[2]—each of these awful experiences we seem to share. Eliphaz himself recalls his impressions so vividly that he involuntarily uses the present tense in describing them.

But why should Eliphaz imagine that because Job had not had a revelation of this kind he is therefore ignorant of the truth? He actually confounds the complaints wrung from Job by his unparalleled mental and bodily sufferings with the 'impatience' of the 'foolish man' and the 'passion' of the 'silly' one, and warns him against the fate which within his own experience befell one such rebellious murmurer against God—an irrelevant remark, unless he has already begun to suspect Job of impiety. Then, as if he feels that he has gone too far, he addresses Job in a more hopeful spirit, and tells him what he would do in his place, viz. turn trustfully to God, whose operations are so unsearchable, but so bene-

[1] So xv. 15. M. Lenormant compares Gen. vi. 1–4 (an incomplete fragment). See above on the 'sons of the Elohim' of the prologue, and comp. Chap. X.

[2] Compare the Hebrew *ne'ūm* in a common prophetic formula.

Digitized by Google
Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

volent. Let Job regard his present affliction as a chastening and he may look forward to even more abundant blessings than he has yet enjoyed.

In these concluding verses Eliphaz certainly does his best to be sympathetic, but the result shows how utterly he has failed. He has neither convinced Job's reason nor calmed the violence of his emotion. It is now Job's turn to reply. He is not, indeed, in a mood to answer Eliphaz point by point. Passing over the ungenerous reference to the fate of the rebellious, which he can hardly believe to be seriously meant, Job first of all justifies the despair which has so astonished Eliphaz.[1] Since the latter is so cool and so critical, let him weigh Job's calamity as well as his words, and see if the extravagance of the latter is not excusable. Are these arrow wounds the fruit of chastisement? Does the Divine love disguise itself as terror? The good man is never allowed to perish, you say; but how much longer can a body of flesh hold out? Why should I not even desire death? God may be my enemy, but I have given Him no cause. And now, if He would be my friend, the only favour I crave is that He would shorten my agony.

> Then should (this) still be my comfort
> (I would leap amidst unsparing pain),
> that I have not denied the words of the Holy One (vi. 10).

Job's demeanour is thus fully accounted for; it is that of his friends which is unnatural and disappointing.

> My brethren have been treacherous as a winter stream,
> as the bed of winter streams which pass away:
> (once) they were turbid with ice,
> and the snow, as it fell, hid itself in them;
> but now that they feel the glow they vanish,
> when it is hot they disappear from their place.
> Caravans bend their course;
> they go up into the desert and perish.
> The caravans of Tema looked;

[1] The following lines develope what Job may be supposed to have had in his mind.

Digitized by Google Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

the companies of Sheba hoped for them ;[1]
they were abashed because they had been confident ;
when they came thither they were ashamed (vi. 15–20).

And was it a hard thing that Job asked of his friends? No; merely sympathy. And not only have they withheld this; Eliphaz has even insinuated that Job was an open sinner. Surely neither honesty nor wisdom is shown in such captious criticism of Job's expressions.

How forcible is honest language,
and how cogent is the censure of a wise man !
Think ye to censure words,
and the passionate speech of one who is desperate? (vi. 25, 26.)

With an assertion of his innocence, and a renewed challenge to disprove it, this, the easiest part of Job's first reply, concludes.

And now, having secured his right to complain, Job freely avails himself of his melancholy privilege. A 'desperate' man cares not to choose his words, though the reverence which never ceased to exist deep down in Job's nature prompts him to excuse his delirious words by a reference to his bitter anguish (vii. 11). Another excuse which he might have given lies on the very surface of the poem, which is coloured throughout by the poet's deep sympathy with human misery in general. Job in fact is not merely an individual, but a representative of mankind; and when he asks himself at the beginning of chap. vii.—

Has not frail man a warfare [hard service] upon earth,
and are not his days like the days of a hireling?—

it is not merely one of the countless thoughts which are like foam bubbles, but the expression of a serious interest, which raises Job far, very far above the patriarchal prince of the legend in the Prologue. It is the very exaggeration of

[1] Thomson has finely but inaccurately paraphrased this, changing the localities :—

'In Cairo's crowded streets
The impatient merchant, wondering, waits in vain,
And Mecca saddens at the long delay.'
(*Summer*, 980–2 ; of the caravan which perished in the storm).

Digitized by Google
Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

this interest which alone explains why the thought of his fellow-sufferers not only brings no comfort[1] to Job, but fails even to calm his excitement.

> Am I the sea (he says) or the sea monster,
> that thou settest a watch over me? (vii. 12.)

It is an allusion to a myth, based on the continual 'war in heaven' between light and darkness, which we have in these lines. Job asks if he is the leviathan (iii. 8) of that upper ocean above which dwells the invisible God (ix. 8, Ps. civ. 3). He describes Jehovah as being jealous (comp. Gen. iii. 4, 5, 22) and thinking it of importance to subdue Job's wild nature, lest he should thwart the Divine purposes. But here, again, Job rises above himself; the sorrows of all innocent sufferers are as present to him as his own; nay, more, he bears them as a part of his own; he represents mankind with God. In a bitter parody of Ps. viii. 5 he exclaims—

> What is frail man that Thou treatest him as a great one
> and settest Thy mind upon him;
> that Thou scrutinisest him every morning,
> and art every moment testing him? (vii. 17, 18.)

It is only now and then that Job expresses this feeling of sympathetic union with the human race. Generally his secret thought (or that of his poet) translates itself into a self-consciousness which seems morbidly extravagant on any other view of the poem. The descriptions of his physical pains, however, are true to the facts of the disease called elephantiasis, from which he may be supposed to have suffered. His cry for death is justified by his condition—'death rather than (these) my pains'[2] (vii. 15). He has no respite from his

[1] Contrast the touchingly natural expressions of an Arabian poet, translated by Rückert (*Hamâsa*, ii. 315):—

> 'Gieng es nicht wie mir vil andern,
> Würd' ich's nicht ertragen;
> Doch wo ich nur will, gibt Antwort
> Klage meinen Klagen.'

The same sentiment is expressed more than once again; comp. Buddha's apologue of the mustard seed.

[2] So Merx and Bickell. Text, 'my bones.'

Digitized by Google Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

agony; 'nights of misery,' he says, 'have been allotted to me' (vii. 3), probably because his pains were more severe in the night (xxx. 17). How can it be worth while, he asks, thus to persecute him? Even if Eliphaz be right, and Job has been a sinner, yet how can this affect the Most High?

(Even) if I have sinned, what do I unto thee,
O thou watcher of men? (vii. 20.)

What bitter irony again! He admits a vigilance in God, but only the vigilance of 'espionage' (xiii. 27, xiv. 16), not that of friendly guardianship; God only aims at procuring a long catalogue of punishable sins. Why not forgive those sins and relieve Himself from a troublesome task? Soon it will be too late: a pathetic touch revealing a latent belief in God's mercy which no calamity could destroy.

Thus to the blurred vision of the agonised sufferer the moral God whom he used to worship has been transformed into an unreasoning, unpitying Force. Bildad is shocked at this. 'Can God pervert judgment'? (viii. 3.) In his short speech he reaffirms the doctrine of proportionate retribution, and exhorts Job to 'seek earnestly unto God' (viii. 5), thus clearly implying that Job is being punished for his sins.[1] Instead of basing his doctrine on revelation, Bildad supports the side of it relative to the wicked by an appeal to the common consent of mankind previously to the present generation (viii. 8, 9). This common consent, this traditional wisdom, is embodied in proverbial 'dark sayings,' as, for instance—

Can the papyrus grow up without marsh?
can the Nile reed shoot up without water?
While yet in its verdure, uncut,
it withers before any grass.
So fares it with all that forget God,
and the hope of the impious shall perish (viii. 11–13).

It is interesting to see at how early a date the argument in favour of Theism was rested to some extent on tradition. 'We are of yesterday, and know nothing,' says Bildad, 'be-

[1] Bildad more than implies that the fate which overtook Job's children was the punishment of iniquity (viii. 4). Wonderful harshness!

Digitized by Google Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

cause our days on earth are a shadow' (viii. 9), whereas the wisdom of the past is centuries old, and has a stability to which Job's novelties (or, for this is the poet's meaning, those of the new sceptical school of the Exile) cannot pretend. But Job at least is better than his theories, so Eliphaz and Bildad are still charitable enough to believe, and the closing words of the speech of Bildad clear up any possible doubt with regard to his opinion of erring but still whole-hearted[1] ('perfect') Job.

> Those that hate thee shall be clothed with shame,
> and the tent of the wicked shall be no more (viii. 22).

But Job has much to say in reply. He ironically admits the truth of the saying, 'How can man be righteous with God?' but the sense in which he applies the words is very different from that given to them by his friends. Of course God is righteous ('righteousness' in Semitic languages sometimes means 'victory'), because He is so mighty that no one, however innocent, could plead successfully before Him. This thought suggests a noble description of the stupendous displays of God's might in nature (ix. 5–10). The verse with which it closes is adopted from Eliphaz, in whose first speech to Job it forms the text of a quiet picture of God's everyday miracles of benevolence to man (v. 9). Where Eliphaz sees power, wisdom, and love, Job can see only a force which is terrible in proportion to its wisdom. The predominant quality in this idol of Job's imagination is not love, but anger—capricious, inexorable anger, which long ago 'the helpers of Rahab' (another name for the storm dragon, which fought against the sun) experienced to their cost (ix. 13; comp. xxvi. 12). Job himself is in collision with this force; and how should he venture to defend himself? The tortures he endured would force from him an avowal of untruths (ix. 20). If only God were a man, or if there were an umpire whose authority would be recognised on both sides, how gladly would Job submit his case to adjudication! But, alas! God stands over against him with His rod (ix. 32–34).

[1] See viii. 20. Bildad agrees with the statement in the prologue (i. 1).

Digitized by Google Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Bildad had said, 'God will not cast away a perfect man' (viii. 20). But Job's experience is, 'He destroys the perfect and the wicked' (ix. 22). Thus Job has many fellow-sufferers, and one good effect of his trial is that it has opened his eyes to the religious bearings of facts which he had long known but not before now seriously pondered.

At last a milder spirit comes upon the sufferer. He has been in the habit of communion with God, and cannot bear to be condemned without knowing the cause (x. 2). How, he enquires, can God have the heart to torture that which has cost Him so much thought (comp. Isa. lxv. 8, 9)? A man is not a common potter's vessel, but framed with elaborate skill.

> Thy hands fashioned and prepared me;
> afterwards dost thou turn [1] and destroy me?
> Remember now that as clay thou didst prepare me,
> and dost thou turn me into dust again?
> Life and favour dost thou grant me,
> and thine oversight guarded my spirit (x. 8, 9, 12).

God appeared to be kind then; but, since God sees the end from the beginning, it is too clear that He must have done all this simply in order to mature a perfect human sacrifice to His own cruel self-will. Job's milder spirit has evidently fled. He repeats his wish that he had never lived (x. 18, 19), and only craves a few brighter moments before he departs to the land of darkness (x. 20–22).

It was not likely that Zophar would be more capable of rightly advising Job than his elders. Having had no experience to soften him, he pours out a flood of crude dogmatic commonplaces, and in the complaints wrung from a troubled spirit can see nothing but 'a multitude of words' (xi. 2). Yet he only just misses making an important contribution to the settlement of the problem. He has caught a glimpse of a supernatural wisdom, to which the secrets of all hearts are open:—

> But oh that God [Eloah] would speak,
> and open his lips against thee,

[1] Following Sept., with Merx and Bickell.

Digitized by Google Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

and show thee the secrets of wisdom,
for wondrous are they in perfection ![1]
Canst thou find the depths of God [Eloah]?
canst thou reach to the end of Shaddai?
Heights of heaven! what canst thou do?
deeper than Sheól! what canst thou know? (xi. 5–8.)

If Zophar had worked out this idea impartially, he might have given to the discussion a fresh and more profitable turn. He is so taken up with the traditional orthodoxy, however, that he has no room for a deeper view of the problem. His inference is that, in virtue of His perfect knowledge, God can detect sin where man sees none, though that cruellest touch of all with which the Massoretic text[2] burdens the reputation of Zophar is not supported by the more accurate text of the Septuagint, and we should read xi. 6 thus:

and thou shouldest know that God [Eloah] gives unto thee
thy deserts[3] for thine iniquity.

But indeed a special revelation ought not to be necessary for Job. His trouble, proceeding as it does from one no less wise than irresistible (xi. 10, 11), ought to dispel his dream of innocence; as Zophar generalises, when God's judgments are abroad—

(Even) an empty head wins understanding,
and a wild ass's colt is new-born as a man (xi. 12).

We may pass over the brilliant description of prosperity consequent on a true repentance with which the chapter concludes. It fell quite unheeded on the ears of Job, who was more stung by the irritating speech of Zophar than by those of Eliphaz and Bildad.

The taunt conveyed indirectly by Zophar in xi. 12 is ex-

[1] Comp. Isa. xxviii. 29 (Heb.) By a slight error of the ear the copyist whom our Hebrew Bibles follow put a Yōd for an Alef. Hence the Massoretic critics pronounce *kiflayim* 'twofold,' instead of *kif'lāim* 'like wonders:' following this text, Davidson renders, 'that it is double in (true) understanding.'

[2] Literally '. . . . that God brings into forgetfulness for thee some of thy guilt.'

[3] Following Sept., with Bickell. Comp. the Hebrew of Job xxxiii. 27.

Digitized by Google Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

posed in all its futility in the reply of Job. Zophar himself, however, he disdains to argue with ; there is the same intolerable assumption of superiority in the speeches of all the three, and this he assails with potent sarcasm.

> No doubt ye are mankind,
> and with you shall wisdom die.
> I too have understanding like you,
> and who knows not the like of this? (xii. 2, 3.)

In what respect, pray, is he inferior to his friends? Has Eliphaz enjoyed a specially unique revelation? Job has had a still better opportunity of learning spiritual truth in communion of the heart with God (xii. 4). Is Bildad an unwearied collector of the wisdom of antiquity? Job too admits the value of tradition, though he will not receive it unproved (xii. 11, 12). In declamation, too, Job can vie with the arrogant Zophar ; Job's description of the omnipotence of God forms the counterpart of Zophar's description of His omniscience. But of what account are generalities in face of such a problem as Job's? The question of questions is not, Has God all power and all wisdom, but, Does He use them for moral ends? The three friends refuse to look facts in the face ; the *righteous* God (we must understand the words, *if there be one*) will surely chastise them for insincerity and partisanship (xiii. 10).

And now Job refuses to waste any more words on his opponents.

> But as for me, to Shaddai would I speak,
> I crave to reason with God ;
> But ye—are plasterers of lies,
> patchers of that which is worthless.
> Your commonplaces are proverbs of ashes ;
> your bulwarks are bulwarks of clay (xiii. 3, 4, 12).

He forms a new project, but shudders as he does so, for he feels sure of provoking God thereby to deadly anger. Be it so ; a man who has borne till he can bear no longer can even welcome death.

Digitized by Google Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

> Behold, let him slay me ; I can wait [be patient] no longer ;[1]
> still I will defend my ways to his face (xiii. 15).

It is the sublimest of all affirmations of the rights of conscience. Job is confident of the success of his plea: 'This also (guarantees) victory to me, that an impious man cannot come before him' (xiii. 16) with such a good conscience. Thus virtue has an intrinsic value for Job, superior to that of prosperity or even life: moral victory would more than compensate for physical failure. He indulges the thought that God may personally take part in the argument (xiii. 20–22), and in anticipation of this he sums up the chief points of his intended speech (xiii. 23–xiv. 22), such as, 'How many[2] are my sins,' and 'Why chase dry stubble?' (xiii. 23, 25). Sad complaints of the melancholy lot of mankind follow, reminding us again that Job, like Dante in his pilgrimage, is not only an individual but a representative.

> Man that is born of woman,
> short-lived and full of unrest,
> comes up as a flower and fades,
> flies as a shadow and continues not.
> And upon such an one keepest thou thine eye open,
> and me dost thou bring into judgment with thee ! (xiv. 1–3.)

Hard enough is the natural fate of man ; why make it harder by exceptional severity ? An early reader misunderstood this, and thought to strengthen Job's appeal by a reference (in ver. 4) to one of the commonplaces of Eliphaz (iv. 17–21). But ver. 5 shows that the idea which fills the mind of Job is the shortness of human life.[3] A tree, when cut down according to the rules still current in Syria,[4] displays a marvellous vitality ; but man is only like the falling

[1] This rendering is based on the reading of the Hebrew margin. The Hebrew text has, 'Behold, should he slay me, for him would I wait,' implying an expectation of a Divine interposition in Job's favour after his death. But this idea is against the connection ; besides which the restrictive particle 'only' (nearly = still) agrees better with the other reading and rendering. 'Wait' means 'wait for a change for the better,' as in vi. 11, which occurs in a similar context.

[2] He admits that he is not without sins (comp. ver. 26).

[3] Comp. the well-known lamentation of Moschus (iii. 106–111).

[4] See the notices from Wetzstein in Delitzsch.

Digitized by Google Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

leaves of a tree (xiii. 25), or (the figure preferred here) like the canals of Egypt when the dykes and reservoirs are not properly kept up (xiv. 11 ; comp. Isaiah xix. 5, 6). If it were God's will to 'hide' Job in dark Sheól for a time, and then to recall him to the light, how gladly would he 'wait' there, like a soldier on guard (comp. vii. 1), till his 'relief' came (xiv. 14)!—a fascinating thought, on which, baseless though he considers it, Job cannot forbear to dwell. And the beauty of the passage is that the happiness of restoration to conscious life consists for Job in the renewal of loving communion between himself and his God (xiv. 15). Alas! the dim light of Sheól darkens the glorious vision and sends Job back into despair.

Digitized by Google
Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

CHAPTER II.

THE SECOND CYCLE OF SPEECHES.

(CHAPS. XV.–XXI.)

THE three narrow-minded but well-meaning friends have exhausted their arsenal of arguments. Each with his own favourite receipt has tried to cure Job of his miserable illusion, and failed. Now begins a new cycle of speeches, in which our sympathy is still more with Job than before. His replies to the three friends ought to have shown them the incompleteness of their argument and the necessity of discovering some way of reconciling the elements of truth on both sides. *They* can teach him nothing, but the facts of spiritual experience which *he* has expounded ought to have taught them much. But all that they have learned is the impossibility of bringing Job to self-humiliation by dwelling upon the Divine attributes. No doubt their excuse lies in the irreverence of their friend's manner and expressions. It is a part of the tragedy of Job that the advice which was meant for practical sympathy only resulted in separating Job for a time both from God and from his friends. The narrow views of the latter drove Job to irreverence, and his irreverence deprived him of the lingering respect of his friends and seemed to himself at times to cut off the slender chance of a reconciliation with God. From this point onwards the friends cease to offer their supposed 'Divine consolations' (xv. 11)—such as the gracious purpose of God's ways and the corrective object of affliction (v. 8–27)—and content themselves with frightening Job by lurid pictures of the wicked man's fate, leading up, in the third cycle of speeches, to a direct accusation of Job as a wicked man himself. And yet, strange to

Digitized by Google Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

say, as the tone of the friends becomes harsher and more cutting, Job meets their vituperation with growing calmness and dignity. Disappointed in his friends, he clings with convulsive energy to that never quite surrendered postulate of his consciousness a God who owns the moral claims of a creature on the Creator. Remarkable indeed is the first distinct expression of this faith of the heart, of which an antiquated orthodoxy sought to deprive him. He has just listened to the personalities, the cruel assumptions, and the shallow commonplaces of Eliphaz (who treats Job as an arrogant pretender and a self-convicted blaspheming sinner), and with a few words of utter contempt he turns his back on his 'tormenting[1] comforters' (xvi. 2). (Soon, however, he will appeal to them for sympathy; so strong is human nature! See xix. 21.) Left to his own melancholy thoughts, he repeats the sad details of his misery and of God's hostility (and again we feel that the poet thinks of suffering humanity in general[2]), and reasserts his innocence in language afterwards used of the suffering Servant of Jehovah (xvi. 17; comp. Isaiah liii. 9). Then in the highest excitement he demands vengeance for his blood. But who is the avenger of blood but God (xix. 25; comp. Ps. ix. 12)—the very Foe who is bringing him to death? And hence the strange but welcome thought that behind the God of pitiless force and undiscriminating severity there must be a God who recognises and returns the love of His servants, or, in the fine words of the Korán, 'that there is no refuge from God but unto Him.'[3] 'Even now,' as he lies on the rubbish-heap—

> Even now, behold, my Witness is in heaven,
> and he that vouches for me is on high.
> My friends (have become) my scorners;
> mine eye sheds tears unto God—
> that he would right a man against God,
> and a son of man against his friend (xvi. 20, 21).

[1] Miss E. Smith's rendering, 'irksome,' Renan's 'insupportable,' are not definite enough. Job means that his would-be comforters do but aggravate his unease.

[2] Notice the expressions in xvi. 10, and comp. Ps. xxii. 7, 12, 13. (Ps. xxii., like the Book of Job, has some features which belong to an individual and some to a collection of sufferers.) Job would never have spoken of his friends in the terms used in xvi. 10, 11.

[3] Sur. ix. 119.

Digitized by Google
Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

It is a turning-point in the mental struggles of Job. He cannot indeed account for his sufferings, but he ceases to regard God as an unfeeling tyrant. He has a germ of faith in God's goodwill towards him—only a germ, but we are sure, even without the close of the story, that it will grow up and bear the fruit of peace. And now, perhaps, we may qualify the reproach addressed above to Job's friends. It is true that they have driven Job to irreverent speeches respecting God, but they have also made it possible for him to reach the intuition (which the prophetic Eliphaz has missed) of an affinity between the Divine nature and the human. In an earlier speech (ix. 32–35) he has already expressed a longing for an arbiter between himself and God. That longing is now beginning to be gratified by the certitude that, though the God in the world may be against him, the God in heaven is on his side. Not that even God can undo the past; Job requests no interference with the processes of nature. (Did the writer think that Job lived outside the sphere or the age of miracles?) All that he asks is a pledge from God, his Witness, to see his innocence recognised by God, his Persecutor (xvii. 3). So far we are listening to Job the individual. But immediately after we find the speaker exhibiting himself as the type of a class—the class or representative category of innocent sufferers. Job, then, has a dual aspect, like his God.

> And he hath set me for a byword of peoples,
> and I am one in whose face men spit.
> At this the upright are appalled,
> and the innocent stirs himself up against the impious;
> but the righteous holds on his way,
> and he who has clean hands waxes stronger and stronger
> (xvii. 6, 7, 9).

Here it is difficult not to see that the circumstances of the poet's age are reflected in his words. The whole Jewish nation became 'a byword of peoples' during the exile,[1] and the mutual sympathy of its members was continually taxed.

[1] Comp. Ps. xxii. 6, Isa. xlix. 7, Joel ii. 17 (where we should render 'make a byword upon them').

Digitized by Google Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

It was a paradox which never lost its strangeness that a 'Servant of Jehovah' should be trampled upon by unbelievers, and the persecutor was rewarded by the silent indignation of all good Jews. That this is the right view is shown by the depression into which Job falls in vv. 11–16, in spite of the elevating passage quoted above.

Bildad's speech, with its barbed allusions to Job's sad history, had a twofold effect. First of all it raised the anguish of Job to its highest point, and, secondly, it threw the sufferer back on that great intuition, already reached by him, of a Divine Witness to his integrity in the heavens. It is a misfortune which can scarcely be appraised too highly that the text of the famous declaration in xix. 25–27 is so uncertain. 'The embarrassment of the English translators,' remarks Prof. Green, of Princeton,[1] 'is shown by the unusual number of italic words, and these of no small importance to the meaning, which are heaped together in these verses.' It is scarcely greater, however, than that of the ancient versions, and we can hardly doubt that the text used by the Septuagint translator was already at least as corrupt as that which has descended to us from the Massoretic critics.[2] This would the more easily be the case since, as Prof. Green says again, 'Job is speaking under strong excitement and in the language of lofty poetry; he uses no superfluous words; he simply indicates his meaning in the most concise manner.' Without now entering on a philological discussion, we have, I think, to choose between these alternatives, one of which involves emending the text, the other does not. Does Job simply repeat what he has said in xvi. 18, 19 (viz. that God will avenge his blood and make reparation, as it were, for his death by testifying to his innocence), without referring to any consequent pleasure of his own, or does he combine with this the delightful thought expressed in xiv. 13–15 of a

[1] *The Argument of the Book of Job* (1881), p. 200.

[2] Dr. Hermann Schultz is an unexceptionable witness, because his tastes lead him more to Biblical and dogmatic theology than to minute textual studies. He is convinced, he says, after each fresh examination, of 'the baffling intricacy and obscurity and the probable corruption of the text' (*Alttestamentliche Theologie*, ed. 2 [1878], pp. 661–2).

Digitized by Google Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

conscious renewal of communion with God after death?[1] The context, it seems to me, is best satisfied by the former alternative. Job's mind is at present occupied with the cruelty, not of God (as when he said, 'O that thou wouldst appoint me a term and then remember me,' xiv. 13), but of his friends. His starting-point is, 'How long will ye (my friends) pain my soul?' &c. (xix. 2.) We may admit that the best solution of Job's problem would be 'the beatific vision' in some early and not clearly defined form of that deep idea; but if Job can say that he not merely dreams but *knows* this ('I *know* that . . . . I shall see God,' xix. 25, 26), the remainder of the colloquies ought surely to pursue a very different course: as a matter of fact, neither Job nor his friends, nor yet Jehovah Himself, refers to this supposed newly-won truth, and the only part of 'Job's deepest saying' which the next speaker fastens upon (xx. 3) is the threatening conclusion (xix. 29). Ewald himself has drawn attention to this, without remarking its adverse bearing on his own interpretation.[2]

Here, side by side, are Dr. A. B. Davidson's and Dr. W. H. Green's translations of the received text of vv. 25–27, and Dr. Bickell's version of his own emended text.

But I know that my redeemer liveth,
and in after time he shall stand upon the dust
and after this my skin is destroyed
and without my flesh I shall see God:

[1] I agree with Dr. W. H. Green that the third view, which 'conceives Job to be here looking forward, not to a future state, but to the restoration of God's favour and his own deliverance out of all his troubles in the present life,' is to be rejected. I do not follow him in all his reasons, but these two are decisive. 1. Everywhere else Job 'regards himself as on the verge of the grave. . . . Every earthly hope is annulled; every temporal prospect has vanished. He invariably repels the idea, whenever his friends present it to him, of any improvement of his condition in this world as plainly impossible.' 2. 'If he here utters his expectation that God will interfere to reward his piety in the present life, he completely abandons his own position and adopts [that of the friends]' (*The Argument of Job*, pp. 204–5).

[2] Job's vindication, thinks Ewald, would be incomplete if at least the spirit of the dead man did not witness it.

[3] The dust beneath which Job lies; comp. 'ye that dwell in dust' (Isa. xxvi. 19).

Digitized by Google Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

whom I shall see for myself,
and mine eyes shall behold, and not another—
my reins consume within me !

And I know my redeemer liveth, and last on earth shall he arise ; and after my skin, which has been destroyed thus, and out of my flesh [i.e. when my vital spirit shall be separated from my flesh] shall I see God . . . .

Ich weiss, es lebt mein Retter,
Wird noch auf meinem Staub stehn ;
Zuletzt wird Gott mein Zeuge,
Lässt meine Unschuld schauen,
Die ich allein jetzt schaun kann,
Mein Auge und kein andres.

Most critics are now agreed that the immediately preceding words (vv. 23, 24) are not an introduction, as if vv. 25–27 composed the rock inscription. Job first of all wishes what he knows to be impossible, and then announces a far better thing of which he is sure. His wish runs thus :

Would then that they were written down—
my words—in a book, and engraved
with a pen of iron, and with lead
cut out for a witness in the rock.[1]

But whatever view we take of the prospect which gladdened the mind of Job, his remaining speeches contain no further reference to it. Henceforth his thoughts appear to dwell less on his own condition, and more on the general question of God's moral government, and even when the former is spoken of it is without the old bitterness. In his next speech, stirred up by the gross violence of Zophar, Job for the first time meets the assertions of the three friends in this cycle of argument, viz. that the wicked, at any rate, always get their deserts, and, according to Zophar, suddenly and overwhelmingly. He meets them by a direct negative, though in doing so he is as much perturbed as when he

[1] On the text see Bickell, Merx, Hitzig ; on the use of metal for public notices see Chabas, quoted by Cook in *Speaker's Comm.*, *ad loc.*

Digitized by Google
Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

proclaimed his own innocence to God's face. He is familiar now with the thought that the righteous are not always recompensed, but it fills him with horror to think that the Governor of the world even leaves the wicked in undeserved prosperity, as if, in the language of Eliphaz, He could not 'judge through the thick clouds' (xxii. 16).

> Why do the wicked live on,
> become old, yea, are mighty in power?
> Their houses are safe, without fear,
> neither is Eloah's rod upon them.
> They wear away their days in happiness,
> and go down to Sheól in a moment (xxi. 7, 9, 13).

Digitized by Google
Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

CHAPTER III.

THE THIRD CYCLE OF SPEECHES.

(CHAPS. XXII.–XXXI.)

IT is not wonderful that the gulf between Job and his friends should only be widened by such a direct contradiction of the orthodox tenet. The friends, indeed, cannot but feel the force of Job's appeal to experience, as they show by the violence of their invective. But they are neither candid nor, above all, courageous enough to confess the truth; they speak, as the philosopher Kant observes, as if they knew their powerful Client was listening in the background. And so a third cycle of speeches begins (chaps. xxii.–xxxi.), in which the friends grasp the only weapon left them and charge Job directly with being a great sinner. True to his character, however, Eliphaz even here seeks to soften the effect of his accusations by a string of most enticing promises, partly worldly and partly other-worldly in their character, and which in a different context Job would have heartily appreciated (xxii. 21–30).

But Job cares not to reply to those charges of Eliphaz; his mind is still too much absorbed in the painful mystery of his own lot and that of all other righteous sufferers. He longs for God to set up his tribunal, so that Job and his fellows might plead their cause (xxiii. 3–7, xxiv. 1). What most of all disturbs him is that he cannot see God—that is cannot detect the operation of that moral God in whom his heart cannot help believing. 'I may go forward, but he is not there; and backward, but I cannot perceive him' (xxiii. 8). With the ardour of a pessimist he depicts this failure of justice in the darkest colours (chap. xxiv.), and is as powerless as ever to reconcile his deep sense of what God ought to

Digitized by Google
Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

be and must be and the sad realities of life. Upon this Bildad tries to frighten Job into submission by a picture of God's irresistible power, as exhibited not only in heaven and earth, but even beneath the ocean depths in the realm of the shades (xxv., xxvi. 5–14). Not a very comforting speech, but fine in its way (if Bildad may really be credited with all of it), and the speaker frankly allows its inadequacy.

> Lo ! these are the outskirts of his ways,
> and how faintly spoken is that which we hear !
> but the thunder of his power who can understand ? (xxvi. 14.)

In a speech, the first which is described as a *mashal*,[1] Job demolishes his unoriginal and rhetorical opponent, and with dignity reasserts his innocence (xxvi. 1–4, xxvii. 1–7). He may have said more ; if so, it has been lost. But, in fact, all that was argumentative in Bildad's speech was borrowed from Eliphaz, and though Job had the power (see chaps. ix., xii.), he had not the will to compete with his friends in rhetoric. The only speaker who is left is Zophar, and, as it is unlikely that the poet left one of his triads of speeches imperfect, we may conjecture that xxvii. 8–10, 10–23 belongs to the third speech of Zophar.[2] Certainly they are most inappropriate in the mouth of Job, being in direct contradiction to all that he has yet said. If so it seems very probable that besides the introductory formula a few opening verses have dropped out of the text. The verses which now stand at the head of the speech transport us to the disputes of those rival schools of which Job and his friends were only the representatives. Hence the use of the plural in ver. 12, of which an earlier instance occurs in the second speech of Bildad (xviii. 2). What Zophar says is in effect this : Job's condition is desperate, for he is an "impious' or 'godless' man. It is too late for

[1] On this characteristic word for parallelistic poetry, see on Proverbs.

[2] Note that xxvii. 13 is repeated from an earlier speech of Zophar (xx. 29). There it concludes a sketch of the 'impious' man's fate ; here it begins a similar description. Verses 11 and 12 of the same chapter would stand more properly (Bickell and virtually Hirzel) immediately before chap. xxviii. Mr. B. Wright is very near doing the same ; following Eichhorn, he takes vv. 13–23 as a specimen quoted by Job of the friends' 'inconsequential' style of argument (a less natural hypothesis than that adopted here).

Digitized by Google Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

any one to attempt to pray when overtaken by a fatal calamity. For how can he feel that 'deep delight' in God which enables a man to pray, with the confidence of being heard, 'in every season' of life, whether prosperous or the reverse? The rest of the speech is substantially a repetition of Zophar's former description of the retribution of the wicked. It was not to be expected that Job should reply to this, and accordingly we find that in continuing his *mashal* (xxix. 1) he utterly ignores his opponents. But unhappily he is almost as far as ever from a solution of his difficulty. His friends, we may suppose, have left him, and he is at liberty to revive those melancholy memories which are all that remain to him of his prosperity.

In chap. xxix. (a fine specimen of flowing, descriptive Hebrew poetry) Job recalls the honour in which he used to be held, and the beneficent acts which he was enabled to perform. Modesty were out of place, for he is already in the state of 'one turned adrift among the dead' (Ps. lxxxviii. 5). The details remind us of many Arabic elegies in the *Hamâsa* (e.g. No. 351 in Rückert's adaptation, vol. i., or 97 in Freytag). In chaps. xxx., xxxi. he laments, with the same pathetic self-contemplation, his ruined credit and the terrible progress of his disease. Then, by a somewhat abrupt transition,[1] he enters upon an elaborate profession of his innocence, which has been compared to the solemn repudiation of the forty-two deadly sins by the departed souls of the good in the Egyptian 'Book of the Dead.' The resemblance, however, must not be pressed too far. Job's morality, even if predominantly 'legal,' has a true 'evangelical' tinge. Not merely the act of adultery, but the glance of lust; not merely unjust gain, but the confidence reposed in it by the heart; not merely outward conformity to idol-worship, but the inclination of the heart to false gods, are in his catalogue of sins. His last words are a reiteration of his

[1] It seems clear that chap. xxxi. was not written as the sequel of chap. xxx. Since, however, it bears such a strong impress of originality, one can only suppose that the author placed it here by an afterthought, and omitted to construct a connecting link with the preceding chapter.

Digitized by Google Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

deeply cherished desire for an investigation of his case by Shaddai. With what proud self-possession he imagines himself approaching the Divine Judge! In his hands are the accusations of his friends and his own reply. Holding them forth, he exclaims—

> Here is my signature—let Shaddai answer me—
> and the indictment which mine adversary has written.
> Surely upon my shoulder will I carry it,
> and bind it as chaplets about me.
> The number of my steps will I declare unto him ;
> as a prince will I come near unto him (xxxi. 35–37).[1]

We must here turn back to a passage which forms one of the most admired portions of the Book of Job as it stands—the *mashal* on Divine Wisdom in chap. xxviii. The first eleven verses are at first sight most inappropriate in this connection. The poet seems to take a delight in working into them all that he knows of the adventurous operations of the miners of his day—probably those carried on for gold in Upper Egypt, and for copper and turquoises in the Sinaitic peninsula (both skilfully introduced by Ebers into his stories of ancient Egypt). How vividly the superiority of reason to instinct is brought out to vary the technical description of the miners' work in vv. 7, 8.

> A path the eagle knows not,
> nor has the eye of the vulture scanned it ;
> the sons of pride have not trodden it,
> nor hath the lion passed over it.

No earthly treasures lie too deep for human industry ; but —here we see the use of the great literary feat (Prov. i.–ix.) which has gone before—'where can wisdom be found, and where is the place of understanding?' And then follows that fine passage in which language is strained to the uttermost (with another of those pictorial inventories in which poets delight, vv. 15–19) to convey at once the preciousness and the unattainableness of the higher wisdom. The moral of the whole, however, is not revealed till the last verse.

[1] These verses have been misplaced in the Massoretic text (as Isa. xxxviii. 21, 22). They clearly ought to stand at the end of the chapter. So Kennicott, Eichhorn, Merx, Delitzsch.

Digitized by Google Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

And unto man he said,
'Behold, the fear of the Lord is wisdom,
and to turn aside from evil is understanding' (xxviii. 28).

Thus there is no allusion whatever to Job's problem, and it is only the present position of the *mashal* in the Book of Job which suggests a possible relation for it to that problem.

And now, looking at the passage by itself, is it conceivable that it was originally written to stand where it now does? Is it natural that the solemn contents of chap. xxvii. (even if we allow the first seven verses only to be Job's) should leave Job in a mood for an elaborate poetical study of mining operations, or that after agonising so long over the painful riddles of Divine Providence he should suddenly acquiesce in the narrow limits of human knowledge, soon, however, to relapse into his old inquisitiveness? Is it not, on the other hand, very conceivable (notice the opening word 'For') that it was transferred to its present position from some other work? In a didactic poem on Wisdom (i.e. the plan of the universe), similar to Prov. i.–ix., it would be as much in place as the hymn on Wisdom in Prov. viii. To this great work indeed it presents more than one analogy, both in its subject and its recommendation of religious morality (or moral religion) as the branch of wisdom suitable to man. The only difference is that the writer of Job xxviii. expressly says that this is the only wisdom within human ken, whereas the writer of Prov. viii. does not touch on this point. But, whether an extract from a larger work or written as a supplement to the poem of Job, the passage in its present position is evidently intended to have a reference to Job's problem. The author, or the extractor, regarded the foregoing debates much as Milton regarded those of the fallen angels, who 'found no end, in wandering mazes lost;' in short, he could only solve the problem by pronouncing it insoluble.[1] Verses 11 and 12 of chap. xxvii. have very much the appearance of an artificial bridge inserted by the new author or the extractor.

[1] But for this tendency of the poem one might follow Delitzsch (art. 'Hiob' in *Herzog-Plitt*, vi. 133) and regard chap. xxviii. as inserted by the author of *Job* from his 'portfolio.'

Digitized by Google Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

CHAPTER IV.

THE SPEECHES OF ELIHU.

(CHAPS. XXXII.–XXXVII.)

AT a (perhaps) considerably later period than the original work (including chap. xxviii.)—symbolised by the youthfulness of Elihu as compared with the four older friends—the problem of the sufferings of the innocent still beset the minds of the wise men, the attempt of the three friends to 'justify the ways of God' to the intellect having proved, as the wise men thought, a too manifest failure (xxxii. 2, 3). One of their number therefore invented a fourth friend, Elihu (or is this the name of the author himself?[1]), who is described as having been a listener during the preceding debates, and who reduces Job to silence. It is noteworthy that the sudden introduction of Elihu required the insertion of a fresh narrative passage (xxxii. 1–6) as a supplement to the original prologue.

I assume, as the reader will observe, the one assured result of the criticism of Job. To those who follow me in this, the speeches of Elihu will, I think, gain greatly in interest. They mark out a time when, partly through the teaching of history, partly through a deeper inward experience, and partly through the reading of the poem of *Job*, the old difficulties of faith were no longer so acutely felt. Two courses were open to the Epigoni of that age—either to force Job to say what, as it seemed, he ought to have said (this,

[1] So M. Derenbourg, who points out that none of the other speakers have a genealogy, and identifies Buz with Boaz, and Ram with an ancestor of David (Ruth iv. 19). The author of chaps. xxxii.–xxxvii. might thus be a descendant of Elihu the brother of David (1 Chr. xxvii. 18).

Digitized by Google Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

however, was not so easy as in the case of Ecclesiastes), or to insert fresh speeches in the style of the original, separating the corn from the chaff in the pleadings of the three friends, and adding whatever a more advanced religious thought suggested to the writer. In forms of expression, however, it must be admitted that Elihu does not shine. (True, he does not profess to comfort Job.) For offensiveness the two following verses are not easily matched:

> Where is there a man like Job,
> who drinks [1] scoffing like water? (xxxiv. 7.)
> Would that Job might be tried to the uttermost
> because of his answers in the manner of wicked men (xxxiv. 36).

A 'vulgar braggart' he may not be from an Oriental point of view, nor is he 'the prototype of the Bachelor in *Faust*;' but that he is too positive and dogmatic, and much overrates his own powers, is certain. He represents the dogmatism of a purified orthodoxy, which thinks too much of its minute advances ('one perfect in knowledge is with thee,' xxxvi. 4).

Elihu distributes his matter (of which he says that he is 'full,' xxxii. 18–20) over four speeches. His themes in the first three are: 1, the ground and object of suffering (chaps. xxxii., xxxiii.); 2, the righteousness of God (chap. xxxiv.); and 3, the use of religion (chap. xxxv.), all of which are treated in relation to the questionable or erroneous utterances of Job. Then, in his last and longest effort, Elihu unrolls before Job a picture of the government of God, in its beneficence and righteousness as well as its omnipotence, in the hope of moving Job to self-humiliation (chaps. xxxvi., xxxvii.) Let us remember again that Elihu represents the debates of the 'wise men' of the post-regal period, who were conscious of being in some sense 'inspired' like their prophetic predecessors (xxxii. 8, xxxvi. 4; Ecclus. xxiv. 32–34, l. 28, 29), so that we cannot believe that the *bizarre* impression made by Elihu on some Western critics was intended by the original author. That his portrait suggests certain grave infirmities, may be granted; but these are

[1] On 'drinks' see Thomson, *The Land and the Book*, p. 319.

Digitized by Google Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

the failings of the circle to which the author belongs: the self-commendation of Elihu in his exordium is hardly excessive from an Oriental point of view, or would at any rate be justifiable in a more original thinker. Indeed, he only commends himself in order to excuse the unusual step of criticising the proceedings of men so much older than himself. After what he thinks sufficient excuse has been offered, Elihu takes up Job's fundamental error, self-righteousness, but prepares the way by examining Job's assertion (xix. 7, xxx. 20) that God took no heed of his complaints.

> Wherefore hast thou contended with Him
> because 'He answers none of my words'? [1] (xxxiii. 13.)

To this Elihu replies that it is a man's own fault if he cannot hear the Divine voice. For God is constantly speaking to man, if man would only regard it ('revelation,' then, is not confined to a class or a succession). Two means of communication are specially mentioned—nightly dreams and visions, and severe sickness. The object of both is to divert men from courses of action which can only lead to destruction. At this point a remarkable intimation is given. In order to produce conversion, and so to 'redeem a man from going down to the pit,' a special angelic agency is necessary—that of a 'mediator' or 'interpreter' (Targ. *p'raqlītā*; comp. *παράκλητος*, John xiv. 16, 26), whose office it is to 'show unto man his rightness' (i.e. how to conform his life to the right standard, xxxiii. 23).

We must pause here, however, to consider the bearings of this. It seems to show us, first, that inspired minds (see above) were already beginning to refine and elevate the popular notions of the spiritual world. That there were two classes of spirits, the one favourable, the other adverse to man, had long been the belief of the Israelites and their neighbours.[2] The author of the speeches of Elihu now intro-

[1] The *text* (which has '*His* words') is generally rendered 'because He gives not account of any of His matters,' i.e. of the details of His government. This is very strained; the Sept. has 'my words,' the Vulgate 'thy words,' either of which readings gives a natural sense.

[2] See 2 Sam. xxiv. 16, and comp. 1 Chr. xxi. 15, Ps. lxxviii. 49, Prov. xvi.

Digitized by Google Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

duces one of them among the symbols of a higher stage of religion. In antithesis to the 'destroyers'[1] (ver. 22) he implies that God has thousands of angels (the 'mediator' is 'one among a thousand'), whose business it is to save sinners from destruction by leading them to repentance. Such is the *φιλανθρωπία*, the friendliness to man, of the angelic world,[1] without which indeed, according to Elihu, the purpose of sickness would be unobserved and a fatal issue inevitable. To students of Christianity, however, it has a deeper interest, if the concluding words, 'I have found a ransom,' be a part of the Old Testament foundation of the doctrine of redemption through Christ. This, however, is questionable, and even its possibility is not recognised by the latest orthodox commentator.[2] In his second speech Elihu returns to the main question of Job's attitude towards God. He begins by imputing to Job language which he had never used, and which from its extreme irreverence Job would certainly have disowned (xxxiv. 5, 9), and maintains that God never acts unjustly, but rewards every man according to his deeds. There is nothing in his treatment of this theme which requires comment except its vagueness and generality, to which, were the speech an integral part of the poem, Job would certainly have taken exception.

The subject of the third speech is handled with more originality. Job had really complained that afflicted persons such as himself appealed to God in vain (xxiv. 12, xxx. 20). Elihu

14, Ezek. ix. 1, x. 7; also Jost, *Gesch. des Judenthums*, i. 304. For Assyria see *Records of the Past*, i. 131–5; iv. 53–60 (the sinner was thought to be given up in displeasure by his God into the hands of the evil spirits). For Arabia see Korán, lxxix. 1, 2—

'By those (angels) who tear out (souls) with violence,
And by those who joyously release them:'

for the early Christian, Justin M. *Dial. c. Tryph.* 105, *τὰ αὐτὰ αἰτῶμεν τὸν θεὸν, τὸν δυνάμενον ἀποστρέψαι πάντα ἀναιδῆ πονηρὸν ἄγγελον μὴ λαβέσθαι ἡμῶν τῆς ψυχῆς*: and for the medieval, Dante, *Inferno*, xxvii. 112–123; *Purgatorio*, v. 103–108. Comp. below, Chap. X.

[1] Blake seems to have felt Elihu's strong faith in the angels. The border of his 12th illustration is filled with a stream of delicate angel forms.

[2] Davidson. Ewald explains the 'ransom' partly of the intercession of the angel, partly of the prayer of repentance.

Digitized by Google Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

replies to this (xxxv. 9–13) that such persons merely cried from physical pain, and did not really pray. The fourth and last speech, in which he dismisses controversy and expresses his own sublime ideas of the Creator, has the most poetical interest. At the very outset the solemnity of his language prepares the reader to expect something great, and the expectation is not altogether disappointed. 'God,' he says, 'is mighty, but despiseth not any' (xxxvi. 5); He has given proof of this by the trials with which He visits His servants when they have fallen into sin. Might and mercy are the principal attributes of God. The verses in which Elihu applies this doctrine to Job's case are ambiguous and perhaps corrupt, but it appears as if Elihu regarded Job as in danger of missing the disciplinary object of his sufferings. It is in the second part of his speech (xxxvi. 26–xxxvii. 24) that Elihu displays his greatest rhetorical power, and though by no means equal to the speeches of Jehovah, which it appears to imitate, the vividness of its descriptions has obtained the admiration of no less competent a judge than Alexander von Humboldt. The moral is intended to be that, instead of criticising God, Job should humble himself in devout awe at the combined splendour and mystery of the creation.

It is tempting to regard the sketch of the storm in xxxvi. 29–xxxvii. 5 and the appeals which Elihu makes to Job as preparatory to the appearance of Jehovah in xxxviii. 1. 'While Elihu is speaking,' says Mr. Turner, 'the clouds gather, a storm darkens the heavens and sweeps across the landscape, and the thunder utters its voice . . . . out of the whirlwind that passes by Jehovah speaks.'[1] So too Dr. Cox thinks that Job's invisible Opponent 'opens His mouth and answers him out of the tempest which Elihu has so graphically described.'[2] In fact in xxxviii. 1 we may equally well render '*the* tempest' (i.e. that lately mentioned) and '*a* tempest.' The objection is (1) that the storm does not come into the close of Elihu's speech, as it ought to do, and (2) that in His very first words Jehovah distinctly implies that

[1] Turner, *Studies Biblical and Oriental*, p. 146.
[2] Cox, *Commentary on the Book of Job*, p. 489.

Digitized by Google Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

the last speaker was one who 'darkened counsel by words without knowledge' (xxxviii. 2).

Such are the contributions of Elihu, which gain considerably when considered as a little treatise in themselves. It is, indeed, a strange freak of fancy to regard Elihu as representing the poet himself.[1] Neither æsthetically nor theologically do they reach the same high mark as the remainder of the book. 'The style of Elihu,' as M. Renan remarks, 'is cold, heavy, pretentious. The author loses himself in long descriptions without vivacity. . . . His language is obscure and presents peculiar difficulties. In the other parts of the poem the obscurity comes from our ignorance and our scanty means of comprehending these ancient documents; here the obscurity comes from the style itself, from its *bizarrerie* and affectation.'[2] Theologically it is difficult to discover any important point (but see Chap. XII., below, on Elihu) in which, in spite of his sharp censure of the friends, he distinctly passes beyond them. His arguments have been so largely anticipated by the three friends that, on the whole, we may perhaps best regard chaps. xxxii.–xxxix. as a first theological criticism on the contents of the original work. From this point of view it is interesting that the idea of affliction as correction, which had already occurred to Eliphaz, acquired in the course of years a much deeper hold on thinking minds (see xxxiii. 19–30, xxxvi. 8–10). There is one feature of the earlier speeches which is not imitated by Elihu, and that is the long and terrifying descriptions in each of the three original colloquies of the fate of the impious man, and one of the most considerate of Elihu's Western critics[3] thinks it possible that Elihu, who says in one place—

> And the impious in heart cherish wrath,
> and supplicate not when he hath bound them (xxxvi. 13)—

considered no calamity whatever as penal in the first instance.

[1] So Lightfoot (see Lowth, *Prælect.* xxxii.). [2] *Le livre de Job*, p. liv.
[3] Davidson, *The Book of Job*, p. xlv.

Digitized by Google Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

CHAPTER V.

THE SPEECHES OF JEHOVAH.

(CHAPS. XXXVIII.–XLII. 6.)

'THE words of Job are ended' (xxxi. 40*b*), remarks the ancient editor, and amongst the last of these words is an aspiration after a meeting with God. That Job expected such a favour in this life is in the highest degree improbable, whatever view be taken of xix. 25–27. It is true, he sometimes did almost regard a theophany as possible, though he feared it might be granted under conditions which would make it the reverse of a boon (ix. 3, 15, 33–35; xiii. 21, 22). He wished for a fair investigation of his character, and he craved that God would not appear in too awful a form. It seems at first sight as if Jehovah, casting hard questions at Job out of the tempest, and ignoring both the friends' indictment and Job's defence (xxxi. 35–37), were realising Job's worst fears and acting as his enemy. The friends had already sought to humble Job by pointing him to the power and wisdom and goodness of God, and Job had proved conclusively that he was no stranger to these high thoughts. Is the poet consistent with himself, first, in introducing Jehovah at all, and, secondly, in making Him overpower Job by a series of sharp, ironical questions? Several answers may be given if we wish to defend the unity of the poem. Job himself (it may be said) has not continued at the same high level of faith as in xix. 25–27 (assuming Prof. Davidson's view of the passage); he needs the appearance of Jehovah more than he did then. As to the course attributed in xxxviii. 1 to Jehovah, this too (the poet may have felt in adding these speeches) was really the best for Job. Jehovah might no doubt have declared Job to

Digitized by Google Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

be in the right as against his friends. He might next have soothed the sufferer's mind by revealing the reason why his trials were permitted (*we* know this from the Prologue). But this would not have been for Job's spiritual welfare: there was one lesson he needed to learn or to relearn, one grace of character he needed to gain or to regain—namely, devout and trustful humility towards God. In the heat of debate and under the pressure of pain Job's old religious habit of mind had certainly been weakened—not destroyed, but weakened—and a strong remedy was necessary if he was not to carry his distracted feelings to the grave. And so, as a first joyful surprise, came the theophany: to 'see' God before death *must* have been a joyful surprise; and if the questioning cast him down, yet it was only to raise him up in the strength of self-distrust. The object of these orations of Jehovah is not to communicate intellectual light, but to give a stronger tone to Job's whole nature. He had long known God to be strong and wise and good, but more as a lesson learned than as personal experience (xlii. 5). And the means first adopted to convey this life-giving 'sight' is not without a touch of that humour which we noticed in the Prologue. Job, who was so full of questions, now has the tables turned upon him. He is put through a catechism which admits of but one very humbling answer, each question being attached to a wonderfully vivid description of some animal or phenomenon. For descriptive power the first speech of Jehovah, at any rate, is without a parallel. The author, as Prof. Davidson remarks, 'knew the great law that sublimity is necessarily also simplicity.' It is true he does but give us isolated features of the natural world: no single scene is represented in its totality. But this is in accordance with the Hebrew genius, to which nature appears, not in her own simple beauty, but bathed in an atmosphere of emotion. The emotion which here animates the poet is mainly a religious one; it is the love of God, and of God's works for the sake of their Maker. He wishes to cure the murmuring spirits of his own day by giving them wider views of external nature and its mysteries, so won-

Digitized by Google Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

drously varied and so full of Divine wisdom and goodness. He has this great advantage in doing so, that they, like himself (and Job), are theists; they are not of those who say in their heart, 'There is no God,' but of the 'Zion' who complains, 'Jehovah has forsaken me, and my Lord has forgotten me' (Isaiah xlix. 14). And the remedy which he applies is the same as that of the Babylonian-Jewish prophet, a wider study of the ways of God. Job had said, 'I would tell Him the number of my steps;' Jehovah replies by showing him, in a series of questions, not irritating but persuasive, the footprints of His own larger self-manifestation.

The Divine Speaker is introduced by the poet thus:

> And Jehovah answered Job out of a tempest, and said.

A storm was the usual accompaniment of a Divine appearance: there was no intention of crushing Job with terror. In Blake's thirteenth drawing Job (and his wife!) are represented kneeling and listening, with countenances expressive of thankfulness; in his fourteenth, Job and his four friends kneel rapt and ecstatic, while the 'sons of God,' sweet, vital, heavenly forms, are shouting for joy. In fact, the speeches of Jehovah contain, not accusations (except in xxxviii. 2), but remonstrances, and, though the form of these is chilling to Job's self-love, yet the glorious visions which they evoke are healing to every sorrow of the mind. The text of the speeches is unfortunately not in perfect order. For instance, there are four verses which have, no one can tell how, been deposited in the description of behemoth (xli. 9–12, A. V.) but which most probably at one time or another opened the first speech of Jehovah. Perhaps the author himself removed them, feeling them to be too depressing for Job to hear; or perhaps it was purely by accident that they were transferred, and Merx and Bickell have done well to replace them in their corrected editions of *Job* between xxxi. 37 and xxxviii. 1. As corrected by the former they run thus:—

> Behold, his hope is belied:
> will he fight against mine appearing?

Digitized by Google Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

He is not so bold as to stir me up ;
who indeed could stand before me ?
Who ever attacks me in safety ?
all beneath the whole heaven is mine.
I will not take his babbling in silence,
his mighty speech and its comely arrangement.

We must regard this as a soliloquy, after which, directly addressing Job, Jehovah upbraids the 'mighty speaker' with having shut himself out by his 'blind clamour' from a view of the Divine plan of his life.

Who is this that darkens counsel
by words without knowledge ? (xxxviii. 2.)

To gain that 'knowledge' which will 'make darkness light before him,' Job must enrich his conception of God. Those striking pictures already referred to have no lower aim than to display the great All-wise God, and the irony of the catechising is only designed to bring home the more forcibly to Job human littleness and ignorance. Modern readers, however, cannot help turning aside to admire the genius of the poet and his sympathetic interest in nature. His scientific ideas may be crude ; but be observes as a poet, and not as a naturalist. Earth, sea, and sky successively enchain him, and we can hardly doubt that the natural philosophy of the Chaldæans was superficially at least known to him.[1] In his childlike curiosity and willingness to tell us everything he reminds us of the poet of the *Commedia*.

Has the rain a father ?[2]
or who has begotten the dew-drops ?
from whose womb came forth the ice,
and the hoar frost of heaven—who engendered it,
(that) the waters close together like a stone,
and the face of the deep hides itself ?

[1] See Sayce on 'Babylonian Astronomy' (*Transactions of Soc. of Bibl. Archæology*, 1874) ; Lenormant, *La magie chez les Chaldéens*, and his *Syllabaires cunéiformes* (1876), p. 48.

[2] This is not mere 'patriarchal simplicity' (Renan, p. lvi.), but a contradiction of the mythic view that a nature god like Baal is the 'father' or producer of the rain and the crops (see Cheyne, *Isaiah*, ed. 3, i. 28, 294, ii. 295). Elihu no doubt goes further in his explanations ; see xxxvi. 27, 28.

Digitized by Google Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Dost thou bind the knots of the Pleiades,[1]
or loose the fetters of Orion? [2]
Dost thou bring forth the moon's watches at their season,
and the Bear and her offspring—dost thou guide them?
Knowest thou the laws of heaven?
dost thou determine its influence upon the earth?

(xxxviii. 28–33.)

'The laws of heaven!' Can we refuse to observe the first beginnings of a conception of the cosmos, remembering other passages of the Wisdom Literature in which the great world plan is distinctly referred to? Without denying a pre-Exile, native Hebrew tendency (comp. Job xxxviii. 33 with Jer. xxxi. 35, 36) may we not suppose that the physical theology of Babylonia had a large part in determining the form of this conception? Notice the reference to the influence of the sky upon the earth, and especially the Hebraised Babylonian phrase Mazzaroth (i.e. *mazarati*,[3] plural of *mazarta*, a watch), the watches or stations of the moon which marked the progress of the month. But it is not so much the intellectual curiosity manifest in these verses which we would dwell upon now as the poetic vigour of the gallery of zoology, and, we must add, the faith which pervades it, reminding us of a Bedouin prayer quoted by Major Palmer, 'O Thou who providest for the blind hyæna, provide for me!' Ten (or nine) specimens of animal life are given—the lion and (perhaps) the raven,[4] the wild goat and the hind, the wild

[1] Heb. *kīma*; comp. Ass. *kimtu*, 'a family.' The word occurs again in ix. 9, Am. v. 8 (but are not this verse and the closely related one in iv. 13 additions by a later editor of Amos in the Exile period?)

[2] Heb. *k'sīl*, the name of the foolhardy giant who strove with Jehovah. The Chaldeo-Assyrian astrology gave the name *kisiluv* to the ninth month, connecting it with the zodiacal sign Sagittarius. But there are valid reasons for attaching the Hebrew popular myth to Orion.

[3] 'He did not watch the stars of heaven, nor the *mazarati*.' So Fox Talbo quotes from a cuneiform tablet (*Transactions of Soc. of Bibl. Archæology*, 1872, p. 341). The above explanation, however, which is that of Delitzsch on *Job*, differs from that of Fox Talbot.

[4] Mr. Bateson Wright's pointing, *lā'ereb* for *la'ōrēbh*, is plausible. The raven is an insignificant companion to the lion, and the birds of prey are mentioned at the end of Job's picture gallery. Render 'who provides in the evening his food,' &c.; but in this case should not *lābhī* in ver. 39 be rendered 'lion' rather than 'lioness' (note '*his* young ones')? The root idea is probably voracity. That

Digitized by Google Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

ass, the wild ox,[1] the ostrich, the war horse, the hawk and the eagle. It is to this portion that the student must turn who would fain know the highest attainments of the Hebrew genius in pure poetry, such as Milton would have recognised as poetry. The delighted wonder with which the writer enters into the habits of the animals, and the light and graceful movement of the verse, make the ten descriptions referred to an ever-attractive theme, I will not say for the translator, but for the interpreter. They are ideal, as the Greek sculptures are ideal, and need the pen of that poet-student, faint hints of whose coming have been given us in Herder and Rückert. The finest of them, of course, is that of one of the animals most nearly related in Arabia to man (in Arabia, but not in Judæa), the horse.

> Dost thou give might to the horse?
> Dost thou clothe his neck with waving mane?
> Dost thou make him bound as a locust?
> The peal of his snort is terrible!
> He paws in the valley and rejoices in his strength;
> he goes forth to meet the weapons;
> he laughs at fear, and is not dismayed,
> and recoils not from the sword:
> the quiver clangs upon him,
> the flashing lance and the javelin:
> bounding furiously he swallows the ground,
> and cannot stand still at the blast of the trumpet;
> at every blast he says, 'Aha!'
> and smells the battle from afar,
> the captain's thunder and the cry of battle (xxxix. 19–25).

The terrible element in animal instincts seems indeed to fascinate the mind of our poet; he closes his gallery with a sketch of the cruel instincts of the glorious eagle. We are

lābhī in iv. 11 is the feminine is no objection. Comp. Ps. lvii. 5, and perhaps Hos. xiii. 8. Possibly, however, the 'raven' was inserted here to make up the number ten, by a reminiscence of Ps. cxlvii. 9.

[1] The 'unicorn' of A. V. comes from the Sept. and Vulg.; but in Deut. xxxiii. 17 the *re'ēm* is said to have 'horns.' Schlottmann and Delitzsch identify it with the oryx or antelope, but the oryx was tamable (Wilkinson, *Egyptians*, i. 227), whereas our poet asks, 'Will the *re'ēm* be willing to serve thee?' See Cheyne on Isa. xxxiv. 7.

Digitized by Google Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

reminded, perhaps, of the lines of a poet painter inspired by Job—

> Tiger, tiger, burning bright
> In the forests of the night,
> What immortal hand or eye
> Could frame thy fearful symmetry?[1]

And now we might almost think that the object of the theophany has been attained. Never more will Job presume to litigate with Shaddai, or measure the doings of God by his puny intellect. He has learned the lesson expressed in Dante's line—

> State contenti, umana gente, al quia,[2]

but also that higher lesson, so boldly expressed by the same poet, that in all God's works, without exception, three attributes are seen united—

> Fecemi la divina potestate,
> La somma sapienza, e 'l primo amore.[3]

He is silenced, indeed, but only as with the poet of Paradise—

> All' alta fantasia qui mancò possa.[4]

The silence with which both these 'vessels of election' meet the Divine revelation is the silence of satisfaction, even though this be mingled with awe. Job has learned to forget himself in the wondrous creation of which he forms a part, just as Dante when he saw

> La forma universal di questo nodo.[5]

Job cannot, indeed, as yet express his feelings; awe preponderates over satisfaction in the words assigned to him in xl. 4, 5. In fact, he has fallen below his better knowledge, and must be humbled for this. He has known that he is but a part of humanity—a representative of the larger whole, and might, but for his frailty, have comforted himself in that thought. God's power and wisdom and goodness are so wondrously blended in the great human organism that he

[1] Blake, *Songs of Experience.*
[2] *Purg.*, iii. 37.
[3] *Inf.*, iii. 5, 6.
[4] *Parad.*, xxxiii. 142.
[5] *Parad.*, xxxiii. 91.

Digitized by Google
Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

might have rested amidst his personal woes in the certainty of at least an indirect connection with the gentler manifestations of the 'Watcher of mankind' (vii. 20). This thought has proved ineffectual, and so the Divine Instructor tries another order of considerations. And, true enough, nature effects what 'the still, sad music of humanity' has failed to teach. Job, however, needs more than teaching; he needs humiliation for his misjudgment of God's dealings with him personally. Hence in His second short but weighty speech 'out of the tempest' Jehovah begins with the question (xl. 8)—

> Wilt thou make void my justice?
> wilt thou condemn me, that thou mayest be righteous?

This gives the point of view from which Jehovah ironically invites Job, if he thinks (see chap. xxiv.) that he can govern the world—the human as well as the extra-human world—better than the Creator, to make the bold attempt. He bids him array himself with the Divine majesty and carry out that retribution in which Jehovah, according to him, has so completely failed (xl. 11–13). If Job will prove his competence for the office which he claims, then Jehovah Himself will recognise his independence and extol his inherent strength. Did the poet mean to finish the second speech of Jehovah here? It is probable; the subject of the interrogatory hardly admitted of being developed further in poetry. A later writer (or, as Merx thinks, the poet of *Job* himself) seems to have found the speech too short, and therefore appended the two fancy sketches of animals which follow. But in the original draft of the poem xl. 14 must have been followed immediately by Job's retractation, closing with those striking words (see above, p. 49) which so well supplement the less articulate confession of xl. 4, 5—

> I had heard of thee by the hearing of the ear,
> but now mine eye sees thee:[1]
> therefore I retract and repent
> in dust and ashes (xlii. 5, 6).

[1] [All his thinkings seemed like hearsay. This, then, was the real God.] So an anonymous writer well expresses it (*Mark Rutherford's Deliverance*, p. 196).

Digitized by Google Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

How complete a reversal of the 'princely' anticipations of Job in xxxi. 37! To us, indeed, it may seem somewhat ungracious to Job to give this as the last scene of his pathetic drama. But the poet leaves it open to us to animate Job's repentance with love as well as awe and compunction. With fine feeling Blake in his seventeenth illustration almost fills the margin with passages from the Johannine writings.

The long description of the two Egyptian monsters (xl. 15, xli. 26) is, as we have hinted above, out of place in the second speech of Jehovah. It has indeed been suggested that the writer may have intended it as a development of xl. 14—

> Then will I in return confess unto thee
> that thy right hand can help thee—

which implies that Job has no power to help himself in the government of the world. According to this view, the opening words of the behemoth section will mean, 'Consider, pray, that thou hast fellow-creatures which are far stronger than thou; and how canst thou undertake the management of the universe?' It must, however, be admitted that the emphasis thus laid on the omnipotence of God, apart from His righteousness, introduces an obscurity into the argument which almost compels us to assume that the sketches of behemoth and leviathan are later insertions. At any rate, even if we regard them as the work of the principal writer of Job, we must at least ascribe them to one of those afterthoughts by which poets not unfrequently spoil their best productions. The style of the description, too, is less chastened than that of chaps. xxxviii. xxxix. (so that Bickell can hardly be right in placing xl. 15, &c., immediately after xxxix. 30), and if it relates to the hippopotamus and the crocodile is less true to nature than the other 'animal pieces.'

The truth is that neither behemoth nor leviathan corresponds strictly to any known animal. The tail of a hippopotamus would surely not have been compared to a cedar by a truthful though poetic observer like the author of chaps. xxxviii. xxxix. Moreover that animal was habitually hunted

Digitized by Google Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

by the Egyptians with lance and harpoon, and was therefore no fit symbol of indomitable pride. The crocodile too was attacked and killed by the Egyptians, though in xli. 26–29 leviathan is said to laugh at his assailants. Seneca in his description of Egypt describes the crocodile as 'fugax animal audaci, audacissimum timido' (*Quæst. Nat.*, iv. 2). Comp. Ezek. xxix. 4, xxxii. 3; Herod. ii. 70.

To me, indeed, as well as to M. Chabas, the behemoth and the leviathan seem to claim a kinship with the dragons and other imaginary monsters of the Swiss topographies of the sixteenth century. A still more striking because a nearer parallel is adduced by M. Chabas from the Egyptian monuments, where, side by side with the most accurate pictures from nature, we often find delineations of animals which cannot have existed out of wonderland.[1]

It is remarkable that the elephant should not have been selected as a type of strange and wondrous animal life; apparently it was not yet known to the Hebrew writers, though of course it might be urged that the poet was accidentally prevented from writing more. Merx has pointed out that the description of behemoth is evidently incomplete. He also thinks that the poet has not yet brought the form of these passages to final perfection: a struggle with the difficulties of expression is observable. He therefore relegates xl. 15–xli. 26 to an appendix with the suggestive title (comp. Goethe's *Faust*) Paralipomena to Job. He thinks that a reader or admirer of the original poem sought to preserve these unfinished sketches by placing them where they now stand. This is probably the most conservative theory (i.e. the nearest to the traditional view) critically admissible.

[1] *Etudes sur l'antiquité historique*, prem. éd., pp. 391–393.

Digitized by Google
Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

CHAPTER VI.

THE EPILOGUE AND ITS MEANING.

WE now come to the *dénoûment* of the story (xlii. 7–17), against which, from the point of view of internal criticism, much were possible to be said. We shall not, however, here dwell upon the inconsistencies between the epilogue on the one hand and the prologue and the speeches on the other. The main point for us to emphasise is the disappointingness of the events of the epilogue regarded as the final outcome of Job's spiritual discipline. Surely the high thoughts which have now and then visited Job's mind, and which, combined with the personal self-revelation of the Creator, must have brought back the sufferer to a state of childlike resignation, stand in inappropriate companionship with a tame and commonplace renewal of mere earthly prosperity. Would it not have been fitter for the hero on whom so much moral training had been lavished to pass with humble but courageous demeanour through the dark valley, at the issue of which he would 'see God'? It is hardly a sufficient answer that a concession was necessary to the prejudices of the unspiritual multitude; for what was the object of the poem, if not to subvert the dominion of a one-sided retribution theory? The solution probably is that Job in the epilogue is a type of suffering, believing, and glorified Israel. Not only the individual believer, not only all the elect spirits of suffering humanity, but the beloved nation of the poet—Israel, the 'Servant of Jehovah'—must receive a special message of comfort from the great poem. In Isa. lxi. 7 we read that glorified Israel is to 'have double (compensation) instead of its shame;' comp. Zech. ix. 12, Jer. xvi. 14–18. The people of Israel,

Digitized by Google Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

according to the limited view of the prophets, was bound indissolubly to the Holy Land. The only promise, therefore, which would be consolatory for suffering Israel, the only possible sign of God's restored favour, was a material one including fresh 'children' and many flocks and herds (Isa. liv. 1, lx. 7). Observe in this connection the phrase, xlii. 10, 'Jehovah turned the fortunes of Job' (others, as A. V., 'turned the captivity of Job')—the phrase so well known in passages relating to Israel (e.g. Ps. xiv. 7, Joel iii. 1).

The explanation is perhaps adequate. Some, however, will be haunted by a doubt whether the author of the prologue would not have thrown more energy and enthusiasm into the closing narrative. An early reader, probably of Pharisaic leanings, felt the poverty of the epilogue,[1] and sought to remedy it by the following addition in the Septuagint: 'And Job died, old and full of days; and it is written that he will rise again with those whom the Lord raiseth.'[2] The remainder of the Septuagint appendix testifies only to the love of the later Jews for amplifying Biblical notices (see Chap. VII.) Our own poet painter has also amplified the details of the epilogue, but in how different a way! (Gilchrist's *Life of Blake*, i. 332–3).

[1] Other readers, however, found no difficulty in the close of the story; to such St. James addresses himself in the words, 'Ye have heard of the endurance of Job, and have seen the end of the Lord' (James v. 11), i.e. the blessed end vouchsafed by the Lord to Job. It was also, no doubt, such a reader who composed the beautiful romance of Tobit, to show that, however tried, the righteous man is at last delivered by his God.

[2] Those rabbis who in later times held this view appear to have assumed that Job was of the Israelitish race (Frankl in Grätz's *Monatsschrift*, 1872, p. 311).

Digitized by Google
Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

CHAPTER VII.

THE TRADITIONAL BASIS AND THE PURPOSE OF JOB.

I.

Did Job really live?

THIS is widely different, remarks Umbreit,[1] from the question whether Job actually said and did all that is related of him in our book. It is scarcely necessary, he adds, in the present day to disprove the latter, but we have no reason to doubt the former (the theory as to the historical existence of a sort of Arabian king Priam, named Job). In truth, we have no positive evidence either for affirming or denying it, unless the 'holy places,' each reputed to be Job's grave, may be mentioned in this connection. The allusion in Ezek. xiv. 14 to 'Noah, Daniel, and Job,' proves no more than that a tradition of some sort existed respecting the *righteous* Job during the Babylonian Exile: we cannot tell how much Ezekiel knew besides Job's righteousness. In later times, Jewish students do appear to have believed that 'Job existed;' but the force of the argument is weakened by the uncritical character of the times, and the extreme form in which this belief was held by them. How early doubts arose, we know not. The authors of *Tobit* and *Susanna* may very likely have been only half-believers, since they evidently imitate the story of Job in their romantic compositions. At any rate, the often-quoted saying of Rabbi Resh Lakish, איוב לא היה ולא נברא אלא משל היה, 'Job existed not, and was not created, but he is (only) a parable,'[2] shows that even before the Talmud great freedom

[1] *Book of Job* (1836), E. T. i. 7.

[2] *Baba Bathra*, § 15, 1. Comp. Frankl in Grätz's *Monatsschrift*, 1872, pp. 309–310.

Digitized by Google Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

of speech prevailed among the Rabbis on such points. In Hai Gaon's time (d. 1037), the saying quoted must have given offence to some, for this Rabbi not only appeals for the historical character of Job to the passage in Ezekiel, but wishes (on traditional authority) to alter the reading of Resh Lakish's words, so as to read איוב לא היה ולא נברא אלא למשל, 'Job existed not, and was not created, except to be a parable.'[1] (See note 7, Appendix.)

The prevailing opinion among the Jews doubtless continued to be that the Book of Job was strictly historical, and Christian scholars (with the exception of Theodore—see Chap. XV.) found no reason to question this till Luther arose, with his genial, though unscientific, insistence on the right of questioning tradition. In his *Tischreden* Luther says, 'Ich halte das Buch Hiob für eine wahre Historia; dass aber alles so sollte geschehen und gehandelt sein, glaube ich nicht, sondern ich halte, dass ein feiner, frommer, gelehrter Mann habe es in solche Ordnung bracht.'[2] Poetically treated history—that is Luther's idea, as it was that of Grotius after him, and in our own country of that morning-star of Biblical criticism, Bishop Lowth.[3] It is acquiesced in by Schlottmann, Delitzsch, and Davidson, and with justice, provided it be clearly understood that no positive opinion can reasonably be held as to the historical origin of the tradition (*Sage*, Ewald) used by the author. I have said nothing of Spinoza and Albert Schultens. The former[4] pronounces most unfavourably on the religious and poetical value of the book which he regards as a heathenish fiction, reminding us somewhat (see elsewhere) of the hasty and ill-advised Theodore of Mopsuestia. The latter[5] actually defends the historical character both of the narratives and of the colloquies of Job in the strictest sense. Hengstenberg, alone perhaps among orthodox theologians, takes a precisely opposite view. Like Reuss and Merx, he regards the poem as entirely a work of

[1] Ewald and Dukes, *Beiträge zur Gesch. der ältesten Auslegung*, ii. 166.
[2] *Werke* (Walch), xxii. 2093. [3] *De sacrâ poesi* (1753), Prælect. xxxii.
[4] *Tractatus theologico-politicus*, c. x.
[5] *Liber Jobi* (1737), vol. i., *in fine Præf.*

Digitized by Google Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

imagination. We may be thankful for his protest against applying a prosaic standard to the poetical books of the Hebrew Canon. Those who do so, he remarks,[1] 'fail to observe that the book stands, not among historical, but among poetical books, and that it would betray a very low grade of culture, were one to depreciate imaginative as compared with historical writing, and declare it to be unsuitable for sacred Scripture.'

I entirely agree with the eminent scholar, whose unprogressive theology could not entirely extinguish his literary and philological sense. But I see no sufficient reason for adopting what in itself, I admit, would add a fresh laurel to the poet's crown. Merx indeed assures us[2] that the meaning of the name 'Job' is so redolent of allegory that it must be the poet's own invention, especially as the name occurs nowhere else in the Old Testament. He adds that the story of Job is so closely connected with the didactic part of the book that it would be lost labour to separate the legendary from the new material. All was wanted; therefore all is fictitious. This is not, however, the usual course of procedure with poets whether of the East or of the West, whose parsimony in the invention of plots is well known. As for the name Job (*Iyyob*) it may no doubt be explained (from the Arabic) 'he who turns to God,'[3] and in other ways, but there is no evidence that the author thought of any meaning for it. When he does coin names (see Epilogue), there is no room for doubting their significance. Ewald may, certainly, have gone too far in trying to recover the traditional element: how difficult it would be to do so with *Paradise Lost*, if we had not Genesis to help us! But the probability of the existence of a legend akin to the narrative in the Prologue, is shown by the parallels to it which survive, e.g. the touching Indian story

[1] *Das Buch Hiob* (1870–75), i. 35.

[2] *Das Buch Hiob*, Vorbemerkungen, p. xxxv.

[3] In Korán, xxxviii. 16, 29, 44, David, Solomon, and Job are all called, one after another, *awwâb*, i.e. not 'penitent,' but 'ever turning to God.' Hitzig remarks that Iyyôb (Arabic *Ayyûb*) will thus be equivalent to the mythic prophet Saleh (= 'pious') in the Korán (*Das Buch Hiob*, Einl., S. x.), on whom see Palmer, *Desert of the Exodus*, p. 50, where he is identified with Moses. This is bold, and, in any case, must not such a name be comparatively modern?

Digitized by Google Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

of Harischandra,[1] given by Dr. Muir in vol. i. of his *Sanskrit Texts*. The resemblance may be slight and superficial, but the sudden ruin of a good man's fortunes is common to both stories. Had we more knowledge of Arabic antiquity, we should doubtless find a more valuable parallel.[2]

The story of Job had a special attraction for Mohammed, who enriched it (following the precedent of the Jewish Haggada) with a fresh detail (Korán, xxxviii. 40). To him, as well as to St. James, Job was an example of 'endurance.' The dialogue between Allah and Eblis in Korán, xv. 32–42, may perhaps have been suggested by the Prologue of our poem.

'Did then, Job really live?' That for which we most care comes not from 'Tradition, Time's suspected register,'[3] but from an unnamed poet, who embellished tradition partly from imagination, partly (see next section) from the rich and varied stores of his own experience.

2.

The Autobiographical Element in its Bearing on the Purpose of the Poem.

A German critic (Dillmann), in speaking of *Job*, has well reminded us that 'the idea of a work of art must reveal itself in the development of the piece: it is not to be condensed into a dry formula.' Least of all, surely, is such formulation possible when the work of art is an idealised portraiture of the author himself, and such, I think, to a considerable extent is the Book of Job. Those words of a psalmist,

> Come and hear, all ye that fear God,
> and I will declare what he hath done for my soul
> (Ps. lxvi. 16, R. V.)

might be taken as the motto of *Job*. In short, the author is

[1] This was perhaps first pointed out by Schlottmann, in chap. i. of the Introduction to his Commentary.

[2] Nothing can be built upon the occurrence of the name Ayyûb in pre-Islamic times, for Jews and Arabs were in frequent intercourse before Mohammed.

[3] Davenant.

Digitized by Google
Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

thoroughly 'subjective,' like all the great Hebrew and especially the Arabian poets. 'In the rhythmic swell of Job's passionate complaints, there is an echo of the heart-beats of a great poet and a great sufferer. The cry "Perish the day in which I was born" (iii. 3) is a true expression of the first effects of some unrecorded sorrow. In the life-like description beginning "Oh that I were as in months of old" (xxix. 2), the writer is thinking probably of his own happier days, before misfortune overtook him. Like Job (xxix. 7, 21–25) he had sat in the "broad place" by the gate and solved the doubts of perplexed clients. Like Job, he had maintained his position triumphantly against other wise men. He had a fellow-feeling with Job in the distressful passage through doubt to faith. Like Job (xxi. 16) he had resisted the suggestion of practical atheism, and with the confession of his error (xlii. 2–6) had recovered spiritual peace.'

The man who speaks to us under the mask of Job is not indeed a perfect character; but he does not pretend to be so. How pathetic are his appeals to his friends to remember the weight of his calamity—'therefore have my words been wild' (vi. 3)—and not to 'be captious about words when the speeches of the desperate are but for the wind' (vi. 26). He was no Stoic, and had not practised himself in deadening his sensibility to pain. Strong in his sense of justice, he lacked those higher intuitions which could alone soothe his irritation. But he was throughout loyal to the God whom his conscience revered, and, even in the midst of his wild words, he let God mould him. First of all, he renounced the hope of being understood by men; he ceased to complain of his rather ignorant than unfeeling friends. He exemplified that Arabic proverb which says, 'Perfect patience allows no complaint to be heard against (human creatures).' Then he came by degrees to trust God. There is a kernel of truth in that passage of the Jerusalem Talmud (*Berakhoth*, cix. 5) where, among the seven types of Pharisees, the sixth is described as 'he who is pious from fear, like Job,' and the seventh, as 'he who is pious from love, like Abraham.' Job's religion was at first not entirely but still too much marked by fear; it ended by becoming a religion of

Digitized by Google Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

trust, justifying the title borne by Job among the Syrians, as if in contradiction to the Talmud, of 'the lover of the Lord.'[1]

So far as the author of *Job* has any direct purpose beyond that of giving a helpful picture of his own troubles, it is no doubt principally a polemical one. He has suffered so deeply from the inveterate error (once indeed a relative truth) so tenaciously maintained by the wisest men that he would fain crush the source of so much heart-breaking misery. But that for which we love the book is its *φιλανθρωπία*, its brotherly love to all mankind. No doubt the author thinks first of Israel, then (as I suppose) suffering exile; but the care with which the poem is divested of Israelitish peculiarities, seems to show that he looks beyond his own people, just as in his view of God he has broken the bonds of a narrow 'particularism.' 'I can see no other explanation of those apparently hyperbolical complaints, that strange invasion of self-consciousness, and that no less strange 'enthusiasm of humanity'[2] . . . . than the view expressed or implied by Chateaubriand, that Job is a type of righteous men in affliction—not merely in the land of Uz, nor among the Jews in Babylonia, nor yet, on Warburton's theory of the poem, in the Judæa of the time of Nehemiah, but wherever on the wide earth tears are shed and hearts are broken.' This is the truth in the too often exaggerated allegorical view[3] of the poem of *Job*. According to his wont, the author lets us read his meaning by occasional bold inconsistencies. No individual can use such phraseology as we find in xvii. 1, xviii. 2, 3, xix. 11, and perhaps I may add xvi. 10, xxvii. 11, 12. And yet the fact that Job often speaks as the 'type of suffering humanity' no more destroys

[1] Hottinger, referred to by Delitzsch, *Iob*, p. 7. In the Peshitto, Heb. xii. 3–11 has for a sub-title, 'In commemoration of Job the righteous.' The choice of the section shows in what sense Job's 'righteousness' is affirmed—not the Talmudic.

[2] See especially Job vi. 2, 3, vii. 1–3, xiv. 1–3.

[3] This view goes back to the last century (Warburton, Michaelis, &c.) It has been remodelled by Seinecke and Hoekstra, who regard Job, not as the people of Israel in general, but the idealised Israel or 'Servant of Jehovah.' See especially Hoekstra's essay, *Theologisch Tijdschrift*, 1871, p. 1 &c., and Kuenen's reply, *Th. Ti.*, 1873, p. 492 &c.

Digitized by Google
Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

his claim to be an individual 'than the typical character of Dante in his pilgrimage and of Faust in Goethe's great poem annuls the historical element in those two great poetical figures.' [1]

3.

The Purpose of Job as illustrated by Criticism.

More precise definitions of the purpose of Job depend on the acceptance of a critical analysis of the book. Some suggestions on this subject have been already given to facilitate the due comprehension of the poem. I must now offer the reader a connected sketch of the possible or probable stages of its growth. This, if it bears being tested, will perhaps reveal the special purpose of the several parts, and above all of that most precious portion—the Colloquies of Job and his friends. (Compare below, Chap. XII.)

I. The narrative which forms the Prologue is based upon a traditional story which represented Job as hurled from the height of happiness into an abyss of misery, but preserving a devout serenity in the midst of trouble. It is impossible to feel sure that this Prologue is by the same author as the following Colloquies. It stands in no very close connection with them; 'the Satan' in particular (an omission which struck William Blake [2]) is not heard of again in the book; and there is abundant evidence of the liking of the pre-Exile writers for a tasteful narrative style. It is not a wild conjecture that the first two chapters originally formed the principal part of a prose book of Job, comparable to the 'books' once current of Elijah, and perhaps one may add of Balaam and of Daniel—a book free from any speculations of the 'wise men' and in no sense a *māshāl* or gnomic poem, but supplying in its own way a high and adequate solution of

[1] Quoted from Essay ix. in vol. ii. of *The Prophecies of Isaiah*.

[2] Blake's 16th design is devoted to the defeat of Satan. Beneath the enthroned Jehovah and his angels, 'the Evil One falls with tremendous plummet-force, Hell naked before his face, and Destruction without a covering.' Another point in which Blake corrects his author is the introduction of Job's wife into the illustrations of the Colloquies.

Digitized by Google Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

the great problem of the suffering of the righteous. The writer of this Prologue, whether he also wrote the Colloquies or not, firmly believed that the calamities which sometimes fell on the innocent were both for the glory of God and of human nature. It was possible, he said, to continue in one's integrity, though no earthly advantage accrued from it. If the Prologue once formed part of a distinct prose 'book' of Job, one can hardly suppose that the same author wrote the Epilogue; for while the Colloquies *do* contain hints of Job's typical character (as to some extent a representative of humanity), the Prologue does not, and it is only the typical or allegorical intepretation which makes the Epilogue tolerable. In fact, the Epilogue must, as it seems to me, have been written, if not by the author of the Colloquies, yet by some one who had this work before him. The prose 'book' of Job, if it existed, and if it originated in Judah, cannot have been written before the Chaldæan period. This period and no other explains the moral purpose of the 'book,' precisely as the age of the despotic Louis XIV. is the only one which suits the debate on the disinterested love of God with which the name of Fénelon is inseparably connected. The Chaldæan period, however, we must remember, did not begin with the Captivity, but with the appearance of the Babylonian power on the horizon of Palestine. We must not therefore *too hastily* assume that the Book of Job is a monument of the Babylonian Captivity, true as I myself believe this hypothesis to be.

We are, however, of course not confined to this hypothesis of a prose 'book' of Job. The author of the Colloquies may have been equally fitted to be a writer of narrative, and may have felt that the solution mentioned above, although the highest, was not the only one admissible. We may therefore conceive of him as following up the solution offered in the Prologue by a ventilation of the great moral problem before himself and his fellow 'wise men.' He throws the subject open as it were to general discussion, and invests all the worthiest speculations of his time in the same flowing poetical dress, that no fragment of truth contained in them may be lost. He himself is far from absolutely rejecting any of them;

Digitized by Google
Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

he only seems to deny that the ideas of the three representative sages can be applied at once, as they apply them, to the case of one like Job.

[Böttcher, however, regards Job as the work of one principal and several subordinate writers. It was occasioned, he thinks, by a conversation on the sufferings of innocent men, at that time so frequent (i.e. in the reign of Manasseh). See his *Aehrenlese*, p. 68.]

II. The completion or publication of the colloquies revealed (or seemed to reveal) sundry imperfections in the original mode of treating the subject. Some other 'wise men,' therefore (or possibly, except in the case of III., the author himself), inserted passages in the poem with the view of qualifying or supplementing its statements. These were merely laid in, without being welded with the rest of the book. The first in order of these additions is chap. xxviii., which cannot be brought into a logical connection with the chapters among which it is placed, in spite of the causal particle 'for' prefixed to it ('*For* there is a vein'). It is possible, indeed, that it has been extracted from some other work. The hypothesis of insertion (or, if used without implying illicit tampering with the text, 'interpolation') is confirmed by the occurrence of 'Adonai' in ver. 28, which is contrary to the custom of the author of Job, and by its highly rhetorical character. If the passage was written with a view to the Book of Job, we must suppose the author to have been dissatisfied with the original argument, and to have sought a solution for the problem in the inscrutableness of the divine wisdom. Zophar, it is true, had originally alluded to this attribute, but with a more confined object. According to him, God, being all-wise, can detect sins invisible to mortal eyes (xi. 6):—it is needless to draw out the wide difference between this slender inference and the large theory which appears to be suggested in chap. xxviii.

III. One of the less progressive 'wise men' was scandalised at the irreverent statements of Job and dissatisfied with the three friends' mode of dealing with them (xxxii. 2, 3). Hence the speeches of Elihu, the most generally recognised

Digitized by Google Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

of all the inserted portions (chaps. xxxii.–xxxvii.) The author partly imitates the speeches of Jehovah.

IV. In another inserted passage (ch. xxxviii.–xl. 14, xlii. 1–6), the Almighty is represented as chastising the presumption of Job, and showing forth the supreme wisdom by contrast with Job's unwisdom. It is clear that the copy in which it was inserted was without the speeches of Elihu, for the opening words of Jehovah (xxxviii. 2) clearly have reference to the last discourse of Job, which they must have been intended to follow. The effect of this fine passage is much impaired by the interposition of the speeches of Elihu.

V. The description of the behémoth and the leviathan (xl. 15–24, xli.) seems also to be a later insertion, and somewhat more recent than the speeches of Jehovah. It is a 'purple patch,' and the appendix last mentioned gains by its removal.

VI. An editor appended the epilogue. He must have had the prologue before him, but took no pains to bring his own work into harmony with it, except in the one point which he could not help adopting, namely the vast riches of his hero. He agreed with Job's friends on the grand question of retribution, though he would not sanction their line of argument. Job's doubts, according to him, contained more faith than their uncharitable dogmatism.

Can we feel grateful to this writer? He has at any rate relieved the strain upon the imagination of the reader, and possibly, if we assume him to be distinct from the author of the Prologue, carried out an unfulfilled intention of that author (note the words in i. 12, 'only upon himself put not forth thy hand'). But he did so in a prosaic spirit, and made a sad concession to a low view of providential dealings. He has also, I think, caused much misunderstanding of the object of the book. Thus we find Dr. Ginsburg saying,[1]

> The Book of Job . . . . only confirms the old opinion that the righteous are visibly rewarded here, inasmuch as it represents their calamities as transitory, and Job himself as restored to double his original wealth and happiness in this life.

Against which I enter a respectful protest.

[1] Art. 'Ecclesiastes,' *Ency. Brit.*, 9th ed.

Digitized by Google

Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

The view here adopted of the gradual growth of the book seems important for its right comprehension. In its present form, it seems like a very confused theodicy, designed to justify God against the charge of bringing misfortune upon innocent persons. But when the disturbing elements are removed, we see that the book is simply an expression of the conflicting thoughts of an earnest, warm-hearted man on the great question of suffering. He protests, it is true, against the rigour and uncharitableness of the traditional orthodox belief, but is far more aspiring to solve the problem theoretically. This is one chief point in which he differs from his interpolators (if the word may be used), who mostly appear to have had some favourite theory (or partial view of truth) to advocate.

Digitized by Google
Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY

CHAPTER VIII.

DATE AND PLACE OF COMPOSITION.

WE have seen (Chap. VII.) that the unity of authorship of the Book of Job is not beyond dispute, but we shall not at present assume the results of analysis. Let us endeavour to treat of the date and place of composition on the hypothesis that the book is a whole as it stands (on the Elihu-portion however, comp. Chap. XII.) It is at any rate probable that the greater part of it at least proceeds from the same period. Can that period be the patriarchal? The author has sometimes received credit for his faithful picture of this early age. This is at any rate plausible. For instance, he avoids the use of the sacred name Jehovah, revealed to Moses according to Ex. vi. 3. Then, too, the great age ascribed to Job in the Epilogue (xlii. 16) agrees with the notices of the patriarchs. The uncoined piece of silver (Heb. *kesita*) which each kinsman of Job gave him after his recovery (xlii. 11), is only mentioned again in Gen. xxxiii. 19 (Josh. xxiv. 32). The musical instruments referred to in xxi. 12, xxx. 31, are also mentioned in Gen. iv. 21, xxxi. 27. There is no protest against idolatry either in the Book of Job[1] or in Genesis. Job himself offers sacrifices to the one true God, like the patriarchs, and the kind of sacrifice offered is the burnt-offering (i. 5, xlii. 8); there is no mention of guilt- or sin-offerings. The settled life of Job, too, as described in the Prologue is not inconsistent with the story of Jacob's life in the vale of

[1] The absence of such a protest is characteristic of the Wisdom-literature in general. The reference to star-worship in Job xxxi. 26 suggests a date subsequent to the origination of the title 'Jehovah (God) of Hosts.' See appendix to Isa. i. in my commentary.

Digitized by Google
Original from HARVARD UNIVERSITY