

ESCHATOLOGY

Eschatology has traditionally been understood as that branch of theology which is concerned with "final" things. Topics such as the future of the world, the parousia of Jesus Christ, the coming kingdom of God, the last judgment of humankind, the resurrection from the dead, heaven and hell, the transformation of the cosmos, etc., are all generally considered under its heading. The term *eschatology* is often used interchangeably with *apocalyptic*, although in recent years the latter has been more correctly defined in terms of a distinctive literary genre which may or may not be concerned with temporal "last things" (as J. J. Collins and C. C. Rowland demonstrate). The relationship between chronological history and eschatology has been a major source of scholarly discussion in recent years. G. B. Caird has offered an important linguistic assessment of eschatological language which focuses on the *metaphorical* sense as primary to its meaning. The result of such an approach is similar to genre investigations, namely that a straightforward equation between temporal "last things" and eschatological literature, particularly apocalyptic texts, is qualified, if not challenged altogether.

Strictly speaking a distinction should be maintained between the two terms *apocalyptic* and *eschatology*, despite the fact that much earlier scholarly endeavor uses *apocalyptic* without knowledge of the genre clarification, inadvertently providing the basis for some modern confusion when these older materials are consulted (see Sturm for an overview; cf. Marshall, Barker). L. Keck has tried to address this problem when he suggests that we take *apocalyptic* as an adjective "which characterizes a type of theology, not merely a type of eschatology" (Keck, 233). According to Keck, Paul's apocalyptic theology is to be distinguished from his wisdom theology since it arises from a different theological base. This is true, although it is possible to see both types of theology overlapping within the Pauline letters, often within key passages (such as 1 Cor 2–3; Phil 2:5–11; Col 1:13–20).

Paul's place within the area of eschatological theology is central, not least because his writings are among the earliest Christian documents preserved, thus reflecting foundational perspectives on eschatological matters. Most of the standard introductions on Paul have a section dealing with eschatology (H. Ridderbos, D. E. H. Whiteley, G. Bornkamm, F. F. Bruce). In addition, many of the classic interpretative studies of Paul in previous generations were dependent upon critical analyses of his eschatological thought (e.g., A. Schweitzer, G. Vos, E. Käsemann, J. Munck, H. J. Schoeps, W. D. Davies). In the past decade or so several important studies of Pauline eschatology have been produced, most notably that of J. C. Beker (1980). These have served to revitalize interest in the topic and have highlighted how central eschatology is to Pauline studies as a whole.

Paul's eschatology provides the background for many other important topics which constitute the substance of Pauline theology; christology, pneumatology, ecclesiology, soteriology and anthropology are all built upon the eschatological foundation of Paul's thought. This foundation is all pervading in Pauline studies for it is possible to see eschatological concerns or presuppositions surfacing in virtually every letter within the Pauline corpus (Gal and Philem have been suggested as possible exceptions since they do not contain explicit references to the future Day of the Lord). Eschatological material occurs in a wide variety of contexts within the Pauline letters: creedal, polemical, pastoral, ethical, paraenetic and personal pericopae all contain such teaching. The importance of Pauline eschatology is evident no matter what one's opinion about the question of the authenticity of some of the letters, namely 2 Thessalonians, Colossians and Ephesians or the Pastorals. Even if some of these letters within the Pauline corpus are taken to be the work of Paul's followers in a subsequent generation, it is clear that Paul's own eschatological viewpoint helps condition the teaching contained within [p. 254] them (more about this below).

1. The Context of Pauline Eschatology: Jewish Apocalyptic Literature
2. The Contingency of the Pauline Letters
3. The Content of Pauline Eschatology: Some Central Tenets
4. Pauline Eschatology and Christology
5. Pauline Eschatology and Ethics
6. Pauline Eschatology and Jewish Mysticism
7. Social Dynamics in Paul's Eschatological Teaching

1. The Context of Pauline Eschatology: Jewish Apocalyptic Literature.

Recognition of the importance of the eschatological milieu of the NT materials is one of the most important results of twentieth-century investigations by biblical scholars. It needs to be recognized that the production of apocalypses was by no means restricted to Jewish or Christian writers; there are examples from many parts of the ancient Near East. However, it is the apocalypses of the first-century Jewish-Christian world (such as *1 Enoch*, *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*) that are the most important parallels to Paul since it is these materials which are closest to him in terms of date and geographical setting; they therefore afford us the best opportunity of appreciating the eschatological content of Paul's thinking.

In the memorable words of E. Käsemann, “apocalyptic was the mother of all Christian theology” (Käsemann, “Beginnings,” 102). Indeed, apocalyptic has been viewed as one of the keys for unlocking the meaning of the NT as a whole. It is for this reason that Beker has described the apocalyptic worldview as the “coherent center” of Paul’s thought and “rejects those construals of Paul’s thought that suppress, delimit, or compromise its apocalyptic texture” (Beker 1980, 135). Beker is here following the lead of Käsemann in defining apocalyptic eschatology in terms of a belief in the future, imminent consummation of the world, an event which is triggered by (and at times even equated with) the future parousia of Jesus Christ. At the same time Beker takes the argument a step further than Käsemann did, asserting that Paul’s apocalyptic framework is not only the starting point for Paul’s thought but constitutes “the indispensable framework for his interpretation of the Christ-event” (Beker 1980, 19). This stands in contrast to Käsemann, who argues that Paul later departs from such an apocalyptically conditioned perspective. In short Beker serves as the advocate for many who would see the long standing debate about the center and periphery of Paul’s thought as resolved in favor of the centrality of the apocalyptic-eschatological element of his teaching. The focus of theological discussion is thereby shifted away from earlier arguments about justification by faith (e.g., Käsemann) and Christ mysticism (e.g., Schweitzer) as being the focal point(s) of Paul’s theology. As an alternative Beker asserts that “the triumph of God [is] the center of Paul’s thought” (Beker 1980, 355), a suggestion which arises directly out of an apocalyptic framework of Paul’s thought. Beker summarizes this approach as one which recognizes Paul’s thought as an interaction between “contingency” and “coherency” (see Center).

Some scholars have criticized the extent of Beker’s approach, however, pointing out that in certain instances he imposed the apocalyptic scheme upon Paul’s letters without due consideration to its appropriateness. J. L. Martyn, for example, has argued that Beker’s interpretation of Galatians is misdirected and fails to take into account the role that the cross has in the letter (the letter is not easily fitted into an apocalyptic framework since eschatological material is notably absent within it). Nevertheless, according to Martyn, Galatians forms, as it were, an “apocalypse of the cross,” which initiates a cosmic battle between the flesh and the spirit (as in Gal 5:16–25). (See Beker’s response in his preface to 2d ed., *Paul the Apostle*.) A modification of the basic thesis is in order (as Beker [1991] himself now acknowledges).

Such attempts at interpreting Paul’s theology from the standpoint of its eschatological foundation could legitimately be seen as a reaction to the overly realized approach of some interpreters such as Dodd or Bultmann, who build upon the (presumed) loss of an eschatological perspective as the Christian faith spread into the Hellenistic world. However, this is not to suggest that Paul’s viewpoint is completely apocalyptic in substance, merely that it lies within an eschatological framework. Clearly there is, at the same time, a dimension of realized eschatology in Paul’s thought which tempers his obviously futuristic teaching (as V. P. Branick argues). Any attempt to contrast what is “present” with what is “eschatological” in Paul’s thought misrepresents his position—the two are dynamically interconnected. Recognition of Paul’s two-dimensional eschatology (present/future; immanent/transcendent) is particularly important when it comes to determining how the message of Pauline eschatology is applicable to us today. The two dimensions of Paul’s thought are sometimes usefully described as the “vertical” and “horizontal” (or the “spatial” and “temporal”) planes of his eschatology. The perceived relationship between the spatial and temporal dimensions of Paul’s eschatological thought has [p. 255] proven to be one of the great divides among interpreters of Paul; those who emphasize the vertical dimension tend to see the conflict implied by a two-age dualism in cosmological terms (earthly versus heavenly), while those who emphasize the horizontal dimension tend to see the conflict arising out of straightforward chronological considerations (present versus future). A full examination of Paul’s letters reveals that he uses the language of both time and space within his eschatological teaching (see Lincoln). The latter should not be neglected nor the former overemphasized; both help constitute Paul’s eschatological thought. Even such a passage as Colossians 3:1–6, dominated by “spatial” language, has a wider eschatological vision behind it which hints at its “horizontal” counterpart (see Levison for a discussion).

Over the years considerable discussion has been given over to determining the background sources for Paul’s eschatological viewpoint: does it ultimately derive from his Jewish heritage or from the wider Hellenistic world of which he was a part? Most scholars now accept that Paul’s Jewish heritage and background, including its twofold division of temporal history into two aeons, the “now” and the “not-yet,” is determinative for his eschatological worldview. M. C. de Boer [1989] further subdivides Jewish apocalyptic eschatology by suggesting two tracks: a cosmological-apocalyptic eschatology and a forensic-apocalyptic eschatology. De Boer argues that these correspond respectively to Käsemann’s cosmological understanding of apocalyptic and Bultmann’s anthropological understanding of it. Be that as it may, for Paul Jewish apocalyptic is a worldview which has had to undergo significant adaptation in light of the crucial event of Jesus’ resurrection from the dead. It is the resurrection of Jesus Christ, above all, which conditions and determines Paul’s eschatological teaching for it is in the resurrection that the inauguration of the eschaton has truly taken place, the new order begun. While the resurrection is central to it, Pauline eschatology is by no means monolithic in its conceptualization, nor is it uniform in its expression. A great deal of variety characterizes the letters on this score. As W. Baird puts it: “Paul does not have a clear and simple apocalyptic picture of the end. His language is drawn from external sources and is not used consistently” (Baird, 325).

Before we turn to consider some of the specifics of Paul's eschatological teaching there is one additional matter of significance which must first be addressed.

2. The Contingency of the Pauline Letters.

One of the most important contributions in recent Pauline studies has been the increased understanding of the contingent nature of the letters which form the Pauline corpus. Even if, as we suggested above, Beker argues that apocalyptic be recognized as the "coherent center" of Paul's thought, he rightly notes that it must be translated into "the contingent particularities of the human situation" (Beker 1980, ix). More than ever before scholarship has come to appreciate how the circumstances surrounding the production of a letter help to contribute to our understanding of its contents. In short, the greater our knowledge of precisely how and why the apostle Paul (or, perhaps one of his followers, in the case of the so-called Deutero-Pauline letters) came to write a given letter, the better our chances of understanding not only its original message, but of interpreting the meaning for us today.

An informed study of the relationship that Paul (or his successors) might have had with the intended congregation better enables us to expound the text as a whole. Unfortunately, the contingent nature of many of the letters is such that we are often left with many key questions unanswered. We simply do not know enough about what actually occasioned the apostle to write to the congregations (or they to him), and are often forced to hypothesize so as to fill in the gaps of our knowledge; we do not even have the complete Pauline corpus to work with (as 1 Cor 5:9 demonstrates). Hypothetical reconstructions of the correspondence between Paul and the various congregations are needed to overcome this problem (as J. C. Hurd's seminal "backward extrapolation" theory about the Corinthian correspondence illustrates). These problems affect virtually all of the letters in the Pauline corpus and involve many theological themes, but become particularly acute in the area of eschatological teaching within several of the undisputed letters. Is Paul responding to questions arising from the congregations concerned? Have they misunderstood (or misrepresented) him? How much of what he writes in reply is dependent upon a common eschatological understanding which he shares with them (or perhaps, even was responsible for imparting to them)? How much of what he writes is designed as conscious corrective? Two examples are worth citing at this point.

2.1. 1 Thessalonians 4:13–5:11: The Premature Death of Christian Believers? The Thessalonian letters both appear to have been written in response to serious questions raised by the congregation about the death of believers prior to the expected parousia of the Lord (1 Cor 11:30 and 15:18 may hint at the same issue being debated in Corinth). Paul's answer in 1 Thessalonians 4:13–5:11 attempts to deal with this concern and basically asserts that the dead suffer no [p. 256] disadvantage and will be joined with Christ at his coming. The difficulty here is that it is not entirely clear what eschatological beliefs were held by the church at Thessalonica, nor why they were thrown into such theological turmoil by the death of some of the members of the congregation. Did they simply misunderstand what Paul (presumably) had taught them about the future when he helped found the congregation? Or could it be that Paul himself had altered his views about the resurrection in the interim and that he is correcting his earlier teaching within the letter? Part of the problem lies, no doubt, in the imprecise nature of eschatological material itself (Klijn notes that the question of the status of the deceased was a problem common to apocalyptic literature). However, because we do not know the earlier exchange between Paul and the Thessalonians, it is not possible to be sure about the accuracy of any interpretation; it is like trying to listen to one end of a telephone conversation and deduce the matter being discussed.

2.2. 1 Corinthians 7: The Institution of Marriage and Human Sexuality in the Face of the Parousia. In this chapter Paul responds to some questions raised by the Corinthians about sex and marriage in the lives of Christian believers. It appears that the Corinthians had adopted an ascetic attitude toward sexuality in light of their belief that full salvation in Christ had already arrived (in 1 Cor 7:1b Paul cites one of their slogans to this effect). Paul writes to correct this attitude, emphasizing in 1 Corinthians 7:2–6 the mutual obligations and responsibilities of sexual relationships between husbands and wives. This section presents little difficulty as far as eschatological matters are concerned. However, in 1 Corinthians 7:7–40 Paul continues with advice that seems much more conditioned by his views of the imminent parousia of Christ; this is particularly true in 1 Corinthians 7:25–35. There he advises those who are single (for whatever reason) to remain so in light of the "present distress" (1 Cor 7:26) and the "shortening of the time" (1 Cor 7:29). The chapter is an exegetical minefield, but most scholars agree that to some degree Paul's eschatological perspective is coloring his ethical advice to those contemplating marriage. Whatever interpretation is eventually adopted, one must give due consideration to the eschatological backdrop of Paul's thought (see Moiser for an overview).

3. The Content of Pauline Eschatology: Some Central Tenets.

Clearly an eschatological viewpoint underlies the whole of Pauline theology. The extent to which the perspective is determinative and the variety of form and expression which it employs makes it difficult to assess the matter simply. However, the main points may be summarized under the following eight headings.

3.1. The Messiahship of Jesus of Nazareth. For Paul, Jesus of Nazareth is without doubt the Messiah, the Christ promised of old. So much is this so that the title "Christ" (*christos*) functions almost as if it is the surname of

Jesus himself. Several other messianic titles and designations are accorded to Jesus within the Pauline corpus, including Son (of God) (sixteen times in Rom 1:4, 9; 5:10; 8:3, 29, 32; 1 Cor 1:9; 15:28; 2 Cor 1:19; Gal 1:16; 2:20; 4:4, 6; Eph 4:13; Col 1:13; 1 Thess 1:10), Son of David (two times in Rom 1:3; 2 Tim 2:8) and Lord (around 275 times, including such important christological passages as 1 Cor 8:6; Phil 2:11). Yet it cannot be forgotten that the appearance of the Messiah was regarded within many writings of first-century Judaism above all as an eschatological event, an indisputable sign that the age to come had arrived. In a sense then, it is true to say that the linchpin of Paul's eschatology is the proclamation of Jesus of Nazareth as the Messiah. At the same time it also needs to be said that the key event which guarantees, or authenticates, that messiahship is the raising of Jesus from the dead, for it is that act of resurrection which demonstrates how the eschatological age has impinged upon the present.

3.2. The Presence of the Eschatological Age. One of the standard features of Jewish apocalyptic literature is the division of time into two aeons (4 Ezra 7:50, "The Most High made not one age but two," is a classic statement of this). Perhaps the most demonstrable way that Paul shows his acceptance of this sort of an eschatological dualism of two aeons is in his use of the phrase "this age" (Rom 12:2; 1 Cor 1:20; 2:6–8; 3:18; 2 Cor 4:4). The corresponding phrase "the age to come," although implied at several points in the Pauline corpus, is never used in the undisputed letters (it does appear in Eph 1:21). The present age is occasionally described as evil (*ponēros*, Gal 1:4; Eph 5:16; 6:13), and the inhabitants of the world are a "wicked and perverse generation" (Phil 2:15). And yet it becomes clear that Paul believes that the eschatological hope of the future has in some way impinged upon the present. As the apostle declares in 2 Corinthians 5:17, "the old has passed away, behold the new has come." In 1 Corinthians 10:11 he asserts that "the end of the ages has come" (with a deliberate use of the perfect verb *kaiētēken*), and in 1 Corinthians 7:31 he states that "the form of this world is passing away." He describes this eschatological age as a "new creation" [p. 257] (*kainē ktisis*, 2 Cor 5:17; Gal 6:15). More than this, Paul associates the arrival of the eschatological age with the revelation of Jesus Christ as God's Messiah. Thus he declares in Galatians 4:4 that "when the time had fully come, God sent forth his own Son." All of this is to suggest that Paul's teaching about the presence of the eschatological age must be set against the backdrop of a temporal dualism.

Several related images are used to express this idea of two aeons, including the Adam/Christ analogy of Romans 5 and 1 Corinthians 15 (see Adam and Christ), and an extended anthropological image involving a contrast between the old self/new self (Rom 6:6; Col 3:9–10; Eph 2:15; 4:22–24); outer self/inner self (Rom 7:22; 2 Cor 4:16; Eph 3:15); physical person/spiritual person (2 Cor 2:14–16; see New Nature and Old Nature). A spatial image involving the use of "heaven" (*ouranos*) and its related terms also offers an important means whereby eschatological truth is communicated in the Pauline letters (as Lincoln demonstrates).

The assurance of the present reality of the new age gave rise to an overly realized understanding of Christian existence within some congregations. So certain were they about the reality of eschatological existence *now* that there seemed little need for any resurrection in the *future* — the resurrection life was presently being lived (most scholars accept that 1 Cor 4:8; 15:12 and 2 Tim 2:18 can all be exegetically linked as expressive of this overrealized perspective, but see Wedderburn for a dissenting opinion). In the case of Corinth this overrealized enthusiasm seems to have manifested itself in an unhealthy preoccupation with spiritual gifts, demonstrating how closely allied eschatology and pneumatology were in Paul's time (as Thistleton argues; see Holy Spirit). Surely R. P. Martin is correct at this point in suggesting that 1 Corinthians 15 must not be separated from 1 Corinthians 12–14, particularly within an exegetical framework. It is not difficult to demonstrate that the same dynamic interplay between eschatology and pneumatology persists throughout church history and holds true even today, with appeal to the Pauline letters being made by all sides over the years. Paul counters the enthusiasm of the Corinthians in two major ways: first, by the use of sarcastic rebuke (as in 1 Cor 4:8); second, by forcefully reemphasizing the futuristic dimensions of their common faith (as in 1 Cor 15). Similar overly realized understandings of Christian existence are reflected (and challenged!) in 2 Timothy 2:16–18, 2 Thessalonians 2:2 and (possibly) 1 Thessalonians 4:13. There exists in Paul a dialectic between the present and the future, particularly as it is connected to the concept of salvation.

However, despite the assurance of a present dimension of eschatological hope, it should not be overlooked that for Paul the final revelation of the eschatological age still lies in the future. The ultimate transformation of the world order, the final redemption of the believer (the granting of the resurrection body) and the final judgment are all events which are yet to be awaited. The present is conditioned by both the past (death and resurrection of Jesus Christ) and the future (the awaited parousia at the end of time).

3.2.1. The Kingdom of God/Christ. Although the idea of the kingdom of God/Christ is a standard feature of the Jewish eschatological perspective which Paul shares and is something which clearly underlies much of his ethical teaching, the phrase itself is not a prominent one within the Pauline letters (see Kingdom of God/Christ). Apparently Paul does clearly assume the life and ministry of Jesus Christ to have been in some way the inauguration of the kingdom of God on earth, despite the fact that this is never explicitly stated anywhere within his letters.

Paul tends to talk of the kingdom of God /Christ as if it is something awaited in the future, although occasionally he hints at the present reality of the kingdom in the life of the Christian (as in Rom 14:17 and 1 Cor 4:20). One of his most common statements about the kingdom is that it is something which the believer inherits (as in 1 Cor 6:9–10; 15:50; Gal 5:21) as a result of faithfulness; again, clearly it is a future inheritance which is in view. More

central within Paul's teaching on the kingdom of God /Christ is the place that the resurrection of Jesus Christ has in bringing the kingdom to bear within human history.

3.3. The Resurrection of Jesus Christ from the Dead. For Paul the resurrection of Jesus is primarily an eschatological event affirming the fact that the new age has arrived. At the same time it is understandably seen as the vindication of Jesus' death on the cross and is closely associated with Christ's accession to power at the right hand of God (Rom 8:34; see Exaltation), providing the basis for his intercession on behalf of the saints. Despite the fact that the resurrection is for Paul an eschatological act of God, it is never simply a "spiritual" event loosed from the moorings of history or distanced from some sort of physicality. For Paul the resurrection of Jesus clearly involves the risen Lord in some sort of somatic existence, although admittedly it is an existence of a different order.

3.3.1. Romans 1:3–4: Son of God and Resurrection. Most scholars agree that within these two verses we have the apostle alluding to a traditional creedal affirmation (see Creed) about Jesus Christ. Several features of the passage hint at an earlier setting of the declaration, perhaps arising from the Palestinian [p. 258] church. Notable among these are the unusual phrase "according to the Spirit of holiness" and the juxtaposition of Jesus' earthly credentials ("descended from David according to the flesh") with his heavenly status ("designated Son of God in power"). In short, we have here a dual affirmation of Jesus' sonship: he is both Son of David and Son of God. What is significant in terms of Paul's eschatology is the fact that Jesus' credentials as Son of God are closely linked to his resurrection from the dead. It is no wonder that this passage is sometimes described as reflecting one of the earliest stages of theological reflection among the first Christians, where the resurrection is the act which accords Jesus his status as God's Son. When this consideration is held alongside the fact that the participial form *horisthentos* in verse 4 (translated as "designated" in the RSV, "declared" in the NRSV) is very difficult to interpret precisely, it is easy to understand how those who advocated adoptionism found the text a key one for their position.

3.3.2. 1 Corinthians 15: An Excursus on Resurrection. In 1 Corinthians 15 we have a semi-independent excursus on the resurrection and its implications for the believer. This is the most detailed discussion of the resurrection within the Pauline corpus. The focus of discussion within the chapter is *not* whether or not Jesus Christ has been raised from the dead (as is often assumed in popular apologetics), but what the implications of Christ's resurrection are for the believer. Thus 1 Corinthians 15:12 provides an important clue for the discussion as a whole: "Now if Christ is preached as raised from the dead, how can some of you say that there is no resurrection of the dead?" Important insight is here gained about the nature of the controversy at Corinth and the identity of the so-called Corinthian heresy. Paul is here confronting an overrealized eschatology within the Corinthian congregation, one which suggests that the Corinthians (or at least some of them) believed there was no need for their future resurrection since they had been baptized and were living the resurrection life already. Paul's initial defense of a futuristic eschatology involves his reminding the Corinthians of his earlier teaching on the matter, one built on traditional creedal declarations about the resurrection of Jesus Christ (1 Cor 15:3–7) and his appearance to witnesses. In other words the Corinthians share Paul's acceptance of the resurrection of Jesus Christ as foundational to their Christian faith but differ as to their understanding of its significance for Christian hope.

3.3.2.1. The First Fruits (1 Cor 15:20, 23). Paul uses an illustration drawn from agriculture to demonstrate the connection between the resurrection of Jesus Christ and the resurrection of the believer. In 1 Corinthians 15:20 and 15:23 he describes the risen Lord Jesus Christ as the first fruits (*aparchē*), implying that the believer will share in the resurrection life in the same way that the full harvest is related to the initial crop. The important qualifier interjected by means of this agricultural image is that the resurrection existence of the believer is still future and yet to be awaited. The whole image is dependent upon an understanding of a dynamic unity existing between Christ and the believers; whatever happens to the risen Lord Jesus Christ is automatically transferred to the Christian community, albeit within an eschatological context. As M. J. Harris (114) puts it, the first fruits image demonstrates that Christ is "both the pledge and the paradigm of the somatic resurrection of believers."

Paul also applies the *aparchē* image to his eschatological teaching about the gift of the Holy Spirit in Romans 8:23, as well as to Jewish/Gentile relationships within the plan of God in Romans 11:16 (the image may also be present in 2 Thess 2:13 depending on the textual variants adopted). A related image, describing the risen Christ as the "firstborn of the dead" (*prōtokos ek tōn nekron*), is contained in the pre-Pauline hymn of Colossians 1:15–20.

3.3.2.2. The Adam/Christ Analogy (1 Cor 15:20–21, 44b–45). Paul's use of the Adam/Christ analogy is one of the most important features of his eschatological teaching in the chapter. Beginning in 1 Corinthians 15:20 the apostle sets up a deliberate contrast between Adam and Jesus Christ as representative figures of humanity. The analogy is further extended in 15:44b–45 where Paul once again appears to correct an overrealized understanding of resurrection existence among the Corinthians. In 1 Corinthians 15:46 he reverses the order in which the physical body and the resurrection body are to appear (the Corinthians may be exhibiting dependence upon the kind of teaching about Adamic mankind found in Philo of Alexandria at this point). The result of this is that Christ is portrayed as embodying what R. Scroggs has described as "eschatological humanity."

3.3.2.3. Death: The Last Enemy (1 Cor 15:26). Within the Pauline letters death is portrayed in both physical and spiritual terms. Thus, it is both the cessation of mortal life (Phil 1:21; see Life and Death) and the state of spiritual separation from God (Rom 7:9–14; Eph 2:1–3; Col 1:21). The destructive power of death is never downplayed in Paul

(note the use of *katalyoce* in 2 Cor 5:1), although it is occasionally presented as the doorway of departure to another existence (2 Cor 5:8; Phil 1:23; 2 Tim 4:6). In the midst of his extended discussion on the implications of Jesus Christ's resurrection, [p. 259] Paul uses an unusual phrase in describing physical death, referring to it as "the last enemy to be destroyed." M. C. de Boer argues that this defeat of death is central to 1 Corinthians 15:20–28, the heart of Paul's eschatological teaching in the chapter. This is a highly evocative image, emphasizing the importance of the cross for Paul's thought as it hints at a confrontation between Jesus Christ and Death, as if the latter is a personified figure who must be engaged in combat on this cross of Calvary (see Triumph). The figure of Death as an enemy is clearly drawn from Paul's eschatological worldview (similar instances of precisely this sort of personification of death can be found in other Jewish and Christian apocalypses such as 4 Ezra 8:53 and Rev 6:8; 20:13–14; see de Boer, 90–91, for further details).

At the same time the image sets up something of a tension within Paul's teaching on physical death, a tension which can perhaps best be highlighted by considering *when* it is that Paul views this enemy to be destroyed. Has it already been accomplished by Christ's death on the cross (as the use of the aorist *katargēsantos* in 2 Tim 1:10 suggests)? Or is it something which is still to occur in the indefinite future, at the awaited parousia of Christ? Clearly the immediate context of 1 Corinthians 15:20–28 would suggest the latter, although how this is then to be applied to believers and what its implications are for their present ethical conduct are matters which are far from certain. To put it another way, if death and sin are interconnected (as Paul forcefully asserts in Rom 5:12), how is it that the Christian is exhorted to live a life in the present which is freed from the power and effect of sin, and yet be expected to await the deliverance from death as something in the future? Sin (which is personified in Rom 5:14, 17, 21; 7:8–11, 13–25) is already conquered—yes; but not the physical death that is so intimately associated with it—that must await the future consummation. At the very least we must admit a theological tension being expressed here, although we need not go so far as some do to suggest that Paul is involved in a damaging self-contradiction at this point.

3.4. The Awaited Day of the Lord and Final Judgment. The Day of the Lord (*ἡμέρα YHWH*) is a standard feature in OT prophetic literature, one which Paul takes over and expands within his letters. As far as can be adduced it was originally conceived as a day of future joy, when God would intervene on behalf of his people and save them from calamity, righting injustice and defeating Israel's enemies. However, many of the prophets, such as Amos, Ezekiel, Isaiah, Zechariah, Zephaniah, Malachi and Joel, in an effort to call the people back to true obedience, shifted the focus within their message, proclaiming the Day of the Lord to be not only a time of deliverance but a time of judgment for the nation of Israel as well (see Everson). The idea of an eschatological Day of the Lord can also be found in Jewish pseudepigraphal documents (such as 1 Enoch, 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch) and in select Qumran documents (such as 1QM and 1QS). In the Gospels it is most closely associated with Jesus' statements about the coming Son of man, but can be identified within all gospel strata. Paul takes over the Jewish concept of the Day of the Lord, including the twin themes of eschatological salvation and future judgment, within his teaching on the theme. However, he creatively integrates this OT hope with his own developing christology, effectively transforming the "Day of the Lord (Yahweh)" into the "Day of the Lord *Jesus Christ*." This creativity stands as one of the most important contributions within Pauline eschatology (see 4 below).

3.4.1. The Day of the Lord and the Parousia of Jesus Christ. A variety of expressions are used within the Pauline letters for the eschatological Day of the Lord, particularly as it is used with reference to Jesus Christ. The simple phrase "Day of the Lord" occurs in 1 Thessalonians 5:2 and 2 Thessalonians 2:2; the phrase "Day of the Lord Jesus Christ" in 1 Corinthians 5:5; "Day of the Lord Jesus" in 1 Corinthians 1:8 and 2 Corinthians 1:14; "Day of Christ Jesus" in Philippians 1:6; "Day of Christ" in Philippians 1:10 and 2:16; "the Day" in 1 Thessalonians 5:4 and 1 Corinthians 3:13; "that Day" in 2 Timothy 1:12, 18; 4:8. In addition Paul is the major NT source for the use of the term *parousia* of the future coming of Jesus Christ (1 Cor 15:23; 1 Thess 2:19; 3:13; 4:15; 5:23; 2 Thess 2:1, 8–9). The noun *apokalypsis* ("revelation") is used in a similar way in 1 Corinthians 1:7 and 2 Thessalonians 1:7. In the Pastorals a significant change in vocabulary appears; the term *epiphaneia* is used with reference to the appearance of the Lord Jesus Christ in 1 Timothy 6:1; 2 Timothy 1:10; 4:1, 8; Titus 2:13, while the verb *epiphainō* ("appear") appears in Titus 2:11 and 3:4 (the noun *epiphaneia* ("appearance") also appears in 2 Thess 2:8). In all three Pastoral letters the immediate context of these verses suggests a future manifestation of the glory of the Lord Jesus Christ, although the present dimension is also clearly in evidence (especially in 2 Tim 2:10). Several related verb forms are also used within the Pauline corpus to denote this future eschatological event: forms of *erchomai* ("come") appear in 1 Corinthians 4:5; 11:26 and 2 Thessalonians 2:10; *apokalypō* ("reveal") in 2 Thessalonians 1:7; and *phaneroō* ("make manifest") [p. 260] in Colossians 3:4. The phrase "the Day of redemption" appears in Ephesians 4:30; while *to telos* ("the end") occurs in 1 Corinthians 1:8; 15:24; 2 Corinthians 1:13; and *ta telea* in 1 Corinthians 10:11. *The future parousia of Jesus Christ is often popularly described as "the Second Coming" or "the Second Advent," although it is worth noting that neither phrase is found within the Pauline letters (nor anywhere in the NT, for that matter); the first attested distinction between a "First Advent" and a "Second Advent" is found in the writings of Justin Martyr (c. a.d. 110), although a close approximation is found in Hebrews 9:28.*

At several points in the Pauline letters it appears that traditional declarations of the coming of the Messiah from heaven are cited. Generally these statements are filled with apocalyptic language and imagery, much of it drawn

from OT prophetic literature (as in 1 Thess 1:9–10; 4:13–5:11). One of the most interesting is the Greek transliteration of the Aramaic phrase *Maranatha* found in 1 Corinthians 16:22. The linguistic evidence deriving from a bilingual setting makes this potentially the earliest recorded acknowledgement of the lordship of Jesus Christ. Some dispute remains about how *Maranatha* should be divided and separated and whether it should be understood as an invocation for the Lord to come (*marana tha*, “Come, our Lord!”) or as a straightforward declaration that he has already come (*maran atha*, “The Lord has come!”). In any event, the context of the passage is presumably the Lord’s Supper (as in the interesting parallel in *Did.* 10:6), and it seems reasonable to take the Aramaic phrase to contain at least an element of future fulfillment within it. In short, the ejaculation *Maranatha* is a prayer, uttered within a liturgical context, that may call for the future parousia of the Lord. The parallel in Revelation 22:20 would support such an interpretation.

3.4.2. *The Delay of the Parousia.* One prominent school of thought within NT scholarship has held that the nonarrival of the parousia of Jesus Christ created a crisis early within the life of the Christian church. This “delay of the parousia” is sometimes portrayed as triggering the need for a de-eschatologization of the Christian hope, a movement away from Jewish apocalyptic ideas which see the fulfillment of God’s promises as taking place in the not-too-distant return of Christ to earth; such a belief is replaced by a more Hellenistic understanding of Christ’s “presence” as taking place within the life of the believer. Under the impact of the delayed parousia (so the argument goes), eschatology is necessarily dehistoricized, and the meaning of the future hope was spiritualized and transposed into a more mystical union between Christ and the church. The Pauline materials figure prominently within such theories about the crisis presented by the delay of the parousia, although there is an increasing swell of voices objecting to the assumption that the parousia presented such a theological crisis among the early Christians that is so often supposed (see Aune, Bauckham). Many scholars have concluded that the later Pauline letters (such as 2 Cor 10–13 and Phil) reflect precisely this sort of shift in perspective, a suggestion which raises the question of development within Paul’s eschatological thought.

3.4.3. *The Question of Development in Pauline Eschatology.* Two basic ways of approaching this question have been employed by Pauline scholars. The first is to note the differences (even inconsistencies) between sections of Paul’s letters with regard to eschatological matters and suggest that the apostle has changed his mind, or developed in his understanding of the issues, or that his follower(s) responsible for the Deutero-Pauline letters have done so (see Achtemeier and Beker 1991). Generally such an approach involves both a detailed study of Pauline chronology and careful attention to the polemical contexts in which the letters are written. Indeed, J. W. Drane argues that the diversity of eschatological expression is directly related to the diversity of opponents against whom Paul is writing, although he rejects some of the more radical results of advocates of such an approach. In any event, the dating and circumstances surrounding the production of a letter are crucial in determining whether development of thought is detectable. In the main, the letters of the Pauline corpus are divided by scholars adopting this explanation of development into three groups, representing an increasingly Hellenistic and individualistic understanding of eschatology which occurs over time: (1) Paul’s early letters (1 Thess, 2 Thess); (2) Paul’s major letters (Rom, 1 Cor, 2 Cor, Gal); (3) Paul’s later letters (Phil, Col, Eph, Philem) (diversity of opinion about the categorization of some letters is common).

The second approach is simply to allow the differences to stand and to explain them as inevitable given the nature of the subject matter; to accept them as the apostle trying to explain the inexplicable and, not surprisingly, creating some real theological tensions within his writing. In the words of C. F. D. Moule, such tensions are “best explained as the result, simply, of the unmanageable dimensions of the Christian verities” (Moule, 4).

In summary, the question of development in Paul’s eschatology inevitably involves one in scholarly investigation on at least three separate but interconnected fronts: controversy about the integrity of the [p. 261] Corinthian letters (two, three or four letters?), the chronological order of the letters (notably Phil) and debates about Pauline authorship of some of the disputed letters (namely, 2 Thess, Col and Eph). However, even within the undisputed letters the controversy about development of Paul’s eschatological thought arises.

The eschatological teaching contained in 1 Corinthians 15 and 2 Corinthians 5:1–10 has long been one of the major areas of discussion (Gillman offers a survey of interpretation). Many feel that in 1 Corinthians 15 we have Paul giving his clearest expression of the future hope for the believer, associating the granting of the resurrection body with the parousia of Christ (which is expected very soon, during Paul’s own lifetime). However, in 2 Corinthians 5:1–10 it appears that Paul provides an alternative perspective, one in which the Christian believer is somehow united with Christ at the point of death, and the granting of the resurrection body postponed indefinitely, presumably until the parousia (see *Intermediate State*). Many scholars have attempted to explain this shift in perspective between the two letters. Dodd, for example, explains the shift to have come about because of Paul’s own brush with death, something which, Dodd suggests, took place between the writing of the letters we know as 1 Corinthians and 2 Corinthians (this trauma is perhaps hinted at in 2 Cor 1:8–11). Many scholars (including F. F. Bruce and E. E. Ellis) would dispute this suggestion, arguing that it is highly improbable that Paul would have changed his mind on so central an issue within the span of a few short weeks or months (the supposed time lag between the writing of the two Corinthian letters). For them the essential teaching contained in 1 Corinthians 15 and 2 Corinthians 5:1–10 is

perfectly compatible. Some scholars have attempted to explain the difference between the teaching contained within the two letters by arguing that 1 Corinthians 15 is concerned primarily with a collective eschatology and 2 Corinthians 5:1–10 is concerned primarily with an individualistic eschatology. The fact that so much attention (and variety of interpretation) is given to the problem raised by the eschatology of the Corinthian letters is some indication of its importance within Pauline studies.

Others have sought to identify a development in Paul's eschatological thought even within his earlier letters, namely 1 and 2 Thessalonians. C. L. Mearns, for example, suggests that Paul's earliest eschatological teaching was radically realized and that the death of Christian believers within the Thessalonian congregation forced a radical shift in his understanding of such matters. This sort of approach assumes that the death of believers would have come as something unexpected and theologically worrying to Paul, resulting in him "re-conceptualizing the Parousia in the form of a 'Second Coming.'" (Mearns, 139). While the death of some of the members of the congregation is certainly an issue within the church at Thessalonica (as in 1 Thess 4:13–18), there is little to suggest that this was a result of Paul's own teaching to them. Indeed, it is difficult to imagine that in the approximately twenty years of missionary activity prior to his writing 1 Thessalonians, Paul had not yet been faced with the death of Christians nor worked out the matter theologically.

3.4.4. The Judgment Seat of God/Christ. Paul takes over the standard Jewish expectation that all men and women will be held accountable before God for their lives (see Travis). There is within Paul's letters a close association between the parousia of the Lord Jesus Christ and the execution of final judgment. A classic example of this is found in 1 Thessalonians 3:13, where declaration of the parousia is placed within a judgment context "before God" (*emprosthen tou theou*). In 1 Corinthians 3:12–15 Paul offers an extended passage about the final judgment, using an image of building materials being tested by the purifying fires of "the Day" (1 Cor 3:13). Similar imagery of giving account before God is used in Romans 2:1–11; 14:10–12 and (with reference to Paul himself) in Philippians 2:16. In Romans 2:16 God is said to judge the secrets of humankind by Christ Jesus (*dia Christou Iēsou*).

In connection with the final judgment at the consummation of this age, Paul speaks explicitly of the judgment seat (*bēma*) twice within his letters (Rom 14:10; 2 Cor 5:10), building upon the image found in Isaiah 45. The curious thing about this motif is that the judgment seat is described as belonging to God in the first reference and as belonging to Christ in the second. There is some precedent for this fluctuation between God and messianic agent within Jewish pseudepigraphal texts (such as *1 Enoch* 37–71; *T. Abr.* 13:1–2); the same is carried on in Christian writings after Paul, probably under the apostle's influence (e.g., Polycarp *Phil* 6.2). By extension, the right of judgment is extended to the Christian church acting as Christ's agents. Thus Paul himself feels able to pass judgment on unethical behavior (1 Cor 5:3–5) and exhorts the church to do the same (1 Cor 5:11–13; see Discipline). He even hints that the saints will execute eschatological judgment over the world and the angels (1 Cor 6:2–3).

3.4.5. The Judgment of Satan and His Angels. Satan is mentioned frequently in the Pauline letters, always as a power hostile to God and malevolent to the saints (Rom 16:20; 1 Cor 5:5; 7:5; 2 Cor 2:11; 11:14; 12:7; [p. 262] 1 Thess 2:18). The terms *Tempter* (*ho peirazōn*) and *Devil* (*diabolos*) are also used (in 1 Thess 3:5 and Eph 6:11 respectively). This is perfectly in keeping with the eschatological dualism of other Jewish apocalyptic texts which characteristically describe the present age as one in which Satan's power and authority are in evidence. Indeed, Satan is called "the god of this age" in 2 Corinthians 4:4, and "the prince of the power of the air" in Ephesians 2:2. Also in keeping with these apocalyptic texts is a developed angelology, with Satan being supported by a host of figures; in the main Paul conforms to this Jewish usage (see Carr). We find angels (sometimes friendly, but generally hostile) mentioned in passing throughout the Pauline letters (Rom 8:38; 1 Cor 4:9; 6:3; 11:10; 13:1; 2 Cor 11:14; 12:7; Gal 1:8; 3:19; 4:14; Col 2:18; 1 Thess 4:16). Related to this are the references to the "rulers of this age" (1 Cor 2:6–9); the "principalities and powers" (Rom 8:38; 1 Cor 15:24; Eph 6:12; Col 2:15); "world rulers of this present darkness and spiritual hosts of wickedness in high places" (Eph 6:13); and "the elemental spirits of the universe" (Gal 4:3; Col 2:8, 20). Yet the ultimate judgment and defeat of Satan, together with his angelic minions, is portrayed as a certainty in several key passages, notably Romans 16:20. Thus Paul balances the present and future dimensions of this judgment of Satan, with the cross of Christ being the fulcrum of the scales of justice.

There is considerable fluidity of referents within the language of angelic powers in the Pauline corpus. At times (such as Rom 8:38–39; Col 2:15 and Eph 2:2; 3:10; 6:12) the referent is apparently a spiritual force, while at other times (such as Rom 13:1–7 and 1 Cor 2:6–8) it is clearly a political power that is in view (see Carr, Wink; see Principalities and Powers). The relationship between the two basic categories (spiritual and political forces) inevitably involves one in discussions about Pauline chronology and the authorship of Colossians and Ephesians.

3.4.6. The Judgment of the Man of Lawlessness (2 Thess 2). There has been considerable debate about the identification of the "man of lawlessness (or sin)" mentioned in 2 Thessalonians 2:1–12. The fact that it is found in a letter which is disputed by some as genuinely Pauline has also contributed to the debate. The passage presents significant exegetical dilemmas in its own right, not least the difficulty in determining who the "man of lawlessness" (2 Thess 2:3) is supposed to represent. Is he a symbol of Satan, or one of his agents? Is he a figure in the tradition of the wicked Antiochus Epiphanes from the days of Daniel, associated with the "abomination of desolation" and the Roman emperor Caligula (Mk 13:14)? Should we identify this figure with the political leadership of Rome, a

representative of civil authority or perhaps even with the emperor himself as the one who brings political upheaval (*apostasia*)? It seems clear that the underlying imagery for this ungodly figure is found in Ezekiel's passage about the King of Tyre (Ezek 28:1–19), but recognition of this does not necessarily aid in determining who is intended. Association with the antichrist figure in Revelation is understandable given the overall tone of the passage (see Mounce).

Similarly, who or what is “the restraining influence” (2 Thess 2:6–7; see Man of Lawlessness and Restraining Power)? Is it Paul himself (as Cullmann and Munck suggest)? Or is it the need for the gospel message to be proclaimed throughout the world (as Aus argues)? Again, one of the reasons why it is difficult to determine precisely what the author has in mind arises from an exegetical oddity, an unusual phrasing in the Greek text which provides both a neuter expression (*to katechon*, 2 Thess 2:6) and a masculine one (*ho katechōn*, 2 Thess 2:7) in successive verses.

In any event, the main thrust of the passage is to place the rise of the “man of lawlessness” within a temporal framework (as in 2 Thess 2:3), while at the same time assert his ultimate defeat by the Lord Jesus at the future parousia.

3.4.7. The Wrath to Come. The coming wrath (*orgē*) is mentioned over twenty times within the Pauline letters, the noun appearing both with the definite article and without it. Several other terms and phrases, mostly drawn from the verb *krinō* (“judge”) and its cognates, are also used to express the just execution of judgment by God or his designated agent at the end of the age (see Kreitzer, 99–100, for details). The fact that Paul tends not to associate God directly with the execution of this wrath has prompted some scholars (notably Dodd) to suggest that he depersonalizes wrath. There is some validity to the suggestion, although the phrase “the wrath of God” (*hē orgē tou theou*) does appear three times (Rom 1:18; Eph 5:6; Col 3:6).

3.5. The Gentile Mission and the Fate of the Jewish Nation. According to his own testimony Paul's calling as an apostle is intimately related to his encounter with the risen Lord Jesus (Gal 1:11–17). While the focus of Paul's “Damascus Road” experience is often placed upon it being his conversion experience, it is important to note that it might be more properly described as his calling to participate in the fulfillment of God's promises to bring all nations to him in the fullness of time (as in Is 49; see Conversion and Call). This means that Paul sees the whole of his subsequent ministry among the nations (see Gentiles) as taking place [p. 263] within the context of an eschatological act, the resurrection of Jesus from the dead. Paul's commissioning as the “apostle to the Gentiles” (Gal 2:8) is alluded to throughout Paul's letters (see Kim, 1–31, for details). Clearly Paul sees his own apostolic ministry as part of God's eschatological activity, and an essential component of that activity is the salvation of a people called to be his own (as Wright notes). But how does this affect his understanding of the fate of the Jewish nation (see Israel)? Several key texts deal with precisely this question.

3.5.1. Romans 9–11. C. H. Dodd long ago recognized the special nature of Romans 9–11, suggesting that it was an independent source, possibly a sermon which was inserted by Paul into the letter. Certainly the fact that it is possible to read from Romans 8:38 to 12:1 without a discernible break in thought lends weight to this suggestion. However, many Pauline interpreters feel that Romans 9–11 is an integral part of the overall argument of the letter and do not feel the interpolation approach is warranted. The problem of the fate of the Jewish nation lies at the heart of this section of the letter, but this is anticipated earlier in the letter (as in Rom 3:1–8 and the Abraham image in Rom 4:1–25). Insofar as the section is concerned with the future fate of the Jewish nation, in light of their rejection of Jesus Christ as Messiah, it deals with eschatological matters.

What does Paul feel will ultimately happen to the Jewish nation (his own people)? In Romans 11:26 (“all Israel will be saved”) he appears to come close to what might be described as a national universalism. How literally should we take the “all Israel” (*pas Israēl*) in Romans 11:26 to be? It is difficult to reconcile such teaching with the theme of justification by faith so strongly emphasized elsewhere in his writing. One way to understand Romans 9–11 is that it reflects an unresolved tension within Paul's own thought, one which cannot quite seem to abandon faith in God's promises to historical Israel, yet one which is challenged by the redefinition of Israel into spiritual terms demanded by the Christ event. Traditionally Israel was seen as the instrument of God's salvation of the Gentile nations (as in Is 40–66); Paul's dilemma is how to maintain belief in this strand of prophetic proclamation in light of Israel's rejection of Jesus Christ. A volcanic eruption has taken place within Paul's thought and the place of Israel within the revised eschatological scheme is like lava that has not yet cooled; it is not yet hardened or fixed, remaining somewhat resilient.

3.5.2. 1 Thessalonians 2:13–16. Since the days of F. C. Baur scholars have often claimed that this pericope breaks the flow of Paul's argument in the letter and have suggested that it is an interpolation, perhaps inserted by a later editor after the fall of Jerusalem in a.d. 70. At the heart of such an interpretation is the assumption that the pericope is incompatible with Paul's eschatological teaching elsewhere concerning the fate of the Jewish nation. Competent cases have been made for both possibilities (the section is genuinely Pauline; alternatively, it is a non-Pauline interpolation). To a large degree the argument hinges on whether a historical setting can be determined to fit the judgment on the Jewish nation implied (such as the Jewish Passover riot of a.d. 49).

3.6. The Eschatological Gift of the Spirit. Jewish eschatology traditionally associated the dawn of the age to come with the bestowal of the Spirit of God (see Holy Spirit). Paul carries through this idea, knitting together his doctrine of the risen Lord Jesus Christ as experienced by the indwelling presence of the Spirit of God in the life of the believer. In 1 Corinthians 15:45 the risen Christ, the last Adam, is even described as the “life-giving Spirit” (*pneuma zōopoioum*). Several images are used to express the role that the Spirit has in the life of the believer. Similar declarations about the impartation of life by the Spirit are recorded in Romans 8:2, 10 and 2 Corinthians 3:6.

3.6.1. The Spirit as First Fruits. Paul explicitly describes the Spirit as the first fruits (*aparchē*) in Romans 8:23, paralleling what is said about the risen Christ himself in 1 Corinthians 15:20. This agricultural image is used extensively in the OT (as in Lev 23:10–14).

3.6.2. The Spirit as Guarantee. At several places within the Pauline letters the gift of the Holy Spirit is described as the guarantee (*arrabōn*) of God (2 Cor 1:22; 5:5; Eph 1:14). This unusual term is a Semitic loan word and was well established in Greek as a financial term. It denoted the promise to pay a full balance based upon the handing over of an initial down payment. The financial metaphor lent itself readily to Paul’s doctrine of the indwelling Spirit and is clearly eschatologically conditioned. The essential point is that the believer is assured of his or her ultimate redemption based upon the present possession of the Holy Spirit.

3.6.3. The Spirit and Inheritance. The language of inheritance also figures within Paul’s pneumatology (1 Cor 6:9–10; 15:50; Gal 5:21), where it is closely connected to his understanding of covenantal blessing and the fulfillment of the promise of God to his people in Abraham. The idea of the Christian’s possession of the Spirit as the basis for the adoption (*huiothesia*) as the children of God is declared at [p. 264] several places within the Pauline letters (Rom 8:15; 9:4; Gal 4:5; Eph 1:5). The use of the Greek transliteration of the Aramaic term *Abba* is linked to this (Rom 8:15; Gal 4:6). By virtue of the fact that the Christian (by definition) has the Spirit, the status of adoption exists as a present reality. Yet it is not difficult to detect a future dimension to this adoption within the passages, a feature which is consistent with the rest of Paul’s eschatological teaching.

3.6.4. The Spirit and Christian Ethical Life. Paul’s eschatological perspective informs his ethical teaching, often helping to frame the way in which he describes the Christian as one who is to live his or her life with an eye to the future (see Ethics). In effect this means that Paul’s ethical dualism is eschatological in nature, not anthropological (as many advocating a clash with Gnosticism have suggested in the past). For Paul soteriology and eschatology are intertwined, finding the basis of expression through his christology. For example, in Galatians 1:4 the sacrificial death of Christ is described as the means of believers’ deliverance “from the present evil age.” Similarly, in Romans 8:4 he defines Christian existence in terms of a “life in the flesh” which has been surrendered for a “life in the Spirit.” The Spirit is also spoken of as the power of resurrection existence made operative in the Christian’s ethical life (as in Rom 8:11; 1 Cor 2:4–5).

3.7. The Transformation of the Cosmos. One of the standard features of apocalyptic eschatology is the transformation of the created order under the effects of the emerging age to come. This cosmic redemption is also reflected at several key points within the Pauline letters, demonstrating a close connection between the ideas of creation and redemption (see Gibbs). Cosmic redemption is also intimately connected to anthropological redemption within the Pauline letters. The destiny of both the created order and the human race are determined by Christ’s resurrection from the dead, and both find their fulfillment in his lordship. Thus Paul concludes his short excursus on creation in Romans 8:19–22 with the proclamation that this redemption includes the adoption of his children via the activity of the Spirit (Rom 8:23).

3.7.1. Romans 8:19–23. In the midst of an extended discussion of the effects of Jesus Christ’s redeeming action for the Christian we have a short section which describes its cosmic dimensions. Paul here employs the language of Jewish apocalyptic, anthropomorphizing the created order (*hē ktisis*), and mixing in the image of birth pangs (*synōdinei*). As D. C. Allison demonstrates, “birth pangs” is something of a technical term within apocalyptic texts, often associated with the tribulations surrounding the advent of the Messiah. Interestingly, Paul also includes the image within the passage on the parousia in 1 Thessalonians 5:3, a section built very much on the traditional OT expectations of the Day of the Lord. It is a common image within apocalyptic sections of the OT (Is 26:16–19; 66:7–14), of the Synoptics (Mk 13:8; Mt 24:8), and it occurs within other apocalypses (4 Ezra 5:1–13, 50–55; 6:21–24; 9:3). Yet the paragraph from Romans is not intended as a detailed teaching about creation as such, but is made to serve as a supporting illustration of Paul’s main concern, the “adoption, the redemption of our body” (Rom 8:23 NRSV; see 7.2 below).

3.7.2. Philippians 3:21. In Philippians 3:20–21 we have another example of Paul’s concern with the transformation of the believer’s physical body into a glorious body by the power of the resurrection. Yet at the conclusion of this couplet Paul includes a phrase which breaks out of the boundaries of the anthropological imagery and interjects a cosmic note. The resurrection is said to be the power “which enables him even to subject all things to himself.” This is similar to the declaration made in 1 Corinthians 15:27 and is built upon Psalm 8:7. Once again the transformation of humankind and the subjection of the cosmos are interconnected ideas.

3.7.3. Colossians 1:15–20. The idea of Christ’s role as creator is prominent within the pre-Pauline hymn of Colossians 1:15–20. This creator motif is also balanced within the hymn by the proclamation of Christ as the agent of

redemption (*di} autou apokatallaxai*, Col 1:20). The cosmic dimension of the redemptive action of Christ on the cross is brought out by the inclusion of *ta panta* (“all things”) and *eite ta epi tēs gēs eite ta en tois ouranois* (“whether things on earth or in the heavenlies”) in verse 20.

3.7.4. Ephesians 1:10. In Ephesians 1:9–10 the mystery of God’s plan of salvation is described as pre-planned in Christ and revealed in the fullness of time. The author of Ephesians then includes an unusual verb (*anakephalaiōsasthai*) to denote the ultimate goal of this plan as it is fulfilled in Christ. This verb carries with it a strongly eschatological note, as well as a cosmological one (it is *ta panta*, “all things,” which is said to be “summed up” in Christ).

3.8. To Telos and To Teleios. The *telos* word group is used quite extensively within the Pauline letters, often with an eschatological meaning which is perhaps best interpreted in straightforward temporal terms. J. M. Court contends that this is part of the technical language of apocalyptic which Paul adopts. Almost certainly a temporal sense of *to telos*, “finally,” is intended in 1 Corinthians 15:24 where the noun is used to describe the conclusion of a sequence of [p. 265] eschatological events, including the Son’s handing over of the kingdom to the Father (although some interpreters take *to telos* here as a noun). A related occurrence, again bearing a temporal sense, is 1 Corinthians 10:11 where Paul describes his Corinthian audience as those “upon whom the ends of the ages (*ta teleōtōn aiōnōn*) have come.” The noun (*to telos*) is also used in Romans 6:21–22 to denote the contrasting end results of sin (death) and grace (eternal life; see Life and Death). *To telos* is used by Paul to communicate the time of ultimate judgment, as in Philippians 3:9 where the enemies of the cross of Christ are declared in Philippians 3:19 to have their end (*to telos*) in destruction (see Wrath, Destruction). Similarly, in 2 Corinthians 11:15 the servants of Satan are also said to be heading for an appropriate end (*hōn to telos estai kata ta erga autōn*); and in 1 Thessalonians 2:16 the Judaizers are condemned as under judgment of the wrath of God which will come upon them “in the end” (*eis telos*). The term can also be used to denote the time of ultimate redemption, as in 1 Corinthians 1:8, where the Lord Jesus Christ is said to sustain the believing Christians “until the end” (*heōs telous*).

To telos can also carry the sense of “goal” or “destination,” although it is difficult to separate this completely from the temporal sense just discussed. The most celebrated instance of this meaning is Romans 10:4 where the noun is used to describe the effect of Christ’s coming upon the Jewish Law: “For Christ is the end (*telos*) of the Law, that every one who has faith may be justified.” It may be that Paul is here reflecting the saying of Jesus recorded in Matthew 5:17, associating the end (*to telos*) with the idea of fulfillment of the Law (*plērōsai*). A similar use of *to telos* is found in 1 Timothy 1:5.

The neuter form (*to teleion*) of the adjective *teleios* is used as an abstract noun in 1 Corinthians 13:10, denoting “that which is perfect or completed” and thus sets up a contrast with the future eschatological age and the present imperfect world. The adjective *teleios* can also take the sense of “mature” or “adult” and is so used in 1 Corinthians 2:6; 14:20; Philippians 3:15 (see Perfect, Mature). In Ephesians 4:13 and Colossians 1:28 the same term is applied anthropologically to the church and the believer respectively.

4. Pauline Eschatology and Christology.

The interface between Paul’s eschatology and his christology is extensive, particularly as it concerns the role that Jesus Christ has as the executor of God’s final judgment. Although Paul does not choose to use the title Son of man (the most prevalent language in the Synoptic Gospels) to express this, he does nevertheless use equivalent ideas and images. Within the Pauline letters OT theophanic traditions about the Day of the Lord become invested with new meaning and are applied to the risen Lord Jesus Christ. This re-emphasis generally builds upon a referential shift of “Lord” from God to Jesus Christ, or on the reapplication of “Day of the Lord” passages to the messianic agent (see Kreitzer, 112–128, for a discussion of eleven key texts where this occurs).

The central feature of Paul’s eschatology, the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, is indisputably a theological declaration, as can be evidenced by the ways in which God is said to be active in Christ’s resurrection. At several points within the Pauline letters God the Father is explicitly said to be responsible for Jesus’ resurrection (Rom 4:24; 10:9; 1 Cor 6:14; 15:15; 2 Cor 4:14; Gal 1:1; Eph 1:20; Col 2:12; 1 Thess 1:9–10); once it is the God through his Spirit who accomplishes this (Rom 8:11); once it is the “Spirit of holiness” (Rom 1:4); and once it is the “glory of the Father” which raises Jesus (Rom 6:4). Other passages simply use an impersonal verb to denote the resurrection, generally taken to be a divine passive (Rom 4:25; 7:4; 1 Cor 15:4, 12, 20; 2 Cor 5:15; 2 Tim 2:8).

Yet Paul maintains a strong note of subordination of Jesus Christ to God the Father even in the midst of the most exalted christological passages. The two most important examples are 1 Corinthians 15:28c and Philippians 2:11c, lines which round off passages containing eschatological material.

One of the most intriguing features of Paul’s eschatology (which anticipates the rise of the doctrine of the Trinity in the church) is the relationship between the risen Lord Jesus and the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit is described as “Christ’s Spirit” (Rom 8:9; Phil 1:19) and the “Spirit of (God’s) Son” (Gal 4:6). At the same time, in other passages the Holy Spirit is clearly “God’s Spirit” (1 Cor 3:16; Phil 3:3; 1 Thess 4:8). The overlap between God and Christ (with

reference to “the Spirit”) is highlighted in 2 Corinthians 3:17, a *crux interpretum* which it is possible to take in either direction.

5. Pauline Eschatology and Ethics.

It is sometimes suggested that an overemphasis on eschatological matters undermines the need for a strong ethical code for living in the present (see Ethics). Contrary to many popular assumptions about the detachment alleged to be inherent within eschatological teaching, Paul’s letters demonstrate a close connection between eschatology and ethical exhortation. This is evident within the earliest of his letters, those written to the church at Thessalonica where [p. 266] Paul confronts a misguided understanding about work which is based upon an erroneous view of the imminent return of Christ (see Kaye). Similarly, the ethical exhortations contained in Romans 12–13 are wholly conditioned by an eschatological perspective; the passage begins with an appeal that the believer not be “conformed to this world but be transformed by the renewal of your mind” (Rom 12:2), and concludes with an extended paragraph warning of the approaching day of Christ (Rom 13:11–14). The same observation can be made about 2 Corinthians 5:1–10 where the eschatological teaching about the implications of a Christian’s death are interwoven with the exhortation to gain Christ’s approval (1 Cor 5:9).

Indeed, it is possible to see the whole of Paul’s ethical teaching as providing instruction about how the Christian is to live in the interval between the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ and his future parousia. In the evocative phrase of Sampey, Paul’s moral teaching involves teaching the Christian about walking “between the times.”

6. Pauline Eschatology and Jewish Mysticism.

We have already mentioned the “horizontal” (or “spatial”) dimension of eschatology (see 1 above). This feature of Paul’s eschatological thought has received special treatment in recent years, particularly as it relates to the mystical traditions of Judaism. The so-called merkabah mysticism, influential within certain Jewish circles during the NT period, was built upon the opening vision of Ezekiel in which the prophet sees the throne chariot (*merkābā*) of God in heaven (Ezek 1:26–27). This mystical tradition is widespread within Judaism and has produced a separate subsection of literature which offers a comparative reference point for NT studies. The critical point with reference to Paul’s letters comes in the supposed relationship between the apostle’s apocalyptic eschatology and his mysticism (which manifested itself in ecstatic experiences). Some scholars have argued that the distinction between the two (apocalypticism and mysticism) is exceedingly fine, if not altogether artificial. A. F. Segal, for example, has recently argued that Jewish apocalypticism *was* mysticism in the way it was experienced and that it is entirely proper to speak of Paul as an apocalyptic mystagogue. Crucial to Segal’s argument is the contention that in terms of religious experience there is no distinction between apocalypticism and mysticism, despite the fact that the two are clearly distinct literary genres. Several key passages from the undisputed letters are appealed to in support of such an interpretation of Paul.

6.1. 2 Corinthians 12:1–10. Most scholars rightly feel that this curious passage is reflective of Paul’s own experience, although not necessarily his conversion/call on the Damascus Road (Acts 9:1–19; 22:1–21; 26:12–23). It is noted that he combines apocalyptic language with a denial of the validity of boasting (1 Cor 12:5–6) and a brief description of the tribulations he must suffer in fulfilling his role as the missionary to the Gentiles (1 Cor 12:7–10). He does begin this section by describing his experience as a revelation (*apokalypsis*) from the Lord (1 Cor 12:1).

6.2. 1 Corinthians 9:1. Paul bases a defense of his apostleship (see Apostle) on the fact that he has seen (*heōraka*) the Lord. The verb is usually taken to mean physical sight, but it is possible to interpret it as ecstatic insight given by means of revelation (similar descriptions of “seeing” the risen Lord occur in 2 Cor 4:4–6).

6.3 Galatians 1:11–17. Here too Paul employs the language of apocalyptic literature choosing to describe his commissioning as an apostle coming to him via a revelation (*apokalypsis*, Gal 1:12) of Jesus Christ (see Visions). Yet this revelation is not so much a revelation *to* Paul, but a revelation *in* him (*en emoi*, Gal 1:16) suggesting almost an incarnational understanding of the encounter with the risen Christ (cf. Gal 2:20; 6:4). Such highly personalized language could be taken as expressing the mystical and ecstatic experience of the visionary mind (as Segal suggests). However, it is doubtful if that is the way Paul perceived his encounter with Jesus Christ; he associates his sight of the risen Lord alongside the postresurrection appearances found in early Christian tradition (1 Cor 15:5–7), firmly basing them in objective history and not subjective imagination. His use of the aorist passive verb *ōphthē* supports this (1 Cor 15:5, 6, 7, 8; cf. 1 Tim 3:16).

6.4 Apocalypticism, Mysticism and Christology. That apocalypticism and mysticism share the common ground of religious experience seems evident; there is much insight that can be gained into one aspect of Paul’s eschatological thought as a result of a comparison of the two. However, too much can be made in straightforwardly equating them, not least the seeming evacuation of Paul’s eschatology of any future significance. It is not only the way that the encounter of the risen Lord Jesus is communicated to Paul that is important to him; this is merely the form of the experience. Of at least equal importance is the *content* of that experience; *who* is revealed (not only *how*) is of crucial concern for Paul. As a result perhaps the most helpful contribution that the Jewish mystical tradition has

to offer to a study of Paul's eschatology is the fact that it helps provide a context in which Pauline christology can develop. There is much to suggest that the [p. 267] most enduring feature arising from the overlap between apocalypticism and mysticism is the importance of the theme of revealed "glory" (Heb *kābôd* inherent within them (see Newman for a recent study of this and a critique of Segal's thesis). When applied to christological considerations this allows the shift from a theocentric to an anthropocentric fulfillment to take place. In other words, the common ground of apocalyptic and mysticism within Judaism allows Paul (and others) to see the risen Lord Jesus Christ as the agent of the fulfillment of God's eschatological purposes. The future revelation of Jesus Christ is, in Paul's words, closely connected with the manifestation of the glory of God (1 Cor 3:18; 4:4, 6).

7. Social Dynamics in Paul's Eschatological Teaching.

Considerable understanding into Paul's letters has been gained in recent years by applying the insights gained through sociological approaches to the documents (see Social-Scientific Approaches). This has also held true with respect to his eschatological teaching, especially when it is used to assess what W. Meeks has described as the "millenarian beliefs" of the congregations to which Paul responds. D. W. Kuck has carried the investigation a step further, examining the place that the judgment theme has within Paul's Corinthian correspondence and making some important observations about how such a futuristic eschatology functioned socially within the congregation.

Much work is yet to be done on this issue, particularly as it will help explain how eschatological ideas influenced (and perhaps even determined) the beliefs and practices of the congregations. Recognition of the social dimension of eschatological beliefs (see Sociology; Social-Scientific Approaches also enables us to discover the enduring relevance of Paul's teaching and begin to apply it to our own contemporary problems (as Glasswell points out). This is nowhere more acute for the contemporary situation than in the areas of human sexuality (matters involving sexual identity and role) and creation (matters involving ecology and the created order). In both instances eschatological perspectives can dictate both the interpretations accepted for these passages and the practices adopted by the Christian church in expressing them.

7.1. Galatians 3:27–28. In recent years this has become one of the most debated passages within the whole of the Pauline corpus, largely because of the implications it has for social conventions. The pericope opens with a declaration about the believing community as having been "baptized into Christ" and having "clothed yourselves with Christ," two images which are powerful symbols of a resurrection theology in Paul. In Galatians 3:28 Paul goes on to assert that unity in Christ transcends various human barriers: ethnic (Jew/Greek), economic (slave/free) and sexual (male/female).

Many would argue that the focus of the passage is on the means of entry into the community of faith, and that there is no difference between male and female on that point. But what does the passage imply about Paul's eschatological understanding of male-female relationships? Is Paul giving a programmatic statement about how human relationships should be conducted in the present, a manifesto for social activism? Or is he caught up in the enthusiasm of the moment and providing us with a visionary's glimpse of what the future ultimately will be like when Christ comes at the parousia to bring everything to its accomplishment? If so, what impact might this have upon the way that women are often assigned lower places of value and service in modern societies? Does not Paul challenge us with, in the enticing phrase of Scroggs, "the eschatological woman," whose place in society must be reassessed if we are to remain true to Paul's eschatological vision?

The "visionary" interpretation has been pursued by many, particularly as it does not necessarily demand that equality of role between men and women in the present order is what Paul intends. On the other hand, it is difficult to restrict the force of Galatians 3:27–28 to the future and not recognize its relevance for the present (see Man and Woman). The social implications (e.g., the role and ordination of women) are wide-ranging. No doubt Galatians 3:27–28 will continue to be a major focal point for contemporary theology (see MacDonald).

7.2. Romans 8:19–23. In these few short verses we have the most extensive discussion within the Pauline corpus about the future of the created order. As we mentioned above (see 3.7), the primary focus of the passage is to illustrate God's ultimate redemption of his children (Rom 8:23). Nevertheless, there clearly is an indication of God's concern for the created order (see Creation and New Creation), despite the fact that it has been tainted and suffers under the effects of Adam's disobedience (Gen 3 underlies the whole passage). God's concern that creation itself is worthy of being transformed and set free should inform our own attitudes toward it. Thus it is possible to integrate fully a protectionist stance toward creation and the environment within Paul's eschatological perspective. Indeed, it could be argued that to do so is to demonstrate our continuing revelation as the children of God (Rom 8:19).

In conclusion, it is clear that Paul's thought is [p. 268] thoroughly conditioned by an eschatological perspective in which Jesus Christ's death and resurrection are seen in some way to inaugurate the long-awaited age to come. Virtually every letter within the Pauline corpus reflects, to a greater or lesser degree, this eschatological viewpoint. Many of the key areas of Pauline teaching, such as ethics, christology and ecclesiology, share as common ground this eschatological perspective. All of this helps to make Pauline eschatology one of the main arenas of modern scholarly debate.

See also ADAM AND CHRIST; APOCALYPTICISM; CHRISTOLOGY; CREATION AND NEW CREATION; DYING AND RISING WITH CHRIST; ETHICS; EXALTATION AND ENTHRONEMENT; FIRST FRUITS, DOWN PAYMENT; GENTILES; GLORY, GLORIFICATION; HEAVEN, HEAVENLIES, PARADISE; HOLY SPIRIT; HOPE; IMMORTALITY; INTERMEDIATE STATE; ISRAEL; JUDGMENT; JUSTIFICATION; KINGDOM OF GOD/CHRIST; LIFE AND DEATH; MAN OF LAWLESSNESS AND RESTRAINING POWER; MYSTERY; MYSTICISM; PEACE, RECONCILIATION; RESTORATION OF ISRAEL; RESURRECTION; REWARDS; SALVATION; TRIUMPH; UNIVERSALISM; WRATH, DESTRUCTION.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. P. J. Achtemeier, "An Apocalyptic Shift in Early Christian Tradition: Reflections on Some Canonical Evidence," *CBQ* 45 (1983) 231–48; D. C. Allison, *The End of the Ages Has Come* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987); D. E. Aune, "(Early Christian) Eschatology," *ABD* II.594–609; idem, "The Significance of the Delay of the Parousia for Early Christianity," in *Current Issues in Biblical and Patristic Interpretation*, ed. G. F. Hawthorne (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975) 87–109; R. D. Aus, "God's Plan and God's Power: Isaiah 66 and the Restraining Factors of 2 Thess. 2.6–7," *JBL* 96 (1977) 537–53; W. Baird, "Pauline Eschatology in Hermeneutical Perspective," *NTS* 17 (1970–71) 314–27; M. Barker, "Slippery Words: Apocalyptic," *ExpT* 89 (1977–78) 324–29; R. J. Bauckham, "The Delay of the Parousia," *TynB* 31 (1980) 3–36; J. C. Beker, *Heirs of Paul: Paul's Legacy in the New Testament and in the Church Today* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991); idem, *Paul the Apostle: The Triumph of God in Life and Thought* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980, 2d ed. 1984); idem, *Paul's Apocalyptic Gospel: The Coming Triumph of God* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982); idem, "Recasting Pauline Theology: The Coherence-Contingency Scheme as Interpretative Model," in *Pauline Theology. Volume I: Thessalonians, Philippians, Galatians, Philemon*, ed. J. M. Bassler (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991) 15–24; idem, *The Triumph of God: The Essence of Paul's Thought* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990); M. C. de Boer, *The Defeat of Death* (JSNTS 22; Sheffield: Academic, 1988); idem, "Paul and Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology," in *Apocalyptic and the New Testament: Essays in Honor of J. Louis Martyn*, ed. J. Marcus and M. L. Soards (JSNTS 24; Sheffield: Academic, 1989) 169–90; G. Bornkamm, *Paul* (New York: Harper & Row, 1969); V. P. Branick, "Apocalyptic Paul?," *CBQ* 47 (1985) 664–75; F. F. Bruce, *Paul: Apostle of the Heart Set Free* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977) 300–13; G. B. Caird, *The Language and Imagery of the Bible* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1980) 201–71; W. Carr, *Angels and Principalities* (SNTSMS 42; Cambridge: University Press, 1981); J. J. Collins, ed., *Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre. Semeia* 14 (Missoula, MT: Scholars, 1979); J. M. Court, "Paul and the Apocalyptic Pattern," in *Paul and Paulinism: Essays in Honour of C. K. Barrett*, ed. M. D. Hooker and S. G. Wilson (London: SPCK, 1982) 57–66; O. Cullmann, "Le caractère eschatologique du devoir missionnaire et de la conscience apostolique de saint Paul. Étude sur le katevcon (- wn) de 2 Thess. 2:6–7," *RHPR* 16 (1936) 210–45; W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism* (4th ed.; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980); J. W. Drane, "Theological Diversity in the Letters of St. Paul," *TynB* 27 (1976) 3–26; E. E. Ellis, "II Corinthians V.1–10 in Pauline Eschatology," *NTS* 6 (1959–60) 211–24; A. J. Everson, "Day of the Lord," *IDBSup* 209–10; J. G. Gibbs, *Creation and Redemption: A Study in Paul's Theology* (NovTSup 26; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1971); J. Gillmann, "A Thematic Comparison: 1 Cor 15:50–57 and 2 Cor 5:1–5," *JBL* 107 (1988) 439–54; M. E. Glasswell, "Some Issues of Church and Society in the Light of Paul's Eschatology," in *Paul and Paulinism: Essays in Honour of C. K. Barrett*, ed. M. D. Hooker and S. G. Wilson (London: SPCK, 1982) 310–19; M. J. Harris, *Raised Immortal: The Relation Between Resurrection and Immortality in New Testament Teaching* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983); J. C. Hurd, *The Origin of 1 Corinthians* (2d ed.; Macon, GA: Mercer, 1983); E. Käsemann, "The Beginnings of Christian Theology," in *New Testament Questions of Today* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969) 82–107; idem, "On the Subject of Primitive Christian Apocalyptic," in *New Testament Questions of Today* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969) 108–37; B. N. Kaye, "Eschatology and Ethics in 1 and 2 Thessalonians," *NovT* 17 (1975) 47–57; L. Keck, "Paul and Apocalyptic Theology," *Int* 38 (1984) 229–41; S. Kim, *The Origin of Paul's Gospel* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982); B. Klappert, "King, Kingdom," *NIDNTT* 2.372–90; A. J. F. Klijn, "1 Thessalonians 4.13–18 and Its Background in Apocalyptic Literature," in *Paul and Paulinism: Essays in Honour of C. K. Barrett*, ed. M. D. Hooker and S. G. Wilson (London: SPCK, 1982) 67–73; L. J. Kreitzer, *Jesus and God in Paul's Eschatology* (JSNTS 19; Sheffield: JSOT, 1987); D. W. Kuck, *Judgment and Community Conflict: Paul's Use of Apocalyptic Judgment Language in 1 Corinthians 3:5–4:5* (NovTSup 66; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1992); J. R. Levison, "2 Apoc. Bar 48:42–52:7 and the [p. 269] Apocalyptic Dimension of Colossians 3:1–6," *JBL* 108 (1989) 93–108; A. T. Lincoln, *Paradise Now and Not Yet* (SNTSMS 43; Cambridge: University Press, 1981); D. R. MacDonald, *There is No Male and Female* (HDR 20; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987); I. H. Marshall, "Slippery Words: Eschatology," *ExpT* 89 (1977–78) 264–69; idem, "Is Apocalyptic the Mother of Christian Theology?" in *Tradition and Interpretation in the New Testament*, ed. G. F. Hawthorne with O. Betz (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987) 33–42; R. P. Martin, *The Spirit and the Congregation* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984); J. L. Martyn, "Apocalyptic Antinomies in the Letter to the Galatians," *NTS* 31 (1985) 410–24; C. L. Mearns, "Early Eschatological Development in Paul: The Evidence of I and II Thessalonians," *NTS* 27 (1981) 137–57; W. A. Meeks, "Social Functions of Apocalyptic Language in Pauline Christianity," in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East*, ed. D. Hellholm (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1983) 687–705; J. Moiser, "A Reassessment of Paul's View of Marriage With Reference to 1 Cor. 7," *JSNT* 18 (1983) 103–22; C. F. D. Moule, "The Influence of Circumstances on the Use of Eschatological Terms," *JTS* 15 (1964) 1–15; R. H. Mounce, "Pauline Eschatology and the Apocalypse,"

EvQ 46 (1974) 164–66; J. Munck, *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1977); C. C. Newman, *Paul's Glory- Christology: Tradition and Rhetoric* (NovTSup 69; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1992); idem, "Transforming Images of Paul: A Review Essay of Alan Segal, *Paul the Convert*," *EvQ* 64 (1992) 61–74; H. Ridderbos, *Paul: An Outline of His Theology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975); C. C. Rowland, *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity* (New York: Crossroad, 1982); J. P. Sampey, *Walking Between the Times* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1991); R. Schippers, "Goal, Last, End, Near, Complete," *NIDNTT* 2.52–66; H. J. Schoeps, *Paul: The Theology of the Apostle in the Light of Jewish Religious History* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1961); A. Schweitzer, *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle* (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1931); R. Scroggs, *The Last Adam* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1966); idem, "Paul and the Eschatological Woman," *JAAR* 40 (1972) 283–303; A. F. Segal, *Paul the Convert* (New Haven: Yale University, 1990); R. E. Sturm, "Defining the Word 'Apocalyptic': A Problem in Biblical Criticism," in *Apocalyptic and the New Testament: Essays in Honor of J. Louis Martyn*, ed. J. Marcus and M. L. Soards (JSNTS 19; Sheffield: Academic, 1989) 17–48; A. C. Thistleton, "Realised Eschatology at Corinth," *NTS* 24 (1978) 510–24; S. H. Travis, *Christ and the Judgment of God* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1987): 31–124; G. Vos, *The Pauline Eschatology* (Princeton: University Press, 1930); A. J. M. Wedderburn, "The Problem of the Denial of Resurrection in 1 Corinthians XV," *NovT* 23 (1981) 229–41; D. E. H. Whiteley, *The Theology of St. Paul* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1966); W. Wink, *Naming the Powers* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984); idem, *Unmasking the Powers* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986); B. Witherington, *Jesus, Paul and the End of the World* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1992); N. T. Wright, "Putting Paul Together Again," in *Pauline Theology*. Volume I: *Thessalonians, Philippians, Galatians, Philemon*, ed. J. M. Bassler (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991) 183–211.

L. J. Kreitzer