

end, B.D.; and an *Index to the Law of Moses*, by Canon Henry Thompson, B.A.

Mr. Justice Darling has brought his two books *Scintillæ Juris* and *Meditations in the Tea Room* into one volume, and the volume has been published very attractively by Messrs. Stevens and Haynes (5s. net). In spite of Mr. Justice Darling's declaration that he writes for fellow-lawyers, the new edition will be read by all the professions. For time has dealt with these books as it does with good books always, just as surely as with good wine. Here is a very short extract from each: 'The chief difference between prisoners and other people is, perhaps, captivity.' 'Honesty is disgusting to many men of fine feeling because it is represented as a good investment.'

Those who read the papers which Mr. L. G. Chiozza Money, M.P., contributes to the *Westminster Gazette* and other periodicals will rejoice to be told that he has collected the best of them into a volume. It has been published by Mr. Fisher Unwin under the title of *The Future of Work and other Essays* (6s. net). Let us pick out some of the topics: 'British Homes and their Furnishings,' 'The Divorcing of Wealth and Work,' 'Science has solved the Problem of Poverty,' 'Space and Health,' 'Wages and Efficiency.'

Mr. Money is best known as a vigorous opponent of Tariff Reform. But whatever he discusses he discusses with striking persuasiveness, for he discusses nothing that he has not first mastered. And he has a way of setting forth figures and facts so as to endow them with life.

Mr. Sholto O. G. Douglas has written a book to ventilate *A Theory of Civilisation* (Fisher Unwin; 5s. net). It has come at a bad time. We are sick of the words civilisation and culture. And it is a bad book. Practically every statement made in it has to be challenged. To start early. On page 17 Mr. Douglas says, 'Our fathers were not deep thinkers in the Dark Ages, the ages of faith; that is why they were ages of faith.' They were deep thinkers; there are few deeper thinkers today. And the Dark Ages (a silly and worn-out epithet) were *not* ages of faith. On the very next page we read: 'It was fitting, perhaps we may say inevitable, that the Christian civilisation should first come into prominence in Italy, the old home of its precursor, rather than in Judæa, the land of its birth, for—the principle that a prophet is not without honour save in his own country—the Jews saw too much of the real Christ to accept His divinity; it was only at a distance from the historical home of its founder that the great psychic illusion could find its necessary environment.' That sentence is compounded of ignorance and prejudice, and there are no other ingredients in it.

To Messrs. Williams & Norgate's 'Home University Library,' Canon R. H. Charles has contributed a volume on *Religious Development between the Old and the New Testament* (1s. net). This is work that could not have been done until Dr. Charles himself made the materials for it available; and it was just and right that he should be asked to do the writing. He is also best qualified.

## The Book of Job.

BY THE REV. A. D. MARTIN, EDINBURGH.

THERE are signs that this scripture is now receiving closer attention than it has ever received before, not only amongst scholars but also amongst the reading public generally. Its peculiarly bold outlook suits the spirit of our age. Its superb vigour of language and dramatic intensity commend it to every artistic mind. Accordingly, we greatly value any work like *The Book of Job Interpreted* (by the Rev. James Strahan) as ful-

filling a truly useful function by the presentation of the poem in a form that combines scholarship with popularity. We have needed such help as his, because while here the R.V. is an immense improvement upon the A.V., there is a good deal more required before the average Bible-reader can obtain much idea of the book in its original purpose and meaning.

The problem of the text is extremely difficult

and allows room for some pure guesswork. It is admitted on all sides that Job has suffered much at the hands of editors and transcribers. The fact that the text of the LXX was considerably shorter than the Massoretic text—some 400 lines less in the time of Origen—affords an opportunity for the free use of critical shears. It is an open question whether the Greek translators omitted, or whether the Hebrew transcribers amplified. Mr. Strahan, following Professors Bickell and Duhm, is evidently greatly influenced by the Greek Version. Dr. Driver, on the other hand, inclined to the opposite view. In either case, as has been pointed out by Professor W. T. Davison,<sup>1</sup> the variations of the LXX do not relieve the chief difficulties.

There is a tendency in some quarters to deal with the poem in too modern a way. By cutting out a third line here, and lessening the length of a clause there, the poem may be made more shapely. But is it, or rather was it, as it left the hands of its author, a sort of Gray's *Elegy*, displaying in Mr. William Watson's words—

The cunning of the jewelled line and carven phrase?

It appeals, surely, as a poem of quite a different order. There is a tumult of passion in it, a palpitation, which, it would seem, must at times naturally overleap even the very free channels of Hebrew versification. There are places where the vividness of debate is so real that, as Mr. Strahan has pointed out, some change in the expression of the faces of the auditors is evidently assumed without being remarked.<sup>2</sup>

One very heartily agrees that certain drastic alterations have to be made. Every one feels the intrusion of Elihu. The missing third speech of Zophar can certainly be restored from an utterance ascribed to Job,<sup>3</sup> but wholly inconsistent with Job's previous and later speeches. The lovely poem on the place of Wisdom in ch. 28 is altogether unsuitable either to Job or to any of the *dramatis personæ*. Finally, the answer from the whirlwind would be far more effective without the laboured descriptions of Behemoth and Leviathan.

Nothing, however, is gained by the trimness to which certain scholars seek to reduce the poem. Allowance must be made for the genuine passion

<sup>1</sup> Art. 'Job' in the *Dictionary of the Bible*, ii. 664.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Job 6<sup>14-20</sup> and see Strahan, p. 74. <sup>3</sup> 27<sup>7-22</sup>.

of a smitten man, leading him at times into sayings that border upon mutual contradiction. This question of inconsistency is, no doubt, a difficult one to settle. What is flagrant must of course, as already indicated, be ruled out. But the poem is obviously progressive. Job is seen in conflict, not only with his friends, but with his own past. And every one who has had any experience in passing away from an accepted orthodoxy to a larger faith will know how often the mind is invaded by the persistency of discredited ideas.

The temptation to mend the text is, for some people, like the temptation which a schoolboy feels to look up the answers at the end of his book when he cannot make headway with his sum. A little harder thinking over the text as it stands might reveal hidden beauties. If a man cannot see the perfect art of Job's terrible indictment of his Maker in the words—

I cry unto thee, and thou dost not answer me :

I stand up, and thou lookest at me (30<sup>30</sup>)—

but thinks this second line strange and wants to alter it to 'Thou lookest *not*,' or 'Thou ceasest to regard me' (Duhm), why, one does not know how you can explain it to him, but he should think again. To take another instance of this kind of criticism: by changing a ך into a ך (בְּסוּךְ into בְּסוּךְ) Buhl and, apparently, Mr. Strahan obtain 'when God protected my tent' (29<sup>4</sup>) in place of 'when the secret of God was upon my tent,' but in that case one also gets a commonplace line, instead of one which perfectly expresses a piety at once mystical and practical—the reality of a Divine-human friendship brooding like the shechinah over a man's home. Or once more: when Job exclaims, 'I stand up in the assembly and cry for help,' is it not rather prosaic to find a difficulty in Job's being allowed to stand in the assembly, on the ground that he was a leper? And really, what do we gain if we follow Professor Duhm and, by altering the text, read, 'I stand up in the company of foxes'? This too frequent emendation of the text may stimulate ingenuity, but it often reduces the sublime to the trivial. It certainly makes the work of the preacher needlessly difficult; and, so far as the public become aware of it, it destroys confidence in the Bible, or tends to cast discredit upon a quite necessary branch of the study of Holy Scripture.

The most controverted question relating to the integrity of the Book of Job is the relation of the prologue and the epilogue to the poem. By very many scholars these prose passages are ascribed to a lost People's Book of Job. It would not appear that this theory rests upon linguistic arguments so much as upon considerations of a more general kind. Various small points in these chapters, such as the statement in the epilogue that Job lived after his trial 140 years, do indeed confirm the impression, derived from other sources, that the prose framework of the book embodies a personal legend. But to ascribe the authorship of this prose to another than the author of the poem is to assign the root idea of the whole book to that other. For the scenes in heaven described in chs. 1 and 2 are of the very marrow of the drama. They state the theory of suffering which the poem works out. And the question arises, In what period of the history of Hebrew thought are you going to place this theory? Is not the oldest idea of human suffering that which the poet sets out to destroy, or at least to modify? Can you, with a due regard to the propriety of Revelation, suggest any place for the theory of suffering contained in the prologue earlier than the Exile—that is to say, earlier than the time to which the poem itself belongs? As a matter of personal impression, the unveiling of the heavenly courts savours much more of Zechariah 3 than of any pre-exilic literature. Again, the most plausible objection to the authenticity of the epilogue is that in it Job is restored to more than his former prosperity. This, it is thought, is too much in a line with that doctrine held by the friends from which the author clearly dissented. But such an objection reveals a total misconception of the *motif* of the drama. This matter must be viewed in the light of the challenge, 'Doth Job fear God for nought?' If that accusation fails, as it is shown to do, then there is no reason why Job should *not* be blessed with riches. *For the quarrel of the author of the poem with the traditional doctrine is not that it seeks to establish the goodness of God, but that it imputes a narrow forensic motive to His actions.* The achievement of the book is that it pulls down an ancient structure of thought, not to leave it a ruin, but to build another, a larger structure, a spiritual habitation for the mind of man of more permanent make, incorporating the old materials with others formerly neglected. We hold, therefore, somewhat

tenaciously to the original unity of prose and poem in this scripture. It was natural for one part to be in prose, because it was narrative which had to be set forth, and Hebrew poetry is essentially lyrical rather than epic. It was equally inevitable that the passion of the great debate should break into verse. But the same genius which shaped the poem gave us also those sublime words of the narrative, and others like them: 'The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away; blessed be the name of the Lord.'

## II.

Having now endeavoured to indicate the material upon which this paper proceeds, let us, in the second place, attempt an interpretation of the book from our own standpoint. Whatever mind one can usefully bring to bear upon the theme must be to a great extent a mind that is indebted to others, and that is yet more profoundly modified by an inner experience of truth, such as under the Spirit's teaching may be the portion of every careful student.

If we could think ourselves back into the life of those to whom this scripture first came, perhaps the initial impression upon our thought would be the feeling of real drama involved in the story. We should wonder how it all could end. For from the very first the issue seems doubtful. The uncertainty is felt in heaven itself. The Lord and the Accuser discuss the character of Job in terms that seem to imply that neither of them is quite sure how things will turn out. The Lord has confidence in His servant, but it is the sort of confidence a father might have in his boy, as, untried and alone, he ventures out into the world. The Lord believes rather than knows that Job will prove true when he passes through the tests of suffering. On the other side, if the attitude of the Lord is one of faith, that of the Accuser is one of reasonable scepticism. It is felt that the Accuser has made out a case for inquiry. Job must be tested to be known.

So the baptism of suffering falls upon him, and as we listen to his words of lamentation, we are made to feel that the issue for a long time remains in doubt. Satan had said, 'Put forth thine hand now, and touch his bone and his flesh, and he will renounce thee to thy face' (2<sup>5</sup>). And for a while it looks as though he would. He falls away from his earliest piety in a clearly marked declension. The

first utterance is in the language of perfect submission: 'The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away; blessed be the name of the Lord' (1<sup>21</sup>). The second shows a lower but still a very real reality: 'Shall we receive good at the hand of God, and shall we not receive evil?' (2<sup>10</sup>). Then comes the cursing of his day and the beginning of his arraignment of Providence—

Why is light given to a man whose way is hid,  
And whom God hath hedged in? (3<sup>23</sup>).

The bitterness of his spirit increases under the provocation of debate, and in the 10th chapter we come to the passage in which the sufferer accuses his Maker of having made him in order to torture him.

Hast thou not poured me out as milk,  
And curdled me like cheese?  
Thou hast clothed me with skin and flesh,  
And knit me together with bones and sinews.  
Thou hast granted me life and favour,  
And thy visitation hath preserved my spirit.  
Yet these things thou didst hide in thine heart;  
I know that this is with thee:  
If I sin, then thou markest me,  
And thou wilt not acquit me from mine iniquity.  
If I be wicked, woe unto me;  
And if I be righteous, yet shall I not lift up my head;  
Being filled with ignominy  
And looking upon mine affliction.  
And if my head exalt itself, thou huntest me as a lion:  
And again thou shewest thyself marvellous upon me  
(10<sup>10-16</sup>).

The words remind us of Browning's Caliban watching the ants clambering about their hole—

He made all these and more,  
Made all we see, and us, in spite. . . .

In such passages Job comes very near to that renouncing of God which had been predicted of him. Yet his attitude is markedly different from that of the typical wicked man of the O.T., whose response to the teaching of the prophet is, 'Get you out of the way, turn aside out of the path, cause the Holy One of Israel to cease from before us' (Is 30<sup>11</sup>). That might be spoken of as a real renouncing of God to His face. For in the history of the Hebrew word *נָתַן*, here rendered 'renounce,' the turning-point is the idea of saying 'Good-bye' to a person. The sneer of the Accuser is that when Job has to say 'Good-bye' to his property and to bodily health, he will of his own accord say 'Good-bye' to God. But Job's actual attitude turns out to be the very reverse of

this. At first, it is true, when Eliphaz urges, 'As for me, I would seek unto God' (5<sup>8</sup>), Job's reply is—

He is not a man, as I am, that I should answer him  
That we should come together in judgment.

Let him take his rod away from me,  
And let not his terror make me afraid:  
Then would I speak, and not fear him (9<sup>32-35</sup>).

But gradually the thought of seeing God lays deeper hold upon him, and he becomes confident that if he could receive this vision, all would be well. So strong does this feeling grow that when in the darkness there presently leaps up the conviction of a future revelation—

From my flesh shall I see God:  
Whom I shall see for myself,  
And mine eyes shall behold, and not another (19<sup>26-27</sup>)—

he is physically prostrated with excess of joy, and the fainting cry escapes him—

My reins are consumed within me (19<sup>27</sup>).

This means, of course, that there is a contradiction in Job's attitude. On the one hand, he assails the moral government of God in the most scathing terms; on the other hand, his spirit pants for the revelation of the Divine Presence. Thus it would almost seem as though the duality of attitude in the prologue, respecting the issue of the trial, were justified by the dualism developed in Job, as though *both* the Lord and the Accuser were right, so near does Job go to cursing his Maker, so strongly does he cleave after God's Presence.

This antinomy is a transcript of experience. One meets it in great thinkers like Lucretius, whose scorn of the gods, as Dr. John Masson has shown in his valuable book, was yet accompanied by an essential piety of attitude towards that which may be known of God 'through the things that are made, even His everlasting power and divinity.' 'His feeling for Nature,' says Masson, 'is a reverence which might almost of itself be called worship—a worship which defies his creed' (p. 74). There is, as has been said by another writer, an anti-Lucretius in Lucretius (Glover, *Conflict of Religions*, p. 27, quoting M. Patin). In the same way it may truly be said there is an anti-Job in Job, or rather a Job in the anti-Job. And it is not so much the consummate genius of the artist as the working of true experience which leads the author to develop the discord in the patriarch's

tempest-tost nature into the harmony of a new attitude to God. Boldly does the sufferer appeal against God to God—

Mine eye poureth out tears unto God;  
That he would maintain the right of a man with God  
(16<sup>20</sup>. 21).

Give now a pledge, be surety for me with thyself (17<sup>8</sup>).

So striking a feature of the poem has inevitably led Christian men to hear in it the call of humanity for an Incarnation. Job's conception of the Daysman, the Heavenly Witness, the Afterman, the Avenger, represents a craving such as man at his deepest has ever felt. Yet the writer's thought, while throwing out these great conceptions, does not reach the Christian goal. It looks for a theophany but not an Incarnation. The confident expectation—

I know that my redeemer liveth . . .  
And from my flesh shall I see God:  
Whom I shall see for myself,  
And mine eyes shall behold, and not another—

is evidently regarded by the author as satisfied by the Voice and Glory from the whirlwind—

I had heard of thee by the hearing of the ear,  
But *now* mine eye seeth thee (42<sup>6</sup>).<sup>1</sup>

Not even from afar does Job see the Christ. There is no passage in the book which is, strictly speaking, Messianic. And it may be it is for this reason that the writers of the N.T. make no use of material which to us seems so rich in its apologetic value. Hence, however greatly we may appreciate that pluralistic conception of God developed in Job under terrific stress of trial, the main purpose of the poem does not lead us to pursue the logical objective of his craving, but to view the matter subjectively, in its reaction upon his own moral nature. The governing thought in our inquiry must be that of the prologue—the testing of Job's character by fire. And here we notice that it is in strict line with the purpose of the prologue that there comes the cry from the furnace—

He knoweth the way that I take;  
When he hath tried me, I shall come forth as gold (23<sup>10</sup>).

The very thing the Accuser had questioned, the integrity of Job, is here exquisitely revealed. It is as though at this point Job had received a glimpse of the scene in heaven, hitherto hidden from him, and had caught for a moment at the secret of his

pain—not penalty, nor injustice, but probation, and that in order to the vindication of human worth. Thereafter, even if the clouds should roll down closing the view, nothing avails to destroy the magnificent fidelity of the sufferer.

One other passage of similar nature remains to be noted. It manifests, if less piety and hope, a yet sublimer confidence—

As God liveth, who hath taken away my right;  
And the Almighty, who hath made my soul bitter;

Surely my lips shall not speak unrighteousness,  
Neither shall my tongue utter deceit.

Till I die I will not put away mine integrity from me.  
My righteousness I hold fast, and will not let it go:  
My heart shall not reproach me so long as I live (27<sup>2-6</sup>).

As Dr. Davidson<sup>2</sup> has pointed out, the patriarch here in effect 'proclaims his resolution to adhere to righteousness though God and man alike show themselves unjust.' Could the Accuser, we ask, receive a finer answer than this?

We need not linger long over the Voice from the whirlwind except to indicate how completely it exonerates Job from any worse fault than that of foolish speaking. Whatever the purpose of the Divine Speaker—and that purpose is not very obscure—it is impressive that after the cruel accusations of the friends of Job, and the rigour of their ideas of the Divine Holiness, the Lord Himself brings no weightier charge against Job than that of 'darkening counsel by words without knowledge.' The semi-blasphemous expostulations of Job, his arraignment of God for cruelty and injustice, are simply ignored—a line of procedure on the writer's part which is in strict accord with both prologue and epilogue, confirming our view of the general unity of the book. The Lord addresses Job as though Job were all that He had already in the presence of the Accuser declared him to be. The whole spirit of the speech is conceived in the grand style, with a regal liberality of outlook. It shows us the sweep of stars, the rain falling on a land where no man is, and the wild ass whose house is the wilderness. But a more unethical address was never ascribed to a Holy God. In the circumstances, that is one of its charms. For, obliquely, it repudiates the friends. One feels that they must have been shocked at such a godless God—not that any shocking thing is said, but that

<sup>1</sup> See Kautzsch, *D.B. Extra*, p. 730.

<sup>2</sup> *Old Testament Theology*, p. 270.

so much is left unsaid. For so far as Job is concerned, it seems to be assumed that he does not need any conviction of sin, such as Zophar especially had desired for him. Apparently all that he does need is a wider survey of life. Such sin as may be truly laid against him is but the foolishness of speaking of things too wonderful for him, and to this fault Job had already pleaded guilty in the earlier stages of debate, and does so again when the Lord has ended His address.

In perfect harmony with the Voice from the whirlwind is the closing word of the Lord in the epilogue to Eliphaz: 'My wrath is kindled against thee, and against thy two friends: for ye have not spoken of me the thing that is right, as my servant Job hath.' That also is conceived in the grand, the regal style. Job had said many indefensible things of God, and the friends had been the Lord's champions throughout. Yet look deeper, and it becomes clear to us that, while he whose orthodoxy is untouched by faith in man can never speak rightly for God, he who holds at all costs to his own inner integrity, though the very universe seem against him, is God's *best* vindicator. This is a truth that is foreign neither to the nobler thinkers of antiquity nor to the modern mind. 'The impious man,' said Epicurus, 'is not he who denies the existence of the gods like those commonly worshipped; on the contrary, the impious man is he who asserts the gods to be such as the vulgar conceive them.'<sup>1</sup> Tennyson wrote the same when he sang—

There lives more faith in honest doubt,  
Believe me, than in half the creeds.

Perhaps we may go further. Wordsworth speaks of

Conscience reverence and obeyed  
As God's most intimate presence in the soul.<sup>2</sup>

This allusion may seem a little too modern to compare with the thought of a Hebrew poet. And yet is it not true that there is an amazing sense of the oneness of God and man continually underlying the thought of Holy Scripture? A sinner who is believed to have stained his hands with blood and lust cries to God in his distress—

Against thee, thee only, have I sinned.

In Second Isaiah, as Dr. Davidson writes, 'Jehovah and Israel are not two, but glorified Israel reflects His glory.'<sup>3</sup> And the words of our Lord come to us from the Gospel: 'Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these, ye have done it unto me.' In any case, Job has spoken rightly of his God in that he has declared himself for truth though the heavens should fall.

It is in this there lies the final answer to the Accuser. The question, 'Doth Job serve God for nought?' implied the absence of any core of reality in Job's worship of his Maker. And it is seen that in the thickest darkness and deepest pain Job holds to the things that are of God—uprightness of spirit and hatred of evil. The thing which in every age the world demands to see in the religious man—secret truth—is revealed beyond possibility of cavil.

The question which may rise in our minds, however, concerns the fictitious character of the story. Historic fact may lie behind the poem. Spiritual fact is certainly embodied in it. But the work, with all its passion, is obviously a free treatment. Hence we may still be tempted to ask, Do people really act like this? Surely we may cling to at least an affirmative *hope*. The case of John Hus comes to our mind as that of one whose martyrdom was not so much in defence of truths men counted heresies—for in matters of doctrine Hus did finally agree to the findings of the Holy Council—as in defence of his own integrity leading him to refuse a formal retraction of things he had never said or done. A nearer parallel to the case of Job is that of an obscure Turkish martyr, of whom Mr. Lecky tells us in his *History of Rationalism*,<sup>4</sup> Mohammed Effendi, who died in defence of the doctrine of Atheism. Nearer still, and yet also infinitely far away, is the death of our Lord. The cry of dereliction, rendered as Bengel preferred to translate it, and as surely the aorist here should be rendered (ἐγκατέλιπες), 'Why *didst* thou forsake me?' shows that Jesus knew a vacancy at least as desolate as that of Job, and yet was silent until around His spirit He felt the returning clasp of God. By that cry we are reminded that not only the upright man but the Holiest of all suffered, maintaining a stainless front, yet not knowing the reason of the

<sup>3</sup> *Old Testament Theology*, p. 262.

<sup>4</sup> 'Although there is no recompense to be looked for, yet the love of truth constraineth me to die in its defence.'—Lecky, ii. 371.

<sup>1</sup> Diog. ix. 123, quoted by Masson, 410.

<sup>2</sup> *Works*, 455.

sternest element in His pain, learning in this thing also to be made like unto His brethren. So the final vindication of human worth is after all in history. We meet it in the cross of Christ.

As we sum up this brief study of Job we return once more to its author's purpose. Negatively, he sought to modify, if not to destroy, the doctrine of suffering, as commonly held in Israel up to the time of the Exile, and as he himself no doubt had once believed it. But his aim was positive too. It seems plain enough that he put in place of the penal doctrine a doctrine of probation. That brings his work into comparison with a third view of the problem, one belonging, probably, to his own period of Hebrew history—the theory of *vicarious* suffering in Second Isaiah. There is no necessary conflict between Job and Second Isaiah, excepting where it may be said that in the latter we have a view of suffering not perfectly cleared from the old legalistic notion. In so far as any conflict exists at all, the honours may be divided. The teaching in Second Isaiah approaches the truth of the cross of Christ more nearly in expressing the love that can suffer for guilty men, while the teaching of Job is nearer on another side, in understanding the suffering undertaken as sympathetic rather than as penal.

The doctrine of Job is, then, a doctrine of probation, and the question arises, Will this stand the tests of experience any better than the penal theory? In the form of the poet's thought, 'No.' God cannot need to experiment with His creatures in order to discover their worth. And we have got beyond the mediæval conception of a public opinion in the Kingdom of God that requires to be considered. But the way in which a good man will bear great adversities will often reveal the genuineness of his piety by developing it. 'A deep distress doth humanize his soul.' May we not say that Job becomes a greater man through the

agency of pain? He sees life no longer from the viewpoint of an Arab chieftain, but from that of the outcast. His thought of God is both corrected and enlarged. One might easily make too much of his appeal against God to God; and yet a man who has made that appeal can never again think of God as a monad, and that means a gain. It is an open question how far certain passages in Job's speeches indicate the dawn of faith in an after-life. Certainly Job set out from the usual unhappy view of that subject, and we cannot decisively say he ever transcended it. But the man who has once challenged the hopelessness of his age with the question, 'If a man die, shall he live again?' and the heart of his Maker with the prayer, 'Thou wouldest have a desire unto the work of thine own hands,' is not likely in the hour of returning peace to acquiesce in the thought of another and a final separation from God.

So if suffering is neither always penal nor always probationary, it may yet be creational. And just as we enter the world through the pains of another, so the sufferings of the present time may be inevitable to the shaping of a future birth. In any case, if we are deepened by the things we endure, it will not matter so much whether or not our theories are correct. Our words of wind and language of revolt may be to a regal God only the wrath that praises Him—a thing at worst immaterial, so long as the integrate soul grows deeper in its capacities for the Divine, so long as the words of Job continue to receive fulfilment—

Yet shall the righteous hold on his way  
And he that hath clean hands shall wax stronger and  
stronger (17<sup>9</sup>).

For as this personal direction of our experience is maintained we are drawn into the richer life of the Spirit of God, and, in the language of a recent writer, we then begin to 'assist in the spiritual transfiguration of the universe.'<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Boyce Gibson's *Eucken*, p. 17.