

the view which restricts the language to an *earthly hope*, as opposed to the proper force of the words, to the connection of the thought, &c." If Job refers to an existence beyond the grave, he must be speaking of what was to take place *after* his resurrection, for till then he was to be, corporeally, *in* the grave. But if Job is speaking of seeing God after his resurrection, how is it that Dr. C. represents him as declaring that he is to see God, "without his body," when it is destroyed, and when his reins are consumed? Dr. C., on the authority of Ewald, &c., condemns restricting the language to an earthly hope. Does he mean to maintain that Job's hope is not connected with *the earth*? Even Dr. C.'s improved version declares that Job said he knew that his Redeemer was to stand on the earth, and that he was to see him. Now, if Job's Redeemer was to stand on the earth when Job saw him, where does Dr. C. suppose Job himself would be at the time? On the earth also? If not there, where then? In *heaven*? But there is not one word in either Testament, that teaches that Job in heaven ever saw Jesus Christ standing on the earth. This is mere fancy. I read of none but Jehovah looking from heaven on men on earth. (Ps. xiv.) But if Job, as well as Jesus, must be on the earth, when the vision occurs, the question again presses, What standing on the earth is referred to? It will hardly answer to say, At his first appearance; for Job was not on earth then. Though his body was then destroyed, and his reins consumed, I am not aware that it is an article in Ewald's creed, that Job's soul looked down from heaven on the baptism in Jordan, the transfiguration on the Mount, or the cross of Calvary. If, then, there is no alternative but allowing that it is the second coming of Christ of which Job is speaking, we can easily see where Job is to be then; he must be where his Redeemer is. But how, then, does Dr. C. translate, so as to teach, that Job's body is destroyed when he sees his Redeemer? It is then that Job's body is to be restored, no more to see corruption, to be smitten by Satan, or defaced and tortured by disease. If Job is not speaking of this blessed hope, what is he speaking about? I can assure Dr. C. that hope will not be put out of countenance, though all the Neologists of Germany, and all who sympathise with them, and reccho them in America, should combine to frown on it as earthly.

It is much to be regretted that Dr. C. should have ventured to send out such a version as this, without that "discussion" in the introduction which he promises, and the "refutation" of the objections to his new, which he threatens in his Explanatory Notes. The discussion and refutation should by all means have gone with the text. We have waited long enough for Dr. C.'s views, to have had them complete when they come. The sooner they appear now, the better for the interests of truth and the Bible Union.

Though I have deemed it my duty to make these brief objections to Dr. C.'s version of this famous passage, and in opposition to his alterations of the Revised Version, it is by no means because I am of opinion that our Revised Version is unexceptionable. My view is very different. I maintain, however, that Dr. C., instead of mending it, has injured it essentially.

As it is comparatively a small matter to expose error, unless it be to establish the truth, I will, with your permission, send you a few pages in explanation and vindication of what I regard as the true English rendering of Job's confession.—Meanwhile, I remain, yours, for the faith of the Resurrection and all its blessings,

JAMES LILLIE.

SUMMARY OF PRINCIPLES OF THE U. P. CHURCH (SCOTLAND.)

(EXTRACT FROM MINUTES OF SYNOD.)

EDINBURGH, 9th May, 1855.—The Synod, without entering into a minute examination of the Summary prepared by the Committee, approve of it as fitted to promote the end in view, namely, that of affording, especially to persons seeking admission