The object of this paper is twofold: 1. to trace the history of the passage as it stands in the Authorized Version; and 2. to submit the summary of an interpretation.

1. The history of the passage.

It is taken for granted that the line of succession begins with the Hebrew in the form here presented, and runs through the Septuagint, the Italae and Vulgate, Wiclif, Matthew, Coverdale, Genevan and the Bishops', and that the Chaldee paraphrase, the Syriac and Arabic among the ancients, Luther, Olivetan, Pagninus, Münster and Tremellius, etc., among the more modern, have directly or indirectly influenced the English version. To these should, possibly, be added the names of Diodati and Cassiodoro, as well as that of Castalio. It is unnecessary to state the reasons here, as they are, of course, known to the members of this Society.

Beginning, then, with the LXX., we meet the following text:

25. οἴδα γὰρ ὅτι ἀνυωνός ἦσσιν ὁ ἐκλέξις μετὰ μέλλουν ἐπὶ γῆς.
26. ἀναστήσας δέ μου τὸ δέρμα (τὸ σώμα) τὸ ἀνυγμός ταῦτα, παρὰ γὰρ κυρίου μοι ταῦτα συντείλθει, τοῖς ἡμῖν μοι ῥητοῖς καὶ ἐν κύλπι.
The various readings of moment are: 25. ἐγώ for γὰρ in Compl. and some MSS.; ἐξωύς A and some MSS.; comma after μελίων, Roman edition of B.; 26. ἀναστῆσαι το ἄρρητα μου τῷ ἀναστλόου, ταῦτα μου B.; 27. ὁ ὀρθιαμός μου ἔφραξε, B.

It is also proper to add that Theodotion (Hexapla) renders:

25. ὁ ἀγριστεύως μου τῇ, καὶ ἔργας ἐπὶ χώμας ἀναστήσει.
27. Ἐξήλισσον οἱ νέφροι μου ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ μου.

There seems little doubt that the old Septuagintal reading is generally expressed in the old Sixtine rendering (see Walton and Jager): 25. "Scio enim quia aeternus est qui me resoluturus est, super terram ad resuscitandum datem mean quæ perpetuæ hac: a Domino enim hac mihi consummata sunt, 27 quorum ego mihi conscius sum, quæ oculus meus [or, plural] vidi, et non alius, et omnium mihi consummata sunt in sinu." In v. 25, however, quod seems preferable to quia, and ἀναστῆσαι the more accepted reading, according to Origen (Hexapla) at least, appears to have belonged to v. 25, and conformed to the Hebrew; yet, while he renders the latter, "... redemptor meus vivit et novissime super pulverem staturus," his Greek ὁμη ἐν τῷ ἀναστλόου is represented by ... "perennis est qui soluturus me est super terræ." The rendering of Theodotion is unsupported and an interpretation rather than a translation. The most interesting and, perhaps, instructive rendering is that of ἔγι by ἔξωνις, which I regard as a key-word to the meaning; as to the form of the word, that with a double ἐγί, being the less usual, is probably the best sustained; as composed of ἐγί and νῶ, it signifies primarily, ever-flowing, and then perennial, everlasting, ever-living, eternal,—so that we may understand the clause to carry the sense that, in the opinion of the Seventy, Job held that ὁ ἐκλογεύω is eternal, and that dispos of Theodotion’s ἀγριστεύως, although it is cited by Theodoret.—v. 26, tested by the Hebrew, seems to be pure paraphrase, conversion, or conjecture; it makes, of course, good sense, but at the expense of grammar and the omission or addition of words; e.g., it contains no trace of ἓν and ἤμις by ἐξωμις, renders ἅμα το ἀναστλόου ταῦτα, inserts or substitutes for ἤμις τοῦ ἀναστλόου—συνετελέσθη. The changes introduced are so startling, that either a text now unknown must have been the basis of their rendering, or they must have drawn on their imagination for a solution of the difficulties. v. 27 they connect ἤμις, rendered ἦ, with the mysterious ταυτα of v. 26, express ἤμις by ἐκματστο συνεπιστουμαι, confound ἥμις ἦ τον with some form which they felt justified to render: πάντα δὲ μου συνετελέσται, in which rendering the noun entirely disappears, and an enigmatical ἦ looms up
in the shape of πάντα. Their way of evolving this rendering from the
next is very amusing, and sheds light on the origin of the various read-
ings. Their Hebrew text was unpointed and written in uncials, thus:

which they resolved into or spelt out: πάντα, translating as
above, and taking Ἰ, the Chaldee for τὰ, as the equivalent of "π.

As to the real meaning of the ancient Septuagintal rendering, the old
Italic version, which was made from it, bears testimony; it seems to
have stood thus:

"Scio enim quia aeternus est qui me resoluturus est, super terram
resurget cutis mea, qua hæc patitur: a Domino enim mihi haec conti-
gerunt, quorum ego mihi conscius sum, qua oculus meus vidit et non
alius, et omnia mihi consummata sunt in sinu." The variant render-
ings in the Latin text given above, immediately after the Septuagint,
indicate the changes made by Sixtus V. in the edition of 1587; while
that which follows shows the alterations introduced into the Paris Poly-
glot (ed. 1645). "... qui solvere de debe, super terram suscitare
pellem meam que tolerat hæc. Ab enim Domino haec mihi confecta
sunt. Quae ego ... alius; omnia autem ...

The old Italic text, with numerous variations, was that out of which
has grown the Vulgate, and it may be instructive to see how the latter
stood in 1557 (ed. Bryling):

"Scio enim quod redemptor meus vivit, et in novissimo die de terra
surrecturus sum. Et rursum circumdabor pelle mea, et in carne mea
videbo Deum. Quem visurus sum ego ipse, et oculi mei conspecturi
sunt, et non alius, reposita est haec spes mea in sinu meo."

A glance suffices to show that this text is not based on the Septuagint
and the Italæ, and the question arises, which is its basis? We answer,
Jerome's; and it is not only based on it, but it is Jerome's translation
verbatim et literatim.

Now, this text departs very widely, and perhaps audaciously, from
the Hebrew text, for it presents the following variants:


For these departures Jerome assigns no reasons in his translation or
in his commentary, and I have not been able to discover any reason for
them in the Hebrew MSS. or in the ancient versions. Of the latter, I
produce now from Walton the Chaldee Paraphrase, and the Syriac and
Arabic versions in Latin.
Chaldee Paraphrase:


This paraphrase is far less paraphrastic than the Septuagint, and sustains, with due allowance for several peculiar and not very elegant terms, the grammatical structure of the Hebrew text as placed at the head of this paper.

Syriac and Arabic version:


This version, probably as ancient as the Chaldee Paraphrase, is considered to have been made direct from the Hebrew. The text of the passage under notice, however, must have been in many respects different from the Hebrew, if de Rossi's statement of its literalness and great fidelity is to be accepted. Dr. Greedner thinks that it has been influenced by the Chaldee and the Septuagint, but it is not improbable that the original version was corrected by or adapted to them at a later period by Syrian transcribers. Structurally, the version conforms to the Hebrew text in v. 25, for it ends with הָּ, but forsakes it in the subsequent verses, which it seems extremely difficult, if not impossible, to conform to it. It is not improbable, however, that some of the innovations of Jerome have been suggested by this version.

At this stage it may be proper to turn to the English versions.

Wiclif (Forshall and Madden):

"Forsothe I wot that myn agheenbier liveth, and in the laste dai I am to rise fro the erthe; and eft shal ben enuyround with my skin, and in my flesh I shal se God, my sauere. Whom I myself am to seen, and myn eyhen ben to beholden, and noon other. This myn hope is led vp in my bosum."

This is doubtless the first English basis of our present version. With the solitary interpolation of my sauere, it is a literal translation of the Hieronymian text of the Vulgate as given above.

The next English version was doubtless influenced by the continental versions, more especially by those of Luther and the Zürich. Luther's translation of Job appeared in 1524, and the text ran as follows:†

* Circumdederunt haec.

† In almost every instance the extracts given preserve the original spelling and punctuation of the editions from which they have been taken.
Luther (ed. Hans Luft, fo. 1545.)


English Translation.

But I know that my Redeemer liveth, and he will afterwards awake me out of the earth. And thereupon I shall be surrounded with this my skin, and I shall see God in my flesh. The same I shall see for myself, and my eyes shall behold him, and not a stranger. My reins are consumed in my lap.

Concerning this version it is proper to say that the influence of the Vulgate against the Hebrew is very pronounced, for it preserves all the objectionable renderings of the former, except in v. 27 which follows the latter.

The Zürich version came out in 1527-1530, and brought the passage in the form here given:

Zürich (ed. Froschower, fo. 1531.)


English Translation.

For I know that my saviour and protector liveth, and that some day I shall rise again out of the dirt, and that my members shall be again covered over with this skin, and that clothed with my flesh I shall look upon (or, behold) God. Yea, I myself shall look upon (or behold) him, not with other but with these my eyes. My reins shall be consumed within me.

This version is undoubtedly a revision of Luther, with certain paraphrastic amplifications, a marked debasement of expression, and a good deal of conjecture. Both the additions and changes show the revision did not follow the Hebrew text.

The first complete English Bible is Coverdale’s, published in 1535, and our passage stands in it as follows:

“For I am sure, that my redeemer lyueth, and that I shall rise out of the earth in the latter day: that I shall be clothed againe with this skynn, and se God in my flesh. Yee I myself shal beholde him, not with other, but with these same eyes. My reines are consumed within me. . . .”
Collating this with Luther, the Zürich, and the Vulgate as well as Wicklif, we get these results:*

For: 
1. *dann* Z. | *I am sure* W. | *REDEEMER* V. 
2. *agheenbiere* W. | *AND THAT* V. | *I SHALL RISE OUT OF* L. 
3. *Erlöser* L. 

THE EARTH: 
1. *I am to rise from* W. 
2. *aus dem Kaat* V. 
3. *wider auf-_ston wird* Z. 
4. *de terra sur-recturus sum* V. 

THAT I SHALL BE CLOTHED AGAINE: 
1. *and eft shal ben enuyroned* W. 
2. *bekleidet (transposed)* Z. 
3. *deser Haut* Z. 

THIS SKYNNE: 
1. *dieser [meiner] Haut* L. 
2. *ja ich* Z. 
3. *selber Z.* 

NOT WITH OTHER, BUT WITH THESE SAME EYES: 
1. *nit mit andern,* Z. 
2. *sunder mit di-sen meinen* Z. 
3. *augen* Z. 

CONSUMED WITHIN ME: 
1. *sind verzeret in meinem Schos* L. 
2. *werdend in mir verzeert* Z. 

In other words, Coverdale's version of the passage does not contain a single word that gives evidence of a direct reference to the Hebrew. It is not necessary to produce Matthew (folio 1537), for it agrees literally with Coverdale (1535). But it is curious that about 1550 in his translation of Wermüller's *Hope of the Faithful*, he introduces the passage essentially changed, viz.: "For I am sure that my Redeemer liueth; and that he shall stand ouer the dust, or earth, in the latter day; that I shall be clothed agayne with this skynne, and se God in my flesh. Yee, I myself, or, for myself, shall behold him, not another, but with these same eyes." The reason for the changes may be found in his having probably become acquainted with Leo Judae's Latin translation, a rendering of the Septuagint, or Sebastian Münster's version, or he simply rendered the passage as Wermüller gave it. Still another version, not yet mentioned, may have been consulted by Coverdale, although it was published in the same year as his *editio princeps*, which, if printed in Switzerland, would of course raise the possibility into probability. The version of Olivetan, to which I refer, is in some respects very striking, and has, if not directly, certainly indirectly influenced in succession the Genevan, the Bishops' and the Authorized Version. As copies of that edition are extremely rare, and examples seldom met with, I give its

*The words in small capitals denote Coverdale's text, and the letters L. V. W. Z. stand for Luther, Vulgate, Wicklif and the Zürich.*
rendering here: “Car je scay bien que mon redempteur vit, et* qu’il me resuscritical sur la terre au dernier iour. Et combien que les vers aient ronge ceste chair apres ma peau: toutes foys ie verray Dieu en ma chair. Lequel je contemplayer en moy, & mes yeuls le regarderont et non autrè: mes reins sont defaillis a mon sein.”

It is proper to state that Olivetan is not original, as appears from the rendering of Pagninus, here presented, which was published in 1528.

“25. Et ego novi Redemptorem meum vivum, & novissimum qui super terram surget, 26. Et post pellem meam contritam, vermes, con­­triverunt hanc carnem, et de carne mea videbo Deum. 27. Quem ego visurus sum mihi, & oculi mei videbunt, & non alienus: defecerunt renes mei in sinu meo.”

The words: Car je sais bien, bear a closer resemblance to Coverdale’s For I am sure, than Wiclif’s Forsothe I wot, and if Coverdale saw Olivetan before his Bible was published, the presumption that he adopted that phrase is very strong. Variety and inconsistency mark the versions with which he was connected, and the passage before us furnishes a striking illustration of those characteristics, for although the version in Hope of the Faithful contains renderings derived from the Hebrew, a copy of Cranmer (1539) printed by Cawood in 1568 agrees verbatim with Coverdale (1535) and Matthew (1537).

The editions of Taverner likewise present no change whatsoever, except as to the spelling. But the text underwent a tremendous change in the Genevan (1560), as will be seen by comparison:

Coverdale—Matthew—Cranmer.

For I am sure, that my redeemer liueth, and that I shall rise out of the earth in the latter daye: that I shal be clothed againe with this skynne, and se God in my flesh. Yee I myself shal beholde him, not with other, but with these same eyes. My reynes are con­­sumed within me.

In this collation the words in small capitals and italics indicate the changes; that remarkable version reflects the mind, if it does not reveal the hand of Calvin, Münstre, Leo Judæ and Pellican, in addition to the English refugees by whom it was set forth. The version may be said to have been translated direct from the Hebrew, with due consultation and use of the ancient versions and Pagninus, as reference will show. The Genevan translators retained from Coverdale-Cranmer the clause “For I am sure that my Redeemer liveth,” which Olivetan had rendered:

* Margin: Aucüs qu’il est le dernier qui sera debout sur la terre.
"Car je sais bien que mon redempteur vit;" in the next clause: "and he shall stand the last on the earth" they adhered to the Hebrew for the 3d pers. sing. future, and the LXX. ἀναστήσει, but weighed the statement of Münster "potest et sic iste locus reddi, novissimus resurget in pulvere," and the rendering of Leo Juda: "et novissimum qui super terram surget;" the super terram also is expressed in Olivetan's "sur la terre." The Chaldee and Syriac likewise sustained that rendering. To the same French version and Pagninus they seem to be indebted for "and though after my skin worms destroy this bodie," that being an almost literal translation of "Et combien que les vers ayent range ceste chair," the "chair" (flesh) being changed into "bodie," probably suggested by σῶμα; even the "yet" is a literal reproduction of "toutesfoys." In the next clause: "Whom I myself shall see," they adhere closely to the Hebrew and the Chaldee, after whom Olivetan translated "Lequel ie contempleray en moy," and Leo Juda: "quem ego visurus sum mihi." The Chaldee (q. v.) and Leo Juda's "et oculi mei conspecturi sunt" they regarded as true renderings of the Hebrew, and translated: "and mine eies shall beholde." The only original addition in the next clause is the interpretative for me: ηγεῖται they render alius, not alienus; in the last clause "thogh" is an ingenious amplification.

Summing up, then, the Genevan version, mainly after Olivetan, introduced a rendering which, though in many respects close to the Hebrew, inserted worms and bodie without any warranty of the original, while it discarded "the latter daye" of Coverdale, and "the laste dai" of Wiclif.

The Bishops' Bible, published in 1568, presented the passage as it stands in the collation which follows:

**Genevan (1560).**

For I am sure that my Redeemer liueth, and he shall stand the last on the earth: And thogh after my skin worms destroy this bodie, yet shall I se God in my fleshe: Whom I my selfe shall see, and mine eies shall beholde, and nonother for me, thogh my reynes are consumed within me.

**Bishops' (1568).**

For I am sure that my redeemer liueth, and he shall rayse vp at the latter daye them that lye in the dust. And though after my skin the (wormes) destroy this body, yet shall I see God in my fleshe: Whom I mee selfe shall see, and mine eyes shall beholde, and none other for me, though my reynes are consumed within me.

Dr. Andrew Pearson, who had charge of the revision of Job, can hardly be said to have earned golden laurels for this version of the passage, which, with the exception of the second clause of v. 25, the addition of "the" before worms, and certain changes in spelling,
agrees verbatim with the Genevan; but that second clause, while it restores "the latter day" discarded by the Genevan, and never abandoned in the Coverdale-Cranmer series of Bibles, introduces a theological dogma without any intimation that "them that lie in the" are supplied, and very poorly supplied, for how can in be got out of ἐν τοῖς ἀθάνατοις? It could not be got out of it, and therefore he put it into it; but that is neither translation, nor exegesis, but arbitrary comment, not a whit inferior to the interpolations of the Vulgate before noticed. Except wormes, "body," "for me," and "though," duly italicized in the Genevan, are also printed in the letter of the text.

Thus, then, stood the passage in the most popular, and least popular versions until the Authorized Version of 1611, presented it in the form which still prevails:

"For I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth: ||"And though after my skin, wormes destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God: Whom I shall see for my selfe, and mine eyes shall behold, and not †another, though my reins be consumed ‡within me."

The changes introduced by King James's translators are, first, the cancelling of "he shal rayse vp" and "them that lye in the dust," and "the" before wormes, in the Bishops'; secondly, the adoption of "he shall stand" (Genevan) with "that" prefixed, combined with "at [in—Coverdale] the latter day" (Coverdale), and "upon (on G.)" the earth" (Genevan); thirdly, the transposition of "yet shal I se God in my flesh" (Genevan) into "yet in my flesh shall I see God," and of "whom I my self shall se" into "whom I shall see for myself," fourthly, the correction of "none other for me" (Genevan, Bishops') into "not another," and substitution of "be" for "are" (Genevan); and, lastly, the italicizing of all supplied words. Of these, "whom I shall see for myself" as bringing out the force of †, and "not another" as a rendering of ἐν τοῖς ἀθάνατοις, indicate advanced scholarship, or more correctly, conservative scholarship, in a due appreciation of the force of the original and its treatment by the most approved translators ancient, and contemporary to them.

There are still several remarkable renderings of the passage, which seem to be in place here.

1. The Spanish version of USQUE, 1553:

"Yo conozco mi redemidor bivo, y postrero sobre polvo se leuantará.—Y tras mi cuero tajaron esta, y de mi carne vere Dio.—El qual yo vere por mi, y mis ojos vieron e no estrano, atemaronse mis riñones en mi seno."

|| Or, after I shall awake, though this body be destroyed, yet out of my flesh shall I see God.
† Heb. a stranger.
‡ Heb. in my bosome.
2. The Spanish version of Cassiodoro de Reyna, Basel 1569-1622:

"Yo se que mi Redemptor bue, y a la fin me levantaré sobre el polvo.—Y despues, desde este mi roto cuero y desde mi propia carne tengo de ver a Dios.—Al quál yo tengo de ver por mi, y mis ojos lo han de ver, y no otro, [aunque] mis riñones se consumen dentro de mi."

3. The version of Tremellius, 1579:

"Equidem ego novi redemptorem meum vivere: & posteriorem super pulverem resurrecturum.—Et postquam vermes confoderint istud, evigilante me: tum carne mea me visurum esse Deum.—Idem qui sum, ac non alienus visurus sum mihi, & oculi mei aspecturi: tamen consumuntur renes mei in sinu meo."

4. The version of Cocceius, Op. xl. 191:

"Ego enim novi quod Redemptor meus vivet; et ultimus super pulvem stabit.—Et postquam cutim meam destrinxerint hæc, ibi etiam ex carne mea video Deum.—Quem egomet video mihi: et oculi mei spectabunt, non ingam, alius; consiciuntur renes mei in sinu meo."

5. The version of Diodati, Geneva, 1607:

"Ora, quant'è a me, io so che il mio Redentore vive, e che nell'ultimo giorno egli si leverà sopra la polvere;—e quantunque dopo la mia pelle, questo corpo sia rosso, pur vedrò con la carne mia Iddio;—il quale io vedrò, gli occhi miei lo vedranno, e non un altro; le mie reni mi si consumano in seno."

The examination of the passage through so many versions has necessarily involved the demonstration of numerous renderings not in agreement with the original; it is therefore deemed unnecessary to discuss at length the reasons for the subjoined rendering which seeks to dispense with interpretative supplied matter, as far as practicable, and lays claim only to fidelity to the Hebrew; originality is entirely out of the question, and elegance of diction as well as the finer shades of idiomatic expression are better supplied by a concert of competent judges, than by any individual translator.

**TRANSLATION.**

25. "Yea I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he will stand the Last upon the earth, 26. and though after my skin, even this be broken, yet from my flesh shall I see God, 27. Whom I, even I, shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not a stranger. My reins faint away in my bosom."

This rendering is submitted on the following grounds:

v. 25. יְשֵׁמֵֽעַ may be either and, or, as for me, yea; for, seems out of place. יְשֵׁמֵֽעַ followed by a finite verb without הָיָּה occurs Job. xxx. 23; Ps. ix. 17. 

alive, living, and predicated of
might, perhaps, be expressed in orat. dir. so as to read "my Redeemer lives;" there seems to be no grammatical reason against making 》דיקו govern the; connecting it with יundance and affirming both of 》דיקו may be taken as a substantive, or as an adjective with substantive power, either in apposition with הִנֵּה the subject of the first clause, or as the independent subject of the second clause; perhaps it might be rendered without supplying the; the adverbial renderings at last, hereafter, at, or in the latter day appear to be more or less arbitrary, for in such phrases as at first and at last, even where the reference is to the subject, we have the forms: הִנֵּה, הִנֵּה, הִנֵּה, e.g., Numb. ii. 31: x. 13; 1 Sam. xxix. ii.; Dan. viii. 3, etc.

Zöckler says, denotes indisputably the dust of Job's decayed body; this may fairly be questioned, for while in ch. xvii. 16, xx. 11 and xxii. 26 the phrase signifies the grave, in xlii. 25 it denotes the earth without any reference to the grave, also in xxii. 24, and in xxxix. 14 it means sand.

v. 26. a preposition, not a conjunction; if a conjunction, the verb would follow it immediately, cf. xlii. 7; Lev. xiv. 43; it goes therefore with the noun, not with the verb.

closely connected with הִנֵּה, might be rendered impersonally; the position of הִנֵּה between the preposition and הִנֵּה renders the clause an uncommonly difficult one for translation; the literal rendering, of course, is easy enough, viz., "and after my skin—it shall have been broken (or some other word)—this." But such a rendering seems too vague in English; its ruggedness would require too much explanation; "this my skin" (Ewald, Del. and Revised Bible) appears objectionable, for this may mean that which is under the skin, i. e., the whole frame, (Tayler Lewis), and this my skin would limit the reference to the skin; on the whole, therefore, the reproduction of the abrupt but pregnant הִנֵּה may be desirable.

the 》 admits of being rendered "yet," if "though" is supplied, otherwise even may be better than and.

if privative, denotes free from, separate from, without, not without as opposed to within, but as not having it, cf. xi. 15, xxi. 9; but from seems to be the least interpretative rendering, and preserves the ambiguity of the original.

v. 27. relates to הִנֵּה while ה denotes benefit. The whole clause is emphatic, as is evident from הִנֵּה and ה, and in order to bring
out the full sense, a rendering stronger than the simple relative might be desirable, perhaps, even I, may suffice.

γ has been rendered a stranger, *alienum*, although a good meaning may be had by translating *alienus*. Taking it as accusative is grammatically correct, and understanding it with Gesenius, Umbreit, Vaihinger, Stickel, Hahn, v. Hoffman and Tayler Lewis (q. v.) in the sense of *adversarius*, appears to me far better than the flat, tautological *alius*. As to the meaning *enemy*, that also seems to be well established by reference to Ps. liv. 5; Is. i. 7: xxix. 5; Ez. xi. 9: xxviii. 10: xxx. 12; Hos. vii. 9; viii. 7; Obad. 11; compare also Job. xvi. 9.

β is rendered *faint away*, with reference to the use of that word in the Authorized Version at Ps. lxxxiv. 3: cxix. 81.

II. Summary of an interpretation of the passage.

I cannot resist the conviction that the passage is decidedly eschatological, and stands out in solitary grandeur as an ancient prophecy, or poetic vision of a resurrection. Careful study of the passage, in its true connection, the solemnity of its announcement, the abrupt ruggedness of its enunciation, the fiery rapture of its anticipated fulfilment, and the general sense of its meaning in ancient and modern times, combine to necessitate this view. It is unnecessary to transcribe here the history of the interpretation, a very full account of which is given in Lange's Commentary, *Am. Ed.* An outline of the ideas intended to be conveyed by the translation submitted may suffice.

1. Job felt himself irresistibly impelled to utter something so wonderful, so unheard-of, so momentous, that he desired it to be put on imperishable record in a roll, and as that might be destroyed, engraved upon the rock.

2. It is the announcement of a Redeemer, concerning whom he affirms that he is his Redeemer, his Goel, Avenger, Judge and Saviour, perhaps the Hero-Messiah, whom he conceives to be eternal, and therefore the survivor of earthly vicissitude and mundane destruction—come what may, let universal ruin prevail, He the great Goel is alive for evermore, and will stand upon the dust or the earth, whether that dust be only Job's, or the dust of all whose bodies have returned to earth.

3. His skin may waste away, the whole bodily organism may be destroyed by disease, death, and decomposition, it will not hurt him, for he is certain of the beatific vision, in a conscious state, of his God, in the body, or out of the body; he shall see God; be his body glorified, or his soul disembodied, the vision is certain, from the body as a position, he looking out, or without a body, without flesh, in some marvellous manner he will still see God, and his eyes will behold Him, not as an Avenger, not as a stranger, not as an enemy, but as his friend, the omnipotence of the Mighty God arrayed on his side. And for the consummation and ultimate enjoyment of that blissful estate he yearns with
a longing so intense, he is so carried away, that language seems to fail him, and he is almost ready to faint and die.

These are the ideas which, I believe, lie in the passage, and which its true exegesis cannot ignore; concerning those that have been carried into it, or made out of it, I do not feel called upon to express an opinion. The positions taken appear to me to be sustained by weighty authority, and while I cannot admit that the passage proves the Christian doctrine of the Resurrection, it is certainly the proclamation of a resurrection, and even the most divergent renderings of the original,—no matter how disguised, weakened, distorted and perverted,—bear their testimony to that. Thus much is certain.

NOTE.—I wish to call attention to the remarkable targumistic addition to the book of Job in the LXX.: χριστιανικά δὲ αὐτῶν πάλιν ἀναστήσασθαι μεθ' ὧν ὁ κύριος ἀνέστησαν. It is, of course, the interpolation of some diastenast, drawn from a Syriac version of the LXX. (see Böhl, Forschungen nach einer Volksbibel zur Zeit Jesu, etc. Wien, 1873. p. 129 sq.), but of dogmatic interest, for it reflects a very ancient view of this remarkable passage.

THE AUTHOR.