

THE HISTORICITY, INTEGRITY AND INSPIRATION OF THE BOOK OF JOB (2)

Lee Carl Finley, BS, MDiv, PhD

Response

In view of the wide range of opinion concerning the aforementioned issues related to the book of Job, what can we say? How ought the Reformed believer approach this book? In all that has gone before, I have briefly reviewed these introductory issues as a precursor to stating my own view concerning the historicity and integrity of the book of Job. I have tried to illustrate the difficulty inherent in any serious study of the book of Job and the fact that very little external evidence can be brought to bear upon these matters. Thus the student of the Word of God is left with various avenues of internal evidence.

It is my opinion, after reviewing numerous sources on this issue and examining various lines of thought, that the book of Job belongs to the earliest times of biblical history. Please consider the following:

A) The Historical Nature of the Book and Character of Job

First, the book of Job appears to have been written to be understood as coming from the age from which it purports to come. The book reads as a history. The book itself states that it is a history of the man Job. At no point does the book ever give the impression that it is anything other than a history—the godly, accurate history—of the life and trials of Job. Note the first verse of the book: “There was a man in the land of Uz, whose name was Job; and that man was perfect and upright, and one that feared God, and eschewed evil.” There is nothing to indicate at the outset that what follows is anything but history.

In addition, the speech of the characters involved follows an early speech pattern. In chapter three, we have the beginning of the dialogue or polemic section of the book, as opposed to the narrative section found in the first two chapters. This has been widely recognized by scholars in their study of the structure of the book. What has not been so widely recognized is that each of these conversations between Job and his three friends begins with a very

Historicity, Integrity and Inspiration of Job

common narrative device which is very prevalent within the various sections of the Bible: the phrase "... *and (he) answered and said ...*" This construction is found in every chapter of the dialogue section of Job where the speaker alternates between Job and his three friends (i.e., Job 3:2; 4:1; 6:1; 8:1; 9:1; 11:1; 12:1; 15:1; 16:1; 18:1; 19:1; 20:1; 21:1; 22:1; 23:1; 25:1; 26:1). In Job 27 the pattern is interrupted slightly where Job continues the discourse. This is again repeated in 29:1.

Chapter 32 introduces Elihu. The pattern also continues with his speech (32:6, 34:1). In 36:1 Elihu states that he will continue his speech as was found with Job earlier. This speech pattern continues with God utilizing the same pattern in Job 38:1 and 40:1. Job uses this same grammatical construction in his response to God in 42:1.

From even a cursory examination of a concordance, one can find that this phrase was a common narrative device in the history of Israel. It would seem that this was an earlier literary device, one common in the earlier books of the Bible. This device is also found in both Daniel and Ezra. However, it is not commonly found in Nehemiah and only sparingly in Esther. Although such a construction may indicate an Aramaic influence, it may also indicate an overall Hebrew idiom that was used early on in the history of Israel, which later fell into disuse, and then was revived in or after the exile. Surprisingly, it is also found in the New Testament, in both the Gospels and the book of Revelation. Clearly, more study is needed in this area. But suffice it to say that *this speech pattern is consistent with what is known of the patriarchal age*. This, coupled with the other points above, does not mitigate against an early date, but actually supports such a date. This in turn points to an earlier date of composition for the book of Job.

Second, it is the biblical witness that the book of Job was understood as coming from early age. The book of Job was understood to represent *the life and times of a real person*. James, the brother of our Lord, understood that the character of Job was an historical one:

Take, my brethren, the prophets, who have spoken in the name of the Lord, for an example of suffering affliction, and of patience. Behold, we count them happy which endure. Ye have heard of the patience of Job, and have seen the end of

British Reformed Journal

the Lord; that the Lord is very pitiful, and of tender mercy
(James 5:10-11).

Job was understood by James as *an historical character*, a man who lived in the times described by the book. The book reads as if it were a historical narrative. There is no difference in grammatical construction of this book (especially the narrative sections) from that which is found concerning others of the patriarchal age (i.e., Genesis).

But what is even more significant is the last phrase of James' reference: "... *that the Lord is very pitiful, and of tender mercy.*" If the narrative section (chapters 1-2 and 42) was the only part deemed historical by the biblical writers, where do we see the mercy of God in these chapters? The narrative or prose section makes no sense without the poetic section. The character of God is revealed in the latter chapters, where God speaks with Job. *To state that this dialogue was not originally part of the story is to gut the meaning of the narrative.* In fact, James' argument in chapter 5 loses all of its force if it is predicated upon a *fictional* character. This is why James later uses Elijah as an example of those that pray—he was an actual person. If James were to insert here a fictional example of fervent prayer, would his words have any meaning? Of course not. Likewise, James uses the example of Job because he knew that he was an example, *a real example*, of perseverance under trial. To James, Job was a real person. And the book of Job was a faithful record of everything he endured.

Even in the Old Testament Job was viewed as an historical character. Note the following verses from the book of Ezekiel:

Though these three men, Noah, Daniel, and Job, were in it, they should deliver but their own souls by their righteousness, saith the Lord GOD Though Noah, Daniel, and Job, were in it, as I live, saith the Lord God, they shall deliver neither son nor daughter; they shall but deliver their own souls by their righteousness (Eze. 14:14, 20).

The very mention of the name of Job in Ezekiel is seen by many scholars as proof that the character only, *not the story*, was known at that time. But I propose that the opposite is actually true. The very mention of the name of Job *presupposes* that both the character and the story *predate* Ezekiel.

Historicity, Integrity and Inspiration of Job

Others, as we have seen above, contend that the character of Job is to a greater or lesser degree a work of fiction. If this is true, *such a writing of fiction*, based upon an historical/patriarchal character centuries after the fact (as is so often proposed for the book of Job), *is unknown elsewhere in Scripture*. Further, it appears from the type of material that was admitted to the canon of the Old Testament that such a fictional work *could not and would not have been admitted* to the canon. The material from this time, from the time of the patriarchs or that purports to be from this time, reads as if it is historical material. Further, it was *understood to be historical material*. The vast majority of readers—priests, kings, scribes and laymen—all saw the early books of the Old Testament as historical. This is true of the other historical writings up to the time of the exile. With this understanding of the canon, why would the Jewish people admit a book concerning a known fictional character into the canon (clearly knowing that the work itself was fiction) *and why would none have mentioned that fact for hundreds of years, even up to the time of Christ?*

The historical parallels to Job in other near eastern cultures also point to the historicity of the book. For the modern scholar to state that Job is of the same class or character of literature with the “righteous sufferer” writings which were prevalent in the ancient near eastern world around the time of the second millennium B.C. and then, in the next breath, to state that Job was most likely written in the time of the exile or that Job has a post-exilic date (that is, that it is a fictional work) is effectively to disassociate the book from the very genre that modern scholars claim it represents.

In addition, we need to note the context of the Ezekiel verses. In these verses, we find the Lord Himself speaking. From an evangelical and Reformed position, *it appears that God Himself considered Job to be an historical person*. Thus we see in the time of Ezekiel that Job was known well enough that the mere mention of his name was enough to call to one’s memory the circumstances of his life, just as it was for the life of Noah or Daniel. The primary way of getting around this obvious difficulty is by denying that the words found in Ezekiel are actually God’s words. *Job was understood to be a historical person*. If the narrative portions (at least) of the life of Job were not in existence, there seems little reason for the mention of his name. Further, without the dialectical or polemic portions of the book there seems to be little reason for the Lord to

invoke Job's name at this point. It is Job in his righteousness before God that is at issue in this passage in Ezekiel. To state that the dialogue portion of the book was not known at this point is to gut the argument we find the Lord making in the Ezekiel passage.

Moreover, if, as others say, a historical character of Job was "fleshed out" at some later date (e.g., in a post-exilic time frame by some unknown author), why then is there no mention of such a creation in the Talmud. In fact, the further that one brings this date forward into the exilic or post-exilic period, the silence of the Talmudic writers to this "later creation" is truly amazing. If the book of Job was fresh and new in the post-exilic age, why is there no mention of it, especially in the age in which Israel was dealing with the excruciating judgment of God in and after the Babylonian captivity?

B) The Book of Job Fits Into the Historical Setting of Early Near Eastern Semitic History and Writings

The book of Job reads as if were a very old work. This has been noted by many scholars, usually within the context of the author of Job being a "masterful artist" or a skilled writer in his so capturing the milieu of the ancient Near East. Davidson notes the setting of Job:

The question of the age of the Book must not be confounded with that of the age of Job himself. Job is represented as living in the patriarchal times. The author has skillfully thrown the colours of this age over his composition and preserved its general features. Thus, though employing the Israelitish name Jehovah himself, he allows the speakers in the Book to use the divine names peculiar to patriarchal times, as *El*, *Eloah* ... *Almighty*. No doubt he betrays his own nationality, which he has no desire to conceal, by letting the name Jehovah escape two or three times from the mouth of Job, in current formulas into which the name entered (ch. i.21, xii.9; cf. xxviii.28). Again, like the great forefathers of Israel, Job is represented as rich in cattle and flocks (ch. i.3, xlii.12; comp Gen. xii.16, xxiv.35, xxvi.13, xxx.43). The idea of the separate priesthood is not developed. Job, the head of the

Historicity, Integrity and Inspiration of Job

family, is (p. lxiv) also its priest and offers sacrifice (ch. i.5, xlii.8; comp Gen. xx.13, xxxi.54) Further, the sacrifice in use is the “burnt-offering,” as in ancient times, before the more developed ritual in Israel came into operation. The great age, too, to which Job attains is patriarchal (ch. xlii.16; comp. Gen. xxv.7, xxxv.28), though Bildad speaks as if the age of men in his day was greatly reduced in comparison with former standards (ch. viii.8). The money referred to is the ancient *kesitah* (ch. xlii.11; comp. Gen. xxxiii.19, Josh. xxiv.32); and the musical instruments named are the simple ones of primitive times (ch. xxi.12, xxx.31; comp. Gen. iv.21, xxxi.27). And, to mention no more, historical allusions of any directness are usually to the great events of the patriarchal world (ch. xviii.15, xxii.15 *seq*).¹

But is it not at least possible that the book is as old as it purports to be? The reason that Job was represented as being in a priesthood position is because *he was in that position*. The reason Job’s wealth was represented by his possessions was because *that was how he was viewed*. The reason that Job was said to have lived a long life was because *he did live such a long life*. What we find in Job accords beautifully with what we find of the historical situation represented in the Book of Genesis and the time of the patriarchs. As has been noted above, Job has much in common with other early writings, both biblical (i.e., the Genesis narratives) and those coming from other near eastern cultures.

It has also been noted that there are several parallels in various books of the Bible with the book of Job. Samuel Driver has noted that the following biblical books have some manner of parallelism/allusions to the book of Job: Genesis, Deuteronomy, Psalms, Proverbs, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Lamentations, Hosea, Amos, Ecclesiastes and Malachi (as well as Sirach).² It has been suggested that this is proof that the book was written *after* these other works because the author quotes these sources. But cannot this borrowing have

¹ Davidson, *The Book of Job*, pp. lxiii-lxiv. This sentiment is echoed by Pope, *Job: Introduction, Translation and Notes*, p. xxxii.

² Driver and Gray, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, p. lxvi.

occurred in the other direction?³ Why is it so amazing to state that this may have occurred? Although not numerous, we do have examples of various Old Testament prophets quoting those that went before. Instances of this can be found with certain parallels between Micah and Isaiah, numerous borrowings from the book of Kings in Chronicles and the concept of the Day of the Lord being used in several prophetic books (possibly originating in the book of Obadiah). We also have various instances where later writers were found quoting the writings of Moses. Why, then, is it unthinkable that prophets or other biblical writers in their ministry among the people of Israel would use a book such as Job?

C) The Use of Aramaic and the Historical Context of the Time of Writing Proposed by Many Modern Scholars

As has been shown above in the numerous scholarly quotations, the most common period for the date of writing of the book of Job is either in the time of the exile or (more commonly) the period following the exile. One primary reason for so doing is the abundance of Aramaic terms and forms found within the book of Job. Zöckler comments on the use of Aramaic in the book of Job⁴—both Aramaic terms and Aramaic grammatical devices (e.g., the -yn plural endings on words, and the use of the *lahmed* as a marker of the accusative) and the use of Aramaizing forms “such as occur in ch. vi.27; viii.8; xv.7; 21.23, etc.”⁵ This use of Aramaic has become, for many, *de facto* proof of a late(r) date of composition. Numerous scholars could be brought forth as proponents of this line of thought. H. H. Rowley in his work on Job is representative:

The substantial Aramaic colouring of the language would favour a date not earlier than the fifth century.⁶

The language of the book is marked by the use of many words found only here in the Old Testament. Aramaisms are fre-

³ In noting the books mentioned in the above quote of Driver and Gray, with the possible exceptions of Genesis and Deuteronomy, the books mentioned could have easily borrowed from the book of Job written earlier.

⁴ Lewis and Zöckler, *Job: A Rhythmical Version*, p. 243.

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ H. H. Rowley, *Job* (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd., 1970), p. 22.

Historicity, Integrity and Inspiration of Job

quent, and there are not a few words which can be explained only from Arabic. Very frequently the author uses a word or root common in Aramaic as a parallel to a Hebrew word. This is consistent with the view that the book is of post-exilic origin, coming from the period when Aramaic was increasingly influencing Hebrew speech. There are some linguistic differences between the Elihu speeches and the rest of the book (cf. Gray, pp. xli ff.), and in particular the Aramaic element is rather more prominent in the Elihu speeches (ibid, xlvi).⁷

Concerning this argument for a late date of composition based upon its usage of Aramaic, it must first be noted that to do so effectively denies the historicity of the book. For such a scholar, gone is the possibility that the words we find in the book of Job are the very words of Job. How could they be if it were written some 1,000-1,500 years after the fact?

Second, to affirm that due to its Aramaic usage the book has a late(r) date of composition fails to take into account the historical (i.e., cultural and linguistic) developments that were taking place within Judaism in the post-exilic/intertestamental period. Robert Gordis notes the following regarding the Jewish use of the Aramaic language for religious purposes in this time period:

In Palestine, Aramaic had largely displaced Hebrew as the spoken language of the masses of the people by the beginning of the Christian Era. As a result the practice had developed of having a *Meturgeman* or “public translator” in the synagogue to offer an oral translation into Aramaic of the scriptural reading. The teachers of normative Judaism were greatly concerned lest the Hebrew original be displaced. They therefore insisted—as long as they were able—that these Aramaic translations remain oral and not be consigned to writing. Ultimately, necessity triumphed over other considerations and the various written Targums came into being.⁸

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 23; cf. Driver and Gray, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, pp. lxx-lxxi.

⁸ Gordis, *The Book of God and Man*, p. 362, n. 41. Regarding Rabbinic opposition to Aramaic translations, see pp. 217-218.

Here we find Gordis presenting a rationale for how the Jews of the intertestamental period went to great lengths *not* to use Aramaic in the holy language, especially as it related to the use of Aramaic in the worship of God. This “exalting” of Hebrew may have begun with the return of the exiles, under the governorship of Nehemiah. In chapter 13 of Nehemiah, we find Nehemiah actually beating some of the returned exiles for forsaking their Jewish heritage. And language was one of the issues that Nehemiah mentions in this chapter. Thus, it appears that this respect for Hebrew, especially as it was used in the worship of God, continued on into the post-exilic period and down to the time of the Christian era.

Yet later in his work, Gordis himself assigns a late, post-exilic date to the book of Job based partially on the Aramaisms found therein.⁹ But does it not stand to reason that if the Jews had the attitude that is found in the book of Nehemiah (an attitude that Gordis himself states continued to the Christian era) that any material that was written in this period would *by necessity* have been written in Hebrew, *to the exclusion of Aramaic*?¹⁰

Aramaic, even the numerous Aramaic words and constructions found within the pages of the book of Job, does not by necessity point to an earlier date of composition. I understand that this does not necessarily point definitively to a patristic date, but it is my contention that the linguistic realities that so many scholars state were present in the time of the supposed post-exilic date of writing were also present in this very early time. In fact, if this book were written as has been suggested in a post-exilic period, would not one expect the number of Aramaisms to be far greater than that which we find in the book of Job? The book of Job which we presently have is one of the longest books in the Old Testament. Should we not then expect to find many more Aramaisms? One may wish to counter (as I have illustrated elsewhere): Job was written in a time of renewed Hebrew pride and a renewed sense of value of the Hebrew language. Thus, the author consciously did not use more Aramaisms than he did. If that were the case, he should have done a better job of not using “foreign” terms in his writing.

⁹ As has been shown above, this is a common view, that the Aramaic usage is seen as a *de facto* proof of a later date.

¹⁰ Gordis, *The Book of God and Man*, p. 218; Gordis also dates the book of Daniel in this time period (i.e., second century BC), p. 343, n. 20.

Historicity, Integrity and Inspiration of Job

It is my opinion that the author used the terms found in the book of Job, both Hebrew and Aramaic, because *these were the terms that were used in the age in which Job lived and suffered*. Hebrew and Aramaic are sister languages, being derived from the same mother tongue, and their use in Job represents a time period when both these languages were closer in form—that is, an earlier date. To state that the author of Job was a master literary author in his composition and to deny in the same breath that the terms used represent the speech of the day is to diminish and deprecate the work, in effect stating that *this masterful author was not skilled enough correctly to represent the language*.

The Aramaic that is found within the pages of the book of Job by necessity points to an earlier date of composition. Not all have seen that Aramaic automatically equals a later date. John Hartley, in his commentary on Job, notes the following:

... [another] point that [is] used to favor the late date [is] the number of Aramaisms throughout the book ... Nevertheless, [this point is] debatable. The advance in understanding of the interplay between Aramaic and Hebrew, going back to the 9th century B.C., has shown the fallacy in dating documents late because of Aramaisms.¹¹

And here we seemingly find Hartley echoing what was stated over 100 years before by Otto Zöckler:

... [these Aramaic features] prove nothing definite in favour of a later origin, for such peculiarities are of general occurrence in books of a highly poetic character, as e.g. in Solomon's Song, in the song of Deborah, Judges v.; and also in the prophet Amos, although these books must not for that reason be brought down very late in time.¹²

Others elsewhere have noted similarly. Avi Hurvitz, who has long studied this issue, commented concerning the issue of the importance of Aramaisms in the text of scripture:

¹¹ Hartley, *The Book of Job*, p. 18.

¹² Lewis and Zöckler, *Job: A Rhythmical Version*, p. 243.

The study of Aramaic has achieved impressive results in the last few decades. The discovery of new texts, reflecting previously undocumented stages in the history of Aramaic, has paved the way for a more profound knowledge of the Aramaic dialects and their linguistic history. Naturally, this development directly illuminates the issue of “Aramaisms” within BH (cf. Kutscher 1970: 358). For our purposes, it is particularly important to note here the discovery of Aramaic inscriptions dated as early as the beginning of the first millennium BCE—that is, the first Temple period. Such findings have completely overturned the older view that every “Aramaism” is necessarily indicative of the late biblical era. This mistaken view, which—as already noted—was especially common among nineteenth-century scholars, was fostered by the absence of written sources testifying to the vitality of Aramaic in the early biblical period. However, since it has become clear from these new sources that Aramaic was widespread and enjoyed high prestige already in the pre-exilic period, it could no longer be maintained that the “Aramaisms” encountered in BH must reflect later linguistic usage.¹³

In addition, it has been noted that in earlier sources what has been commonly called an Aramaism may actually be a term that was common both to Hebrew and Aramaic in antiquity but that had subsequently fallen into disuse in Hebrew yet was retained in Aramaic. Such features are called Aramaic-like features by Semitic scholar Gary Rendsburg of Rutgers University,¹⁴ who also denies that Aramaic should be used as a *de facto* indicator of a late(r) date.

Thus it cannot be said that any use of Aramaic in and of itself proves a late date of composition, especially in light of more recent archeological discoveries. If anything, given the relationship between these two languages, Aramaic

¹³ Avi Hurvitz, *Hebrew and Aramaic in the Biblical Period: The Problem of ‘Aramaisms’ in linguistic research on the Hebrew Bible*, in *Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology and Typology*, ed. Ian Young (London & New York: T & T Clark International, 2003), pp. 29-30.

¹⁴ See his *Hurvitz Redux: On the Continued Scholarly Inattention to a Simple Principle of Hebrew Philology* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University, 2011), available online (http://jewishstudies.rutgers.edu/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_view&gid=108&Itemid=158).

Historicity, Integrity and Inspiration of Job

may actually be a marker of an earlier date. Note the words of C. F. Burney, in commenting on the Aramaic usage in the Song of Deborah in Judges 5:

Indeed, it may be claimed that such evidence as we *do* possess as to the relationship between the two languages at a later period (and therefore *a fortiori*, at this period) tends all in the other direction; *i.e.* it is more likely that, if we possessed ample evidence as to the character of the Hebrew or Canaanite and Aramaic, which were spoken at this period, we should find that both languages existed in dialectical forms exhibiting so many common characteristics that we should (at any rate in some examples) find it difficult, if not impossible, to draw a distinction between the two, and to say, "This is Hebrew (Canaanite), and this is Aramaic."¹⁵

Thus for Burney seeing a relation between Aramaic and Hebrew was not a problem, but to be expected, given what we know of linguistics and the development of languages. For Burney, Aramaic and Hebrew were languages that most likely sprang from the same or a similar source. And with him I concur. Thus, whatever Aramaic usage may be found in the book of Job cannot reasonably be utilized to argue for a later date of composition.

The usage of Aramaic forms or grammar cannot be brought forth as *de facto* support for a late(r) date of composition. To do so violates the historicity of the book and seems to ignore the close linguistic relationship which has existed between Hebrew and Aramaic through the centuries.

A Final Comment Regarding the Historicity and Integrity of Job and the Inspiration of Scripture

As can be seen from the discussion above, I believe that the book of Job is an historical record of the life and trials of the man Job, of the often-heated

¹⁵ In a footnote, Burney adds, "The fact is well recognized that Hebrew is 'the language of Canaan' (cf. Isa. 19:18); and that Phoenician, Moabite, etc., are examples of the same language, with dialectical variations." Although this may be overstating the case, it does demonstrate that, for Burney, these languages were, in their earliest forms, related languages (*The Book of Judges with Introduction and Notes and The Hebrew Text of the Book of Kings with an Introduction and Appendix, Two Volumes in One* [New York: KTAV Publishing House, Inc., 1970], p. 172).

discussion that Job had with his three friends, of the very words of the Lord to Job, and of the restoration of Job's possessions. This concurs with the earliest external witnesses to the book. This also concurs with the abundance of internal evidence that we have just examined. And most importantly, *this is what the book itself demands*. Nowhere do we find any hint that the book of Job is anything other than a history of what transpired in and around his life. This, I have attempted to show, is the biblical, historical view of the book of Job.

But related to the historicity and integrity of the book of Job is the issue of inspiration and canonicity. Over the past year, I have been studying the book of Job. And in that time, it has become increasingly clear that those who deny, in one manner or another, the historicity of the book also deny the inspiration of this book. Numerous theories have been proposed, some which have been mentioned, some not. But in each case, the result is the same. The book of Job is seen as just a work of a man, and not the work of one moved along by the Holy Spirit (II Pet. 1:21). This can be seen in the numerous discussions regarding the polemical section of the book. This can be seen in the comments of scholars concerning the heavenly interaction between the Lord and Satan. This can be seen in the response of commentators to the dialogue of the Lord with Job. At almost every turn the historicity of the book is denied—and with it the inspiration of the book. One cannot deny the historicity of the book without undercutting the inspiration of the book. How can it be said that the book was damaged in some form, that entire sections may be misplaced and mis-ordered or missing entirely, and yet affirm inspiration?¹⁶ And even if one does claim to hold to such views and yet affirm the inspiration of Job, such a one could then be faulted—and rightly so—for having a low view of the divine preservation of the Word of God. I am being kind at this point. Such a one in practice cannot seriously claim to hold to any kind of a Reformed view of the preservation of Scripture.

The book of Job quickly exposes the starting point of a scholar. If one holds to the inspiration of the Word of God, there are simply some items and/or doctrines he cannot support (such as a denial of the historicity of the book). The doctrine of inspiration answers for us the following question—are the words found in the book of Job the very words of God? The answer is a resounding

¹⁶ As in the case of the third speech of Bildad in Job 25.

Historicity, Integrity and Inspiration of Job

yes. If not, this book has *no place* within the holy canon. If *yes*, *historicity is no question*. The book claims to be historical. The book was understood by other biblical authors as historical. The Lord Himself affirms its inspiration. And in so doing, He affirms its historicity. Yes, the book is historical. And we know this because the book is inspired.

I remind the reader of this important point because the book of Job is one book which historically has been hard for many to understand. Numerous theories have been presented to deal with these difficulties (both real and perceived) as we have seen. But in so doing, it appears that many have not given a number of these theories a critical examination in that the book was difficult. The book of Job is indeed difficult. It is one of the more difficult books in the Word of God. But these difficulties do not give the scholar, the pastor or the student of the Word of God licence to entertain doctrines or teachings which deny cardinal tenets of the Reformed faith (such as inspiration). By His grace, may we all, as we study this difficult but powerful book, affirm that which the Lord Himself affirms—the historicity of the life of Job.

2014 British Reformed Fellowship Family Conference

**Saturday, 26 July – 2 August, 2014
at Gartmore House near Loch Lomond in Scotland**

God willing, Profs. Herman Hanko and David Engelsma
will give six lectures on the theme

“Be Ye Holy: The Reformed Doctrine of Sanctification”

1. The Divine Work of Sanctification
2. Sanctification and Justification: Relation and Differences
3. The Role of the Law in Sanctification
4. The Imperfection of Sanctification in This Life
5. The Threat of Antinomianism
6. The Victorious Christian Life

For more details, go to
www.britishreformedfellowship.org.uk