

faculty and the appreciative sympathy, ever present in their work. If they had not given their reasons and let us into the secret of their "method," we might have taken its results upon trust. As they have taken the more manly and outspoken course, they invite us thereby to follow them in a similar and parallel effort of criticism.

HENRY HAYMAN, D.D.

*THE REVISED VERSION OF THE OLD
TESTAMENT.*

THE BOOK OF JOB.—II.

IN the second circle of speeches, chaps. xv.—xxi., the changes made by the Revision are perhaps of less importance than those in the first circle. As before, the most difficult passages occur in the speeches of Job, particularly chaps. xvi., xvii., and xix., those of the other speakers being comparatively simple. The alterations made, however, will generally be found helpful to the understanding of the book as a whole.

In the speech of Eliphaz (chap. xv.) the following points may be noticed. In *v.* 4, "restrainest prayer before God" becomes "restrainest devotion." The charge of Eliphaz is that Job by his words and demeanour infringes upon the reverence due from men to God, a broader charge than that suggested by A.V. The change in *v.* 5 also adds to the force of the charge: "thine iniquity teacheth thy mouth," instead of the former, "thy mouth uttereth thine iniquity." It may remain a question whether the charge of Eliphaz be a general one, to the effect that Job's language was inspired by his evil mind, or particular, namely that his *guile* dictated his charges against God, which were only a pretext put forward to cloak his own conscious wrong-

doing. This is the sense of the second clause and may be the meaning here.

The marg. in *v.* 8 deserves attention: "dost (didst) thou hearken in the council of God?" The text has been retained virtually unchanged: "Hast thou heard the secret counsel of God?" Again, in *v.* 11, A.V. "is there any secret thing with thee?" has little pertinency; while R.V. "and the word *that dealeth* gently with thee" indicates that Eliphaz has in mind his own former speech (chaps. iv. v.). There runs throughout this second speech of Eliphaz a constant strain of allusion to his former discourse. The treatment of this discourse by Job has hurt his *amour propre*; it is not what was due to a man of his age and purity of blood. The words suggest, too, that Eliphaz did not quite say in his former speech all that he might have said nor all that was in his mind regarding Job.

Verse 20 has undergone a slight alteration which makes the sense more consistent: the wicked man travaileth with pain all his days, "even the number of years laid up for the oppressor," where A.V. has "and the number of years is hidden to the oppressor." And the same may be said of *v.* 26, which now reads: "he runneth upon Him (God) with stiff neck, with the thick bosses of his bucklers." Figuratively, the wicked man is represented as assailing God with a stiff neck, and with the bosses of his bucklers directed against Him. The tenses in the whole passage, *v.* 25-28, are probably all to be read in the past form.

In Job's reply (chaps. xvi., xvii.), the rendering of some individual words has been altered for the better, *e.g.* "what provoketh thee that thou answerest?" *v.* 3, where A.V. had "what emboldeneth?" *v.* 4, "I could join words together," for "heap up words" of A.V.; *v.* 8, "Thou hast laid fast hold on me," instead of "filled me with wrinkles." The slight addition in italics in *v.* 18, "let my cry have no *resting* place," suggests the meaning better, which is, let

my cry have no place where it shall rest and be silent, but let its appeal for justice sound through all places till it be heard. The rendering in *v.* 19, "He that voucheth for me is on high," is more exact. A.V. has, "my record is on high," but a person, namely God, is intended, the word being parallel to "my witness" in the former clause and of the same meaning. If the language contained such a word as "avoucher" in a personal sense it would express the meaning; but though the verb and one form of noun occur, as Hamlet says, "I might not this believe without the sensible and true avouch of mine own eyes," this particular form either does not occur or would be too obscure.

The change in *v.* 21, is of a different kind, being one of construction. A.V., though expressing a sense compatible enough with the general drift of Job's thoughts, hardly does justice to the desperate condition in which he feels himself at this moment. He has realized that men as well as God have deserted him and hold him guilty, "my friends scorn me." He has only one resort to flee to, the unseen God, his witness and avoucher, and he appeals with tears to Him both against the external God who operates in providence and in events and against men; mine eye poureth out tears unto God "that He would maintain the right of a man with God, and of a son of man with his neighbour." The "man" and "son of man" is Job himself, his neighbour is his friends.

In chap. xvii. 3 the somewhat obscure "lay down now" of A.V. becomes clearer in R.V., "give now a pledge;" and the second clause, "put me in a surety with thee," also is more intelligible in the new form: "be surety for me with thyself," where the same singular duality in Job's conception of God appears as in *v.* 21. Job regarded all the events of providence and of his own history, his misfortunes included, as due immediately to the hand of God, and he moreover regarded the occurrences of providence as

a true index of the mind of God and His disposition toward men, and consequently read in his own history the evidence of the Divine wrath. This was one God. But he was assured there was another, one who knew his integrity and would be his witness and voucher, the moral ideal of man's heart, all whose actual ways ought to correspond to the ideal and must yet correspond. It is his sense of the discordance between the supreme moral ideal and actual providence which he strives to express by speaking of God and God, and his hope is that he shall see the discordance equated and reconciled.

There are ingenious and devout minds who can nourish themselves upon the most unpromising and barren words if found in Scripture; such words become a mere frame in which they set beautiful pictures drawn by the pious imagination; and such minds, perhaps, found a sweet meaning in the language of Job as given in A.V., v. 6, "aforetime I was as a tabret." A tabret or timbrel is a little drum with bells in the rim, and is a favourite oriental instrument of a lively and joyous kind. Job might perhaps have compared himself to this in his old happy days. Here, however, he appears to be describing what he is now, not what he had been aforetime, and R.V., "I am become an open abhorring," or as marg., "one to be spit on in the face," no doubt expresses the general sense. In A.V. v. 12, "the light is short because of darkness," has little meaning. The words are obscure. R.V., however, "the light, *say they*, is near unto darkness," expresses an idea parallel to that of the first clause, "they change the night into day," that is, the three friends are ever putting forward their delusive hopes and foolish comfort, assuring Job that his "night" and "darkness" of calamity and affliction will speedily give place to the "light" and "day" of restoration and prosperity. Job, however, will have none of such comfort, he knows better and is assured of the contrary,

and his assurance is expressed with great pathos in the following verses 13-16, where the slight change in R.V. postponing the apodosis to *v.* 15, is an improvement.

In Bildad's second speech, chap. xviii., several changes occur, of which two or three may be noticed. In *v.* 2 A.V. "how long *will it be ere* ye make an end of words?" is faulty both in grammar and lexicography: R.V. "how long will ye lay snares for words?" that is, hunt for words, in order to find means of replying to the plain and incontrovertible principles of religion advanced by the friends. In *v.* 4 the English is allowed to prevail over the Heb. idiom, "thou that tearest thyself in thine anger," etc. It is known that the ancients did not possess candles, and strict fidelity requires "lamp" where A.V. renders "candle." Some may think that, considering the greater euphony of the latter word and the many fine passages, familiar to the ear and mind, in which it occurs, the change might have been spared. The alteration appears in *v.* 6, where in addition "above him" displaces "with him." A.V. "his candle shall be put out with him," suggests the entirely wrong idea that he and his candle shall be extinguished together; R.V. suggests the idea that the lamp was placed or hung high up in the tent or over the entrance. The prep. might express in a general way the connexion of the sinner and his candle.

In *v.* 13 "strength of his skin" is altered with advantage to "members of his body;" and in *v.* 14 the impersonal construction, "it shall bring him to the king of terrors," is more naturally put in the passive, "he shall be brought," etc. A.V. is obscure in *v.* 15, "it shall dwell in his tabernacle because it is none of his;" R.V., "there shall dwell in his tent that which is (they which are) none of his." The use of "nephew" (*nepos*, Fr. *neveu*) for grandson is now obsolete, though "grandson" is not a Biblical word; R.V. has compromised the difficulty in *v.* 19 by rendering

“son’s son,” as A.V. in an earlier passage. Finally, the omission of the italic *him*, v. 20, suggests that “they that went before” as well as “they that come after” are posterior to the day of the sinner’s destruction. The alternative sense suggested in the marg. is worth attending to.

Apart from the difficult passage, v. 23 *seq.*, Job’s reply in chap. xix. is simple. Only two alterations of any consequence have been made. In v. 6, “know now that God hath overthrown me” is replaced by the more accurate “hath subverted me *in my cause* ;” and in v. 17 the peculiar rendering of A.V., “though I entreated for the children’s sake of mine own body,” is altered into “and my supplication (is strange) to the children of my *mother’s* womb,” with marg. “I am loathsome to the children,” etc. The marg. “I am loathsome,” though without evidence from O.T., is thought to find support in the cognate languages. The rendering affords a parallel to the idea of the first clause, “my breath is strange (offensive) to my wife.” The final words of the verse are obscure ; lit. they read “to the children of my womb.” The last word can be used of the father, and might mean “body,” in which case Job’s own children would be referred to. These, however, according to the prologue, perished ; and as this is sustained by chap. viii. 4 and xxix. 5, it is difficult to assume an inconsequence on the part of the poet in the present passage. It is true that in v. 16 Job refers to his “servant,” although his servants are spoken of as having also perished ; but the difficulty is less, since only his servants who were in the fields are alluded to in the prologue. Some have suggested that children of concubines may be intended ; but no such connexions are alluded to, and in conformity with his high character Job is represented as living in strict monogamy. Others have thought of grandchildren, the objection to which is that Job’s sons, though they had houses of their own, do not appear to have been married. Either, therefore, we

must assume a slight inconsistency on the part of the poet, or render as R.V., "children of my mother's womb;" in the latter case Job would call the womb that bore him "his" womb, and would refer to brothers and sisters or collateral connexions.

The apparent anachronism, "printed in a book," v. 23, is removed by the rendering of R.V. "inscribed." The notable verses 25-27 were rather an interpretation in A.V. than a translation, and by the removal of all the words interpolated R.V. gains greatly in fairness. A.V. "he shall stand at the latter *day* upon the earth," v. 25, contains a reference too definite; R.V. "he shall stand up at the last," is more just. The rendering of A.V. v. 26, "*though* after my skin *worms* destroy this *body*, yet in my flesh shall I see God," expresses a perfectly unambiguous sense, and contains an explicit declaration of faith in the resurrection of the flesh. This sense, however, is gained by interpolating three words: *though*, *worms* and *body*; and though these interpolations may be in harmony with exegetical tradition, they can hardly be justified. The rendering of R.V., "and after my skin hath been thus destroyed, yet from my flesh shall I see God," is much fairer, though readers will probably complain of its ambiguity. The words "from my flesh" naturally mean the same as "in my flesh" of A.V., and some may still find the doctrine of the resurrection in the verse. Others will not unnaturally fasten on the apparent distinction introduced between "skin" and "flesh," and conclude that what Job's assurance amounts to is this: that though his disease go the length of committing frightful ravages in his "skin," *i.e.*, perhaps, his body superficially, yet in his mangled body—his "flesh"—and before death, he shall still see God. While others may obtain a similar sense by a different road. It may occur to them that "skin" and "flesh" may be identical in meaning, being mere variant expressions for "body," and that Job's statement is put in the form of

a paradox, "though my body be destroyed, yet in my body shall I see God," the meaning being that, though his disease should bring him to virtual annihilation, yet even in that condition and before death he should see God. That the verse is susceptible of a sense quite different is indicated by the marg. on "from my flesh," namely, "without my flesh," that is, disembodied and after death. The American Revisers continue to hold out for this sense, and the reader may refer to their rendering of the verse as a whole at the end of the O.T. According to this rendering, Job postpones his hope of seeing God till a future life, as we should now say, or, as would be said more accurately on O.T. ground, till after death.

In the speech of Zophar, chap. xx., a few changes occur which help to make that hot disputant's points clearer. He acknowledges that he is warm, and his impetuosity makes his opening sentences somewhat abrupt. R.V. with marg. on *v.* 3 may be referred to without quotation. Zophar's doctrine in the whole passage is that the wicked man's ill-gotten wealth does not abide with him, he has to restore it; his sweet pleasures turn to gall and the poison of asps within him; he must vomit up again all that he has so greedily swallowed. These harsh figures are crowded together with a reference to Job's history which is scarcely veiled. In this light, *v.* 10, "his hands shall restore their goods" is more pertinently "his goods" in R.V. In *v.* 20 A.V., "surely he shall not feel quietness in his belly" seems to express a rather curious threat; R.V. refers the verse rightly to the past career of the wicked man and his insatiable greed, "because he knew no quietness within him" (in his belly, the seat of appetite). In A.V. *v.* 21 has little sense, "there shall none of his meat be left;" R.V. "there was nothing left that he devoured not." In *v.* 23, "when he is about to fill his belly" has been retained in R.V., but with the marg. "let it be (it shall be) for the fillin of his

belly that " God shall cast the fierceness of His wrath upon him. In the last clause A.V. has also been retained, " and shall rain it upon him while he is eating," though with marg. "rain it upon him as his food." Both these margins are deserving of attention.

In Job's reply, ch. xxi., though the changes are not numerous they are of the utmost importance, and have the effect of altering the whole complexion of the chapter as A.V. allows it to be read. To the doctrine of Zophar in the previous chapter, which was the doctrine of all the three friends, that the wicked man is always miserable and invariably comes to a wretched end, Job opposes a direct negative, and shows by instances which cannot be gainsaid that such an assertion is false. He admits that his friends' doctrine ought to be true; it is what the conscience of man demands to be true, and what the providence of God, if it were righteous and corresponded to the ideal in man's mind, would show to be true, but the facts of life and history tell quite a different tale; and the tale is so full of mystery and of moral failure on the part of the Ruler of all, that Job, when he thinks of it, is troubled, and horror taketh hold of his flesh (*v.* 6).

In *v.* 14 a change of the slightest kind alters the whole drift of the passage. In pursuance of his argument against the three friends, Job directs attention to the multiplication of the wicked, the joyous happiness of their children, the prosperity of their flocks, and their own peaceful end at last (*v.* 7-13), and then according to A.V. adds, "therefore they say unto God, Depart from us" (*v.* 14). This reading makes the worldly ease and felicity of the wicked the source of their impiety. Now this might be a conclusive proof of the ingratitude of men, but it would be no arraignment of the providence of God, and nothing relevant to Job's contention. R.V. renders, "yet they said unto God, Depart from us"—that is, though they were persons who would have none of

God, yet every worldly blessing was showered upon them. Again, A.V. reads *v.* 17 as an exclamation with an affirmative meaning, "how oft is the candle of the wicked put out!" R.V. as a question, "how oft is it that," etc.? meaning, what examples can be shown of such a thing? there is no such law of providence to be observed. In these verses 17, 18, Job directly traverses the theory of his friends. Once more the whole scope of *vv.* 19-21 is altered by the insertion of the italic *ye say* in R.V. *v.* 19. The friends, in answer to Job's evidence of the happiness of many a wicked man himself, fall back upon the old doctrine of retribution: "God layeth up his iniquity for his children," to which Job replies "let Him recompense it unto himself . . . for what pleasure (concern) has he in his house after him"? The passage is very curious and instructive. We can infer from the prophets Jeremiah and Ezekiel that the miseries of the exile had begun to react upon the doctrine of retribution formerly accepted. The people concluded that they were being punished for the sins of their ancestors, "the fathers ate sour grapes and the children's teeth are set on edge." The generation of the exile were suffering not for their own but for their fathers' transgressions, and they began in their misery to question the rectitude of the providential law. Job does not attack the law on the side of its injustice, but assails it on another ground, namely, that as a law of retribution it is a failure, it lays the penalty on the wrong parties—"let his own eyes see his destruction." Though his children suffer the wicked man himself escapes, for what knowledge has he of his house after him or what concern in it? Both the proverb in Jeremiah and Ezekiel, and the present passage, imply that men were now occupying a different point of view from that of Hebrew antiquity. The old view as illustrated in the case of Korah and other instances, appears to have been this: a man's children or family and dependents were regarded as part of himself,

hence his punishment if thorough included them, or if they suffered after him it was still retribution on *him*, he was being still pursued by vengeance in them, who were his and part of him. He was not supposed to represent them so that his evil might be imputed to them and considered theirs—such an idea inverts the whole conception—on the contrary the standing of the children or dependents as distinct and independent persons was not considered, they were comprehended in the father or head. This view was breaking up in the age to which the Book of Job belongs. The dissatisfaction of men with it was a symptom of a general change that was coming over O.T. conceptions. The individual, with his rights and responsibilities immediately before God, was the new conception which was to lay the foundation for a truer order of things. Both in Ezekiel and in Job the father and his children are regarded as quite distinct from one another, the latter are independent persons. Hence in the prophet the law that the children suffer for the sins of the father is assailed as doing an injustice to the children, while in Job it is repudiated, because it fails to touch the father. The individualism of Ezekiel has been attacked by some writers as carried to an extreme which is far more false than the old view which it would displace. All questions of this kind are complicated in the O.T. by the fact that two things are mixed up which fuller revelation and larger experience have taught us to keep apart, namely, the religious relation of the individual soul to God, and the external token and pledge of this relation in the person's worldly prosperity or the reverse. The contribution which Ezekiel makes is to the former point, the individual's freedom and responsibility and reward or the reverse according to his conduct. What entangles his teaching to us is that he appears to leave the second point untouched, the favour and displeasure of God continue to be manifested externally, remaining untranslated into the forms of spiritual experience.

In *v.* 32 the marg. "that the evil man is spared in the day of calamity," etc. is certainly much more in harmony with the general scope of the chapter than the text "is reserved for the day of calamity." Job is supposed by some to modify his views in chap. xxvii., but here he is delivering a crushing assault upon the stronghold of his friends, and he is not likely to cripple his attack by considerations of another kind.

In the third circle of speeches (chap. xxii.-xxxi.) there is a multitude of changes; but though useful, few of them are of such importance as those just noticed. In the opening speech of Eliphaz, chap. xxii., the following may be referred to. In *v.* 4, "will He reprove thee for fear of thee?" is more accurate in R.V., "is it for thy fear of *Him* that He reproveth thee?" More important is the alteration in *v.* 15, where "wilt thou keep the old way?" (*i.e.* the way of the ancient sinners) takes the place of A.V. "hast thou marked the old way?" A.V. *v.* 20 has little meaning; R.V., by inserting the italic *saying*, connects the verse with the preceding and otherwise modifies it. In A.V. *v.* 24, "then shalt thou lay up gold as dust," etc., is a promise of riches to Job on his returning to God; R.V. gives the words quite another turn, making them a warning to Job against his love of wealth, "lay thou thy treasure in the dust . . . and the Almighty shall be thy treasure." The very curious rendering of A.V. (*v.* 30), "He shall deliver the island of the innocent," arose from confounding 'N, an island, with 'N, a form of the negative; R.V., "He shall deliver *even* him that is not innocent."

In Job's reply, chap. xxiii., xxiv., xxiii. 2 remains obscure for all that can be done to it. Verse 6, "No; but he would put *strength* in me," has no relevancy in the connexion. Job fancies himself pleading before the judgment seat of God, and asks how he should wish God to receive him; hence R.V., "Nay; but He would give heed to

me." In *v.* 17, which remains virtually as in A.V., the marg. offers quite a different view of the meaning. The text taken in connexion with the preceding, God hath made my heart faint and the Almighty hath troubled me (*v.* 16) "because I was not cut off before the darkness," etc., appears to mean that Job is troubled and perplexed because God had not caused him to die before such awful calamities befell him. Of course if Job had been dead he would not have been here discussing mysteries of providence any more; but in the sense in which he speaks, his being "cut off" would have been just the same mystery as now alarms him. The marg. suggests a profound and pathetic sense, and one in the line of all Job's statements, namely, that it is not his calamities in themselves nor his death that Job is affrighted at; it is the moral aspect of his afflictions, the fact that *God* causes them in defiance of rectitude, that paralyses his mind. The marg. runs: "for I am not dismayed because of the darkness (affliction), nor because thick darkness covereth my face." It was not a question of the sufferings or death of him or any man; the moral Sun in heaven was labouring under disastrous eclipse.

Chap. xxiv. 1 is clearer in R.V., "why are times (of assize) not laid up by the Almighty? and why do not they that know Him see his days" (of judgment)? The pious, who know God, cannot perceive His righteous rule on earth. A.V. "why, seeing times are not hidden from the Almighty, do they that know Him not see His days?" appears to assume that God has days for doing judgment appointed by Him, and to complain that men cannot see them. The distinction is one not drawn by Job. The complaint that men cannot see Him doing judgment, dispensing right upon the earth, is a complaint that right is not dispensed by Him.

The changes in this chapter are too numerous to notice

in detail; the attention of the reader may be directed to two landmarks set up by R.V.: *v.* 9, "there are that pluck," etc.; and *v.* 13, "these are of them that rebel," etc. The passage *v.* 18 to the end is difficult of interpretation; many consider *v.* 18-21 to give the popular view of the fate that awaits the sinners described in the previous verses, while *v.* 22-25 give a very different view of their fate, a view which is Job's own. If this construction of the passage be adopted the marg. of *v.* 22 should be substituted for the text, which as it stands is rather obscure.

In Bildad's brief speech, chap. xxv., there is no change requiring notice. In Job's reply, chap. xxvi., two or three useful changes have been made. In *v.* 5, A.V., "dead things are formed from under the waters," has no meaning at all; R.V., "they that are deceased tremble beneath the waters," etc. The reference is to the realm of the dead and the shades (*Refaim*) congregated there; this abode of the departed was considered to be beneath the sea. Again, *v.* 9, "He holdeth back the face of His throne," is obscure; R.V., "He closeth in the face of His throne," *i.e.* with clouds. And as in a former passage, "Rahab" takes the place of "the proud," *v.* 12.

Chaps. xxvii., xxviii. are encompassed with difficulties when the question of their integral connexion with the book is considered. Otherwise the chapters are of no great difficulty, though in the beginning of both some great and useful changes have been introduced. Chap. xxvii. 3 has been thrown into a parenthesis in R.V. and made to express Job's consciousness and mental clearness in spite of his wasting malady, and thus to add weight to the asseveration of his innocence which he is about to make. This asseveration follows in *v.* 4-6. The text of these verses reads, "my lips shall not speak unrighteousness" (*v.* 4), "my heart shall not reproach me," etc. The marg. suggests presents for these futures: "my lips do not speak

unrighteousness," *i.e.* in maintaining my innocence; "my heart doth not reproach me," *i.e.* I have no consciousness of sin; a sense with which goes the rendering, "for any of my days." Of course it has always to be remembered that Job is not here arrogating to himself absolute sinlessness; he is merely repudiating the kind of sins insinuated against him by his friends and implied (as he supposed) by his misfortunes.

In chap. xxviii. 1 the marg. "for," instead of "surely," suggests a close connexion between the chapters. Verses 3, 4, are made much clearer in R.V. by the insertion of the word *man* for "he" in v. 3, "*man* setteth an end to darkness;" as well as by making "man" the subject in v. 4, instead of "the flood" as A.V. In A.V. v. 4 has no meaning, while R.V. by referring it to the operations of the miner offers a graphic picture of the dangers and the successes of ancient mining. The change of "rivers" into "channels," v. 10, and the rendering, "he bindeth the streams that they trickle not," v. 11, help to vivify the description.

In Job's last speech, chap. xxix.-xxxi., most difficulties occur in chap. xxx., and there a number of changes have been introduced, *e.g.* "they gnaw the ground," instead of "fleeing into the wilderness," v. 3; "they were scourged out of the land," instead of "they were viler than the earth," v. 8; "the *pains* that gnaw me take no rest," instead of "my sinews take no rest," v. 17; "Thou dissolvest me in the storm," instead of "Thou dissolvest my substance," v. 22, and others. The well-known passage, 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," appears in R.V. thus: "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!" Job

desires that he had one that would answer him, meaning that God would appear to justify or explain his afflictions; to his own protestation of innocence he appends his signature and waits for the Almighty's reply in opposition to it; the indictment or charge of God his opponent is what he longs to possess, for then the riddle of his sorrows would be solved.

It is unnecessary and would be tedious to adduce further instances. Enough has been noticed to indicate the kind of changes that have been introduced, and the bearing which many of them have upon the general scope and leading conceptions of the book, and also perhaps to commend to the reader's attention the margin in many places where A.V. has still been retained or only slightly modified.

A. B. DAVIDSON.

THE PROPHECIES OF ST. PAUL.

III.—THE LATER EPISTLES.

THE distribution of predictive passages through the letters written by St. Paul during his first imprisonment,—Ephesians, Colossians, Philemon and Philippians (A.D. 62 and 63),—is analogous to what we have observed in the preceding group. In the more theological and polemical letters, as there, so here, such passages are few, while in the more practical and personal letters they are comparatively numerous. The Second Advent is not directly mentioned at all in Ephesians, and only once, and then very incidentally, in Colossians; while, although the brief and purely occasional letter to Philemon naturally enough contains no allusions to the future, the Epistle to the Philippians, which resembles in general manner and contents the letters