

On Job. xix. 25-27.

BY REV. J. I. MOMBERT, D. D.

25 אֲנִי יָדַעְתִּי אֲלֵי הַיָּם וְאֶחְסֶנָּה עַל-עֶפְרַיִם וְקָיִים :

26 יִאֲהַר עֵינַי נִקְשְׁרוּ אֶת וּמִבְּשָׂרִי אֲהוּהָ אֱלֹהִים :

27 אֲשֶׁר אֲנִי אֲהוּהָ-לִי וְעֵינַי רָאוּ וְלֹא-יָוֶה בְּלֹו כְלֵי כְּתָקִי :

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.

I. 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 Itala 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. οἶδα γὰρ ὅτι: ἀέγναός ἐστιν ὁ ἐκλύειν με μέλλων ἐπὶ γῆς ·

26. ἀναστήσει: δέ μου τὸ δέσμα (τὸ σῶμα) τὸ ἀναντλοῦν ταῦτα. παρὰ γὰρ κυρίου μοι: ταῦτα συνετέλεσθη,

27. ἃ ἐγὼ ἐμαυτῶ συνεπίσταμαι, ἃ οἱ ὀφθαλμοί μου ἐωράκασιν.
καὶ οὐκ ἄλλοτ'· πάντα δέ μοι: συνετέλεσται: ἐν κόλπῳ.

The various readings of moment are: 25. ἐγὼ for γὰρ in Compl. and some MSS.; ἀέναός A and some MSS.; comma after μέλλων, Roman edition of B.; 26. ἀναστήσει τὸ δέριμα μου τὸ ἀναγλωῶν, ταῦτά μοι B.; 27. ὁ ὀφθαλμός μου ξώραζε, B.

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

25. ὁ ἀγγιστεύς μου ζῆ, καὶ ἔσχατον ἐπὶ χώματος ἀναστήσει.

27. Ἐξέλιπον οἱ νεφροὶ 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 26 ad resuscitandam cutem meam quae perpetitur haec: a Domino enim haec mihi consummata sunt, 27 quorum ego mihi conscius sum, quae oculus meus [or, plural] vidit, et non alius, et omnia mihi consummata sunt in sinu." In v. 25, however, *quod* seems preferable to *quia*, and ἀναστήσει 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 *χοινη* is represented by . . . "perennis est qui soluturus me est super terra." The rendering of Theodotion is unsupported and an interpretation rather than a translation. The most interesting and, perhaps, instructive rendering is that of רָתַי by ἀένναος, which I regard as a key-word to the meaning; as to the form of the word, that with a double ν, being the less usual, is probably the best sustained; as composed of ἀεί and νάω, 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 ἐκλύειν is eternal, and that disposes of Theodotion's ἀγγιστεύς, 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 רָתַי and וּמִבְּשָׁרִי , renders נִקְשְׁפוּרְוֹנָה τὸ ἀναγλωῶν ταῦτα, inserts or substitutes for הַלְלוּהָ אֱלֹהֵי παρά γὰρ—συνετέλεσθη. 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 רָתַי , rendered *ā*, with the mysterious ταῦτα of v. 26, express הַלְלוּהָ by ἐμαυτῷ συνεπίσταμαι, confound כָּלֹו כְלִיתִי with some form which they felt justified to render: πάντα δέ μοι συνετέλεσται, in which rendering the noun entirely disappears, and an enigmatical כל 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 readings. Their Hebrew text was unpointed and written in uncials, thus:

which they resolved into or spelt out: *בְּלִיכִלְיִתִּיבְחֻקִּי*, translating as above, and taking *יְתִי*, the Chaldee for *יִתִּי*, as the equivalent of *לִי*.

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 æternus est qui me resoluturus est, super terram resurget cutis mea, quæ hæc patitur: a Domino enim mihi hæc contigerunt, quorum ego mihi conscius sum, quæ oculus meus vidit et non alius, et omnia mihi consummata sunt in sinu." The variant renderings 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 Polyglot (ed. 1645). ". . . qui solvere me debet, super terram suscitare pellem meam quæ tolerat hæc. Ab enim Domino hæc mihi confecta sunt. Quæ 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 hæc spes mea in sinu meo."

A glance suffices to show that this text is not based on the Septuagint and the Itala, 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:

Hebrew.	Jerome.
עַל-עֶפֶר יָקוּם	מֵעֶפֶר יָקוּם
נִקְפִּי	נִקְפִּיתִי
מִבְּשָׂרִי	בִּבְשָׂרִי

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:

"Et ego scio quia redemptor meus vivit, et post haec redemptio ejus consurget super pulverem. Et postquam inflata fuerit pellis mea, erit hoc: et de carne mea videbo iterum Deum. Quem ego visurus sum mihi, et oculi mei videbunt, et non alius: consumpti sunt renes mei in sinu meo."

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:

"Ego quidem scio quod Salvator meus vivens sit, et in consummatione super terram appariturus. Et pellem meam angustaverunt haec et carnem meam. Si viderint oculi mei Deum, videbunt lumen. Renes mei penitus perierunt de loco meo."*

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. Credner 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 עֵינַי, 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 agheenbiere 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 hæc.

†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.)

Aber ich weis das mein Erlöser lebet, vnd er wird mich hernach aus der Erden auffwecken. Vnd werde darnach mit dieser meiner haut umgeben werden, vnd werde in meinem fleisch Gott sehen. Den selben werde ich mir sehen, vnd meine augen werden jn schawen, vnd kein frembder. Meine nieren sind verzeret in meinem schos.

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.)

Dann ich weiss das mein retter und schirmer läbt, vnd das ich der tag eins aus dem Kaat wider aufston wird, vnd das *meine glider* mit diser haut wider überzogen werdend, vnd das ich mit meinem fleisch bekleidet Gott anschouwen wird. Ja ich selber wird jnn anschouwen, nit mit andern, sunder mit disen meinen augen. Meine nieren werdend in mir verzeert.

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 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 reines are consumed within me. . . ."

Collating this with Luther, the Zürich, and the Vulgate as well as Wicklif, we get these results:*

FOR { dann Z. } I AM SURE { Forsothe I wot W. } . . . REDEEMER
 { enim V. }
 { agheenbiere W. } . . . AND THAT { vnd das Z. } I SHALL RISE OUT OF
 { redemptor V. }
 { Erlöser L. }

THE EARTH { I am to rise from } IN THE LATTER { in the laste dai W. }
 { the erthe W. } DAYE { in novissimo die V. }
 { aus dem Kaat }
 { wider auf- }
 { ston wird Z. }
 { de terra sur- }
 { recturus sum V. }

THAT I SHAL BE CLOTHED AGAINE { and eft shal ben enuyroned W. }
 { bekleidet (transposed) Z. }

THIS SKYNNE { dieser [meiner] Haut L. } . . . YEE I MYSELF { ja ich }
 { deser Haut Z. } { selber Z. }

. . . NOT WITH OTHER, BUT WITH THESE SAME EYES { nit mit andern, }
 { sunder mit di- }
 { sen meinen }
 { augen Z. }

. . . CONSUMED WITHIN ME { sind verzeret in meinem Schos L. }
 { 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 ie scay bien que mon redempteur vit, et* qu' il me resuscitera sur la terre au dernier iour. Et combien que les vers ayent rongé ceste chair apres ma peau: toutes foys ie verray Dieu en ma chair. Lequel je contempleray en moy, & mes yeuls le regarderont et non autre: 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 lyueth, 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.

Genevan (1560).

For I am sure that my Redeemer liueth, and HE shall STAND THE LAST ON the earth. AND THOUGH AFTER MY SKIN *wormes* DESTROY this *bodie*, YET SHAL I se God in my flesh. WHOM I my self shal SE, AND MINE eies shal beholde, AND NONOTHER *for me, though* my reines 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, Münster, 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*: Aucûs 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 Judæ: “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 thogh after my skin *wormes* destroy this bodie,” that being an almost literal translation of “Et combien que les vers ayent rongé 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 shal se,” they adhere closely to the Hebrew and the Chaldee, after whom Olivetan translated “Lequel ie contempleray en moy,” and Leo Judæ: “*quem ego visurus sum mihi*.” The Chaldee (q. v.) and Leo Judæ’s “*et oculi mei conspecturi sunt*” they regarded as true renderings of the Hebrew, and translated: “and mine eies shal beholde.” The only original addition in the next clause is the interpretative *for me*: ׀ 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 shal stand the last on the earth: And thogh after my skin *wormes* destroy this *bodie*, yet shal I se God in my flesh. Whom I my self shal se, and mine eies shal beholde, and nonother *for me*, *thogh* my reines are consumed within me.

Bishops' (1568).

For I am sure that my redeemer lyueth, and he shal rayse vp at the latter day them that lye in the dust. And though after my skin the (*wormes*) destroy this body, yet shal I see God in my fleshe: Whom I mee selfe shal 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 *wormes*, 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 עַל-עֲפָרָה ?

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 shall 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 shall I see God in my flesh" (Genevan) into "yet in my flesh shall I see God," and of "whom I myself shall see" 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 אֶל-אֲנִי, and "not another" as a rendering of אֲחֵרִים, 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 estraño, 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 à la fin me leuantaré sobre el poluo.—Y despues, desde este mi roto cuero y desde mi propria carne tengo de ver à 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 vivit; et ultimus super pulverem stabit.—Et postquam cutim meam destrinxerint hæc, ibi etiam ex carne mea videbo Deum.—Quem egomet videbo mihi: et oculi mei spectabunt, non *inquam*, alius; conficiuntur 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 roso, 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. וַיֵּדַע may be either *and*, or, *as for me, yea; for*, seems out of place. וַיֵּדַע followed by a finite verb without כִּי occurs Job. xxx. 23; Ps.

ix. 17.

וַיֵּדַע alive, living, and predicated of

גַּאֲלִי might, perhaps, be expressed in *orat. dir.* so as to read "my Redeemer lives;" there seems to be no grammatical reason against making גַּאֲלִי יִדְעֵהוּ govern יִתְחַיֶּה; the ׀ connecting it with הוּא and affirming both of גַּאֲלִי; יִתְחַיֶּה may be taken as a substantive, or as an adjective with substantive power, either in apposition with גַּאֲלִי 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: בְּרִשְׁמֵהּ, בְּאַחֲרֵיהָ, e. g., Numb. ii. 31: x. 13; 1 Sam. xxix. ii.; Dan. viii. 3, etc.

עֹלֵ-עָפָר, see Ps. xii. 6; Is. xxx. 10, appears to make good sense, if the arising, or standing up, be understood of Job's deliverance. עֹלֵ-עָפָר, 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 xxi. 26 the phrase signifies *the grave*, in xli. 25 it denotes *the earth* without any reference to the grave, also in xxii. 24, and in xxxix. 14 it means *sand*.

v. 26. הַאֲרֵ, 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.

וְנִפְסָה, closely connected with וְיָה, might be rendered impersonally; the position of עֵינַי between the preposition and נִפְסָה-וְיָה 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, (*Taylor Lewis*), and *this my skin* would limit the reference to the skin; on the whole, therefore, the reproduction of the abrupt but pregnant וְיָה may be desirable.

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

מִן 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. אֲטַר relates to אֲלֵהָ, while לִי denotes benefit. The whole clause is emphatic, as is evident from אֲטַר and לִי, and in order to bring

out the full sense, a rendering stronger than the simple relative might be desirable, perhaps, *even I*, may suffice.

רַי 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.

פָּלַךְ 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.: γέγραπται δὲ αὐτὸν πάλιν ἀναστήσεσθαι μεθ' ὧν δ' κύριος ἀνίστησιν. It is, of course, the interpolation of some diaskenast, 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.