

from the valuable "Variorum Edition" of the Bible published by the Queen's Printers, a book which can hardly be too highly recommended. It may be prejudice, or even a touch of superstition, but we must confess to a decided emotion of pleasure at finding Job xix. 25 so little altered. We need not quote the older version: it now appears in this form:

But I know that my redeemer liveth,  
And that he shall stand up at the last upon the earth:  
And after my skin hath been thus destroyed  
Yet from my flesh shall I see God.

It is, of course, well known that the words cannot now be quoted with the exact application which gave them their place in Handel's "Messiah"; but there will be no violent shock to the feelings of association which have been so long connected with the words. It is different with another text often quoted in a manner not quite edifying. We refer to Job xxxi. 35: "Oh! that one would hear me! behold my desire is that the Almighty would answer me, and that mine adversary had written a book." Here we have one of the comparatively infrequent instances in which the meaning is considerably altered. The new version reads:

Oh! that I had one to hear me!  
(Lo, here is my signature, let the Almighty answer me!)  
And that I had the indictment which mine adversary hath written.

It will be seen from the two examples foregoing that the poetical portions of the translation are printed in a manner to distinguish them from the prose. This is observed throughout. The average of changes throughout the Book of Job is a good deal higher than in the examples given. Thus in chapter xli. we have rather more than one alteration in each verse.

It will be interesting to note some of the changes in the best known parts of the Bible. In the twenty-third Psalm there is hardly a change that any one would remark, only "guideth" for "leadeth" and "hast anointed" for "anointed." In the hundredth there are scarcely more, but they are of greater importance. For "it is he that hath made us, and not we ourselves," we have, "it is he that hath made us and we are his." In the last verse, instead of "For the Lord is good: his mercy is everlasting; and his truth endureth to all generations," we have: "For the Lord is good; his mercy endureth for ever (compare Psalm cxxxvi.); and his faithfulness unto all generations." Psalm cxli. must often have puzzled English Churchmen who use the Prayer Book version. It may be interesting to compare the three forms of the difficult verses (5-8). Prayer Book Version: "Let the righteous rather smite me friendly: and reprove me. But let not their precious balms break my head: yea, I will pray yet against their wickedness. Let their judges be overthrown in places stony, that they may hear my words, for they are sweet. Our bones lie scattered before the pit, like as when one breaketh and heweth wood upon the earth." Authorized Version: "Let the righteous smite me; it shall be a kindness: and let him reprove me; it shall be an excellent oil which shall not break my head; for yet my prayer also shall be in their calamities. When their judges are overthrown in stony places they shall hear my words for they are sweet. Our bones are scattered at the grave's mouth, as when one cutteth and cleaveth wood upon the earth." Revised Version:

Let the righteous smite me, it shall be a kindness;  
And let him reprove me, it shall be as oil upon the head;  
Let not my head refuse it:  
For even in their wickedness shall my prayer continue.  
Their judges are thrown down by the sides of the rock,  
And they shall hear my words for they are sweet;  
As when one ploweth and cleaveth the earth  
Our bones are scattered at the grave's mouth.

Every one can see how, by progressive stages, the meaning of this passage has emerged into greater clearness; and it is the case with many others that might be cited.

For another example we turn to the ninth chapter of the Book of the Prophet Isaiah, in which the changes are numerous and important. Our readers will probably refer to the two versions: we have room for only one example. How often has this passage in the first lesson for the morning of Christmas Day puzzled the listener: "Thou hast multiplied the nation, and not increased the joy; they joy before thee according to the joy in harvest." All becomes clear when we read: "Thou hast multiplied the nation, *thou hast increased their joy.*" In the great fifty-third chapter of this book the alterations are not very numerous nor perhaps very important, but they are interesting. Without quoting the well-known originals, we will introduce two or three of the variations. Verse 3, we read "A man of sorrows and acquainted with grief, and as one from whom men hide their faces; he was despised and we esteemed him not." Verse 7: "He was oppressed, yet he humbled himself and opened not his mouth; as a lamb is led to the slaughter, and as a sheep that before her shearers is

dumb; yea, he opened not his mouth." Verses 8, 9: "By oppression and judgement he was taken away; and, as for his generation, who among them considered that he was cut off out of the land of the living? for the transgression of my people was he stricken. And they made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death; although he had done no violence, neither was any deceit in his mouth."

Here we must pause. There are multitudes of points to notice. In some respects, here and there, the revisers seem to have been a little too conservative. Sometimes they have been bolder than those of the New Testament, e.g. in putting *demons* for *devils*, which the others refused to do. We have, however, said enough for the present. It is only after repeated perusal, and after hearing the assailants and the defenders of the new version that we shall be able to arrive at a settled judgment. In the meantime our readers should carefully study the admirable "Revisers' Preface," and give good heed to the rejected emendations of the American Company which are printed at the end of the text. C.

### LIGHT WINES AND BEER.

It is one of the silliest of the Prohibition fallacies that, because alcohol is poisonous in large quantities and concentrated form, it must be, and is of necessity, harmful in small doses. This Samsonian reasoning is paraded and made to do duty on every possible occasion as an infallible argument against the moderate drinking of light fermented liquors—man's favourite beverages since prehistoric times. If this reasoning were good and could apply in parallel cases then we might abandon all foods at once, for it would be difficult to obtain anything in the nature of an alimentary principle which could not be shown to be harmful in excessive quantities. Salt, a necessity of animal life without which we should miserably perish, is in large quantities a most powerful poison. Orfila, indeed, mentions several cases of death occurring through its agency. How comes it that this substance, poisonous in large doses, is not only harmless in small quantities but absolutely beneficial? We might name dozens of alimentary principles of a like nature, but the above will amply serve to expose the absurdity of such reasoning.

The true position of alcohol has been, in its relation to the animal economy, ably and finally defined by the late Dr. Anstie in his work on "Stimulants and Narcotics." He shows it to be a true food stimulant in moderate quantities: toxic and narcotic in excessive doses. Moreover, he points out that all foods invariably act as stimulants when used in moderation, but that taken in excess they exert marked toxic and narcotic effects. Who has not noticed the tendency to sleep after the taking of a heavy meal, and the headache, biliousness, and general disinclination to exertion experienced upon awaking from such a slumber? Indeed the difference between delirium tremens and the nightmare caused by a lobster supper is only one of intensity, while the ultimate effect upon the system will not be greatly dissimilar.

The chief argument put forward by total abstainers against the moderate use of the milder alcoholic beverages is that their effect after a time diminishes, and that thereupon the dose has to be increased to produce a like effect. If this were true then it would be wise to let all alcoholic drinks severely alone; but Dr. Anstie has shown that the idea is entirely erroneous, that it is only those who have *habituated* themselves to the narcotic effects of excessive quantities who are obliged of necessity to increase their daily allowance. More recently also, as if to deprive the teetotalers of any argument being based upon the possibility of medical authority of the present day being against Anstie, the London *Lancet* has expressed a similar opinion. The nearer we get to absolute alcohol (a substance, let me here remark, only met with in the laboratory) the greater the danger becomes of taking an excessive dose; hence a reason for excluding ardent spirits from the list of ordinary beverages. On no account should spirits be taken simply as beverages, and when used for medical or dietetic purposes should have the sanction of the physician.

With the primary fermented liquors, however, it is very different; in these are associated ingredients which give rise to modified and additional effects upon the system. The beverages, for instance, which are rich in extractive matter, such as beer, stout, and porter, have a nutritive and fattening power not possessed by a simple alcoholic liquid. Nor is the intoxication produced by their excessive use so harmful as that occasioned by spirits. Its bitter principle renders it a good stomachic and tonic. "A light beer," says Dr. Pavy, "well flavoured with the hop is calculated to promote digestion, and may be looked upon as one of the most wholesome of the alcoholic beverages." There is no eminent authority on dietetics who has not pointed out the many benefits accruing to the system by its moderate