

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

sixty thousand words, but spite of its copiousness, still far from complete, and an insufficient guide through the Sanskrit literature. A great desideratum, namely, a Glossary to the episodes and extracts which have been published in Germany, has been furnished to beginners by Bopp himself.

ARTICLE V.

SPIRITUALITY OF THE BOOK OF JOB AS EXHIBITED IN A COMMENTARY ON CHAPTER XIV, EXAMINED IN CONNECTION WITH OTHER PASSAGES.

By Taylor Lewis, LL. D., Professor of Greek in the University of the City of New York.
(Concluded from p. 229.)

Verse 13. *כי רתן בשאול תצטנני*. The apparent utter despondency of the preceding expressions is succeeded by the language of agonizing prayer, as though the gloomy conception had suggested and even impelled the cry for deliverance. The idea of annihilation, when dwelt upon, becomes intolerable. The earnestness of the petition shows that the seemingly despairing statement had not been the language of denial, but of a soul seeking in it a confirmation to faith as the only refuge from the intolerable darkness of the opposing view. *Oh that thou wouldst lay me up in Hades.* *צָפַן* means not simply to conceal generally, like *סָתַר* or *הִסְתִּיר*, but also to *lay away in security as a precious deposit*. Compare Ps. 27: 5 *He will hide me in his pavilion, in the secret of his tabernacle*. Hence the righteous are called *צְפוּנֵי יְהוָה*, *clientes Jehovah*, as Gesenius gives it—more properly—*His hidden ones*.

שְׂאוּל. This word alone is sufficient proof that the ancient Hebrews, from the earliest periods of their language, believed in a separate world of souls, a realm of the dead, distinct from the grave, for which they had another distinct and well known term. Although regarded as denoting a subterranean habitation, or as a region to which the grave might seem the local entrance, yet almost every use of the word, from Genesis to Malachi, indicates a conception clearly distinct from that of the mere earthly receptacle of the body. This, indeed, seems conceded both by Herder and Rosenmüller. There can be no better proof than the account of the transaction between Saul and the

witch of Endor, to convince any candid mind that such a ghost-world, or realm of departed spirits, was a settled part of the *common belief of the common Jewish mind*, entertained as strongly, and perhaps more strongly, than the prevailing notions now existing respecting an unseen spirit land. Whatever view we may take of that strange narrative, as wholly or partly real in respect to the particular scenes exhibited, it proves incontestably three things. It shows us, first, a common or popular belief in a world of departed spirits; secondly, a belief in the reëpearance of such spirits, at certain times, upon the earth; and thirdly, in the power of a certain class of persons called *oboth* (אֹבוֹת) thus to have intercourse with, and to bring up, the departed dead. In fact, this incident, together with the frequent mention of the effort made to put a stop to the evil practices connected with such a belief, and which date back to the time of Moses, proves that among the Jews there was as firm a recognition of a ghostly state, as has ever prevailed among us. The very name given to these professed dealers with the spiritual world, was sometimes applied to the ghost itself, as in Isa. 29: 4, And thy voice shall be like that of a *spirit* (רוּחַ) *coming out of the earth*.¹

There may be traced a manifest resemblance between the Hebrew Sheol and the Greek Hades. The etymology ever given by the older Hebraists, whether Jews or Christians, made this more striking. Hades means the *invisible*, the *unknown*. The same idea was sought in the Hebrew word, by supposing it to be derived from the verb אָשַׁא, to *ask* or *demand*. Of this, two views were taken: one referred the verb to the ghostly world itself, as ever *demanding* or *asking* more and more victims, as never satisfied, *rapax orcus*,² as it is styled by the Latin poet Catullus; the other regarded it as addressed, objectively, to Sheol, in the sense of anxious and gloomy interrogation. In this way it presents the conception of the unknown state, towards which is ever directed the very inquiry contained in the 10th verse of this chapter, *Man dies and yields up his breath, and oh where is he?* (יָיָא) It is the unseen spirit land, from whence no answer comes, although so often and so anxiously invoked. From such conception came the ancient practice of thrice solemnly calling upon the *manes*, as the mortal remains were borne towards their final resting place. It is this feeling of the unknown, of the unseen, of the unsatisfied, which be-

¹ Gesenius defines the רוּחַ *νεκρόμαντις*, i. e. *hæriolus incantationum et carminum magicorum vi manes evocans*.

² It would almost seem as if there were some allusion to such a *supposed* etymological sense of the word, by the prophet Habakkuk, ch. ii. verse 5, *who hath enlarged his desire like Sheol, and cannot be satisfied*.

longs to the Greek Hades; and if this derivation could be allowed, the Hebrew Sheol would etymologically present the same *idea*, only through a different organ of sense. From the one, it might be said, there comes no gleam of light to the anxious eye;¹ from the other, no voice to the listening ear. The other derivation, which is probably the correct one, regards it as connected with the radical שָׁוַה, having the sense of *hollowness, cavity*, and corresponding to the Greek *κοῖλος*, the German *Hölle*.

Although the Hebrew conception of Sheol, as well as the Greek of Hades, was of a sombre, and on the whole undesirable state, still it was regarded as a condition of conscious rest, where one might be supposed to repose in security under the watchful eye of God, and which might, therefore, be looked to and prayed for, by the suffering, as a refuge from the overwhelming calamities of the present life. Thus the ghost of Samuel complains, or is represented as complaining, when disquieted and made again to revisit the agitating scenes of this world, 1 Sam. 28: 15. There are, moreover, some few intimations of distinct apartments for the righteous and the wicked. It is in reference to the latter, that it is so often spoken of as the *pit*; and there are now and then expressions of a far different kind, which seem to denote a different *state*, if not a different *locality*, for the beloved of God. Of this kind were, *the congregation of the fathers—the secret place of the Most High—the shadow of the Almighty*, where he hides his *chasidim*, or *subjects of his grace*. These latter terms, it is true, are metaphorically used of the divine protection even in this life; but they may be also regarded as having their fullest import in reference to the unseen world, and to those who, although long since departed, are said still to “*live unto Him*,” and of whom he styles himself “*their God*.” *He is not the God of the dead, but of the living*.

The general feeling, however, accompanying the word Sheol, is that of a joyless and undesirable life; and therefore, although Job may have looked to it as, in some sense, a refuge, there is an exceeding naturalness and probability in the allusion which he afterward seems to make to a deliverance from Sheol into some higher condition of renovated being, whenever and wherever it might be, whether upon the earth, or in the heavens, or heaven of heavens; whether to be a life like the present, or one far more blessed, permanent, and glorious. As also in

¹ With the etymological conception of Hades, as the obscure, the unknown, the invisible, are connected some of the more common expressions of the Greek poets for life, such as *ὄραν φῶς ἡλιόιο*, and also the poetical use of verbs of sight as equivalent to *ζῆν* or *ζῶειν*. The same metaphor also exists in the Hebrew, as in Ecclesiastes 11: 7, *It is a pleasant thing to behold the sun*.

Ps. 49: 15, where the whole context impels us to regard it as spoken of a state after death, in which there shall be some deliverance peculiar to the righteous, and not of a mere temporal salvation: *surely God will redeem my soul from the hand (or power) of Sheol, for He will receive me.* Compare also Ps. 16: 10, *Thou wilt not leave my soul in Sheol.*

The reader will pardon us here, in making a summary review of the probable state of this ancient belief in a future life, the modified aspects under which it may have been held, at different times, in different nations, or in different states of individual souls, and of the circumstances to which may be ascribed its growth and development in the world. There may be traced, we think, two several kinds or rather grades of belief. There was, *first*, the common *creed*, or rather *sentiment*; of which we have spoken as being universal in the age of Job. It was the bare notion of a continued spiritual existence after the dissolution of the body. This was in some unknown though generally imagined subterranean locality. It was thought of by means of conceptions derived, in a great measure, from the impressive phenomena of the dying hour, and of the grave or funereal rites, and therefore tinged with many sombre and fear inspiring shades. To this extent, at least, the dogma of a ghostly world seems to have been held, *semper, ubique, et ab omnibus.* Pages of antiquarian research could produce no surer conviction of its universality than the repeated Homeric expression, *κλυτὰ ἔθνεα νεκρῶν*, *The renowned, the far-famed nations of the dead of whom all have heard*—who were everywhere the subjects of religious rites, and addressed with sacrifices and supplications.

Again, there was, in the *second* place, what may be styled the occasional or individual belief, brought out by peculiar circumstances, and though naturally connected with the first, yet still held as a matter of experience or personal interest, rather than as part of some universal tradition, which the individual soul holds, not so much of itself, as through its participation in the common mind of the nation or period. This more personal belief, thus manifesting itself in occasional hopes and fears, brought out by inward workings, or prompted by outward suggestions, may be the commencement of a new modification which becomes afterwards more and more common among reflecting souls, and in this way finally assumes the form of a settled and universal creed. It is first the strong desire, having its birth in their souls, and then the incipient belief, then from the prison of Hades, undesirable even for the good, there would yet be a deliverance to some better state. In minds of a certain cast, this might give rise to the idea of a metempsychosis, or a continual transition to a higher and still higher

condition of corporeal being. In others it would assume a more spiritual or transcendental aspect; as in the Platonic idea of an existence, which although not wholly disembodied, recedes more and more from matter, in its approach to a reünion with the universal mind. Others again, possessing more of the devout than the philosophical temperament, and living nearer to the stream of primitive revelation, would give this hope more of a moral aspect; they would connect it with the idea of a general future judgment. The death of the body and the imprisonment in Sheol being regarded mainly as a moral penalty, their hope of deliverance from it would assume the form of a *new* life, to be shared by the body, in some unknown isles of the blest, or in some celestial region, or in some future renovation of the earth on which we dwell.¹

Such prayers, and hopes, and ejaculations, as these of Job, may have been the germ of what afterwards became a common idea, assuming a statement more and more definite, until finally it grew into that doctrine of a resurrection which is obscurely hinted at in some of the Psalms and in Isaiah, which is so manifestly taught by Daniel, which undoubtedly existed among the Jews at the coming of our Saviour, and to which, finally, Christ gave his sanction, as to a truth, not then first taught by him, but which had for ages been known in the Eastern world.

Mr. Barnes asks, Can we believe that God would reveal such a doctrine to an Arabian sage? Why not? Although his question, we think, is an absurd one, yet still we say, Why not? Why not to an Arabian, as well as to some Babylonian or Chaldean sage or sages,

¹ Along with this, and probably of prior birth, as being more strongly demanded by the moral sense, was the idea of a final judgment of the incorrigibly wicked;—a judgment as to which they were to be *brought forth* (see Job 21: 31), from the same unscen world of imperfect and unblessed existence. This idea of judgment for the wicked, became sooner an article of common belief, than the hope of deliverance for the righteous. The inference is derived not only from historical traces of the doctrine among other nations, but from the most unforced exegesis of Job 21: 28, where the idea is treated as common to all reflecting men, as carried by wayfarers from land to land, and which, therefore, every one had heard of—*Wilt thou not ask them who go by the way, and recognize their tokens; that the wicked are reserved (held back) for the evil day; in the day of wrath shall they be brought out,* יִבְּלוּ *brought out in a solemn public procession.* The attempt of some to give אֲשֶׁה here the contrary sense of *being rescued*, would have been pronounced most forced and uncritical, had it been employed in favor of any evangelical interpretation. Mr. Barnes, although generally inclined to follow Rosenmüller, is here compelled to abandon his track. The allusion to some great period of signal retribution is too plain to be mistaken; and the demand of the argument shows, that this must be referred to some period connected with the winding up of the present drama.

from whom the unevangelical commentators contend the Jews derived the doctrines of a future life and of the resurrection of the body? The important question is not, *to whom* God first revealed it, or whether he ever expressly revealed it at all to certain individuals, but how we are to account for its being in our world as a fact which revelation acknowledges when it comes to speak in the most direct terms about it, and on which acknowledged fact its subsequent communications do seem most evidently to proceed. The truth must have had a beginning somewhere and at some time. It requires no very profound rationalizing to show that it must have been small before it was large; and if the Chaldeans generally, or even the Chaldean sages, had it as an acknowledged dogma at the time of the captivity, it must certainly have been growing for many centuries at least. It must have been gathering strength from those more remote periods when it had its origin perhaps in ejaculations, and sighs, and hopes, and prayers brought out by peculiar circumstances in God's providence, such as now surrounded Job, and which may have been designed for the very purpose of thus giving the initiative to this great doctrine of the resurrection of the dead. Or it may have been the result of some early special *inspiration*; and this term may be used of just such a state of things as we have supposed in the other case. It may not have been by way of a formal dogma historically viewed, or regarded as oracularly announced. Although not revealed in any prophetic ecstasy, or in any vision of the seer, or by any voice from the shrine, yet may it have been truly *inspired* by being gently breathed into the souls of tried and suffering saints, in the sore travail of whose earth wearied spirits it was born into the world; not in the form of a dogma, precise and well defined, but rather as an embryo or germinal sentiment, at first faint and obscure, though afterwards unfolded more and more until it became part of the common mind, and grew up into an established and universal article of faith.

Such questions as this of Mr. Barnes seem to proceed from what we must deem erroneous views, both of the matter and manner of revelation. No one can produce a passage from the Scriptures (the challenge is made in reference to the New Testament as well as the Old), in which the resurrection, or even the future life, is presented as a newly announced truth, then formally proclaimed, and treated as something unknown before. The same may be said of almost all the great truths of religion. They have either been in the world from the beginning, or they have thus come into it in the course of the providence of God introducing them historically in some known or unknown way, and then treating them as known grounds of appeal in the

written word. This is certainly true of the great and fundamental articles of the divine existence, of the divine moral government, and of the general doctrine of a separate spiritual life of the dead. The first two are assumed throughout the Scriptures. The third, if it did not exist from the beginning, is at least presented in the Old Testament in its incipient growth, in the hopes of the pilgrim patriarchs—in the common popular language respecting the dead who are gathered to the congregation of the Fathers, in the apparently casual, yet on that account the more significant mention of the popular belief of some kind of intercourse with departed spirits; and in the superstitious regard for a certain class by whom it was supposed such intercourse could be maintained. To one who views this doctrine from a still higher ground, it manifests itself in those highly spiritual ideas of the divine moral government, and in those sublime expressions of faith in the eternal righteousness, which have no meaning when the rationalist forces them down to a connection with the idea of a mere animal existence of the briefest kind for man. And finally, it reveals itself in the praises and prayers of God's beloved saints, growing clearer, and loftier, and more animated, until we come down to the manifestation of the Desire of all nations, and to those teachings of the New Testament in which the spiritual life is everywhere assumed as something long previously maintained, whilst it is nowhere announced as that which was utterly unknown before.

We may say the same of the primitive dogma of sacrifice, and of the need of some form of expiation for acceptance with God. So also of that most solemn of all doctrines, without which all the rest, even the being of God, and the question of a future life, lose all their interest for the soul,—we mean the fundamental truth that man, frail and finite as he is, is the subject of a moral law connecting him with the infinite and eternal Justice, and imparting to his actions an incalculable importance, which must extend far beyond the brief period of his present phenomenal existence.

What then, it may be asked, does the Bible most truly reveal? We answer—*Jesus Christ and him crucified*, as the great fact which gives its highest meaning to every other fact and doctrine. It was not the knowledge of sin, of wrath, of the need of expiation. It was not the atonement as a doctrine, nor the redemption, nor the moral law, nor the resurrection, nor the life to come. It was no one of these as an abstract dogma. It was the *person* and life of the incarnate Redeemer—He of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets, did write, and of whom evangelists and apostles testified. It was Jesus the Messiah, the Expiator, the Mediator, the Redeemer, and who embraces all these

doctrines in himself, when he is called the Peace, the Redemption, the Way, the Truth, the Resurrection, and the Life.

עַד-שֶׁיָּפֶקַח, *Until thy wrath be past.* The Jews and Arabians, as we have remarked, regarded Sheol as an undesirable state or place, ἀστεργία χωῖον, "a joyless region," as Homer styles it. This we have spoken of as arising, in a great measure, from the physical conceptions of vastness and desolateness, and sepulchral gloom in which the imagination was first led to invest it. But this was not all. The feeling had much of its force from a moral sentiment, if not a moral doctrine, connected with it; and which affected especially those who were nearest to the stream of primeval revelation. Among such as had preserved, more or less distinctly, the traditional story of the fall, Sheol was regarded as, in some respects, a state of wrath. It was such, in some degree, to all our race; to the comparatively good as well as to the bad. This unnatural existence of soul or shade, separate from its former body, and inhabiting a subterranean region, was a part of the penal death which had come upon all the sons of the covenant-breaking Adam. It was ever felt as a *penalty*, and no effort of naturalism could ever wholly divest it of this aspect. Even the righteous, then, although dwelling there as in some secret place of the Almighty, and existing apart from the wicked, as in the covert of his pavilion, might still be supposed to sigh for deliverance. It might be preferred to a condition of exquisite misery on earth; yet still it was an imperfect state, and therefore not to be desired as the final and permanent abode of the soul. The departed shade was not *wholly man*. It was only a marred relic of our former being. It was regarded as not capable of exercising the functions of the fully organized humanity, and hence the language respecting it ever tended to the style of impersonal expression.

On this account, along with the *hope*, there would most naturally arise the *idea* of deliverance to a new and more glorious condition, after the wrath had passed away; and how strikingly is this confirmed in those passages of the New Testament which not obscurely intimate that, for this very purpose, Christ himself went down to Hades. It was to preach deliverance to the captive, the opening of the prison to them who were bound, to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord, and to announce the finished ransom to those believing spirits, who, as we are told, Heb. 11: 40, were waiting for this perfect redemption, "until God should have provided some better thing for us."

We would not, of course, maintain that Job looked definitely to this period, or to the general resurrection, or to any definite time or manner of deliverance, or that he exercised any very strong assurance in

his prayer, and yet, may we not suppose that the pathetic cry that God would lay him up in Sheol, that he would hide him until the wrath be past, that he would appoint him a set time and remember him,—may we not suppose, that this, and many a similar prayer under the darker dispensation, did in some sense receive their answers in that descent of Jesus into Sheol from whence he returned in triumph, when he led captivity captive, and divided the spoil with the strong.

The idea that Job is praying for death, in the sense of spiritual annihilation, is at war with every view of the context,—as well with that which maintains that the change subsequently spoken of is a temporal deliverance, as with the idea of a deliverance from Sheol.

V. 14. אִם-יָמִיתָ נָבֵר תִּחְיֶה. There may have been intended an emphasis here in the word נָבֵר as used for man. The radical idea is *strength—a robore dictus, Ges.* It is then a far more emphatic term than אִישׁ. *The strong man; the man of might*; the Greek *ἦρος*—shall he die, when the most insignificant herb of the garden has its period of reviviscence? This idea presents still more clearly the striking resemblance, as far as mere expression is concerned, to the language of Moschus in the epitaph on Bion.

Ἄμμες δ' οἱ μεγάλοι καὶ κατεροὶ ἢ σοφοὶ ἄνδρες.
But we the great the strong the wise.

Our previous comments have, in a great measure, anticipated all that might have been said on this remarkable question. One class of commentators give what they deem the intended answer at once. *Minime vero*—say Rosenmüller and others—*Most certainly not—He lieth down and shall never awake or be aroused from his sleep.*

Two things on the very face of the text seem to stand in the way of this most decided negative. One is the previous prayer, and the other the subsequent declaration. The process, or probable train of thought may be thus stated. Job had used language apparently of the deepest despondency. As though in danger of being overwhelmed in the exceeding gloom of his own suggestive picture, he cries out in the language of agonizing prayer,—*Oh that thou wouldst lay me up in some secret place in Sheol—Oh that thou wouldst appoint unto me some set time and then remember me.* He cannot bear the thought which he had presented so strongly to his own mind—the thought of lying down and rising no more; and the prayer of anguish, which is the consequence, is followed by its appropriate effect—the springing up of faith, expressing itself first in the musing or wondering interrogatory, and secondly, as it rises still higher, in the strong declaration which succeeds. In other words—despondency had driven him to prayer,

prayer had led to faith, faith to patient submission, and this, finally, to a feeling (although for a moment, it may be) of almost triumphant assurance—"All the days of my appointed time will I wait until my springing forth (ἡ ἀνάστασις) shall come. Thou wilt call and I will answer—thou wilt have regard to the work of thy hands.

An interrogatory of this kind, we have said, instead of imparting doubt, much less denial, may be a natural mode in which strong emotion presents some new truth, or some new aspect or conception of an old truth which seems suddenly to be accompanied with a life and an importance unrealized before. Something of this kind, as far as the style or tone of expression is concerned, appears in that famous query of Achilles, *Iliad* xxiii. 103; where he exclaims, less in a spirit of doubt than of wondering awe—

ὦ πόποι, ἡ βύ τίς ἐστὶ καὶ εἶν' Αἴδαο δόμοισιν
ψυχὴ καὶ εἶδωλον;

Pope has been censured for making too free with Homer, and yet we think he has here seized the spirit of the passage, although he may have given it too much of a philosophical aspect—

'Tis true, 'tis certain; man, though dead retains
Part of himself; th' immortal mind remains;
The form subsists without the body's aid;
Ærial substance and an empty shade.¹

Achilles had just been visited by the shade of his friend Patroclus, and the manner in which the vision of Eliphaz is recorded in the 4th of *Job*, shows that the belief in ghosts and a separate ghostly existence was as familiar to the early Arabian as to the Grecian mind. Indeed when and where has the world been without it? and yet when brought suddenly before the mind with some unusually life-like accompaniments, we start back with awe as from a conception too great or too wondrous to be realized.²

¹ The question here, however, may perhaps point mainly to the succeeding words ἄτὰρ φρένες οὐκ ἐνὶ πάμπαν—expressing not so much his wonder at the fact of a separate life, as at the strange mode of the spirit's existence. *Can it be that there are in Hades any life and form (or unbra) without mind?* etc. He may allude to the common notion, as we have before presented it, of the purposeless and almost mindless condition of the shades. This would seem to have been one aspect of the question, from what follows—παννυχίη, etc. All night the ghost of Patroclus had seemed to converse with all the reason and recollection of the present life.

² Plato in the *Republic*, Lib. iii., condemns this passage from Homer, and other similar representations of ghostly apparitions, as tending to pervert right views of the other life. We doubt, however, whether all his reasonings in the *Phædon*

May we not conceive of a pious mind putting to itself such an interrogatory, and in just such a time, respecting the being of a God? It might be called out, in the same manner, by wonder at some new and startling aspect of the thought flashing upon the soul, and lighting it up with a sudden illumination, which, for a moment, gives an unwonted *reality* and vividness to the whole horizon of moral and religious truth. In such a quickened state it would almost seem as though we had never truly believed before; so that the soul asks or rather exclaims in wonder, Is there indeed a God who rules the earth, and who will bring every work and thought of man into judgment!

Very much, too, depends upon what strikes us as the most emphatic form of the interrogatory, *If a man die shall he live again?* Is *death* then the wondrous way to *life*, and are all the trials with which God disciplines us here, but the birth throes to another higher, and more perfect, and more permanent existence? Is this world, after all, itself the death, the anomalous living death, the night far spent,—and may what we call death be but the dawning of another and eternal day? As the mourner sat contemplating the inexplicable visitations of Providence, or as he brooded over his painful domestic bereavements, and the condition of his diseased and loathsome body, there may have flitted across his dark mind some such strange query as Socrates quotes from Euripides. As when he says, in the *Gorgias*—“But indeed life is really an awful thing, and I should not wonder if Euripides spoke the truth when he said—

Τίς δ' οἶδεν, εἰ τὸ ΖΗΝ μὲν ἐστὶ ΚΑΤΘΑΝΕΙΝ,
τὸ καρθαίνειν δὲ ζῆν—

Who knows but to live is to die, and to die is to live? and that we now are in reality dead, as I have heard from wise men (of old)—namely, that we are now really dead, and that *the body* (τὸ σῶμα) is our *grave* (τὸ σῆμα, by a play upon the word, our monument), in which we are buried,” etc. *Gorg.* 493 A.

There is no need of maintaining that such, or any other definite or indefinite view was Job's settled creed,—as we use the term when we speak of the acknowledged articles of our faith. It may have been a mere gleam, soon sinking into a deeper shade. We would only contend that such thoughts are not only possible, but also probable, as being most naturally suggested by the circumstances in which he was

furnish as strong a proof of such a life as this universal belief. The representations of the poet are more in alliance with the deepest feelings of our nature, than the subtle arguments of the philosopher.

placed; especially in connection with the rudimentary ideas which men in all ages have had of the Spirit World.

Such thoughts also are more likely to occur in the soliloquising style, which may be regarded as greatly prevailing throughout the poem, especially in the speeches of Job, when the introspective, subjective, or exclamatory is more consistent with his condition, and is therefore more marked, even when he is using outwardly the manner of direct address to his interlocutors. Here, too, we think, is the key to unlock many of the apparent contradictions of the book. In such an introspective state of meditation, becoming objective to itself in speech, there is but little regard to words expressive of the transitions of thought. The soul thus talking to itself, loves to present its conceptions in various and even seemingly opposing lights; sometimes assigning, apparently, the prominence to such as it would in reality most strongly reject. In this way only can we reconcile Job's expressions,—at one time of utter despondency, again, and perhaps quite suddenly, of hope, and faith, and even assurance,—at one time of fretful and almost blasphemous impatience, at another, of the most perfect submission,—now cursing his day, and again exclaiming, *though he slay me, yet will I trust in him*,—at one time exhibiting a sort of despairing exultation at the thought of the prosperity of the wicked, as though it furnished him with a reason for his reproaches of his Maker and an answer to his insulting friends, and again (when the tumor of his soul had settled down), manifesting a feeling of the most perfect confidence in the Divine Justice.

Very much of this same reflex or subjective style appears in that only other remnant of what may be styled the Hebrew philosophy,—namely, the book of Ecclesiastes, or the “Inquiry into the *Summum Bonum*.” There, too, opposing ideas are presented in their strongest lights. In one place, all is chaos, chance, death under the notion of a total cessation of being, an utter confounding of the good and the bad, of the wise and the unwise, of the joyful and the miserable, of man and beast. Again—to say nothing of a future life—there is the strongest expression of confidence in other truths utterly inconsistent with all this,—even more inconsistent with it, we may say, than any direct assertion of such future life regarded in its physical rather than its moral aspect. We mean, that doctrine of a *Divine Justice*, which must make an eternal difference—a difference necessarily extending far beyond the present state—between right and wrong, between sin and holiness, and of course between the sinner and the righteous man. In one place we have before us nothing but the materialist, the virtual atheist, the apparent denier of all providence and of all moral govern-

ment—"Time and chance happen to all—As dieth the fool so dieth the wise—Man has no supremacy over the beast—As dieth the one so dieth the other—There is a vanity done upon the earth in that it happens to the righteous as to the wicked, to him that feareth God as to him that feareth him not." Again (as though the soul had cast all his darkness about itself, in order that it might emerge into a clearer assurance of the great truth which the moral nature demands, and demands too in the face of all inductive phenomena to the contrary), how suddenly do we find ourselves in the midst of declarations involving the contrary of all this, and implying if not revealing, a future life in the idea of an eternal justice—*Though the sinner do evil times innumerable, and yet prolong his days, still do I surely know that it shall be well with those who fear God; but it shall not be well with the wicked*, Eccl. 8: 12, 13. *For God will bring every work into judgment with every secret thing whether it be good or whether it be evil*, Eccles. 12: 14. *All the days of my appointed time will I wait*, etc. Some would regard this as hypothetical—*All the days etc. would I wait*. But there is nothing which urgently calls for this, and such a departure from the more obvious construction is not to be justified except on the ground that there could be no good meaning without it.

צָבָא. Properly rendered by the Vulgate, *militia*—*military service*. See its use Job 7: 1. It however embraces, both here and in Job vii., the idea of appointed or *set time*—*an enlistment*. The LXX also intend this in their paraphrase—*συντελέσας ἡμέρας αὐτοῦ*. It also agrees with the context, especially with the term קִרַּח, in the preceding prayer that God would appoint him a decree, and not forget the years of his dark and unjoyous abode in Sheol.

אֶיֶתְלִי—This word seems to have here the same strength as in Job 13: 15, *Though he slay me yet will I wait for him*. So here, *Even in death or in Sheol will I wait for him*. Compare Ps. 23: 4.

הִלְרִיתִי *My change*—more properly, *my springing forth*—*my germination*. Neither Rosenmüller, nor Mr. Noyes, nor Mr. Barnes, adverts to the evident relation which this word bears to the verb הִלְרִיתִי (verse 8), in the comparison of the two. We might almost rest upon it alone for proof, that there is intended here no merely temporal deliverance, but something analogous to the new life which appears in the plant. The strong sense of reviviscence suits poorly with such a change as would consist simply in a restoration of Job's lost sheep and camels. Such an idea destroys all the force of the comparison in the very points for which it was mainly intended. It is, moreover, out of keeping with the sombre ideas of death and Sheol which both precede and come after it. He had prayed that God would hide him as some secure de-

posit in the spirit-land; that he would there appoint him his set time and remember him. How unnatural the supposition that the next thought, suggested by all this, should be simply the prospect of again attaining to a state of worldly riches. It is equally at war, too, with the sombre pictures that follow, in which he describes the gradual decay of all terrestrial things,—how the powers and changes of the natural world continually prevail against man, blighting all his hopes, and finally changing his countenance, and laying him low in the dust. Such a picture would not have naturally followed an exulting expression of confidence in some restoration to temporal wealth. At all events, it would not have succeeded it so suddenly, that we are hardly cheered by the dawning of worldly hope, before being again visited by a deeper darkness than before. All this, however, is perfectly consistent with a sudden expression of hope beyond the tomb. Even our most joyous conceptions of a spiritual world of blessedness, or of a final resurrection to a more glorious existence, may very naturally connect themselves with mournful thoughts of the grave that intervenes. We cannot think of the glorious promised land, with its never-withering flowers, without also bringing in the swelling flood, and the gloomy Jordan that rolls between. The transition is most natural from such ideas of future blessedness to those serious thoughts, which are connected with a view of our frailty, and of death regarded physically as the dark termination of our weary pilgrimage upon earth.

“How can it possibly be accounted for,” says Mr. Noyes (in his Commentary, p. 123), “that he should sink into *despair*, because he could not hope to enjoy the doubtful good of living again in this world of sin and misery, whilst, at the same time, he believed in the existence of a world of happiness and purity to which the righteous were to be admitted.” Modify the terms of this a little; put despondency or melancholy for despair, and hope in place of fixed belief, and Mr. Noyes’s query may be explained on the best known principles of human nature, even as they appear at times in the exercises of the Christian. Should we even call it despondency, or weakness of faith, the transition from spiritual hopes to a species of serious melancholy, connected with thoughts of death and the grave, is certainly far more natural and usual, than that any such sudden change of feeling should follow the hope of great worldly prosperity, which, from its nearness, and consequently distorting magnitude, is so apt to blind the mind to all considerations of a more serious kind.

V. 15. תִּקְרָא. *Thou wilt call and I will answer.* This language is used in reference to judicial proceedings. There will be a day when my case shall be called up, and I shall answer to the summons. Mr.

Barnes thinks it refers to the present time. There is nothing however strongly leading to such a view; whereas the entire context shows that the mind of Job, however weak and indefinite his faith, was brooding over the thoughts of the distant future, in fact in just the condition, spiritually and physically, in which the ideas of another life, and of a future deliverance would most naturally, if ever, present themselves.

Thou wilt have a desire to the work of thy hands. יִבְרַר. This is a very peculiar verb, occurring but few times in the Hebrew Bible. It is from the same root with the noun for *silver*, although the connection of meaning is far from being obvious. It is, however, unquestionably one of the strongest words to express the emotion of longing desires. As in Niph'al, Ps. 84:3, *My soul longs for the courts of the Lord.* In Genesis 31:30, it denotes the powerful feeling of homesickness, or love to one's native land—*Because thou sore longedst after thy father's house*; as Ulysses (Odys. I. 58) is represented as almost ready to die for the longing desire he had to see his father-land—

Ἰέμενος καὶ καρπὸν ἀποθρῶσκοντα νοῆσαι
ἧς γαίης θανάειν ἱμείρεται—

Such a peculiar word as this, and indeed the whole expression, seems altogether out of place when regarded as referring to no higher change than a restoration of worldly wealth or prosperity. But what an intense beauty has it when thus interpreted of God's watchful care over the righteous dead? If Job did not mean the remains of the body as deposited in the grave, still it may with great propriety have been spoken of his *rudimentary humanity*, as laid up in Sheol, and awaiting the summons for trial and deliverance. But why should it be thought a thing incredible that even the former idea may have suggested itself to one who, as we may judge from such cries and lamentations as we find ch. xvii. verse 1, had evidently no hope of any such reviviscence in the present life. In the 139th Psalm, v. 16, God is represented as taking most careful note of the future rudiments of the human body before birth, and even before conception—*Thine eyes did see my substance yet unwrought, and in thy book all my members were written, when as yet there were none of them.* If this thought is so natural to a soul in elevated meditation, why may not one equally natural and affecting have suggested itself to the mind of the afflicted righteous man,—the thought that even *when "he made his bed in Sheol,"* He who had formed him and fashioned him would still have regard to *the work of his hands*? This last expression would have little or no meaning considered as referring to outward worldly prosperity; but its application to the bodily frame, or at least to his humanity in general, would

seem to be almost certain in view of the similar language he is so fond of using, and of which we have a specimen ch. 10: 10—*Thy hands have fashioned me and made me, and wilt thou let me be swallowed up? Hast thou not poured me out as milk, and curdled me as cheese? With skin and flesh hast thou clothed me; with bones and sinews hast thou fenced me. Thy providence (הַחֲרָה) hath preserved my spirit.*

V. 16. כִּי עַתָּה—*Truly now*—as the particle כִּי is best rendered when followed by עַתָּה—as Gen. 26: 22. Num. 22. 29. Job 6: 3 etc. Or כִּי may have an adversative sense; as in Hab. 3: 17, 18—*Though the figtree shall not blossom, yet will I rejoice.* And so here—*Though now thou dost number my steps, yet thou wilt not (always) keep wrath on account of my sins.* There seems to be an emphasis on עַתָּה. There will come a time when thou wilt no longer cherish wrath against me. He would appear to have in mind that future judicial deliverance, when all the mysterious dealings of God's providence should be cleared up. A contrast of times seems certainly intended, and even if we suppose that Job had in view only a future deliverance in the present life, it makes a far more natural rendering than that which violently converts the latter clause into a question, and thus brings out an opposite sense. To effect this, Rosenmüller regards אֵל as for אֵלָא (*nonne*), for which usage he cites Lam. 3: 36 and Jonah 4: 11. In the first example the sense is much better without the supposition of any interrogation at all; and in the second, the interrogative, or rather exclamatory aspect (which any reader of the Hebrew must see more properly belongs to it) is imparted by the tone of the context, irrespective of the negative particle.

לֹא חָשָׁמוֹר is best taken here as an ellipsis for the usual expression, חָשָׁמוֹר אָמֵן or עָבְרָה; as in Jer. 3: 5—אִם יִשְׁמַר לְעַד—*Will he keep forever*—that is, *his wrath forever.* This ellipsis, however, is more frequent with the very similar verb נָצַר.

הַכְּסֵל. Rosenmüller renders this—*et concinnas super iniquitatem meam.* Gesenius regards it as equivalent to the Latin—*mendacia concinnavit*, or the Greek phrase *δόλον ἰάνπειν*. The primary sense of the verb is unquestionably—*sarsit-assuit*; and we would venture to suggest, whether in this word, and in חָרַס of the preceding clause, there is not a reference to the *sealing up* and enclosing of a tale or account. The allusion then would be to that same judicial process, to which he had previously referred in his prayer, v. 13, and in his confident declaration, v. 15. The other view, which represents Job as charging, not only injustice, but *fraud* upon the Almighty, seems certainly inconsistent with the previous submission, and the confident hope of some deliverance, whether it refer to this life or to another.

V. 18. וַאֲזַלְתָּ הַר-נִיבָלָה—*And surely the mountain falling*, etc. There has been much discussion respecting the true bearing of the verses that follow to the end of the chapter. Some regard the figures here employed as denoting very much the same with those of the 8th and 11th verses, namely, the completeness and irreparableness of death. Thus Rosenmüller—*Irreparabilis, inquit, est occasus hominis, ejusque fatalis, illa ruina, haud secus ac montis collapsi, rupis a radicibus revulsae, lapidum a fluxu exesorum, quin et terrae alluvionibus attritae et absorptae. Ita nulla spes reviviscendi plane relicta est ei qui semel occubuit.* It is perfectly consistent with the view we have taken of the previous train of thought, to admit that Job here returns to a sombre if not wholly desponding state of mind. Such a transition, too, we would regard as probable and natural. There is, however, danger of false interpretation, if we persist in applying here the principles and rules of a direct, uninterrupted, logical, or rhetorical discourse. We are not, therefore, to look for a well connected train of thought, nor for regular transitions denoted by their appropriate particles and grammatical forms. Especially is this remark applicable to the discourses of Job. These, as we have said, partake largely, in some parts, of the nature of soliloquies. Mingled with appeals, now to God, and again to his interlocutors, together with occasional direct notices of their arguments, there is, throughout, a continued communing with his own soul, and with the wondrous thoughts concerning his present and future destiny which God's dealings were suggesting to him. He turns them over and over; surveys them in many varied aspects,—now in the shade of his despondency, and again in the light of his hope. The transitions, of course, are sudden, apparently abrupt, sometimes seemingly contradictory; and in this lies much of the dramatic power of the unknown author of this wondrous production. Imagine the aged mourner lying on the earth,—sackcloth on his body, and ashes on his head, his “face soiled with weeping,” his “horn in the dust,” the “shadow of death upon his eyelids”—now cursing his day, now sinking in despondency, now rising in hope, now humbled in prayer, now patient in tribulation. Long intervals of silence intervene between his passionate ejaculations; during which his friends forbear to disturb the current of his thoughts,—as when at first they sat with him in silence three uninterrupted days and nights. In this way his silent meditations may carry him very far from apparent connection with the previous current of the discourse, until at length from his surcharged heart he again “takes up his parable”—it may be in a strain quite different from that which formed the closing cadence of what, to the eye, seemed immediately to precede it. The

introductory words of transition, in such cases, may be regarded as referring to, or as suggested by, these silent, intervening thoughts, just as though they had been spoken aloud in the continuity of the discourse,—or the new commencement may sometimes be startling and abrupt. In some such way as this, may we suppose a musing pause, brief yet crowded with serious thought, to have followed the preceding strong expression of faith and hope. In the rapid transitions of his soul, the sombre ideas arising from the contemplation of his physical humanity again return, and he breaks out here with the abrupt argumentative particle $\epsilon\tilde{\nu}\nu\alpha$, just as though he had been contending in spirit with some imagined opponent. *Ὁὐ μὴν δὲ, ἀλλὰ*—as the Greeks would say—‘*No indeed—there is nothing permanent in our mere physical or earthly existence; All nature is ever manifesting the law of phenomenal change and decay. For verily even the mountain falling cometh to nought, and the rock is removed out of its place.*’

We do not, however, think that irreparability is the main thought intended to be suggested by the figures that follow. There is in all of them, rather, an idea of gradualness, if we may use the term, which seems inconsistent with the other view, or to have, at least, no necessary connection with it. It looks like a representation of the powers of an external world, gradually, yet irresistibly prevailing against man, destroying all his works, disappointing all his hopes, and, finally, after a protracted struggle bringing him down to the dust of death. Slowly, but surely, is he decaying and dying through the greater part, if not the whole, of his earthly existence. His life is inefficient. He accomplishes nothing compared with his hopes and purposes. He is as the Greek poet describes him—*ὀλιγοδρανίος, ἄκις, ἰσόνειρος*. He cannot contend with nature. His mortal existence is like the troubled dream of a sick man, in which he is ever doing, ever striving, yet never effecting the object at which he aims—

Veluti in somnis oculos ubi languida pressit
Nocte quies, nequicquam avidos extendere cursus
Velle videmur, et in mediis conatibus aegri
Succidimus; non lingua valet, non corpore notae
Sufficiunt vires nec vox, nec verba sequuntur.¹

The mind of the muser returns here to the earthly and mortal aspect of humanity. Slowly but irresistibly, as the mountain crumbles, as the rock is removed from its place, as the waters wear the stones, so God, through the appointed powers of the physical world, prevails

¹ *Aeneid* XII. 908.

against man regarded as a mere physical being, destroys continually all his hopes, gradually changes his aspect, from youth to manhood, from manhood to age, from age to decrepitude, and finally sends him away from this scene of ever unsuccessful conflict with the outward influences that are continually bearing upon him.

vs. V. 19. *The waters gradually wear the stones.* פּוֹחֵץ—*paulatim atterunt*—by little and little. Hence the noun פֶּחַח—*pulvis*—corresponding to the modern geological term *detritus*,—that which was worn down by the waters, as was probably the case with all that now constitutes the loose soil of the earth. Isa. 40: 15—*The small dust of the balance.*

Thou washest away the things that grow out of the dust of the earth. In this our English Version gives the common sense of פּוֹחֵץ אֶת־הָאֲדָמָה, although it does not explain the suffix. Herder and Noyes render it—*The floods overflow the dust of the earth.* Rosenmüller's translation comes to the same thing. They all give an unusual sense to פּוֹחֵץ אֶת־הָאֲדָמָה, not warranted, we think, by its connection, in any other place, and besides requiring a very harsh grammatical anomaly, in a plural masculine nominative to a feminine singular verb. Such a construction can hardly be justified by an appeal to some rare usage of the Arabic. Moreover, in this idea of a sudden inundation of a flood, there is lost that feature of the comparison which appears in all the other parts, namely, of steady and irresistible power,—gradual, yet finally prevailing. May not אֶת־הָאֲדָמָה be the nominative? It would present something of an anomaly in respect to gender, but nothing so strange as that arising from the other view. Besides, in the compound nominative אֶת־הָאֲדָמָה אֶת־הַצִּמְחָה, we may regard the gender of the latter noun in regimen as controlling. The sense then would simply be—*The dust of the earth—or the earth with its dust—overwhelms its productions, or the vegetation which grows spontaneously out of it.* It would then seem to refer to the gradual encroachment of the desert sands upon the cultivated soil, such as often had taken place, and does yet take place, in that part of the world. It would, in this way, present a very natural parallel to the first member,—the former referring to the gradual encroachment of the waters, the latter to that of the desert upon the cultivated earth. And then follows most naturally the sentiment of the closing member—*Thou destroyest the hope of man.* Nature is ever at war with him—or, rather—Thou, through nature, art ever defeating his most lasting plans, and bringing to nought his proudest works. Horace has something of this idea, together with comparisons substantially the same, though presented in an opposite aspect—

*Debemur morti nos nostraque, sive receptus
Terra Neptunus classes aquilonibus arcet,
Regis opus: sterilisve diu pontu- aptaque remis
Vicinas urbes alit, et grave sentit aratram;
Doctus iter melius; mortalia facta peribunt.¹*

With this view admirably coincides the verse following — *וְהָיָה כְּמִצְחָוּתוֹ וְהָיָה כְּמִצְחָוּתוֹ*—*Thou prevailest continually against him until he depart; or, that he may depart; ever changing his countenance until finally thou sendest him away.* *וְהָיָה* as a rare word occurring here, in Job 15: 24 and in Eccl. 4: 12, with some few instances of the derivative noun. The places where it is found are, however, sufficient to show that its radical idea is that of *irresistible power*.

וְהָיָה Rosenmüller finds here also his favorite idea of irreparableness — *opprimis morte irreparabili ut resurgere nequeat*. It accords well with the primary idea of the word, and the previous train of thought, to render *וְהָיָה* *continually*,—implying a *steady, uninterrupted, and irresistible* course of action, operating by way of an immutable law, or of a fixed divine procedure in the employment of natural powers. This also agrees well with the other sense of the word, namely, that of *victory or final triumph.* *וְהָיָה*. This word, according to the view we have taken, would not refer merely to the change that passes upon the human countenance at death, but to the gradual evidences of decay which attend us during almost the whole of our earthly life.

V. 21. This verse evidently refers to a state after death, when man has finally succumbed and given up the weary conflict. *His sons come to honor, and he knoweth it not; they are brought low, and he regardeth it not.* There is here the same idea to which we have before adverted. Man goes not to the land of annihilation, but to the ghost-world of Sheol, where the soul, in its penal separation from the body, loses its connection with the upper world,—has no longer any recollection of, or interest in its past scenes; but is reduced to its rudimentary, quiescent, dream-like, powerless state of ghostly animation.

Their hatred and their love is lost;
Their envy buried in the dust.
They have no share in all that's done
Beneath the circuit of the sun.

The closing verse of the chapter seems to have given the commentators much trouble. There is something very harsh in regarding it as spoken of the dead, on any view we may take of their condition; and yet many have given it this interpretation. "He speaks figura-

¹ Hor. Ars Poet. 65.

tively," says Rosenmüller, "of his body, as though it felt the gnawing of the worm, and of his soul, as though it felt grief for its separation." We cannot help thinking this exceedingly unnatural, repulsive, and improbable. Even on his own hypothesis, it would be strange that such a figure should come directly after Job is supposed to have spoken of death as a state in which there was no recollection. The reference by Rosenmüller to Num. 6: 6, is unworthy of his scholarship. The use of שָׁרֵפְתָּ there for a dead body, is on a different principle altogether. It is merely an elliptical expression for what visibly remains of man after dissolution, or the departure of the spirit, and which is taken as the true representative of what was once the whole humanity. So the Greeks sometimes use $\psi\upsilon\chi\acute{\eta}$ by way of ellipsis for death, or the loss or departure of the soul—as in Euripides Iphig. in Aulid. 1453

ὁ πενθεῖν με σὴν ψυχὴν χρεών.

By a similar, though inverted use of a part for the whole—*νεκροί*, which literally means *dead bodies*, is sometimes put for the *souls* in Hades, or the dead generally. As in Eurip. Hecuba 557

—*ἐν νεκροῖσι γὰρ
δούλη κεκλήσθαι, βασιλῆς οὐσ', αἰσχύνομαι.*

The true explanation of the connection here may be found in what has been already said of the meditative, musing, soliloquizing and ejaculatory nature of Job's discourse. May we not here also imagine a pause of impressive silence? He reviews the whole ground of his former meditations, and then comes the closing thought,—not intended to be in immediate logical connection with what just precedes, but as a sort of moral, or summing up, to the whole chapter containing this rhapsody on mortality; or rather to the general picture of human frailty presented in the latter part. As though he had said—"Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter—*Such is man*. His life is a scene of perpetual conflict. Death conducts him to the ghostly land of forgetfulness. Such is his mere physical condition in this world. It is sorrow, and labor, and a sore travail, and a heavy yoke for all the sons of Adam, from the day in which they come forth from their mother's womb, until they return to the earth, the mother of all." As the son of Sirach thus sums up human life—"Anxious thought—fear of heart, passion, zeal, commotion, fear of death, little or nothing of rest;" so Job most concisely expresses it all in reference to both departments of human nature—*His flesh upon him has ever pain; his soul within him ever mourns*. The one is ever the seat of disease in some of its

various forms; the other of care and grief alleviated by comparatively little of rest or enjoyment. In other words—*Flesh and heart* (בשר וליבָבִי) body and soul) *both fail*. Here closes the picture as drawn by desponding Job. The stronger and steadier faith of the Psalmist could append the triumphant finale—*But thou, O God, art the strength of my soul (the rock of my heart) and my everlasting portion*.

A strong, though not conclusive argument for this view of the *verse*, is derived from the use of the futures, which the whole style of the passage requires us to take in what has been called the frequentative or habitual sense, as referring to that which is done continually or uninterruptedly; a good example of which may be found in Job 1: 5, in the future, תִּשָּׁחֵק. So here they refer not to what takes place in the future strictly, or after death, but to what is commonly experienced by both soul and body upon earth.

ARTICLE VI.

REINHARD'S SERMONS.

By Edwards A. Park, Professor in Andover Theological Seminary.

IN the last No. of the Bib. Sac., it was proposed to give some illustrations of the sermons of Francis Volkmar Reinhard, the celebrated Court Preacher at Dresden. Some remarks having been made on his Life and Labors, the Novelty and Variety of his Themes for the Pulpit, the Connection of his Themes with his Texts, and with the Occasions on which they were discussed, the Rhetorical Structure of his Discourses, their Vivacity, and their Fitness to excite the Curiosity of hearers or readers; we now proceed to consider the

§ 9. *Historical Character of his Sermons.*

The festivals¹ of the Romish and some of the Reformed churches, have reference to the external facts of Christianity. Many of the lessons prescribed for these festivals are of course narrative in their character, and lead to the composition of historical discourses. When

¹ Such as Annunciation day, Good Friday, Easter, Ascension day, Whitsuntide, etc.