which the tender conscience knows should be sternly challenged, before allowing it to pass into the citadel of the soul. Be ours the prayer, "turn away mine eyes from beholding vanity; and quicken Thou me in Thy way." Nor let any who ponders this argument turn from it with a sigh of despair, "for me it is too late." If we have enough of will left to desire earnestly a new mind, it is not too late. Such can still hear the voice—"him that cometh unto Me I will in no wise cast out." 2

May we not well pray: "Lord! let sin, which is the very hell of hell, fade from mine eyes, and let them be filled with Thee who art the very heaven of heaven. Cause them to see the light of Thy glory, and the beauty of Thy face. Be present with me in joy and sorrow, in pleasure and business, at the altar and by the hearth, all day and all night. Where Thou art, Thou art seen. Thou Who art invisible, art seen seen invisibly by that nature which is also invisible in us, a heart purified by the Spirit. Where Thou dwellest, the eye is pure and the soul ceases from sin." "There is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus."

WILLIAM DERRY AND RAPHOE.

THE REVISED VERSION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

THE BOOK OF JOB.-I.

THE Revision has effected changes in the rendering of the Book of Job more numerous and more important perhaps than in any other book. Many of the changes, which are but slight in themselves, and the influence of which would

¹ Ps. exix. 37. ² John vi. 37. ³ S. Aug., Epist., exlviii.

not be felt in other books of Scripture beyond their immediate context, from the fact that the Book of Job has more unity than most books, colour or alter our view of the whole complexion of the poem. Thus in chap, xiv. 14, the change of "will" into "would"—"all the days of my warfare would I wait till my change should come"—besides giving a consistent meaning to the passage, enables us to perceive more clearly the views regarding a future life with which Job began his great struggle, and to estimate more accurately the advance which he made during it. No doubt the "will I wait" of the A.V. has been allowed a place in the margin. This is a specimen of a class of margins that deserve the attention the reader less than others. In very many instances where a new rendering has been introduced into the text, and the A.V. permitted to occupy a place in the margin, it may be presumed that, in addition to some plausibility in behalf of the A.V., the fact that it was the A.V. was allowed, perhaps unconsciously, to weigh somewhat in its favour. It is probable that the next revision, whenever it shall come, will sweep many of this class of margins away. On the other hand, the margins which present an alternative rendering to the A.V., without displacing it, will very generally be found to be instructive.

The alterations made in this part of Scripture are so numerous that it will not be possible to call attention to them all. Only the more important of them, chiefly those which have some bearing on the scope or general conceptions of the book, need be noticed.

In the first two prose chapters there was little room for emendation. The expression, "cursed" God in their hearts, "curse" Thee to Thy face, has been changed in all the passages where it occurs (i. 5, 11; ii. 5, 8) to "renounce." In the original the word means usually "to bless." There are no doubt in the Shemitic languages words which have such contradictory senses, but there is

no probability that this term "bless" is one of them. It is more likely that the expression, being used in saying farewell, came to have the meaning "to bid adieu to," and hence further "to renounce." Such a slight advance in meaning is common both in the classical and modern languages: "valeat res ludicra," good-bye the stage (Hor.); "si maxime talis est Deus ut . . . nulla hominum caritate teneatur valeat"—farewell to him (Cic.). In the only similar passage, 1 Kings xxi. 10, 13, the word "curse" has been put in the text, and "renounce" as an alternative placed in the margin.

In i. 22 R.V. renders, "In all this Job sinned not, nor charged God with foolishness." The A.V., "nor charged God foolishly," had its antidote already in the old margin. "nor attributed folly to God." This was the form which Job's sin, if he had sinned, would have taken—he would have imputed folly, lit. insipidity to God, that is, a want of right moral flavour, or wrong in His conduct of men's history and of the world. This was the sin to which Job was being driven, which he probably in the heat of conflict committed, though not in the degree or manner, or at least not with the consequences, which the Satan predicted. ii. 8 the A.V. missed the graphic touch of the original, "he took a potsherd to scrape himself withal; and he sat down among the ashes," which should be, "as he sat among," The last clause describes the position in which he already was when he took the potsherd to scrape himself. R.V. has merely omitted "down," and scarcely suggests at once the state of things.

In Job's opening speech, chap. iii., there are at least two important changes. Of minor alterations, "the night which said," for "the night in which it was said" (v. 3), is a gain, restoring the poetry of the passage. "They hear not the voice of the taskmaster" (v. 18) is at once more precise and suggestive than "the oppressor" of A.V. "Let

darkness and the shadow of death claim it for their own " (v. 5), takes the place of the unmeaning "stain it" of A.V., though nothing more than modern phraseology for the old margin, "challenge it."

The change in v. 8, however, is important: "let them curse it that curse the day, who are ready to rouse up leviathan," instead of "ready to raise up their mourning" of the A.V. The passage contains one of the many mythological allusions in the book. To curse the day and to rouse up leviathan mean the same thing. Leviathan was the fabled dragon or serpent that swallowed up the sun or moon, or wound himself about them, obscuring their light and inducing the blackness of the day (v. 5). Enchanters were credited with power to set this dragon in motion. Such a curse Job invokes upon the night of his conception. The rendering of A.V. is really without meaning, while the new sense fits precisely into the passage. Such a mythological play might seem out of harmony with the despairing earnestness of Job. But, apart from the factthat what seems but an imaginative play to us may have contained some elements of reality to him, it is not uncharacteristic of the mind not only keenly to analyse its own despair or affliction, but also to subject it to the play of the intellect.

The other important alteration occurs in the last two verses of the chapter, where the past tenses of A.V. have given place to presents, and the passage is seen to refer to Job's condition of affliction at the moment when he spoke. "The thing which I greatly feared is come upon me," of A.V., would necessarily refer to the period of Job's life before his calamities befel him, and would suggest that even during his time of prosperity he was uneasy and haunted by apprehensions of impending evil. But such an idea would run counter to the whole scope of the book, according to which Job's calamities were wholly unexpected

by him and inexplicable, as well as to his own express words: "I said I shall die in my nest, and I shall multiply my days as the sand" (xxix. 18, and the whole of that chap.). The alteration, though slight in itself, removes an obstacle to the general understanding of the poem, and helps to bring all its parts into harmony with one another.

The fine opening speech of Eliphaz (chap. iv.-v.) has required little retouching, its great beauty lying largely in its simplicity. The very slight alteration required by grammar in v. 2, "if one assay," for the former "if we assay," suggests better Eliphaz's feeling of the tact necessary to handle Job, and the delicacy to be observed in approaching him. A more important emendation occurs in v. 6, where A.V. has, "Is not this thy fear, thy confidence, thy hope, and the uprightness of thy ways?" - a combination of words rather baffling to the natural understanding. The syntax of the original is somewhat unusual, but R.V., "Is not thy fear of God thy confidence, and thy hope the integrity of thy ways?" gives the sense required in the connexion, and is doubtless right. In v. 15, a "spirit" passed before my face, has been retained, and "breath" put in the The word has both senses; "spirit," though familiar to us in the sense of "apparition," occurs nowhere else in the O. T., and "breath" may be the true meaning. In v. 15 Eliphaz probably describes what he obscurely felt; in the next verse what he dimly saw; and in the verse following what he faintly heard.

The margin on "there was silence and I heard a voice," viz. "I heard a still voice," is well deserving of attention. And the same may be said of the margin to v. 17, "be just before God," where the text runs, "shall mortal man be more just than God?" The latter sense, though natural in syntax and favoured by some good authorities, has nothing in any other part of the book to support it. Job, though on one memorable occasion (chap. xvii. 8, seq.) he

expressed his determination to adhere to righteonsness though God and man should both abandon it, and though he was charged by the Almighty with attributing injustice to Him that he himself might appear innocent (chap. xl. 8), never put forward the claim to be more righteous than God, and never was charged by his friends with making such a claim. The wrong he committed, and the wrong he was charged with committing, was that of attributing unrighteousness to God. And it is a great mistake to suppose that either Job or his friends showed any superfluity of naughtiness in their dispute, or drew invidious inferences, after the manner of modern controversialists, from each other's positions. There is no exaggeration anywhere in the substance of that for which they respectively contended, although Job perhaps admits a certain extravagance of manner, due to his desperate condition. In the present passage Eliphaz is animadverting on Job's murmurs against God, and, to bring back Job's mind to right thoughts of God and of himself, he extols the moral purity of God, which is such that no creature, not even the angels, are faultless in His sight, and much less such a gross and earthly being as man-or rather, perhaps, a being so frail. To Eliphaz no being could be pure before God; the idea of any creature being more pure than God was not only irrelevant to his purpose, but was an extravagance on which the speaker would not have wasted words.

In v. 20, "they are destroyed from morning to evening" of A.V. suggests rather the idea that they are continually, without intermission, destroyed. The meaning is, that men are destroyed in a single day, they are ephemerids. R.V. "betwixt morning and evening" is better, though betwixt a morning and an evening would be almost necessary. In v. 21, "doth not their excellency which is in them go away?" has been altered to "is not their tent-cord plucked up within them?" The striking of the tent is a graphic

and not uncommon image for the removal which comes in death; and, though the verse is rather obscure, R.V. probably suggests the true sense.

In chap. v. 1, the term "saints" becomes "holy ones," and so throughout. The angels are alluded to, while "saints" more naturally suggests men. In v. 2, for "wrath killeth the foolish man, and envy slayeth the silly one," R.V. uses the terms "vexation" and "jealousy." The latter word (Kin'ah) is difficult to render; jealousy is a common sense, though some such word as passion would be in place here. The meaning of course is not that the foolish and silly vex themselves to death, but that their rebelliousness or incorrect and passionate behaviour, under the just afflictions of heaven for their sins, brings down upon them additional chastisement, under which they perish. In v. 5, "robber" has been changed to "snare," in accordance with chap. xviii. 19.

A very slight though important alteration appears in v. 6, 7: "although affliction cometh not forth of the dust . . . yet man is born unto trouble," being changed into, "for affliction . . . but man," etc. The passage contains the general aphorism with which Eliphaz sums up his doctrine of human suffering and his explanation of its origin. Affliction is not an accident nor a spontaneous product of the world's soil, springing up like weeds without being sown; it is due to the evil heart of man, who is born of such a nature that he sins almost instinctively and as it were by a law—as the sparks fly upward—and thus brings trouble upon himself.

There may be some explanation unknown to us of the omission of the word "but" in A.V., v. 8, though it be expressed in the original, and the abrupt commencement, "I would seek unto God." R.V. "but as for me, I would seek," &c., "as for me" representing the pronoun, which is also expressed. The translation of the pronoun when

expressed is a delicate matter. It is often rendered in A.V. "as for me," "I, even I," and sometimes very falsely. Nothing could be worse than the rendering of the words of Deborah (Jud. v. 3), "I, even I, will sing unto the Lord." In languages which do not need the expressed pronoun along with the verb there is a much greater tendency to express the first personal pronoun than the others, though no emphasis upon it be designed. And in Heb. the pronoun is expressed when no special emphasis falls upon it, but in order to communicate a certain breadth and weight to the whole sentence, as for instance in the angel's reply to Gideon's request (Jud. vi. 18), "I will tarry until thou come again." Even when stress falls upon the pronoun, "as for me," or "I, even I," is unwieldy and unidiomatic; the force can only be rightly felt from the tone in which the simple "I" is uttered.—Finally, A.V. "shalt visit thy habitation and shalt not sin," receives meaning by being altered into "visit thy fold and shalt miss nothing" (v. 24).

The speeches of Job are generally more difficult than those of his friends, and consequently the alterations in them are in proportion more numerous. This applies, however, less to his first answer to Eliphaz (chap. vi.-vii.), than to those which follow. In all cases the sense of the individual points can be ascertained only from understanding the drift of the whole. In these two chapters there are three general divisions: Job's defence of his complaints, which Eliphaz had blamed (v. 1-13); his disappointment at the position which his friends had assumed towards him (v. 14-30); and his new sorrowful review of the brevity and pain of human life (chap. vii.). These three general ideas suggest more than once the right treatment of particulars.

In his justification of his complaints and despair several points have been made plainer in R.V. In v. 3, "therefore my words are swallowed up," could hardly mean anything

else than that the weight of Job's calamities had choked his utterance. But such a thought is quite irrelevant at the moment when he is defending his former language. And Job could hardly say that at any time he failed to get his breath out; for more than once he avows his determination to have his say against the Almighty's treatment of him, come what might (vii. 11; ix. 22; xiii. 13). R.V. "therefore have my words been rash" is much more to the purpose. It may remain doubtful, however, whether Job admits a certain moral error in his former words (rashness), or only concedes some extravagance and violence of language. It must be remembered that the injustice, which in chap. iii. he insinuates against heaven, he plainly charges in later speeches, and never retracts the charge—at least not until the appearance of the Lord in the storm (chap. xxxviii.). And the question he puts to his friends in regard to their cavils and the defence he offers, v. 26, "do ye imagine to reprove words? though the speeches of one that is desperate are as wind (or, go into the wind)," seems to imply that his admission affects only the form, not the substance, of his former complaint (although cf. v. 14).

In grammar at least an improvement has been effected in v.10, in which A.V., "yea I would harden myself in sorrow: let him not spare," becomes "yea I would exult in pain that spareth not." The meaning of the word rendered "exult," is not very certain.—When it is remembered that in these verses Job is defending his impatience (v.1), the pertinence of the change in v.11 will be apparent, "what is mine end that I should be patient?" instead of A.V. "that I should prolong my life." In v.13, A.V. gives a sense diametrically the opposite of that demanded by the connexion, "is not my help in me?" R.V. rightly, "is it not that I have no help in me?" Similarly the second clause must be put negatively, for Job's defence of his desire to die now (iii. 20; vi. 8) is his assurance that he must ultimately die of his

malady, for he is beyond recovery. The term rendered "wisdom" in A.V. appears here to mean something like physical resource, power of recovery, unless it might mean confidence in recovery. R.V. "effectual working" may appear to some readers not quite effectual.

In the verses where Job laments the defection of his friends there are several changes. In v. 14, he lavs down the rule that kindness should be shown to the afflicted, or fainting, by his friend, and adds in A.V., "but he forsaketh the fear of the Almighty." The "he" can only refer to the "friend" of first clause; but such a charge against his comforters is quite out of place here. Their fault is inhumanity, not ungodliness (v. 27). R.V. renders, "even to him that forsaketh the fear," with marg. "else might he forsake," etc. In v. 18, "they go up into the waste," rightly supersedes "they go to nothing." In other respects a good deal may be said both for R.V., which makes the verse refer to caravans, and for A.V. (now in marg.), which makes it refer to the brooks. The remark of Ibn Ezra, that it was not the habit of caravans to "turn aside" from their route in search of water, is in favour of A.V. In v. 19, "the caravans" for "the troops" of Tema is a gain. "Caravan." like "canal." is one of the new semi-technical words of modern language which the Revisers have felt it necessary to introduce. They have scrupled at the less familiar "mirage" (rendering "glowing sand," Isa. xxxv. 7, and retaining "heat" Isa. xlix. 10), and given it a place only in the margin. Verse 27, "yea, ye overwhelm the fatherless, and ye dig a pit for your friend," gains decidedly both in point and accuracy in R.V., "yea, ye would cast lots upon the fatherless, and make merchandise of your friend "-the second clause after chap. xli. 6, "will the partners bargain over him " (leviathan)?

The course of thought in chap. vii. is clear, and, with one exception, no changes of great importance appear. The

minor changes are improvements, e.g. "warfare" for "appointed time," v. 1; "the night is long" for "and the night be gone," v. 4; particularly the graphic touch, v. 5, "my skin closeth up and breaketh out afresh," instead of the flatter "is broken and become loathsome"; and the substitution of "sea-monster" for "whale" v. 12. The whale is not a specially dangerous monster; and since Hamlet, allusion to him makes us laugh. Although the terms "sea" and "sea-monster" be without the article, this is common in poetry even when nouns are definite in sense, and perhaps "the sea," "the monster of the sea," would best suit Job's sarcastic demand, whether he be dangerous to the safety of the world, that he must be watched and plagued as he is by the Almighty? The monster of the sea is probably nothing more than the sea itself, mythologically conceived, when it rages and threatens to engulf the earth.

But of more than ordinary interest in various ways is the alteration in v. 20. A.V. reads: "I have sinned; what shall I do unto Thee, O Thou preserver of men?" This is naturally to be understood as a confession of sin, and perhaps an inquiry how if it were possible amends might be made for it unto God, who is devoutly addressed as "preserver" of men. R.V. gives an entirely different complexion to the passage: "If I have sinned, what do I (marg., can I do) unto Thee, O Thou watcher of men?" Here Job does not confess sin; he makes the supposition that he has sinned, as a supposition merely, and asks how by that he could affect God? upon whom he throws a side-charge of severity and espionage, calling Him watcher of men (chap. xiv. 16, 17). This view of the passage, which is doubtless correct, is of interest, not only as marking the state of Job's mind at this stage of the drama, but as suggesting some peculiar directions which the Hebrew doctrine of sin and God might take. Several points deserve notice in the passage. One is the conception of the greatness of God, who is so exalted that nothing done by man can affect Him, a common idea in the book. Another is the extreme littleness and insignificance of man in contrast with God, and also as belonging to his littleness, his imperfection and liability to err, though this point is less prominent here than for example in chap. xiv. And a third point is the tendency, due perhaps to the very strong theism of the Hebrew mind, to regard sin or wrong exclusively as a personal offence or injury to God, without any consideration of its nature in This way of looking at sin in relation only to God personally, while it added emotion and often keenness to the sense of it, had in certain moods the contrary effect, evacuating it of its real meaning. If sin was merely an offence against God, who was so infinitely exalted, on the part of man so miserable and fallible, why was God so jealous in tracking it and so egoistic in exacting the penalty of it? This is the mood of Job's mind here; hence to his hypothesis that he may have sinned, he adds the question, Why dost Thou not pardon my transgression and take away mine iniquity?

In the speech of Bildad, chap. viii., there is no alteration of consequence. In v. 14, "whose hope shall be cut off," is changed into "shall break asunder," which agrees better with the comparison to a spider's house in the parallel clause. And in v. 18, the indeterminate construction, "if he destroy him," becomes clearer when put in the passive, "if he be destroyed." On the other hand in Job's reply, chap. ix., which is one of the most difficult chapters in the book, and in which Job reaches the lowest point of mental alienation from God, the changes are frequent.

In v. 3, A.V., "if he will contend with him," leaves in ambiguity who "he" and "him" is. R.V. decides that "He" is God and "him" man—"if He be pleased to contend;" but the other view occupies the marg., "if one should desire to contend," and is very well worthy of attention.

A more important change is found in v. 13, in which A.V., "if God will not withdraw His anger, the proud helpers do stoop under Him," becomes, "God will not withdraw His anger, the helpers of Rahab do (did) stoop under Him." Job is setting forth the impossibility of a man like himself contending with God in order to establish his own innocence, for who has opposed Him and been safe? (v. 4), and he refers to a memorable conflict which Rahab and his abettors vainly waged against Him. And his conclusion is, "How much less should I answer him?" Rahab is probably the raging sea, the sea-monster (chap. vii. 12); at all events the allusion is mythological. With similar advantage, "I would make supplication to my judge," has been altered into "to mine adversary" or opponent. Job fancies himself entering a judicial contest with God in regard to his innocence. Being a party in such a cause, God is not judge but adversary; yet such is the terror He would inspire that Job would desert his own just plea and make supplication to his opponent. With such an adversary law is a farce (v. 19).

The numerous margins to v. 19 indicate how difficult that verse is to render without a paraphrase. This is one of the passages where the use of marks of quotation would have been helpful to the reader; the words "lo" (here I am) and "who will appoint me a time" to plead? being expressions supposed to come from the mouth of God. The want of quotation marks has to be supplied by "saith he," as marg. 16.—"If we speak (if it be a question, or, matter) of strength of the mighty, Here am I (saith He), and if of judgment (law), Who will appoint me a time?" The general sense is evident. Whether the trial be one of power or of law man has no chance with God, who is ready for any kind of encounter, omnipotent in might and irresponsible in law.

The sense in which the next verses are to be taken will

appear from the change in v. 21, where "though I were perfect" has been altered into "I am perfect." Of course this assertion of perfection is not an assertion of sinlessness, it is only a claim to that which God Himself had conceded to Job, that he was a perfect and upright man, fearing God and eschewing evil (chap. i. 8). Interpreted by this claim, however, the meaning of v. 20, "if I justify myself (R.V. if I be righteous), mine own mouth shall condemn me," becomes plain. It means that in this encounter with God, though Job were righteous, as he is, he could not establish his righteousness; the terror of his adversary would so overpower him that his own mouth would betray him and stammer out, guilty. The verse is often read as meaning that for a man to justify himself is in fact to condemn himself out of his own mouth, that self-justification is in articulo self-condemnation. Such an idea, however, is foreign to the scope of this passage, in which Job makes the strongest claim to be righteous, and if his claim is ineffectual, it is not because it is not just, or because it is abashed before the holiness of God, but because it is overborne and paralysed by His might. Job's position in claiming to be "righteous" may not be altogether, or at least at first sight, a Christian position, and the clearest proof of this perhaps is the difficulty which Christian interpreters have felt in accommodating themselves to the book, and the frequent strain they have put it under in order to make it speak the language of Christian piety. interpreters of the book have, in some respects, occupied a higher religious platform than the book. At the same time, in justice to the book, the claim of Job should not be misunderstood. It must be remembered that it is less an absolute claim than a relative and antagonistic one. All that he contends for is really that he is a God-fearing man, and that his life has been consistent with his fear of God. There is such a thing as the fear of God, and there is a life that corresponds to it. Men may enter into a life with God, and this life is continuous and of one consistency, embracing both the thought of the mind and practical conduct. He claims to have lived and to live such a life. his witness being his conscience; and what he resists with all his might is the insinuation of his friends, or the implication of God by his misfortunes (as he supposes), that he has been guilty of actions which to his mind would invalidate the possession of such a life. The view of life taken by his friends, on the other hand, is more atomistic or sectional, as we might say. According to them, a good man may act well for a time, then he may fall into gross sins and a sleep of sensuality, out of which the sharp rod of Divine chastisement may awaken him, when he will repent and do the first works, and all will be well. Now of course this theory is also true within certain limits and along the degrees of a certain scale; but it may be doubtful whether in thus cutting life into sections Job's friends do not drive their cleavage so deep down as to sever the continuous and permanent substratum of religious life which is the very presupposition of true religious life. On the other hand, Job was entitled to claim to be a God-fearing man against the denials of men; but when he made the claim against what he admitted was the denial of God, could he have had present in his mind the feeling that man could not attain to be God-fearing without the will and, to say the least, the co-operation of God?

Other changes in chap. ix. help to place the reader in the right point of view from which to look at Job's speech. In v. 22, A.V., "this is one thing, therefore I said it," etc., becomes, "it is all one, therefore I say, He destroyeth the perfect and the wicked," i.e. the perfect as the wicked. It is probable that "it is all one" means, I am indifferent whether I die or live; for Job anticipates that speaking out his mind on God's rule of men and the world will provoke

the Almighty to destroy him. Again, v. 24 gains in clearness and point by the change in the last clause: "He covereth the faces of the judges thereof (of the earth): " if not, where and who is He?" R.V. "if it be not He, who then is it?" And only to notice one other point: v. 29, "if I be wicked, why then labour I in vain?" becomes in R.V. "I shall be condemned, why then do I labour in vain?" Job complains that all his efforts to show himself innocent are unavailing—he will be condemned, he has to be guilty, God is resolved so to consider him, why then should he expend useless efforts to demonstrate his innocence? a thought which he expresses in a graphic figure in next verse.

The changes in chap. x. are less numerous. In v. 1 the rather obscure phrase, "I will leave my complaint upon myself," becomes, "I will give free course to my complaint." In v. 13-16 some useful alterations occur. Job, baffled by the contrast between God's present affliction of him and His goodness to him in the past, is compelled to believe that His former goodness was but feigned, was indeed but a temporary expedient in order the better to carry out His purpose of plaguing him, as at present, which all the while was in His heart. In both versions the verses are translated from the point of view of the present, "if I sin, then thou markest me"; they would have gained in clearness if read from the point of view of God's past intention: "if I sinned, then thou wouldst mark," etc. In A.V. v. 16, "for it increaseth," is referred to Job's affliction; R.V. connects the words with an earlier part of v.15, and renders, "and if my head exalt itself."

In the speech of Zophar, chap. xi. there are several margins which the reader should not miss. Verse 6 is difficult in the original, and A.V. "show thee the secrets of wisdom, that they are double to that which is," is somewhat enigmatic; R.V. "that it is manifold in effectual working";

marg., "sound wisdom is manifold." Verse 7, "canst thou by searching find out God?" is sometimes read as a question whether God be discoverable by the efforts of the natural mind. The marg., "canst thou find out the deep things of God?" suggests that the question is not whether God be discoverable at all, but whether He be wholly discoverable; not whether He can be found, but whether He can be comprehended. No Hebrew writer would have thought of putting the question whether God could be found or was knowable; the question, however, whether He could be wholly known, whether there were not deeps in His nature unfathomable by the mind of man, was a question which, with a view to right conduct under trying providences, many felt themselves compelled to put.

Verse 12 has long exercised the ingenuity of interpreters and come out under much variety of form. R.V. has adopted the suggestion of Gesenius, rendering, "vain man is void of understanding" (yillabeb), a sense which Delitzsch affirms to be improper in the tense and impossible in the conjugation. The marg. deserves attention: "an empty man will get understanding, when the wild ass's colt is born a man." Several slight changes in the succeeding verses are helpful, e.g. "life" for "age," v. 17; "thou shalt search about thee" for "thou shalt dig about thee," v. 18; and the omission of as in v. 20.

In Job's reply to Zophar, chap. xii.-xiv., there are some important alterations. A very small change in v. 4 adds greatly to its lucidity, "I am as one mocked of his neighbour," "who calleth upon God, and He answereth him"; R.V., "a man that called," etc. Hebrew shows a curious disinclination to pursue constructions in the first or second person, diverging whenever it can into the third. Micah's "Hear ye peoples, all of them," is strange to modern ears. In translating it is often necessary either to follow the practice of our own language, or to effect the transition to the

third person by using some indefinite term, as "a man," "one." Thus chap. xiii. 27, 28, "Thou drawest a line about the soles of my feet, though I am like a rotten thing," etc., R.V.; A.V. has, "and he, as a rotten thing, consumeth." The most natural rendering would be: "soles of my feet, one who," etc.

Verse 5 is wholly transformed, largely through a change not grammatical, but lexical, the term lappîd, formerly considered a single word, lamp, being regarded as a compound, pîd "misfortune," and the prep.; and several other changes, such as "priests" for "princes," v.~19, are at least gains in accuracy.

In xiii. 9 the change in tense and meaning is not without importance: "or as one deceiveth a man, will ye deceive Him?" for A.V., "or as one mocketh another, do ye so mock Him?" the time referred to by Job is when God shall appear to judge his friends for their false partiality in his favour. No doubt v. 12 refers to the same time, and might be put in the future tense: R.V., "your memorable sayings are proverbs of ashes, your defences are defences of clay;" certainly clearer than A.V., "your remembrances are like unto ashes, your bodies to bodies of clay."

The notable v. 15 has been left by R.V. very much in the condition in which it stood in A.V., with the alteration of "wait" for "trust," and "nevertheless" for "but." It may not be quite apparent at once what precisely R.V. means. It is known that the Vulgate, etiamsi occiderit me, in ipso sperabo, though a translation of the Heb. margin, passed into many modern versions, as into our own. Delitzsch in his commentary notices some affecting instances of the consolation afforded by the passage, as usually read, to pious persons when near death, although he himself feels constrained to reject the traditional sense. There are many mistranslated or misinterpreted passages in Scripture that have greatly supported pious thought

and feeling, such as "I am that I am," the present passage, "magnify the law and make it honourable," and others, because, though inaccurate renderings of the particular passages, they expressed forcibly great general truths of Scripture, or at least truths certainly scriptural. history of such passages finds its parallel in very many of the expositions of Scripture which are heard from week to week. They are anything but accurate, well-balanced exegeses of the passages formally expounded, but they set forth in a rough and right way a meaning for which there is Scripture somewhere or other, and doubtless benefit many of those who hear them-although they give the unhappy few di color che sanno a bad quarter of an hour now and then, driving the wretched men sometimes to exclaim, that if they perish it is going to church that will be their undoing. What might be called truthful exegesis is one of the rarest things to meet. The reason is that the power of producing it is not a gift but an acquirement. Many sermons bear witness to the brilliancy, the thoughtfulness, or even to the laboriousness in certain directions of their authors, but comparatively few give any evidence of a patient study of Scripture in its connexion.

As regards the present passage, the margin is particularly deserving of attention. Both A.V. and R.V. are translations, not of the Heb. text, which reads "not" (lo'), but of the margin or K'ri, which is "for (in) him," or, "it" (lo)—following the ancient versions. The difference of reading is of little consequence. The margin of R.V. is: "Behold, he will slay me; I wait for him, or, according to another reading, I will not wait." The meaning of the verse as thus rendered is clear. Job anticipates that his boldness in going before God to defend his ways will provoke God to destroy him, and he says he waits for His destroying blow, nevertheless he will defend his own ways. If the reading "I will not wait" be accepted, then the meaning seems to be that Job

will not wait for a more distant death, but encounter the immediate one which his boldness makes too probable.

The important change in chap. xiv. 13-15 has already been alluded to.

A. B. DAVIDSON.

THE EPISTLE TO THE COLOSSIANS.

XXI.

THE PRACTICAL EFFECTS OF THE PEACE OF CHRIST, THE WORD OF CHRIST, AND THE NAME OF CHRIST.

"And let the peace of Christ rule in your hearts, to the which also ye were called in one body; and be ye thankful. Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom; teaching and admonishing one another with psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts unto God. And whatsoever ye do in word or in deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God the Father through Him."—Col. iii. 15-17 (Rev. Vers.).

THERE are here three precepts somewhat loosely connected, of which the first belongs properly to the series considered in our last paper, from which it is separated, only as not sharing in the metaphor under which the virtues contained in the former verses were set forth. In substance it is closely connected with them, though in form it is different, and in sweep is more comprehensive. The second refers mainly to Christian intercourse, especially to social worship; and the third covers the whole field of conduct, and fitly closes the series, which in it reaches the utmost possible generality, and from it drops to the inculcation of very special domestic The three verses have each a dominant phrase duties. round which we may group their teaching. These three are, the peace of Christ, the word of Christ, the name of the Lord Jesus.

I. The Ruling Peace of Christ.

The various reading "peace of Christ," for "peace of